

NAME

EP 178 8/27/20.mp4

DATE

September 21, 2023

DURATION

2h 9m 31s

12 SPEAKERS

Del Bigtree

Jefferey Jaxen

Jonas Salk

Various speakers

Stephen Hahn

Alex Azar

Donald Trump

David Martin, PhD

Various news reporters

Savo Manojlovic (protester)

Dolores J. Cahill, PhD

Marcus de Brun, MD

START OF TRANSCRIPT

[00:00:59]

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 and donate now.

[00:01:39]

Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Wherever you are out there in the world, it's time to step out onto The HighWire. I'll bet you wish you were in Wuhan, China, the center of the epicenter, the epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic, because you know what they're doing there? They're partying like rock stars. That's right, this event had tens of thousands of people at the world's largest pool party, all while we were locked down. While we were in our basements, while we were wearing our masks, while we were social distancing, Wuhan, China is partying it up. Why are they partying? I don't know. Maybe because of this headline. "China cashes in on America's coronavirus lockdown." China's tech shipments surged. Here it is. "China's economy is getting a boost from soaring demand for tech products that make it easier and more efficient for Americans to" stay in jail. Wait, no, it says, "for Americans to work from home during the COVID-19 pandemic, according to economists at one Wall Street bank." Goes on to say, "Tech shipments from China soared 37% from a year earlier in the April-through-June quarter, contributing 2.4 percentage points to the country's overall export growth of 2%, wrote William Deng and Tao Wang, Hong Kong-based economists at investment bank UBS...Exports accounted for more than 18% of China's gross domestic product last year, and are helping the country's economy emerge from its COVID-19 recession faster than any other nation." I don't know. I hate to tell you I told you so, but I told you so.

[00:03:32]

You see, I have been complaining. I am saying that if China was attacking our borders, flying in planes and hitting us with ships and getting out, and then taking all of our jobs away, locking us into our basements, buying up all of our real estate, destroying everything we know to be the United States of America, how many people would we risk? What death rate would we risk to hold on to our freedom, to hold our borders and remain the United States of America? I assure you we would risk the lives of millions, and not those over the age of 65 that are dying from other co-morbidities. We would rush our youngest, best and brightest into that war to hold on to the dream of the United States of America. But because it's an invisible enemy, a virus that came from China, we are handing over everything we know to be true about this nation. At the risk of 0.26% of us dying, just nearing 200,000 total casualties, people who most likely were probably going to die this year anyway. We've even denied those people popular treatments like hydroxychloroquine and others. What is really going on here? Why is it no one seems to be looking at what's happening? We are losing our power. We are losing our strength. United States of America is on the verge of falling apart and handing over everything that made us great to the one nation in the world that is manufacturing.

[00:05:15]

They are in their business places. Their restaurants are open. They are partying like rock stars on our account. Does that bother you? Do you ask yourselves, who in America is supporting China right now? Supporting, wasn't there supposed to be a deadly epidemic there? How is it that they are through it and we are not? Why is it we are the only cars off of the track while China is there? We're taking a pit stop and they are running laps on us. They are going to win this race if we don't change our course of action. We're going to talk about a lot of that today. Changing courses of action, flip-flopping, changes. I've got David Martin from Plandemic coming up later in the show. Many of us said, who is this guy? One of the central figures in Plandemic, where did he come from? We're going to talk to him about his background, how he knows what he knows and perhaps where he thinks this is all going. But first, there's a lot of news going on, so let's get right to The Jaxen Report. Alright, Jefferey Jaxen. They're partying in Wuhan. We are depressed, we're committing suicide, we're drinking, we're drugging, the United States of America, we are not happy. It's really upsetting to see the dichotomy between two different sides of the planet right now. But while we're talking about the planet, there's a lot going on in the news, so take us through it.

[00:06:49]

There certainly is. You know, I was looking through the news and normally I pick 1 or 2 stories, but this time I took them all. So we're going to go through a lot of stories today. As Louisiana is bracing for the storm, and it is hitting as we speak, just to the east of that in Florida, they're bracing for a storm of their own in the form of a mosquito swarm. So in 2016, there was a headline that talked about the FDA calling out, saying that "...deploying genetically modified mosquitoes is environmentally safe." This a preliminary finding of no significant impact after a small field trial. And at the time, Zika was the excuse. That was during the Zika outbreak. This was a big deal, it was grabbing the headlines, so this idea gained some traction there, but then it kind of floundered. A lot of people pushed back. And here we go, it pops in the headlines again in June. It says, mosquitoes are, they've received full FDA approval for release. So, "Genetically engineered mosquitoes get EPA approval for Florida release despite objections from environmental groups." There was a Change.org petition, over 230,000 signatures. The EPA's comment section had over 30,000 comments. Only about 56 of them were positive, were for this. Even the Center for Food Safety, a gentleman by the name of J.D. Hansen, said, look, this is Jurassic Park without the island. He said the government basically has unlawfully refused to really study this thing fully, because they don't really know what's going on. So tracking this....

[00:08:24]

When I look into this, Jefferey, I mean, right in the middle of it, I'm sorry to interrupt you, but it feels like these are the types of things that we should be allowed to vote on. I don't know why we just hand this over. Why does the FDA get to make a decision that is irreversible? We cannot reverse this, right? I mean, once you have 750 million genetically modified mosquitoes flying around, it's not like you can go out with a vacuum cleaner and get them back. This is a decision that alters the course of nature forever. And when we start making choices like that and a couple of geeks that are probably getting paid in the back and who knows, right? I mean, corruption is always rampant. It just, these are those moments that you just think to yourself, what could possibly go wrong, and why is it I don't have a say in the matter? We have no idea what this is going to do to the food chain, for instance. You got to imagine mosquitoes are base level of the food chain. There's so much we don't know about what we're doing here. I mean, who's behind this? Isn't this another, you know, God complex moment by Bill Gates or am I wrong about that?

[00:09:29]

Well, it's a UK company, they were recently bought by an American company, so I haven't tracked down exactly who is releasing these mosquitoes. I mean, I don't, I haven't seen any pictures of Bill Gates going out there and popping them out himself. But what we do know from the science is that, you know, this was done in Brazil, Panama, Malaysia, way before Florida. And in Brazil, they did some of the first studies there, and it showed that these mosquitoes were breeding. So the idea was to take this species, give it a genetically modification so the males breed with the females and then their offspring don't live to adulthood. But what they found after a field experiment in 2013 to 2015 in Brazil, that the ones that were supposed to die weren't dying. So what they were finding was that they were, some of them were growing up, and they were passing this genetic modification onto other mosquitoes. So they were having fragments of that, that modification within them. So like you said, 750 million mosquitoes are due to be released sometime after January 2021 in Florida, and also, this is Monroe County, southern Florida. Also Harris County, Texas, will be beginning sometime in 2021. It's interesting, the article says, the location hasn't been determined yet. I'm wondering if that's because people will just take the boxes of eggs and move them. But that's just a speculation.

[00:10:53]

Well, it is like that famous moment, too, right, in Jurassic Park where the, you have the scientists and the mathematician, he's saying, you know, we bred them all to be, what is it, males or females, I forget, you know. And the one scientist, the Jeff Goldblum character, says, now nature finds a way. Nature always finds a way. You know, this is the problem. We keep messing with nature. For some of us, that means messing with God, but however you look at it, we just never seem to have any foresight in the long-term consequences of the things we do. In fact, I think there's one thing that I've learned, in all of my work now investigating science and really drilling down from the time that I was looking at psychology when I was working on the Dr. Phil Show and then of course, all the medical journals when I was working on the CBS talk show, The Doctors, where I won an Emmy Award, you start recognizing that scientists are the most short-sighted, narrow-vision human beings on the planet. And I mean that. I mean, they have a place, right? They have a goal, and they are so utterly focused on that goal that they deliver the exact point of the goal, but all the repercussions to the side, all of the side effects, any long-term damage or problems down the road, they don't even see it as their responsibility. Hey, I was just here to reach this goal and I did it and I want my award. The rest of you figure out the problems that I just created, and that's the world we live in. And then how do you get funding to fix problems when the real funding all went into whatever that new product or that new thing that's selling like hotcakes? These things are....Go ahead.

[00:12:25]

Yeah. And to your point, this goes into our next story, you want to call it man versus disease or man versus nature. And it's about polio. This has been ongoing throughout the headlines for so many years, and this is out of NPR and the headline reads, "Africa declares Wild Polio is Wiped Out - Yet it Persists in Vaccine-Derived Cases." In the article, it goes on to say, "...there's another type of polio that's problematic. Sixteen African nations are battling outbreaks of what's called 'vaccine-derived polio.' This is a form of polio that stems from the oral polio vaccine....'It's actually an interesting conundrum. The very tool you're using for [polio] eradication, is causing the problem,' Raul Andino, professor of microbiology at the University of California...told NPR in 2017." Very interesting headline. Now, the US stopped the oral polio vaccine in 1999 because of this very reason, because they knew the type two version of it would cause the vaccine-derived polio, and that's exactly what's been going on throughout a lot of these countries.

[00:13:28]

It's an amazing headline, really, like why even, it's like we're bragging, hey, we wiped out polio. One slight problem. Now all we have is some man-made mutant version of polio that's running around the planet. But we'll figure that out. We want to celebrate today. Hey, don't be negative. Let's stick to what's positive. Wild polio, natural polio, gone from Africa. But, you know, we do have this pesky little problem with the way we tried to wipe it out.

[00:13:54]

Yeah. And, you know, there was something called the switch, that's what it's referred to in the scientific literature and that was in 2016, where these countries switched over from a trivalent, which was type one, two and three polio, to a bivalent, which was only type one and three, to try to avoid this situation because it was the type two polio that was causing this vaccine-derived polio outbreaks. And I wrote a report, this was one of my Jaxen Reports. I titled it, "WHO's Problem? Vaccine-Derived Polio, Sanitation & Next Steps." And this was covering a report released by the Independent Monitoring Board of the Global Polio Initiative. And they were saying that vaccine two polio virus was spreading uncontrolled in West Africa, quote, bursting geographical boundaries. And talking about it was already endemic in the Democratic Republic of Congo, it was found in China, Nigeria, the Philippines. But it was also talking about that one of the reasons this thing spreads like this is because of the poor sanitation and they were saying in this report, it pulled no punches, I recommend anybody read this this report from this monitoring board. It was saying that the large number of doses of polio vaccine are needed because of the poor quality of sanitation and that most, the people most at risk, of course, are the ones with the limited access to fresh water and public service infrastructure. But the final thing that they said was, there's growing community distrust because they keep having to come around with these, they call them pulse polio campaigns where they come around and continue to inoculate these children. And the community is....

[00:15:30]

Over and over and over again, right? It's just not going away.

[00:15:31]

Yeah. The community was rebelling. They were refusing the vaccine and they were saying in this report, this isn't just a gesture. This is the distillation of anger for, the communities feel with these public workers coming to their doors continuously, but nothing's changed with the public infrastructure which was promised them.

[00:15:49]

Jefferey, as you know, we are working on a lawsuit through the International Criminal Court because of the use of the DTP vaccine that we now know is killing children all over the Third World, based on the work by Dr. Peter Aaby, Stabell Benn, others that are all saying, hey, we have a problem, this vaccine is really dangerous. And this is just one of those things, and it shows once again how Unicef, WHO, that are always being worshipped, really are not protecting these children. And to make that point, I think we should go back to Jonas Salk, we have a video of Jonas Salk, who's, you know, we say gave us the polio vaccine, is a hero. Look what he had to say about the live virus vaccine.

[00:16:32]

To bring us back to the question of polio, I can tell you now that the only countries of the world that have solved the polio problem completely are those that have used the kill virus vaccine alone. And amongst these are Sweden and Finland and Holland, parts of Canada. And it has now come to light in the United States, as we have known now since 1961 in the United States and prior to that in other countries, that the live virus vaccine for polio does cause the disease itself.

[00:17:08]

And I think there have been about 200 or more cases reported in the United States, have they not?

[00:17:12]

Not quite that many. 140 or so have been reported, but the likelihood is that the number's, as you say, 200 or more because of reporting problems. Now, I should tell you that the manufacturers in the United States who made the kill vaccine, when given the opportunity to make the live vaccine, which became more popular, withdrew from the business because they refused to undertake something that they did not themselves believe in, in the sense of having been aware of the data showing, from the very outset, that the live virus vaccine was causing polio.

[00:17:50]

I mean, it's outrageous. Look, all the way back in 1978, we know that this vaccine causes polio. Can I, should I just go ahead and assume the reason why anyone's using is just because it's cheaper or cheap, I'm going to guess it's about money.

[00:18:03]

Yeah, that's my understanding, it's cheaper and it's easier to give to children and then also the poor infrastructure is sometimes it's hard to update these health clinics with the newer versions. But yeah, the main reason seems to be it's cheap from what I've been able to gather.

[00:18:18]

And once again, when we, you know, the what could possibly go wrong scenario, I think that one of these things that we need to be careful of here in America as, and you and I, we've been tracking this. The WHO is actually very, very worried about this issue. Some of the problems that have been coming out, I remember when we were talking about this last year, is that there appears to be a period of time where people are infectious for a year before they have their own symptoms. So they're asymptomatic carriers with this man-made strain of polio or the virus strain of polio, so they can spread it for a year before they even know they have it, which makes contact tracing virtually impossible to figure out where these things came from. And even more alarming is that this, you know, it's one, two and three strains, this two strain, we are not being vaccinated for here in the United States of America. Our killed vaccine covers polio one and polio three. So there's a real concern right now that nobody's talking about in mainstream news that if this polio virus that is now spreading caused by vaccines somehow makes its way into America, we could really have a problem because, you know, everyone thinks they're covered, they think the vaccine's covering them.

[00:19:34]

I'll be honest, this is why I prefer no vaccines for my children, I want my children to have the most robust natural immune system, really so their immune system can defend themselves against any idiotic products made or not made or not designed correctly by the scientists that are playing God that are out there. In the end, one of these things is going to come after us and I would just prefer my children have a robust immune system that from the beginning of time has been great at protecting them. These are shocking stories, and again, it's like we put way too much trust in these scientists, don't we? We put them on a pedestal, we think they got it all covered, they got it all figured out, and now we have a strain sweeping the world that could end up hurting a lot of people in America. Great story, thank you Jefferey for sharing that.

[00:20:20]

You're welcome, it's truly a Pandora's Box, and speaking of vaccine scientists, we reported recently that the Russians were, the Russians are coming, the Russians were here with their vaccine and the world was up in arms. But apparently now it looks like they're leaving, in the form of a defection. So this is out of Daily Mail. The headline reads, "Russia's top Respiratory Doctor Quits Over 'Gross Violations' of Medical Ethics That Rushed Through Putin's Coronavirus 'Vaccine.'"

[00:20:44]

No, rushing of vaccine. A scientist is upset about that, shocking. So what's this guy up to, what's he saying?

[00:20:53]

Well, this is Russia's leading respiratory doctor, he's quit "over 'gross violations' of medical ethics that rushed through Putin's coronavirus vaccine. Professor Alexander Chuchalin quit the Russian health ministry's ethics council after making a fierce attack on the new Sputnik V drug ahead of the body approving its registration." Now, this isn't just a regular guy, this isn't some regular doctor. He said, "...the safety criteria for a vaccine must also be long-term and this becomes clear only with long-term observation - at least two years." Now, this guy created the Russian Research Institute of Pulmonology. He has the Department of Hospital Therapy and the National at the Russian National Research Medical University. So he is, you know, you want to call him a health luminary there, a health leader, but he's not the only one. So there's two more Russian officials that were quoted in this article. Another one, his name is Professor Alexander Tschepurnoff, he's the head of Laboratory for Hazardous Disease at the Vector Institute. And he developed a vaccine, he's worked with developing coronavirus vaccines, and he talks about the antibodies. So in his quote, he says that, "Time is needed...antibodies are different. In some situations - and for coronavirus, this is already known - the infection intensifies with some antibodies. It should be known which antibodies the vaccine produces." So here we talk, this guy is talking about the science, and then we have a third guy, his name is Vladimir Chekhonin. He's the Vice President of the Russian Academy of Sciences. And he warned this, he warned on the ethics issue of that. And his quote was, "'We cannot conduct experiments on humans,' said the respected immunologist. This is a gross violation of the international Nuremberg Code. We are just making fools of ourselves with this early vaccine that can bring us lots of trouble." Boy, if the US scientists started talking like this at that at those levels.

[00:22:47]

Right, isn't that really, I mean, these are the things that are so disturbing because we sort of look down on Russia and its science, as we talked about when this vaccine first was announced just a couple of weeks ago. They're calling it Sputnik V, as though it's another race to the moon or a race to Mars, it's a race to this vaccine. Clearly now we're racing each other and scientists in Russia are jumping ship big time for all the same reasons, by the way, that our nonprofit, the Informed Consent Action Network, that makes The HighWire possible for everybody, we have written the FDA, we had a petition go to the FDA. We've demanded a placebo group be added in the third phase trials, that is happening. We also have other petitions have gone forward saying exactly this. You cannot give this vaccine to children until it has been tested for 2 or 3 years showing long-term side effects. This is, it's amazing to see scientists around the world making this argument. The idea that we're going to warp speed our version of this vaccine, to possibly be here, what, before an election or before the end of the year, it's total madness. You know, we got a copy of the report coming out about this vaccine. I just want to read a couple of things that stood out to us.

[00:24:00]

This is how it came to us. So we had a friend of ours who, by the way, said you don't want to go back to Russia. You know, I left that nation because you don't know what it's like to be spied on and tracked and have no freedom and have people turning each other in. Why is the United States of America so easily rolling over to become what so many of us left that Eastern bloc for, to the freedom that was offered in America? But our friend Christina read through this, and here's what some of the things we thought were interesting. It says, "The vaccine is prepared in a biotechnological way by which the human-pathogenetic virus SARS-CoV-2 is not used. It consists of two components:" --so it's not the virus-- "It consists of two components: component I and II. Component I contains recombinant adenovirus vector based on human adenovirus 26 serotype carrying gene of protein S-virus SARS-CoV-2, and component II same thing, but an adenovirus-5 serotype...Immunological properties and vaccine safety studied in clinical study in adult healthy volunteers both genders age 18 to 60: 9 volunteers received component I, 9 component II and 20 as prime-boost." Now, I read that as I believe it looks like there's 18, nine and nine and then 20, 38, somebody might say that that 20 contains them.

[00:25:26]

But it looks like at best we have 38 people that were involved in this trial and they were jumping up and down saying, we're ready to go to the population. No doubt, no reason. This is the reason why scientists are jumping ship. I believe it goes on to say that, you know, there was, "The protective titer of antibodies is currently unknown. The duration of protection is unknown. Clinical studies on epidemiological effectiveness have not been conducted," so they don't even know. "In an open clinical study of the safety, tolerability and immunogenicity of the drug Gam-COVID-Vac, negative side effects (NSA) by frequency of occurrence may be regarded as occurring frequently and very often." That sounds like the Moderna's vaccine description. "It is not possible to determine more accurate occurrence of adverse events due to the limited sample of the study participants." So frequent. And by the way, this adenovirus vector virus approach sounds a lot like the Oxford, the AstraZeneca vaccine that's being attempted at Oxford University right now. They're using, just so that people understand, they're using essentially a virus that our body doesn't really react to, an adenovirus. They're putting a gene of the SARS-CoV, so that's just a delivery system. It's like a little spaceship that goes in with your body with the gene in it.

[00:26:46]

I think something interesting when I'm looking at this study is it appears they're using two different adenoviruses, which would address an issue a lot of scientists are talking about, where if you use the same adenovirus, the first time it enters the body, our immune systems are going to see it and develop antibodies. So if you need a booster shot, that second shot like at Oxford, there may be a problem that the body will fight the adenovirus and stop it from delivering that gene. So it looks like Russia may be trying to get around that by using two different adenoviruses hoping the second one is not recognized by the body. That's about all that we've gleaned from that. But I think in the middle of this is the big dark question that we got really deep in the weeds on last week, is this, as the scientists are pointing out, in Russia, too? Is this going to create that immune enhancement problem, as that scientist said, where we don't know what antibodies. Remember last, if you didn't see our show last week, then we went through this explanation. But if you're just creating binding antibodies, they say lots of antibodies produced, but if it's only binding antibodies, then binding antibodies don't kill the virus. In fact, they can just hide the virus or drive it deeper into the body where you have an overreaction, this immune enhancement that kills animals in the animal trials.

[00:28:03]

It's killed children with other vaccines that had this issue. So obviously, scientists in Russia are screaming and yelling from the mountaintops for good reason. We should all be yelling from the mountaintops, slow down and test more. I was just, I just spoke at the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices yesterday, Jefferey, and that's all I talked about, all I said to them. Of course, it was like, you know, over Zoom, but I got selected, I was the first one to speak yesterday. And I said, you were on the verge at ACIP for doing something that's never been done. You could easily kill innocent people at numbers that have never been expected before. I warned them about immune enhancement. Obviously warnings happening in Russia too. It's an amazing story, isn't it? I mean, while we watch, you know, heads of countries rushing and trying to force the science, you have a defection. I think we even really are seeing a defection in America with about, I think it was, as you reported, 400 doctors, including Dr. Paul Offit and Peter Hotez, who definitely know how vaccines work, signing a letter to Donald Trump saying do not rush these trials, this is dangerous.

[00:29:13]

Yeah, you know, it's funny too, we always see that the Russians are sowing vaccine misinformation, that's the headlines we've seen for the last couple of years. But really, it seems like they're out front with the ethics piece and questioning the science with those 400 doctors, including Paul Offit, so what of a change of events in the last two years. You mentioned AstraZeneca. Astrazeneca was in the news last month in Reuters, and it said AstraZeneca would be exempt from coronavirus vaccine liability claims in most countries. "This is a unique situation" --it says-- "where we as a company simply cannot take the risk if in...four years the vaccine is showing side effects," Ruud Dobber, a member of Astra's senior executive team, told Reuters." Now, Dobber wouldn't name the countries that were granted the request of liability from immunity, but this is a shocking thing to report because, as we know in America, we don't even have that advantage because the courts took that away or yeah, it's exempt, Congress took that away. And so now after that month, we moved to Brussels, we moved to Belgium, this is Brussels Times reports that "Belgian experts 'shocked' as AstraZeneca Seeks liability waiver for vaccines." So welcome to the US, Belgium. "Thierry Vansweevelt, professor of medical law" --it says-- "at the University of Antwerp called the request 'very exceptional' and even 'slightly shocking,' in light of existing EU regulations on companies' liability for what they put on the market. 'There is a European directive on product liability,' Vansweevelt said. 'Any producer who places a defective product on the market is responsible for that without exceptions. You can't escape that.'" Well, you kind of can if you're in the US.

[00:30:57]

Yeah, yeah, escape to the US where we don't protect our citizens, they have no recourse. You can't sue the manufacturer, there's no market force of a lawsuit that can make them make a better product. It's, I mean, both of these stories are really quite shocking because I think we hold ourselves in regard as like American exceptionalism, the best science in the world, the best data keepers, you know, advancing the world as we know it. And then you hear the most obvious like third grade questions like, they are going to be liable, right, in Belgium, or we are going to test this for at least two years coming out of Russia, and in America, it's like, lalalalala, no, we're just awesome. We just nail it and we don't need to sue anybody because, hey, everything is awesome, everything is perfect. It's really crazy.

[00:31:45]

Yeah. You know, it's like people ask those questions and you hear, shut up, anti-vaxxer, and then the rest of the world starts asking it and you go, wait, wait, that's actually a pretty good question, I'm sorry I called you an anti-vaxxer.

[00:31:56]

That's a really good point. You know, in America, if you question the fact that you want a long-term safety study or you actually want liability on the product, you get called names, you must be an anti-vaxxer. You must be out of your mind. What, for wanting actual science, for wanting long-term studies, for wanting product liability. I mean, it's absolutely mind-blowing, and again, they keep blaming me for, you know, it's Del Bigtree and the anti-vaccine movement, Robert F Kennedy Jr are going to keep this vaccine from reaching its herd immunity place. Where are you talking about the 400 doctors that usually argue with me saying, yeah, we stand right behind Del. And so Del is leading the way. He's right. Super scary vaccine. "Nation's leading vaccine authorities urge thorough review of safety and efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines." That's the group, 400 doctors. Why aren't they being called anti-vaxxers? Oh, I don't know, because they're scientists. It's about time these scientists stepped up and demanded, by the way, demanded the type of safety study, not a single vaccine we're giving our kids right now has been through. That's what's so shocking. And that's where I think this story is really going to unfold over the next months in years, if we have any say in the matter.

[00:33:06]

I agree with that, I agree with that. So let's talk from, let's talk from therapies that don't really exist in this physical reality, which is the unicorn COVID vaccine, to therapies that may have some potential. So last week, this was last Friday, Trump came out and made an announcement about convalescent plasma therapy. He announced the federal government granted the emergency use access to treat COVID patients with convalescent plasma therapy, so this is where the blood plasma is taken from people who have beat the virus and put in people who are fighting the virus. It's been used for over 100 years, even since the 1930s it was used in several infectious diseases. Very safe and, you know, we have a clip from this, and this clip is fascinating because this is Alex Azar, head of HHS, Stephen Hahn, head of FDA, and this is them talking about this plasma therapy.

[00:34:00]

So in the independent judgment of experts and expert scientists at FDA who have reviewed the totality of data, not just the data from this expanded access program, but more than a dozen published studies, as well as the historical experience associated with this. Those scientists have concluded that COVID-19 convalescent plasma is safe and shows promising efficacy, thereby meeting the criteria for an Emergency Use Authorization.

[00:34:28]

The data we gathered suggests that patients who were treated early in their disease course, within three days of being diagnosed, with plasma containing high levels of antibodies, benefited the most from treatment. We saw about a 35% better survival in the patients who benefited most from the treatment, which were patients under 80 who were not on artificial respiration. I just want to emphasize this point because I don't want you to gloss over this number. We dream in drug development of something like a 35% mortality reduction. This is a major advance in the treatment of patients. This is a major advance.

[00:35:13]

So those are amazing statements, right? I mean, it's really I mean, fantastic, 35% reduction. I keep thinking about all the doctors that have been discussing hydroxychloroquine when they say, you know, Ford Medical Center said 50% reduction. When you talk to Zelenko and and Didier Raoult in France, they're saying, 98% success rate. I think they said an 88% reduction or something. But either way, this is a great product. I'm already seeing headlines where Fauci say, well, this has already been around, it's not ready for everybody. I mean, again, it's just like, whatever Donald Trump says, the media has just got to attack it, right. I swear, if Donald Trump came out and said, you know, everybody should probably drink more water, I am sure they would attack him, saying, don't you know people drown in swimming pools every year? I mean, it's getting ridiculous. But so we've got this great product that's out there and a 30% reduction is fantastic. When I saw this, it made me think about something that I've been enjoying in watching with Donald Trump. We know that, I don't agree with his warp speed with the vaccine. I stand with a lot of scientists that that is really dangerous. But most of the time when we hear him, he's been saying, hey, I'm not going to force anybody to get that vaccine. It's going to be available for frontline workers and those that need it first, and of course, that's what the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices was all about yesterday. If we have a limited supply, who gets it first is a big conversation. But what I've appreciated about Donald Trump is, he's not just only talking vaccine, which is what Tony Fauci seems fixated on, what Bill Gates is fixated on. They're the ones saying we will never get back to normal. Leaders of Australia, you got the Virginia health minister saying, the vaccine, as soon as it's here, it's the only way forward. I appreciate that Donald Trump has remained focused on treatments. Here's him discussing this from the White House with the Fox Medical examiner.

[00:37:15]

Are we going to beat this virus?

[00:37:16]

We're going to beat it, yeah, we're going to beat it. And with time, you're going to beat it. Time. You know, I say it's going to disappear. And they say, oh, that's terrible, he said, well, it's true. I mean, it's going to disappear. Before it disappears. I think we can knock it out before it disappears, that's what I want. And if I had my choice of vaccines or therapeutics, give me therapeutics every time because I'd love to walk into a hospital and give everybody something and they start walking out in two days, that's what I'd like. Vaccine is very good longer term, but give me therapeutics and we're doing really good work therapeutically.

[00:37:48]

I just want to say, this is actually a statement I make when I'm interviewed by The New York Times or the Washington Post or anybody. I always say, look, it's perfectly noble to want to protect people from a virus. You know, it's noble to want to create a vaccine, if it's safe, if it makes it through the safety process. But I said, I believe that we should have more faith in scientists being able to create products for those that actually need them. And this is where I completely agree with President Trump, is a treatment is far better than the vaccine because vaccines always have risks. This is why Russia is defecting. That's why you have 400 scientists really worried because despite this belief that vaccines are just safe and effective by nature, they are not. They cause serious injury. We've won multiple lawsuits against the National Institute of Health, the FDA, CDC, all this because of the issues around vaccines. And the problem with vaccines is they're given to perfectly healthy people that don't need them. You will hear that 90% or more, 99 they argue for like the measles vaccine in New Jersey, that 99% of us need this vaccine in order for it to work, whereas a treatment only needs to be given to, right now, 0.26%. 0.26, one quarter of 1% of people in the world, die from COVID-19.

[00:39:07]

We should care about them. We should take care of them. And if a plasma or an HCQ or something like that can help those people, the rest of us move on with our lives, take your vitamins, eat your food, live your life. There is no reason to subject perfectly healthy people to the adverse effects that come from every pharmaceutical product. Why give something to perfectly healthy people if you have something for the sick? That makes perfect sense and I couldn't agree more with Donald Trump on this issue. I don't agree on everything, but on this I am absolutely with him. Treatments are way better than vaccines. Think about it. A treatment's side effects, everything has side effects. If we just say they all have the same side effect, giving something to 0.26% of people, a quarter of 1%, means your side effects are going to affect, what, 100th of 1%, whereas you give this to 99% or 100% of the population, like they want to, 7.5 billion people, do you know with just a 1% problem or a 10% side effect is going to do, it is devastating. This is why, I can keep making this argument all day, but you get the idea.

[00:40:18]

Yeah, yeah, absolutely. Well, those are great points. The plasma therapy is already getting the, we'll call it the hydroxychloroquine treatment in the media. It's already getting pushed back. But really the only thing they can say about it, because it's not dangerous, is that there's no double-blind, randomized placebo-controlled trials, they're complaining about that. But that's the purpose of an Emergency Use Authorization, so you can get those going. So they're not much of a leg to stand on, but yet it's still being attacked. And you mentioned hydroxychloroquine earlier, so speaking of that, last week, Senators Ron Johnson, Mike Lee and Ted Cruz sent a letter to FDA Commissioner Stephen Hahn, and they were asking for all the studies and the medical papers used to inform the FDA that hydroxychloroquine had no clinical effect and may be harmful. And in the letter, it's in the letter it quoted that they, you know, they had talked to a lot of physicians, they said, "The physicians are concerned that the FDA's actions regarding HCQ may be directly costing lives by limiting outpatient access to this potentially beneficial treatment." Now, that was last week, those were due by the 25th of August so presumably all that data is in the hands of the Senators and they're going through that. What I see with this is they're taking this fight, I guess you want to call it, to non-politicize a treatment and get this thing out there. They're taking it from social media censorship, a social media battleground, to more of an officialdom of the Senators and whatever department needs to get involved to make this thing happen. So the censorship won't affect the conversation as much, that's that's how I interpret this.

[00:41:51]

It's so unfortunate that this thing has turned into a political football because people's lives are hanging in the balance. But whatever senators or congressmen are out there, it's good to know that somebody, obviously is getting onto social media because you're not going to get the hydroxychloroquine study from CNN or anywhere. Fox, I have to say Fox has done, they've covered it a little bit, but we've been on this from the beginning, all the way back when this was first announced by Didier Raoult I believe in April, we have been talking about hydroxychloroquine. And finally, you have government officials getting involved. I suppose it took, and these are the things, right? We think about censorship, the censorship of the America's Frontline Doctors, those doctors that risked their careers as we know at the front of it. What's her name? Gold. I remember last name Gold. The doctor, Simone Gold, I think she lost her job at the hospital she was working at. I believe she's working on a lawsuit right now simply for coming forward and giving the evidence, the eyewitness accounts of the patients that they were treating with hydroxychloroquine, just like Vladimir Zelenko, who came on our show. We interviewed him for almost an hour discussing all the details of the success he had with hydroxychloroquine. Facebook pulled that video down and made it so that no one could see it. This type of censorship obviously scares some politicians. It should scare every American on the planet since it's only our First Amendment rights that are under attack.

[00:43:15]

But this is really, I think that. You know, I've been saying, we've been talking about this, I think hydroxychloroquine is going to end up being arguably probably the biggest part of this entire story. I think that when you look at the science, it is clear this is an effective treatment. We know it's safe because of the 65 years of use. So when you have the FDA halting it or Cuomo stopping the use of it in a state or Fauci speaking out against it, I think these individuals are going to really have to answer to this and it may be criminal. I think that criminal charges should be discussed with anyone that denied this treatment when it was so clear the science was there. And by the way, for all those people out there saying, well, we need a double-blind study like all these, you know, Tony Fauci, show me the double-blind placebo study of any of the childhood vaccines we gave our kids. Show me the MMR double-blind study against the placebo. Show me the DTaP against the placebo. I'm really glad all of you scientists and you pundits at CNN are screaming, we need a placebo group. Show me one for a vaccine, because this is what our science has done. Our investigators found this out. Down there would be a placebo. Not one of the vaccines we gave our children was ever tested the way that Tony Fauci is saying he wants it to for blood plasma or HCQ.

[00:44:32]

Not once, not ever, did we have a placebo group except for one, one caveat, one tiny little group in the Gardasil vaccine trials. And then they threw out the evidence of what happened there. So these are, I mean, I love that they're saying it, right. I love that they're back in the corner, I love that they're gunning for it, because this is going to make it easier to fire them and move in people that actually have talent and care about human lives. And it's also going to open up the discussion that we've been all alone on with ICAN and The HighWire, ICAN being our nonprofit. And while we're talking about it, for those of you that are watching right now and you're new to this show, this is a completely transparent show. We are not just going to talk about these issues and show you the headlines and the excerpts that we want you to see. All you have to do right now to read every article that we're talking about here with Jefferey Jaxen is type in ICAN. If you're watching on Facebook, just type that in the comments and we'll send you all of the information, the studies, everything we're discussing here so that you can read it and you can come to your own informed conclusion. If you're not on Facebook, if you're watching on our website, which is up and running and doing so much better, we've worked hard to get streaming happening so you'll always find us at thehighwire.com.

[00:45:46]

But if you're watching here, all you do is text us at 33222 and type in ICAN as the message and we will text you links to everything we're talking about. These lawsuits, we've been all alone on the beginning of this, filing lawsuits against Health and Human Services, the FDA, the CDC, in order to get the truth out there. Well, now Fauci and everybody, Paul Offit, are outing themselves, they are proving our point. Everything should get a saline placebo study. There should be tens of thousands of people involved in the third phase trial, as Dr. Paul Offit is demanding of the COVID-19 vaccine. But you would be shocked if you looked at one of our older shows. The MMR vaccine that was approved that our children are using had less than, I think, 900, it was about 800 total participants, not 30,000, no saline placebo group anywhere to be found. This is the work we're doing, and if you want to support our lawsuits and our ongoing work that our non-profit's involved in, The HighWire that you watch here every week that brings you the truth that nobody else is bringing you, has a half of the work that we do is one of the world's greatest legal teams that works directly with scientists to bring lawsuits and to bring truth and to help other defenses and to get involved in depositions like the Stanley Plotkin and doctors like that get brought forward, we make sure that the people, the lawyers that are doing those depositions are well-educated.

[00:47:13]

You can support that. You can help us do all of this work by simply going to icandecide.org. No one else funds us but you. We're asking for \$20 for 2020. Just donate to ICAN, make it a recurring donation. If you can't afford the \$20 a month, which is really about four lattes, you know, cut back on the lattes and go ahead and send us \$20 a month. But even if it's \$1 a month, it helps us do the work we're doing. And guess what? For everybody that is a recurring donor, no matter how much you're donating, you get a newsletter every Monday now that, it's not just that link we send from ICAN, it lays out all of the information with a description so that you can sort of reflect on the show, the parts you want, and it allows you those links so that you can develop the talking points so that you can have these conversations with your friends that are not being told the truth. You'll have a real ability to discuss these things with science on your side. I just want to get that all out there. Alright, back to business, there's still more in the headlines.

[00:48:23]

So you mentioned Fauci. Dr. Anthony Fauci has been silent as of late, and there might be a pretty good reason for that. It was reported that he underwent vocal cord surgery. This was just recently. "Fauci undergoes vocal cord surgery to remove polyp." The report says he'll be unable to speak normally for nearly a month. So he's been out, Doctor Atlas you saw has been put in there, Fauci kind of nowhere to be found. But what's interesting is in his absence, the CDC has made sweeping changes to the coronavirus recommendations. Three of them to report here. So first of all, they made, The New York Times reports that they are now telling people without COVID-19 symptoms they do not need testing. In the article, this is a gigantic situation, in the article, it says, the CDC, "...that people who have been in close contact with an infected individual - typically defined as being within six feet of a person with the coronavirus and for at least 15 minutes - 'do not necessarily need a test' if they do not have symptoms. Exceptions, the agency noted, might be made for 'vulnerable' individuals or if health care providers or state or local public health officials recommend testing." So I went and looked at these and it says, if you work in a nursing home or a long care facility, you do need a test. And then it said, if you've been in a high transmissible, COVID transmissible area with more than ten people who aren't wearing masks or aren't social distancing, you don't necessarily need a test. So that is fascinating turn of events when it comes to this, but it doesn't stop there.

[00:50:03]

The CDC goes on further. It says it recommends now that the 14-day travel quarantine, they no longer need that. So "The CDC no longer recommends 14-day self quarantine for travelers." The agency removed its recommendations for travelers to complete a 14-day quarantine if they're coming in from the country or even state to state. Now, what I see this doing is this possibly sets up some fights at the state level. We already saw California Governor Newsom say he's not going to adhere to this. So it's almost as if the CDC is saying, hands up, we're hands off, the federal government's hands off, you states do your own thing. You've kind of been doing that anyway but now it seems like it's going to be a state situation, which will be very interesting to see how that unfolds. And then the final point on the CDC, and this was July 31st, this was on masking. So this was the CDC's "Public health guidance for community-related exposure." This is directions for health care personnel to follow while making decisions at the community level. So under factors to consider when assessing a close contact, it says, "While research indicates masks may help those who are infected from spreading the infection, there is less information regarding whether masks offer any protections for a contact exposed to a symptomatic or asymptomatic patient." So make of that what you will, Del, this is a fascinating chain of events and it's hitting multiple angles of what we thought the coronavirus response was from the federal level, it's almost rewritten at this point.

[00:51:34]

It's really outrageous, right. Essentially saying, well, if you're around people that are infected, whether they're wearing a mask or you're wearing a mask, we really can't determine that it has any value whatsoever. I mean, this is, and this is what really starts pissing me off. We're walking around like this while in Wuhan, China, that started this whole thing, they are partying like rock stars, shoulder to shoulder in gigantic swimming pools. And, you know, when we look at these stories with the CDC, I have multiple theories on this that are just like, that are like, there's a battle going on. It's like a war going on in my head and I think about two things. One thing is that, you know, Redfield's, that's the head of the CDC, normally, he should have, Robert Redfield should have been the head voice through this entire thing, but he sort of got sidelined very early on and Tony Fauci took over. That gave me the impression that Fauci has a different agenda, that Redfield didn't fit the agenda, and I've been suspecting for some time that Redfield does not agree with this. You know, this is a theory, I'm going to put this out, a lot of things, we bring up facts, right. But I wonder if Redfield from the beginning was just like, this is a cold, everybody. Like, what are you talking about? You got, CDC's got to make up, you know, 100 million tests right away. And he's thinking, why? Alright, I mean, I'll make some tests. And then he gets buried for not getting the tests out in time. And he just got rolled over by the agenda train, right.

[00:53:02]

You don't understand. We were going to push the forced vaccination program with us, and you're getting on our way. And so the moment you have Fauci out of the way, it's like Redfield is like, you know what? All of this is ridiculous. It's not necessary. Now, I don't know if he's behind it. I also question now, we know that, as you pointed out earlier, Scott Atlas is inside the White House. Is he somehow involved. We know that Scott Atlas, Dr. Scott Atlas, who's now on the recovery team for COVID-19, we know that he's been very outspoken on simply protecting those that are elderly and at risk, but the rest of us getting out, let's get to herd immunity, let's move on so that we can save the economy, something that we have been talking about for a very long time here on The HighWire. All of these things would seem to say, asymptomatic carriers mean you're healthy people. You don't even know you have it. And there's an added benefit to this, right. Number one, we get to herd immunity quicker. Number two, we pound the hospitals, as soon as people are running in the hospitals get tested all the time, you're distracting your doctors that need to care for that acute group that are coming that actually have symptoms. And I also think you have a hypochondria or, you know, a psychosomatic event that if someone tests positive, they're going to rush into the doctor when maybe they didn't have an issue before. And I think, most importantly, what really could be behind this and should be, is here Donald Trump, you know, again, the President of the United States of America.

[00:54:32]

I'm not choosing sides on this, I'm just saying this is the guy that's leading our country right now. He did everything he could to fund the all the extra testing, right, so that we could contact trace the entire country, and all the media did was make a headline over the rising numbers of COVID-19 and the president kept saying, we are just doing more testing. The numbers are going up because there's more tests. We're just more aware of everybody that has this cold, and yes, it is a cold. It may be a bad cold, but you can't argue with me that this isn't a cold. A coronavirus is one of the viruses that we call the common cold. So all of a sudden, the media keeps trying to scare us. But you know what they did? They scared us out of being able, they scared Europe out of allowing us to travel there and China out of allowing us to travel. We have essentially locked ourselves in a prison in America because our newspapers, that are clearly funded by pharma and other interests, are trying to scare us and therefore are scaring the world and destroying that inter-reaction, that ability to travel, because of the misrepresentation that's going on here. So I say good on them. What difference does it make whether or not, you know, the numbers are going up because we're testing more, and I think that you take it away. And my final question would be this, Jefferey, honestly, what single advantage have we seen from all of the testing? Have we seen some, we don't see products.

[00:55:56]

I mean, you're testing people, you're freaking them out. And then every time there's a product available to them, you make them terrified of the product. So we're basically testing you and telling you the only thing you can do is absolutely nothing. And if you get really sick, let us ram a ventilator down your throat, which, Dr. Neu, I know you're watching, he's like Del, they don't ram ventilators down your throat. The ventilator's the entire machine, you know, it's the intubation tube. I get that, Dr. Neu. But here's the point. What advantage have we had? We keep saying all of this testing is going up. We've recognized that if we're going to open our restaurants, if we're going to open our offices, at some point, it's just going to go up. We're going to have to let people get this illness or stay locked down, what should be 2 or 3 years if you want a safe vaccine. So what are we going to do, just destroy the world as we know it, have like food shipped, we can just drink syrup as a food because nobody can produce anything? It's a ridiculous approach and the testing just gets in the way of reality, which is, Sweden's already got herd immunity. China either has herd immunity or doesn't care. If we want to be in the game, if we want to hold on to this nation, I think we need just to move forward. It's an amazing time though, isn't it?

[00:57:10]

It's an incredible time and this is why we're hitting all these articles, because there's just so many. Let's not forget, the CDC's early guidance said that the testing shouldn't be used to inform decisions about going back to school, going back to work. I mean, there's so many issues with the testing. And then just the testing itself, there are scientific questions around the PCR testing that still, you know, still unresolved. But the CDC does recommend for vulnerable populations across the board that they still get tested, people working in health care facilities. But speaking of vulnerable populations, we finally see some movement on the Department of Justice. Now, this comes with the nursing home scandal that's been ongoing and heartbreaking. Every time I report this, it's just more and more bad news, but here's some good news. The Department of Justice is now investigating nursing homes and they put out a press release. The agency's civil rights division is collecting data and deciding whether to start investigations under what's called the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act. This is in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan. So it's asking the governors of those states and the health officials to submit data, and they're going to see if they're going to start an investigation. Now, this started just like it started with hydroxychloroquine, it started with some Congress, people in Congress and Senators sending letters, asking questions and saying, look, we want your data that you use to inform these decisions about hydroxychloroquine. They said the same thing about the nursing homes. Show us your data of why you made these decisions and why you kept them going. So now we have the Department of Justice involved. It'll be very interesting to see what's going to come from this, and if anything does come from it, better believe it'll be front page headlines everywhere. And I hope it does.

[00:58:52]

I think so, too, and this is a gigantic story we've been on from the beginning. New York is a disaster. It's amazing to watch Anthony Fauci say, you know, New York did it right, we hold them up as the example for the world with literally one of the highest death rates the world has ever seen, especially in nursing homes. The cover up of the actual deaths by not listing people that end up dying in the hospital that got the illness in the nursing homes. Andrew Cuomo all week has been screaming and yelling and stomping his feet over the fact that the CDC is changing regulations about quarantine and the other things. Meanwhile, he has been thwarting an investigation into these nursing homes, so I guess that's forced the Department of Justice to get involved here. So, again, Jefferey, I just, these are the things that make me proud about the work that we do, because CNN isn't talking about this, right? MSNBC isn't talking about this. Fox touches on it here and there, CBS, ABC. You know, if it weren't for The HighWire, I don't think that anybody would know that these things were going on. Nursing home issues, ventilator deaths. We were the ones that brought a lot of focus to Dr. Kyle-Sidell.

[01:00:03]

New York's a disaster. And look, I don't, I'm not into calling names except when the people at the top making the decisions call everybody else a name, call the President of the United States a name. There's a lot of blaming going on here. And we've got to learn something. We've got to learn what took place here. Was this virus worthy of destroying our economy over? Is 0.26% a death rate that we will hold to? Is there every virus that is on track for 0.26%, a quarter of 1%, of those infected, you know, could die do we lock down our economy? Because honestly, that's like the flu, virtually every other year is on track for that. So we are looking at a totally different world where we wear masks all the time, quarantine all the time, and it appears to me nothing has changed. Jefferey, fantastic job this week. That was a lot to try and get ahold of. And I just want to thank you for your continued work. You're such a valuable asset to The HighWire. We've been at this for some time, so keep up the good work, we really appreciate it.

[01:01:07]

It's a pleasure and I appreciate everyone's attention and thank you. See you next week.

[01:01:11]

Alright, see you next week. Well, if you are one of those people in the United States of America that still knows how to read, you should check out The Jaxen Report. Of course I'm joking with you, but The Jaxen Report is a written newspaper, essentially, by discussing a lot of these issues that we get into on the show in greater detail. You can go to thehighwire.com and check out The Jaxen Report. Well, you have, if you're watching The HighWire and you have not seen the documentary "Plandemic Indoctrination," then you're probably one of the only three people that watched this show that have not. Last week I had the honor of interviewing the director of Plandemic, Mikki Willis. An amazing job on this documentary that is asking really, really powerful questions of what is really going on here. At the center of this documentary is really one figure. David Martin is at the center of this documentary, making some incredible claims. This is some of what was discussed in Plandemic.

[01:02:16]

We maintained a series of inquiries into every individual, every organization, and every company that is involved in anything that either blurs the line of biological and chemical weapons or crosses that line, in any of 168 countries. In 1999, there were a million patents digitized by IBM, and those million patents were the first time human innovation had been put into an electronic, digital, searchable format. We took that information and we did a very simple exercise using our linguistic genomics technology, where I made the horrific assessment that approximately one third of all patents filed in the United States were functional forgeries, meaning that while they had linguistic variations, they actually covered the same subject matter. In 1999, patents on coronavirus started showing up, and thus began the Rabbit Trail. In 2003, the Center for Disease Control saw the possibility of a gold strike, and that was the coronavirus outbreak that happened in Asia. They saw that a virus they knew could be easily manipulated was something that was very valuable, and in 2003 they sought to patent it and they made sure that they controlled the proprietary rights to the disease, to the virus, and to its detection and all of the measurement of it. We know that Anthony Fauci, that Ralph Baric, that the Center for Disease Control, and the laundry list of people who wanted to take credit for inventing coronavirus, were at the hub of this story. From 2003 to 2018, they controlled 100% of the cash flow that built the empire around the industrial complex of coronavirus. On April the 25th, 2003, the US Center for Disease Control filed a patent on the corona virus transmitted to humans. Under 35 US Code Section 101, nature is prohibited from being patented. Either SARS coronavirus was manufactured, therefore making a patent on it legal, or it was natural, therefore making a patent on it illegal. If it was manufactured, it was a violation of biological and chemical weapons treaties and laws. If it was natural, filing a patent on it was illegal. In either outcome, both are illegal.

[01:05:06]

Well, it is my honor and pleasure to bring on David Martin for this discussion. David, thank you for taking the time today.

[01:05:16]

Dal, it's an honor to join you.

[01:05:18]

Alright. I want to say something right up front, because, just simply by playing those clips, by even saying the word plandemic, odds are that this entire interview will be taken off of Facebook immediately. It may even shut down the channel permanently, we're always at risk of that right now. So I want to say to my viewers out there, if you have not taken the opportunity, please go to thehighwire.com and sign up with our mailing list because we are not going to shy away from these discussions simply because we're being threatened by social media platforms. Go to thehighwire.com and sign up to our email list so that you can always find us. Now, I want to say this too, David. Just because I bring people onto the show and I discuss documentaries does not mean that I believe everything hook, line and sinker. These are important discussions and they have to be thorough and I think that you've done a brilliant job of laying things out here. But for those fact checkers that are watching right now, I want to point out that David Martin should be on MSNBC and Fox and every major network right now being asked the questions that he's being attacked about from this film. It's unfortunate that The HighWire is one of the few places that this can happen, but we're going to have a thorough discussion. I just want to say to my audience that what we're going to discuss now are theories put forward by David Martin.

[01:06:41]

Just because I'm interviewing him does not mean that I support these statements. I want to be clear on what The HighWire is, because we have so many new viewers. We are a part of an ongoing investigation into one of the most confusing moments in science and world history. There are those that say that this virus is manmade, others that swear it's natural. I personally am still on the fence, and I have brought on scientists from both sides of this conversation. And as I've told you before, I do very little work pre-interviewing my guests and figuring out what I want them to say. I want a natural conversation, I want to ask the questions, and I want to allow the people that come on this show to thoroughly share their perspective and where they're coming from. I want to make that clear that what you're about to see, I know this seems ridiculous to a lot of you, why is he doing this? Because I'm tired of being censored. I'm tired of being taken down for doing what I was allowed to do when I worked on CBS, if I was allowed to tell the story. If pharma, our sponsors, let us do the story, we were allowed to talk about it. We live in a time now where we are not allowed to ask people conversations.

[01:07:48]

I want to remind you, I believe it was Barbara Walters that sat down with Khamenei or, you know, and other leaders like Gaddafi. That does not mean that the reporters supported Gaddafi or regimes like Saddam Hussein. We interview because we're curious, and I, Del Bigtree, am a curious citizen in the United States of America where free speech is supposed to reign supreme. So with one of the longest and most boring caveats in world history, let me start out this conversation with you, David Martin. First of all, when I watched this film, it blew my mind. And the statements, especially when you talked about the legalities around whether it's natural, a natural virus that's been patented or a bioweapon, either way, it could be illegal, we're going to get into those discussions first. But what I did not get from the documentary is who are you? Where do you come from? What is it? You know, when I watch television, I have seen you as a financial analyst of some kind. On CNBC, you talk about investments and finances and hedge funds. Can you explain to me what the heck a financial adviser or, you know, specialist on Wall Street, how do you now find yourself in the middle of a discussion of the origin of a virus that is the heart of one of the strangest moments in world history? What is your specialty that puts you here?

[01:09:26]

So Del, it's it's actually funny and you have to go back, actually quite a long way. And I know everybody thinks this is a new thing. It isn't. This has been around for a long time and I've been involved with it for a long time. In fact, a long time for me goes back to 1991. In 1991, I was somewhat discovered at the time as a graduate student at Ball State University as having a very unique capability of speaking science to the capital markets. Back in 1991, what that meant was that we were working on the very first clinical trials, at the time, for measuring cholesterol using reflectance photometry. Most people will forget that cholesterol wasn't really a thing until the Framingham Heart Study got published, and in 1990 and 1991, suddenly everybody wanted to get tested. Sound familiar? We didn't know it was the thing, then it had to be a thing. And in a very unusual set of developments, I happen to be someone who both had the physiology training as well as the ability to speak about the commercial consequence of the measurement of cholesterol at that time into the capital markets. And so I was kind of one of those anomalies that actually could speak science on one hand and balance sheets and excel on the other hand.

[01:10:59]

And that gave rise in 1992 to the first formation of a medical device clinical trials organization at the University of Virginia, which is where I went for my PhD and ultimately joined the faculty of the medical school at the University of Virginia. But we set up the first clinical trials, for-profit clinical trials center, on medical devices for the FDA. And we went on for a decade running clinical trials and everything from MRI technologies to large-scale treatments of pain therapies, all sorts of modalities that had to do with chronic, both orthopedic and rheumatoid conditions. We had an enormous amount of work in the first combined drug device submissions in the history of the FDA, which was using inert gases to measure the effects of contrast enhancement for MRI across the blood-brain barrier. So I was the pioneer of medical device clinical trials for the FDA for a decade. In fact, we were at that time working directly with CDRH at the FDA, we were working on breast cancer technologies from Russia, we were working on I-128 iodine and gadolinium and other forms of diagnostic agents that were both drugs and devices. So I spent a decade doing clinical trials and running those at the University of Virginia through a company at the time called Idea Med.

[01:12:35]

We did some of the largest clinical trials on medical devices in US history. And so that decade concluded in 1998 when the United States government and the, specifically the Small Business Administration, realized that there was a fundamental problem in the banking world, which was, people were not able to understand how intellectual property and intangible assets supported commercial credit. And my company, M-CAM, was set up as the world's first, and still to this day the only, entity that has the ability to provide regulatory capital relief for banks using intangible assets, patents, copyrights, trademarks, things that are actually intangible assets, as regulatory acceptable collateral in the markets, which gave rise to an entire business that we're very well known for, speaking about innovation and the role of innovation in the capital markets. And for those who are not familiar, it's worth noting that our systems are what officially measures the leading economic indicators for the US and the global economy, the Innovation Alpha Indexes published by the Conference Board. So our company is the official measure of both US and international innovation economies, and we've been that since the 2015 creation of the CNBC IQ 100 index....

[01:14:04]

Let's point that out, let me just read that that really quick. Hold on one second, David. We found that, "How we created the CNBC IQ 100 Index of innovation leaders... Today, CNBC unveils the CNBC IQ 100 Index, a first of its kind rules-based index of large-cap companies that derive substantial revenue growth through the use of protected, proprietary technology. It is powered by MCAM-International, a firm that maintains an unprecedented archive of documents related to patents, trademarks, copyrights and other intangible assets from 160 countries." Now, I'm not a big finance guy, but from a layman's perspective, am I to understand that while a lot of people analyze the liquid assets, the financial background of a company, valuing it there, that your specialty is looking at the types of proprietary things that they own, patents they own, and giving some sort of quantifiable understanding of what the value of those things are.

[01:15:03]

That's right, and we are the only ones in regulated capital markets across the entirety of the world to actually underwrite them. And Del, what's important for your audience to understand is that underwriting starts with a fundamental question, which is, do you actually own what you say you own? That sounds like a simple question, but when it comes to a thing like a patent or a copyright or anything else, it is more nuanced than you might think. And that is because, in the pursuit of patents, in the pursuit of copyrights, it is very frequently the case that you will find that companies or agencies or individuals misrepresent or seek to influence the law in ways that are actually not legal, which is how we get, in a very direct way, oddly enough, into this conversation.

[01:15:59]

It reminds me of, you know, I work a lot with Robert Kennedy Jr. on the discussion of vaccines, and people will say he's not a doctor, you know, he has no business here, but what he'll say is that I'm an environmental attorney. I spent my life defending or fighting against chemicals and properties. I read journals and medical journals and can read a medical study as a profession. It's a part of the profession that I have so when somebody, when people start to hand me medical references and journals discussing mercury in vaccines and things like that, it wasn't like I didn't understand that, I have been fighting and very, very good at reading those those technical journals. In this case, though, it revolves around finance and people try to write off, he's just a finance guy. You read patents as probably the larger part of what you do, which is the central part of what the Pandemic discussion is, right? What is patented? Where do they come from? Go ahead.

[01:16:59]

Yeah, and it's important for people to realize that as a member of the medical school faculty at the University of Virginia, right. So this is not you know, medicine is my training, it is my background, and I spent many years on the faculty. So when I talk about clinical trials, I'm not talking about them in an abstract sense. I did submissions to the FDA. I worked on the panels. So these are things that are professionally part of my life and I have a very long and published legacy in doing it. So this is not an avocation for me, but when it comes to understanding intellectual property, and when it comes to the forensics around intellectual property, we add one more credential. In the early 2000s, the United States Treasury deputized me individually and contracted with my corporation to lead criminal and civil penalty inquiries into what at the time was one of the largest tax frauds in US history, which was a scam perpetrated on the United States Treasury by corporations who willfully misrepresented their intellectual property positions. So we've been both involved in civil and criminal proceedings with respect to that. And, as is the case now, it was very, very popular for agents of those companies to seek to disqualify me at the time as just a medical guy. So the funny thing is, when I was taking down bad guys, I was just a medical guy, and when I'm now taking down bad medical people, I'm just a finance guy. So I think somewhere in the middle, I think I've landed probably in the middle of the fairway.

[01:18:46]

So then, I was good, my next question is going to be, you know, that you are used to some adversity. Plandemic is arguably one of the most controversial films in the world right now. It's getting censored. You are under attack by most, multiple publications. How many new, let me just ask you right now, how many news organizations have had you on the show, whether it's NBC, ABC, I mean, these are networks that might have had you as an analyst before. Has anyone really asked to have you come on and defend or discuss the issues around Plandemic?

[01:19:19]

No, We have been only corresponded with specifically by The New York Times. When we filed the Office of Inspector General for the Department of Health and Human Services complaint in April, we started showing the evidence that we were providing in that particular proceeding. We showed that evidence to the New York Times, and we have had not only email correspondence, but one very extensive phone conversation about this. And the article has yet to appear. The only other media outlet that has come out is that we did receive from a USA Today Fact Checker fellow, we received an email, after Plandemic came out. In that email, we responded to a series of information disclosures that they had, and then they published the FactCheck.org smear campaign without making reference to a single thing that we had actually sent them. So those are the only, those are the only two mainstream media inquiries we've had. And it's important to put that in contrast to the fact that when we took on the patent case with respect to the EpiPen scandal several years ago, my op-eds were the subject of CNBC publications. I was on camera, I was on air, and that was the exact same type of forensic investigation we're doing now. But obviously, the political overtones were very different and we were successfully able to lead a very dynamic assault on the EpiPen price gouging exercise. And as you know, that ultimately wound up in favor of families who desperately need to keep their kids alive after allergens.

[01:21:15]

So let's get in, I think that one of the things I want to do here is give you an opportunity that you're not getting anywhere else to answer to these fact checkers. Now, I thought Plandemic did a great job already discussing fact checking, where it comes from. So many of these organizations don't even have a doctor or a patent specialist. They make phone calls, an expert says, well, this is what's going on, and they take the expert's word for it. You're an expert, your expert opinion doesn't matter. So it clearly fact checkers are just opinion checkers, and if it doesn't match their opinion, then they write you up. It's a really crazy world we live in here, it's leading to book burning, censorship. But let's go through some of these fact checks, shall we, just to sort of, I want to hear what you have to say about it, because they raise some interesting questions. This is the FactCheck.org, "New 'Plandemic' video peddles misinformation...Martin runs a company called M-CAM, which analyzes patents and intellectual property to estimate the investment value of companies...The 'Plandemic' video shows footage from Event 201 - with references to travel restrictions and misinformation, for example - next to footage taken during the actual pandemic about those same subjects...Coronaviruses are a family of viruses, and experts who have known of the pandemic threat posed by coronaviruses for years. So it's not surprising to those who study such outbreaks that a preparedness exercise would have centered on a coronavirus...Martin claims that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention saw 'the possibility of a gold strike' when the SARS epidemic arose in 2003."

[01:22:54]

"Skimming across the screen while Martin makes that claim is a headline for a November 2003 news story about the race to patent the virus. However, that story doesn't support his argument. It actually explains that the CDC wasn't pursuing the patent for profit. Rather, it was doing so to keep others from monopolizing research...Similarly, the director of the CDC at the time, Dr. Julie Gerberding, told reporters that filing for the patent was 'a protective measure to make sure that the access to the virus remains open for everyone.'" Okay, so they are saying that your claim that they were trying to own or make money off of it, we are hearing a lot about NIH patents involved in this vaccine that are going to make scientists millions and millions of dollars, that's not the part, you're not talking about NIH. But what do you have to say to this idea that the CDC, first of all, didn't patent it to control it, patent it to free it up?

[01:23:54]

Yeah, that's a beautiful piece of absolute crock of shit. I'm sorry, but that's the bottom line. Let's review a tiny piece of patent law first. There's a thing called section 102 of the 35 US code, which is a law that basically says that you can't patent something that has been published in an enabling disclosure in the public domain. Now, in 2003, April 25th, 2003, when the CDC filed its patent application, it could have done something else. If it wanted to keep it from ever being patented or commercially exploited, it could have simply printed the SARS coronavirus genome. By doing so, it would have placed it in the public domain, making any patent on it, ever, in the history of humanity, illegal. Patents are not to defend the release of information, patents are for commercial exploitation. Which means that if you file a patent, what you're saying is that for the next 20 years, you want to control the commercialization and the commercial consequence of your innovation. So let's on its face state that if the CDC filed a patent to release something into the public domain, that would be a misapplication of the patent law and it would be a waste of taxpayer money, at the minimum. But here comes the bigger problem. The bigger problem is what they said in the article you just quoted is a lie. And it's a lie because on September the 7th, 2005, the United States Patent Office agreed with me. They said, you are not entitled to a patent on this because the information you're seeking to patent is in the public domain. Therefore, no one can get a patent on it. It's called a Section 102 rejection. The CDC wasn't happy with that, and so they submitted a series of filings, and in May 2006, the Patent office wasn't convinced and the Patent Office issued a final rejection. That final rejection....

[01:26:25]

So let me get this straight, let me get this straight, because I just want to, before we get too deep. CDC then, if I'm not understanding this, CDC is saying, we filed a patent so that some company couldn't grab a patent and keep anybody else from getting near it.

[01:26:39]

Right.

[01:26:39]

We wanted to make sure that all the great scientists of the world would always have access. Therefore, that's why we filed the patent. And what you're saying is the patent got rejected because the patent office said, this is already protected space. You are not allowed to patent just like nobody is, because this needs to remain available to the public because it's part of the public domain. So they clearly went out of their way to get it out of the public domain and make it their own.

[01:27:07]

Well, and let's be clear, I'm not saying this. This is their documents and this is where your disclaimer falls apart, Del, because I haven't stipulated an opinion once. I'm reciting from their own legal filings at the United States Patent Office that I happen to have copies of. You can't make up an opinion on the fact that on September the 7th, 2005, the CDC was told, you submitted something that has 99.9% homology to what is in the public domain. Therefore, you don't get a patent. And they protested, and they came back and said, no, no, no, no, no, no. We are entitled to the patent that you just told us we're not entitled to, and even after they said that, the patent office was unconvinced, and on May the 5th, 2006, the Patent office came back and said, you're still wrong, people. You are not entitled to this patent. And the CDC, again, not only came back and appealed that decision, but they filed an appeal to overrule the decision of the patent examiner, who would not relent on this point by the way. The patent examiner did her job. She did not relent.

[01:28:35]

But they went over her head and they ultimately got a patent granted on the genome --and this is important for everybody to listen to-- for the genome called SARS coronavirus, which is the subclade of the betacoronavirus that we're talking about today. And everybody who wants to jump through hoops about, well, this is a different SARS, this is a different coronavirus, this is a different fill-in-the-blank. The problem with their argument is for it to be SARS coronavirus, which is kind of the front-end of SARS-CoV-2, for it to be SARS coronavirus, it has to have a high homology to the existing and patented version of coronavirus. So that everything about what the CDC said in their public statement is falsifiable on their own evidence, it's falsifiable in patent law itself. They are not allowed to actually file a patent on something that's already in the public domain. And as I stated in the film, and as I routinely state, it's also a violation of Section 101, which is a bigger problem, because Section 101 of 35 US code says that patents on nature are not legal.

[01:30:00]

Alright. So I want to, and let's hold it right there before we jump in, I want to, this is, because I would say when I was watching the whole thing, you know, I'm watching the documentary, making sure I'm ready to talk to Mikki Willis. This line jumped out of me. To me, it was the biggest statement in the entire film. We've already played it in the larger package, but I want to bring attention to this. Take a look at this.

[01:30:24]

Under 35 US code Section 101, nature is prohibited from being patented. Either SARS coronavirus was manufactured, therefore making a patent on it legal, or it was natural, therefore making a patent on it illegal. If it was manufactured, it was a violation of biological and chemical weapons, treaties, and laws. If it was natural, filing a patent on it was illegal. In either outcome, both are illegal.

[01:31:03]

Okay. So there's huge issue being taken with this, this is what the fact checker article had to say about it. That "Next, Martin claims that federal law wouldn't have allowed for a patent on that isolated virus. Again, he's wrong. Instead of reading from the US patent laws, as he says he is in the video, Martin reads from a 2013 US Supreme Court decision. That's an important distinction since the decision, which changed one aspect of patent law that's relevant here, came 10 years after the CDC filed for patent related to the virus that causes SARS...While the Supreme Court did find that '[a] naturally occurring DNA segment is a product of nature and not patent eligible merely because it has been isolated,' that decision came a decade after the CDC sought the patent." So it sounds like the fact checkers are saying here that you are right, you can't patent something that's natural, but you are making the statement as though that has always been the case, but this was a new finding, that this patent was legal at the time it was patented because the Supreme Court had not ruled that nature is unpatentable, that didn't happen until, what did it say, 2013? What is your response to this?

[01:32:19]

Well, that's actually one of the most easy layups, that is putting it right in front of the green, because what it shows you is the fact checkers are not familiar with the division of powers in the United States. The Supreme Court does not make the law. 35 US code Section 101 was written long before the Myriad Genetics case and 35 US Code Section 101 predates the CDC filing. Nature cannot be patented, period. Now the fact that people sought and ultimately obtained patents on nature is in fact a fact. That has been going on ever since the United States Patent Office changed its business model to issue patents and then have them contested after the fact. It's a good business model when you get to print forgeries and collect revenue for those. But the Supreme Court, in their own decision, which is what the fact checkers should have bothered reading, which we know they didn't, the Supreme Court bothers to point out that they have long held that there is no way to patent nature.

[01:33:33]

I have it right here, let me read it. "We have 'long held that this provision contains an important implicit exception[:] Laws of nature, natural phenomenon, and abstract ideas are not patentable.'" There you have it, long held. Seems pretty clear, it's not saying we are....

[01:33:53]

And so, listen, I mean, you've seen this, Del, you've seen this with the way people misquote the Jacobson case in vaccinations, right. People sit there saying, well the Jacobson case clearly showed that the Supreme Court says you can mandate compulsory vaccination. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Jacobson case was about a \$5 fine, not compulsory vaccination. And that Jacobson case turned on the fact that he didn't want to pay the fine or get the vaccination, and basically what the Supreme Court said was if you're not going to get the vaccination, you can be charged a \$5 fine.

[01:34:30]

As I pointed out to Alan Dershowitz, right, Right. Alan Dershowitz says, Jacobson means I can forcibly inject you. I said, no it doesn't. It means you can charge me a fine. Holding me down, pinning me down, and piercing my body and injecting a toxic chemical into me, you know, outside of my will, has never been upheld in a court, so...

[01:34:48]

No, assault and battery, assault and battery is not a police state power. You're not allowed to do it. So but here again, we have a situation where the fact checkers almost get it right, except they're hung on their own little noose here, and here, let me tell you what's wrong with their argument. Let's give them the benefit of the doubt. Let's say for the sake of argument, I've got it wrong, and the CDC was justified in patenting nature, even though it's against the law in 35 Section 101. Let's say they're right. Here's the tiny problem. Their patent came up for renewal, which is something every patent does, and it came up for renewal in 2015, which I think fact checkers would be willing to submit, is two years after the Supreme Court declared these patents illegal. And the CDC repaid the maintenance fee to keep the patent. So even after it was declared illegal, they re-upped the patent. Every single fact that is laid out in their public, their legal record, shows that they are lying and willfully, in 2015, willfully breaking the law. Because if it was a question before 2013, and even if we grant it was, which it wasn't, because the Supreme Court said, we've long held that these are not legal. But even if I'm wrong about that opinion, they still broke the law in 2015. There's no way. And that's why I love the fact checkers, because they actually feed it up. They said, well, he might have got it wrong. Well, okay.

[01:36:45]

Alright, let's move on, okay. Alright, I think that we would be, at least I'm willing to say that, to me, the Supreme Court saying we have long held means this goes back in time. But you're right, even if it didn't mean that, 2015 comes after that decision. Now, what about the next part. "After that" --here we go, here's the next fact check, and it's a part of the same thing. You said that you can't patent nature, but-- "Martin takes his claim one step further, saying: 'If it was manufactured, it was a violation of biological and chemical weapons treaties and laws. If it was natural, filing a patent on it was illegal. In either outcome, both are illegal.'" That's the video clip that we showed. "That's not right either, said Arti Rai, a professor at Duke University School of Law, in a phone interview with FactCheck.org. 'Lots of things have been patented over the years that would be illegal to use,' said Rai. She gave the example of devices for taking illegal drugs, explaining that having a patent on something doesn't give you the right to use it." I guess she's referring to some sort of pot pipe or something like that is the same as a biological weapon. It's a, right there. I mean, it sounds like apples and oranges, but let me do a better job for them, because I think that this is, this may be more of a sticking point for me. You know, you are saying that patenting a SARS coronavirus is illegal either way.

[01:38:08]

If it was natural, you're not allowed to do it, but if it's a potential biological weapon. But I would say this. I focus on vaccines all the time. MMR vaccines, you know, the MMR, like it's the mumps strain of the vaccine that Merck owns, that allows them to patent. They attached measles and rubella to make a vaccine so that they could claim the market. But they own the patent to the mumps strain of the virus. Vaccines are made because these companies own patents to, what appears to me to be, natural elements. That could. I mean, you could argue they're using it to make a biological weapon because mumps could be, it'd be a very weak biological weapon, but you get the idea, whether it's chickenpox or measles or any of these things, these companies have been patenting these things for a long time. How do you decipher? I mean, I think the CDC could easily say it wasn't for a bioweapon, it was for a future vaccine that the world is going to need. So you're making a claim and it seems to me you're missing a middle point. What if it's not a biological weapon, it's not, you know, it's not nature or maybe they've adjusted it just enough to get through the patent office, but they're going to try and make a vaccine in case we're attacked by a biological weapon. Shouldn't the CDC be allowed to do that?

[01:39:23]

No. See, that's the problem. If it was a therapy or if it was a detection or if it was something that was actually for the laudable reasons you just laid out, then one can very easily make the argument that detecting ricin or detecting anthrax or detecting Ebola or Zika or fill-in-the-blank pathogen, detecting any of those things is actually a very laudable thing to do. It's actually in the public interest. Here's the problem. The problem is that beginning in 2005, all of the parties that we talk about, and by all the parties, I specifically mean the National Institutes of Health, DARPA, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and others specifically began looking at how the coronaviruses could be combined to increase their pathogenicity. That's where the line crosses. You are not allowed, under biological and chemical weapons treaties and conventions, you are not allowed to take an active agent of nature and willfully increase its pathogenicity. That is the reason why we got into things like the Nuremberg trials, the ultimate Nuremberg Code, and the biological and chemical weapons treaties that followed. It is not a matter of legal action to engage in the increased pathogenicity of any pathogen for any reason.

[01:41:06]

And it's really important that we get this distinction, Del, because the problem is that in 2005 we knew, in published documents, that DARPA saw both offensive and defensive capabilities of using coronavirus as a pathogen of war. This was not some sort of, what if we get attacked? This was actually a recognition that this thing could be chimerically altered to achieve strategic battlefield and warfare-implemented benefits. Now, once again, CDC is not entitled to play around with the chimeric and recombinant alteration of a pathogen to make it more lethal. That's not ever authorized. It never will be authorized, and it is actually the violation I speak of. Part of the reason why the Supreme Court, and part of the reason why 35 US code Section 101 is so explicit on saying that the technology of nature is a technology, yes, that can be understood and exploited, but it must be used as nature, not patented. And if you patent that nature and then you seek to commercially exploit it, and the way you go about exploiting it is by starting to recombine and symmetrically alter a pathogen, that's where you cross the biological and chemical weapons gray line into a bright line violation.

[01:42:43]

I think that that makes sense to me and it's something that, you know. I feel like there's this place in humanity, especially in the United States of America, where we think we have really, you know, we're sort of above the rest, we mean well for the world, and we do what's right to try and protect the world. But I feel like deep down, this really, we shouldn't really even be having to have this argument, because I bet you if I stop everyone on the street and say, do you think that our government secretly uses viruses and works towards developing potential future weapons, do you think that they do that? Even if I, you know, they may not, I could stop someone and say, you know that it's illegal to make a virus into a weapon, right? They'd say, oh, yeah, even though you know that they just heard it for the first time. But if you ask them, do you think the government does it anyway as a way to potentially protect us in the future? I think that most people would say of course they do. I mean, that's what we do, right? We know every country has spies. We know that they break rules, they break laws, and that's just what we do, we look the other way. But when it comes to these issues, I think where it starts to get really dicey is, we were used to all the discussions about nuclear weapons, right? We look at Iran, we got to get into your facilities. We got to see what you're doing there, because nuclear energy, it's really similar, right? Nuclear energy, okay, nuclear bombs not okay. Studying a natural virus in case it ever, you know, breaks out across the country to make a vaccine, okay, making that virus or taking that energy to do some harm, not okay, right.

[01:44:20]

Well Del, in 2013, let's remember that the National Institutes of Health came to this conclusion. This is not Dave Martin's conclusion. The National Institutes of Health came to the conclusion that what was being done on gain of function and chimeric alteration of coronavirus was crossing possibly both legal and ethical lines. This is not me opining on it, this is the National Institutes of Health, the check-writers themselves, who themselves said that they felt that they had probably blurred or crossed lines. So don't, you know, this is not Dave spinning the story, this is real policymakers who came to the conclusion that this shouldn't be done and came to their own recommendation of shutting down the programs on their own. So I am reciting facts, I'm not making them.

[01:45:14]

Okay, so let's get to then, I appreciate, I think those were all fairly clear defenses, they make sense to me. Someone else can try and take that deeper, but I for one as a reporter, I think you've done a good job of making that clear. Clearly, the Supreme Court ruled that we've always said that you can't patent nature, and you make sense in, since they're already admitting maybe we should stop doing this, that there was a problem. But here's my issue. I mean, I'm still going to say Plandemic was powerful. I'm not sure, does the film definitively set out to say, this is a manmade virus that was released upon the world? I'm still on the fence. I think that what you are presenting, what Plandemic and other scientists, I'm hearing more and more and I'm interested in in this conversation, but a lot of it's circumstantial. A lot of it is still circumstantial evidence. So let me just ask you for your opinion. Do you believe that this is a manmade virus and do you feel like you have enough proof to make that statement?

[01:46:22]

I think that if you look at the transition of funding in 1999 from the ten years of research where coronavirus was focused on cardiomyopathy in rabbits, and then recombinant research on coronavirus started looking at the amplification of the S1 spike protein, the open reading frame around the receptor binding domain, and the ACE2 receptor as a target of amplification, I think it is reasonable to say that the human species, and by the way, I'm now quoting from patents filed by these individuals, so these individuals include Ralph Baric, the CDC, and Moderna. I think it's important to realize that these individuals made a point of saying that coronavirus has historically not been a pathogen of major concern. And then, beginning in 1999 and between 1999 and 2003, we see the amplification and modification of two strands of coronavirus, and suddenly in 2002, going into 2003, we have the first SARS coronavirus outbreak. Now we've got a linear problem with the way we tell stories. Karl Popper was famous for talking about the era of Historicism, and one of his arguments is that we have a very linear view of things. We think that things start and then they tree and they kind of branch out from a single root. What we don't contemplate is the possibility that people who were doing research on the combination of coronaviruses in bat populations, who themselves were going into bat populations and exchanging information biologically with bat populations, we don't have a postulation even at this point in time that suggests that bats could have been cross-contaminated with what humans were doing.

[01:48:23]

We have this theory, and the way the theory goes is that coronavirus was highly mutagenic, it does all kinds of adaptations. And suddenly in 2002/2003, somehow some bat populations got next to humans and we had the first outbreak of SARS. The inconvenience of that story happens to be the fact that for three years we were actually focused on the things that ultimately nature seemed to mutate. I'm very careful about trying to ascribe blame or credit, to whether this was a human-derived or a genetic-derived or some sort of in between. But I do think that it is tragically ironic that if you look at this bat SARS-CoV populations around the world, which predominantly, according to Columbia University, find themselves in the Seattle area, in the New York area, in northern Italy, in parts of Iran, and in several parts of central China, I do think it's interesting that all of the outbreaks have occurred where zoonotic transmission studies have been taking place, where researchers are going into bat caves and bats are coming out of bat caves. Now, that doesn't make it causal, I'm not stating at all that it is a unidirectional thing, but I'm also not stating that when you have human-animal interactions, our illusion that things can only go one way clouds our thinking.

[01:50:01]

We have an ability, and we've seen this, by the way, in the craziness we do, when we mess with mutations in nature, we have an ability to amplify mutations that nature then goes on and amplifies more. So can you blame a bat, can you blame a person? I'm actually not sure that's a constructive question even, because at the end of the day, what we know is that, to your earlier point in this show, when humans start messing with nature, we often don't think of the consequences. And so is it the case that researchers interacting with bats may have crossed contaminated bats? Well, that's plausible, I'm not saying it is or isn't the case, but I do find it alarming that when we went to identify the unique attributes of SARS-CoV-2, and if you look at the ICTV publication, which is the World Health Organization's International Committee on the Taxonomy of Viruses, and you look at how they made the distinction of what type of coronavirus subclade this SARS-CoV-2 was, they specifically harvested unique populations of known bat colonies and decided that the homology was based on known bat colonies. So this was not a mysterious bat cave that somebody stumbled across. This was a bat cave that was pretty highly trafficked in the past, and the samples that were collected happened to match the ones that allegedly came out of Wuhan, China, in December of 2019.

[01:51:42]

And samples, we have to imagine, were going and being taken into the laboratories, right? They're using them....

[01:51:48]

We know that that was going on and we know it was going on through federally funded research for many, many years. And that's the reason why I'm so cautious about this, Del, because it's important for us to recognize that we've got to break this notion that nature just happens immune from our effect on nature. The fact is that we may contribute to natural, you know, mutations, we may contribute to nature changing its own course, and that's why I think that the question of the provenance of the mutation is somewhat secondary to the fact that, to your earlier point, we mess with nature at our great peril because we don't think about the collateral consequences of our actions very often, and after the fact, we then try to back ourselves into a story to make it look like we were the victims and nature was somehow the perpetrator.

[01:52:46]

I think that's all really clearly put, and you're right. I mean, I think that it bothers me. It bothers me when we have nuclear weapons facilities that still develop weapons. It bothers me when we know that we're developing biological weapons and we excuse it by saying, well, we're trying to protect ourselves. All of this is just waiting for a mistake to happen at some moment. You know, whether or not this escaped from a lab, what we know is there have been escapes from labs. These things are going on. I think Judy Mikovits points to cross-contamination that we've witnessed in multiple products. You know, as though sitting in a lab, that these labs are all working on different experiments, but they're cross-contaminating each other. I want to thank you for taking the time. We could go on for hours and hours. This is what we do on The HighWire, though, it's not about a quick headline. I find this conversation extremely fascinating. You have a very fascinating outlook on this. And just before we started the show, I was talking to Mikki Wilson and his team. I want to put forward that, a lot of the work that we do at ICAN is based on vaccines and the science around that. You are clearly investigating patents and ideas like that.

[01:53:54]

So I think that we should all work together. I think that, whether or not this is manmade, somebody, I don't believe it's been answered, I'll tell you that. Anyone that tells me that we've decided it's clear. Someone said to me the other day, a really good friend, well it's proven it was natural, I say where, what, what? I mean, show me that proof. Show me, like, they're already admitting that they couldn't find the virus in the Wuhan seafood market, so. Oh, here we go. I mean, here's the proof. It's a bat and a pangolin went into a Chinese bar and that was proven, there's the cartoon that proves it. I mean, that's the world we're in right now. Will you work with us at the Informed Consent Action Network to drill down? I know that you have more information, some of which we were talking about bringing out here, but I want to vet it further. I think that we may lose our channel here. This isn't about channels, this is not about fame. I want to get the science right and somebody better be willing to answer the questions and ask the questions. So can we work together moving into the future to get to the bottom of what the hell is really going on here?

[01:54:53]

So Del, one of the things I love is I love how many people have this incredulous story of 1 or 2 bad actors can seemingly take over the world, and we have the history of the the Hitlers or the Pol Pot's or the Stalin's. We have all these stories of the 1 or 2 bad actors who wind up, you know, wreaking havoc on our story of humanity. And unfortunately, we have a bunch of stories where good people die early. And so all of our hero stories seem to end with, you know, somebody on a cross or somebody getting shot or somebody. And what I find is that what we're missing as the human story, is people who actually can transcend that it's not about them. It's not about their individual story, it's about the collective good. And I love the fact that Mikki and you and our organization and others can actually come together and be as organized as the forces of darkness. The fact of the matter is that if I made the following sentence, which I'm now making on The HighWire. I'm putting the pharmaceutical companies on notice, on your show. I happen to have the prosecution histories of all your vaccines, not just COVID, all of them.

[01:56:13]

Wouldn't it be interesting if the Patent Trial Appeals Board at the United States Patent Office suddenly got all of your vaccine patents challenged? Wouldn't it be interesting if we brought this same scrutiny to every single one of the toxins that you are putting into the public in the name of public health? Wouldn't that be interesting? And wouldn't it be fun if they couldn't pick the, oh, that's the Del story or that's the Mikki story or that's the Dave story, because it turns out we would just have a few too many heads to figure out which was the hydra to chop. And the answer is, not only a hearty yes, but it's actually, it's time to go on offense. We're not going to play defense on this. But we're going to be the 11 member team on the field, we're not going to be a superstar. Because at the end of this story, this is a story of humanity standing together for the benefit of the human race. This is not going to be Del or Dave or Mikki's show. This is about us doing what any decent human being would find both laudable and desirable. And to that end, you have my undying commitment.

[01:57:36]

Fantastic. Look, folks, this is really happening. You know, we are in an investigation. We know we are not being told all the truth. The media's jump to immediately, and this is my problem, David. The way they jump to immediately say no, this is natural, defies all reason. As a journalist, I have to say it defies all reason, number one, that we could come to that conclusion that quickly, and number two, that every media organization went with that story. Let's be clear. China is not our ally, China is our enemy. They have a communist nation, we do not agree with their philosophy. We do not agree with how they treat their people. We do not trust them at all. Yet every mainstream media outlet is telling me, telling us, trust China. Oh no, China was absolutely right. No, why? This makes no sense. When Iran has a nuclear facility, as I said, we want inside or we're not going to hand you any money. In the middle of an Iraq war, we got to see your bunkers, we got to see what's inside of them. We have got to see what's inside of the Wuhan Laboratories, and any others around the world. You cannot tell me that in the 17 seconds that this made the media that everyone figured out that it's natural, and that's where I'm at right now. I want to take this investigation deeper. We're going to. I'm not selling you on it. I'm not telling anyone my audience right now that this is a manmade virus, but I'm telling you what, I have not stopped investigating it, now we have a new member on our team that's going to help us do that, get to the bottom of it for you. So for that, David, I'm sure this is not the last time we'll be talking to you. Thank you for all of your time, I look forward to working with you in the future.

[01:59:14]

It is a delight, Del, thanks for all you're doing and I look forward to it as well. Have a beautiful day.

[01:59:20]

Alright. You too. Well, you know, this is what The HighWire is about, this is what you make possible when you donate to The HighWire. You're helping great scientists reach out to us, trust us, and say, hey, The HighWire seems to be getting it right. We're creating allies, allegiances with people that have information that we maybe didn't have as of yesterday, so that we can not only report on things, but make a difference in this world. That's why we have a legal team, that's why I love this idea of looking into the patents. Maybe there's an angle in. Perhaps the pharmaceutical industry in America is protected from lawsuits based on the injuries caused by their vaccines, but is their patent totally safe? Look out, everybody. We are going to look into this. You know, we have a lot of fun here on The HighWire attempting to make a difference in the world. But so much of the time we sit in our homes, you know, I'm lucky, I have The HighWire..I have a great team of people that help put this all together, but what can you do? Sometimes all you have to do is make a loud voice, to join the voices that are out there and make a difference in the world by simply saying, we are here, we are present, we are accounted for, and that is happening all over the world.

[02:00:37]

A million workers to be kept at home. A quarter of the nation's economy will be shut down. We have never seen this incompetence in the history of government.

[02:00:54]

Quarantine fatigue is growing in this and other countries.

[02:00:57]

Every day brings further drama, allegedly to halt the spread of coronavirus.

[02:01:01]

On the 19th of March 2020, the government website stated that the virus was downgraded from being a high consequence infectious disease. Four days later, we went into lockdown. Why? We've been deceived, we've been failed, and so many people, young and old, have been drilled with absolute fear.

[02:01:24]

They've declared a state of disaster. Which prompts a simple question. Was that declaration a political decision or a health decision?

[02:01:32]

[translator] We are against abuses of power. They want to use this crisis for their own benefit.

[02:01:39]

There is an accumulation of dissatisfaction. The majority of people here don't have exact demands, but most of them feel injustice.

[02:01:46]

We will not stand by and watch you ruin a generation of <unclear>.

[02:01:54]

Understandably, senior business leaders are now starting to speak out.

[02:01:57]

My name is Marcus de Brun. I'm a GP and there was a time when I was proud to say that. I'm angry at what my children are expected to do, I'm angry at what I'm expected to do, and I'm angry at what's happened to our country.

[02:02:14]

In a recent publication, The Lancet argued, and I quote, "In our analysis, full lockdowns and widespread Covid-19 testing were not associated with reductions in the number of critical cases or overall mortality."

[02:02:31]

No lockdowns, no masks. No social distancing. No infringements of our rights. No forced vaccinations. And most of all, children should not be interfered with in the schools.

[02:02:56]

We put a man on the moon half a century ago, and this is the best we can do to protect the elderly and the vulnerable without smashing the economy.

[02:03:04]

The more fearful you are, the easier you are to be controlled and manipulated. The less fearful you are, the harder it is to be. And by us being here today proves that to be true, because it shows the people at the top of the chain that we are not afraid.

[02:03:24]

The solution is that everyone take to the streets and raise their voices. We need to go to the street and do what we're doing here, prove to them that we know what this is about, and that we're claiming our rights. If this were truly a pandemic, they are taking the wrong measures.

[02:03:37]

We will fight until fear is overridden by strength, knowledge, and unity.

[02:03:46]

[translator] The only thing we have left is to protest.

[02:03:52]

Shame on me. Shame on me. Shame on me....

[02:03:57]

I don't know if you have the same reaction I do when I watch that, but I think, where is America? I thought we were the fighters of the world. I thought we were the most intelligent nation in the world. I thought we knew better. And yet thousands, tens of thousands, some of those crowds look like hundreds of thousands of people standing up for their freedom. The United States of America is the freedom capital of the world, and we are locked in our basements right now, at least most of us. I want to say I was just at a great event in Utah over the weekend. I was there all weekend. A great turnout, 12 to, I think, 1500 people, all fighting for medical freedom in Utah. It was a great event and I want to give a shout out to those that put it together. But I want to see more than 12 to 1500 people. I want to see the crowds they're seeing in Germany. I want to see the crowds they're seeing in Spain. I want the crowds that are happening in Poland and France. This is the United States of America, we're supposed to be making a difference, so do me a favor. We have a call to action this week. There are at least two, that I know of, rallies that are taking place in the United States of America. The first one in New York let's bring that up. This is, oh actually, there we go. The Global Rally for Health and Freedom. Join peacefully. Stop mandatory vaccines. The march in solidarity along with Berlin and Europe. These are taking place simultaneously. If you knew the ingredients in a vaccine, would you risk it? 08/29/20.

[02:05:29]

The location, Albany State Capital, Academy Park, Saturday, August 29th at 9 a.m. until everyone's voice has been heard. And then also Massachusetts is having a rally August 29th, 2020 at 10 a.m. till noon at the Massachusetts State House. We will be attempting to broadcast all of these. And then there's the Unite for Freedom Mass Protest and March at Trafalgar Square in London, Saturday 29th, August 2020 at 12 noon their time, very early here. Global Rally for Health and Freedom, London, Berlin, New York, and Boston, live Worldwide coverage begins 12 pm. London, that's 7 a.m. our time, 4 a.m. Pacific time. We will be hosting that on The HighWire so that you can watch it, but I want to say this. If you were within 200 miles of Massachusetts, New York, London or Berlin, and I found out that you were tuning in to The HighWire to watch this event, I'm going to be seriously, seriously disappointed. You need to make your voice known. You need to step up now. You need to get in your car, you need to stand with united citizens saying that this is preposterous. That just because the CDC is now admitting that masks essentially do nothing, lockdowns are ineffective, and quarantining after you've been on a plane is ridiculous, we've known it from the beginning, but they're getting away with it because we are not making our voices heard. Throughout time, crowds have been gathering all over the world, making a difference, whether it was bringing down a dictator, whether it was changing a law, whether it was destroying a wall and tearing it to the ground so that freedom would reign.

[02:07:11]

People have been marching, people have been speaking, and we have been celebrating it as American citizens, saying, see, that is what freedom looks like. That is what is supposed to happen. Yet right now, America is the one nation that is sitting asleep. Hiding in our basements, wearing our masks, and destroying our economy and our ability to lead the world to democracy and freedom. We need to hold on to this seat of power, and that means every one of you have got to at least do your part to stand side by side with each other in public. We have the opportunity in Massachusetts and New York this week, and please be one of those people that says, you know what, I'm going to host a rally at the state capitol in my state. It's true. It's time. Not 100 of us, not 1000 of us, not 10,000 of us, not 100,000 of us, millions of us need to stand up now and claim our rights as free citizens, or we will have no claim. This is The HighWire. We're getting serious about this. I love you. We can make a difference together. So do your part, and we'll see you here next week.

[02:08:38]

Thanks for watching, and thanks to The HighWire Insiders who make this show possible. If you'd like to become a HighWire Insider, then go to our website, thehighwire.com, and sign up now. And please, share the show. We're on Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Bitchute, and now on Roku. Because knowledge is power, censorship is real, and we need all the help we can get.

END OF TRANSCRIPT

THE HIGHWIRE