[00:00:06] Del Bigtree
Did you notice that this show doesn't have any commercials? I'm not selling you diapers or vitamins or smoothies or gasoline. That's because I don't want corporate sponsors telling us what to investigate and what to say. Instead, you're our sponsors. This is a production by our non-profit, the Informed Consent Action Network. If you want more investigations, more hard-hitting news, if you want the truth, go to icandecide.org and donate now.

[00:00:50] Del Bigtree
Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Wherever you are out there in the world, it's time for us all to step out into The HighWire. Welcome. As we look around this world today and try and figure out where we stand, I think a lot about the statements from "The Art of War," right, know your enemy. I think it's also, though, just as important to know your friends. As strange as they may be, and whatever religion they're involved in, we've got to all accept each other. This became very clear to me when I watched a little segment from Fox Five this week. Take a look at this.

[00:01:26] Harold Ford Jr.
I think the message from is get the shot if you want. I will, if you don't, don't get it.

[00:01:31] Various speakers
I just said I'm not going to ask anybody if they're getting their shot.

[00:01:34] Harold Ford Jr.
I won't wear a mask, but I'm going to get the shot.

[00:01:36] Various speakers
You are? What number shot is this for you?

[00:01:38] Harold Ford Jr.
I've had it every, so I'm going to do one in October. I had one in April.
Various speakers
How many? What's the total?

Harold Ford Jr.
This will be my seventh.

Various speakers
Seventh, seventh shot.

Various speakers
And I've had COVID three times, coming up.

Del Bigtree
I mean, you know, everybody's got their religion. Some of us, on Ash Wednesday, have the ash on our forehead and walk around, and others have different traditions they go through and there's going to be this huge group of people, really nice people like Harold Ford, that apparently just think getting a vaccine every couple of weeks is the way he should be living out his life to be doing the right thing with whatever God he believes in. You know, when we look at this, we think we should start seeing these people just a little bit differently than we do as they're out there in public. But honestly, what I want to say about this is that, we're all trying to figure out how to enroll people into this issue. And obviously, Harold Ford is going to be of no use to any of us that are working on scientific integrity and proper safety testing. And what I want to say to you is don't waste your breath, right? If this is your friend, really good friend, you've known each other since college or high school or elementary school, you don't have to lose your friend. I mean, it is what it is. But if they are this deeply ensconced in this religion, I don't think there's much you can do about it. Move on to someone that is a little bit more open minded. I mean, this guy clearly, and we all, I mean, I know people like this, right? They so clearly know this vaccine doesn't work, but for some reason, they just go through this traditional penance on a bi-monthly basis for whatever reason. And so when we think about how we're going to build a movement, I just want to remind you, I don't care if they're your brother or your sister or your mother or your father, I get it.

Del Bigtree
They're family, best friend. But if they are fully, deeply indebted and in love with the entire pharmaceutical intervention world that they live in, then leave them alone. I mean, we can't change that. But there are millions and millions of people we can change. There are millions ready, standing in the line, ready to get on to the arc of change and move into that promised land together. The rest of them can inhabit whatever is left. So stay focused. Focus on those that are ready to change. Alright, speaking of change, speaking of reaching down and being your inner hero, which this is all about, we've all got to find that thing that guides us, that drives us. So many of you come up to me and you say, Del, what is it I should be doing with my life? I mean, I don't, I feel like I want to be a part of this, and I say the same thing. We all have different talents, I don't know what your talent is. Maybe you're a software designer and you can design something that can change the world. Maybe you're a great speaker or you want to start a podcast, all of that's fine. I'm Del, I started a podcast, it turned into this. It doesn't mean we're all going to do that. But what's awesome is when we see people that just seem to step outside their comfort zone and decide to make a difference in this world. That is exactly what my good friend Jackie Schlegel decided to do with her life. Take a look at this.

Various speakers
Our guest today is Jackie Schlegel.

Del Bigtree
Jackie Schlegel,

Various speakers
Jackie Schlegel.

Various speakers
This is Jackie Schlegel.

Jackie Schlegel
I'm just a mom. And like you, I'm here to fight like hell for my children. As a medical freedom advocate and a parent of a child with special needs, and complex health care challenges, this bill is incredibly important to me. Why do state legislators believe that they somehow know my children better than I do? And so when I'm out in the community, they're questioning what they're seeing on the news or in the media or the push to override their rights. The tactic over the last 15 years was small bills that did not gain a lot of attention. The stage has been set heavily against us and we have got to fight for Texas. We were forced to drive almost two hours to find a pediatrician who would accept her as a patient.

Various speakers
Did you just say that a doctor wouldn't see you because a child didn't have HPV vaccine?

Jackie Schlegel
They wouldn't let me in the door.

Various speakers
Are you kidding me?
[00:05:51] Jackie Schlegel
I'm not. The mechanism of tyranny is the industry that seeks to own your body, cradle to grave. Industry is carrying out their agenda, and we happily give them the freedom to do so. We've already gone too far. We've got to rally up and we've got to say, absolutely not. You will not test me. You will not track me. We really not only love Texas, we love our country. We love what we were founded on. I think that was one of the first things that really struck me in this building when I first stepped foot in there. We stood outside the Senate doors. I was there for two days straight. It's been a very busy day at the Capitol, have visited hundreds of offices. I'm here with state Senator Drew Springer. This is a chairmain, Dustin Burrows. This is Representative Cole Hefner. Mister Sid Miller. My friend, Tim Davis. A lot of resources here in the state of Texas have been used to promote this vaccine. We just want to know the facts. One of our groups went into an office and they actually refused to meet with us because they felt like maybe there could be a risk of disease amongst our individual.

[00:07:17] Various speakers
There was no risk that we posed to anyone there except to maybe open a few minds.

[00:07:22] Jackie Schlegel
Texas has a duty to step up and give us the answers where the federal government has failed. We are the last resort. If you lose this battle, if you lose Texas, I promise you, you lose the entire country. Today is the beginning of a revolution. That's really what we need. This needs to be the start of it because there is a silent majority taking place and they don't know that they are feeling the same as their neighbors or their communities. Friends, it is not time for fear. It is time we take our power back. I love you guys, thank you.

[00:08:08] Del Bigtree
You want to talk about a warrior mom, a warrior mom talked me into getting a pedicure all the way back in 2016. This is us getting a pedicure during one of my first meetings. Come to town, I need to talk to you about what we're doing here. I am honored and pleasure to be joined right now by Jackie Schlegel, executive director of Texans for Medical Freedom.

[00:08:27] Jackie Schlegel
Yes, sir.

[00:08:28] Del Bigtree
I've said it before, you're probably one of the main reasons I moved to Texas. You have been at this for so many years, and the beauty of what I saw in Texas was that you actually had developed relationships in a way with the Senate and the Congress, the health committees, that they were listening. I mean, whether or not they were ready to make giant changes, I just found that when I went and testified that they were listening to what I had to say, which meant that you hadn't scared them away like some of the other groups around the country. So first of all, what's your approach? How is it that you've developed that relationship inside our government here in Texas?

[00:09:08] Jackie Schlegel
First of all, thank you so much for having me here. It's so great to be back in studio. You have the best staff, they are so wonderful.

[00:09:14] Del Bigtree
I agree.

[00:09:15] Jackie Schlegel
And seeing that video was a blast from the past. I mean, we've been at this for a while and we do, we met back in 2015, 2016. Really I was just getting started, like you said, and I'm just a mom. And I did, I called Mr. Bigtree and said, hey, you know, we got this event in Texas, will you come out, and then pick you up in the airport and we ended up, my toes need to be done. You get a pedicure, you graciously paid. But we've had lots of conversations throughout the years. And to be honest, looking back, when I first started, you know, I wasn't entirely sure what the best way to advocate was. But my gut instinct walking into that building for the first time was they really weren't going to be receptive to somebody who was angry, irrational, they weren't going to want to listen to that. So my approach really was just one conversation at a time. If I can walk into this building, into this office and this staffer, this legislator, this chairperson, and I can share my heart, and I can do it from a place of compassion and ask them what their experience is, meet them where they are then I can start to win over hearts and minds.

[00:10:30] Jackie Schlegel
And let me tell you, friend, throughout the last eight, nine years of doing this, there's been a lot of ups and downs. They haven't always been receptive. But the one thing they can always guarantee, when I step foot in that office, they are going to be treated with respect, they are going to have their questions answered. If I don't have an answer to their question, I am going to go find it. And then we rely on experts to come in and bring the science and have the discussions and to show up and testify. We ask our members and our supporters to bring out their families and respectfully engage. And when you do that, you will slowly but surely start to see the tide turn. And I think COVID did help with opening a lot of ears and eyes. But had we not been here Boots on the ground the last eight, nine years paving that way, I don't think we would have been as successful as we've been.

[00:11:24] Del Bigtree
Well, you wouldn't have been able to use it, right? You wouldn't have had the relationships in order to say, see, this is what I was warning you about, this is what we're talking about. And it does feel like Texas. I mean, I think a lot of people, especially, I lived in California, would think Texas has got it easy, why do they even need to worry about the vaccine issue? But you've actually been fighting here and you had some success this year. When you think about bringing bills, and we brought a lot of bills around the country, many of them don't go anywhere, but you actually got something passed this year.
[00:11:50] Jackie Schlegel
We did. I am so proud of House Bill 44. This is a bill that I've worked on for the last six years. It was very personal to me and my child, and it's very personal to the families that we serve.

[00:12:03] Del Bigtree
You have a vaccine-injured child.

[00:12:05] Jackie Schlegel
I sure do. And she is on the state Medicaid program. And this bill, we were having a really difficult time finding a provider that would see my child based on vaccination status. And this was not an issue unique to me. A lot of families, special needs, low income, for whatever reason, this child was vulnerable, they're on this program, they rely on it, and providers were discriminating based solely on vaccination. Mind you, including vaccines such as HPV, okay. So they had this blanket policy, you couldn't get into the door. And this was providing enormous hardship for our families. So we drafted this bill called the Medicaid Discrimination bill. Over the course of six years, I walked those halls, I had those meetings. But we really picked up momentum with it.

[00:12:55] Del Bigtree
To be clear, you've been pitching this to your representatives for six years. I'm back again, here this year, because I think a lot of people don't realize how much time and energy gets put into this. You know, you're just, you keep showing up, you keep looking to sign up more and more people. So six years at it. Don't get it in the door, second, three, oh, man, it's amazing.

[00:13:14] Jackie Schlegel
You got to keep, you got to keep it at it. So in 2021, we made really good progress with this bill. We had a great legislator, we had a great person who believed in the bill and wanted to advance this bill to the next level. And we got several steps in the process. But unfortunately, it stalled out, it timed out. But with that momentum we had, we came back this legislative session. We brought the bill, we got it through the House. We got nine Democrats on board with this bill. So when I say it was a bipartisan bill, it truly was. It was a great effort, we got it moved over to the Senate. Again, met all of those milestones and got it to Governor Abbott's desk. And we're incredibly proud that tomorrow this bill goes into law and this will protect our most vulnerable children and families with their right to access medical care.

[00:14:13] Del Bigtree
So this basically says that the doctor cannot turn you away based on your medical status.

[00:14:18] Jackie Schlegel
For Medicaid and chip providers, 100%.

[00:14:20] Del Bigtree
Okay, so if you're on Medicaid and you're working with that. What's so ironic about this issue for you is under these circumstances, your child has all the medical issues that they have and need a medical physician because of the vaccine program. And now, and this is just a perfect example, right. All of the side effects, or not all, but many of the side effects are listed in the vaccine. But as soon as it happens to you, you're all on your own. So it's not like, oh, sorry, you're one of the few that didn't get a good reaction, come on in and we're going to take care of that. They're literally like, don't ever come in my office again.

[00:14:52] Jackie Schlegel
You can't even get in the door, which is really how I frame the discussion this legislative session. We've always called this the Medicaid discrimination bill. This session, I presented this for what it was, which is access to care. There is a problem when you can't even step foot in the doctor's office to have the discussion about whether these vaccines are appropriate for your child. And in my discussions with the pediatricians, who many were opposing this bill, you know, that was a big speaking point of how are you giving informed consent when you are stopping these families at the door? They are not even allowed in your facility. You're sending these kids to urgent care in emergency rooms for basic medical care. This is Texas, in Texas we take care of our citizens.

[00:15:44] Del Bigtree
So what's that costing, you know, the taxpayer and everything that's involved in system, right. Go to the ICUs, ERs, whatever. When you look at the, I mean, Texas, obviously, fairly conservative, but when you look at the writing on the wall, is there still a push? I mean, I've always said, when I was moving here, I'm not moving to Texas because I think it's just going to be free forever. I think they're going to attack Texas because if they can take down Texas, they can take down the world. They've got New York. They've got the two giant Democratic centers of the world, California and New York. But, boy, if they could grab Texas, the most conservative state in the union, then this is all over, pharma takes over the world. Do you feel that pressure coming in here?

[00:16:29] Jackie Schlegel
1,000%. I feel it in the legislature, I feel it in our communities. Look, the federal government, the overreach, the CDC, they are not stopping just because Texas passed a bill that protects our right to informed consent. Ultimately, their goal is to shove these mandates down our throats, whether you want them or not. We've seen that. It doesn't matter what the science says. I mean, they just completely railroad the science, they push through their agenda. We saw it with COVID, we've seen it with vaccine mandates, we've seen it with employer mandates. And so 100%, here in Texas, all across the country, there are safer places, but there's no one that is off limits. And that is why we have to push back against the CDC and the complete overreach of government into our homes, no matter what state we live in.
A lot of people I run into are totally jaded now, like the system doesn’t work, I don’t want to have anything to do with it, there’s no point in voting, and all of this, yet when people like you come in here and say, we just passed a bill, there’s, I mean, what would you say to someone that says that. Like it’s just, they’ve just given up on the entire political system?

You know, I hear this, I see it, I feel it. I've had advocates at the Capitol with me who burn out, but we don’t have a choice. We do not have a choice. What we did this legislative session is absolutely proof that if we stick with it, if we stay with it, if we are the calm, reasonable voice of freedom, of liberty, of pushing back, especially here in Texas, we don’t like our rights infringed upon. That is something that we can agree upon. So we need to get active, we need to get involved, and it has been a very challenging time. But now is not the time to let up. Look at your children, think about their future, and think about what we want to hand over to them. And come and join me at the Capitol, I have a lot of fun. You’ve been there before. I don’t know if you would call it fun.

Oh, it’s fun. I actually really that's what got me into all this, I really love talking to the different representatives because it's a game, right? You go in, throw out a a and try and feel out where they’re at and find where that soft place is in them, whether it's just they don't trust pharma or maybe they don’t like products being rushed out on the market, whatever it is, you can find that place or they have a soft space for children that are handicapped and having issues, which is part of the angle that you've brought in here. Jackie, it's always great to hear that we're winning and that it's possible. You represent just this great body of warrior moms that has stepped up, figured out this political system. It's really, truly what makes me love this country, that it's possible. And I love that you're here because you're proving it's still possible, we shouldn't give up. You obviously haven’t. Six years to get a bill passed, congratulations. Thank you for....

Thank you, I appreciate that so much.

....joining us today. Alright. TexasforMedicalfreedom.org. Check out the work that Jackie is doing and join her at the Capitol if you want to pass some more bills. And if you are in your own state or city and you’re wondering what's going on, you got to get involved, you got to get the capital, you got to talk to those that represent you. Alright, it's time for The Jaxen Report. Alright, Jefferey Jaxen. It's amazing, isn't it, to watch people like on the news admitting, like, honestly, smiling, laughing, yeah, I know I got seven of these things. You just wonder, how bad would something have to fail? I just, you know

I never thought we'd be here.

It's beyond like, and we've talked about this a lot, it's getting beyond my ability to reason it, right. I've been studying, I've been, really I feel like I've been a journalist since was about five years old. I was that kid that never stopped asking questions. I've been interviewing everyone I've ever met my whole life, and I feel like I have a pretty good grasp of humanity. And now in this time, I just, I cannot get all the dots to work from a reasonable place. I just can't figure out how you explain how a nice, intelligent person is in government and will continue to just take a product that isn't working for them. Anyway.

We used to put some comedy into this, but it seems like people are like trolling us with their lives. We can't even make fun of it anymore because they're beating it to the punch.

I know, right. It's just a giant cartoon everywhere you go. How do you crack a joke when you live in a cartoon? Alright.

Well, there's a lot going on here, and we're less than two weeks out from an advisory committee on immunization practices meeting. That CDC's ACIP committee, where they make recommendations for vaccines. And it's anticipated that they're going to talk about a new annual booster there, that's what's being signaled. And this booster hasn't been tested on anything but mice because it's been updated with the new variants. And really the public has become aware of the transparency issues around the vaccination conversation, the testing issues, really during COVID, it's streamlined. And, you know, you called that out, you said they're going to make the cookies in public. Before we had to really dig to show, but now they're going to do this full sight. So no place has it really been more obvious than the testing around pregnant women during COVID and remember, the CDC messaging, despite really lack of what they call robust data around vaccinating pregnant women with a COVID vaccine, this is what the CDC messaging looked like. Take a look.

Alright.
[00:22:03] Dr. Rochelle Walensky
No safety concerns were observed for people vaccinated in the third trimester or safety concerns for their babies. As such, CDC recommends that pregnant people receive the COVID-19 vaccine. We have no reason to suspect that these vaccines result in any infertility now or in the future. And in fact, it's implausible that they would. It absolutely is safe to get vaccinated. So I would say if you are thinking about getting vaccinated, there is no bad time to get vaccinated. Get vaccinated while you're thinking about having a baby, before you're thinking about having a baby, while you're pregnant with your baby, or after you've delivered your baby, there is no bad time.

[00:22:46] Del Bigtree
Amazing the level of confidence that she has there, knowing full well, I hope she knows full well, that these videos will last till the end of time.

[00:22:55] Jefferey Jaxen
Right. And if you think that's just a slip up live on live, interviews, this is the CDC's own Twitter account back in 2021. You can check this out, it says, "URGENT: If you are pregnant, recently pregnant, or plan to get pregnant, get vaccinated against #COVID19 as soon as possible." So at any point in your life, just get the vaccine. At that time the data....

[00:23:13] Del Bigtree
And what's amazing, I just want to point out, she says the third trimester, like we looked at it. So they talk about third trimester. That thing, that tweet doesn't say anything about third trimester. It's like if you're thinking about it, you're at the beginning of it. So this is just part of the scam that's going on here, right? Let's look at the most robust side of pregnancy and then see what happens. I know you're going to get into that. I just want to point that out, though, you got to start having the, you know, we're trying to teach you out there in the audience how the red flag goes off, what should trigger the red flag. Like, what time were you looking at? What grouping? Just listen to what they're saying when they talk about it. Alright, go ahead.

[00:23:49] Jefferey Jaxen
Absolutely. Watch the words. And so during that time that these statements were being made, there was basically observational studies, meaning people had, they looked at the VAERS data reporting system and they looked at the V-safe app. The V-safe app was basically an app on your phone that we, that lawyers at the Informed Consent Action Network sued to get the data from the raw data. We put up this dashboard, you can check it out.

[00:24:13] Del Bigtree
It's still on our website, everybody, if you want to see the actual V-safe data that was recorded from everyone that got the COVID vaccine, or that and signed up to this program, over 10 million people were in this program. We've done a lot of reporting on this, but a gigantic group of them ended up reporting having to go to a hospital or seek medical care after vaccination. But that's a different story.

[00:24:34] Jefferey Jaxen
And this is self-reporting. So this is people just, how do you feel today? I feel good, smiley face. And the other data that was was from the vaccine safety datalink, which is really closed to the public, essentially. Researchers sometimes get ahold of this stuff, they can do it, but that was it. There was no like really big studies. And by the way, both the V-safe data, this is the headline, the CDC is quite...

[00:24:54] Del Bigtree
And let's be clear, there weren't pregnant, you weren't allowed to be in the original trials of these vaccines if you were pregnant, right. In fact, I think we've reported on it, you weren't even allowed, you weren't supposed to be having sexual intercourse while you were in the trial, which is a really odd demand and we've talked some about that. But just that's how specific they were.

[00:25:11] Jefferey Jaxen
Right. Exactly. And the CDC has ended that V-safe reporting system, this was the recent headline that's really been going around here. So that V-safe data is now, there's a bookend on it. "CDC quietly removes COVID-19 vaccine adverse events collection from website." So think about this, Pfizer never did a proper study on pregnant women with a COVID shot, just like they never did, to see if it stopped transmission before they rolled out the shot to the world. Now in 2021, what also happened? So you have Walensky saying all these things, the CDC is tweeting these things. Pfizer makes this big announcement. Again, the vaccine has already been given out worldwide to pregnant women. Pfizer comes along in 2021 and says this, "Pfizer and BioNTech commence" --we're going to commence-- "global clinical trial to evaluate COVID-19 vaccine in pregnant women." Huh? We're already giving this out. So you go in here and this is their grand plan. They say basically, eventually, "The phase 2/3 trial is designed as a randomized, placebo-controlled, observer-blind study in approximately 4,000 healthy women" --remember, they get the healthiest people they can find-- "18 years of age or older vaccinated during 24 to 34 weeks of gestation." So that's basically....

[00:26:15] Del Bigtree
There it is again, late on in, s all they're going to look at is when your baby is the healthiest it can be, not when it's just starting to form in the first trimester, which would be where you would obviously imagine you would have spontaneous abortions and things like that. They don't even bother to put any of those into this trial. I mean, folks, this is how your regulatory agencies are allowing the pharmaceutical industry to do their science. They are literally cherry-picking coming out of the gate. And remember, this trial isn't even started to millions and millions and maybe hundreds of millions of pregnant women are already receiving this vaccine around the world. You know what? Maybe we should look at this. Let's do a totally fixed study so that we can make everybody feel good about what they already did last year. Alright.
[00:27:01] Jefferey Jaxen
And these were agreed upon things. This is the FDA saying like, look, if you roll this out, you're going to have to do a study on myocarditis. You're going to have to do a study like, really look into this Pfizer. So Pfizer is saying, we'll do this on pregnant women, sure. So they're looking at 4,000 healthy pregnant women. Now we go to clinicaltrials.gov. Now this study is on the way, clinicaltrials.gov, it's posted there. And you see this, you start reading, they're expecting 4,000 healthy women, that was a press release. Now it says, "...in approximately 350 healthy women" --whoops-- "women 18 years of age or older vaccinated at 24 to 34 weeks' gestation." So they have the same frame, but they lost some people in the study. What happened? So the homework, Pfizer just submitted their homework in the end, basically mid-July of 2023. The trial is over, they're analyzing the data, and this, when you go to the completed study at ClinicalTrials.gov, you see this. "Eventually 348" -so now we pared it down even, two less, from 350 to 348-- "maternal participants were randomized to receive treatment. 335 were infants born to maternal participants." So there's 13 pregnancies there that are unaccounted for. Let's hold that for a second, but if you have a trial with 348 people, obviously this is what's called an underpowered study. You're not going to find much out from this when it comes to safety. Losing 13 people out of this study is a big deal.

[00:28:26] Del Bigtree
Let me just, this whole underpowered thing was something I didn't fully understand when I got involved in here, and if you're watching this for the first time, an underpowered study means there are not enough people in the study to determine really simple issues. Like imagine if the vaccine ends up causing a spontaneous abortion in one out of 100 people that receive it, right. You ask yourself, if we're looking for a 1 in 100 problem. And remember, they like to say that the vaccines only have a 1 in 1,000,000 problem. 1 in 100 would be a catastrophic problem. But if you only have 350 people in your study and you're dividing it in half into 175 in each half, you don't even have enough people to catch two people in a 1 in 100 problem. And I assure you, if in that 175, two of them spontaneously abort, they'll say, well, we don't have a large enough group of people to say that that would have been consistent across tens of thousands or millions of people, so it really probably is just an anomaly. This is how they're designing these studies. They design them so they have absolutely no power to determine anything at all. So even if they see a problem, they just say, nah, you know, it could have happened as the background rate. You do something with 10,000 people in it, or even the 4,000 they started with, now you have 2,000 people. If you have a 1 in 100 problem that's 20. Right now you see, oh, my God, now let's look at the placebo group and we can start to see if something's going on here. If you're deciding, well, they had two over here and one over here or one, mean, you see. This is what underpowered means. This is why we should not be allowing products that could potentially alter our DNA or make us spontaneously abort, and only having 175 people in the group that gets the product.

[00:30:12] Jefferey Jaxen
We're looking through this data, we're finding more questions than answers, really. An Australian journalist, Maryanne Demasi, wrote about this. She's been tracking this story, particularly in pregnancy and the data and the trials, and she wrote this headline. "Pfizer drip feeds data from its pregnancy trial of covid-19 vaccine." And we go into the story. Remember, it's 4000 to 350 they reduced it to. There's a screenshot of the protocol amendment in this article and you can see Protocol amendment, May 2021. The trial was announced on February of 2021, so it took them three months to do this. "Reduced the study sample size based on regulatory feedback and evolving global availability of COVID-19 vaccines for pregnant women," whatever that means, so.

[00:30:54] Del Bigtree
Evolving global availability of a product that is being given to hundreds of millions of people. The 350 people we have in this study, we had to kind of like jockey their way around because of what, you know. There's vaccines everywhere. What are they talking about? Alright.

[00:31:11] Jefferey Jaxen
Right. Again, more questions, so she writes, "Notably, study protocols indicate that Pfizer was given the green light as early as May 2021 by drug regulators to scale back the trial and reduce the sample size." She reached out to Retsef Levi, he's an MIT professor, and he gave this quote in the article. "To me, the wording in the protocol suggests that the FDA or another regulator basically gave Pfizer permission to do less." Three months into the trial, they amend the protocol to do less. It goes on to say, "Of the 13 pregnancies unaccounted for, Pfizer reported one fetal death (stillbirth) in the vaccine group and the outcome of the other 12 pregnancies remain unknown." That's a big problem. She finally says, "Finally, there were quite a few babies that were lost to follow-up in the trial. Twenty-nine babies in the placebo arm didn't get to the end of the 6-month surveillance period, versus 15 babies in the vaccine arm. That's almost double. Again, this is concerning and requires a detailed and transparent explanation," said Levy.

[00:32:11] Del Bigtree
I can't, I can't help myself, I've got to just step in here. Folks, you start out with like 350 people and suddenly there's 13 of them are missing from the data. I mean, this is science that is determining the future of the world. Is determining whether or not this is safe. This is a bit like when I was working on "The Doctors" television show, I would scrub in. I would go in and shoot inside the OR surgeries. A lot of people don't realize this, at the end of the surgery, they do a count of all of the sponges and all of the rubber gloves and all of the scissors and tools that came into the room, because believe it or not, they get lost inside of the surgery all the time. So they have to sit there and one person's going one, two, and they go, okay, we came in with 30. We have 30 sponges, we're good to go. This is like walking with 350 sponges. You do the surgery, you sew the person all up and say, we're missing like 15 sponges. Aah, it'll be fine. This is how the science is being done. This is the best we can possibly do.
[00:33:09] Jefferey Jaxen
Right. And so we look at the study protocol, this was what they set out to do. And you're thinking, okay, they're studying pregnant women, they're going to give them the vaccine, they're going to monitor these women for years, they're going to monitor their children. That's how it's portrayed in the media, robust science from the best agencies. This is the protocol. You go back to Pfizer's protocol for this study and they say this. "Maternal participants who originally received the placebo" -- which was a saline placebo -- will receive Pfizer's vaccine "at defined time points as part of the study." Del, they're vaccinating the placebo group, so it's over. You're done. Long-term follow-up is over, they got the vaccine, so that is over now. So we're just kind of looking for the...

[00:33:54] Jefferey Jaxen
Looking for those babies they lost, at this point, and that's what's going on. So.

[00:35:09] Jefferey Jaxen
And the science in America was something we reported on last week. So we started to see patterns in the headlines, concerning patterns, showing that masks were coming back at universities, at hospitals, other places as well, and there was this drumbeat of this similar fear we saw in the headlines in 2020. And we said, oh, it's time to really look into this. And there was even a fact check after the show because so many people were looking at this. They had to go out of their way to say, don't worry about it. Nothing's coming back. We're fact-checking this, it's a fact. We're not doing this again.

[00:35:43] Del Bigtree
The lockdowns aren't going to happen. You know, this happened a lot of places. And by the way, folks, I mean, don't go back to sleep. Don't trust. If I have to say it, clearly already this far in the show, you should say, I don't know if I can trust my government. That's right. You're allowed to not trust your government. That's why it's the United States of America. If you lose the ability to not trust your government, you know you're in real trouble.

[00:36:03] Jefferey Jaxen
And they're literally, people are literally, organizations are literally still doing studies to see if the lockdowns worked, if the restrictions worked, masking worked. And one of those organizations is the Royal Society. The Royal Society is the oldest, continually existing scientific academy in the world. It was started in 1660. And they just put out, think about this, in the middle of all of these headlines over the last couple of weeks, they dropped this review. "COVID-19: examining the effectiveness of non-pharmaceutical interventions." This is out August 2023. What do they mean by non-pharmaceutical interventions? Well, that's masking, that's social distancing measures, including school, workplace closures, closing bars, closing sporting events, basically lockdowns. Upgrades in ventilation, so that's all packaged in this one thing, and this is what they say. Again, this comes out right in lock step with the headlines. "In summary, evidence about the effectiveness of NPIs applied to reduce the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 show unequivocally that, when implemented in packages that combine a number of NPIs with complementary effects, these can provide powerful, effective and prolonged reductions in viral transmission." But then they admit this. "Understanding all these other health and social and economic impacts of NPIs is of course extremely important and is a key question for inquiries being conducted around the world. However, this report focuses specifically on the impacts of NPIs on SARS-CoV-2 transmission while acknowledging the need for similar analyses of all the other consequences of the implementation of NPIs."

[00:37:31] Jefferey Jaxen
And if you can see how ridiculous this is, the Science Media Center took a stab at it before we did, and they said this. "expert reaction to Royal Society report" and they write, "In that context it looks rather ironic that this report, and the evidence reviews that accompany it, choose explicitly to leave consideration of adverse effects largely out of the picture, particularly social and economic effects...They mention [page 25] that the consideration of all the health, social and economic impacts 'is a key question for inquiries being conducted around the world.' But will those inquiries, most of which have strong political aspects, get to the bottom of that question..." Well, we're going to get to the bottom of the Royal Society, because as we reported on the show for a long time now, there's a lot of studies showing that the masks are at best highly questionable. The Cochrane Collaboration report had 78 studies showing really not much difference in stopping flu-like symptoms or flu-like influenza or COVID. But let's look at the Royal Society donor list, let's start there. Companies, it says. Well, there you go, right at the top. AstraZeneca, whoops, they make vaccines.

[00:38:36] Del Bigtree
Right....the people that made it for you, okay.
Google Europe. I tend to remember Google Europe and Google as a company in general helping censoring the medical conversation online, that's interesting. Well, let's look at what the Royal Society has brought on for honorary fellows. These are very important people that work with the Royal Society. Number one, you may recognize this gentleman, Tedros Ghebreyesus. He runs the W.H.O. Now, another person we have, Edward Holmes, Professor Edward Holmes. You remember him from this statement in April of 2020 from the University of Sydney, "Statement from Prof Edward Holmes on the SARS-CoV-2 virus." He says, "There is no evidence that SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19 in humans, originated in a laboratory in Wuhan, China." And of course Professor Eddie Holmes was one of the many virologists that was in the email chains that we reported on from the unredacted emails at the beginning of the COVID response, trying to figure out how are we going to kind of hide these anomalies because it looks like this thing may have came from a lab. And he even writes that in the email here. Putting the paper together, which was originally the origins paper of COVID, he says, "It's fundamental science and completely neutral as written. Did not mention other anomalies as this will make us look like loons. As it stands, it's excellent basic science..." So left out a lot of stuff, kind of cherry-picked the data. Let's keep going here. Another honorary fellow from the Royal Society, Sarah Gilbert. She actually was the creator of the AstraZeneca vaccine. This is the BBC article, "The woman who designed the Oxford Vaccine," that's the AstraZeneca vaccine. You may remember this vaccine from 2021 when "Major European nations suspend use of the AstraZeneca vaccine" in concert because of some of the issues it was causing. And then currently...

AstraZeneca is funding the Royal Society and has the designer of the vaccine on the, was it...

Honorary fellow.

Honorary fellow, okay.

Yes. And, speaking of AstraZeneca, there's even more in the headlines just recently, this vaccine is not doing well. "AstraZeneca facing two London lawsuits over COVID-19 vaccines," that's Reuters. But then this guy, Sir Patrick Vallance, he actually played a part in this actual study about NPIs, he's credited in the study. You may remember him from this headline, "Sir Patrick Vallance to step down as No10's chief scientific adviser after playing key role in Covid lockdown." So this is the Royal Society...

So literally, from the people that locked you down comes a study saying that we did it exactly right. Trust us.

It was unequivocally, really great. So.

Amazing.

We've looked at, let's talk about masks for a second, because they're still in the headlines. And we've looked at a lot of the science showing do they work, do they not work? But how about the actual mask itself? A Korean researcher has just looked at this, this study has been really going around. They measured, "Measuring the quantity of harmful volatile organic compounds inhaled through masks." So they say, "If hazardous compounds are released from these masks, the human body is at risk. For example, dimethylformamide (DMF) and dimethylacetamide (DMAc), which are organic solvents used in the production of masks and have been detected in KF masks in South Korea, cause reproductive toxicity, liver toxicity, and cancer in the human body." That's just one of these volatile organic compounds. But we go to the chart here that they show in this study, and they tested a lot of different masks. So you can see on the left side the samples, they letter them A, B, C, D, E, and masks A and B are the disposable masks, essentially what everyone was wearing. You take them out of the little cheap plastic package, put them on your face, use them once, one-use masks, and the rest of those C, D and E, those are cotton masks, polyester masks, those are a little different. And so we look at the testing results and we see this graph here. On the left, this is total volatile organic compounds. You can see A and B, especially A2, B1, B3, you're looking at over 2600. 4800 in one sample. Now keep in mind, at around 3000, the German Federal Environmental Agency has flagged those to be health concerns, after 3000. So two of those masks go, blow past that. The other two in the 2000s are approaching it, so this is...

And to think we were living in these things, right? I mean, people just literally living in them, in their cars, everywhere they went. It's unbelievable, to think you're just sucking these fumes down.

And it said, obviously the cotton masks were a little better, but, you know, for those people that are watching the show that either have to mask or still want to mask, it does say, in full disclosure in this study, if you open the package of the mask and you let it sit for 30 minutes, it reduces those volatile organic compounds by 67%. So that is a technique if you're really not looking at inhaling these potentially toxic compounds for the entire day or your child, leave that mask out after you open it.
See even the pro-maskers get a takeaway here on The HighWire, we cover everybody. We got everybody covered.

We're all-inclusive. Unfortunately, one of the stories that we reported last week is X, Twitter. And Elon Musk, who became a champion of free speech when he took over Twitter and said, this is going to be open to everybody, we're not going to do any type of censorship, basically. And so when we, we streamed this, as I'm speaking right now, this is streaming on the X platform. We've been streaming on the Twitter platform for a very long time. And something interesting happened after our show last week. We had the live stream, all things were well.

And to be clear, I was claiming that I thought I might be being shadowbanned, where I usually would get thousands of views on things, I was only getting 5 or 6 and things like that, so we were curious. We were talking about it on last week's show, calling out Yaccarino saying, is she changing the culture of X? So all of that was a part of our show, to be clear. We weren't being nice to Twitter last week, or X.

Right. And we were just asking some open-ended questions that beg the question to be asked. And now our show is, how this works after the live show, the feed, the actual video still stays up on the platform. Anybody can rewatch it on the platform. And what was happening is people would hit play, it would spin, but there would be no more live feed. And that has continued to this day as I'm speaking right now, so it's been off-platform for a week, essentially. The post is still up there. We checked on our end. We really didn't see anything that we did wrong, so it's an open-ended question, it's a mystery right now. But this prompted a conversation between us of, let's look into Elon Musk, because this is a guy who, he has his hands in a lot of things. He's doing a lot of things, most recently free speech. But check out kind of a background of all of the things he is really involved in. Take a look.

Alright.

The story of Elon Musk is almost too incredible to believe.

People have called you the real Tony Stark.

On any given day, he could be the world's richest man or he could be the world's second richest man.

Elon Musk is one of the most important entrepreneurs in the world.

Elon Musk grew up in South Africa, studied in Canada, but then moved to California and became a Silicon Valley superstar by creating the online commerce business, PayPal.

When eBay acquired PayPal in 2002, Musk took home $165 million. The young entrepreneur turned his gaze upwards and set up Space Exploration Technologies, or SpaceX, with a mission statement of enabling people to live on other planets.

Since its founding in 2002, SpaceX has had many achievements. It's the first private company to launch, orbit, and recover a spacecraft. How is it possible that Elon Musk could launch two impossible businesses? SpaceX, a builder of rocket ships, and Tesla, which could be the first successful car company start-up in America in 90 years?

All transport, with the exception of rockets, will go fully electric. I see the value of Tesla as a catalyst in that transition.

The Tesla Model S has been called the greatest car ever built.

Now you've got SolarCity and the solar pack that people put in their housing.

It's the largest provider of rooftop solar systems in the US, and the company boomed on Wall Street.
Elon Musk
We really need to make solar panels as appealing as electric cars have become.

Various speakers
SpaceX's satellite internet service, Starlink has also allowed Musk to play savior in a new way.

Various speakers
Starlink is a globe encircling network of internet beaming satellites that is trying to get you online no matter where you are in the world.

Various speakers
It's been critical to Ukraine's armed forces.

Various speakers
They absolutely depend on it so that they can coordinate their communications of their troops. In a strange way, gives Elon Musk an enormous amount of power.

Various speakers
Elon Musk's brain implant company, Neuralink, said on Thursday it had been given a green light from the US FDA to kick start its first in human clinical study.

Elon Musk
We put a chip in your brain to control your mind.

Various speakers
Over the years, Musk has publicly outlined an ambitious plan for Neuralink. He envisions its devices to cure a range of conditions from obesity, autism, depression, schizophrenia, to enabling web browsing and even telepathy.

Elon Musk
It'll be about restoring functionality to people who've lost their connection between their brain and their body.

Various speakers
I think the concern that people have is, is this just leading us into this dystopian transhumanist future?

Various speakers
He bought Twitter in October 2022 for $44 billion, funding some of the purchase by selling $39 billion worth of his Tesla shares.

Various news reporters
The world's richest man is now promising a Twitter makeover, renaming his own account Chief Twit and proclaiming "The bird is freed." Then fired senior execs once closing the $44 billion deal.

Various news reporters
The deal puts him at the helm of one of the leading global social media platforms.

Elon Musk
Having a public platform that is maximally trusted and broadly inclusive is extremely important to the future of civilization.

Stephen Colbert
Are you sincerely trying to save the world?

Elon Musk
Well, I'm trying to do good things, yeah. I'm interested in things that change the world or that affect the future in wondrous new technology, where you see it and you're like, wow, how did that even happen, how is that possible?

Del Bigtree
Really quite an amazing person. I mean, what a track record.

Jefferey Jaxen
This guy can't miss or almost like he's not allowed to miss or something.

Del Bigtree
He's been hitting for the free throw shot for 13 years straight. You know what I mean? Never miss. Okay.
[00:50:05] Jefferey Jaxen
You know, and he's really, you can see there, he's kind of been, he's been handled by the media lightly until really he went after the free speech and he allowed free speech on his platform, then they really clamped down on him. But let's look, let's go dig into this person and more of his business ventures a little more. So in 2015, the LA Times did this article so almost ten years ago now, so these numbers are probably have changed. But, "Elon Musk growing empire is fueled by $4.9 billion in government subsidies." It says, "Musk and his companies' investors enjoy most of the financial upside of the government support, while taxpayers shoulder the cost. The payoff for the public would come in the form of major pollution reductions, but only if solar panels and electric cars break through as viable mass-market products. For now, both remain niche products for mostly well-heeled customers." So think about that. He has a product, he's getting a lot of government subsidies. It's only going to work if these things really get pushed by say, you know, the headlines we're seeing from California were saying all electric by 2030. They're aggressively pushing out this electric grid, the electric cars, so that's really good for somebody that's on government subsidies, that has these products that really need to hit the home run otherwise they're just going to fail. So just putting that there for a second. But in 2015, he was already drumming on the carbon tax, which is taxing people's carbon emissions. So this is a headline here, "Elon Musk says robust carbon tax would speed global clean energy transition." So he was really interested in....

[00:53:14] Jefferey Jaxen

[00:53:09] Del Bigtree
Okay.

[00:51:47] Jefferey Jaxen
And remember, we covered the net zero transition. Because they're pushing it so fast that will require a command and control economy, says one of the reviews that we've covered. A war footing, people would have to really sacrifice to do this. So this is what we're talking about here. 2021 carbon tax. Again, "Elon Musk: 'My top recommendation' for reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a carbon tax." And that sounds a lot like somebody else that we've covered before, which is also in 2021, "Addressing climate change through carbon taxes." Who wrote that? The World Economic Forum. They're all about that as well. And let's take a moment here to look at one of the heads, or the head of the World Economic Forum, Klaus Schwab, someone we've covered here for a very long time. This is him in 2019 talking about another aspect of what he calls the Fourth Industrial Revolution that society is now in. Take a listen.

[00:55:32] Del Bigtree
Okay.

[00:52:39] Klaus Schwab
It changes not only what we are doing, it changes us. Because it's a fusion of our physical, digital, and biological fields, spheres. It's an integration of those spheres. Just think of sensors planted into our brains. The opportunities are immense.

[00:53:09] Del Bigtree
Sensors planted into our brains, the opportunity is immense. Okay.

[00:53:14] Jefferey Jaxen
Right. So, nothing else has to be said there. Two years before that talk, we have Elon Musk and these headlines. "Humans must merge with machines or become irrelevant in AI age." So just a few months ago we had this headline, "Elon Musk's Neuralink Wins FDA Approval for Human Study of Brain Implants." So this is where they basically cut out a piece of your skull, they replace it with a chip, a brain chip, if you will, and that's going to do a lot of things that they promise. Like the commentator said at the beginning here, it's going to cure autism, it's going to allow you to browse your web browser, whatever. So there's an issue with this, and one of the issues is the testing. This was one of the headlines that came out. "Musk's Neuralink faces federal inquiry after killing 1,500 animals in testing." Now here's some images. These images were obtained by a Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, they're in a lawsuit, this was Discovery. These are images of monkeys used by Neuralink and UC Davis, which was collaborating to test these Neuralinks on these monkeys. "Physicians Committee's Response to Neuralink's Nov 30, 2022 'Show and Tell.'" This is a press release they put out and they said this. "An ongoing Physicians Committee lawsuit against the University of California, Davis, which partnered with Neuralink from 2017 to 2020, has revealed hundreds of pages of documents that show the horrors of the company's work. Neuralink employees drilled holes in rhesus macaques' skulls and implanted devices that often broke or caused severe infections. They failed to follow their own protocol, which resulted in at least one monkey suffering from bleeding in her brain and such severe vomiting that she developed ulcers in her esophagus before she was killed." They go on to say, "Monkeys suffered paralysis, seizures, and such poor psychological health that they pulled out their own hair. Ultimately, Neuralink killed many of the monkeys used at UC Davis."

[00:54:59] Del Bigtree
Sounds like a product ready for warp speed to me. Let's get that out to the people as quick as we can get it.
[00:55:06] Jefferey Jaxen
Right. And you know, this isn't, again, Neuralink is not the only company to be trying this brain chip, these neural sensors, but they're very public about it, and obviously there appears to be some issues with some of the testing. But this isn't specifically to the brain chip industry. We've seen this with Dr. Stanley Plotkin, as we've covered on this show before, the godfather of vaccines. He admitted under oath that they tested on people under colonial rule, incarcerated people, people with disabilities. That's the modern day vaccination paradigm is resting upon that. So we're seeing kind of this is different, it's monkeys, but we're still seeing kind of these horrors going through. And now let's go to another video, let's talk Elon Musk's rocket ships. This rocket launch happened and it's an important for a couple of reasons. And you can see here the countdown and off it goes, ignitions and up into the air. The story here, researching this story, it really starts with an organization called In-Q-Tel. And we're going to look at this headline. "In-Q-tel names Dr. Michael D. Griffin as President and Chief Operating Officer. In-Q-Tel is the venture capital funding arm of the CIA. So it funds projects that further the CIA's objectives, that's what it's there for.

[00:56:20] Del Bigtree
Got it.

[00:56:20] Jefferey Jaxen
So that brings us, now hold that space for a second, that brings us to a Bloomberg business article titled "Elon Musk's Space Dream Almost Killed Tesla." So in this article, Elon Musk went to Russia with some friends and they wanted to buy a rocket, an ICBM, Intercontinental Ballistic Missile from Russia because they wanted to work. This was before SpaceX even started, one year before they started. They wanted to understand how this technology works, maybe try to bring this into what eventually was SpaceX. Well, they got shut down. So they went back a year later in 2002. Remember, 2002 is when Griffin takes hold of In-Q-Tel. So here we pick up the article. "In February of 2002 the group returned to Russia, this time bringing Mike Griffin, who had worked for the CIA's venture capital arm In-Q-Tel; NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory; and was just leaving Orbital Sciences, a maker of satellites and spacecraft. Musk was now looking for not one, but three missiles and had a briefcase full of cash, too." Alright. So the story, this byline story follows Michael Griffin. And from then he goes into NASA in 2005.

[00:57:29] Jefferey Jaxen
He's appointed NASA administrator, and that's the headline, "Many NASA scientists encouraged by Griffin's appointment." Some people were excited about that. A year into his administration in NASA, he starts something that really NASA has never done. They opened up the field for collaboration to commercial industry to get into orbit. So in 2006, they looked at what's called COTS, Commercial Orbital Transportation Services. So this guy goes from In-Q-Tel to NASA and he puts this funding round together and it says, "On May 5th, 2006, the COTS Round 1 finalists were selected. NASA made the decision to select two companies in order to allow for competition, while at the same time being able to distribute sufficient funds of money to each partner for their development programs...On August 18, Space Act Agreements were signed with SpaceX and Rocketplane Kistler. The companies were awarded a total of $278 million and $207 million respectively..." So SpaceX now is funded by NASA with the help of this program, who, Michael Griffin is running NASA as an administrator.

[00:58:34] Del Bigtree
And he's running around with Elon Musk before this, right. Taking trips to Russia. Now he's working at NASA, and who does he give the money to? You know what? You know who's the front runner? The guy I've been running all over the world with looking for a rocket.

[00:58:47] Jefferey Jaxen
Right. With suitcases full of money. Interesting. I would challenge anybody to try to go to a different, fly to a different state with a suitcase full of like $1,000 and see how that works. So we go now to August of 2022. Elon Musk had been launching rockets, SpaceX. I should say, has been launching rockets from 2009 up to present day. This headline in 2022, "T-Mobile, SpaceX team up to beam 5G from space." So now we're talking some pretty serious stuff. And that's the idea, they're talking about it, but in April of this year, it becomes a reality. "SpaceX launches world's 1st 5G satellite to bring global connectivity to Internet of Things." And just days ago, that video we just watched of that launch, this is why that's important, here's the headline. "SpaceX launches 5,000th Starlink satellite towards orbit..." and it says in the article, "Five thousand Starlink satellites is a lot to be sure, but the number is likely to grow far into the future. SpaceX has permission to deploy 12,000 Starlink" satellites in LEO, that's Low Earth Orbit, "and it has applied for permission for about 30,000 more on top of that."
[00:59:54] Jefferey Jaxen
So and you can see these things up in the air when they launch these. You can see them following a trail. They’re basically canvassing the globe with satellites that we’re to believe from the headlines that are going to be beaming 5G down. I’m not sure of any scientific studies that show the safety of that, but that’s what’s happening. And SpaceX has worked very closely, in fact, over $5 billion from NASA, from the US Navy, and it’s basically working with the Department of Defense as well. They bring payloads up there, classified payloads. So we kind of don’t really know exactly what’s being put up there. We know the satellites are. But the final piece here is, obviously Elon Musk is very, very smart when it comes to money. So during the beginning of COVID, there was a race for a vaccine. Tesla jumped into that and this was the headline on that one. It says, “Tesla becomes manufacturing partner for biotech firm CureVac working on COVID-19 vaccine.” These are these printers that they were trying to get. It didn’t actually take off like they wanted it to. But Elon Musk goes on April 2023 on Twitter and says this. “This will make some people upset,” he writes, “but I need to emphasize that accelerating synthetic mRNA technology was another silver lining. It is a revolution in medicine, like going from analog to digital. The Covid mRNA vaccine dosage level was too high and having a zillion booster shots was idiotic, causing more harm than good imo, but I am convinced that synthetic mRNA is the surest path to curing cancer, among other things.” So we have that piece in there for the Covid response. And during the Covid response, right at the beginning of 2020, we have Richard Horton. He’s the editor-in-chief of The Lancet, and he writes this. The article is called “The coming technocracy.” He says, “...as the response to the pandemic unfolded, it has become all too clear that the work of scientists has put a powerful constraint on political action. Presidents and prime ministers now fear to step outside the boundaries set by science. Technocracy is replacing democracy.” Now, taking a moment really quick, technocracy is basically rule by experts, rule by scientists. And in that paradigm, as a thought exercise, Elon Musk would be a king in that paradigm, if you really put that. His companies would be. They would...

[01:02:16] Del Bigtree
I mean, look, you think about this. I mean, you’ve got In-Q-Tel, which is a CIA-funded group, working with him. He’s gotten funding for his electric car from the government that then passes laws that you have to get an electric car in order to live in this society. Like everything he’s doing appears to be intertwined with CIA, government. Now he’s going to have more satellites in space than any businessman in the world. He just bought a communications company with Twitter and he’s turning that into X, and now he’s going to have more satellites literally literally literally the Internet of Things, which is that interconnected, every camera that follows us, all of these tracking systems, everything we’re talking about, who owns it? Elon Musk.

[01:02:57] Jefferey Jaxen
And so this brings us back to a study. Now we go way back to the beginning of the 1930s. The Depression just happened in the United States, people were looking for another way to govern themselves. And there was an organization that came up called Technocracy Inc, Technocracy Incorporated. And their idea was to have, it was a movement, an educational movement they called themselves. But the idea was to have no borders, no countries, just one gigantic continental landmass called the Technate. There’s actually a map here from the 1940s. This is the Technate. It’s basically a techno-utopia run by engineers and scientists and experts. And they wanted to organize the world economies on the basis of not money, they actually didn’t want people to have like jobs where they get paid money. They wanted to organize these world economies on the basis of energy consumption, where each person would receive a monthly energy allotment, kind of like a universal basic income. Everything would be priced in energy. And that would be what they had to use.

[01:03:59] Del Bigtree
A couple of books, I want to just show the covers of these books because I think it’s interesting when you look at them. Look at this, this is “Technocracy,” one of the books they put out. Up on the top right, “Science built civilization. Science must save civilization.” I mean, we’re talking about like automobile technology back then. Construct the new America, right? I mean, this is what this thinking is. Remove the borders and let scientists run the this new space, not politicians. Is that essentially the idea?

[01:04:28] Jefferey Jaxen
Yeah, absolutely. And they had a lot of other branching off ideas. But when you look at I mean, there’s a lot of similarities to what the World Economic Forum is talking about. There’s a lot of similarities between a lot of organizations. But we go back to this article, and this was in the CBC as Canada’s reporting. “In science we trust.” It says, “Back in the first half of the 20th century, a group called Technocracy Incorporated wanted to reorganize society by putting scientists in charge. The movement flamed out, but its underlying message still appeals to many in Silicon Valley...Joshua Halderman was a leader of Technocracy Incorporated in Canada from 1936 to 1941, but eventually became disillusioned with both the organization and the country, and packed up his young family to start anew in South Africa. In June of 1971, Halderman’s daughter Maeva gave birth to his first grandson. His name is Elon Musk.”

[01:05:24] Del Bigtree
Wow. I mean, you just got to let that sink in for a second. I mean, just for, you know. And look, coincidence? Maybe. But look at this guy’s coincidental life, right? It now turns out his grandfather had a dream of a technocratic world where science runs the world. His grandson is somehow being given gigantic funding projects by our government, by the CIA, all of which are advancing this technical world that is giving him more and more power. And when you think about it, other than the pushback on Twitter, he has just been giving a free ride everywhere he goes.

[01:06:05] Jefferey Jaxen
Until he talks about censorship, which is a subplot in itself. Until he starts to allow people to have free and open debate on one of the biggest social media platforms. So there’s a lot, there’s no clear ending to this, but there’s a lot of intertwining stories which I think people should find really interesting.
[01:06:20] Del Bigtree
That is and amazing dive there, Jefferey. And look, I want to point out, we're not making any accusations here at all. All we're doing is laying out what I think we should all know. As we try to figure out what we think of the people around us, as I said at the beginning of this show, know your enemy and know your friend. I mean, Elon Musk has been great. The Twitter files have allowed for some lawsuits that are really helping different organizations push back against the government, we'll see where that all goes. And again, I'm always torn. I want to believe that everyone is in this for the right reasons. I get this sense from Elon that he's trying to do what's right, but what does his right mean? What is his right compared to the rest of our right? Does it involve nature at all? Am I going to have a choice when you keep pushing an mRNA vaccine technology and advancing these things and when we're rushing science. Imagine a world run by scientists that, as we've shown so far up until this point in the show, where science isn't actually being done. Where everything that's forced upon you was tested on 175 people and 13 of them are now missing.

[01:07:26] Jefferey Jansen
Right, right. And, you know, looking at the history of Technocracy, Incorporated, it kind of flamed out in the 70s. And at that time, it was the Vietnam War, there was an oil crisis, and so the people's faith in leadership was kind of hitting an all-time low. And the idea of giving more power to these really smart leaders, these scientists, people were like, no, we're done with this. So that is kind of where we're at right now in society. People do not want to give up more power, so the idea of at least a soft technocracy coming in and saying we will be the savior, I don't think people will buy this, but you know, how something might that might come in in another way, that's a conversation I think we have to have.

[01:08:05] Del Bigtree
Yeah. Jefferey great reporting, amazing. I am so lucky to have you on our team here at The HighWire. Keep up the good work and we'll see what you dig up next week.

Alright, thanks Del.

[01:08:17] Del Bigtree
Alright. Well, I have to make a correction. This is something that we do officially when I or someone on the show makes a misstatement. I made a mis-statement last week, off the cuff. I referenced the, two weeks ago, an interview with Geert Vanden Bossche. I talked about the fact that he brought up that, you know, essentially everybody who's been vaccinated is a Petri dish in a gain of function study, and I mentioned the fact that he had worked for the WHO, that he comes from way up high, he did Ebola vaccine trials, has probably one of the most impressive resumes of almost anyone in the vaccine and immunology space. But he reached out to me last week and said, Del, I did not work for the WHO. This is his actually the email I received. "Dear friends, See below. It's indeed not true that I worked FOR the WHO! I do not come from that organization, but worked WITH them on several occasions, for example as a consultant and, more importantly, during my term as senior Ebola program manager at GAVI. Please correct as I don't want to give them any chance to pretend that I've been lying to you!" I appreciate it. Geert. Thanks for clarifying. I am sorry that I made this misstatement. So he was with GAVI that worked hand-in-hand with the WHO during these Ebola trials, but he was never working for the WHO. I promised Geert I would make that clear, and so there you have it. We, of course, every single week essentially are releasing some new incredible find that has happened through our legal work.

[01:09:54] Del Bigtree
We're doing a lot of investigations. We are constantly bringing Freedom of Information Act requests against people inside the government, government agencies. For those of you that don't know what a FOIA or a Freedom of Information Act request is, it's essentially because our government works for us, we are their employers, I get to ask what Tony Fauci wrote in an email. Those emails are my privy, I get to look at them. So we put in certain requests. And if you are on our newsletter, this is the type of thing you find out the moment we put it out. All you have to do to be a part of our newsletter and get this breaking news when we find out something no one else in the world knows at the moment, just go to thehighwire.com, you just scroll down the page, it's just the simple. Type in your email right there, bam, and now not only do you get these legal updates, you get all of the evidence we provide in this show. Every article we talk about, every video that we play, you get a direct link right in your email box so that you can go back and look at something that really grabbed your attention and share it with your friends. I've said it before. I don't want you out there saying this is what Del Bigtree said on The HighWire, that's ridiculous. What you should be able to say is, this is what the CDC printed in a study. Here's the CDC's own pregnancy study, and they still can't find these 13 pregnant women.

[01:11:09] Del Bigtree
You know, this is how this works. And so, anyway, those are the types of things that happen. I actually mixed it up, it wasn't a CDC study, it was a Pfizer study. But so this week, we actually, in our FOIA request, got a very, very revealing and important email. So this is the press release that we put out. "Internal CDC presentation shows it knew for months that COVID-19 vaccine efficacy was waning and kept it a secret." Here's a paragraph that makes this make a lot of sense. "In fact, the data shows that for the final week of July, fully vaccinated individuals made up an estimated 73% of COVID-19 cases and 63% of COVID-19 hospitalizations in the 65+ age group." Remember all of that? It's the unvaccinated filling the hospitals? Aah, not true. "The presentation goes on to show evidence of rapidly waning immunity, as infection rates 5-6 months post vaccination were twice as high as infection rates in the 3-4 months post vaccination. So this email wasn't covered in one of our requests, it just pops up. We were looking at some information and then this just pops up because it has the words we were searching. Here's what that email looked like. Let's dive into this, because everybody that's anybody was talking to each other and this is a huge one. Marion Gruber, right, there she is, Director, Office of Vaccine Research & Review Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research for the FDA. And Phil Krause, you've got Peter Marks, who is the voice that we've been seeing for the FDA the entire time, telling us, oh, the vaccine works great.
Del Bigtree
If you don’t get it, then we can’t stop the infection. So all of this, they get the email. What is this email? Well, here’s what we found in the email. Basically lays out, this is from an outside study that was done that the CDC has funded. “Our observational study VE findings show a very significant decrease in [vaccine effectiveness] against infection and hospitalization in the Delta phase...” -- remember, this is before Omicron-- “of the pandemic for individuals vaccinated with either the Pfizer or Moderna vaccine” -- they both suck-- “for those 5-6 months post vaccination versus those 3-4 months post vaccination.” So they’re reading this, right? This study has been funded and looked at by the CDC. “I recognize that this information, which we brought to the CDC three weeks ago with weekly updates since, is coming to you on a very short notice prior to the upcoming VRBPAC” -- your FDA -- “meeting. Please feel free to contact us if you would like to further discuss or even present our summary findings on Friday.” So this is the FDA. They’re all sitting there at the FDA, they’ve just received this study that tells them, right there in early 2021, that it doesn’t look like this vaccine is working very well at all. It has serious waning immunity. Most of our hospitalizations now are the fully vaccinated individuals above the age of 65. Well, there’s a newsflash, right? This is how they talk about it.

Dr. Rochelle Walensky
Well, let’s show what they’re looking at. They also have graphs looking at this. So it’s not only that they got words, these are scientists, right? They’re running our regulatory agency at the FDA, and it shows how in this 80% vaccinated above the age of 65. So what they’re saying is the vaccine rate of those that were above the age of 65 was 80% of them were fully vaccinated. Yet an estimated 73% of COVID-19 cases occurred in fully vaccinated individuals. It goes on to talk about the Delta breakthrough infection waning over time in 65 years and older. Breakthrough infection rates 5-6 months post vaccination are twice as high as 3-4 months post vaccination. This thing is a disaster, it’s absolutely going south on them, and they have all that information. This is what we’ve uncovered. What does Peter Marks at the FDA have to say about it? Remember, they’re saying, you’re about to go to a VRBPAC meeting, you should have this information. “Well, it would have been nice to know the [Department of Defense] JAIC was conducting this prior to now.” We should have known which CDC was talking to us like we’ve been promising the world they are. “Also might have been nice for CDC to share the data. But better late than never.” I guess. “As I said yesterday, the totality of the evidence is remarkably consistent.” Meaning, we are seeing waning everywhere, right? Is that what they told us? No. Right after seeing all of this information, they took to the television to tell us this.

Dr. Anthony Fauci
As I’ve said over and over again, the way we will get to that form of control, whatever that number is, is by getting vaccinated, because we have a very good, highly effective and safe vaccine.

Dr. Francis Collins
Today, 66 million Americans still have yet to get that first injection. And today we are losing about 1,500 people to COVID-19 deaths. That’s like, you know, five jumbo jets crashing every day. And all, for the most part, preventable because almost all of these are unvaccinated people.

Dr. Janet Woodcock
Vaccinating younger children against COVID-19 will bring us closer to returning to a sense of normalcy. Parents and guardians can rest assured that we conducted a comprehensive and rigorous evaluation of the data on the vaccine safety and effectiveness, and that this vaccine meets our high standards. Based on immune responses in children 5-11 years of age, the vaccine appears to be 90.7% effective in preventing COVID-19.

Dr. Vivek Murthy
While we are heading in the right direction, we’re still not where we want to be and what we need to do to ultimately get to a better place is we need people to go out there to get their vaccines and their boosters, because we are now seeing with Omicron in particular, that these vaccines and boosters are saving lives and keeping people out of the hospital.

Dr. Peter Marks
Our internal drive here is that we want to bring this pandemic to an end as rapidly as possible and save as many American lives as we possibly can. And so that is what drives us to want to get everyone vaccinated across the globe.

Dr. Anthony Fauci
How can we get to that level of control? Obviously you know what the answer is. It’s vaccination.
[01:17:39] Del Bigtree

Now, I suppose guys like Harold Ford that we saw at the beginning of the show are perfectly happy with the fact that all of that ended up to not be true and will go on for seven, eight, and nine vaccines. I suppose it doesn't matter that the Cleveland Clinic has reported that the more vaccines you get, the more likely you are to be infected, meaning there is a negative efficacy now, you are going to get infected more. And even in the five interview that he gave, he says, I've already gotten COVID three times, even though he's gotten seven vaccines. And now we know why. This was the science. They knew it wasn't working, yet they still lied to you. It's why there's a huge difference in this world to me between the heroes and the zeros. I want to be honest with you. All of this work that we do, these FOIA requests where we out them and show you - no one else. By the way, you're the first ones to see this information. If you're only seeing it moments after those that are actually on our new newsletter got to see it. But here's the point. We are breaking stories nobody else has, proving that our government agencies officially lied to us, had the actual science in their hands and went on to lie to us. Meanwhile, you are funding, with your cable bill and keep that television going that you watch, all of those news agencies that brought those scientists into your living room to lie to you and your children.

[01:19:03] Del Bigtree

I hope they didn't brainwash anyone you know while they were in your house. So I think you need to do something to try and balance that out. And here's where we're at. We are spending a fortune, really, when you think about it, trying to constantly bring the pressure on the government of the United States. We are the most effective nonprofit that has ever been in bringing lawsuits and FOIA requests against government health agencies. No one has achieved what we've achieved. These are our legal wins. So I want to thank Aaron Siri and the amazing team that makes this happen on behalf of the informed Consent Action Network. But we are just, we are at the maximum load that we can do. And I'm going to be totally honest because you deserve transparency. We're doing really good as a nonprofit. We were looking at our numbers just a couple of weeks ago, and we found out, because the people that, you know, our CPA and that worked with our numbers worked with a lot of nonprofits, they're like, you're the only ones that haven't lost funding, that you aren't like falling through the floor. Everyone else, these are very hard times, they're going down. You're maintaining, which is awesome, and I want to thank all of you for all of your support. But here's what I want to point out. We are maintaining while the world is collapsing around us, where the pharmaceutical industry is gearing for the next vaccine and paying for the next politicians in every state you live in to force that vaccine,

[01:20:28] Del Bigtree

They've already done it, you know they're going to do it again. You got Elon Musk out there, he's going to try and figure out a way to get into this game. And who is fighting for you? Who is going to make sure that you are going to be allowed to walk down the street free and never have to wear a mask again, never have to be vaccinated again? Who is pressuring your government? Who is suing your government? We are. So I guess it's okay if we're just maintaining right here and we're doing the maximum that we can do. That's great, because God knows why we would want to accelerate right now when we've got 'em on our heels. Why wouldn't we want to just charge over the hill where they're planning their next scheme on us. No, let's just wait here. Let's just stay right where we are, because that will work out just fine for all of us. I'm talking to you. I'm talking to you out there that know what we're saying is the truth. You are totally excited about the legal work we do, and you keep saying to yourself, you know what, next week I'm going to start funding ICAN because they keep doing such amazing work. Well, right now we're maintaining and we're going to keep working as hard as we can, I'm going to keep the law firm doing exactly what we did last year, just like last year.

[01:21:30] Del Bigtree

Or do you want to help us get over the hill to see what they're doing next, instead of finding out in our rear mirror from a FOIA request how they lied to us? We can catch them in the act. We can get right in there and stop it before it happens. We can't do that without you. We can't do it without every one of you that is watching this show right now, that is funding Fox and MSNBC and CNN and all of them to lie to you. Why don't you put down that Starbucks cup, just look at it and say, you know what? Once a week I'm going to drink one less cup of coffee and I'm going to give this $22 to the Informed Consent Action Network. That's what we'd like you to do. Thehighwire.com, just go up, hit that Donate button. Say I'm going to make a difference in this world, I'm going to sue my government, and make sure they never try to take my rights or the rights of my children away. I'm going to go to the most effective nonprofit that has ever been in this space, and I'm going to decide to give $23 a month, or $10 a month or $1 a month. It all works, it all matters, it all makes a difference. And if you're out there and you've done really well in life, and you're starting to get really nervous about the world around you.

[01:22:43] Del Bigtree

You didn't make all this money to have a beautiful house and a beautiful family, only to watch your free speech disappear. We have some special projects that you can get involved with. Maybe we'll even put your name on it if you want, so reach out to us at info@icandecide.org and we will talk to you directly. We're doing great work here, I want to thank everybody. Look, we are accomplishing amazing things and anyone could brag right now. I'm just not in a bragging, I want more, I'm not satisfied. I won't be satisfied until Tony Fauci is in jail and we're free to walk down the street however we want. Alright. That's how I'm wired. Okay. Speaking of heroes, there are those doctors that always stand up, that have stood up against the system and put it all on the line. They're out there, whether it's getting us Ivermectin when we need it, when no one else will touch it, or just telling the truth and writing articles about it, or informing us where the world is actually going. My next guest is one of those superheroes that has put it on the line. She has stood in front of the European Union, our own government. She's been on news programs doing nothing but speaking her truth. I'm talking about Dr. Meryl Nass. And this is what she looks like in front of a camera.

[01:24:03] Meryl Nass, MD

Hello, my name is Dr. Meryl Nass.
I tended to work for hospitals, at first in the E.R. and then as a hospitalist, 25, 30 years. On the side, I had become interested in biological warfare and trying to prevent it. We have many opportunities using repurposed drugs, herbs, supplements, vitamins to treat most conditions, and certainly to treat COVID. The drugs are available, you're just not being able to access them in most cases because of suppression. The new boosters that FDA has told manufacturers to start producing and testing are likely to have twice as much messenger RNA in them as the original shots. It's very likely that the side effects will be significantly higher. Nowadays, we know that the vaccinated are developing COVID at higher rates than the unvaccinated. Nobody's really talking about it in public, but the scientists are talking about it behind closed doors. There's absolutely no reason to get this vaccine. This information has been suppressed, deliberately suppressed, and people like me who try to get the information out are labeled as misinformation spreaders. Everything I said has turned out to be absolutely accurate, but they didn't like it.
Meryl Nass, MD

That's right. You know, I took an oath to take care of patients, and they seem to think I was supposed to break that oath. But in any event, spreading misinformation, I want everybody to know this. Misinformation is not a crime. Misinformation is mistaken things. I actually was telling the truth, so there wasn't any misinformation. But the government, the federal government and the states are trying to make everybody think misinformation is a crime, and you should be reporting doctors and professionals who are spreading misinformation. So strangers reported me to the board. Oh, she was spreading misinformation on the Internet. We have something called the First Amendment, free speech, as well as freedom of religion and the press and assembly. And it's against the law for governments to suppress your free speech, and the Board of Medicine is a government, state government agency. So they were actually breaking the law. And now we are suing them for a malicious prosecution in which they used their role, you know, under cover of law, as a state agency.

Del Bigtree

Here's one of the headlines. "Doc Suspended for COVID Misinfo Sues, Cites Freedom of Speech." You're actually suing the medical board, and is my understanding, also, each individual on the board?

Meryl Nass, MD

Every individual in their personal capacity.

Del Bigtree

I love you, can I just say that? I love that. You know, it's time to turn the tables here and go after the people that are suppressing free speech, especially when people that watch this show. I mean, say, you've got the FDA already, basically saying when they're under oath, we never stopped anyone from using ivermectin. In fact, we said, you can use it whenever you want. So how is it a medical board is even allowed to say that it's misinformation and to be taking someone's license without scientific studies, peer-reviewed, double-blind, whatever, randomized controlled trials that show in the beginning that ivermectin is dangerous, which would be difficult to do since millions and millions of people take it every, you know, every, was it almost every day for lupus and things like that. And then you've got hydroxychloroquine, similarly. All of these things are being taken all the time, and yet if it's not dangerous and everyone's using it for all sorts of different things off label, why would you lose your license?

Meryl Nass, MD

So exactly right. So it isn't illegal, it's perfectly legal to prescribe those drugs. And the board should have known that, they had three lawyers on the board and a doctor, on staff, and then they had about eight doctors on the members. So they all knew they were writing off-label, or maybe they didn't know. A lot of doctors don't know very much about the legal underpinnings of medicine. But in any event, by the time it came to a hearing, they dropped all of those charges. They did not want to litigate against the First Amendment. They did not want to litigate against off-label prescribing, and they said, we don't want to talk about the vaccine either. Take the vaccine out of this case, even though they had complained, yes, that I'd been saying, you know, terrible things about the vaccine. But they knew, they knew what the law was. So they were heavyhanded, and I was supposed to roll over and give them a win that they could put in the national news, which my case went into the national news. And I think they were shocked that I actually fought back. That wasn't part of their equation. I was 70 years old. Clearly, it was going to cost me more money than I'd ever been able to make in the rest of my career to compensate, and Children's Health Defense said they would fund my defense, and that was what allowed me to do this.

Del Bigtree

That's great. So taking it back at them, we'll continue to track that. Now let's get into your research and the work that you've done. This is an incredible article, and it's really for me, you know, we're always trying to connect the dots here on The HighWire. What is what is really going on? Who's behind it? What's the goal? What does gain of function mean? First of all, why write this particular article?

Meryl Nass, MD

So I've been begging other people to write articles that connect the dots because so many things are happening to us now, not just the pandemic, but we've got this transhumanism, we've got the gender identity issue, the CBDCs, getting rid of money. I mean, there's so many things happening. And is it all part of the same thing or is it all these things by chance just happening together? So I've had that in my mind. And I also am very interested in how the WHO has been used to try to gain sovereignty over the nations of the world through public health. So a new version of a proposed pandemic treaty that the WHO is is managing came out two months ago, and I read it line by line and pondered it. And I said, oh, my gosh, this is unbelievably terrible. I'm going to have to write about it. And so I started writing about it. And then I realized, oh my goodness, no, this is too important. Now I have to add the background and I have to add the links and I have to explain the details. And it wound up to be this very long article, but I did connect a ton of dots.

Del Bigtree

You did.

Meryl Nass, MD

And I'm hoping people will read it, because it takes 20 or 30 minutes to read, but it gives you a ton of information on the history of biological warfare, gain of function, and how things are going now and what the plan is for the future, what the globalists are trying to do, with the WHO, with vaccines and other things.

Del Bigtree

What are they trying to do?
Meryl Nass, MD

Well, I think the globalists, as we saw with COVID, already have control of most, if not all, of the developed countries' governments. And they have control of the bureaucratic structure of the WHO. And so the WHO is 85% funded through voluntary contributions, most of which are earmarked. They're only getting 15% of their budget from the nations as assessments. So the WHO is already owned by private interests. And some of that money comes from nations, but still, it's the nations special interests. What is happening is, there's a pandemic. So the WHO, and its nations, claimed that there has been a terrible catastrophe of the pandemic, and it's due to nations not cooperating with each other, and we have to do better. So we're going to make a treaty and it is not going to be like anything we've had before, where the WHO gives nations recommendations, this is going to be binding. So the WHO will give orders and every nation has to carry out the orders.

Del Bigtree

So no Sweden allowed to sit there as an outlier and then just sort of laugh at all of us when they didn't lock down and end up having lower death rates than Europe and the nations around them. Or forget Africa, which just sailed through this thing almost unscathed, didn't get vaccines, you know, barely at all across Africa and have one of the best outcomes. They don't want to have that. We've got to have uniformity. If we're all going to die, we're going to die together.

Meryl Nass, MD

And they're particularly interested in Africa, by the way. So in fact, the idea is, so everyone's going to get vaccinated, of course. The vaccines are going to be developed in only 100 days instead of the 10 to 15 years they normally take. And factories are being set up in Africa, everywhere, local factories, to make vaccines. So BioNTech has already sent a factory in, I think, 12 containers to Africa to start making mRNA vaccines. There will be enforced surveillance, so nations will have to swab their people and animals to see whether there are any viruses around that might be dangerous, which they call potential pandemic pathogens. They'll have to swab the animals, check the wastewater, but they also have to perform surveillance of our social media of our electronics, and they're required to censor us. They must only put out the WHO narrative on public health.

Del Bigtree

Which like YouTube and all of the social media we've been reporting on are literally writing in there, we're going to follow whatever the WHO and everything else is misinformation. It doesn't matter that almost everything the WHO said throughout COVID proved to be wrong, which ultimately is misinformation now, that doesn't change it, we're still sticking with the WHO.

Meryl Nass, MD

And this would potentially supersede the First Amendment, which is a complicated issue, but my organization, Door to Freedom.org has a poster that explains the legal underpinnings of how this pandemic treaty and new amendments to the existing WHO international health regulations could supersede the Constitution and US law, so that's....

Del Bigtree

When we think about it, if you're going to homogenize a response across all nations, and it involves the civil liberties of every people in every single nation, we being having one of the strongest constitutions that's out there compared to somewhere else that's got a dictatorship, how are you going to get that homogenization where we're all acting the same if this treaty doesn't, you know.

Meryl Nass, MD

Right. Provide it.

Del Bigtree

Provide it. Right, if it doesn't break through, we can't have whatever documents your country is founded on getting in the way if we're going to have everybody acting the same way.

Meryl Nass, MD

Exactly. So Tedros is going to be your doctor. He will tell you what vaccines you must have, what drugs you must have if there's a pandemic and what drugs you're not allowed to have. So you can forget ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine next time. There's a lot more to it than that. It's, the way they're going to push the 100-day vaccines is by shaving time off of every part of vaccine development, like safety and efficacy.

Del Bigtree

What they're doing right now, every single new, I mean, we just reported today, right? You have a new booster. It's being tried on mice, there's no human studies being done. These are brand new forms of the virus, right, if we're looking at. Some people would even argue that Omicron wasn't the original virus to begin with, so it's a different virus. And so whatever, it doesn't matter how much it changes or if it's totally different, we're just going to try it on mice because, hey, our human trials went so well, we don't ever have to do that again, right?
Well, precisely. You don't want to test it on humans because you might find out it's not safe, it doesn't work. What I want the audience to know is that you cannot do safety trials in animals, it's impossible. Animals behave very differently than humans. You must vaccinate or give a drug to humans, and then you have to watch them, and you have to watch them for a period of time, like at least six months, to find out what are the long-term side effects for vaccines. You often get autoimmune effects and they can take a considerable time to develop. So testing on mice is like not testing at all. So if we want to be bound by these new amendments and a new treaty, basically, we can say goodbye to democracy and freedom. Now, the amendments require that the head of WHO, which would be Tedros, has to declare a public health emergency of international concern before he can then issue orders, okay. But with the current draft, there's no standards for him to do that. So he can just.

Meryl Nass, MD
They did it for monkeypox.

Del Bigtree
Right. That's right, monkeypox, and I didn't even know anybody that had that issue.

Meryl Nass, MD
Yeah. No, he's declared three in the six years he's been in office. But for the pandemic treaty, he doesn't have to declare anything. It is going to be enforced all the time, during pandemics and between pandemics.

Del Bigtree
Really?

Meryl Nass, MD
I know, it's extraordinary. Why would you do that?

Del Bigtree
Wow.

Meryl Nass, MD
Yeah. Now, both these documents will be voted on by the members of the WHO next May, and it's very likely that we will not see a final draft. Because they're already up to like the third or fourth draft on the documents, they're worked on by committees behind closed doors. And last year, the WHO members voted in amendments that had not been made public before. They had, so an original version has to be shown to the members and made public at least four months ahead of time. But then when they change it, you don't have to see the changes. So we are likely to find out what's in these documents next May after they are voted in.

Del Bigtree
This is what's amazing when people feel like they can just sort of, oh, we made it through COVID. When I look back at it, you watched the President of the United States of America wipe away any body autonomy or right to privacy that you have, forced everyone he could to get the vaccine, everyone he felt like he had reach into, whether it was large businesses over 100 people, working in the healthcare system. So your government is now showing you they are fully down with forcing you to take a product. Now, what I find concerning is something you talked about and some research we're doing. This isn't just, you know, and you have to imagine the next vaccine or whenever they think they really got something they want us all to get. But the technologies they're working on, they're working on vaccines that they can give to one person but they spread it to everybody else, right?

Meryl Nass, MD
Yes. So we know for a fact that Pfizer was working on self-spreading vaccines. We know that self-spreading vaccines have been placed in bait for rabies, to vaccinate wild animals against rabies.

Del Bigtree
Well they've already done that.

Meryl Nass, MD
It's been done, I think probably for a couple of decades maybe. So the technology exists and.

Del Bigtree
And the polio vaccine technically that they use, right, that they're using in the Middle East and third World is designed, they know they can't get to everybody so they expect some shedding.
Meryl Nass, MD

Well, yes and no. So the oral polio vaccines, which are cheaper to make and are being used in poorer countries, in some people they set, these are live vaccines. So they are attenuated weakened strains of polio, and in some people they set up a permanent infection in your gut, and you are releasing that virus in your stool. All that, it could be for a week or a month, a year, or for your lifetime. Most people don't do that, but some do. So those live attenuated viruses get into the wastewater and sometimes they mutate back to be virulent. And so the majority of polio cases in the world are from mutated vaccine-strain polio viruses. There's a much smaller number of cases that are actually the naturally occurring polio. Now, we had those cases in the United States until 1999 when finally our public health agency said, look, the only polio we're seeing is the vaccine strains. Let's get rid of them and bring back the injected, killed polio virus. Turns out that one doesn't work as well as the live. So now there's a question, how many Americans who have been vaccinated with the injected vaccine are, in fact, susceptible to polio? So that's another issue.

Del Bigtree

It is. All of these issues, people don't. And I think it's interesting because they'll talk about polio, running people, we eradicated polio. No, you haven't. That story is not over yet. I mean, not that I'm wishing a fate on the world, but they are claiming victory when they haven't actually achieved the victory. And now we're seeing, I think, you know, I saw some articles saying that they're seeing polio in wastewater in New York, which means there may be trouble ahead on these issues. There's so much in this article, but one of the things that really stood out to me that I kind of freaked out a little bit was you talk about Nixon, and that when Nixon basically was the first one to sort of put a ban on biological weapons and things. And the reason you gave is essentially because they're easy to make, and he wanted, we had this advancement and we were in nuclear, we had nuclear weapons down and not everybody could afford, knew how to do that, but he wanted to stop this new technology that was coming that would be easy for countries that didn't have moneys, so that's why he set the ban. Tell me a little bit about it because I'd never heard that.

Meryl Nass, MD

Yes. So you have to remember that Kissinger was his advisor. So, you know, very strategic guy. And he's come into this war that he didn't start and he doesn't know how to get out of it, and he's getting a lot of pushback, and so he wants to look good. And came up with this idea that we could ban biological weapons. And we're going to be so, you know, we're wonderful, we're going to ban a whole class of weapons of mass destruction, we'll never have to worry about them again. So the idea was, behind that, that biological weapons were called the poor man's atomic bomb, and almost anybody could make them. They were used in World War I, actually, against horses. They were developed and they were used in China by Japan in World War II and before World War II. And so they've been around more than a hundred years, biological weapons, and any country or even small groups could potentially make them. So this would enable us to just get rid of that problem so the poorer countries, people without a lot of money, would no longer have access to biological weapons. That was the idea. But in order to make it work, you had to have what they call challenge inspections. So one country has to be able to challenge another, say, I think you're making biological weapons at this facility and we want to go in and look. And that's what is done with the chemical weapons treaty. That so was supposed to be put into the biological weapons treaty, but it never was. And so all these countries said, we're not, we agree, we're not going to make biological weapons anymore, but the way the treaty stands, it was a question of intent. So you were still allowed to do research on biological agents, you know, you weren't supposed to make quantities of weapons, your intention was supposed to be peaceful, you know, I'm working on vaccines, but.

Del Bigtree

Right. Like I'm working on nuclear power for our country right now.

Meryl Nass, MD

Exactly. So that's what happened. And then genetic engineering was developed right after Nixon came up with this idea, like the next year. And all of a sudden we had this biotechnology industry that was way advanced from everybody else, and so now we could actually potentially make better biological weapons. And so the United States blocked the addition of provisions to that treaty that would have added the challenge inspections and other mechanisms to actually make it work, make it solid. And they've never been added, even though there are conferences every five years and their job of the conference is to add these things and strengthen the treaty. So we're stuck with a non-workable treaty that we know the US and Russia have broken in the past. And what we need right now to end biological warfare and end deliberate, because deliberate pandemics, pandemics from labs, are biological warfare. And you know, we call them gain of function research so we don't have to say biological warfare or germ warfare research. But it's the same thing. This is a biological warfare pandemic we've been living through for the last three and a half years.

Del Bigtree

So we have Nixon is saying, let's outlaw it, because we are better at nuclear power, like nuclear weapons. We'll hold on to our arsenal, control the world. Then all of a sudden we get really good at it a year later, like, wait a minute, we can start doing things with this where we'll be able to beat the world here too, so let's not sort of anymore, but we've come full circle, because you talk about now in the WHO, whereas we live in a time where every nation was saying we are not going to make biological, we won't do gain of function, essentially, we won't mess with these viruses and bacteria because it would just be dangerous. Now, you're saying that in this treaty, the WHO is basically sort of mandating every nation is going to make the, and we're all going to agree, we're going to just keep making biological weapons, and look at each other, as long as we're all honest about it, it's going to be okay.
Meryl Nass, MD

Yeah, this is, you know, one of the totally crazy things in this treaty. And most people don't have the background, don't really see what they're doing. So what the treaty says, well, if your country is doing gain of function research, you should be sure to do it safely, and do your best to prevent pandemics, but at the same time, get rid of these administrative impediments to the gain of function research. They also say, go out and surveil things all the time to find potential pandemic pathogens, and when you find them, share them globally, with the WHO and all the other governments. What that is, is proliferation of biological weapons.

Del Bigtree

This is literally like open source gain of function research, right? We're all just going to share, it's going to be okay as long as we all share what we just found and what we've just created so you can get into this game too, and we'll all do it together. And since we're all doing it, that's going to make us safer.

Meryl Nass, MD

And when another pandemic happens, we share the pathogen, we don't know who spread it.

Del Bigtree

Who do you blame? Every lab's got it and every lab around the world, every country is working with it. I mean, it's absolute madness.

Meryl Nass, MD

It's insane. It's insanity. There are a few other crazy, there are many other crazy provisions in this treaty. So the draft that's now available, it's called the Bureau Draft, the WHO staff put this draft together. They want advanced commitments. So they, so let me tell you, they started this thing with advanced purchase commitments around 2004, and the WHO brought countries and vaccine manufacturers together and said, look, there's going to be future pandemics and you're going to need vaccines. So sign on the dotted line how many doses you want and what you'll pay for them, and commit to buying them, and then we can make sure these companies will be able to develop the vaccines you need for you in a hurry, when we have pandemics in the future, and all we have to do is have the WHO director general declare a pandemic of a certain level, and that will be the trigger to make these contracts go into effect. So that's what happened in 2009. All these countries signed on the dotted line. We had this, what turned out to be a very mild flu, but they were very worried about it, called it, you know, another swine flu, and countries had to buy billions and billions of dollars of vaccines. And the corporations got to make them very quickly, in about six months or less, and they had no liability. The contracts took away all liability. And so that worked so well for the companies and the WHO, who is sponsored by them, that they decided, and the US government also, well why don't we just keep doing that? Have people agree to things when we don't know what the things are going to be in the future. Just agree to future.

Del Bigtree

You're just buying your spot in the future.

Meryl Nass, MD

Yes. So we're going to create a committee called COP, and they're going to make their own rules and they're going to decide what the provisions of this treaty are going to be. So just sign here. And we're going to make a third section of the WHO, we're going to build its own directorate. We don't know what that's going to look like, we don't know what rules are going to make, that's just part of the treaty. Go, you know, it'll all work out. Now, the US government did the same thing. In the National Defense Authorization Act, which funds the Defense Department, last December they wrote in a provision saying it is the sense of Congress we're going to go along with the global biosecurity agenda, One Health, and whatever they come up with, basically we're going to support, and the WHO. So the Congress, in a 2000-page, 1700-page bill -- who read it? Probably no one -- has already made US law that we're going to follow the WHO's biosecurity agenda. You know, basically we're going to follow the pandemic treaty and the international health regulations that aren't even finished yet. Yeah, it's crazy. Let me tell you something else. This is another method by which the masks and the vaccine mandates got imposed on us. So remember, the federal government put out contracts in the CARES Act and in other acts, to schools, to doctors organization, etc. Sign on the dotted line, we're going to tell you in steps what you'll need to do for the pandemic. And we'll give you this money. But if you don't comply with the terms of the contract, you can have to give it all back to us. So the schools took all this money, started remodeling, buying tents and whatnot, and then in the second and third tranche, it's like now you have to impose a mask mandate. Now you have to make sure all your kids.

Del Bigtree

And if they did, if they just stopped, they'd have to.

Meryl Nass, MD

They would have to give everything back.

Del Bigtree

They'd have to give back the money they got.

Meryl Nass, MD

They already spent. Exactly.

Del Bigtree

Wow.

Meryl Nass, MD

And the doctor's groups, the same.
[01:54:25] Del Bigtree
This reminds me a little bit, you know, “Confessions of an Economic Hit Man,” where we sent in people into third world nations, say we’re going to build you a whole electrical infrastructure, water, power, and all of this, and we tell them, you’ll be able to afford it. We build it for them, they can’t afford it. When they can’t afford it, now they owe us and we can take whatever resources we want. And in this case, the resources are our children and our freedom.

[01:54:52] Meryl Nass, MD
And it’s not only third world countries, I mean, that happened to Greece. You know, they had to give away their airports, their ports, their infrastructure, because Germany wanted it, Germany had loaned the money. This is a paradigm. And yes, it’s happening to us right now. How many people have lost their homes to hedge funds and vulture capitalism?

[01:55:14] Del Bigtree
Yeah, huge, huge problem. I mean, the fact that, I think they’re saying that BlackRock, Vanguard, State Street will own something like 60-something percent of our homes by 2040. They’re going in making cash offers, beating us all out of it. And so the WEF is right. If they get their way, we’re all going to be renting and we’re going to like it. We won’t own anything. Only the giant corporate monoliths. When you look at these things. And I think one of the things that, and I have a question about this. When we’ve looked at the World Health Organization, this treaty, it looks like our health agencies here in America are part of writing it, right. So it’s, in some ways, it’s not like it’s being done to us. We’re doing it. But what’s weird about is it doesn’t look like we’re writing in control of it. Or are we? I mean, what do you think? Are we the head of it or are we just a cog in this thing? Because I think in America, we always think, surely we’re in charge of all of this, right? No matter what happens, we’re America.

[01:56:16] Meryl Nass, MD
Right. So, as far as these WHO documents go, the United States has been central in pushing them, but they’ve lassoed the other countries. They’ve corralled them, and most of the developed ones and many of the third world ones are cooperating. Now, it’s like, who are we? I mean, are we Rochelle Walensky and Tony Fauci and Joe Biden? No. These people have been bought and. You know, Rochelle’s husband got an NIAID contract for $16 million in the months before they hired her to be the CDC director. So I was told Tony Fauci was getting....

[01:56:56] Del Bigtree
I wonder if she was told you’ll have to give it all back if you don’t follow through on all the stages that are ahead of you.

[01:57:00] Meryl Nass, MD
You’re right. He didn’t get it all at once. It was over time. So, yeah, she had to go along with it. And we do not know what the mechanisms are for controlling these people at the top, but we know they’re controlled. Now. So we probably have the best apparatchiks, you know, the best whatever. The people who we have, these PR firms who decide on the message. But this has been going on a long time. People were probably thinking about this after Nixon was President. You know, 20 years ago when the anthrax letters were sent, that was a ruse, those anthrax letters were a ruse to bring on a lot of this biosecurity agenda. The PREP Act and the BioShield Act in 2004 and 2005 came in on the heels of the anthrax letters. There were no EUAs in the United States before 2005. You either had a licensed drug that had gone through a full FDA review or you had an experiment. No gray area. How can there be a gray area? But 2005 EUAs, and no standards....

[01:58:18] Del Bigtree
The Emergency Use Authorization, for people that are maybe listening, Emergency Use Authorization, meaning this ability to rush a product to market before it’s finished its safety trials because there’s such an emergency, we just need to get it out to you.

[01:58:28] Meryl Nass, MD
It doesn’t have to start a safety trial or an efficacy trial. The law, the PREP Act, has no standards. The only standard is that the FDA needs to think it’s likelier than not, in an emergency, that this product will help you. That’s it. You don’t have to inject it into one mouse.

[01:58:48] Del Bigtree
All of the world hangs on likely or not.

[01:58:50] Meryl Nass, MD
Yes, exactly.

[01:58:52] Del Bigtree
Alright. So I want people to read your article, we could get into all the details, it’s really deep. How do you have hope? How do you have hope? Because I think, this is one of the things I struggle with, everywhere I go, people like really love what you’re saying Del, love what’s going on, but the government looks owned, the UN looks like, it looks like the world is being taken over by globalists. What power do we have as individuals?

[01:59:16] Meryl Nass, MD
Okay, so the globalists and their apparatchiks have identified the nodes of power in the world.

[01:59:22] Del Bigtree
What’s apparatchiks? I’ll be honest, I don’t know what that word means.
[01:59:23] Meryl Nass, MD
Sorry. It's a Russian word. It means their henchmen. So the henchmen are clever, right? They've designed this program for whoever the globalists are. You know, nobody's naming any names, we're not sure, but we think we know some of them. And they know how to do things. You know, they know how to legally get, they know the games to play. They know how to get things through Congress, they know how to get the right people elected, they probably control the ballot, the electronic voting machines and all that. But there are 8 billion people that want to say no. I mean, we don't want forced injections, we don't want to be damaged, we don't want to be mutated, and we want our kids to grow up with healthy food, clean water, no mumbo jumbo in their education, et cetera. And so to me, they can't really control us if everybody understands what's going on. And the further along this path we go, as the noose tightens, more and more people are becoming aware. Right now, you can, I mean, people are waking up. If they really impose masks on us again, if they mandate this vaccine that hasn't been tested, the new one coming out next month, people will say no. But we have to talk to everyone we know, we have to make clear, we have to do much better education.

[02:00:53] Meryl Nass, MD
You and I are working as hard as we can to educate the public, but I think it's this noose tightening, along with the education, and we have to do it better. I mean, it's complicated to explain the WHO and two documents, and they have overlapping provisions, and they're managed separately, they're voted on separately in different ways. The Senate may or may not ratify them, you know, blah, blah, it's a lot of detail and most people can't take in the detail. But I think they understand what's being done to their children. They understand what's been done to our food and our water and our air. We don't know exactly who's doing it, we don't know for sure why, but we know they're damaging us. And we all, we just need to drop our little minor disagreements and realize it's us against this globalist cabal. It's the 8 billion rest of us, and we will win once we realize it and take our power. So I'm real hopeful. I just want to stop the damage before it gets any worse.

[02:01:55] Del Bigtree
Yeah. You're doing incredible work, so brilliant. The research is phenomenal. It's just, it's great to know that you're out there, so many like you. And I will say at this point, what gives me hope is it used to feel like, you know, you've been there for a long time. There's you and Sherri Tenpenny. There's this handful of doctors who have been putting it on the line for a long time. But you're being joined now by Oxford and Harvard and Stanford, signed it. When I look at the amount of studies that have been done on this vaccine alone and all of the side effects of it, worldwide, Japan, Korea, everyone, saying, I don't know. Houston, we got a problem here. I don't think you can stop that, the floodgate is open. Science is turning on this vaccine program. I actually think the minority is these sick cabalists that are just trying to take over the world, but they're losing all faith from people that are still thinking and talented around them. I think you sort of, you cut that trail, you cut that path. There's a lot of scientists following you down it now, it's really exciting. So keep up the good work.

[02:03:00] Meryl Nass, MD
Thank you.

[02:03:01] Del Bigtree
Thank you for joining us today. Really amazing. Alright, how do we follow your work? Where's the best?

[02:03:07] Meryl Nass, MD
Oh, yes. So I have a Substack, MerylNass.substack.com, and there is a new organization which is DoortoFreedom.org.

[02:03:17] Del Bigtree
DoortoFreedom.org.

[02:03:18] Meryl Nass, MD
We are working on primarily the WHO and all the things that are happening and trying to connect dots, and we are growing. We are joined by Children's Health Defense, of course, in this effort, the Sovereignty Coalition, and Stand for Freedom. So all of us are working together and we will be growing the network of organizations, we hope The HighWire will join us...

[02:03:46] Del Bigtree
We'd love to be a part of that.

[02:03:46] Meryl Nass, MD
...and then we will push out international actions against this globalist plan. Thank you.

[02:03:53] Del Bigtree
Fantastic. Keep up the great work. Really amazing. Alright. Well, we have the FreedomFiles, which is a brand new set of short documentaries that we, of interviews we conducted while we were at FreedomFest. This week, we're releasing two more on Monday, and if you're on our newsletter, then you're going to know when they're happening, when they're dropping, but you'll all be able to take a look at it. This week, we're going to talk to a freedom advocate that's from Africa, the country of Eritrea, where they used to be one of the greatest democracies in the world. Now they are under complete and total authoritarian rule. Angesom Teklu is who we interviewed, an outspoken journalist that is bravely really risking his life to talk about authoritarian governments all over the world. He's trying to expose them. Just an amazing guy. And just one of the two great interviews that are going to be dropping in our FreedomFiles. Take a look at this.
[02:04:55] Angesom Teklu

I grew up in the space where there is no freedom of press, there is basically zero freedoms that we know as human rights. Um, so, when I grow up, I mean, I and my colleagues decided we need to actually do something to create a space for alternative news. Obviously that was very dangerous, which means we were always, always have to watch our backs. And it was actually very dangerous work, because once information starts to leave the country, obviously the government starts to hunt us. They were hunting us.

[02:05:39] Del Bigtree

We live in an amazing time. There are so many brave individuals like Dr. Meryl Nass and all these people that are putting it on the line, that realize how important it is right now, at this moment. It's really important right now. If you can't tell what's going on here, I mean, you have our country and the nations of the world all saying, hey, whatever the WHO says, we're all going to go along with it. And we don't, why even call it a pandemic? Let's just go ahead and make everybody vaccinate anyway. Even easier, why don't we just make a vaccine that just sort of sheds all over everybody, so you're going to be vaccinated whether you like it or not? That's the future. That's the future you're about to leave your children, I'm about to leave my children. Why do you think I'm here? People say how is it you're so passionate? I can't imagine not being passionate right now. I can't imagine what I would have been doing in my life, even if I wasn't a journalist or something, if I'd just stumbled upon a show like The HighWire and said, wait a minute, let me check out, let me research. Where's that studies? Let me get on that newsletter and see if that's actually true. The CDC actually did write that. Oh, my God, that really is an email that they got inside the CDC and they still lied to me? Are we going to live in this world where we actually accept that? I mean, this is the moment in time where any intelligent species would step up and say, I think we're under threat here.

[02:07:02] Del Bigtree

I think I got to step up, they've got to get outside of my comfort zone. Today so many heroes that have stepped outside of their comfort zone, compared to the zeros that are lying to us on a daily basis. I want to announce also one of our breaking legal stories. We've been talking about the religious exemption that we brought back to Mississippi. Originally, it was a preliminary injunction, which meant we won basically on paper. The judge had said, yes, I'm going to make sure everyone has to be vaccinated right now, but there was going to be a case down the road, and there's always the chance you could still lose that case, even though the judge is saying it looks like the evidence is on the side I'm giving it a preliminary injunction. Well, it's all over, folks. It's done, they've thrown in the towel. They are never going to bring this thing to court, they've given up. And we are now officially, forever, until somebody else tries to come back and change the law, the law of the land in Mississippi is you have a religious exemption for your school children. Not preliminary, it's official. For some of you, it's like, that all sounds like the same thing. There's a lot of nuance to law. I'm still learning about it since I've got such a great lawyer to work with, but a huge win.

[02:08:15] Del Bigtree

Similarly, I also want to point out that Informed Consent Action Network joined forces with PERK in California. We've talked a lot about the mandated HPV Gardasil vaccine bill that went into schools. We worked with PERK, we hired a lobbyist really for the first time, a top level lobbyist, and said, let's play this game their way. Well, first we got them to not bring it to elementary schools, but then it was still going to universities. Then we got it against the universities, but there was still languaging. They have now tabled that bill, it has gone into the freezer. There is nothing going to be passed this year at all. So it is a total and complete victory and win for everybody in California. I want to thank Amy Bohb for really shouldering a lot of that work, but bringing ICAN in, it was great working with PERK. There's victories everywhere. It's all happening. But we want to hire more lobbyists. You probably need a lobbyist in your state if you don't live here in Texas or in California. We want to get behind all these types of initiatives, you make that happen. You make it possible to push back against the WHO again. You may donate to different things. I want to ask you, what is the most important thing right now? Who is doing more for you? Give to whoever you believe that is, but we're on the front lines right now. And I was talking to a friend.

[02:09:31] Del Bigtree

Yes, so please give $23 a month for 2023. That's what we're asking for, but every single dollar counts. I was talking to a really good friend this week that was visiting, and every once in a while we get our families together. And she was saying, you know, when you find yourself sort of stuck in a rut and it feels like it's all moving one direction, you've got to just make radical change in your life. You've got to go out of your way and step out of your comfort zone and change your systems, right. If you're complaining about the world as you see it, the only thing you can do is get radical with your own life. I want to really request that you all try something, especially those of you that are sitting there and saying the world doesn't seem like it's working and I'm losing all hope. I want you to get radical this week. I want you to do something that you probably never do. I want you to read the entire article written by Dr. Meryl Nass. Yes, it's going to take you 30 whole minutes and I know you're busy. But instead of just grabbing a little smattering and saying, wow, that was really an interesting conversation, I pretty much got the gist because of what Del and Meryl said there right on the show. No, you didn't. No, you didn't. We need informed people. I need you to be able to talk about this.
Del Bigtree
You actually need to understand the details. But instead of taking my word for it, get radical this week. Do something different. Go that one extra step. We all need to start trying to be the best of ourselves. Not just okay, not just you know, I'm doing pretty good, I'm getting along. Forget getting along. How about why don't we start being spectacular? So here's what I want you to do. If you haven't signed up to our newsletter, do it. See what happens. Get radical. Just say, you know what, I'm going to take that extra step. For the next five minutes after I've watched this show right now, I'm going to go on the website, www.thehighwire.com. I'm going to go down, I'm going to put my email in there so I have Meryl Nass's article right there, really easy, and all the other great things that The HighWire shares. But I'm going to read that article, this is the easiest way to do it. Then I'm going to go up to the top of the page and I'm going to hit the Donate button, and I'm going to say, you know what? Even if it's only a dollar, this is the experiment, start with a dollar. Just go ahead and say, you know what? I'm going to start being a donating part of this world. I'm going to get radical. I'm going to do something different than I've done. I don't usually give to organizations unless they have to charge me in order to watch my television.

Del Bigtree
I wouldn't pay Fox on purpose, but it's the only way I can watch my TV. Get radical. Get involved. Do something different this week for yourself. Just do it for yourself. See what it feels like. See if it actually changes how you see the world just a little bit. Because if you want change, if you're worried about where this world is going, it literally, literally starts with you. That's all The HighWire is. The HighWire was literally like 2 or 3 people. We all said, you know what, let's get radical. I've never made, I've never been in front of a camera, really. That's how I started The HighWire. Let me sit in front of the camera. I'm going to deliver. I've got Catharine and Patrick to say, would you figure out how to run some things and we're going to try and come up with a little story here. Let's do something different. And here we are. The HighWire. Winning lawsuits against the FDA, the CDC, the NIH, Health and Human Services. Did I ever imagine this was possible? I guess I had a feeling. I knew that humanity is capable of great things, and what would happen if I just started putting one foot in front of the other? But I'll tell you, we're living our lives inside here, the people that work with me, beyond our wildest dreams. Why? Because we started with a simple, radical effort. Try it on, and I'll see you next week.

END OF TRANSCRIPT