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. Good morning. Good afternoon. Good evening. Wherever you are out there in this beautiful world, it's time to step out onto the high wire. I have to tell you, I'm a little bit giddy today. Every once in a while we have a story that blows my mind. So I'm sure it's about to blow yours. Now, what if you found out that the government of the United States was poisoning you like ever since you were born here? Well, that is part of what this story is going to be about today. How would you stop it? Would they ever admit it? What would they do to stop you from hearing the truth? Today we're going to be talking about fluoridation. What is put into our water, obviously, to protect our teeth seemed like a great idea. Certainly when they introduced it and it looked a lot like this.
[00:01:37] Male News Correspondent

Dentists in many cities are helping to bring the benefits of fluoridation to children. Children will be healthier and happier. Our children can have better health through fluoridated water. Wonderful result obtained with complete safety, effective and cheap safe controlled amount of sodium fluoride. They can drink away tomorrow's tooth decay. Seven years ago something happened in this town. Something very simple happened. Something was added to this water added to this town’s drinking water. Grand Rapids fight against tooth decay started when fluoride was added to the water supply. A pumping station sent the water toward Grand Rapids. Sulfur dioxide and sodium fluoride are added after the water leaves, the settling basins and before it enters the filters. This carefully controlled amount of fluoride is perfectly safe and absolutely harmless. We sometimes say this fluoride poisoned. Yes, of course it's a poison in large doses. Very simply, fluoride is safe at one part per million. On file with the Dental society are statements from members of the medical profession. Over and over again that they have seen no ill effects from fluoridation of the Grand Rapids water. It is completely safe. Children in Grand Rapids have less tooth decay, and they did six years ago as much as 65% less. Over 30 million people are now drinking controlled fluoridated water. The benefits of fluoridation will last throughout life.

[00:03:16] Del Bigtree

Now, I don't know about you, but I don't remember the last time I drank a glass of drinking water. I don't let my kids near the drinking water for a whole host of reasons. Fluoridation obviously being a major one. Whether or not the science says it's safe, I don't understand why it's there at all. And given that it's ever toxic at any level, I tend to just avoid putting toxic chemicals into my body and my children. But there are so many innocent people, hundreds of millions across this country, and many of whom would not be able to afford bottled water the way that I can. And I feel blessed that I'm able to make that decision. But what about those that can't? What about those that don't know about it? And what is this stuff really doing there? Can you believe that the fluoridation of water is actually one of the top ten achievements as described by the CDC in terms of public health. Here's that list on the top ten. Is vaccination something that we talk a lot about here? I'm not sure I would put it there. Motor vehicle safety, safer workplaces, control of infectious diseases, decline in deaths from coronary heart disease and stroke, safer and healthier foods. I would question that one big time, healthier mothers and babies.

[00:04:30] Del Bigtree

Lots of reports on how that isn't proving to be the case. Family planning, which I guess is eugenics. I guess that's made the top ten and fluoridation of drinking water in there at nine, recognition of tobacco use as a health hazard. So there it is right there behind recognizing that smoking tobacco is not good for you is the fluoridation of our water one of the great achievements. So what happens when the great achievement maybe proves to not be that great an achievement? You've been seeing a lot of the work that we're doing in our lawsuits, dealing with vaccinations around this country. But we're going to get deeper into this. But it won't be our first foray into this conversation. We've been reporting on this for well over a year because remember the Informed Consent Action Network, that is our nonprofit, our mission statement is this dedicated to eradicating man made disease. What is man made disease? Things that are being put into us, making us sick, that don't necessarily be there. And if we could get the morons out of the way, we'd be a lot healthier. Very simply put. So we started reporting on this some time ago. Here's what some of our reporting on this issue looks like.

[00:05:37] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Reporter

Grassroots organizations took the Environmental Protection Agency to court. The plaintiffs in the case had four experts that had consulted and worked with the EPA setting standards in the past. So one of them, he says, quote, "The evidence available today may well underestimate the true extent of fluoride toxicity with a reasonable degree of scientific certainty. I therefore consider the elevated levels of fluoride exposure in the US population as serious public health concern."

[00:06:05] Del Bigtree

Wow.

[00:06:06] Derrick Broze, Investigative Journalist

Court For the first time, the government agents EPA and Michael Connett, representing Fluoride Action Network and others, were able to present their evidence. You know, the government brought in their scientists it safe. Nothing wrong. Michael Connett brought in the scientists from the Jama study, the scientists from another Spain study, from a Canadian study, a Mexican study. I mean, we had a lot of expert witnesses and that was really, you know, powerful in itself. But ultimately, at the end of the summer of 2020, Judge Edward Chen decided to put it on hold, what’s called abeyance until another study came out. While the delays are happening and the judge is figuring things out, millions of kids families and people are drinking fluoride, showering in fluoride and being told only crazy people think there's something wrong with it.

[00:06:50] Del Bigtree

First of all, I want to thank Derek Broze, who's been doing great reporting on these trials. He brought it to our attention, has been reporting on that also for the Highwire. He brought up Michael Connett, who is the lead attorney in this case. And it is my honor and pleasure to be joined right now by that guy.

[00:07:08] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Thank you Del, it's great to be here.

[00:07:09] Del Bigtree

Michael. It's an honor to meet you in person and to have you here talking about this incredibly important issue. I want to I want to get back to the basics before we get into where you're at now in this case. First of all, whose idea was this? Like, why? Why pour this known toxic chemical into our water systems? What's the genius behind it?
[00:07:31] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Well, it's a great question. United States started fluoridation in 1945. The first experiment was in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Newburgh, New York. There were a number of interest groups that were very involved in those early days. You had the biggest industries in this country, the biggest manufacturing industries like the aluminum industry, the steel industry, the nuclear industry, who all had serious fluoride pollution problems. Okay, because they were emitting a lot of fluoride into the air, into the water and polluting downwind and downstream communities. And they had a lot of liability as a result. They if you look at the documents that the fluoride polluting industries were very. Influential in shaping the early research on fluoride to give it a cleaner bill of health than I think the facts would show. So you have fluoride industries that were involved.

[00:08:27] Del Bigtree
So it's a byproduct of what types of things? When you say, nuclear energy, like what was it? Where is fluoride coming from?

[00:08:34] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Well, various industries use fluoride for different purposes. The aluminum industry uses fluoride as a flux. It allows it allows the aluminum to melt at a at a lower temperature so they save money by using fluoride. Okay. In the 1940s, right at the time when we began fluoridating the water, the US bomb program, the Manhattan Project, was using massive amounts of fluoride because they needed fluoride to build the bomb. They needed fluoride to refine the uranium to make it bomb grade. Okay, the bomb program scientists were very intensely interested in the question of fluoride toxicity, and unbeknownst to the public at that time in the 1940s, the bomb program was overseeing the early water fluoridation experiments. Now, I'm not to say that the bomb program is responsible for water fluoridation, but they took a very keen interest in it. Okay. But there were other interest groups as well. The sugar industry, which was very concerned at that time, that the government may take efforts to reduce sugar consumption in some way to deal with the massive oral health problem that the United States had back then.

[00:09:46] Del Bigtree
Tooth decay being caused by large amounts of sugar intake.

[00:09:50] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
So the sugar industry loved fluoride because fluoride is a way of, hey, don't worry about us. The sugar industry just put some fluoride in the water and then you can deal with the oral health issues.

[00:09:58] Del Bigtree
Who first discovered that this had some ability to harden bones or teeth or whatever this was about?

[00:10:03] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
So initially, 1920s, 1930, it came to light that fluoride in drinking water, naturally occurring, causes a condition of the teeth called dental fluorosis. This is a staining of the teeth. Can be brown staining, can be black, staining can result in crumbling of the enamel in its severe condition. Okay. It was we discovered that fluoride in the water causes that condition. Okay. We also discovered that fluoride is causing a lot of other health problems in fluoride exposed workers, bone disease, things like that. So in the 1930 there was a growing amount of concern in the scientific community, as expressed by scientists at the US Department of Agriculture and elsewhere, that fluoride could be a real problem to public health. Okay. But simultaneous to that, in the 1930s there were studies that were done that showed an association between in fluoride and water and lower tooth decay. And so based on some of those studies and some rat studies that were done, a scientist by the name of Gerald Cox, who was funded, incidentally by the sugar industry as well as the aluminum industry. Okay. In 1939, Cox was the first person to suggest that we might want to add fluoride to drinking water to reduce tooth decay. As he said, the current trend towards the complete removal of fluoride from drinking water may need some reversal because lo and behold, it may be good for teeth. So I think when you look back at the early history of this issue, it's a perfect storm of interest groups that stood to benefit from this program. And to be fair, though, there were a lot of dentists and a lot of people who looked at fluoride with great enthusiasm and optimism because no doubt people believe this could be something that could reduce the problem that we had with tooth decay. So I don't mean to minimize the role of good intentions back in those early days, but there were also interest groups that were,

[00:12:04] Del Bigtree
Well, they're affecting the science as we see. Right. The doctors and as we've recognized in a lot of the work that we do, I don't think, I think doctors mean well. They just don't know who's actually funding the science that they're reading and who's funding the science that the EPA and the CDC and Health and Human Services start using. So in this case, once again, we have industries that would benefit at adding fluoride to the water. Sugar wants the monkey off of their back and say, well, look, we're doing something about let's treat the symptom and not the problem. And then you have industries, saying, Look, we'd like to get rid of this. This, I guess in some ways, like if you made it that it was good for you. This one that's over your pollution that you're causing with fluoride goes away a little bit too. So there's a does this start out, did this start out as just companies saying, can we reduce the fear of fluoridation? And then as they looked at it, said, wait a minute, not only can we do that, it hardens bones. So maybe we could say it has a benefit. Or is someone just walking down a road and there's a tribe of Indians drinking out of highly fluoridated water and they just have gorgeous teeth. And someone said, bam. What is the spark?
Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Well, it's a $1 million question. I really think there's an entangled web of interests in those early days, including the organized dental profession, the dental trade associations, because they were very concerned in the 1940s about the potential for the government to begin to get involved with the dentistry profession, to provide dental care because there were too few dentists at that time to treat people who needed treatment. And so the American Dental Association and various dental groups didn't want the government to get involved with providing dental care. They wanted to keep their monopoly, if you will.

Del Bigtree
And keep it privatized. They make the money. Let's keep the government out of this.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
And fluoridation was a perfect fit for them because, oh, you just put some industrial pixie dust in your drinking water and that's how you can deal with oral health. You don't you don't get you don't get socialized dentistry, if you will, you know. And so that was an interest group as well.

Del Bigtree
Interesting. Okay. So they start adding it in the water. Tell me about how you get into this work. What is the group that starts investigating this? Everyone's hunky dory. Look, we love it. I mean, other than Stanley Kubrick, as if I think about, in his film, when they have the moment, it's fluoridation and the guys having the meltdown, it seemed like nobody was really questioning this thing. So who starts questioning it?

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Right from the very beginning, you had independent scientists with a great amount of integrity, including George Walbert, who was one of the doctors who first diagnosed some of the health problems from cigarette smoking. George Walbert was an allergist and he saw in his own practice people who had heightened susceptibility or sensitivities to fluoride. And you had a lot of independent doctors who saw the problems from the early days that we didn't have enough safety data, we didn't know what the long term ramifications from adding this toxic substance to water was. And people who questioned why should we be adding a medicine which fluoride to the Food and Drug Administration defines fluoride as a drug? People were concerned. Why are we adding a drug to the water supply? You know, that's taking away people's informed consent. So there was dissent from the early days, but that dissent was stigmatized. It was marginalized and ridiculed. And I think history has shown that these early dissenting voices were really on to something, that we were dealing with a toxic compound, and we were handling it in an extremely reckless manner by adding it to hundreds of millions of people's water supply. Right. And but so from the early days, there was dissenting voices in the independent scientific community. And that and that has persisted over time. But the science on fluoride today is much more mature, much more developed, and we know much more about how fluoride can adversely affect human health than we did back in the 40s and 50s.

Del Bigtree
Yeah, I mean, in many ways medicine was in a Neanderthal stage. When we think about how you test chemicals, how do you do proper trials on people. Alright, so there's your lawsuit. When does your lawsuit start? What year did you begin this lawsuit?

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
We filed a petition with the EPA in 2016 under a statute called the Toxic Substances Control Act. And we we basically under this act, the EPA has the authority to ban the particular use of a chemical that presents an unreasonable risk to human health, including to susceptible subpopulations. So based on this growing body of scientific research on fluoride in the brain and the developing brain, we went to the EPA and asked them to ban this practice of fluoridation. On the grounds that it presents an unreasonable risk to the brain. And in February of 2017, the EPA denied our petition. And so we filed suit in federal court in April of 2017. So over six years ago.

Del Bigtree
You've been at this for some time now. Who are the plaintiffs in this case who sort of is bringing these cases?

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
So we have a consortium of environmental health groups as well as individual mothers and their children.

Del Bigtree
Okay. And you this isn't you're not just like a first generation fluoride investigator. Your father got into this a little bit. Tell me about that.
[00:17:36] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Yeah, My father is an environmental toxicologist and he has been working for many years on things like dioxin emitted from incinerators and various environmental health issues and my mother as well. And and then in the late 1990s we live in lived in a little small town in New York state, Canton, New York. And it was considering whether to end fluoridation, as many communities in the United States have considered that question Should we stop adding this chemical to our water? My dad didn't know anything about fluoride, really. He always thought that people opposed to it were, you know, a little bit crazy, right? He thought they were just getting the science wrong. They were mistaking fluorine for fluoride and he didn't take the issue seriously, as I think many, many people who haven't looked at it at this issue might, might be in a similar situation. But he looked at it and he was really disturbed by what he found by the number of red flags in the scientific literature indicating that fluoride exposure is associated with hip fracture, bone fragility, with effects on the thyroid gland, effects on the brain, effects on the pineal gland that produces melatonin, that regulates a number of things in the body. So my dad was disturbed by the number of red flags that the science was indicating and from a precautionary standpoint said there's just there's no it doesn't make sense to continue adding this to water and exposing people on such a widespread basis. And then I was in college at the time. I didn't know anything about fluoride and I started to research it myself. And I've been involved since 2000 researching this issue.

[00:19:11] Del Bigtree

What when you say so obviously when you're going to bring a case, you now need a body of evidence and science. What has shifted? Obviously you have the original science that's done. I think you probably have issues with it, who's funding it. But there ends up being studies now looking at things. What was let me ask you this, since there were obvious even in the video we saw, this little video says, yes, it can be toxic at this amount. So they knew there was a toxic problem. So when they decided it was safe, what were they focused on? What was their concern? Where do they draw the line and what they would make sure it wasn't so toxic that it did blah, blah, blah. As long as we don't have that happen, it's safe. So what were they focused on?

[00:19:54] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

The early science that that purported to establish the safety of fluoride is incredibly crude. And to show you how crude it is. And today, as we sit here today, safety standards in the United States are still based on what I'm about to tell you. Yeah. The according to to our safety standards, the earliest, most sensitive endpoint of fluoride toxicity is a severe crippling bone disease called crippling skeletal fluorosis. This is an extraordinarily advanced form of toxicity. Literally, your spine is fused. And it's it's a very advanced form of arthritis, basically. And under the under our safety standards, until you have crippling skeletal fluorosis, you're not going to be harmed by safe.

[00:20:49] Del Bigtree

So let's just looking at crippling spinal fluorosis, back it off a notch from there. And we're in the safety zone. We're ready to go.

[00:20:56] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

That's essentially what the regulations the premise of the regulations is. All you need to protect against is this severe crippling bone disease.

[00:21:06] Del Bigtree

I find it stunning just from a layperson knows nothing about this, this idea that you're hardening, hardening your teeth is the whole purpose of this. And no thought about hardening calcium or anything else throughout the rest of your body. Like even if it does that and that's a benefit. But what does it doing to the rest of my body? Something that is hardening, turning my bones to stone? Or what happens to the calcium floating my all of these things have just been questions for me. But let's get to where you're at. So when you decide to bring a case, it's not because of the crippling effects that they seem to have think they thought they avoided from this? There are actually other issues.

[00:21:44] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Absolutely. There's there's many health concerns with fluoride that far precede the development of crippling skeletal fluorosis. By the time you have crippling skeletal fluorosis, you're in a whole lot of trouble. And, you know, so but just to give you an example, just looking at the bones, let's just focus right now on the bones, leaving aside the brain, the thyroid and the other systems in the body just on the bones. You have a study just out this summer and there's been many before it that link fluoride exposure to arthritis, to osteoarthritis. So this study from this summer finds a significant association and a strong association between low level fluoride exposure and knee osteoarthritis. Okay. Then you have a study a couple of years ago from Sweden finding a significant association between low levels of fluoride and hip fracture in postmenopausal women. Again, these are health endpoints that that will occur far well before you develop crippling fluorosis.

[00:22:44] Del Bigtree

And hip fracture being one of the major issues for the elderly. I know in this country. So many of us want your relative has a hip fracture like that really spells a very difficult road from there on for the rest of their life.
Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Right. Hip fracture is a serious, very serious concern if you’re an elderly person. And so just limiting the discussion to the bones, you can see that the the government standards on this are so crude they’re not accounting for the earlier effects of fluoride. But, you know, there’s obviously a lot of other concerns with fluoride exposure beyond the bones, beyond the skeletal system. And certainly the brain is one of the key areas of research over the past 20 or so years.

Del Bigtree
Great. So you. So there's studies then on the brain now and neurological effects and things like that. Is that when you were going in with your case, what were what was the science that you felt was the most compelling?

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Okay. So an important point in the history of this issue is 2006. And the National Research Council, which is part of the National Academies of Science, at the request of the EPA, did a comprehensive review of the scientific literature on fluoride. Okay? And not only did they conclude that EPA safety standard is too high and needs to be lowered, of which the EPA has never done anything about that.

Del Bigtree
So in the in that black and white thing, he says one part per million perfectly safe. Is that what’s in our water?

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
That is the that's the so-called optimal level of fluoride that that used to be added to water. They recently lowered that to 0.7 parts per million.

Del Bigtree
Alright, great.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
But the National Research Council was looking at a higher level of fluoride in water. It’s called the maximum contaminant level. That is the maximum level of fluoride that communities can have in their water.

Del Bigtree
Okay. And still be okay.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Still be okay. Okay. And the EPA set that in the 1980s at four parts per million, despite getting medical advice that, quote, you'd have to have rocks in your head to allow your kid much more than two parts per million. And it was EPA scientific staff was up were strongly pushing against this this standard of four parts per million. In fact, the union of scientists at the EPA tried to bring a lawsuit against their managers for implementing such a crude and unsafe standard. It's the first and only time in EPA history where you have scientific staff who are trying to join an environmental groups lawsuit against the agency because the agency's action was so crude. Fast forward to 2006. The National Research Council agrees with EPA scientists and says, Yeah, this standard is too high, it is unsafe. You need to lower it. But the EPA has not yet taken any action in response to the NRC's recommendation.

Del Bigtree
So is that so you're bringing the lawsuit then? Is the lawsuit technically against the EPA? Is that the case?

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
It is now in that National Research Council report in 2006, one of the key findings that they discuss are is fluoride's ability to affect the brain. And the NRC documents in detail the various changes in the brain that have been seen in animals that are exposed to fluoride, so controlled laboratory experiments. And then you give the animals fluoride and then you take out your microscope and you look at their brain and you see if the brains are affected. And sure enough, they are. The National Research Council discussed those findings in detail and really flagged neurotoxicity damage to the brain as an endpoint of concern that needed much more attention. And subsequent to the National Research Council's report, there have been many additional studies, many of which in human populations, okay, that have examined the relationship between fluoride and drinking water and IQ in children. And these studies, most of which for a while were done in China, where you have high levels of naturally occurring fluoride in the water. These studies almost unanimously have found that when you have elevated fluoride exposure to in your early years of life that is associated with reductions in IQ.

Del Bigtree
Okay, So permanent brain damage essentially in your in your children.
[00:27:26] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Permanent reductions in cognitive performance. Yes. And based on those studies, again, most of which are from other countries like China, India, Iran, then the National Institutes of Health here in this country, NIH, in about 2012. Funded birth cohort studies here in North America. To understand whether lower levels of fluoride, the kinds of exposures that me and you would get if we drank fluoridated water here. Okay. Whether fluoridated water ingested by the mother during pregnancy. So prenatal in utero exposures, whether those exposures are linked to reductions in IQ. The NIH has now funded two separate birth cohorts, one in Mexico, one in Canada, and there have been many. There's been about 4 or 5, six papers published. All of those analyzes of these birth cohorts have shown that fluoride exposure by the mom during pregnancy is significantly associated with reductions in IQ in the children, as well as measures of ADHD, attention deficit disorder. So these so that those birth cohort studies funded by the NIH. Are really the focus of our lawsuit against the EPA.

[00:28:54] Del Bigtree

Let's get into the lawsuit. You have some amazing depositions that have come out of this. Obviously put professionals on the stand and gotten to the bottom of it. Again, this is one of those stories where I think prior to the work that I got into just about 6 or 7 years ago, you have this sense that the regulatory agencies are there to protect the people from industry, from, industries taking advantage or poisoning waterways or products that aren't really healthy for us. And in this case, you would think as soon as you started seeing reports like you're talking about, risks of things that look like Alzheimer's or brain issues, calcification like hardening of bones, different problems like that. But certainly we start looking at infants and IQ. You would think your nation that wants to be advanced in civilization, civilization would suddenly go, wait, hold on a second. We're talking about reduction in IQ. Why is it that in your mind you even need to bring a case when this was what regulatory agencies, they had this information. Epa is getting this information right and it's not lost on them. It's not lost on the CDC and NIH. This isn't happening in a vacuum. They're seeing these reports by modern science now, not some archaic 60 year old, whatever idea that was funded by the sugar industry or some nuclear regulatory agency. But actually, real science is now being done with the type of technology we have. They don't do anything.

[00:30:21] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Yeah. And it's the federal government has profoundly let us down when it comes to fluoride and fluoride policies. And you know, as to why, you know, one of the factors is that these federal health agencies like the Centers for Disease Control, really see their job as promoting fluoridation, and they have been promoting fluoridation very aggressively. Like cheerleaders. For decades. And they've taken such a strong, aggressive posture that it's absolutely safe. Absolutely effective. One of the top ten public health achievements of the 20th century that I think it's very difficult for them to change course. And it's about I think a lot of the effort is about protecting policy versus protecting public health. And and that's certainly what we've seen with fluoride over the years. You know, that the EPA, for example, has always kowtowed to the dental interests and has failed to stand up for the public and to apply its risk assessment procedures to fluoride, because if it ever did. Del, the safe dose of fluoride is far below what we're getting from water.

[00:31:32] Del Bigtree

Well, let's get into this case because this is the stuff we love on this show. We can say it. It's our opinion, it's your opinion. But when you start hearing professionals under oath and what they ultimately admit, I think it changes this game completely. So we've got this head, a guy at the CDC. I want to talk about this first deposition. We're going to look at. Set it up for me. Who is this?

[00:31:51] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

So first off, one of the benefits of this case is we had the subpoena power to actually depose under oath federal officials. Okay. Which was remarkable

[00:32:02] Del Bigtree

Great.

[00:32:02] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

It was wonderful. So one of the federal officials that we deposed was the director of the CDC's Division of Oral Health. Named Casey Hannan. And I asked and I think we'll see a clip here in a second. But one of the things I asked Mr. Hannan about was the NRC's findings from 2006, where the NRC talked about these brain changes in the laboratory rats and or laboratory animals. And here I asked Dr.. Mr. Hannan, does CDC accept these findings? Does CDC agree that this is what's happening in animals?

[00:32:36] Del Bigtree

Right. So this is now 2018?

[00:32:38] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Yeah, I'm deposing him in 2000.

[00:32:39] Del Bigtree

2000 is 12 years after this information has come out. Is the CDC aware of this? Everybody, take a look at this.
The next paragraph begins. Fluorides also increase their production of free radicals in the brain through several different biological pathways. These changes have a bearing on the possibility that fluorides act to increase the risk of developing Alzheimer's disease. Did I read that correctly?

Michael Connett, Esq.

Yes.

And CDC agrees with that finding of the Toxicologic literature.

Yes. And again, not clear if they're talking about as demonstrated in laboratory animals or in human studies.

Okay. And you see, the next section of the on this page is titled Anatomical Changes in the Brain?

Yes.

And it begins. Studies of rats exposed to sodium fluoride or aluminum fluoride have reported distortion in cells in the outer and inner layers of the Neocortex. Neuronal deformations were also found in the hippocampus and to a smaller extent in the amygdala and the cerebellum. Did I read that correctly?

Yes.

And CDC agrees with that finding as a summary of the hazard?

As it relates to Rat studies. Yes.

So obviously, just because it affects one mammal, I guess he's thinking maybe it doesn't affect human beings. But this is this is the thing that is so shocking about our regulatory agencies. Any anybody with blood pumping through their brain would say. But obviously, if you're seeing a rat study, CDC immediately went and started doing human studies. Right? Like you got to the bottom of this and said, look, if we're seeing it in any mammal at all, this starts with animal studies. The whole point of an animal study is, let's take this a step further. Houston, we've got a problem. They don't do anything.

That's right. I asked him, does CDC have any safety data on neurotoxic effects for humans? So do we know the dose that humans can ingest that will not pose problems for the brain? The answer was no.

Right. Let's take a look at this. 

So I just to clarify, because I think is the CDC aware of any evidence demonstrating benefits from consumption of fluoridated drinking water during the first six months of life?

We are not aware of any evidence.
[00:35:13] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
That clip is important Del because the risk of the neurotoxic effects, the risks to the brain, okay, are really at their zenith in the earliest stages of life. In the in utero and during pregnancy, as well as early months of infancy. And that's because the blood brain barrier is not yet developed. And so that the chemicals that we ingest have ready access to the brain. So one of the things I asked CDC is, is there any benefit from fluoride exposure during those early stages of life that might conceivably justify incurring that risk, taking, that risk? And as you saw right there, when it comes to the early infancy, the first six months of life. His answer was no, we don't have any evidence that there's a benefit during that time frame. And I also asked them, I think we have a clip I asked him about, well, are there any benefits during the when the baby is in the womb?

[00:36:08] Del Bigtree
Alright. Let's roll the clip.

[00:36:09] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
So if a pregnant mother wrote an email to CDC asking Will if I drink fluoridated water during my pregnancy, will that provide a benefit to the teeth of my baby? Cdc? Cdc would not answer yes to that question. Correct.

[00:36:28] Casey Hannan, CDC Director of Oral Health
If we were to get an email as such, we would summarize our understanding of the evidence and saying we have not found evidence that supports benefit, that that shows benefit to the child if ingested, if community water fluoridation or some other form of fluoride is ingested by the mother.

[00:36:53] Del Bigtree
These are incredible points because it's the risk benefit ratio, right? This is what we're always talking about in any pharmaceutical intervention. As you said, fluoride is listed as a drug. You're putting drugs in our water. So there's always a risk to every drug. They know that this can be toxic at some level. So the question being, since we're taking on some toxic risks, a known toxic risk, how bad science will need to be done there. But certainly there's a benefit to warrant that risk. And what he's saying is we have no benefit at this point. We don't see nothing to prove a benefit.

[00:37:26] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Right. For this most vulnerable period of life where the risk of the effects on the perfect sense is at its greatest. There is no benefit, not some, but no benefit to justify the risk. So even if you believe, as many people do, that fluoridated drinking water has benefits for teeth, we can discuss that at length. But even if you believe that, the fact of the matter is, is when you're pregnant and when a baby is, you know, less than six months old, there is no benefit whatsoever.

[00:37:55] Del Bigtree
This is a little off of your lawsuit, but have you seen this like extra fluoridated water they sell in like baby stores that they is designed for babies.

[00:38:03] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Yeah.

[00:38:04] Del Bigtree
What are your thoughts on that? Just based on what's said here, if there's no benefit whatsoever, why would anybody be pouring extra amounts of fluoride into their baby?

[00:38:13] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
It is an incredibly irresponsible product to be sold.

[00:38:18] Del Bigtree
Wow. Alright. Let's get into the NSF. Tell me about that.

[00:38:22] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Well, the NSF is this certifying body. It's a private organization. It's not a federal governmental body, but it is an organization that communities look to, to certify that these fluoridation chemicals that are being added to water are okay, that they've passed muster. And so as part of this deposition, I wanted to I wanted to talk with them. And what have you done, NSF, to see if this these chemicals in our water are safe for the brain and are not going to cause potential effects on IQ or other other things like that. So I had an opportunity to speak with them and I asked them point blank, have you done anything whatsoever to make sure that these chemicals added to over 200 million people's drinking water are safe for the brain? I asked him that.

[00:39:14] Del Bigtree
Let's take a look.
[00:39:15] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
So I'm moving now to topic seven of the deposition notice, which reads what NSF has done, if anything, to determine the potential for fluoridation chemicals to cause neurotoxic effects. So let me ask you, has NSF taken any steps to determine the potential for fluoridation chemicals to cause neurotoxic effects?

[00:39:40] Amanda Phelka, PhD, Representative of NSF International
No.

[00:39:40] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Does NSF have any position on whether fluoridation chemicals can cause neurotoxic effects?

[00:39:48] Amanda Phelka, PhD, Representative of NSF International
Since we have not conducted our own risk assessment on the fluoridation chemicals, we do not have a position on whether they are able to cause neurotoxic effects.

[00:39:57] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Okay.

[00:39:58] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Has NSF taken any steps to determine the upper tolerable daily dose of fluoride that will not cause neurotoxic effects in humans?

[00:40:08] Amanda Phelka, PhD, Representative of NSF International
We have not.

[00:40:09] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Does the NSF have a position on what the upper tolerable daily dose of fluoride that will not cause neurotoxic effects is?

[00:40:17] Amanda Phelka, PhD, Representative of NSF International
Since we have not conducted risk assessments on any of the fluoridation chemicals, we do not have a position on the daily dose that would be appropriate to prevent or to reduce the risk for neurotoxic effects from fluoride exposure.

[00:40:33] Del Bigtree
I find this so amazing because this is the group that's literally stamping with approval. What exactly are you approving? What does your stamp mean? And what she's saying is basically we haven't looked at any issues. We don't do any science to see whether this is safe, whether it's causing neurological disorders, especially in the face of at this point, we're 12 years past studies that are clearly showing a relationship from all around the world, places that have naturally occurring high levels of fluoride or seeing lowering in IQ. NSF, Who is this this body of professionals that give it the stamp of approval? We never even looked into it. So are they approving? I think this is like this is like an a mercury approval group. Yep. That's mercury. Yep. It's is that what she's saying us is that's mercury. That's fluoride. That's all we're telling you is that's a giant pile of fluoride. What it does to you, we have no idea.

[00:41:24] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
That's pretty much what they do. It's like, does it have some excess degree of contaminants of other stuff,

[00:41:30] Del Bigtree
Right.

[00:41:31] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Other than fluoride

[00:41:32] Del Bigtree
Don't worry, we didn't find any vitamin C in your fluoride. It's good to go.

[00:41:36] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
And Del I got the same testimony from the CDC. I mean, I asked him, do you have this type of data? And the answer was no. I mean, have you done anything to determine the safe dose? The answer was no. And so NSF is not alone in this. However, the next time you see that NSF stamp of approval on the chemicals being added to your water, just know that that says nothing about whether this is safe for your child to drink.

[00:42:02] Del Bigtree
What it is saying is, it's there. Fluoride's their it's fluoride. We guarantee you there's fluoride in your water. Okay. You have an EPA deposition I find fascinating because this is one of the this is someone that you're deposing that's been at this quite a long time.
Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Right. In 2019, we had an opportunity to depose a senior scientist at EPA's Office of Water named Dr. Joyce Donahue. Dr. Donahue is actually EPA subject matter expert on fluoride at the Office of Water. She's been working on fluoride issues since the 1990s. And so during the deposition, I asked Dr. Donahue about her assessment of these recent birth cohort studies from North America, the ones that have been funded by the NIH. And she gave me her her thoughts on those studies.

Del Bigtree
Okay, Let's take a look at this.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
So you would agree that this is an important study here, a prospective birth cohort study, which is finding a significant relationship between low levels of fluoride in the urine of pregnant women and ADHD symptoms in children.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
Yes.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
And you would agree that this this study further supports the need for reassessment of current safety standards of fluoride in the United States?

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
Yes, it's one of several.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
Okay. You would agree that this study right here adds further reason why we need to do a reassessment of the fluoride safety standards in the United States.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
I think it's a reason for doing not just the United States. I think it's a reason for doing an update to the fluoride assessment.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
Everywhere.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
Well, for anybody who's interested in fluoride and the need for regulation of fluoride exposure.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
Right. And anyone interested in making sure that fluoride is safe for consumption.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
That people are not overexposed. Yes.

Dr. Joyce Donohue, PhD, Senior Scientist at EPA’s Office of Water
Okay.

Del Bigtree
This is amazing because here's a person. This is her job. Her job is to define quality of water. Right. She's a water specialist. You're talking about a study that didn't happen six weeks ago or six months ago. It literally happened back in 2006. We're now in 2019. And correct me if I'm wrong. you're saying does this study in your mind, as the head of our water quality department here, does this warrant further investigation into whether or not this is causing serious problems? Should there be a reevaluation of the amount, what we're doing with our water system? Absolutely. That's what this tells us.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Just one clarification. The studies I was asking her about were the birth cohort studies.

Del Bigtree
Or the more recent NIH studies.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Right. And they to be they were first they started to be released in 2017.
Del Bigtree
Okay. So so those are more recent.

Michael Connett, Esq., Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Those are More recent. But I did ask Dr. Donoghue about the NRC review of the neurotoxicity literature from 22,006. And she agreed the NRC review identified big potential problems with fluoride that needed to be evaluated. Okay. So she agreed that, oh yeah, that report had a lot of was

Del Bigtree
A doozy. It’s such a strange look on her face, like she’s about to giggle. I can’t figure out what’s going on there and we won’t get into the weeds. I’m going to ask you to speculate. It’s not what lawyers like to do, but all I can say is if I’m sitting there as a judge and I always try to imagine my job now is I’m listening to this. And all of a sudden something I was told was perfectly safe and it was good for all of us. And I try to imagine what the judge is doing is they’re listening to these depositions and saying, hold on a second. The government agency that I and my family and my grandchildren, I’m alive on this planet. This is affecting me. Never did studies, even after showing that there’s neurological effects, never looked deeper into it. Animal studies are showing definitively neurological issues. Nobody seems to be doing anything. Cdc admits, Yeah, that science is credible. We’re just not doing anything about it. Head of EPA’s water that’s looking at my water saying, Oh yeah, that’s always been a problem. Definitely was a problem in 2006, even more of a problem now. And not only do I think we should be reevaluating, but basically anyone in the world putting this stuff in their water should be reevaluating. It seems to me that at the moment this is a slam dunk. Case is close. I know everyone watching this that is in a lawyers like me, I’m not one. You just think, okay, so you won the case.

Michael Connett, Esq., Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Well, we did. We we went to trial in June of 2020. And had a seven day.

Del Bigtree
So these depositions are done to prepare for the trial. But all things that are going to be in front of the judge’s purview.

Michael Connett, Esq., Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Right.

Michael Connett, Esq., Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Seven day bench trial in front of a judge in the northern district of California. And it’s the first time, by the way, that citizen groups have ever taken a citizen petition under Tosca, the Toxic Substances Control Act all the way to a federal trial. So that was a landmark in and of itself.

Del Bigtree
Good for you. We know what that is to set landmarks. Our lawyer, Aaron Siri, has pulled it off a few times for us. But these are where people where no man has treaded before or woman.

Michael Connett, Esq., Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Thank you. And so but we had the great fortune to be able to call to the stand some of the most prominent experts in the field of fluoride neurotoxicity, including Dr. Philippe Grandjean, whose research on mercury and IQ set the is what EPA used to establish the safety standards for Mercury. Dr. Grandjean has now been studying fluoride and has been is very concerned about what it could be doing to children’s to developing brain. So we called Dr. Grandjean to the stand. We called Dr. Howard Hu, who was the principal investigator of the birth cohort study in Mexico. We called Dr. Bruce Lanphear, who is a scientist who’s done some of the seminal research on lead and IQ, and Dr. Lanphear is one of the principal investigators of the birth cohort study in Canada. We also called to the stand Dr. Kathleen Tyson, a risk assessment scientist who has actually written reports on fluoride for the EPA in the past. And so we presented substantial expert testimony at trial, which was very compelling. And the judge at the end stated that we had presented serious evidence that raises serious questions about this policy. However, and I and I totally understand why he would do this at that time Del, there was a draft report by the National Toxicology Program, which is the which is this agency at the federal level, the Department of Health and Human Services. There’s this there’s this agency called the National Toxicology Program, NTP.

Del Bigtree
I'm assuming these are scientists that are really good at studying toxins.

Michael Connett, Esq., Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
They are the subject matter experts on toxicology issues at the federal government. Right now, so at the time of our trial, there was a draft report out, but it wasn’t yet final. And what the judge said is I before I render a decision in this case, I want to see what the NPS final conclusions are. And until that report comes out, I’m going to put this case on hold. So it was disappointing for me as an attorney. I just finished a trial. You’re hoping to get a decision, and you hear, no, we’re going to wait for this federal agency to complete a review. That gave me heartburn because I’ve seen the political interferences in the past.
Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

May of 2022. About two years later, I received word from an individual with knowledge that the NTP report was done and it was going to be published in one week on May 18th. Thrilled. We finally are going to get the final report. Report doesn't come out, so we're waiting still. We're waiting and waiting. And then we find out in July from an individual with knowledge that it looked like the report may never come out. At that point in time, I went to the judge. I filed a motion and I said, we can't keep waiting for this report because it may never come out. And then we're waiting forever and we're effectively denied our day in court. So we had a hearing with the judge.

The judge should be pissed off about that because the judge is saying, look, I'm waiting for this report to this is important to me. Everything you said has me really alarmed. But I'm going to let the final highest level group in our federal government tell me what they think. And now they're ready to do that. But something's stalling.

Something is stalling it. And I didn't have obviously, I didn't have documents. I couldn't prove anything.

You don't even know what it's going to say.

I don't even know what the final report says. Okay. But I know I want to get that final report

especially when they start blocking it.

Yeah. Yeah. Well,

That gives you a little sense. Maybe this is going to come out on my side. I think, like, good chance this isn't making them look very good.

And so we, the judge agreed that we can no longer keep waiting for a final report. And he so he set the case for a second trial. So we're going and that's going to be January 29th of next year. Okay. And the judge has agreed that. Let us consider that. Well, the report that the PNP was going to release in May of 2022, we will consider that for the trial. But we're not going to keep waiting and waiting and waiting for a final report to come out.

Do you know what they're doing? What are they trying to do? What is the waiting about? Are they trying to rewrite it? What's happening?
Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

So after I learned that something untoward had happened, I began filing. Well, Christie Lavelle, who's one of the plaintiffs in the case, she began filing FOIA requests, Freedom of Information Act requests. And we have since obtained a large number of documents that show what happened at the federal level last year, why the NTS report was not released. And the reports make it very clear what happened.

Del Bigtree

That there basically there's a hang up. Let's look at we have a couple of emails. Let's take a look at this and you can tell me what we're looking at. This is from Tara Schwetz. "I don't think a release date of May 18th is feasible. There are too many folks interested in this and it needs to be further refined. The communication needs to be carefully thought through and we will need to brief the ash on this." Who's A s h?

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Assistant Secretary of Health, Rachel Levine

Del Bigtree

Okay. So we got to we got to tell Rachel Levine we have a problem here and we can't release this yet. It doesn't matter that this is a government document. It doesn't matter that this government works for us, which they forget all the time and something we report on all the time. We need to hold this up. What's going on there?

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Well, that that email was from, I think, May 12th, the day before. On May 11th, the NTP sent an email to all the federal agencies that are interested in this, the CDC, the Nidcr FDA, telling them the report is done, conclusions are set. We're releasing the report next week. May 18th. Okay. And it was full scale alarm. I mean, you see emails immediately flying back and forth between the Nidcr and the CDC, between Nidcr and the assistant secretary of health and the director's office at the NIH. And they're all saying, Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. What's going on? We, you know, and there was and they they were very agressive immediately at saying there's no way this report is coming out next week. And the emails are very clear on that. So it was a situation where the NTP scientists said very clearly, we are we have completed our review. We've considered all of your input.

Del Bigtree

We've got a very interesting another email. This is Brian Berridge. Let's take a look at what he is saying. "Hi, Tara. I have significant concerns that the level of engagement on this scientific product has crossed the line. From rigorous peer review to ensure balance and accuracy to one that could be construed as attempting to influence the outcomes." He's clearly saying all you guys are calling me while you're asking me to do goes way beyond what we want to do some peer review. You're telling me it it seems to me, to reevaluate this and change the outcome. "After 17 years in industry," he says, "I've seen efforts to modify messages to fit commercial interests. I wasn't party to that there, and I'm not game to do that here." Holy cow. So this is the guy at the NTSB.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

Dr. Berridge was the scientific director for the NTP.

Del Bigtree

Oh NTP. Right, right.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

He wrote that email the morning of May 12th. After this whole again, the NCB announced they were going to release the report the day before and there was this fire alarm where they got a lot of, you know, input from.

Del Bigtree

I'm sure he's getting yelled at on the phone and being told you are not going to release this, you know, because that that type of response is someone that's pissed off and basically drawing a line in the sand, which is which is hard to do in a federal agency like that.

Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

And in other emails, Dr. Berridge commented on the, in his words, the unprecedented degree of review and scrutiny that the NTP was being subjected to by these other federal agencies. And at one point Dr. Berridge made, I thought, a really interesting comment and he was writing to the Nidcr. Nidcr is the is an institute at the NIH that focuses on the teeth. Okay? They are big proponents of water fluoridation. Dr. Berridge sent an email very politely, very professionally, but he basically asked a question. How is it that you as dentists, are peer reviewers of a report on toxicology?

Del Bigtree

It's not in your area of expertise. You don't know what you're talking about.
Right. What is it that gives you the right to basically tell us how to do our job as toxicologists? This isn't your lane, right? He said it.

Del Bigtree
This isn't a study on how it hardens the teeth. This is a study on is it toxic?

Del Bigtree
So you must be psyched, though, at least you know, you've got Dr. Berridge on the other side standing here as this. And this is still going on, I assume, as you're coming up to this case.

Del Bigtree
Now you've got a copy of what we are what they're saying is not ready to release. There's something you've got you're going to share a couple of quotes from this piece. Let's take a look at what we are now showing you. Folks, you're seeing here on The HighWire, “NTP Board of Scientific Counselors Working Group report on the draft state of the science monograph and the draft meta analysis manuscript on fluoride.” Here's a few of the quotes. “Reported Associations between higher fluoride exposure and lower children's IQ are consistent in the vast majority of studies of both low and high quality. It doesn't matter how good the study is, they're all coming to the same conclusion. “Several of the highest quality studies showing lower IQs in children were done in optimally fluoridated 0.7” what is that?

Del Bigtree
Okay. Areas. So basically saying even when it's the right dose similar to what we're giving in drinking water, I'm assuming they're saying.

Del Bigtree
That's the exact level of fluoride that we add to drinking water in the United States.

Del Bigtree
So even at that dose, we were seeing problems. Okay. It goes on to say "it's always easy to call for more research, and we agree that targeted research can certainly add clarity to the existing data, particularly at lower exposure levels. However, hundreds of human and animal studies have been published on this topic." Basically, we are telling you we are not left wanting. We are telling you this stuff is toxic. The levels it's being given to American citizens.

Del Bigtree
And the NTP identified 72 human studies on fluoride and IQ 72.

Del Bigtree
Wow.

Del Bigtree
And of those, they found that 19 of them were high quality studies. And of those 19 high quality studies, 18 found an association between elevated fluoride exposure and reduced IQ. So 18 out of 19 high quality studies showing a similar effect, namely fluoride reducing IQ in children. So in the NTP's own words, as you saw there, the vast majority of studies that have looked at fluoride exposures in human populations have found associations with reduced IQ.
Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years

And let me just if I could, just one clarifying point for the NTP. I mean, the NTP is cautious in a lot of their language. I don't think the NTP would like they're not saying water fluoridation is harmful or water. We know that water fluoridation is causing IQ loss. They're more cautious. But what they do say is they have resisted the repeated requests by the CDC and the fluoridation proponents at the federal level to add language that says don't worry about this if you're drinking fluoridated water, there's nothing to be worried about at 0.7 ppm. Right. The NTP has said, no, we're not going to add that language because it's not justified because there is a basis for concern at those levels. And that's where the NTP is coming from. They're not saying we know it's causing IQ loss at the optimal level, but they are saying certainly with the data we have, there's a real reason for concern. And that's what the CDC and the Nidcr cannot accept because they really they insist they insist that the A.P. add language that tells the public, don't worry if you're in a living in a fluoridated area, there's nothing to worry about. And the A.P. has resisted that. And I think that's to their credit, because as scientists, they say you can't you can't say that with the data that we now have.

I mean, you have to read the obviously, when we read these things, they're nice to each other. They play nicely, nice between different departments. But this department is saying, look, we are not going to tell people this is safe. Yeah, right. What you're not getting here is a stamp of approval.

Absolutely right. Absolutely

Now, you read what? We're showing you hundreds of studies, animal studies, almost on every level, every time it's done bad quality, good quality, high levels, low levels, same levels we're getting in our drinking water. They're having a similar result. There is a toxic effect. There's an IQ drop. This is something that certainly does not warrant being called safe.

Yeah, and I think really raises the question, should we continue adding a neurotoxicant to the water of over 200 million people in this country and that fluoride that you add to water doesn't just go into the water, it goes into all the processed foods and processed beverages made with that water like your sodas or your beers or whatnot. So people

You were saying, baby Formula one of the biggest when you're using baby formula are getting much higher levels than even a breastfeeding mother. That's diluting the levels that are coming through her body. Those are directly going in. When we look at this right now, where we're at, what are you hoping in January, we have a case your this judge is going to look at whether or not they've released or not. It's my understanding they're going to look at what you now are holding, whether they said we've signed off on it or not. This is going to appear in a court.

Right. The judge is going to have that NTP report from last year. He's going to have the NTP's responses to all of the agency criticisms. Okay. And he's also going to have all of the studies that have been published since the trial. Okay. And so the judge is going to be able to consider this more recent evidence, including the NDP's assessment, and make a judgment about whether fluoridation, chemicals added to water pose an unreasonable risk to human health.

And that's your question.

That's the question

We want the judge to determine whether or not this is an unreasonable risk to public health.

Yes. And if the judge rules that there is a risk, then the statute requires the EPA to take steps to eliminate that risk. So the EPA will be bound by law to eliminate the risk posed to the brain by fluoridation.
[01:04:10] Del Bigtree
Incredible work, really, Michael. So what does what does the call to action? We have a very involved I have a great audience that actually get involved, do something. What can they do right now to to help this move along?

[01:04:22] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Well, certainly if anyone out there wants to support the lawsuit, then if anyone wants to donate, you can do so by going to momsagainstfluoridation.org. And and also, I highly recommend that people tune in to the trial because the trial will be by zoom.

[01:04:42] Del Bigtree
Really?

[01:04:43] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Right by Zoom. So it starts on January 29th, 2024. And it's at and if you go to momsagainstfluoridation.org or Fluoride Action Network's website, you will find all the information as to how you can go and access the Zoom trial. But I really think this is an incredible educational opportunity for people to hear what the scientists at this highest level are saying about this issue of fluoride in the brain. They're going to hear from the best experts on the, you know, the independent scientists who are raising concerns. And they're going to hear from the government's people. So they're going to hear the back and forth. And I think it will be a great educational process.

[01:05:24] Del Bigtree
Thank you for making that all happen, Michael, and thank you for taking the time to come out here to Texas. Bring us the whole scoop. Really honored to meet you. Thank you for your work. It's people like you that give me hope that we still have a chance here in the level of corruption we see in regulatory agencies. Why are agencies are not rushing forward to protect us and saying we need to get on studies, we need to figure out what to do here, whether it's reduce it or take it all the way out of the water system when we see them just protecting their own butts, protecting bad mistakes they've made, that's a problem. It's people like you either make a difference. So thank you. Thank you for joining us.

[01:05:57] Michael Connett, Esq. Attorney to Fluoride Action Network & Plaintiffs, Has Been Litigating Case Against Fluoride for Seven Years
Thank you, Del. It's great to be here.

[01:05:58] Del Bigtree
Alright. Great. I have a great show coming up. We want to talk about environmental toxins and things that affect our health. We're going to be talking to medical practitioner Barry Smeltzer, who has done a lot of work in this space. But before we get there, it's time for the Jaxen report. Wow. Jefferey. These are those moments that I love where, you and I and our team sit and, we talked to Derek Rose and we started getting like, pinning together these stories. And, we've seen the writing on the wall and fluoride. We're seeing some of the radio hosts starting to, that are doctors saying, wait a minute, have you been seeing this trial? It's really unnerving. We covered that. And to get all the way full circle to Michael Connert himself, coming in here and laying it out that way, the only thing that I think is is so sad is how similar this story is to everything else we cover. As we sit and break it down. I'm like, I could tell you exactly, once you get a few sentences, you can just say, I know exactly where this is going. We've been studying a very similar cover up ourselves, same, same type of players, same approach. And it's always it always comes back to CDC, EPA, NIH. It's so disappointing that we're supposed to be leading the world in transparency of government and protection of humanity, freedoms and liberty. And the opposite is often the case. So many countries won't even go near fluoridating their water.

[01:07:30] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Reporter
And who would have thought it was this difficult to get to the science? And who would have thought? Once we arrived at this truth of science, there was no science to be had. And this is a trial, very symbolic. Everyone should be watching this. But let's talk about some other issues here that that science may be lacking a little bit. So in May of this year, the FDA approved the first RSV vaccine. That's a respiratory syncytial virus for for people over 60 and shortly after, Here is the messaging you saw on your TV.


[01:07:57] Male News Correspondent
Flu and Covid shots are now available, as are the new RSV vaccines.

[01:08:01] Female News Correspondent
Trying to avoid another triple demic.

[01:08:03] Mandy K. Cohen, MD, MPH, is the Director for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
For the first time ever, have vaccines against all three of the major viruses that spread this fall and winter.

[01:08:11] Peter Marks, M.D., Ph.D. is the director of the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER) at the Food and Drug Administration
You can be vaccinated against Covid 19 influenza and RSV, also known as respiratory syncytial virus with RSV.
The CDC does say that co-administration with other adult vaccines is acceptable. The advantage is that you can get it taken care of in a single appointment.

They all can be given at the same time,

2 in 1 arm, one on the other, and then you would be good to go for the season.

We highly recommend getting all three in the same visit. That way you're protected and geared up against this vaccine season.

Alright, triple. Ouch. Okay.

Get them together. It makes the fall, the winter, the holidays just much safer, much better for everybody.

Let's take our RSV vaccine, the old flu shot that never worked and the Covid vaccine that was tested on ten mice slap them all in you at once. What could possibly go wrong?

Triple. Ouch. As she says.

Indeed

So how the heck did we get here? So this is a headline from 2021. It says "CDC says Covid Flu Vaccines Can be co-administered." And in this article it says, "When the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention released its latest round of recommendations regarding seasonal influenza vaccines, the document contained one notable update Flu vaccines and Covid vaccines can now be given simultaneously. This change stands in marked contrast to previous recommendations in which the CDC said that other vaccinations should not be administered within a two week window before or after receiving Covid 19 vaccine." So in 2021, they said, you know what, flu season is coming, just stack them all in the same visit. And then RSV comes and says, just put them all in the same, put them all in the same time just fine. Just just keep stacking them. And if they come out with another vaccine, maybe we'll get four at the same time. But remember, never question this, never space them out. If you do that, you're an anti-vaxxer. And here's a problem, though. We just saw this headline. "Top FDA official suggests spacing out vaccines to avoid side effects." Whooops. Looks like the marketing campaign has a little problem here. This is Peter Marks. He's the director. He's not just some underling. He's the director of the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research at the FDA. And this is what he had to say. Take a listen.

Alright.

I have to be an honest person and say that some people are saying, well, could I get RSV, Covid and the flu vaccine on the same day? Yes, indeed, you could. But honestly, I might not, just because each of them can potentially make one a little a little fatigued or have a little bit of a fever and I might just want to space them out a little bit. But if if you had to drive a lot of miles to get the vaccines and that it might not be unreasonable to get all three of them at once.

People. I mean, I want you to learn this is what we're trying to teach you on this show. There's moments red flags should go up. Here's when a red flag should go up, when every single news anchor, you know went on a blitzkrieg telling you get all three at the same time. And then a week later, one of your heads at FDA says, there's some people out there saying, get them. At the same time, I'm not going. I have to be honest with you, I'm not recommending that that is the equivalent to something really bad. Must have just gone down where the statement by the way, everyone on CNN, Fox, MSNBC, CBS, NBC did not all say the exact same thing and Peter Marks knew nothing about it. He was a part of writing that statement. He made everybody say that on the news. That is the propaganda. That's the tool they use. And now all of a sudden, after 71, everyone out telling you to get at the same time, he's now telling you and the headlines are saying actually probably smarter to spread it out because we don't want to be seeing adverse reactions. Oh, really? Oh, wait a minute. You mean taking three at the same time could cause more of a reaction than not? What about the seven I was just giving my child yesterday. You see, this is the problem. This is why they want sort of this this one size fits all pull off and saying you can take 10,000 of these things at the same time. We'll never affect you. They never wanted to change this language. They never want you thinking that one or 2 or 3 of these things makes a difference. Now, Houston, we've got a problem. Ask yourself what just happened that they have changed their safe and effective no matter how many you get, whenever you get them all day, any day. Something's going on, folks.
And from a public relations standpoint, think about this, too. Peter Marks is now aligned with anti-vaxxers, the quote, anti-vaxxers. We've been told was anti-vaxxers. Remember in 2016 when there was a California pediatrician named Dr. Sears, this was the headline here, "Alternative vaccine Dr. Robert Sears accused of gross negligence." Well, he was suggesting that patients spaced their vaccines out to avoid side effects and reactions. So here we are. But now let's look at let's look at the CDC call directives. This is the clinical outreach call. It's about almost an 80 page PowerPoint that your clinicians get. These are the marching orders CDC gives to your local community, public health providers. This is for "preparation for the upcoming respiratory virus season." So these are the marching orders. And it says in here, "Co-administration with all other adult vaccines is acceptable." It also says "If vaccines are not administered the same day, there's no requirement required intervals between vaccines." Let's look at the CDC schedule.

This is what the doctors are getting. This is when we're saying doctors like my doctor knows best. Your doctor doesn't know best. Your doctor was lied to. And if they didn't do their homework after being and sitting through this PowerPoint, they think, no, I'm supposed to be giving all the same time. Forget the fact that Peter Marx saying, look, some people like your doctor are telling you to get all three at the same time. I wouldn't recommend it, certainly wouldn't do it to myself.

Right. Exactly. And so, I mean, one could say he's sowing vaccine disinformation because now people are going to question their doctor. Oh, my gosh. So let's look at the CDC schedule for adult vaccines. There's up to 13 other adult vaccines here. So this administration, they're saying you can give these with all other adult vaccines. Obviously, they're not going to give them with 13 other ones. But there is there a lengthy amount of safety data on this practice? Not really. But they'll tell you they're monitoring the safety, the adverse events of these vaccines. That's what we have, a robust monitoring system. And so let's go back to this call directive sheet. It says this. Let's look at the data they have. It says "there are currently limited data available on immunogenicity of co-administration, of RSV vaccine and other vaccines." That's the immune response you're supposed to be getting for the vaccine. You're supposed to elicit an immune response. They said we don't really have that data is limited. Well, they also go on to say, however, "RSV and influenza antibody titers were generally somewhat lower with Co-administration. The clinical significance of this is unknown." So we're actually trying to boost antibody titers, but when we put them both in at the same time, it actually lowers them. We don't really know what happens, but go ahead and just give them with all the other vaccines.

Let's simplify that. Here's what they're saying. Basically, we didn't really do any studies or many at all where we actually combined vaccines all together before we told you just combine them all together. But the couple of studies we did do or that we looked at actually showed that the titers go down and they're less effective when you give them together. But again, not a lot of science on it. So that's where we're at. It's amazing that they send out this blitzkrieg of news anchors and basically never did any science to back that statement up. Just assume we're just assume taking them all together is fine. Oh, wait, hold on. Maybe not.

Alright. And if they're question if anybody at the agency's question, they say we have a robust monitoring system. Well, the quiet part was just said out loud. Check out this study. This is published just. April of 2023, in the Journal of Human Vaccines and Immunotherapeutics is titled "Vaccine Co-administration in Adults and Effective Way to improve vaccination coverage." And it says in here. "Furthermore, if vaccines were administered separately, transient adverse events would be reported at each visit, and the total cumulative number of transient adverse events would likely be greater than after administration of multiple vaccines." So if you're if you're reading this like I'm reading this, they're saying, look, put them all in at the same visit. That way they'll only have one report for an adverse event because if you do them separately, you could possibly get up to three reports for an adverse event.

But just make it look like there's a lot of adverse events happening and it has something else they don't even mention here? If they took them all at the same time, we're never going to be able to pinpoint which one is causing the problem. Therefore, it's hidden safety in numbers here. And this is why our data in America sucks so bad and they want it that way. If you actually had a monitoring system, if you gave them one at a time, you might actually see that some of these are worse than others. We might actually learn something about the human body. Instead, let's literally they basically just said, here's how we're going to push it under the rug. We're going to hide it under our bed. We know there's going to be multiple adverse reactions for a lot of people, but let's combine them all into one adverse reaction by making them take them all at the same time. It's outrageous.

They're basically mean just telling people marching orders in this in this this article, this study. And it's almost like a pharmaceutical company paid for this. And then when you look at who paid for this, it is a pharmaceutical company. It says this "GlaxoSmithKline Biologics took responsibility for all costs associated with developing and publishing the present manuscript". Cool. So there you have it. But now we have Peter Marks. He's entering the land of, you know, maybe spacing out vaccines, questioning the efficacy of vaccines. Yeah. When it comes to this. But now we have also Dr. Paul Offit. He's been really vocal about questioning vaccines as well. What the heck is happening? Dogs and cats sleeping together. This is Paul Offit just recently talking about the most recent booster. Take a listen.
[01:17:53] Dr. Paul Offit, Director, Vaccine Education of Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia

My last dose was in November of 2021. I had a mild two day infection in May of 2022 with what was probably a ba2 strain because that was prominent at the time. I think I’m protected. I didn’t get last year’s Bivalent vaccine. I’m not getting this year’s vaccine because I think I have high frequencies of T cells. Maybe I’m wrong. Any time you take any medicine or any biological, there’s a downside. If it has an upside, it'll have a downside. The downside may be rare, it may be very rare. But nonetheless, there’s always a downside. And we’re going to find out about this this vaccine over time. It is a novel strategy. We certainly were surprised by myocarditis and pericarditis. And we’ll see whether or not over time, you know, when we’re five years into this, ten years into this, 15 years into this, whether there’s any evidence of residual myocardial disease. And I think it’s perfectly willing to reasonable to take those risks if the benefits are clear but the benefits aren’t clear, then it’s not so reasonable to take risk, even a rare risk.

[01:18:50] Del Bigtree

We actually tweeted out about this statement and basically saying Paul Offit is now officially an anti-vaxker. Now, I know he thinks he’s just a good scientist, but that’s true about all of us that start questioning vaccines. But just to be clear, this is the definition in Webster’s Dictionary of An Anti-vaxxer, “a person who opposes the use of some or all vaccines.” Pretty sure that’s what Paul Offit just did. Said I’m opposed to using the booster. Don’t think I need it. He’s also, if you’re opposed to regulations mandating a vaccination, vaccination or usually both, I would assume he would also say if you mandate that vaccine, I don’t think that’s the right idea. I don’t think I need it. I think I’m as boosted as well as I need to be. And there’s actually no decent science to show that this thing works at all. So Paul Offit, as I said before, welcome. Welcome to the pool. The water is warm and this is how science happens. Eventually it catches up with you. Alright. So amazing that these scientists, they’ve pushed it so far and been so reckless in the science that they’re having to back up, change their play, change their mind and make public statements that go against what we just heard on the news last week. Absolutely incredible. Somebody better start apologizing really soon.

[01:20:05] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Reporter

And let’s do a really quick hit on a study here, Del. We try to bring these studies. As soon as they come out, they come out. They’re coming out rapidly now. And this is one of the studies and it’s talking about myocarditis. But in order to frame this study, we have to understand this. “The future of cardiac disease assessment using 18 FDG in Pet scans and CT scans.” What is that? That’s an acronym or abbreviation for Fluorodeoxyglucose. It’s a tracer dye and it’s injected into people when they go in for, assessment for a cancer. They put them in a CT scan and they can see what what type of cancer malignancies that far they’ve developed. Well, in this in this research here, they’re talking about a new way to assess cardiac disease. So they say this “glucose is one of the main substrates for the myocardium.” So to break that down, your heart muscles take up glucose. It’s one of the main foundational substrates. It says “myocardial cells take up this tracer, this 18 FDG, similar to glucose.” So great. The heart’s accumulating this stuff just like glucose. Well, what does it do when it gets there? Well, it says “in addition, this 18 FDG is accumulated in inflammatory foci because of activation of inflammatory inflammatory cells such as lymphocytes and macrophages.” So it’s able to detect inflammation, it congregates in inflammation. So think about this. You’re a researcher. There’s a new vaccine technology out there that’s actually causing some people’s bodies to make inflammatory immune responses to their own heart muscles. Let’s try this new tracer dye to see what happens. And this is what these brilliant researchers did. This is the study here, “assessment of myocardial uptake in the asymptomatic Sars-cov-2 vaccinated non-vaccinated patients.


So it’s vaccinated that study. And they say this “in this observational study of patients who underwent Pet and CT scans during comprehensive medical checkups to evaluate malignancies.” So understand this had nothing to do with vaccines. They just went in for these regular checkups or for a cancer evaluation. It says “patients who had received SARS-CoV-2 mRNA based vaccination showed increased myocardial FDG uptake on scans compared to non vaccinated patients.” They go on to say “when patients were divided into groups based on the time interval between vaccination and imaging, myocardial FDG uptake was higher in all vaccinated groups. Suv max range of 4.6 to 5.1 compared to non vaccinated groups.” So let’s take a look at this at the chart. Some of the actual figures in this study and you can see here on the left side of this figure, you have the unvaccinated patients compared to the vaccinated patients. So understand, you don’t want any inflammatory uptake of this tracer dye in your heart. It’s showing there’s inflammation, there’s showing, there’s an inflammatory response in the heart muscles of these vaccinated patients. And obviously, you can see less there on the left side and the non vaccinated patients. But what’s more. Interesting is they do a time interval out and this is this next image. So on the left side here, you have 303 non-vaccinated patients. You see a little bit of this, this candle bar. And then on the right, you see the first dose that’s in 40 patients and you have this bar goes up. But then across the entire bar there, that’s the second dose. You have all of these time intervals that go across and all the way up to 181 days and it’s showing 181 days.

[01:23:21] Del Bigtree

They’re showing heart damage out if you’ve gotten the vaccine.


And Del the key point on this is these people did not go in for myocarditis. These people didn’t go to their doctor and say, my heart hurts. I’m having shortness of breath. It hurts when I do exercise. And then they they receive this. This is someone just walking off the streets doing a regular medical checkup or walking in saying, you know, there may be a malignancy. I’m having a bump here. They brought me in for the CT scan. And these researchers check this out and said, wait a minute, you’re vaccinated. People are showing pretty much across the board this heart inflammation. What’s going on now, as a caveat, the researchers just say we can’t tell the extent of inflammation and damage to the heart. We just know there’s inflammation going on.
[01:24:02] Del Bigtree
Wow. It's incredible. There you have it, folks. And honestly, when I look at this vaccine now and I see the booster rolling out, people that are lining up for it, I don't know what to say. I mean, at this point, I feel like, you got to spread the word. If you have loved ones you’re trying to protect, you better get them watching the Highwire right away because I’m running out of hope for these people. I think that now you’re moving the third, fourth, fifth booster. Everything is showing us. We just did a show talking about turbo cancers. Now we know for certain you’re damaging your heart. If you're getting these vaccines every time you're getting it, it's getting worse. So across the board, it's like these people that are lining up. If it hasn't sunken in on them, that the thing is completely ineffective is only doing damage. I just starting to feel like all these people's days are numbered on this earth. They're shortening their lives in one way or another. They're making a huge mistake. It's not their fault. I don't blame them for it. They're being lied to by the regulatory agencies. But what are we going to do? What are we going to do about it? We’ve been here since the very beginning. We've been right. There's nothing we've had to refute about what we've said or nothing that we've had to bring back. We told you it wouldn't stop transmission. It doesn't. We told you we assumed there'd be cancers and heart problems. There are. Now what do you do? And if people the fact that they’ve been sick five times after, you know, six and seven boosters, I really don't know what it's going to take to wake these people up. But I think it's a last ditch effort. You better stop them now, because if kids, whoever starts getting this next booster, they're in real trouble.

Absolutely. And we have an update on a story we did a couple of weeks ago. This was a story of the Omicron variant. And remember, just for context, the Omicron variant came out of nowhere in 2021. This is a phylogenetic chart showing at the bottom there. That's the normal mutations arising of the alpha strain, the delta strain. Then this omicron strain just shot up. This red line comes out of nowhere, plants its flag in 2021 and becomes the dominant strain. And researchers and people around the world were going, where the heck did this come from? How did it become so dominant? Like, what's what's happening? Well, two Japanese researchers actually did this research. This is a doctor, Atsushi Tanaka and Dr. Takayuki Miyazawa, and they did this "unnatural evolutionary process of SARS-CoV-2 variants and possibility of deliberate natural selection." We covered that a couple of weeks ago. And they looked at them located at nearly 400 omicron variants to track the mutations, to try to reverse track the mutations, to really find out where the heck did this come from, because there's these really forensic fingerprints in the in the genome you can track and they publish this chart. And this kind of tells the whole story. We covered this again two weeks ago. You can go back to that that broadcast. But there's this stepped process here. And this is not natural evolution. What they're seeing is, you know, it's almost as if it's like a panel of researchers we use to create and test what each mutation would do. So they turn on a mutation, they turn off a mutation and to see what type of activity it does. And the researchers, the two Japanese researchers, they actually had very gentle and unbiased conclusions given the data that they found. They basically said science at this point should not exclude the possibility of an artificially synthesized virus when discussing these mutation processes.

[01:27:17] Del Bigtree
I mean, this was an amazing story. I just want to reiterate, this was a preprint. It's not published science, but these scientists believe in what they're saying is part of what you're going to get into. But I want to put it out there. This show is not saying that this is a fact, but it is saying this is an alarming theory and discovery if it proves to be true. Okay. Go ahead.

Yeah, absolutely. And the story is just as much as about these two researchers trying to trying to get other people to listen and to validate their data and to get this peer reviewed. So we did what we do best on this show, which is try to give doctors and researchers a platform. So I reached out to both of these two doctors, these researchers, to see if they wanted to come on the show. And this was one of their replies here. They said this "Mr. Jefferey Jaxen, thank you for your email. At first I was hesitant to respond because I wasn't sure if your email is genuine. I saw your program on Highwire. Thank you for featuring our paper on your show." And I also asked, you know, this is a preprint. Have you tried to get it peer reviewed? And the the one of the researchers that wrote me back actually sent me what he received from what I can just say at this point is a major scientific journal that they tried to get peer reviewed. And this is what the Journal wrote them back. This is what he sent to me. He says, quote, "The reason for this decision is this manuscript has been withdrawn on behalf of the authors and is no longer under consideration for publication in this journal. During our initial checks, some issues were identified regarding potential inflammatory language in the manuscript. The authors have not amended this in line with the suggestions to make the text more objective. This prevents the manuscript from proceeding further into review." So these doctors held their line.

[01:29:01] Del Bigtree
It's exactly what's happening, what we just talked about with this fluoride issue. Right? You have a study and everyone's saying you better water it down. You better not make it so that it does not look at all like you were saying, this stuff isn't safe. And these scientists like, look, we're just reporting what we're seeing and we read the language in there. They were being so careful not to say, look, it looks like his lab created, but it sure looks like every variant had a human fingerprint on it.

Absolutely. And so, lo and behold, kind of out of nowhere, there was the 70th 70th annual Japanese Society of Virology meeting. And these scientists are virologists, and they were asked to present at this meeting well, outside outside that that meeting, one of the scientists took to the streets last week and this is what it looked like.
[01:29:50] Dr. Takyuki Miyazawa, Japanese Virologist
Attention everyone. I ask you all. Let's save Japan! Don't you want to save Japan? Are you okay to let Japan disappear in 100 years? The corona virus was artificially created and linked to vaccines. Even I thought that the story of artificial creation of the coronavirus was a conspiracy theory. That can't be true. The government's and scientists would never do such a horribly bad thing. I thought so. But when I analyzed the data of the virus, it was quite obvious. The governments have been completely taken over by evil people! I beg you all. Please listen to me. You may think I'm crazy. I am a Professor at Kyoto University. I came all the way here with my decision to resign from Kyoto University. It is because there is something I must tell you all. I do hope to save Japan for the young generation.

[01:30:33] Del Bigtree
This is one of those moments, folks. I mean, you can sit there. I mean, just tap in here, just check your pulse and see just think about what you just saw. This reminds me of Geert Vanden Bossche when he first sent his letter out saying, I beg of you, I implore everyone in the science community to listen to my call of my cry of distress. When a scientist leaves, her laboratory, goes out and stands in Times Square and starts yelling for everyone to listen to them because they're not being able to publish something. They've seen something, and they want to try and save the children of Japan and essentially the world. Sure, Guy might have just totally flown the coop or they are out of options and no one is listening. And the powers that be have such control over the universities and the governments and anything you can do that, what are you left to do? I mean, that is a scary moment. It's the opening of a Hollywood movie. What is this crazy person? Oh, only one of the top scientists from the Kyoto Institute.

Right. And so the Japanese language video of this this video has received nearly 11 million views so far on Twitter.

[01:31:38] Del Bigtree
Wow.

This is one of the the individuals that was responsible to helping Dr. Miyazawa there with the video. We reported on this. We broke this story at The HighWire. This is the article here. "Top Japanese virologist Warns of manufactured Omicron Strain." I put this article out last week. It has nearly 900,000 views on our Twitter.

[01:32:00] Del Bigtree
Wow.

[01:32:01] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Reporter
In Japanese language. One Japanese language Twitter post that I came across, it has 2.3 million views. And Del I just received an email this morning, I asked the researchers, we're going to we're going to give an update on this. Is there anything that you would like to share? And they said, we are the only people. No one in Japan, the media in Japan did not cover Dr. Miyazawa's demonstration in front of Sendai station there that we just saw. There was a media blackout on this conversation. Literally, the HighWire is leading this and people from Japan are having to read the Highwires or go to go on Twitter on and look at this. The YouTube is not showing this nothing. No one is showing this. So this now let's let's look at this doctor really quick. Dr. Miyazawa, the person that was standing out there just imploring people to listen to him, he is from Kyoto University. So is his coauthor.

Dr. Tanaka, this university ranks 46th in the world, according to this rating system and this article, it says, "Kyoto University was one of Asia's leading research oriented institutions and is famed for producing world beating researchers, including 13 Nobel Prize laureates. The motto of the school, which was founded in 1897, is freedom of academic spirit." So let's go to Dr. Miyazawa's profile. Just to give you an idea. This guy is not just, you know, an intern or something or a med student. This is what he says on his profile at the university. "We mainly study animal derived viruses, especially feline retrovirus and endogenous retroviruses, their role in mammalian evolution and the safety of biologics and xenotransplantation. It's been about 15 years since I arrived at Kyoto. My dream is to eradicate infectious disease." How interesting is this, Del? Because when you started, ICAN your your dream essentially was to eradicate manmade disease. And here we are from across the world, from really across disciplines. You have the scientists and we are all meeting here in this story to to to understand where we're at right now. But Dr. Miyazawa goes on to say this. This just gives you an idea of the heart of this person. "But more than anything, I want to uncover even just one impact that viruses have had on the evolution of living things. Then tumor control by endogenous retroviruses. I want to stop the metastasis of breast cancer, ovarian cancer, colon cancer, lung cancer," etcetera.

[01:34:17] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Reporter
And so here he is going from that that directive of his life to standing on a street corner trying to get someone to look at his research paper. And so after he did that demonstration, he took to Twitter and he wrote this. "No one would listen. So I raised my voice for the last 15 minutes or so. Is this reality test? He says it doesn't work if you speak quietly and it doesn't work if you raise your voice. Youtube is no good. X is no good either," he says. "We handed out flyers and held information sessions in the streets, but almost no one passed by. No one took our flyers and almost no one would listen. I usually speak when there are people willing to listen to me, so I mistakenly thought that they were interested in me. I was shocked to see the reaction of the people in the town. Not even 0.1%," but then obviously he he received some pushback. So he had to he had to do what a lot of doctors do and write this "by no means am I anti-vaccine. It is clear from history that vaccines have made a significant contribution to overcoming infectious disease. However, the safety of mRNA vaccines is clearly insufficient and we oppose their use against the new coronavirus. We request that it be stopped immediately." That is his statement.
[01:35:27] Del Bigtree
Wow. Incredible reporting, Jefferey. And great to see the effect that you're having on this. Very important story. And once again, one of the things we're doing here, folks, that we pride ourselves in, I just ran into actually a handful of scientists last week in an event and they said, Del, we're all watching your show now because it's not just fluff. In fact, you are helping us understand where investigations are going when we can't communicate with each other. You are now putting up red flags and showing science that we all need to see. Jefferey This is and for the audience out there, one of the things that we like to say is, look, there's enough for you all to understand, but when we get in the weeds, we're well aware we're in the weeds. But you must recognize that scientists and doctors around the world are now counting on The HighWire to knowing what's really going on, because everyone recognizes that there's propaganda taking place, government agencies, there's crackdowns. And even if these scientists can't be public, they are quietly finding out what's going on and doing private research. And they're getting a lot of their information through. The HighWire Jefferey you're a huge part of that. I want to thank you for this incredible reporting this week.

You bet. Thank you

[01:36:31] Del Bigtree
Alright. I'll see you next week. When you think about it, there's certain things that need to happen When we're talking to Michael Connett, he said definitely be watching the you know, be watching this case. You may be thinking, well, how am I going to remember to be watching that case? I'll tell you how you remember. All you have to do is be on our newsletter because we're going to make sure, you know, the day that that case goes live on Zoom so you can check in on it. But you're never going to know these things. You're never going to know what's breaking. You're never going to know if there's some toxic chemical being released or maybe a vaccine coming from the sky or any of the things you will probably want to know if you're not on our newsletter. So will you do me a favor? It doesn't cost you anything right now. Go to thethehighwire.com. Just scroll down the page and type in your email. It's just that easy. Hit Subscribe. Not only are you now going to be a part of a giant community that's going to be informed before everyone else on the planet Earth is, you're also going to get all the details, all the studies, all the trials, all the peer reviewed science that we talk about on this episode this week, on Thursday, on Monday, you're going to get it all in your inbox so you can read the entire report that we are discussing.

[01:37:35] Del Bigtree
It's a huge value, and I don't understand why anyone wouldn't take it up when it's free. So I hope you'll do that. Huge news this week. Not sure if you caught it, but another Nobel Prize has been given out this time to what they're calling the inventors of the mRNA vaccine. "2023 Nobel Prize in Medicine to Doctors Kariko and Weissman awarded prize for mRNA research." We had a photo of them. This is incredible. They're really psyched about having won. But let's talk about what they actually did achieve. Dr. Robert Malone was a part of inventing this. He wasn't given the Nobel Prize, even though it was something that we had discussed with him some time ago. I think that what they did do it. He probably wouldn't want the Nobel Prize. But let's be clear. Here's what they can put their name to. They took an mRNA of the spike protein and they use pseudouridine. They Frankenstein, this mRNA so that it's not actually a spike protein you would be inhaling. This one can't die. Your immune system is unable to kill it. Why did they do this? Well, essentially, they said, look it, if we have this foreign mRNA, your immune system sees it as a foreign invader protein and it can't get into your cell to start turning your cells into spike virus, spike protein manufacturing plants, basically manufacturing a bioweapon inside of your own body.

[01:38:57] Del Bigtree
It's not going to do that because your immune system is too acute. It is killing this mRNA before we can get it to the cells. So what did Crick and Weissman do? They said, I know. Let's put your immune system to sleep. That's how we'll do it. We'll add this pseudo uridines. So when it goes in, it'll put your toll like receptors, the centurion standing at the guards of your immune system to attack any cancer cell, to attack any virus or any bacteria that's coming in. Let's just put them to sleep. Your guardians. That way it's going to slip in. This is what it looks like with the new pseudo uridine pseudo uridine inserted. I'm not going to get into all the details. Let me just say this. When you start seeing rises in turbo cancer, guess who you can thank for that. Your new Nobel Prize winners. Because your body can't fight cancer anymore because of these two geniuses. After you've gotten the vaccine, your body can't fight the chickenpox virus that's in you, varicella. That's why you are getting all other skin irritations and problems because they took down your immune system. This is probably why we're seeing rises in all sorts of disease all around the world thanks to these two people and all the heart attacks, the myocarditis and pericarditis. That's right. These two geniuses just won an award for doing that to you.

[01:40:14] Del Bigtree
In fact, we should be looking at the rise of all cause mortality between 10 and 40%, depending on what time of year and what age group you're looking at. All we know is more people are dying on the earth and we've given these two people an award for achieving that. Welcome to America. Welcome to the world. Welcome. To the world we live in. Do you realize when you hear the story about fluoride, when you see doctors that are discovering it looks like the variants are all being man made, which means our entire earth is being manipulated? When you see Nobel Prize going to a vaccine that has honestly got more death reports than any vaccine in history, when we look at the VAERS reports and we're talking, there's usually 400 a year. Now there's about 30 something thousand. Okay. So this is the worst vaccine ever made. And they're all kind of pretty bad if you've been watching our show. But they're getting the Nobel Prize and who's telling you the truth about it? Who's at risk for doing it? Who has their YouTube channel? Facebook channel? That's right. Yours truly right here. Del Bigtree and The HighWire. Our nonprofit Informed Consent Action Network. We're suing. And by the way, I'm not going to stop just suing the higher up we get. I want these people on the stand. I want to take Nobel laureates and say, why exactly did you win an award? Did you actually know this was going to cause cancer? We want to do that.
There’s a path to doing that. But that path cannot take place. We cannot lay those bricks out to get to the truth on that level without you. We have no sponors. We are not being funded by pharmaceutical companies. We’re not being funded by gas companies or even health food companies. We’re funded by you, which is the only reason we’re able to bring the world renowned lawsuits that have won against NIH, CDC, Health and Human Services. We just brought back the religious exemption to Mississippi because of you. But there’s also this incredible show, the Highwire, that now has scientists from around the world saying thank you. You’re the only ones in the world that let our science out, that lets the world know that we’re doing something important. And I may have worked my last day at the Kyoto Institute, but thank you Highwire for at least giving me a reason and giving me a pulpit by which I could warn the world, When you donate to us, you are opening up a microphone that is allowing the greatest scientists in the world to give us warnings. When you don’t donate well, you have to ask yourself what world you’d like to live in. If we weren’t here, we will always be here. The only question is how much can we do? And that’s decided by you. So I hope you will think about that right now.

Think about all the things that you donate to. And I know there’s a lot of important issues out there, but this one is actually got your own butt hanging in a sling. We’re the ones fighting for you. We’re the ones that are now going to be bringing lawsuits to try and stop the investigations into vaccines that can be spread through the air, hyper hyper infectious vaccines, something we’re going to talk about in the future, vaccines that will infect people that didn’t get them. That’s right. They’re coming after you even if you’re trying to avoid them. Who’s going to try and stop them? You can decide that. Please become a recurring donor right now. Just go to the top of the page. Hit donate to ICAN. That’s our nonprofit, Informed Consent Action Network. We would love it if you would become a recurring donor. It helps us understand exactly how many lawsuits we can bring, how much support we’ve got. We’re asking for $23 a month for 2023. Give more if you can, less if you’ve only got a little bit. I understand. But I want you to feel what it feels like every time we bring reports like this to say, you know what, I did that without me and my donation The HighWire couldn’t do it. That’s the truth. We are working for you and we’re happy to do it for all of you that are sponsoring and making this incredible experiment such a success.

Thank you. And for those that are joining us today, we are so happy to have you as a part of our network, the Informed Consent Action Network. Well, look, we’ve been talking about a lot of the lies and deceit. Clearly, if you think you can walk into a grocery store, just eat anything there, because the EPA and the FDA have looked into it safe. You know, that’s not the case now. You can’t even go near your drinking water. I’m sorry. I’m sorry that we did that. But what do you do? How do you find a doctor when the doctor is hoodwinked and the doctor is the one saying, no, you can get all three of these vaccines together, but you say no. But clearly, I just saw Peter Marks say, and by The HighWire they’ll be like this guy. But he’s saying it. And the doctors say, look, you really need to stop getting involved here. Well, when you. And how do you go about finding a doctor that maybe is looking at things a different way? There’s a lot of them out there. There’s a lot of people that are changing the way that they’re moving in medicine. A lot that started out in the system and said, Wait a minute, something isn’t right here. That’s exactly what happened to our next guest, Barry Smeltzer. Take a look at this.

I’ve always had a real need to help people. I thrive being in that position of making people feel better. I was drawn to medicine in that set the course for the rest of my life. I graduated from what was called Finch University Chicago Medical School back in 2002. I ended up finishing and getting my degree in athletic training, but had no urge to actually do that work because I was falling in love with the medicine side. I worked with one of the top surgeons in Chicago at the top orthopedic practice doing hip and knee replacements. I was treating it very conventionally, had no real understanding of any other way to address health. I’m also the father of six. My proudest accomplishment. When we had our third son, Nick, he started out beautifully. We were very mainstream at the time, so we followed doctor's orders. And as Nick started getting more of the mainstream interventions like is on schedule vaccines, my wife started to delay them because he was having more and more reactions with each one until at I want to say between 18 to 20 months he had a vaccine injury and started losing all of his skills, all of his development. I always feel like when I talk about that though, I should have my wife sitting here because it was truly her passion that healed him.

I can’t deny that I don’t even tell my patients. I’m like, No, I didn’t heal my son. My wife healed my son. I was there to explain to her why it was working. That was the light bulb for me. Everything I had learned in medicine now was becoming into question. I had to change not only our lifestyle, I had to change my career. I had to figure out what was going on. And as we continued and as we started getting better, then yeah, I caught up and that set the course for the rest of my life. I ended up interviewing in San Antonio with a doctor, Donald Sprague, and he was the medical director of a hyperbaric facility. He and I had multiple conversations about not only my own family's health, but health of the children of this generation and how it was one of the sickest generations that had has ever been. It really came to me that I need to start up a new practice. I needed to do something in this field. At first we just started seeing kids on the spectrum and helping them both from a, you know, immune from a gut perspective, helping them get their toxicity out, trying to heal things, especially if they were vaccine injured, really focusing on the immune dysregulation.
Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
But what ended up evolving was a lot of children we were seeing, especially the parents started waving their hands, saying, you know, do you see adults, environmental medicine, or as now is popularly called functional medicine has evolved. It is now become something where, in my opinion, it is the cutting edge of medicine. Forever we have been waiting for people to get sick to the point where now it's literally sick care and we really don't do a whole lot to keep people well in medicine. My goal for all of my patients and my families is to educate them to such a degree they graduate out. I tell them, this is the college of your family. This is the College of your health. It's not about me giving you the pill and you just going and taking it and be on your merry way. This is interactive, and if you truly believe that you can manage and you can live your life in a way that prevents disease, then we can be partners. Environmental medicine truly is the way forward.

Del Bigtree
Well, as the co-executive director of the American Academy of Environmental Medicine, It's my honor and pleasure to be joined by Dr. Barry right now.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
Yes nice to see you

Del Bigtree
It's good to see you, too. And, I've known you for some time when I was traveling around with vaccines, when we sort of first got involved. And I've watched you just get deeper and deeper into the exploration of dealing with autoimmune disease and issues and environmental toxicity some of them were doing to ourselves on vaccines. One of the biggest questions we get is what do I do now, right? So we have millions of people that are now watching the Highwire. And one of the issues is we lay out all the problems with mainstream medicine. You woke up to it, but where do they go? Where do we go now?

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
It's a great question. And that was the question that I had when we were trying to figure out what was going on with our son was what do we do? How do we get this addressed? More than just a symptomatic treatment. And that's where I started investigating and started looking into different types of medicine and had some amazing mentors. And that's when I got introduced to this environmental medicine model and saw the American Academy of Environmental Medicine was actually teaching these things, talking about all the stuff that you've been talking about, toxicity, the different types of autoimmune reactivity, the actual exposure side of this. It was actually showing. Okay, well, what do we do about it? This academy, which I became a fellow in, has been addressing this since 1965. They've been doing this for such a long time. They've been at this type of of finding that root cause. And as a lot of us say, they were kind of the original functional medicine.

Del Bigtree
What does that term mean? I hear this term, right? First there's like alternative medicine, alternative healing practices. And we think about like chiropractors and homeopathy naturopathy, things like that. But this term, then there's environmental but functional medicine, like I'm hearing it a lot. What does that actually mean?

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
It's a it's a kind of a catch all term. So what started off you were right, it started off as alternative and then it kind of became integrative.

Del Bigtree
Okay. Right. Integrative.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
And then it started to become more this this there was a an academy called the Institute of Functional Medicine. And that kind of encompassed a lot of what the alternative practitioners were doing. So into trying to create some type of conformity. I think a lot of practitioners just started to state like, what are you? And they say, Well, I'm a functional medicine practitioner, I actually like stating my specialty as environmental medicine. Because environmental medicine takes functional medicine to another level. I always call it functional medicine 2.0 because instead of just saying, you know, want to make sure we're eating the right foods, we're drinking, you know, good clean water, we want to detoxify from from chronic inflammation. We want to make sure that we are hormones are balanced. What environmental medicine does is actually look at what exposures have you had not now, not yesterday, but over the span of your lifetime that has built up, built up over time, what we call the total bucket theory. Okay. And all of those exposures not just environmental, though, right? You have to think about it. We have stress, We have infection. We have allergens. We have sensitivities. Well, they all go into that same bucket. And all of that then lends to that bucket filling up. When that bucket hits its top, the next thing that goes in spills the bucket. That's symptoms, right? Symptoms then, is where mainstream medicine starts.

Del Bigtree
It just says it just looks at that last thing that hit you and tries to make that all the reason with what's going on with you. Okay.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
And that is where the last three years has turned this into this nightmare of autoimmune inflammation. Because what else has happened over these last three years? Well, we had the panic, right? We had the fear mongering. We had the virus that we don't know where that we know but don't know where that origin really was. We know it's not natural. So all of that and I think about it.
[01:54:15] Del Bigtree
When you make such a good point, because even though I think a lot of people watching this show probably are a little bit further down the road in using natural remedies. But how much rage were we all carrying every time we had to put on? I know I did like I put on that mask on the plane just so I could get out to speak to the people out there and meet them and talk about what I want to talk to you. But the internal like rage over the fact that I’m doing something I absolutely know doesn’t work. And then to have someone condescending towards you as though you’re an idiot when you’re not wearing it. I mean, that stress.

[01:54:49] Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
It was real.

[01:54:50] Del Bigtree
It was real. It was real and it was unhealthy, I’m sure.

[01:54:53] Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
But it was different than people that were believing in the masks. They were scared because of the invisible invader that was anybody could spread to them. So they were coming in with all sorts of levels of anxiety. And that’s something that shifted even my practice, which sees a lot of kids. And kids think of the lockdowns. They weren’t in school. They weren’t, you know, able to.

[01:55:19] Del Bigtree
What are you seeing? We don’t get to talk to a lot of practitioners that that deal with children. I see we reported a lot of these studies. Education is down. Huge reports coming out just this week on drop in math scores and not even proficient now in reading and math in cities and counties all across America. But in your practice and honestly, it’s in Texas. So I would say probably less hit by this thing than most states. Are you seeing what are you seeing in the children?

[01:55:50] Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
I’m seeing everything from kids that were perfectly normal in 2019 to after the lockdown, and they ended up having to go to school now, so riddled with anxiety that they can’t make it through a day of school. I’m also seeing kids that either got infected with the virus or got the vaccine and getting an autoimmune inflammatory reaction to it to where not only are they having, you know, adequate spike protein antibodies, but instead of it being in the hundreds or two hundreds, we were seeing it in the tens and 20 thousands.

[01:56:31] Del Bigtree
The body’s just way over.

[01:56:33] Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
Way over reacting to it. And this is for that that population was they were the frontline. Their their innate immune system was taking care of it before it even needed to get to the antibody level. But I also was seeing a lot of autoimmune allergy type of reactivity. In other words, the term is molecular mimicry. And what that is, is the body. Then once it starts to get an inability to regulate its immune response because of all the things that are coming in that are so foreign. Remember, we just talked about fluoridation. I can tell you about about 15 other chemicals like MTBE, ETBE. We can talk about perchlorate. We can talk about glyphosate. All of that getting into your system? Well, it’s not a big deal. It is to your immune system. These are all the little hits that when you have a big hit, like the stress of coronavirus, the different viruses that are not natural that then turns their immune system against them. And what happens then is even their own metabolites from like their bacteria in their gut starts triggering inflammatory responses that not only goes to their body but in their brain. I was seeing a spike, incredible spike in Pans and Pandas cases, which is pediatric autoimmune neuropsychiatric syndrome.

[01:58:03] Del Bigtree
Let’s talk about that. That’s something that we’ve only touched on a little bit. So what is Pans? How is it triggered?

[01:58:10] Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
Pans is a neuropsychiatric disorder. Okay. That’s what the official diagnosis of the caveat to it is. It’s one of the few neuropsychiatric disorders that they actually connect to an infection or something that triggers should be a fever response. It used to be called pandas because it was associated with strep. So people would have strep throat and then all of a sudden they would have massive OCD. They would have.

[01:58:42] Del Bigtree
Having had an infection starts causing.

[01:58:44] Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
Neuropsychiatric syndrome.

[01:58:46] Del Bigtree
Neuropsychiatric. Okay Got it.

[01:58:46] Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
So they were having all of these different psychiatric symptoms from an infection. Well, what they weren’t having was a fever.

[01:58:57] Del Bigtree
Got it.
Then people had you That's triage on medicine 278

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
So then even after

Del Bigtree
I wonder about that, just just really quickly, one of the things I find shocking is how often this is something my mom was always really against. My mom told me when I started having kids, I never gave you guys aspirin or Tylenol or anything like that. Let the fever ride. It's your body working out. Do you think any of this is when parents just stop that fever and then and then keep it from happening?

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
It contributes. Okay. I don't think it's the primary cause. I think the primary cause is the bucket theory. That is there's so many exposures now. I mean, think about it. When we were kids, you know what organic food was called? What food?

Del Bigtree
Right

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
Our water wasn't fluoridated, you know, our bodies were able to handle the exposures that we had because it wasn't so many. You know, we were able to drink from water hoses. We were able to eat mud pies and our bodies were fine. Now these kids go outside. They can't even they, they can't go to school with a peanuts. They can't be given anything at the schools because some kids are going to have an anaphylactic allergy to it. That didn't happen when we were kids.

Del Bigtree
So I wonder that, too. Even in this vaccine space, I mean, I will always think vaccines ended up didn't they didn't live up to what I think that everyone had hoped. But certainly if you gave 72 vaccines to someone that lived 200 years ago, that's working on a farm, was breathing perfectly clean air and drinking spring water and just had this healthy lifestyle. In that case, it'd be an empty bucket. Would those 72 toxic vaccines not be causing autism or all the. Certainly I would imagine a lot less. But what we're doing is we're already, as we see it, babies being born. Mothers have umbilical cords with over.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
278 chemicals.

Del Bigtree
278 chemicals before we even on this planet, high in mercury, high in aluminum, when they're tested, what happens if you just give them one more hit in, and so. Alright, let's get to what do you do then? Alright. So we get that there's a problem. What is a functional medicine doctor? Environmental doctor like yourself? What is the approach that's different? Obviously, I know that mainstream medicine is just going to treat that symptom, probably you give you a drug to just suppress that symptom and say, you'll be fine, get back on the field. In many ways, people describe Western medicine to me. One of the best descriptions I've heard is it's war medicine. It's triage medicine. It's designed to get you out, to fight another day. It's not actually designed to help you. We don't care. We just need you back on your gun and firing away.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM
That's a great analogy. The biggest difference is. The bucket theory. Okay. Once that bucket is full and you spill over and you have symptoms, whether you're ill or you have chronic inflammation or you have brain fog or you have joint pain or anything like that, when you go to that mainstream doctor, they're going to treat that one specific spill over. They're not even touching the bucket. Okay. Environmental medicine. Functional medicine. What we're doing is saying why is the bucket so damn full? So we're going backwards and we're taking a thorough history saying, you know, where are you living? You know, what kind of of exposures could you have had there? Could you have had mold in your home? Could you have was your neighbor spraying gobs of pesticides or were you spraying pesticides because you didn't know? Were you drinking water that was horribly polluted? You know, are you eating food that really isn't food? Those are all things that fill that bucket. Plus in that history. We talk about past exposures. You know, a lot of people don't realize that someplace that they were at, whether it was stressful or it was toxic, that they didn't know or they were under trauma. Trauma is a very underrated cause of chronic illness. Any of those factors fill that bucket? Well, that's just the history, right? Then we say, okay, it seems like you may have gut issues because you're just not even eating real food. You poop once every three days and it's, you know, you're distended. So we have all these signs. So instead of just saying, let's give you a laxative to fix the symptom, we say, Why? Why are you not digesting your food appropriately?
Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM

What's going on with that? So then we start to say, let's ask better questions. Better questions would be what in the process, in the system that God made perfectly is not going right. So let's start looking at that. Is it the 80%? That's our body? Is it are we not chewing well, is it stomach acid? Is it the pancreas and liver enzymes not doing their thing? Is it when it goes through all that? But 90% of the time, probably 95% of the time it's not us. It's the last 20% of digestion. That's not us. It's all bacteria. Well, microbiome medicine is in its infancy, but we are seeing tons of correlations to chronic illness simply because we don't have the right balance, the right abundance of different flora that actually allows us to absorb the food that we're eating. Right. You know, we think we eat 2500 calories. We're absorbing 2500 calories. No, you don't know what you're absorbing because it's an open tube from here all the way to the other end. So if that's the case, we get into this economics of energy, which is how much energy are you making to match your demand? And if you can't match that demand, you drop them below. You're not repairing anything. In fact, you're using your adrenals to actually get the body to get through its day. Yeah. So how many people are dealing with stress? They just feel stressed every day. And then once your adrenals are burned out.

Del Bigtree

you're stressed. As you're saying, you're running on adrenaline, you're staying stressed because it's the only way you have energy because you otherwise you're going to fall asleep.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM

But they don't know that. They don't know that because they don't realize their efficiency of absorption has gone to crap. Why? Because they think they're eating 2500 calories or 3000 calories and they're only absorbing 2000 or 1500 and they're wondering why they're tired.

Del Bigtree

Right.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM

Their battery life is 50%.

Del Bigtree

So you're looking at all these things. We asked you to bring in sort of a top five list. Let's take a look at this. And you can sort of talk us through it. Barry's top five Health Tips for those of you out there that maybe this be new to thinking know what's in your water perfect for today. I don't know if you are going to be talking about fluoride. Know what's in your food. Get a nature therapy increase vitamin D. I do a lot more time in the sun after Covid realizing how important that was. Decrease inflammation, get nature therapy. What do you mean by that?

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM

It's a great thought process. It's actually a philosophy. What it is, is we are beings that should be in nature. We are beings that should be connecting to the Earth. You know, you've talked a lot about grounding. Yeah, Well, what we also don't realize is that there's a there's a higher percentage of oxygen in a forest. Why? Because you have all the plants, you have all the trees. But also the noise, the being in that environment also gets you off your phone as my wife. And I call it a dumb box. You know, it starts to slow down, which actually turns on your parasympathetic nervous system. So many of us are stuck in that fight or flight that we don't slow down and actually reconnect to nature. And you don't have to go to a forest. You can just get to a place where you can be in a like a path or a hiking trail or if you don't have any of that, even just take a walk. Yeah, just to get out. It's also exercise, which is also very important. But it's also a catch all term. That really means reconnect with, the, with the earth. Reconnect with nature. But that also then gives you an appreciation of all things that aren't natural. Like our plastics, you know, preservatives, dyes, MSG, all those things that you're like, Well, I don't see an MSG tree. I don't see red dye number 40 in this plant. That's beautiful.

Del Bigtree

Yeah, that's one of the things. I have been walking more and my wife and I are trying to get out more because one of the things, when I talk to friends, I have I'm lucky. I know a lot of berry smelters and they're like, well, are you walking like you look like you could just like, we see all the work you're doing out there. It's really awesome. But if you're stressed all the time, best thing, take your shoes off or at least get out. And it really is amazing how therapeutic that is. Eating whole foods is something that I'm really focused on now. Lately I'm obsessed with this idea of seed oils all over everything, and that's even like the gluten free crackers. I'm like, Man, I can't even eat those. So picture the crackers and things out the door. Look, you have a conference coming up to really help people understand all the different things that they can do. This is a conference that is it by the American Academy of Environmental Medicine.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM

Correct.

Del Bigtree

And normally this is a conference that would be just for other practitioners.

Barry Smeltzer, MPAS, PA-C, FAAEM

Correct.

Del Bigtree

You guys are telling me about your opening it up to regular people.
Now, one of the things we've learned over the last three years is that. We only have so many practitioners that are doing environmental medicine and the demand is way outstripping our supply. And one of the things that we see all the time is we have patients, we have public people that are dying for this information and they just don't feel like they have any access to going to a place that they can have community. They can talk to people who get it. They can listen to speakers that not only are educational, but inspirational. And so what we focused on in this conference that's going to be November 3rd through the fifth.

Here we go, folks. A new challenge in environmental medicine. There it is, AAEMonline.org. You got the rest of that again. This will also be if you're on our newsletter, we're going to make sure you have this November 2nd to the fifth in San Antonio, Texas.

Here's the thing. Yeah. So want to announce on The HighWire today that we want this to be like a three day retreat for our for your listeners, for the public, because these people need a break. The conference itself is at the number one resort in Texas. It's San Antonio. Okay. What we did with that code that they are choose if they register with that code, if they stay at the the actual resort, their registration is covered. It's included. So that's that's our gift to the public that we want you to join us. So we want them to come and experience not only the most beautiful resort in Texas, but also the community, amazing speakers like Dr. Peter McCullough, who you've had on. Great. We have Dr. Neil Nathan. We have Dr. Joe Ladapo, the Florida surgeon general. Yeah, we have.

One of the superstars of The HighWire.

Absolutely. And so they're going to be there. And these are people that not only are going to be there to speak, but they're going to be there to chat with these with with these people because they're passionate. Yeah, I mean, I've had multiple conversations with Dr. McCullough. He is not a person that he won't talk to. And so just having that kind of community is so inspirational to so many. And we wanted to bring that to not just our practitioners. We felt that the biggest change that we see in these last three years is we're all in this together.

Absolutely. Finding community is such a huge part of that. Getting some tools and realizing how easy it is to start making shifts in your life, but you got to know what you're doing. Barry I really love the work that you're doing. We've worked some together. We appreciate some of the things that you've done for me, and now you're offering it to the world. So thank you for taking the time. Telling us all about it.

Thank you for your chance of putting me on and allowing me to talk about what we do, because it really does fit this program specifically because you've had the legal side of of toxicity. You had the research side of toxicity. Now you get the treatment side. And actually being in a place where people can get better, you know, like I said, sick care is the old school method.

I agree.

Well, care prevention is the key to health. And if we don't understand specifically what our bodies are doing, we'll never be able to stay ahead of all the exposures that are going to fill that bucket and spill.

We're going to find ourselves going into these death centers now of hospitals and all that is sick and corrupt about them because we didn't take care of ourselves. So it's really a huge benefit that you're talking about there. Thanks for joining us today and bringing your thoughts in here. One of the things we've been covering is artists. How many artists want to speak out. But they are now, just getting shut down. You got cancel culture attacking everywhere. We talked to, you know, John Rich recently that said that, you know, all my friends were firing their roadies because they wouldn't get the vaccine. What is that oppression like? Well, luckily, there's a new record label that's saying, screw that, We're going to be here for those people that tell the truth. Check out bass records.

Here goes nothing.

I truly believe music can change the world.

Honest music is the only kind of music worth listening to.

That's not even in the song. That's free. You get that free.
The music industry is incredibly woke and everybody is an activist, but there's still a large percentage of conservatives in the industry. They're just kind of hiding.

There's more of us out there than the other side thinks, and they're afraid to speak out because they don't want to be canceled. They don't want to be uninvited to the Grammys and they don't want to get on a blacklist.

I listen to a lot of music I don't agree with, but it never makes me furious these days. It's not that way anymore. There's no middle ground.

Social contagions and anger are omnipresent. It's like a storm.

Isn't it music kind of like the last bastion of free speech? Like we should be able to say whatever we want to say? Isn't that what the counterculture was in the 60s for me? Poor me. Pour me, pour. Me another shot of whiskey.

We felt like there was a lack of artists who speak to traditional values.

That's what based Records is all about. Hard working.

Family oriented, loving people have been pushed out of the industry for political considerations, cultural considerations. And what we want to do at Bass Records is change that.

Music should have been about free speech. I got sorrow in my bone.

It's a sort of bravery to be able to stand in front of people that may disagree with you and say what you think.

If you don't say what I say, you're an enemy. You know you're on the other side and I won't participate in that agenda.

Definition of a rock star is standing up for independence. Freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of speech. If we get to a point where we can't say what we want to say anymore, what are we going to sing about? Am I the only one? Willing to fight. For my love of the red and white and the blue.

Faced record, just bringing in some amazing talent.

Artists that might have been canceled for standing by their principles.

We want artists, creators, and the people who make music possible to thrive, survive, and ultimately participate in the music economy.

We want to build an infrastructure, like minded people who are freedom minded.

Artists who share our values, build a culture around that, And we wanted to bring music to people that want that and they.

Don't want the other thing. They want the good medicine. I like seeing things like based. It gives me hope. It's nice to know there's more people showing support for people like me.

The country is starving for music that people can relate to. Yeah, I think they're going to sell some records.
Brad Skistimas, Five Times August, "Ain't No Rock and Roll" Out Now on Baste Records
The opportunity that Baste Records has is to find real artists with a real message of substance. Once there's a pivotal change in the culture war, they're going to be at the forefront of.

Jeffrey Steele, Baste Records
It, giving people the option to to see other things and not just one thing out there. It's going to be great. I swear they're. Put me in the grave.

Del Bigtree
Well, The HighWire, we're not just about medicine and science. Ultimately, we are about liberty, transparency and freedom. We love to celebrate every place where we see somebody, something, some company standing up to make a difference in this world where cancel culture propaganda seem to be running rampant. This is one of those opportunities Baste records is getting rolling, and one of their first artists is with me now, our own Brad Skistimas, Five Times August in the House.

[02:16:50] Brad Skistimas, Five Times August, "Ain't No Rock and Roll" Out Now on Baste Records
Good to see you again.

Del Bigtree
It's really great to see you. This is something we've talked about before and we just had John Rich and, talking to us, super awesome. A guy that spoke out, spoke his mind. Amazing how much he understood the science. But he said, Man, I was shocked how many people I'm not going to name names, but some of the biggest people you're following ended up firing their people, never hired them back, turned into total A-holes, didn't stand up for anybody. But you're not as afraid to share some names. I mean, it was disgusting. I mean, what happened to rock n roll?

[02:17:21] Brad Skistimas, Five Times August, "Ain't No Rock and Roll" Out Now on Baste Records
Well, yeah, that's exactly the question, isn't it? You know, growing up, you know, music's my life. It's when I'm not, you know, when I don't have anything to do. I'm at a record store, and that's what fuels my life. So when 2020 came around and we're starting to see this tyranny sort of creep in little by little, and I'm looking around asking, where are my heroes? That became an issue for me. And that's one of the reasons why I started speaking out. So that idea sat with me for a while and I ended up writing a song about it called Ain't No Rock and Roll. Yeah, pretty much calling out all these guys. And you know, they've been there at the forefront. You can see them there in big Pharma ads. They're making Pfizer commercials. You know, there's articles out there where they're calling you an enemy. So, you know, go ahead, name the names. They're out there.

Del Bigtree
I mean look at Neil Young was the one that, like, really blew my mind. This is a guy that comes up in the 60s. Antiwar bucked the system, fight against the machine, rage against the machine. When we get into more modern times, I mean, the entire Rage against the Machine, the entire like the whole concept seemed to be, don't trust your government. They're lying to you. Stand up for your rights. Rage against that machine that is being manipulated by funding and propaganda. And then they turn around and start making people get vaccinated to see shows,

[02:18:11] Del Bigtree
Right. Yeah. And that's been the joke for the last couple of years, is that Rage Against the Machine is now raging for the machine. We saw so many artists require vaccination shots and segregate their audiences. And you know, that really hit me. It gut punched me. And to thinking, you know, is rock and roll just a farce? You know, at the end of the day, there was never a greater time to stand up against the man than the last three years. And we do, you know, very, very, very few of them, you know, that you would have expected to to speak up, spoke up.

[02:18:45] Brad Skistimas, Five Times August, "Ain't No Rock and Roll" Out Now on Baste Records
You would think if you were saying keep on rocking in the free world, like for at the time, I want my aunt to be keep on rocking the free world. But you're not free to decide what's injected into your body. I'm going to make you and I'm going to pull my songs from Spotify for, allowing Joe Rogan to say what he thinks on the literally, I want to censure people. I don't want anyone rocking. I don't want any freedom. I mean, I'm unbelievable. Dave Grohl To me, as far as I'm concerned, they killed the drummer. I know that's probably, I'm probably like stepping out on the line here, but you had the drummer saying, Hey, man, I don't want this thing. He was public about it. I got a bad feeling about this. You're not going to get to play in. Our band gets it dies.

[02:19:22] Del Bigtree
Yeah. And then. And then nothing about it, you know, let's just be quiet about it. It's a sad thing to see that line be drawn in the sand, you know, with Neil Young in particular saying, Look, it's either me or him when music is really supposed to be bringing people together. You know, a concert is where people can go and stand together despite our differences and sing along and it's become this divisive thing. So it's really a shame to see that.

[02:20:00] Brad Skistimas, Five Times August, "Ain't No Rock and Roll" Out Now on Baste Records
When we look into the future and we talk about it like, you know, even John Rich, he's moving to his own label. Everyone's if you want to do anything, if you want to speak the truth anymore, labels aren't going to be there for you. They're controlling you. It seems to be all sort of output out of Hollywood. So tell me about Baste just for a second.
Brad Skistimas, Five Times August, "Ain't No Rock and Roll" Out Now on Baste Records

Well, Baste came at the right time for me. I've been independent my entire career and never really wanted to work with a label. By the time I was meeting with major record labels 15 years ago, the industry had shifted so much you could do so much on your own as an indie artist. I didn't feel like you needed them anymore. But with the way the culture war is now, bass records are something special that where they're trying to sort of get back to what the artists has to say. It's not fluff, it means something. There's value and substance in the message. And so when I met them, you know, they kind of proposed themselves as the anti label label. And I thought, well, I if I'm going to work with a label. Well, I'm going to work with the anti-Labor label. That makes sense for me. Love it. Yeah. So it's an exciting time to see that because this label, you know, it didn't exist. These artists that are speaking out, the handful of us that are we didn't exist before. And so it's starting to curb that. And when I started speaking out, I didn't know who would agree with me. And it turns out there's a lot of people who agree with me. And little by little, this movement has grown and we're seeing these amazing moments happen where artists like Jimmy Levee are topping the charts, you know, or this label now exists. Baste Records is here now. And that's a great silver lining of what's come out of the last couple of years.

Brad Skistimas, Five Times August, "Ain't No Rock and Roll" Out Now on Baste Records

You can follow them at BasteRecords.com Basterrecords.com and they've got a lot of really great, exciting things in the works. There's a good group of guys over there really have the best interest in what what needs to happen in culture. And so it's just really exciting to see that.

And tomorrow, Baste Records dropping your new music video Ain't No rock and Roll.

That's it.

We're going to give our audience a sneak preview. I want to thank you for taking time to come in and join us. And more importantly, thank you for being so inspiring. Lots of famous people on this track are helping you out. You're working with great people. Tell me a little bit about just this song really quick before we go.

Yeah, this song is my response to, you know, pretty much all my heroes that I looked up to that you started to see kind of show their true colors and to have to go back and analyze what rock and roll meant to us over the last 60 years. Was it real? Were these protest artists? Did they mean what they what they were saying back then? Because like I said, the last few years was the time to speak up. And so, you know, I took I kind of took together all of the different commercials. I was seeing, the headlines I was seeing. I put their faces, their sort of scratched out their eyes and kind of as a way to say, look, you're not coming with us.

And we're moving on without you. Let's put let's if you're going to draw a line in the sand, then let's we'll draw a line in the sand and we're moving on. And there's a new path being forged. And so that's kind of what I intended to say with this song and video.
And I'll tell you one thing I can say, one of my favorite things about working here on the Highwire is I get to meet a lot of my current heroes. Those people that actually speak the truth to power put their licenses and their careers on the line, put their records on the line, put their followers and their Facebook pages and their Twitter channels on the line. And when they come in here, I'll tell you this, they always blow my mind. I haven't been disappointed by a single one of the heroes that we brought here on the Highwire. So think about that. You are your hero. You're the hero to your family and you're going to be the hero to the future of this nation because you're going to speak up. I keep saying it. Speak your truth. That's how we change. Create new companies. Don't complain about what doesn't exist or how bad the company you're in is or what they're doing to you. Take this as an opportunity to build something that so many people need and want. There is an economy now to truth. There's an economy to health. There's an economy to critical thinking. Get in it, be a part of it, and recognize that what you once thought was rock and roll. Maybe there ain't no rock and roll. I'll see you next week.

Well, there ain't no rock n roll. Ever since they sold out. Rolling Stone. All the words that were sung in the past. Will never feel the same when we're looking back. All the old men sitting in their make up chair with the gold record walls really couldn't care. Hall of Fame feels the same when you've had enough so they don't bother standing up. And there ain't no peace in love. Ever since the 60s. Kids grew up. The trucks in the girls in the cash. After all the songs, it was gone in a flash. All those bad boy Rebels in the attitude what a show. We didn't know that none of it was true. Only self-serving. Establishment. We were all so innocent. Because there ain't no rock n roll. And the. Lost its soul. Call. The police gave the man control. And every pop star's falling, so. No, the rain. Ain't no rock and roll. And there ain't no Joni, no Bob. No one stuck around for the protest job. All the stars in the big pharma whores shilling for a check from their corporate shores. All the actors say what they're paid to say while the fans take the blame. All the ones cool fools that were me and you. Well, they pushed us all away. Because their ain't no rock and roll. Has lost its soul. All the punks gave the man control. And pop stars bought and sold. No. There ain't no Rock and roll. And there ain't no boss Queen. Never was a rage against the damn machine. No, there ain't no fighter in the foo. No more Rockin in the free world Shoes. All the high strung Neil Young wannabes. Yeah. The silence has been deafening. Boots up the government. What they sang. They never met. No rock n roll. It's lost its so. All in the soul? No. Ain't no rock and roll. All the rain. No, there is no. Ain't no rock and roll.