[00:00:05] Del Bigtree
Did you notice that this show doesn't have any commercials? I'm not selling you diapers or vitamins or smoothies or gasoline. That's because I don't want corporate sponsors telling us what to investigate and what to say. Instead, you're our sponsors. This is a production by our non-profit, the Informed Consent Action Network. If you want more investigations, more hard-hitting news, if you want the truth, go to icandecide.org and donate now.

[00:00:49] Del Bigtree
Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Wherever you are out there in the world, how about we all step out onto The HighWire? You know, one of the things that I want to talk about today is, everyone asks me as I'm traveling the country, how do you have so much faith? How are you so brave? How is it that you're so confident? And one of the things that I hear, and I really love when you walk up to me in airports, you'll come up and say, I love watching The HighWire because it gives me hope. Well, the reason it gives you hope is because I have hope, and everyone on my team has hope. Why? Because we see how the conversation has been shifting since we began this work. And sometimes it's shifting in other parts of the world, sometimes right here in America, and sometimes right in the hardest hit places in the middle of an authoritarian takeover like California.

[00:01:38] Del Bigtree
In this case, this is a story where ultimately they tried to pass laws to take away freedom of speech from doctors, doctors that had a successful operation treating people with things like hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin. California wanted to make sure that you were never treated properly again, and if you went against what the CDC said, your license should be taken away. Well, this bill, as we show it right here, was Assembly Bill number 2098. And in California it was passed and put into law. "California law strips license from 'misinformation'-spreading doctors. "Well, luckily, multiple doctors decided to bring a lawsuit about those, those that still believed in free speech and certainly the doctor-patient relationship and do no harm. "Two doctors file lawsuit to stop Gavin Newsom's SB 2098 law, which censors medical information." In this case, one of the doctors was Jeffrey Barke, this was just one of the cases brought in California. We had him on our show to discuss what this case was about and why he was launching this case against the attorney General of California. This is what he had to say back then.
Physicians are now going to be required to consider the state's narrative before making a therapeutic decision for a patient. That's why I'm involved, to protect patient care. You know, if you read the bill, and it's very interesting, and I'm going to quote you exactly from the bill, it says, "Misinformation' means false information that is contradicted by contemporary scientific consensus contrary to the standard of care." There is no consensus unless you literally censor doctors that have a difference of opinion. So the so-called consensus is constantly changing. Here in the United States, we're recommending boosters to six-month-olds and women that are pregnant. If I speak out against that, I'm now going against the government consensus, and the medical board may sanction me and want to take my license away. And doctors have very limited rights when it comes to being investigated by the medical board. So that's the problem. And when physicians have to consider the state's narrative as to how to treat patients, then patients are putting, being put directly in harm's way and are at risk of being hurt. And that's bad for patients, it's bad for doctors, it's bad for medicine, and that's why Mark and I are fighting against this.

So why do I hope? I have hope because there's heroes everywhere. It's not just a nonprofit like the Informed Consent Action Network that brings lawsuits and makes a difference, sometimes a couple of doctors can literally change the course of history. And in this case, I believe that is what's happened. When you look at 2098 that was passed, ultimately it was in court. There was many cases against it. Here's what one of the judges said about the case that they were looking at. Ultimately, this headline says it all. "Federal judge calls definitions of misinformation 'nonsense' in AB-2098..." the writing was on the wall. Clearly, this was a case that was going to go against the state of California. Gavin Newsom, I would imagine if Gavin ever decides to run for President of the United States, it's really not very good to be considered running an unconstitutional law against doctors and citizens in your state. And so because of that, and all the reasons we do or do not know, we are here to celebrate today that we now have a new bill that overrode the old bill, and this is how the reporting on it, Senate Bill number 815, just shortly after passing 2098, what does it do? "California repeals the COVID misinformation law, bowing to legal pressure." Well, there you have it. Change has been made. California has been saved. Doctors are actually allowed to speak their mind and treat their patients as they see fit. It is my honor and pleasure to be rejoined by one of the great doctors and courageous heroes in America today, Dr. Jeffrey Barke joins me now. Jeffrey, just like, honestly, bictory lap moment. This is a spectacular moment for California. And as we've said, as California goes, so goes the nation and then the world. What are you feeling like today?

Well, listen Del, you're very sweet and I appreciate you having me on. It's a partial victory. So it's, yes, it's a victory that this law was repealed, but it's not a victory that we have not yet got a ruling by our Ninth Circuit judge. We had our case heard by the Ninth Circuit, it's been about two months. And during that case, the judge asked some very strong questions of the defendant, which is the State of California, and seemed to be leaning in our direction, understanding why we believe this law was unconstitutional. But now we haven't got a ruling. We want a ruling. The reason why we want a ruling is, what's to stop the legislature and the governor from signing into law another law just like this. So repealing the law is great. Don't get me wrong, it is good. But we still want a ruling from the judge that says, this law and this type of law is unconstitutional. Interestingly, the court reached out to us, Liberty Justice Center, who's representing us, and asked them if we'd be willing to withdraw our case since the law has been repealed. And we said no. And they said and we would even stipulate, because this law, this new repeal doesn't go into effect until January, we would even stipulate, the court said, that we won't enforce this law over the next couple of months until it actually goes into effect.

And again, we said, no, we're not going to withdraw the case. Stipulation or not, we want a ruling. We've spent money and time and energy and effort. We got heard before the court. It seemed to be going our way, we want the judge to rule. Now we don't know whether the judge will rule since the law is basically moot. And, you know, it's so funny, in the original bill, AB 2090 and I'm going to read from it. Here's part of the preamble to this bill. Major news outlets have reported that some of the most dangerous propagators of inaccurate information regarding COVID-19 vaccines are licensed health care professionals. So major news, major news organizations have reported, that's what they use in this bill. It's ridiculous. Anytime I'm required to follow the state's narrative in discussing information, medical information with a patient, it's bad for patients, it's bad for doctors, it's unconstitutional, it's bad law. We're still hoping for a judge ruling here.

I think that's great. I love that you're not backing down. And that's really what this is about, I appreciate where you're at. I also, I want to say that sometimes we get all of what we want and we experienced this with iCAN all the times, you know, that we go in. A lot of times they will just go ahead and change laws in order to bail out so that precedence is not set. That's why the work that we do, we bring so many lawsuits, because it's a long journey to get to the Supreme Court and to actually rule on something like this. And all along the way, there's always that risk that they go ahead and change some law to make moot your case, which is why it's, you know, whack a mole out there and I love that you're playing this game with us. It's going to take all of us. And for everyone watching right now, I think what's really important is, whether you're a student trying to go to university and you're not able to get in because of some vaccine law, or you're a doctor being shut up or whatever, that your business was shut down, if you have means or can find a nonprofit or some way to bring a case, this is the beauty, I think, Jeffrey, of being in the United States of America. We definitely got off track. COVID was handled horribly, but what we've seen is this aftermath of this brilliant three branch system that we have, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branch. And in this case, the judicial branch has really been leaning heavily on the Constitution of the United States of America, which I think is proving to be one of the most important documents of our time. You know, so it's stepping into courtrooms that makes a difference. When you look at this, now, when you look at the state of science, how crucial is it that you persevere, that precedence is set here. When you think about the future of medicine, what is your greatest concern?
It's really important, Del, and not just, forget the COVID situation for a moment. There's so much in medicine that's wrong. There's so much that we're taught that just isn't so. Whether it's the use of pharmaceutical products to lower cholesterol, which I think is mostly BS. Whether it's direct to consumer advertising, we're the only country, us and New Zealand that allow that to occur. So you watch Monday Night Football or any other sporting event, and you're inundated with drug ad after drug ad after drug ad. The scientific system of research now has been corrupted and it's completely biased. We need to fix this. And I hope in whoever wins the Presidency that they will find a prominent role for him to help with some of that work that needs to be done with our three letter agencies. You know, listen, if your viewers want to learn more about me, they can follow me on Instagram, RX for Liberty, or my website xfolfiberty. We're going to continue to fight, and I've got a license now in Texas, I'm applying for one in Florida. I'm going to protect myself and do the best I can to be true to my patients, to treat them with respect and dignity, and to do so as best I can to teach them how to take care of themselves, so they don't need physicians and they certainly don't need Big Pharma.

Dr. Jeffrey Barke, I want to thank you for taking the time from all your patients, all the great work you've done. You know, just my last statement. What's crazy to me about this story and any attempt to silence doctors is, one thing you never hear in the mainstream media that apparently knows more than the doctors that are speaking out, is how about a study of those doctors that did use hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin? Why do we compare their results with their patients? They're all listed, we know who they are. What were their results compared to all the doctors that stuck with the protocol given by the CDC and the government bureaucracy, saying there's nothing you can treat them with, make them go home, bring them back, put them on a ventilator, give them remdesivir, and then see how they turn out. I think when we look at those numbers, it would be clear that your numbers and many like you across this nation and across the world had far better outcomes. When are we going to get science like that? Comparative studies that ultimately will say who was right and who was wrong. This is where the media is deficient, this is where our government is clearly corrupt.

And lastly, I want to say that we're going to be talking later about the PREP Act and a lawsuit that we are going to be bringing, I think that is going to be a big game changer. But that PREP Act should have, that should have protected you the same way it protected every doctor that shook their responsibility to people that sent them home when they were sick, let them get to the verge of death, then brought them in, put them on ventilators where they had a nine out of ten chance of dying. You know, that PREP Act said that any doctor that attempts anything, basically, should be protected because we don't know what we're doing here. It's amazing that they selected those out that had the best record like you, and then said, you're going to be, we're going to take the PREP Act protections away from you and go further, you have no free speech. We are really living in incredibly strange and dark times, and it's so awesome to have heroes like you out there that are standing in court and really turning this thing around.

Yeah, Del. Well, listen, thanks for the great work you do, thanks for having our back. I mean, listen, I think we should put a warning label on all vaccines, for example. It should say something like, please be aware, the vaccine you're about to get, the company is immune from all liability. Take at your own risk. And I really promote the idea of informed consent. I'm not opposed to anybody getting any vaccine, I just want them to be aware of what are the ingredients, what are the studies that brought it to market, and what are the potential side effects. They're not getting that now, and I think that's important.

And lastly, what you pointed out, and how confident are the manufacturers in the product they're giving you. Do they stand by it or are they making the problem somebody else's responsibility. Such a great point. Dr. Jeffrey Barke, keep up the great work, I look forward to. I'm sure I'm going to be on a stage speaking with you sometime in the near future. Just an honor and pleasure to know you, and thank you for being a guiding light for so many on how we should be holding ourselves in these incredible times.

Thank you, Del. Appreciate you having me on.

Alright, take care. Alright, well, we have a lot to talk about. I got Aseem Malhotra is coming up later in the show, another courageous individual, one of the leading heart doctors in the UK that has come under fire for speaking his truth. We're going to talk to him about where he's at and actually, where is he at? He's in America and you may have an opportunity to see him very soon. And I've got Aaron Siri, we're going to talk to you about an incredible case that may destroy the PREP Act protections of the COVID vaccine. Wait till you hear about that. But first, it's time for The Jaxen Report. Ah Jefferey, it's awesome to get to take a victory lap with so many depressing things that are happening in the world all the time. It's really lovely when we get to say, you know, the people win. When the people stand up, when we stand up for ourselves, good things happen.
Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
They do. And people need real information to be able to stand up for themselves, so that's why the speech of doctors is so important for the conversation. But I want to present something also, going from those speech of doctors that are being protected in California to the speech and open debate of us all. And I want to just say, right before I start this segment, that some of the things we're covering may not be the most appropriate for for kids, so if there's anybody watching, cause we know a lot of parents use this show to homeschool their kids and teach them media literacy, so I just want to throw that out there. So, it's essential to understand a larger picture surrounding these protective, protective media narratives and official stories that we're getting. And a lot of people are really trying to find a way to keep up with this rapid news cycle we found ourselves in. And so it's essential for organizations and even people that can cut through all of this and just get to the facts and say them very simply. It's really important to do that. And this is something we do here on the show, there's a lot of other people that do it, but one of the people that does it best is Russell Brand, comedian, actor. He's also has his own show on Rumble, and here's an example of him doing just that with Bill Maher.

Del Bigtree
Alright.

Russell Brand - actor/comedian
Out of respect for you and your show, I've brought some facts, would you? If you'd like, they're actually.

Bill Maher
You just, you just get the <bleep> out of here. This is not the place.

Russell Brand - actor/comedian
...like facts.

Bill Maher
No, no. We do, we love facts, I love facts.

Russell Brand - actor/comedian
I wouldn't have mentioned it, I'm English, and you know that politeness is our fundamental religion. The pandemic created at least 40 new big pharma billionaires. Pharmaceutical corporations like Moderna and Pfizer made $1,000 of profit every second from the COVID-19 vaccine. More than two-thirds of Congress received campaign funding from pharmaceutical companies in the 2020 election. Pfizer Chairman Albert Bourla told time magazine in July 2020 that his company was developing a COVID vaccine for the good of humanity, not for money. And of course, Pfizer made $100 billion in profit in 2022. And may I just mention that finally, and these are, this is also a fact, that you, the American public, funded the development of that. The German public funded the BioNTech vaccine. When it came to the profits, they took the profits. When it came to the funding, you paid for the funding. All I'm querying is this. Is if you have an economic system in which pharmaceutical companies benefit hugely from medical emergencies, where a military industrial complex benefits from war, where energy companies benefit from energy crises, you are going to generate states of perpetual crisis, where the interests of ordinary people....

Bill Maher
And well, yes.

Russell Brand - actor/comedian
Separate from the interests of the elite.

Del Bigtree
Absolutely so brilliant. It's been fun to watch him over the years as he's waxed spiritual and then political, but his ability to have words flow through him is really something spectacular.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Right. And so the, we've seen in the past that people have been focused on to push a greater kind of censorship narrative. We saw this with Alex Jones. He was pushed, he was pushed against with the Sandy Hook controversy to de-platform him on every platform. He's still not on Elon Musk's X platform. And so we're seeing something happening with Russell Brand now, this has been going on for several weeks. The news coverage, it all looks like this. Take a look.

Various news reporters
Russell Brand under fire after multiple women have accused him of sexual assault in a new documentary report.

Various news reporters
An explosive expose published by The Sunday Times detailed four women's accounts, sexual and emotional abuse by Russell.

Piers Morgan
He's also accused of grooming a 16-year-old girl, who says she was taken from school to his home in a car paid for by the BBC.

Various news reporters
So these allegations come from a joint investigation by British news outlets The Sunday Times, The Times of London, and Channel 4 dispatches.
[00:19:14] Various news reporters
Brand was known for his wild behavior and promiscuity, at one point even describing himself as a narcissist and seeking treatment for sex and drug addictions.

[00:19:24] Various news reporters
Mr. Brand posted a video denying any wrongdoing, hours before claims of rape and sexual assault were published.

[00:19:30] Various news reporters
His suggestion is that this is all part of a grand conspiracy.

[00:19:34] Russell Brand - actor/comedian
Amidst this litany of astonishing, rather baroque attacks are some very serious allegations that I absolutely refute. Is there another agenda at play? Particularly when we’ve seen coordinated media attacks before, like with Joe Rogan. I’m aware of news media making phone calls, sending letters to people I know for ages and ages. It’s been clear to me, or at least it feels to me like there’s a serious and concerted agenda to control these kinds of spaces and these kind of voices. And I mean my voice along with your voice.

[00:20:07] Piers Morgan
The consequences of the accusations are already apparent. Brand’s book deal has been shelved, his tour has been postponed, his management team have dropped him. In the moment, he’s been canceled left, right and center by everybody and everything.

[00:20:21] Del Bigtree
Alright, Jefferey, I want to say, this is a topic that we’ve discussed, how we’re going to talk about it. First of all, I want to state for The HighWire that we are making no claim that it’s okay. Whatever Russell Brand and what he did with other people, I think that that all needs to be adjudicated. I think the question we have is really, is this sort of a, you know, the one reporter said a grand conspiracy. Is it a grand conspiracy? One of the things that makes you ask that question is when you look at the newsstands in the UK the day that this came out, and every single paper, didn’t matter which one, are all in unison on a story all together, every single level everywhere you look. If that’s the case, then who tipped it off and why is this story so important to every magazine that it got the cover? Those are the types of things and more that I know you’re about to share, but I want to say that we don’t condone the activities of those that go out and maybe have inappropriate relationships. But that is for the courts, I believe, to decide. What the question is, is what is the validity of simply having news reports about something? Does the news carry weight? In the case of what Jeffrey Barke just said. The fact that in a law it says because news agencies have reported that trained doctors have spread misinformation, when did a reporter have more power or knowledge about medicine than a doctor, and when was that used as a reason to legislate something? I think this is really at the heart of the question we’re about to ask here, Jefferey.

[00:21:54] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Right. And serious accusations, not us, not for us to judge, but we’re looking at the things happening in parallel with these accusations surrounding this. So, as it said in that news clip, this was an investigation, a joint investigation was led by the Times in the UK. And here’s the headline when it first came out, it was in mid-September. “Russell Brand accused of rape, sexual assaults and abuse” of four women. Now these were women that came forward in this investigation. At that time there was no charges, just claims. Since then the Metropolitan Police said they were investigating it, but during the time when it was just claims, you had some really interesting points happening alongside of this. So let’s start with Beverley Taylor. Beverley Taylor, for our audience, you may remember her in 2021, she was talking, she was questioning the efficacy of the COVID jabs on mainstream media in the UK, and she was banned from some of the stations for doing that, which we know now is a very valid question. In fact, it was the right question to ask. She went through, used her personal Twitter account, to put this out there for Russell Brand. She says, “You are being attacked.... Establishment media don’t know what to do with the fact that you have 6 million subscribers & generate autonomous, knowing and original content. You are welcome on my @GBNEWS show anytime. We are mainstream media. But we are not Establishment media. There’s a difference.”

[00:23:08] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Well, to this, Beverley Turner received a letter from a UK government office. This office is titled The Culture, Media and Sports Committee, and this letter said, among other things, this. “...it is concerning that Beverley Turner, who described Mr. Brand as ‘a hero’ and invited him to appear on her show, subsequently fronted GB News’s coverage of the allegations regarding Mr. Brand on the morning of 18 September. During the broadcast, Ms. Turner announced that ‘if he’d offered to come on this morning, we’d’ve had him, let’s be honest.’” It goes on to say, the letter, the UK government says, “...we remain concerned that having a presenter so clearly supporting an individual who is a subject of intense media coverage, including seeking their appearance on the show, undermines any perception of due impartiality in the broadcasting.” So the UK government is reaching out to a news agency and saying, basically, your main, one of your main anchors is asking for an interview for one of the most controversial, news-grabbing headline people in the world at that time. That’s what news people are supposed to do, that’s what journalists are supposed to do, they’re supposed to get to the story....

[00:24:15] Del Bigtree
Being attacked by your government for allowing someone that is being accused of something that hasn’t been proven in any court, would you like to come on my show and share your side of the story? And they’re saying that that’s incredible that you would give them that opportunity under the amount of accusations against them. I mean, folks, let’s remember, at least in America, I’m pretty sure in the UK, too, you’re innocent until proven guilty. To have a government agency reaching in and reprimanding a news agency for allowing a human being to defend themselves in public discourse, as every headline is making an accusation, that they shouldn’t be allowed a balance of like, here’s my side of the story. It’s really, really, actually very disturbing.
Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
And now we get to the meat of this story. So you have this government now stepping out, it wasn't just GB News, it was the BBC. They received their own letter from the Culture, Media and Sport Committee of the UK government. And in their letter it said this. Instead of asking them not to report on him, they said could you, "Please could you also assure us that, while respecting any potential police investigations, all information that can be disclosed publicly will be so." So they're saying, show us your sources, we need everything. Forget how you want to present it, we just, just throw it all out there. So again they're getting into the role of a journalist. But then it gets into social media. So this is where we interact personally with these stories. Most people get their media and their news from social media. So that government committee reached out to TikTok, the European head of TikTok, and they started asking about Russell Brand's personal, personal, the way he makes money. So they said this, quote, "...we are concerned that he" --Russell Brand-- "may be able to profit from his content on the platform. We would be grateful if you could confirm whether Mr Brand is able to monetise his TikTok post..." So now they're starting to see, again, just just an investigation by a media organization, and now the UK government is asking where this guy gets his money from. Rumble....

Del Bigtree
Let's be clear, they are trying to stop his source of income. They're trying to block the flow of payment for the work that he does, which has nothing to do with these accusations. You've got accusations that have no basis in court, and now you have a government agency. And by the way, when you go back to that question of a conspiracy, what the heck is a government jumping in here when every news agency covers it and now all of a sudden the government is saying, because those news agencies cover it, this is real and therefore, we must stop all payment to this man and stop his job and his career. That's crazy. And it sure smacks of a conspiracy.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
And we've seen this escalation before with the truckers in Canada. We've seen this escalation with with GoFundMe sites that people are trying. So this is not something new where government really steps in and tries to grab the bankroll of people that they, you know, they may not appreciate what they say. So the Culture, Media and Sport Committee sent a letter to Rumble. Now, this is an American company, a streaming platform that competes with YouTube. They asked Rumble the same question that they asked TikTok. They said, "We would be grateful if you could confirm whether Mr. Brand is able to monetise his content, including his videos..." blah blah, blah, blah, blah. So they're asking him about monetization on Rumble site. Well, thank God Rumble CEO put out a response, in part publicly, and said this. "We regard it as deeply inappropriate and dangerous that the UK Parliament would attempt to control who is allowed to speak on our platform or to earn a living from doing so. Singling out an individual and demanding his ban is even more disturbing given the absence of any connection between the allegations and his content on Rumble. We don't agree with the behavior of many Rumble creators, but we refuse to penalize them for actions that have nothing to do with our platform." Well, unfortunately, Youtube, not surprisingly...

Del Bigtree
First of all, can we just have a, I just want to have a little moment just to applaud Chris Pavlovski for Rumble. It has been a great platform, one that has carried The HighWire, we have, it's one of the places where we aren't being censored and we love that that is there. And so again, he represents those people that are like, how are we going to move forward, what are we going to do? It's guys like Chris out there that say, hey, I see a business model here. How about a business where we don't censor voices and actually allow them to speak? So it's really beautiful in this moment that at least someone stood up with some integrity and recognizing the power of our First Amendment rights in the United States of America.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Absolutely. And so that moves us to YouTube, Rumble's, I guess, competitor. And this is a platform that kicked us off for rightly asking in, early in the pandemic about if the lab origins of this COVID virus was something to even investigate. We just asked the question, we're gone. So YouTube just folded like a deck chair. "YouTube suspends Russell Brand from advert income." So you have to assume they received the same letter and said nah, forget it, we'll just cut it, we're done.

Del Bigtree
Based on unfounded at the moment accusations, that's incredible.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Right. And so on the bottom of each one of those letters from the UK government that Rumble received that, that TikTok received, is a woman's name, she signed it. Her name, Caroline Dinenage. Starting in 2020, she played a key role in the development of the UK's Online Safety Bill. At the same time, Russell Brand is going through this in the media, this campaign against him, this investigation, this is the headline out of Reuters. "UK's Online Safety Bill finally passed by Parliament." So it's been approved by the House of Lords, it's clearing the way to become law. This law, we've been covering this on the show for several years, as it's been going through the houses and going through drafts. This is a very dangerous law for open debate, free speech on social media platforms. The law would mandate social media companies to use, basically, their algorithms in these systems to identify what they consider harmful content and try to prevent that. And if the companies don't do it to the liking of the government, then these companies could be, if they don't comply, basically, they'll be fined up to 10% of their annual income. Think about that for a company like Meta or Twitter X or Google YouTube. That's a lot of money. So the government now has full control over that with the purse hanging over the heads of these companies. Now, let's hold that idea for a second and bring in another character here. Mark Lancaster. Mark Lancaster was the deputy commander of the 77th Brigade from 2018 to 2020. If you don't remember what the 77th Brigade is, this is the British Army's unit. And in 2015, they were making headlines that look like this." British Army's new 77th Brigade will wage online PSYOP war with terrorists."
[00:30:59] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Well, that sounds like, that's like a good idea, maybe, you know, just try to fight the war online. But the problem is, just like with Department of Homeland Security, the terrorists out there soon became domestic terrorists and normal people inside the country. And when the 77th Brigade Psyop unit then started, during the COVID response, waging war, that Psyop war, psychological operations that stands for, against UK's own citizens, the headlines now look like this, this is the Daily Mail. "Army spied on lockdown critics: Sceptics, including our own Peter Hitchens, long suspected they were under surveillance. Now we've obtained official records that prove they were right all along." And it goes into this article and it says, "Military operates in the UK's 'information warfare' brigade were part of a sinister operation that targeted politicians and high-profile journalists who raised doubts about the official pandemic response. They compiled dossiers on public figures such as ex-Minister David Davis, who questioned the modelling behind alarming death toll predictions, as well as journalists such as Peter Hitchens and Toby Young. Their dissenting views were then reported back to No 10."
So this is like a high level government snitch culture, but it was directed by the army, the military in the UK. So where does this story intersect? It intersects right here, from an early headline. "EXCLUSIVE: 'Cameron cutie' Caroline Dinenage dumps husband to date Tory MP Mark Lancaster who walked out on baby." Quality people here. But so we have 2020, Lancaster is waging psyop war against the UK's own people and his girlfriend, I guess, Caroline Dinenage is busy crafting the the UK's Online Safety Bill, which is now becoming law. So this couple is surveilling people....

[00:33:07] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Yeah, and coming out of the same bedroom, basically. So but, you know, let's pull this view back a little bit because it goes beyond just two people using their government powers for this stuff. So in Canada, there's this movement that's happening in this past month. In Canada we're seeing similar things happening, and this is all around conversation online. So here's the headline, "Canadian government moves to regulate podcasts and streaming services." What they're talking about is the Canadian government, there's a bill advancing called the Online Streaming Act. This is going to increase the power of what the Canadian Broadcasting, Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, the CRTC, and it's going to regulate broadcasters and streaming services. And this is their own press release from that organization. It says, "CRTC takes major step forward to modernize Canada's broadcasting framework." It says, "First, the CRTC is setting out which online streaming services need to provide information about their activities in Canada." Next, "These conditions take effect today and require certain online streaming services to provide the CRTC with information related to their content and subscribership." So here, the Canadian government, and this is just getting started there, is saying, we want to know, even if it's private, we want to know how many people you reach, what your subscribership, and how's your content this week, what are you going to go and, what are you going to put on The HighWire this week? And so how many of you out there watching right now or in Canada or how many of you out there watching are in the UK? Well, we know in Canada we've had viewers send us this, from two weeks ago with our episode. They were on Facebook now called Meta, and they tried to share our episode and this is what they received from the government and from YouTube. So there's this trying to share, "The post cannot be shared," and why? This is in response to the Canadian government. I mean, how many thought we'd ever see this day?

[00:34:54] Del Bigtree
Wow. I mean, so for those of you that are having some sort of interruption of The HighWire in Canada, or the UK, you know where this is coming from. I just want to take this opportunity, this moment to say, folks, this is hitting in so many different places. I know we're about to just talk about where we're at in America, but right now, wherever you are in the world, this is why you should really sign up to our newsletter. Because no matter what happens, they cannot block us emailing you our show. And so whether you can watch it or not, one of the things that we can definitely do if you're a part of our newsletter, is we can make sure you're getting the information and as we go more and more into these culture wars, when we go into all the insanity that's out there and the oppression, and the next time they try to lock us all down, we are really going to need to be able to communicate with each other. And so if you really do value the information you got here on The HighWire, and you're being kept up to date on what's actually happening, can you imagine if we suddenly disappeared for you, wherever you are in the world or even here in the United States of America. Let's try to make sure that we're in contact with each other because we were, we guarantee we'll always be on the cutting edge of you knowing what's exactly happening, what laws are being passed, what laws are being fought, what we're doing to try and stop it. So take this opportunity right now to just scroll down your screen. It's so easy. Just go down, where it says Brave Bold News, subscribe, just type your email in right there and then now you're on our list.
Now not only will you always be given the episode, even if they try to block it from you, you also get all of the evidence that we provide on our show, whether it's a peer-reviewed study or a video or a newspaper article, you get that in your inbox every Monday after a Thursday show, so you can read the whole thing, when you can look at the whole thing, you can ask yourself, did they somehow cherry pick this, is there a different way to look at it? Yes, I want you being skeptical, I've said it. We're not here telling you what to think, we're trying to show you how to think, how to look at the information. And so we can only do that if you're using this tool. But this tool goes beyond just having evidence that we're providing in every show, the transparency and news that we're trying to lead all other news agencies to. But we'd also love to be able to say to those news agencies, look how many people want this level of transparency. Look how many people that view our show also are signed up and want, we'll never show them your names, but we can give them numbers and say, every news agency should be doing this because the people want it. Why don't you show us that you want it? If you are not on our newsletter right now, get on it so that you are all completely informed, not just partly informed about what we say here on The HighWire. Alright, let's get back to it. So Canada, there's going to be blocking The HighWire, we're going to need other ways to get in there as we've just discussed.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist

Yeah. So we have Canada, we have the UK. But fortunately here in the US we have the US Constitution and the right to free speech, which fortunately a judge has so far upheld. What am I talking about? It's the Missouri v. Biden case. There's been a lot of talk on this, Attorneys Generals brought a case forward against a lot of players, the White House, the FBI, even the Surgeon General. And so far, a judge has ruled that they can no longer have contact with social media companies, because these social media companies were using, what they really called coerced censorship. So they were going into the back end, they were sending spreadsheets in cases of people to censor, and these social media companies would say, yes, we'll censor those people. And so currently, the Biden White House, many members of the Biden White House, the FBI, Surgeon General, they have been forbidden from contacting social media companies. That's just been extended. So here's the recent headline, "Federal appeals court expands limits on Biden administration in First Amendment case." What they expanded that to now is the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, this is CISA.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist

This is the operational component of the Department of Homeland Security. Remember, the reason this is in here is we've had the Department of Homeland Security that was created by the Patriot Act, and that was supposed to be for terrorists out there, internationally. And now look at this, look how far we've come. We have a judge ruling that this agency within here, this digital agency can't censor American speech because what happened during the pandemic response. But it depends on what kind of reporting you're listening to. Because if you're reading Politico, talking about this actual court case, they put it like this, look at this headline. "The anti-vaccine movement is on the rise. The White House is at a loss over what to do about it.... The 2022 lawsuit led by Republican attorneys general that targeted the administration's work" -- they just call it work -- "with social media companies dealt a major blow, quashing the prospect of a sustained effort to push back on anti-vaccine campaigns or target influential figures responsible for spreading conspiracy theories." So there you go. I mean there's a lot....

Del Bigtree

That is so amazing, folks. Just take it, just take it, let's look at it one more time and see what this means. First of all, congratulations to all of you for pushing back. This again, I think we've created a culture where in courtrooms, judges say, this is insane. We also have the Constitution. But when did this become so partisan? When they even point out that, you know, Republican attorney generals brought this, didn't we all once agree with the First Amendment right to free speech? Wasn't that like, did I, I'm pretty sure that all of our founding fathers believed that that was the dream for America. Now suddenly it's a bad thing that the work, the important work our government was doing to try and censor people has now been thwarted. I mean, it's really...

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist

That's a major blow.

Del Bigtree

It's amazing, a major blow, thank God, but it just shows you how in a country like the United States of America, we are really dancing on a tightrope right now where major political organizations, you know, also promoting and using major news agencies for their propaganda, are trying to convince people that censorship is a good and important work. It's like we're living in 1984 right now, where you know, who do the, what is political think is going to affect them? You don't think that squashing free speech ends up affecting your newspaper down the road? Where is your long-term vision? When we now see reporters and media organizations calling for censorship, boy, is that scary. Smacks of some other very scary times in the history of the world.
**Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist**

And it even, if you look at, you only have to read between the lines in that political quote, it says, they're using, the agency's using this to target influential figures. Now it says that spread conspiracy theories, but as we know, we just went through a time when conspiracy theories became fact in about two weeks. So target influential figures, that's what they're using it to do. And so let's pull back here because I know some of the viewers may be young or people may have forgotten about this time, but remember when 9/11, the tragedies of 9/11, that was early 2000s. Six weeks after that, there was an overnight revision to the nation's surveillance acts, and it basically gave government an open checkbook of surveillance. And it reduced the checks and balances, like public accountability, judicial oversight. This was the Patriot Act. And 20 years later, this article is, this is what the, you can read about it now and this is how it's framed. "The PATRIOT Act has threatened freedom for 20 years." And even though it's old, it's still being used. So remember, during the pandemic, people were going, parents were going to school boards, protesting, trying to get kids back in school, trying to get masks off kids face. This is the headline that came out of there. "School board group asks Biden to use the Patriot Act against parents over opposition to COVID measures." So just because it's in the past, this thing is continually being used on...

**Del Bigtree**

Literally to treat parents that were doing things like reading these incredible books with, these sexually explicit books that were in their library, that for doing things like that, they should be considered terrorists based on the Patriot Act. I mean, and it was it's really scary. And it's why when we're in these moments, right now, very tumultuous time in America, in the world, and you reflect, I believe it was Ben Franklin that said never, you know, attempt to garner a little bit of safety by removing a little bit of liberty. You'll have neither liberty nor safety or some version, I know it's sort of paraphrased that, but this idea that our fear during 9/11 made us cut back on our own rights as free citizens, and then it backfires years later. You think, oh, what could possibly go wrong? Well, you could simply be a parent trying to get a school to stop sexualizing your children and find yourself labeled as a terrorist.

**Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist**

And it wasn't people, our representatives and government that stopped this, it was people like Edward Snowden, the former NSA intelligence agent, that blew the whistle on this and said, was shocked when he saw the level of surveillance of innocent Americans, millions of people being surveilled by their government, and he had to come forward. He's now, you know, he's he's now an enemy of the state for the United States. But back when it was signed, most were on board because of the, in the wake of these accidents. In fact, it was 357 to 66 noes, 357 yeses, 66 no's. And this was an overnight revision. So overnight you had basically one day to read this, 130-something pages. There was only a handful of people that opposed this. One of them was this guy.

**Wolf Blitzer, CNN**

Congressman Kucinich, I believe you're the only person on this stage who had a chance to vote on the Patriot Act right after 9/11, who voted against it right away.

**Dennis Kucinich, US Representative from Ohio's 10th congressional district from 1997 to 2013**

That's because I read it.

**Del Bigtree**

Still one of my favorite political lines in history. I've had the opportunity, of course, to meet Dennis Kucinich and spend some time with him, I always congratulate him on my favorite line in history. That's because I read it.

**Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist**

My other favorite line in opposition to that, I think, was Nancy Pelosi, when she said, we have to pass the law to read what's in it. That was a fun one. So let's go from freedom of speech to our right in liberty and, our right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. And some of those things are being kind of challenged because, you know, climate science is settled. So let's move along and rapidly restructure society in order to kind of congeal with this climate science that's settled, by the way. It's settled, so don't question it. So this is the latest headlines coming out of the UK. This is about travel. "Travel as we know it could be on the brink of extinction by 2040, warns report... The report envisages a world in which virtual holidays" --virtual holidays-- "become mainstream and carbon passports restrict movement, unless the travel industry makes significant changes now... The Sustainable Future for Travel analysis predicts that carbon tracking will become 'even more individualized thanks to AI'. It says: 'Travellers will log daily emissions and track travel metrics in real-time to reduce their footprint to meet individual carbon goals." So remember, people, these aren't conspiracy theories, they're telling you what they want to do. These are think tanks, well-funded think tanks, throwing it right out there, going, hey, this is a good idea, let's work towards this. So if and when these things ever happen, these aren't something that just came out of nowhere. This is why we report this stuff early. Along the same time...

**Del Bigtree**

I think there's only one thing that comes out of that article you must just hold in your mind: virtual vacations. Okay. The idea of virtual vacations, virtual travel, the fact that any sane person would put that in writing. I just pictured myself being lowered into jelly like The Matrix and just stick the tubes into me, and go ahead and play a video of the places I'm never going to get to see. That is the future these people are dreaming for us folks, and they're saying it out loud with like their outside voice.
[00:46:23] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
And because virtual classrooms worked so well during COVID, it helped the kids so much. So let's just look to the vacations. But at the same time that article is being run, another article is being run and you can see a pattern starting to emerge here. "The climate change proposal which means you'd never see the Mediterranean again." Again, this is in the UK. Says "A report by a global think-tank has suggested people should take just one short-haul flight every three years.... One flight per person every three years would cut the air industry's emissions by way more than 43%. It would slash them to practically nothing. Because there would be no air industry. The airlines - many of which barely survived the pandemic - would be unable to remain profitable with such meager passenger numbers." So this is coming out...

[00:47:02] Del Bigtree
They're literally admitting to destroying an industry. Like that's their way forward is to destroy an industry. It's amazing.

[00:47:09] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
But it's green, so it's okay, I guess. I mean, it's for the climate because the world is ending, the planet cannot survive another ten years. So we really need to do what we need to do, Del, you have to understand this. The travel industry, virtual holidays, it just has to happen. So who's doing this? Well, this is a nonprofit agency that's working with C40 cities. And if you don't know what those are, there's mayors of 100 cities that have basically signed on, have united to confront the climate crisis by any means necessary. So they're supporting this. So many major cities around the world, these mayors are supporting this. And you can see this is the actual page from this nonprofit research, and you can see here, by 2030, there's a couple goals here. We have we have a goal to slash it every two years you want to see this or every three years you can take that flight. So it's basically 1500 kilometers, you can take a full flight every three years. And that's about 980 miles. So you can see there's a progressive target, and then there's an ambitious target. And that ambitious target is what they're really going for. So you know, there's nothing that says no action or maybe a less ambitious target, it's just like, we're going for this.

[00:48:21] Del Bigtree
Crazy or plaid.

Right. So it may sound crazy to some people, and it's starting to sound crazy to a lot of people. And this is what prime ministers are starting to talk about now. So this is the prime minister of the UK, Rishi Sunak, and you know, this is, we've watched governments push this without even blinking an eye. Until now. Something really big has happened. See if you can, see if you can spot it. Take a listen.

[00:48:46] Del Bigtree
Alright.

[00:48:47] Rishi Sunak, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom
We're absolutely committed to reaching net zero by 2050. But no one in Westminster politics has had the courage to look people in the eye and explain what this really involves. That's wrong, and it changes now. Because the fact is, the UK is so far ahead of every other country in the world when it comes to net zero. We've had the fastest reduction in greenhouse gases in the G7, and we've already cut emissions further and faster than any major country. So how can it be right for the British people to be told to sacrifice even more than others. The risk here, for those of us who care about reaching net zero by 2050, is if we continue down this path, we risk losing the consent of the British people. So today, we're changing our approach to meeting net zero to ease the burden on working people. Here's how. First, we're easing the transition to electric vehicles, meaning you'll still be able to buy new petrol and diesel cars and vans until 2035. And even after that, you'll be able to buy and sell them second hand. Second, we're giving people far more time to replace their old boilers. We'll never force anyone to rip out their existing boiler. You'll only ever have to make the switch when you're replacing your boiler anyway. And families who are hit hardest by costs won't ever have to switch at all. Because it's not right for Westminster to impose significant costs on hard-pressed families without a properly informed national debate. That's why, third, we're making sure government stays out of your life. So the idea that government can tell you what to eat, gone. The idea that government can force you to have seven different bins in your home, gone. The idea that government can create new taxes to discourage flying or taking holidays, gone. The idea that government can tell you how many passengers to have in your car, gone. We'll never impose these unnecessary and heavy-handed measures on you, the British people.

[00:50:42] Del Bigtree
Now, I don't know if I can trust Rishi Sunak farther than I can throw him, but I will say this. What that video says to us is that people are being heard and they recognize they've got themselves in a real juggernaut, and that they better start placating us and backing away from this insanity of trying to ruin our lives and making it our problem, and a problem they can't even very well define. So it's really, I mean, again, there's a lot of, a lot of victory laps due this week because people, this is you. This is you, this is all of you in the UK, it's also America. It's our pushback. It's sharing these videos and these government agencies saying, you know, everywhere we're trying to push this, the bigger videos that are being accepted and the culture is shifting is those that are saying they don't want this level of oppression, and we're going to find ourselves out of jobs and getting voted out if we don't start speaking to the people. So clearly here, he knows what the majority want to hear in the UK, and for all of us, that's what that just said. Despite what they enact or what they do, just know this. We are the majority, the critical thinking people that want to have freedom and liberty and think we can make our own decisions for ourselves. They're now having to speak to us because we are the rulers of the world, and they're having to deal with that.
Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
And I got excited for a second, he stopped just short, the idea I was waiting for him to say, the idea that the government can mandate a risky medical treatment, like a vaccination, gone. He didn’t say that.

Del Bigtree
Still need a little more work to get there.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Yeah. And if you know anything about messaging and his messaging is coming from the probably the best PR firms known in the world. So you go for all tell someone something very positive. We are reaching our goals faster than any country. You put all this great stuff at the beginning, then you put your little bad news at the end. So, not just come out and say, hey, we’re risking losing the consent of the British people, then we got to stop this. No one’s going to say that, but that’s the message. So here’s the headlines that were created from that and there were several. “Rishi Sunak announces U-turn on key green targets.” There’s another person, another guy that he’s kind of involved in the green movement, Bill Gates. He came out during the same week and said this at a conference. Take a listen.

Bill Gates, Co-Founder of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
Whenever voters are tested, like in France, you put on a diesel tax. Well, they say, oh, those people in the city are richer than me, they somehow should pay for this. In Germany, when you say, okay, we’re going to make you buy electric heat pumps, they back off from it. So these, if you try to do climate things brute force, you’ll sometimes get people say, hey, I like climate, I’m for climate, but I don’t want to bear that cost and reduce, reduce my standard of living. You know, I believe we should spend a lot of money on climate change. I believe we should have very high carbon taxes. The political realities are such that without innovation, it’s unlikely, particularly in middle income countries, that the brute force approach will be successful.

Del Bigtree
It’s amazing. That’s so much like the video where he ultimately said about the COVID vaccine, we just expected more people to bow down and do whatever the government told them, we were shocked. And now there’s like this huge group of people that didn’t get it and actually think I might be a bad guy.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Right. And if you get through all his hand-waving, the message basically is brute force isn’t working. We’ve tried brute force and people aren’t happy.

Del Bigtree
We’ve tried it, right. And he admits it, we tried it, hard. We we hit it hard. Didn’t really work.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
So I mean, I was shocked when I heard him start to say this stuff. So here’s another headline that was created by Bill Gates. “Bill Gates sees ‘a lot of climate exaggeration’ out there: ‘The climate is not the end of the planet. So the planet is going to be fine.’” I’m shocked by that headline, because we’re told the planet’s going to end. So far that big of a u-turn to happen. So let’s look at the rest of these puzzle pieces also kind of falling by the wayside or being at least questioned. So the ESG system, it’s a scoring system for finance. It’s Environmental, Social and Governance. It’s what investors use to screen investments based on corporate policies, like are you green enough fast enough? Oh, if you’re not, you’re not going to be included in this sustainable fund. And so this is a headline created from that. “Money managers are shifting their attitude to ESG as ‘realism’ sets in, says S&P’s Dan Yergin.” It says, “In the second quarter of this year, investors have pulled $635 million from US sustainable funds, according to funds research firm Morningstar. That racks up a total outflow of $11.4 billion from these sustainable funds in the past year. And just recently in September, Blackrock informed regulators that it’s closing a pair of sustainable emerging-market bond funds.” These are big, big movements here.

Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
And then let’s look at the electric vehicles, this is over in Germany. “Volkswagen cuts jobs as demand for EVs plunges.” It’s a big one there. How about climate researchers and academics? This headline, this is all at the same time, by the way. “Idea of green growth losing traction among climate policy researchers, survey of nearly 800 academics reveal.” So let’s talk about the younger generation, because a lot of that younger generation has been taught the Earth is going to basically burn up or freeze or go underwater, it’s going to be over. So these are the headlines because they’re experiencing an issue with that, a mental health issue with that. This is the headline. “Climate change can have ‘lifelong impacts’ on young people’s mental health, report says.” Well, is it climate change or is it reports like this that tell people what to think about climate change? So this was a while back. “We have 12 years to limit climate change catastrophe, warns UN.” Then a year later, “Only 11 years left to prevent irreversible damage from climate change, speakers warn...” And then a year later, “The world has less than 10 years to avert climate change catastrophe, report finds.” And then the most recent one, “World has nine years to avert catastrophe warming, study shows.” But apparently that’s all gone. So forget about that, the climate is going to be just fine...
[00:56:36] Del Bigtree
I mean it has been amazing, whether it's Greta Thunberg like, and you talk to kids, they're being made to be like, the Earth is going to disappear right out from under them. I mean, we are, we're making kids live in a constant state of terror. And now, you know, thank God, because the adults in the room are pushing back, they're having to backtrack from this. But you're right. What kind of mental health is there when you are being told that everyone alive, that human beings are a disease and we're killing the planet, we're all going to die. The oceans are going to overtake us, our food supply will disappear. I mean, it's just crazy what we are just pouring into young children's minds right now.

[00:57:18] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
And what we're pouring into young children's bodies. So every week so far in the last month, we've hit basically new myocarditis studies. This is one of the most important and one of the most important issues that have come up from this vaccines. We have the cancers and the blood clots, but that myocarditis has so much science behind it, and so many doctors and academics standing up and saying, no, we're done here. This is the line in the sand from COVID-19. So we had Mandy Cohen, she's the CDC director, she stepped in and she, her primary goal was to bring integrity and trust back to the CDC, back to an agency that lost it during the COVID pandemic, because Rochelle Walensky basically went out there and was changing the messaging all the time and was really not a science-based communicator. So all eyes were on Mandy Cohen. What was she going to do with this, with this promise? Well, here's what she did on CDC's Twitter page.

[00:58:11] Mandy K. Cohen, MD, MPH, Director, CDC
Hi, everyone. Dr. Mandy Cohen from the CDC. I wanted to talk today about the COVID-19 vaccine and kids. While we know kids are less impacted than adults from COVID, the unfortunate news is that kids can still get sick, and sometimes really sick from COVID-19, just like adults. In fact, half of the very young kids who ended up in the intensive care unit with COVID had no underlying medical reason to make us think they would get sick. They didn't have asthma or another underlying condition. The COVID virus just made them really sick. Second, the vaccine is safe for all kids over six months. Millions of doses have been given to children, and their safety has been closely tracked. The benefits to children and teens outweigh the risks, especially the risks to kids if they get COVID-19. For example, teen boys have been up to five times as likely to have heart inflammation after having a COVID infection than after getting vaccinated. Now, I have two daughters, ages nine and 11, and we plan to get them both the updated COVID vaccine. Talk to your child's pediatrician or nurse practitioner about the updated COVID vaccine today, and they can get their flu vaccine at the same time.

[00:59:34] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Alright. So let's talk about this for a second.

[00:59:37] Del Bigtree
I mean, I'm speechless. I honestly, it's a rare moment, I'm just like aaaaah, wow.

[00:59:44] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Well. So first of all, CDC with this message is a global outlier. No European countries are recommending this new booster for healthy kids. So when she's saying safe for 6 months and older.

[00:59:57] Del Bigtree
The booster tested on ten mice with no information whatsoever. We've covered this so much, but okay. Yeah, no one thinks it's safe.

[01:00:03] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Yeah, exactly. And so let's just talk about messaging. So she's trying to bring back trusted messaging to this agency. Well let's go to that Twitter post that was, that video was posted. You can see here we have 7,412 comments to 554 likes. That's called being ratioed. So that's when the number of people that have something to say and comment on what you just said way exceeds the people that just gave it a thumbs up and liked it. And we're not going to do it here because we don't have the time and we don't have the, we don't have the black boxes to censor the words, but you can take a look for yourself, there are some very colorful things that were said to Mandy Cohen and a lot of people that disagreed. So this is something that's not very popular with this statement.

[01:00:44] Del Bigtree
Thank God. Yes, yeah.

[01:01:04] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
And so but you have to wonder, if you've been watching this show, how is she making this statement? If you've been following us, we've been covering studies. We're going to go through some of these studies, some of the big ones. I mean, we don't have time to go through them all right now, but let's go through one of these. This is a Nordic study. Remember, the Nordic countries pulled this vaccine for kids because of myocarditis. So these are, this was looking at national health registries in Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden. They had 23 million people looking at a vaccination myocarditis risk. And let's just go right to the chart here from this study. You see males, 16 to 24. Remember, males have been shown, young boys, adolescents and teenagers have been shown to have some of the biggest pops here when it comes to myocarditis as for the vaccine. So you have Pfizer, two Pfizer vaccines, and you go across, you see the highlighted area, 8.3 per 100,000 myocarditis, pericarditis combined. Or 7.85. And then the other one is Pfizer's vaccine and Moderna's vaccine. So if you mix and match them, and that's 37.94 and 38.51, respectively, in those models per 100,000. Now that's for vaccinated people for myocarditis cases and pericarditis.
[01:01:55] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Now let's go to the just natural infection and see what happens there. Because we're told that natural infection is way more dangerous. Again, 23 million people. We have males 12 to 15 with no infection. You go all the way across, nothing, nothing going on. Males 12 to 15, SARS-CoV-2 infection, not much going on there, zero events. Males 16 to 24, now here's the really important group. No infection, you go across, zero. SARS-CoV-2 infection, 1.37 per 100,000. Drastically different, orders of magnitude different. But that's just one study. Let's go to another study. This was published in the European Journal of Clinical Investigation, a peer-reviewed journal. Vaccine, Pfizer "vaccine-associated myo/pericarditis in adolescents: a risk-benefit analysis." This used the CDC's own Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System, the VAERS system, their own system. It's right there. They can, the CDC could use it too and find these numbers, but outside researchers, independent researchers had to. And they wrote this as the conclusion. "Weighing post-vaccination myo/pericarditis against COVID-19 hospitalization during delta," --remember. Delta was a very deadly wave, we were told-- "our risk-benefit analysis suggests that among 12-17 year olds, two-dose vaccination was uniformly favorable only in nonimmune girls with a comorbidity. Very small, very small little section there.

But then it goes on to say, "In boys with prior infection and no comorbidities, even one dose carried more risk than benefit according to international estimates. In the setting of omicron," --the one we're in now-- "one dose may be protective in nonimmune children, but dose two does not appear to confer additional benefit at a population level." And let's go to one more. This was a study looked at over 21 million people. "Risk of myocarditis after sequential doses of COVID-19 vaccines..." It says this. "The risk of myocarditis was higher 1 to 28 days after a second dose of mRNA..." --that's Moderna's vaccine-- "and persisted after a booster dose. Associations were stronger in men younger than 40 years for all vaccines. In men younger than 40 years old, the number of excess myocarditis events per million people was higher after a 2nd dose of Moderna's vaccine..." than after a positive SARS-CoV-2 test. So there you have it. And you know, I can't believe I'm doing this, but I'm going to give the final word to someone that has been really, during my journalistic career, has been totally pro-vaccine. Listen to what he, even he has to say. This is Dr. Paul Offit when it comes to myocarditis and the vaccination.

[01:04:25] Gad Saad, Psychologist & Host of The Saad Truth
Is there a problematic link between the COVID vaccine and heart inflammation?

[01:04:32] Paul A. Offit, MD, Pediatrician & Infectious Disease Specialist
There certainly is a causal link between vaccination and myocarditis and pericarditis. No doubt about it.

We rest our case.

[01:04:40] Del Bigtree
As he sits there and tells us it's perfectly safe, no connection, worse to be infected than get the vaccine.

[01:04:45] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
So you have to ask yourself, what was the CDC looking at? Are they just making it up out of nowhere? Five times more risk if you get COVID than if you're vaccinated with myocarditis? How are they ignoring, are they ignoring all the studies? Did they just not see them? Well, let's look at the study they were looking at. It was published in 2022 in a non-peer-reviewed, MMWR, this is the CDC's own in-house journal. "Cardiac complications after SARS-CoV-2 infection..." So what they did was they looked at the electronic health records, looking at US health care systems, and we can see, let's look at the number of people because this is where the conversation starts. From this graph and you can see the demographic demographics. So SARS-CoV-2 infection cohort. Under that first column it says, 814,524. These are essentially unvaccinated people that tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection. Then look to the right, you have these four columns. This is what they weighted against. First dose, second dose, unspecified dose, any dose of mRNA COVID-19 vaccination. You add those up, it's almost 13.5 million vaccinated people. So you have 13 point, about 13.5 million vaccinated people against over 800,000 unvaccinated people. So the first thing you should really be looking at is the fact that these two pools are drastically different in size.

[01:06:07] Del Bigtree
Yeah, I wanted to sort of get to the bottom of this, Jefferey, because I think it's really important that, you know, and we talk about this. I don't like giving a lot of advertising to bad science, but when that bad science is being propagated by the head of the CDC, we have to do something about that. And a lot of people out there in the audience, you're going to be told by friends and especially doctors, the studies have shown that myocarditis is higher in those that were unvaccinated and infected compared to those that were vaccinated, and the studies prove it. Only one study does. Only one study does that we can see, and as you've pointed out, studies with millions of people around the world, the reason no one else in the world is giving this booster to kids, were done differently. But I want to show the diary of a fraudulent study, as it were. So give me a minute here, Jefferey, because I think it's important that people understand how they do these studies, their little crappy studies that they point to and try and convince us of. So everybody, why don't we go over to the board over here and we'll see what we can do about this. Now Whoops. Hold on a second, let me grab that. I'm going to admit to you right now that I haven't been at this board a lot, and if you heard me prior to this show, I screamed and yelled at the scream a lot. I'll try to keep the screaming down. We'll see how well we can do. But first, let me switch.
[01:07:25] Del Bigtree
Let's just show you. Now, I don't want you to look at these numbers specifically, they're not accurate, it's an idea. Let's just make this as any study, unvaccinated versus a vaccinated study. In this case, it's the level of myocarditis. Now here's what they do, and this is how they do a study like this. Let me just get this set up. I like red. Okay. Let's say that all these dots that are on this screen represent all the unvaccinated kids in an area that's going to be studied, the United States of America or the state of California, whatever it is. All these dots are those that all these kids got infected with the COVID virus, and they should be a part of this study, but they're not. When you read how this study works, the study only looks at those that sought medical attention. So that's not this group, it's this group in this circle of blue. Let's imagine blue is seeking medical attention. So these are the people that are having a hard time, the kids that are getting sick. So they're having difficulties, and so we focus on that. And let's act like this red dot right here, that this is those that maybe actually ended up going to the hospital. And somewhere in there there's going to be like one little dot of the one kid that maybe died. When we look at the numbers, 0.0027% is the death rate of those that are infected amongst kids, so death rates are super low. But let me explain how they do this. So when they do the study, when it comes to the unvaccinated group, this is the group they look at right here.

[01:08:51] Del Bigtree
They only in this study look at those that sought medical attention. This is the group, not the bigger group, right. Now in a decent comparative study, which is what this is supposed to be, this is exactly you would think they did the same thing in the vaccinated group, but they didn't. Let's just go and take a look at that. So now let's switch over to the vaccinated group. Let's say it's the same type of situation, right. So in this case we have all of the vaccinated that got vaccinated. There is this group that sought medical attention, and then the group that were hospitalized and those that died, same type of situation. But in the vaccinated group, they don't take just those that had sought medical attention. Now in this case, they decide for this group, we're going to look at all of the kids. Everyone that got the vaccine is in their comparative group. Now does it make sense what they're doing here? Smaller group means one out of a million and larger group means one out of 5 million. This is how you manipulate a study. They do it with autism, they do it in many, many different ways. This is how you create a fraudulent study. Let me show you just in a comparative so you really fully get this. Let's put the two right next to each other. Now here are the groups you should have compared, all of the unvaccinated that caught COVID and all of those that got vaccinated. That would have been a fair study.

[01:10:18] Del Bigtree
But no. Did they do that? Of course they didn't. As I've pointed out, this is the group that they study here, and this is the group that they study amongst the vaccinated. And this is how they can say, and these are made up numbers, but you get the idea, 1 in 1,000,000 of the unvaccinated end up having myocarditis, but 1 in 5,000,000 of the vaccinated did. Therefore it is you're five times more likely to have myocarditis in the unvaccinated group. Get it? This is a fraud. This is how our government agencies are lying to us and using science to manipulate the entire story. Don't forget this when you're reading studies, look at what group did they select? Did they select only the sick kids compared to all the healthy kids in the vaccinated group? That's how they do it, folks. We're going to keep watching this game and showing you how the fraud is played by your own government agencies. Alright, Jefferey, thank you for indulging me in that. I hope that that made some sense. But we see it all the time. Whether it's changing timelines between the two groups, changing the size of the group. This is how they play the game and why we no longer have any trust for the CDC, nor should we. I really appreciate your reporting on this, Jefferey, really important stuff and a lot to celebrate. So thank you for the work that you do, because I think that we are bringing truth and that truth is spreading and clearly it is now getting to government agencies and they're realizing they're in trouble.

[01:11:54] Jefferey Jaxen, Investigative Journalist
Absolutely, Del. You're very welcome.

[01:11:56] Del Bigtree
Alright, I'll see you next week. Alright. So, you know there's so many ways to look at this. I love how many of you tune in to The High Wire, how many of you support The HighWire in the work that we do. One of the things we look at, like Jeffrey Barke, when you look at this COVID vaccine, when you look at what they're getting away with. And by the way, what even determines a positive myocarditis examination. We don't even know where they're coming up with those numbers. All of this stuff is being faked, and they're getting away with it because we don't have decent data collection, we don't know how many are being injured, partly because there's total liability protections. Originally this exists for the entire Childhood Injury Compensation Act. In 1986, we blocked, you know, manufacturers from having any liability for their products in all the vaccine program. But then when COVID hit and they were rushing this vaccine out, they decided to take it a step further with the PREP Act. No vaccine manufacturer, there was the HRSA rule. Let's read what it originally said, I think that's the 1986 Act. "No vaccine manufacturers shall be liable in a civil action for damages arising from a vaccine-related injury or death associated with the administration of a vaccine..." Because the manufacturers don't believe in the product enough to stand by it like they do all of their other products. It doesn't say that, but that's what it should say. They will defend the other drugs that they put out there, but when it comes to vaccines, they were losing so much money from death and injury cases, they blackmailed our government and said, we will not make any more vaccines if you don't protect from liability.
[01:13:29] Del Bigtree

That was 1986. Then all of a sudden they want to rush the COVID vaccine out. And by the way, that has to go through an approval process. You have to get through the FDA, and then you have to get the CDC, and the protections to the the 1986 Act only happen when it’s recommended on the CDC schedule. They knew they weren’t going to have the time to get it protected into that protected class of vaccines going through that gauntlet, so they decided we need to make a new act that just blanketlty protects from liability for this totally untested product. And in fact, there was even countries like Belgium that tried to push back and say, we’re not giving you liability protection on this untested product. And I believe it was AstraZeneca, the head of AstraZeneca said, well, if you won’t give us liability protection, then you don’t get our vaccine because we cannot be held liable for serious adverse events that happen five years down the road because we didn’t have enough time to test for that. You’re the ones making us rush, therefore, you should be protecting us from liability. That’s how it went down. That’s how they excuse this whole thing, and that’s why so many people are being injured and heart attacks and all of it.

[01:14:36] Del Bigtree

But because you can’t point to court, because you can’t say that this many people have like proven that they got myocarditis. You know, Mandy Cohen’s allowed to lie to you and say, well, we don’t have any evidence and I’m not lying because I found one study that we totally manipulated that makes me sound like I’m telling the truth. Well, we are going to go after the PREP Act. We go after some big things. We’re the only ones that have ever pushed a law back. Just a few months ago, we brought back the religious exemption from Mississippi, something that had been gone since 1979. Now, people in Mississippi can opt out of a mandated vaccine program to go to school. This is the height of the work that we do with the Informed Consent Action Network. These are bucket list moments, but we’re going to go after liability protection now. And specifically we’re starting with the PREP Act. We’ve just announced that we have filed this case against the PREP Act. And there it is, “ICAN’s attorneys file major lawsuit to strike down portions of the PREP Act.” I’m joined now by one of the greatest attorneys in world history, our attorney for the Informed Consent Action Network. I love doing that to you, Aaron. Here he is, Aaron Siri.

[01:15:46] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Hey, Del, good to see you.

[01:15:47] Del Bigtree

It’s really good to see you. So to start out with, why don’t you describe what the PREP Act is and sort of how it came about? How does it work?

[01:16:01] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

So when there is an emergency that’s declared, the Secretary of HHS can decide that all countermeasures for that emergency, whether they’re vaccines like the COVID vaccine or treatment, supposed treatments like remdesivir, are going to be given immunity, effectively blanket immunity from liability for injuries. The idea is to spur companies to go and rush and create products because they know that, hey, as long as we get it to market, we could sell it, it’s an emergency, the government will buy it, and we don’t have to worry about being sued for injuries. You know, I would submit that all that does is it spurs innovation to create products that are probably not safe, not products that are going to be beneficial to society. Immunity is a really bad idea. The companies already have the incentive to make the money, they’re going to rush. There’s no reason to say you don’t have to pay for injuries.

[01:17:02] Del Bigtree

Right. I agree completely. And so they had these protections. And ironically, I was just talking to Jeffrey Barke earlier, those same protections should have been on because it was also about trying new things, trying off-label usage. If we’re in an emergency, do whatever, we’re not going to hold you accountable for trying things when we’re in the middle of a crisis. You might find some obscure drug nobody thought about in your own exploration of a cure or an answer. You should be held and not liable for that. Ironically, in the middle of this, the PREP Act would have would have taken care of all the hydroxychloroquine doctors that were using that and the ivermectin, but instead they’ve gone outside of that to try and pass laws to take away that protections which which already naturally exist. Am I wrong about that? I mean, shouldn’t the PREP Act have been like protecting those who were trying other treatments that especially had been proven safe in like hundreds of millions of people around the world.

[01:17:56] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

As long as they were considered by our federal health authorities as a countermeasure or deemed as such, then they would have actually been given the protection of the PREP Act, even if it’s an existing product. But they weren’t, as we know.

[01:18:10] Del Bigtree

Alright.

[01:18:11] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

They weren’t seen that way by our federal health authorities.

[01:18:13] Del Bigtree

Okay, so now let’s get a little bit into this liability issue, and I think part of where the case is at, now what is it about the PREP Act that you think is vulnerable right now and what are we looking at?
[01:18:27] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

So the major feature that people think about when they think of the PREP Act, as you just pointed out, is that you can't sue the manufacturer for injury. Now, recognizing that Congress didn't leave folks injured by the countermeasures and particularly the COVID-19 vaccines with no recourse, they left them with virtually no recourse. Why do I say that? Because they created something called the CICP, the Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program. And what that is, this program is where if you're injured by a COVID-19 vaccine, you can file a claim. The problem is, is that when you file a claim in the CICP, it's the equivalent of shoving paper into a black hole and just waiting to see what comes back. Why? Because in the American judicial system, what are we all used to? What do we understand to be due process? We understand there are basic requirements for due process. You know, the government doesn't have to set up a system, it doesn't have to give you a way to challenge a zoning, you know, to create exceptions to a zoning requirement or challenge any other government process. But when it does, that process needs to meet basic constitutional due process. The CICP program, we argue in this lawsuit, does not in any way, shape or form meet that very basic Constitutional due process requirement. Because when you file your claim, what do you have to put in your petition? Not clear. Who's going to review it?

[01:20:01] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

You don't know. Meaning you don't know who the judges, who the trier of fact is. Can you petition them with more information to ask them questions about how they were going to review? No. Do you know what experts they're going to use? No. Can you ask their expert questions? No, because you don't even know who they are. The entire process happens in a black box. You have no rights. You have no discovery rights, you have no rights to address the tribunal. You don't even know if they have conflicts or not because you don't know who they are. And you can't even confront, as we all know, supposed to be able to confront the other, right? So they're not only then basically sitting as the judge, they're also the prosecutors. I mean, there's basically no distinction there. And so what we argue is that that process, the CICP, is a absolute violation of the United States Constitution's due process requirement. And we ask that it be corrected, in all of those ways that I just listed and others, it's all laid out in the complaint, and that if it's not corrected that the entire statute needs to be struck down. It's a similar thing we've done in other lawsuits where the judge rules, look, you got to fix this and if you're not, the whole thing has got to go.

[01:21:14] Del Bigtree

When you, in these cases, one of the things I've learned with you is that judges are not really keen on restructuring scientific, things that involve science. They don't like saying, if you do this, this will fix it. They tend to say, look, if one part of this car is broken, scrap the whole car, go rebuild it and come back to me, but I'm not into trying to describe to you how you fix a car, that's not what I do as a judge. So in some ways, there's a good chance if you break this part of it and show it's unconstitutional and not giving people their right to know a correct trial, then since that part is broken, there's a chance they could just rule this whole thing should be scrapped, right?

[01:21:55] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Yeah, the judges, you know, are article, the judiciary is the article three of the Constitution. Article one is the legislature that writes the laws. And so the judges don't sit around trying to rewrite or reformulate laws. If the law is unconstitutional, they typically, though there are variations, will typically find and say, hey look, this law is unconstitutional. And the CICP program really is inextricably intertwined in many ways with the immunity provided to the manufacturers. So if the CICP program is not fixed, yes, the correct remedy is that the whole statute, including the immunity to liability, should be struck down.

[01:22:31] Del Bigtree

So to give me a sense, like obviously, I know a lot of people are reaching out to The HighWire looking for, they had injuries. They wanted to find some way that they could deal with that. How many cases did you end up looking at? I mean, I know a lot of people were reaching out to your law firm. Is this something that is part of your understanding of this law and the fact that it's not working correctly from the amount of people that you were seeing?

[01:22:55] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Oh, as Del, as you know, I mean, ICAN, the Informed Consent Action ICAN has gotten inundated with folks reaching out about COVID-19 vaccine injuries, and our firm has as well. And so there has been a, you know, we're set up to deal with all the folks who call us for all the other vaccine injuries, we've got a whole team that deals with folks who've been injured by other vaccines, and we file claims for them in the, what you mentioned earlier, the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program. But, you know, we're not, we weren't prepared for the the very quick avalanche. It's different than other vaccines because you're only giving a hep B vaccine to, you know, a smaller cohort of people. They gave the COVID-19 vaccine to 270 million people, more than once, often, sometimes more than two times. So that is an incredible number of people to vaccinate. And, you know, just one group, which was also a plaintiff in the suit that we filed, React19, just one group has 30, over 30,000 seriously injured people who got the COVID-19 vaccine.

[01:24:00] Del Bigtree

I mean, that's what I was going to ask next. I mean, I know when I look at VAERS, I see 30,000 reports of deaths, over 30,000 reports of deaths. Here we go, here's the numbers, 36,000 reported deaths. Now, let me be clear, these are just reports, but these are people that filed reports that should be going on and asking for compensation and some sort of judicial review of what took place to see if they should be compensated, 210,000 hospitalizations, 152,000 urgent care, 253,000 doctor office visits, 10,000 cases of anaphylaxis, 17,000 cases of Bell's palsy, paralysis in the face. So when I look at all of those numbers and we looked at this PREP Act, how many people have been paid out for their injuries so far of the, what clearly looks like hundreds of thousands of people that should have a right to their day in court?
Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Four. Four people have been paid out. That's it. And this is a program, by the way, that they don't, in over 12,000 claims that have been filed, in a program, by the way, that our federal authorities have not, have gone out of their way to not promote.

Del Bigtree

Right. Right.

Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Most people do not know about it. Most folks who get, who have an issue with a COVID-19 vaccine don't know about it. And you know when somebody is going to take the time to actually do this, because they're not, lawyers are not really involved with this program. The program won't pay attorney's fees and the amount of damages you can get, even if you win, the most you can get is $50,000 in lost wages a year, and your lost medical expenses. It doesn't matter how much you're suffering or how much pain, nothing else, that's all you can get, this is all that program. So if you're retired and you are now in insufferable pain for the rest of your life, and you've got Medicare and Medicaid, you know, health insurance, even if you win, you get nothing because you're not losing any income and you have your medical bills paid. So yes, we've got those 12,000 are representing, I think, a very, very small percentage of the folks out there who probably could file a claim, they just don't know about it. Or, and this is very, very common, there's a one year statute of limitations. So you're talking about folks who are really injured, they finally come around, and they finally, when they finally learn about it, most of them are out of time, they can't file a petition. Anyway, it's incredible. 12,000 folks, over 12,000 people have filed a claim to date.

Del Bigtree

Amazing that they set a time limit on the amount of time that you have to claim an injury, but didn't even give you that time limit when they looked at the vaccine. There's no one year, two year, three year, five year study saying how far down the road an injury would happen. I mean, it's just, it's so egregious on so many different angles. Okay, so who are the plaintiffs? Tell me a little bit about the plaintiffs in this case, because I think that's always important. This is, obviously this is a case that ICAN is funding, which means not actually us, but all the people that are watching this program right now that sponsor us are making this happen. So who is it that we are helping bring their case against this egregious government, I guess I could call it an oversight if we're going to try and keep it from sounding nefarious.

Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

That's a very, very kind term. I mean, especially considering a lot of these folks were mandated to get this product as well. With that said, most of the plaintiffs are individuals who have been injured by the vaccine. I should say that if the case is successful, it's not just seeking relief on behalf of the named individuals, but it should extend to everybody in the entire country if it's successful. So it's a number of individuals who have been injured by the vaccine. Some of them filed a claims, some didn't file a claim, some, you know, they're all in varying situations, as well as, I know that React19 is also a group, and I believe, you know, you had.

Del Bigtree

I've worked so much with them. It's just a great group of people that really have spoken out, even through pain and injury, traveling when it hurts them and their bodies are shutting down, still going to try and spread the word. So many horrific injuries there. And for those that have been experiencing vaccine injury through the years from the childhood vaccine program, again, as you put it, this was a tidal wave of injury that took place because everybody, as we know, was told they had to get it in order to work and and live their lives in America. And certainly the rest of the world has their issues, but this is right here. Specifically, are there any cases we would know about, maybe even talked about here?

Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Yeah, sure. You know, one case, for example, was a young girl in high school who got the J&J vaccine and, you may recall that at one point they paused the J&J vaccine for quite a while because they discovered it can cause something called TTS, which is thrombosis, you know, blood clotting, at the same time as it causes thrombocytopenia, reduced platelet counts, right. Usually when you have less platelets, you don't have clotting, you have thinning blood. So it's the opposite. So these folks were presenting to the hospital and the hospital was then going and treating them for low platelet counts, giving them a medicine that would then cause more blood clotting and that could cause even more issues, so, you know, they had six cases that they identified. She was one of those six cases that then resulted in the pause of the J&J vaccine. And as you recall, they said, oh yeah, this is actually happening, they have confirmed causality, the federal health authorities. They didn't, they, which is why, you know, they then put in all of these warnings and so forth. She filed her claim back, I believe it was in November of 2021. So it's been almost two years and still no decision, nothing.

Del Bigtree

No help with their medical bills, nothing, even though she was one of the known reasons they stopped the vaccine and then put warning labels on everything.
Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Yeah. I mean, she had to have brain surgery, she can't really walk well, her parents had to sleep with her because she can't really pull the blanket over her. She needs help going to the bathroom. She can't write or type. Her family has had to move to a new house to be able to accommodate her situation, getting two vans that can accommodate. I mean, serious expenses, devastating impact on her life, you know, such a heartbreaking story, and she was just doing what she was told. Government said go get it. You just heard Mandy Cohen say, go out and get these shots. It's good. It's, you know, the benefits outweigh the risks. Well, certainly did not outweigh the risks for this young lady. She is paying an incredible price. And what the government is doing to her now is really, truly adding insult to injury. Because every time these families follow up with the program, they're told, and they've been often told by them, that they're going to get a decision in a hot minute, a hot minute.

Del Bigtree

They literally say that, a hot minute is the terminology used?

Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

That's my understanding, which is, a very troub-. I mean. So, you know, that's just one example. Another example...

Del Bigtree

Let me ask you this. Okay, go ahead. Yeah.

Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

No, no.

Del Bigtree

I want to ask you this, does this work the same way the '86 Act is, which is, there's a tax on the COVID vaccine that goes into this fund and then is there to pay for these injuries, is that how this act also works, the PREP Act? Is that where the money's coming from?

Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Not my, that's not my understanding when it comes to the CICP. For the VICP, for the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program....

Del Bigtree

So it's not the same. Well because my question is this, is whatever pot of money, and they've only paid out four people, how much money is actually going to what it's supposed to to adjudicate and pay these people for the injuries that clearly it's already admitted it's happening to this young lady, compared to the bureaucrats that are involved in whatever it is they're doing?

Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

That's a great question. And as you know, we have been FOIA'ing the federal health authorities trying to get to the bottom of that. As best as we can tell, there's about $5 million set aside to compensate these folks, which may explain, by the way, the four people who they did provide compensation to, they've only gave them about $2,000 each. And the only injuries....

Del Bigtree

Wait a minute, wait, wait, look at what this just said, folks, it's a little bit different than what you were saying there, Aaron, bring this back up. "CICP lacks accountability, transparency, and cost-effectiveness" --this is the Journal of Law and Biosciences-- "and cost-effectiveness efficiency, with 94% of its total cost spent on administration rather than compensation." So there's a bunch of fat cats getting rich off of the payment when what they seem to be doing is blocking anybody from actually getting compensated. That is absolutely so incredibly egregious.

Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

It's because ,as far as we can tell, there's virtually no money set aside to actually compensate people. The only money that's really there is to actually administer the program. So that percentage is probably lumping in the money that the program has, which is de minimis. You know, just, just to pay this one young lady who was injured is going to take millions of dollars, no doubt, in life care expenses. So if they've set aside, if there's a $5 million, that's, that'll help one person, if they're even willing to do it. And remember, they're not going to compensate her under this program for her pain and suffering. They're not going to compensate her for all the different harms she has. They will give her at most $50,000 in lost wages --she's in high school, she's not working-- and any unpaid medical expenses. And there's going to be a fight, probably, even if they agree to compensate her, on whether or not that, you know, what is considered a medical expense. But here's the thing with her is that so far, the four people and the other folks, what they've signaled is that for the most part, it looks like they're only going to limit, it looks like, time will tell, that they're going to limit this to folks with myocarditis and anaphylaxis. That appears to be what they're willing to admit effectively at this point, whether or not they'll actually, you know, this program may choose to take a different route on her situation, time will tell.

Del Bigtree

Alright, Aaron, I want to thank you for bringing this important case. This is why we do this. This is why when you and I first got together, when I was starting the Informed Consent Action Network at the end of 2016, we wanted to make a difference and you have been so instrumental in doing this. This case, I think, is critical. And so I want to thank you for bringing it. I think we've got the best guy in the house to do it. I know we could talk about all the incredible plaintiffs that are out there, but I think we get the idea and I don't want to hold up any more of your time. You've got so many brilliant cases I want you to focus back on, so thank you for taking the time and joining us today.
[01:35:01] Aaron Siri, Esq., Lead Counsel, ICAN Legal Team

Thank you.

[01:35:02] Del Bigtree

Alright, take care. Alright, folks, this is what I want to say. Emma is just one of the stories out there, paralyzed by a vaccine, is struggling to get through, and no one's compensating her, even when she's one of just a handful that they knowing, they stopped the vaccine program for a moment, the Johnson and Johnson, and then ended up putting warning labels for everybody else and never took care of her. So today, if for no other reason than Emma right now, that deserves to be compensated, and how many hundreds of thousands that don't even know about this program and the millions that are injured, we want liability back on the manufacturer. We want to say, get this government program out of the way and let these people that made and rushed this product out, skipped all their safety trials, let them be accountable. That is what we're trying to do here, and only you can make that happen. I can't stress this enough. You've watched the success that we've had. These are big cases. We're going up against government agencies. They're going to stall, they're going to try and get around it, and the only reason we're able to stand our ground and bring justice all the times we have is because you make this happen. Nearly 50% of all of the donations that come into The HighWire, Informed Consent Action Network actually go into the courtrooms around America to fight for you and people like Emma that deserve to be taken care of.

[01:36:25] Del Bigtree

Help us today. Help us make this happen. Become a recurring donor. All you have to do is go to the top of the page at thehighwire.com, hit donate to ICAN. This is such an important issue right now. Nobody else is going to do it. Nobody has the ability. We're asking you to donate, become a recurring donor. $23 a month would be great. You can't imagine what we can do with that if everybody watching right now gets involved. But I get it. Times are difficult. For some of you, maybe it's just a cup of coffee. Maybe it's $5 a month that you say, you know what, let me skip Starbucks on Wednesday and go ahead and put a donation in, because I'm not going to let people like Emma sit there, courageously put herself forward to try and stand for what's right and all the other kids, I'm not going to leave her alone, I'm going to get involved. This is how we do it. This is how you change the world. This is why we are seeing governments turn around and say, maybe we've pushed too hard. It's because we are pushing so hard, and we're winning. I want to win more. There's so much that needs to be done and I need your help right now. Please become a recurring donor. We'll make it easy for you. Just text us right now. Text the number 72022. Write donate in your phone. And when you send that, you'll get an easy link back that will help us bring this case, that will not only hopefully take care of Emma the rest of our lives, but it will stop this fraud and stop the cover up and stop the ability for these manufacturers to do studies of ten mice and then stand in front of us on television and tell all of us to get it, it's perfectly safe.

[01:38:02] Del Bigtree

This is what we do here at the Informed Consent Action Network and this educational program, The HighWire, you make that possible. For every one of you that has already been donating and helped us win all these cases, thank you for all of your support. We are truly changing the world. You're a part of our network. Become a part of this family, The Informed Consent Action Network. I hope you'll make that happen today. We're talking about courage. We're talking about people that are changing the dynamics. And when you look at the UK, changing their dynamics around these situations, today, I want to talk to you, one of those courageous individuals that pushed back in England. One of the great heart doctors from really a legacy and a family known for the great work they've done in medicine in the UK. Of course, I'm talking about Dr. Aseem Malhotra. We've had him on our show before. Boy, has this guy been speaking truth to power. In case you forgot, this is what that has looked like.

[01:38:59] Various speakers

Please give a very warm welcome to Dr. Aseem Malhotra.

[01:39:03] Various speakers

Welcome to the stage, Dr. Aseem Malhotra.

[01:39:05] Various speakers

That's Dr. Aseem Malhotra.

[01:39:07] Various speakers

Physician, cardiologist, medical researcher, and author.

[01:39:10] Various speakers

Dr. Aseem Malhotra, a global expert on health and disease.

[01:39:15] Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

I was one of the first people to take the jab. I helped out in a vaccine center. I was on Good Morning Britain helping tackle vaccine hesitancy. I did not conceive of the possibility that a vaccine could cause any real harm at all. It wasn't even anywhere in my brain. My father, who was a very prominent doctor in the U.K., he suffered a very shocking, unexplained sudden cardiac death in July of last year, 2021. And he was a very fit guy, healthy diet, I'd actually done some routine heart scans on him a few years earlier. But his postmortem findings did not make sense to me at all. You had two critical stenosis in his arteries, in other words, severe blockages in two of his arteries. And I couldn't explain it.

[01:39:59] Joe Rogan

How did you become this controversial COVID character?
Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

Well, it's interesting. My, I think controversy with me probably started a much, many years ago. I broke into the mainstream saying, why are we serving junk food to my patients in hospitals? I then went into a deep dive to try and understand why we had an obesity epidemic, what was driving poor health for many, many people, was biased and corrupted information that was coming from two big industries, Big Food and Big Pharma. Evidence-based medicine has been hijacked by powerful vested interests. Drug company-sponsored research shouldn't be determining medical decision-making at all. And we've seen the history of what they've done over the years. And that's at the root of our healthcare crisis. Overmedicated society, not just with a vaccine, is considered to be one of the leading causes of death after heart disease and cancer globally because of side effects. I think all cardiovascular conditions have got worse because of the vaccine. This vaccine is not safe and is not effective and it needs to be stopped and pulled now. As soon as your work threatens an industry or an ideological cabal, you will be attacked, sometimes unrelentingly and viciously. We need to stand up and speak the truth, because if we don't, speaking the truth is going to cause us more harm in the long term. History will not be on their side, and the public will not forgive them for it.

Del Bigtree

Well, it's a day full of heroes. This is a really big one. It's my honor and pleasure right now to be joined by Dr. Aseem Malhotra. Dr. Malhotra, I mean, it just, you have really taken it on in many ways in the UK, just such a powerful voice. First of all, you were on this program, I think it was December, so almost a year ago. You were sort of just really entering into this journey, and there's always pushback. There's, in so many doctors here in America, many of them have lost their licenses over these conversations. We just talked about a law that was going to try and strip doctors of their right to free speech. What kind of pushback have you dealt with? Where are you at right now? Is your license, you know, are you having any difficulties with your license in the UK right now?

Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

Del, thank you for having me on again, it's great to speak to you and I just want to reiterate also, thank you for all your work because this is a, you know, I see myself as a medium for a collective message, if you like, for humanity and then you are and The HighWire and yourself have been, you know, very prominent in this process, so thank you for everything you're doing too. In terms of the backlash, it's interesting. You know, there was a, I didn't expect that collage you'd put together, but there was a point where I think I said to Joe Rogan, as soon as you, and in fact to yourself, as soon as you threaten an industry or an ideological cabal, you will be attacked, sometimes unrelentingly and viciously, and you have to grow a rhinoceros hide. And not long after we spoke in Austin, I was called up by the BBC in January, early January 2020. In fact, this year, sorry, early January this year, I was called by the BBC to discuss whether or not we should be giving more people, healthy people, statin drugs, cholesterol-lowering drugs, one of the most prescribed and lucrative drugs in the history of medicine, because, over concerns of excess deaths, which I know you've covered and is an issue globally, our chief medical officer, only a few weeks earlier, had gone on TV and said that it may well be the reason why people have, the excess deaths have gone up, which are predominantly driven by heart disease, because people have stopped taking their statins and blood pressure pills.

Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

And the reality was that that was just simply not true. So they asked me to speak about this. And of course, in that interview, I decided that I had to discuss the elephant in the room, and I mentioned the fact that there had been a concern about the COVID vaccine and I'd done my own research on this, and there was more than enough evidence to call for its suspension. That video, that BBC news item went viral. I think it's currently close to 25 million views. In fact, people have said it's almost as many views for the BBC for a particular segment as a queen, the Queen of England's funeral so clearly that was. But as soon as that happened, and I was very pleased to get that out there, I knew there'd be a backlash. And within 24 hours, the lead story on the Guardian newspaper's website was, you know, BBC criticized for allowing cardiologist to make a false claim about the COVID jab. And that backlash, obviously, you know, is something that I expected, but of course, for me, Del, as I discussed with you, I saw that as a marker of progress. You know, I often quote Mahatma Gandhi who said, first they ignore you, then they laugh at you, then they fight you, then you win. So I saw that as a marker of progress. But in amongst all of that, I mean, ever since I even campaigned quite heavily and was part of a group of people that were successful in overturning vaccine mandates for health care workers towards the end of 2021, early 2022, I received a notification from a prestigious medical organization that was affiliated with that a number of anonymous complaints had come through from doctors saying that I was bringing that organization into disrepute by spreading misinformation on the COVID vaccine.

Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

So that was ongoing, that level of, I would say, harassment. But something since we spoke happened in the last few months, which is unprecedented in the history of British medicine. The General Medical Council are the organization, if you like, the regulatory body that controls doctors license to practice. And despite a number of complaints to them, from anonymous doctors predominantly, saying that I was spreading misinformation and therefore I should be investigated for my fitness to practice, they stood their ground and they said although they don't agree with my views, they didn't feel that I'd done anything to bring my fitness to practice into consideration, and therefore they did not, decided not to investigate me and they made it public. And a group of anonymous doctors are now currently suing the General Medical Council, are trying to take them to the High Court for not investigating Doctor Aseem Malhotra, myself, and that at the moment is in a pre-hearing stage with a judge, we don't know what's going to happen from that, but I think that's quite extraordinary and quite interesting that that's happening. Interesting in the sense that the General Medical Council felt that, you know, and I like to say, listen, Del, I think one thing I've learned in life is that people are not black and white. You know, there are shades of gray.
Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

I've heard mutterings from people close to the General Medical Council that there are people within there that are on my side and feel that, you know, Aseem Malhotra is raising legitimate concerns. He's probably the most prominent person or has been in the last decade speaking out against big pharma manipulations and if we go after him, who else have we got? And the thing is, Del, I also play with a straight bat. You know, it's a cricketing term. When I came out with my advocacy, I did it after very detailed research, after having published a peer-reviewed journal. I talk about the fact that I think there are rational explanations to understand system failures that have driven this problem in the first place around the COVID vaccine. So I think that probably has helped to give me some protection, if you like. But ultimately, as I said to you, Del, when I published my paper, even though I had warnings from colleagues and friends saying, you're going to lose your medical license, it, you know, it wasn't enough to stop me saying what I needed to say. And for the primary purpose of protecting my patients and doing my duty because if I didn't do that, I wouldn't be able to sleep at night.

Del Bigtree

You know, it's amazing to me, in one way, I think, isn't that how all doctors are supposed to act? I mean, the bar in so many ways has just been lowered where doctors are no longer held accountable for the, you know, just patient outcomes. Or when you look at this idea, I remember in California when I watched all, they lined up all of these pediatricians on the microphone to support the bill that would investigate any doctor that decided to write a medical exemption for someone that's got an autoimmune disease or something like that. And I just saw these people lined up. I was like, you're literally censoring yourself. You're asking for government agencies to now stand between doctors and patients, and you want to be supporting that. And in this case, to think doctors, even if you're wrong, let's just say you're wrong, but you're setting a precedence where you're demanding that a doctor be silenced for their opinion. How is it these people do not say that that's ultimately going to affect you. This is going to ruin your ability to investigate. What is going to happen to the future of science and integrity and advancement. How do you advance if every time you step out of consensus thinking and try something new, your own medical professionals and peers are going to say you shouldn't be allowed to do that. Are we just signing off here? Is this the end, is this is it, we're locked in, science is settled, we're not moving forward. No new cancer treatments, no new anything, because God forbid somebody steps out and has a different opinion. I mean, it's really crazy to me. It's like they're killing themselves.

Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

Del, you're absolutely right and you speak rationally, but unfortunately, we are living in a system that is broken and is irrational. And you've alluded to this even earlier on your program when you talk about biased studies. The system is broken and no amount of money itself will fix it. In fact, I would argue the opposite. Certainly when it comes to the United States, you spend 18% of your GDP, higher than any other country in the world for health care. You have amongst wealthy nations the worst health outcomes. You know, even pre-pandemic, Del, I mean, I came across a very startling figure recently, even pre-pandemic, the age-adjusted mortality rate in the United States compared to other, compared to average of other wealthy nations pre-pandemic, resulted in, results in an excess of half a million deaths per year. And that's, and you're spending $1.5 trillion more than the average compared to other countries. So we can, what I'm trying to do, and what I've been advocating for, is to try and help people understand how that's happened. And, you know, alluding to your point around this so-called craziness, all of what's going on with the so-called suppression of free speech, suppression of doctors, speaking out when it comes to highlighting concerns of patients and patient safety, is a product of the fact that we have these very powerful entities, I call them entities in this particular case, big pharma, that whose only purpose is to make profit for shareholders.

Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

And quite often, I would argue, maybe more often than not, in that process, actually behave in a way that can only be described as psychopathic. And what does that mean? Well, it means, you know, callous unconcern for the feelings of others, incapacity to experience guilt, repeated lying, deceitfulness and conning others for profit. And if you look, for example, at just the Pfizer mRNA vaccine, which we've discussed in a lot of detail, you know, that's made Pfizer about $100 billion in profits, it's probably the most lucrative medical product in the history of medicine. And yet, when you look at the, break the data down, you're also talking about a product which has extremely poor efficacy and comes with unprecedented harms, side effects, serious side effects. You mentioned the VAERS data recently. It's extraordinary when you think about it, absolutely astounding, you know, and the death rate could be because of the vaccine. One estimate published in BMC Infectious Diseases, although that paper, I must add, was retracted, not because of any error, but because it looks like the the editor was put under pressure. One estimate from a survey suggested there may be as many as 300,000 Americans that have died purely because of the vaccines and a million serious adverse events. I mean, these numbers are absolutely just extraordinary. So...

Del Bigtree

There's certainly, there's certainly enough to warrant investigation. There's certainly enough to warrant, you know, a warning, a pause. Let's not rush any more new boosters out, certainly not on the backs of ten mice. Maybe we should be a little bit more thorough moving forward. You have, you're coming to the States, you're such a clear voice, and it's really awesome. You have an amazing event coming to California. Just tell me a little bit about that, because I want to get into some of the things you're covering there too.
[01:52:52] Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

Yeah, sure. So this is taking place on the 28th of October in San Jose Civic Center, Northern California. I'm speaking alongside Dr. Vandana Shiva, who's an environmentalist who's been very prolific, pointing out all of the shortcomings when it comes to what's going on with the food industry and agriculture. Dr. Drew Pinsky, who's many people know as a household name in the United States, is going to be moderating. And, of course, my friend who is also going to come and give his perspective and in many ways offer political solutions because we need them, Robert Kennedy, Jr. is also going to be speaking, and we have some surprise guests as well, which I think is going to really startle the audience in a good way. But I don't want to give that away yet. And what, the aim of that conference is called Reclaiming Food & Medicine, Del, is multifold, but really what we want to do is get to the roots of the issue. Why American health care system is failing, what's driving chronic disease, empower individuals both on a health perspective, but also, as I've said earlier, the system is broken and this is, we can't sit back and just expect the authorities now to sort the problem out. I think there needs to be an increase in grassroots movement, and we want to help individuals know what they can do to try and clean up this broken system and this mess that we're in, this medical misinformation mess, this health misinformation mess.

[01:54:13] Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

You know, we're fighting for the soul of medicine, and to paraphrase in Martin Luther King said in the 60s that he was fighting to reclaim the soul of America from war, racism and poverty. I think those issues are still outstanding, very much so. But we really want to focus on how we can help people to lead the best possible lives they can mentally, socially and physically. So we're covering quite a lot in that conference. I wanted to be, certainly with everything I do, I always try and improve on what I've done before, and we're hoping that this conference will be certainly the best up to date health conference in the United States this year, potentially the world, I would like to say, and we're doing this, which is, you know, not for profit, no one's making any money out of this. We've, you know, fortunate to have a generous philanthropist from Australia called Adrian McRae, who has put the money down for the venue, which is a beautiful venue, San Jose Civic. I went to visit it recently, and I saw some amazing photographs of people that had actually performed there before, including the Rolling Stones and the Who, and I thought, wow, this is going to be quite an interesting place to have this event, but it's a beautiful venue and all ticket sales, of course, will make money back for Adrian, but anything excess is going to be given to charities. So this actually is an event's giving back to society in more ways than one.

[01:55:33] Del Bigtree

Here we are, folks, October 28th. It starts at noon. San Jose Civic Center. For events, tickets, ReclaimFoodAndMedicine is the bit.ly. I'll just very quickly, one of the things that I really love about this, and it's so true, our mission statement here at the Informed Consent Action Network, our nonprofit, is dedicated to eradicating man-made disease. That's not just pharmaceutical products, it's not just vaccines. It's also our food supply, which is something that, I love that you're branching out. And in many ways, I think that the vaccine issue is the tip of the spear of issues that are out there, but it's the one that's the most vivid right now, and that we really saw, for those of us that were awake enough to witness what happened, we saw the sausage being made right in front of our eyes. We watched the regulatory agencies become cheerleaders for a product instead of being the skeptical science body they should have been, which is saying, we're not going to rush this out until it proves to be effective and proves to be safe, you can count on that. Instead, before they were even into their trials, were saying, we guarantee you we're going to rush this out to you, which scared me to death. But it also is our food. You know, when we talk about, I talk about the rise of autoimmune disease and issues in America, especially. We are the sickest nation, certainly in the first world, of the first world nations, and really around the world. Highest levels of autoimmune disease, highest levels of neurological disorders, highest levels of drug and pharmaceutical use, so clearly the pharmaceutical industries are not making us healthier, and they happen to own all of our media and a good chunk of our government agencies. But what I loved, even in watching that sort of montage of your work, that what really brought you to sort of stepping outside of mainstream thinking was just food in hospitals. Why are we feeding people such crap when we got them, we're trying to heal them. Just quickly, is there a difference between big food, big ag, big pharma?

[01:57:45] Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine

There are many ways they're not, they're very similar. In fact, actually, Kelly Brownell, a professor from Yale of psychology and a lot of work on obesity and trying to understand what was driving it in the United States, actually wrote a great paper which people can look up. It's, for me, it was very empowering, and it helped me with my advocacy and certainly highlighting the harms of excess sugar in the UK and also influencing a soda tax over there. And it's called How Big Food Played Dirty, sorry, How Big Tobacco Played Dirty and Millions Died. How Similar is Big Food? And Del, you're absolutely right. If you look at the chronic disease pandemic across the world, for the United States, for example, six out of ten Americans have at least one chronic disease, whether it's heart disease, type two diabetes, cancer, high blood pressure, dementia, etcetera. I mean, that's a huge proportion of people who are suffering unnecessarily. You've unfortunately, even pre-pandemic, lost two years off of your life expectancy in the United States from 2014. You've got more and more people living unhealthier lifestyles. And again, that's a lot of unnecessary suffering. So for me, trying to understand the root cause of that, when you look at food and the food system, you know, the Lancet Global of Disease reports, just to give people some perspective in terms of the hierarchy of what may be most important, poor diet now is responsible for more disease and death globally than physical inactivity, smoking, and alcohol combined.
[01:59:06] Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine
So if we're going to fix health care, at the forefront of that means fixing the food. And, you know, I started my campaigning well over ten years ago on the issue of the fact that having an interest in food and how it was related to heart disease, I was trying to make sense of the fact that, you know, how did we allow our hospitals to become a branding opportunity for the junk food industry? 75% of the food purchased in hospital in the UK, I suspect, not dissimilar in the US, is ultra-processed junk food, Del. So how can we be as doctors and healthcare professionals advocating for improving people's health? Yet we are selling sickness on the hospital grounds. And that has been the result of Big Food's amazing success of making their ultra-processed junk foods available to anyone, anywhere, at any time, including even bedbound patients in hospitals, Del, that have had heart attacks, that can't leave the bed for more than 24 hours, so far at least 24 hours, where there are contracts with hospitals where they have to be taken to the bedside in trolleys, you know, sugary drinks, sodas, potato chips, candies. There are contracts that were created to make sure that happened. And then at the same time, we're trying to educate the public on healthy diets. So you can see there's a big conflict there.

[02:00:24] Del Bigtree
Amazing. Doctor Aseem Malhotra, I know you have a lot to do. You're going to be in the States. This is a really important conference and some really big, awesome voices. Dr. Drew Pinsky, also someone that's taken his television career, put it on the line. Of course, we all know Robert Kennedy, Jr. that's been fighting for transparency and science in almost every way of life. And Dr. Vandana Shiva, I mean, just a brilliant voice for the world's great lineup October 28th, 2023. I want to thank you for taking the time to join us today, but really, especially for your clarity. It's so beautiful when not only do we see a doctor and a scientist, someone that's willing to speak so openly but is so absolutely incredible at it. Dr. Seema Malhotra, you're just, you're a courageous leader in this very important time, and it's just an honor to know you.

[02:01:23] Aseem Malhotra, MD, Professor of Evidence-based Medicine
Likewise, Del, thank you so much.

[02:01:25] Del Bigtree
Alright, take care. I'll see you soon. Make sure you don't miss out on that event. San Jose. Look, you have so many friends in California. Drag them out, it's close. They come for a ride with me. Come listen to some of the great voices that have studied these things, are putting it all on the line. These are the types of events that are going to change people's lives, including your own. Alright, well, we're reaching near the end of our FreedomFiles. This is a group of interviews that we did while we were at FreedomFest in Memphis. We sat down with all sorts of great minds and speakers and things like that. And this week is Michael Shermer and Emily Austin. Michael Shermer is the editor, I believe it is, of Skeptic Magazine, Publisher, Founding Publishers of Skeptic Magazine, a science magazine that celebrates that it is the heart of science, which is skepticism, right? Asking the appropriate questions. Well, in our interview, I was a little surprised to find out that he'd stopped questioning something I knew a lot about. In fact, this may be one of the most heated interviews I've had in a long time. I don't know if I handled it really well, but you should see how it turned out. This is just a taste of what's dropping on Monday. And by the way, if you want to be seeing these FreedomFiles and other things that we're doing, get on that list, right. That newsletter list is how you'll be told when these things are dropping, thehighwire.com. I talked about it earlier, Canada, all around the world you better be on this list if you want our show when they're censoring you. We're probably okay in America, at least for a few more weeks, but please, get on our newsletter. This is one of the benefits. You're going to love this interview, I'm sure, because it's a rare moment when I get this intense.

[02:03:11] Michael Shermer, Founding Publisher, Skeptic Magazine
Let's clarify a couple of things. So there is a scientific method, there's the evidence. Now sometimes the evidence is clear, sometimes it's not.

[02:03:19] Del Bigtree
Agreed.

[02:03:19] Michael Shermer, Founding Publisher, Skeptic Magazine
It's alright to go on Joe Rogan and talk about it. I liked the fact that RFK Jr went on Rogan. I happen to think he's wrong about vaccines.

[02:03:27] Del Bigtree
Well, let's have this conversation now then, since you're well educated on it, I'd enjoy this.

[02:03:30] Michael Shermer, Founding Publisher, Skeptic Magazine
Part of this is the, what we call changing the goalpost, moving the goalpost. In fact, the original claim back in the 90s was that vaccines cause autism and other problems because of the mercury. Now, autism rates may not actually be increasing. The category may be expanding that more people are being diagnosed on the spectrum.

[02:03:51] Del Bigtree
Okay, let me challenge that, because I think that's one of the stupidest scientific statements ever made.
I want to thank Michael Shermer for doing that interview. Hopefully, somehow in this conversation, we can change some minds. I hope to, have another opportunity, but if you want to see how that all really turned out, get on our newsletter. That will drop Monday in the FreedomFiles. You know, I think this is a beautiful day, a bright, shining day in a very dark time. There is so much sadness and darkness in the world today, so many things that we would like to talk about or get into, but we are literally unable to address some issues because there is so much control over how we talk about it, how we share on it. We have stood here in The HighWire and one of the most controversial issues of all times in this vaccine space, in the health freedom space, in this idea that this crazy idea that you should actually be in charge of your own body. It used to be you couldn't talk like that, you were ridiculed, you were attacked by mainstream media. You were attacked by your social media groups. Well, now those attacks are beginning to quiet. Your social media groups are starting to ask those questions. The mainstream media will probably be the last to change, because it's owned by those dark lords that drive us into all the sickness and cancer that is spreading throughout this world and I don't just mean the cancer of our health, but the cancer of rage, anger, war, deceit, and lies.

But in the end, the people. This is a nation of people, we are all brothers and sisters. And as you can see, as the litmus test of the work that we've done here on The HighWire, very focused on a very specific set of issues but as controversial as anything could possibly be. What we've shown is that when brothers and sisters honor each other, when we start having intelligent conversations with each other, when we're not afraid to speak our truth, when we're not afraid to listen to a truth that may not line up with ours, but share our feelings and start to converse, we can see that we start seeing changes, not just in our households, not just in our neighborhoods, but as today, you are seeing government agencies having to repeal laws, having to repeal approaches that, as they said, may have been too hard-hitting. Now it's okay, you're going to get to choose whatever car you want to drive. We're actually going to let you have your freedom because you have stood in your freedom, and you've made it clear to these government agencies, even though through all the propaganda, we wanted you to believe you've had no power, your power we are now bowing down to today.

We have a power to create change. We have a power to bring truth. We also have the ultimate power to find love and to spread love. And right now, in these times around this world, no matter what side of the spectrum you are on, remember that every human being is our brother and sister. Some are misguided, some are lost, some are terrified, and we can always find in history, looking back, some reason to hate our neighbor, some excuse that will justify anything we do in this world. One day I pray we will stop looking in our rearview mirror. We will recognize that we are brothers and sisters together, we are grand when we stand together. And we will put aside all that we've done to each other, all that we can point to, and stand in who we are. All brothers and sisters, God's people. This is my prayer. This is what I feel like we have shown in the work that we've done. People can change their minds. We can evolve, we can win. Most importantly, we can love and we can be heroic. That's what The HighWire celebrates every single day, every week, no matter what's happening in the world. I look forward to seeing you every week, I'm glad that you're here, and I look forward to seeing you next week on The HighWire.