Bret Weinstein – The WHO's Dark Agenda

Below video is Tucker Carlson interview with biologist and podcaster Bret Weinstein.

PDF Transcript of Video Below

By Jeffrey A. Tucker

Tucker Carlson has conducted a brilliant interview with biologist and podcaster Bret Weinstein, who has been on the Covid case for a very long time. Weinstein speaks with erudition, expertise, and great precision about a number of features of the Covid response. Mercifully, Tucker lets him speak. I urge you to take an hour and watch the entire episode. The transcript is below my commentary.

The value added from this interview is truly incalculable. It's not only the reach, which quickly passed three million a day after its release. That's a vast number of influencers who now know what's what. We've been striving for nearly four years to get the word out on that scale, so congratulations to Tucker and to Weinstein.

More important is the fundamental message.

The Covid response was a fiasco for the ages, and it was never about public health, even if that was the rhetorical cover. It was about profits and power, a terrible truth that the public is going to be dealing with for many years to come, especially for what it says about the depth of corruption of the political system under which we live.

If you ever puzzle about the source of the loss of trust in our times, this interview is one of your best sources. It also has the advantage of having processed the stream of studies

and revelations over four years and putting them all into a single package. What's striking here is something that I did not recognize when my first book on the topic came out. The promise of the magic antidote to the virus was not ancillary but central to the "all-of-government" and "all-of-society" response that was undertaken.

Indeed, I had never thought about vaccines much either way when the lockdowns swept all before them. Based on my reading, it seemed obvious to me that you cannot vaccinate your way out of a coronavirus pandemic so I was mystified as to why they were attempting this. Beyond that I had no well-formed views. Plus, at some point early on, Fauci himself said we wouldn't need a vaccine to get out of the pandemic. "If we can get the R0 to less than 1, the epidemic will gradually decline and stop on its own without a vaccine," he wrote on March 2, 2020. Discovering that email put me off the trail.

As I later thought about that, I realized that the statement is ridiculous. An R0 less than 1 means that the virus is already endemic, in which case a vaccine would not be needed in any case. But "social distancing" could not possibly achieve that alone. R0 is a measure after the fact, not a determinant of viral dynamics. The R0 measures virus spread; it doesn't instruct or dictate to the virus what to do. Even if you could drive down the infection rate by putting everyone in their own cardboard box, the virus doesn't give up. It's there lying in wait for more spread the instant one goes back to normal.

Why would Fauci make such a statement? Probably to prolong the time of compliance with the lockdown edicts that were going to arrive two weeks later. He knew that he needed many months, ideally (and implausibly) to keep the frenzy going all the way until past the election in November, so that Trump would lose (having destroyed the economy) and then the deep state would be firmly in charge.

Bret doesn't focus on all those specifics but he does give a detailed explanation of what is wrong with the mRNA shots. Here he is uncommonly clear. Like you, I've encountered so many claims and issues here, and speculations on the harm as well as theories why, that it all becomes a bit disorienting and difficult keeping all the information sorted, at least for non-experts like me.

This interview clears up so much, namely concerning the brilliance of the technology but also its difficulty in gaining approval for use. In Bret's view, mRNA tech has long been a coveted asset of pharmaceutical companies, simply as intellectual property. Those with their names on the active patents stood to become very rich, pending approval.

> *Roger Daltrey, singer for classic British rock band "The Who" – "Daltrey – whose sister died from breast cancer aged just 32 – expresses reservations about the scientific establishment's approach to finding a cure for the disease cancer.*
>
> *'I don't think they'll ever find a cure for cancer', says Daltrey. 'I don't think they want to find a cure. I'm being cynical here, but scientists look after the science but they also look after themselves. You do imagine if they did find a cure tomorrow it would be fabulous for the country, but there'd be an awful lot of scientists out of work. You might think I'm being cynical, but I do think that'." – "'It's just human nature, isn't it?', he says. 'You're not going to invent something that's going to put you out of work'."*
>
> *Citation – [The Gateway Pundit]*

As a platform technology, it allows the time passage from sequencing to final product to be reduced to a matter of days. In that case, the sheer number of products that could be produced by replacing existing products, and not only vaccines, is vast. Some 30 years had gone by without a product

that could pass federal approval and the industry had become quite impatient, awaiting some big bang to give them an opportunity.

Covid was the moment to bypass normal testing standards and get it out to the masses of people worldwide under the cover of emergency use. Bret doesn't mention this, but it fits exactly with the facts we have. The first (and really only) vaccine to be withdrawn from the market belonged to J&J and was not an mRNA technology. It became pretty obvious at this point that the FDA and Fauci were privileging mRNA shots and seeking to crush the competition. At least that was obvious to me pretty early on.

The bigger picture, the ominous reality, was slow to dawn on me, namely that the mRNA platform technology for the release of the gene therapy wrongly called a vaccine was central to the entire Covid response. Without understanding that, we miss the forest for the trees. It was the driving motivation for the initiation of lockdowns – together with other political machinations – and their absurd prolongation.

When shot uptake was not as widespread as expected, the mandates under the Biden administration took hold, and the supposed emergency had to be continued on and on. When it became clear that the vaccines were not effective for stopping infection or transmissions, and whatever good they did was so short-lived, the strategy had to turn toward marketing boosters, which in turn required ever more emergency-based public frenzy.

Realizing all of this truly does take one's breath away. When you consider the scale of the damage to the whole society and entire world, all for purposes of patent piracy and fast-tracking a technological deployment, one almost cannot imagine that any government could be so captured and corrupt. It seems to stretch the bounds of plausibility and yet here we are.

Knowing all of this helps frame up some of the mysteries of the time, such as the wild and aggressive censorship. To manage a caper on this scale required the creation of the appearance of consensus. The point was to prepare the way for the vaccine rollout, which everyone was supposed to regard as their salvation from lockdowns, masks, and closures.

Remember, too, that many deep state actors benefit from a strong censorship apparatus, not just pharma but also the national security state, which was intimately involved from the beginning. It's why the edict of March 13 put the National Security Council in a position of rule-making authority and assigned the CDC only an operations role. The crackdown on "misinformation" had become a government-wide priority by then.

Anyone who broke the woven narrative, claiming that such was not necessary and that this wave of respiratory infections would end like every other wave in the history of the world, and, moreover, the actual medical threat was severely limited to a small population cohort of the elderly and infirm, was ipso facto an enemy of the state. That is obviously why stating plain truths of traditional public health – such as you find in the Great Barrington Declaration – was not allowed and why any such attempt had to be subjected to a "quick and devastating takedown," in the words of Francis Collins of the NIH.

Bret Weinstein makes the salient point that the entire plot was foiled by the sheer number of dissidents that were there from the beginning and grew over time. These, he said, shocked the creators of this industrial scheme, because they figured that they had the media, government, and big tech all wrapped up in a bow and that no serious dissidence would ever happen. The ranks of the dissidents grew and grew for two years and reached the multitudes in popular podcasts and writings, as well as new institutions such as Brownstone.

Bret says this is success but it also portends something terrible in the future. In the next go-round, says Bret, the powers that be want to make sure that there is not a repeat. The censorship will be tighter, and the penalties for going against the government's plan will be more severe. They have learned from this experience, and their takeaway is not that such absurdities didn't work but that they were too lenient this time around. They plan to make sure that this doesn't happen next time.

Here we get to the World Health Organization, which has issued a fatwa against disinformation and has greenlighted censorship on a global level. YouTube and Google are already captured and doing the institution's bidding, as is the European Union. They will use the next several years to tighten the screws and get every nation roped into a pandemic accord that will obligate every government to censor and vaccinate one way or another. In other words, they have learned nothing except for the wrong lessons.

This was probably the most intuitively correct and ominous part of the entire interview.

Naively, many of us figured that after this awful experience with lockdowns, masks, and mandates that such would never be attempted again. But that is not where we are today. There is a reason we haven't heard any high-profile apologies or admissions of wrongdoing. The reason is that there was never a purpose to do the right thing. It was an industrial takeover from the beginning, a perfect corporatist scheme for gaining a major advantage in the wars for pharmaceuticals and their future. The rest of the "Great Reset" was just taking advantage of the ensuing chaos.

Bret ends his interview on an optimistic note. The sheer number of people deplatformed and silenced is huge, and they are certainly not without intelligence, wherewithal, reach, and motivation to fight back. They now form a huge

counterforce of correct information. They aren’t going anywhere. With enough people becoming aware, it is possible to stop this and change the trajectory. We have to believe that the whole world is not completely consumed by greed and corruption and that there is still room for high ideals and the innate human longing to be free. – Return Video at Top –