

# **THE MODEL HEALTH SHOW**

**EPISODE 517**

**The FDA's Vaccine Advisory  
Meeting & Another Blockbuster  
Drug Recall**

**You are now listening to The Model Health Show with Shawn Stevenson. For more, visit [themodelhealthshow.com](http://themodelhealthshow.com).**

**SHAWN STEVENSON:** Welcome to The Model Health Show. This is fitness and nutrition expert Shawn Stevenson, and I'm so grateful for you tuning in with me today. On today's episode, we're going to be diving into the FDA's vaccine advisory meeting. This is one of the most important reports that we've ever covered. There's obviously a lot of debate and a lot of controversy swirling around the new policies that are being made, and also the jurisdiction of the FDA and governmental agencies. So, we're going to look into the data and actually see what's going on behind the scenes. And to do that, we're going to need to think logically, to hold a place of rationality, of patience, of understanding. And really help to break these pieces apart so that we understand it in a complete fashion, more of a metaperspective, and then we can zoom in and look at the individual pieces. Now, you might be wondering why a lot of folks aren't able to do that today. A lot of this is very emotionalized, and people are really tying their identities to the different decisions that are being made. And we want to take a step back from that and also understand that here in our culture, if we're really being honest, we're not doing well as far as our health, as far as our mental health, as far as the overall functionality and health of our brains, for example.

Neurological diseases are skyrocketing. And even simple nutrient deficiencies can dramatically suppress and depress our cognitive ability, our ability to perspective-take. If we think about the prefrontal cortex, the part of our brain that is really what makes us human, that's responsible for social control, for distinguishing between right and wrong, for forethought and mapping things out, these executive functions. And this part of the brain can dramatically be suppressed. Again, suppressed, and depressed when we are deficient in key nutrients when we're deficient in sleep. Researchers at UC Berkeley did some brain imaging scans and looked at the sleep-deprived brain. They found that just a short sleep debt dramatically suppresses the activity in the prefrontal cortex. That part of the brain "goes cold." While they also noted that being sleep deprived credibly increases the activity of the amygdala, that part of the brain that activity gets heightened. And the amygdala is more associated with emotional reactions and things that are really driven more with survival. Right? And so if you're wondering why it's such a complicated terrain and there seems to be a lack of logic, a big part of that is our overall health as a society.

You know, I've shared these statistics many, many times, and I'm going to continue to share them. But in the United States, we're knocking on the door of almost 250 million of our citizens being overweight or obese. The number is very difficult for us to logically wrap our minds around. Not a million. Not 10 million. Not 100 million. Not 200 million. 250 million. We're knocking on the door of that. It's beyond an epidemic, and it's been happening for decades.

This build-up has been taking place, and yet we've done nothing about it as a society. As a matter of fact, the entities that are controlling a lot of our decisions have been profiting mightily, and this is just the truth, off of our collective sickness. And so that's just one issue. Also, 130 million of our citizens are diabetic or pre-diabetic. 60% of US citizens have some degree of heart disease already. 115 million Americans are regularly sleep-deprived. I'm talking about how sleep deprivation impacts our cognitive performance, for example. The list goes on and on. It's an incredibly complex terrain that we're dealing with. It's not one thing that's going to fix everything, but it's paying attention to the things that our genes expect of us. And a big part of that, obviously, is providing our brain with the fundamental things that actually enable our brain to function.

And so our brains are really operating on this miraculous electrical currency. And how are they able to do that? Well, a big part of that is very simple tenets in nutrition. Which nutrients have this electrical conductivity? That is the category of electrolytes. Take sodium, for example. Not only does this electrolyte help to maintain proper water balance in that amazing brain of yours, but a study conducted by researchers at McGill University found that sodium literally functions as an on-off switch in the brain for specific neurotransmitters that support healthy optimal function and protect the brain against numerous diseases. That's just one essential electrolyte. Another one: A fascinating study published in the journal *Neuron* found that magnesium is able to restore critical brain plasticity and improve cognitive function. And neuroplasticity is the ability of the brain to change and adapt. We need that now more than ever. So, these are two primary electrolytes, and the third being potassium.

And having the right ratio is critical right now. And this is why I'm such a massive proponent of making sure that you're getting high-quality sources for your electrolytes to literally provide your brain with the essential currency that it's run on. For that, you get a free sample of the leading electrolytes in the world today. No binders, fillers, artificial sweeteners, none of that stuff, no sugar. Just the nutrients that we need for optimal performance. And electrolytes aren't just for our cognitive performance. That sodium-potassium pump is a driver of our mitochondria, of really every cell in our bodies. And so being deficient in these key electrolytes is definitely a big concern today. And we're seeing this in the data even when it comes to COVID-19. A meta-analysis published in the *Annals of Clinical Biochemistry*, titled "Electrolyte imbalances in patients with severe coronavirus disease COVID-19." And it analyzed five studies with nearly 1500 patients with COVID-19 and found that both sodium and potassium were significantly lower in patients with severe COVID-19 coming into the hospital, they found this. So the question is, is their electrolyte deficiency leading to a higher risk of infection, higher rate of susceptibility, or is this viral infection or any viral infection taxing the electrolytes in the system that are needed for recovery?

Now, these are the things that we can expand on, explore more, but it takes for the researchers to ask these questions, but we know for certain that electrolytes matter. Again, you get to try it for free, go to [drinklmnt.com/model](http://drinklmnt.com/model), that's [drinklmnt.com/model](http://drinklmnt.com/model) and they're going to send you a free sample pack of their incredible electrolyte formula. Alright, all you need to do is pay a tiny bit of shipping, and they're going to send it right to your front door to try. And if you've already taken advantage of this incredible free offer, this is the time, again, we want to make sure that our system is charged up, our brains are charged up, because we've got a lot of work to do, and we've got a big mission ahead to help to transform the health of our families and our communities. Again, go to [drinklmnt.com/model](http://drinklmnt.com/model). And something else critical for cognitive function are essential fats. Researchers at Yale University published data reporting that MCTs, medium-chain triglycerides, can readily cross the blood-brain barrier and be utilized by your brain cells. A remarkable study published in the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences sought to find out if MCTs could have an impact on improving the condition of patients with Alzheimer's disease.

The scientists noted in the study that MCTs are quickly metabolized by the liver, prompting the production of ketones, those ketones are easily able to cross the blood-brain barrier and provide an alternative fuel for the glucose-impaired brain cells of Alzheimer's patients, and the scientists found that consumption of MCTs directly led to improved cognitive function in mild to moderate forms of Alzheimer's disease and cognitive impairment. These are essential nutrients, MCTs. This is something that I have literally every day. I have the MCTs, the medium-chain triglyceride from [onnit.com](http://onnit.com), go to [onnit.com/model](http://onnit.com/model). You're going to get 10% off their incredible MCT oil. They have the original MCT oil and they're sourcing it, this is the thing, you don't run out and get company X's MCT oil, it's very likely not going to have that same high quality and standard in sourcing and done the right way than Onnit does. They go above and beyond to make sure that you're getting the purest toxin-free MCT oil. They also have an incredible emulsified MCT oil, which is kind of like a coffee creamer, my favorite is the Almond latte, the almond milk latte flavor. So, pop over there. Check them out, [onnit.com](http://onnit.com), that's [onnit.com/model](http://onnit.com/model) for 10% off. Now, let's get to the Apple Podcast review of the week.

**ITUNES REVIEW:** Another five-star review titled unbiased fact-based and well-researched by “Ms. Driver”, “The Model Health Show is amazing, Shawn Stevenson puts his heart and soul into his passion for getting information to people to improve their health. He supports his episode topics with well-researched data and articles. His open-minded approach motivates you to take your health into your own hands by researching data to make informed decisions that are right for you. Thank you, Shawn, and keep these great episodes coming, your passion, fire, and humor make The Model Health Show so enjoyable to watch and to listen to. You're killing it.”

**SHAWN STEVENSON:** Thank you so much, and we'll do. I appreciate you so much for leaving that review over on Apple Podcast, and listen, if you've yet to do so, please pop over to Apple Podcast and leave a review for The Model Health Show. And on that note, let's get to our topic of the day. Today we're diving into the FDA's vaccine advisory meeting, where the board members and expert advisors weighed in on whether or not to approve the use of Pfizer's booster shot. An alarm was actually raised by several experts due to a substantial lack of safety and efficacy data. To understand how we got from there to here, we need to first take a look at the efficacy of the original mRNA vaccine trials that fostered the newly invented emergency use authorization tag. Now, the reason that we need to look at the original mRNA vaccine trials is to see the pattern of behavior, because the data that we're about to cover demonstrates that Pfizer and Moderna already have a sort of questionable history in reporting from their mRNA clinical trial data. The Moderna and Pfizer vaccine trials were conducted as expected with a control group. This is a group within the trial, who were given a placebo and not the actual vaccine.

However, during the trial and after the vaccines were given emergency use authorization, the vaccine companies conducting the trials decided to break protocol and notify the control group that they were not really given the vaccine. This is supposed to be a blinded trial, a placebo-controlled blinded study, but they broke protocol and notified the control group during the trial that they were not really given the vaccine. These test subjects in the control group were then offered the opportunity to be vaccinated and a huge percentage of the control group were then given the vaccine under the guise that it was the righteous thing to do to offer to them so that they're not left out of this miraculous protection that was deemed to be given with this fast-tracked vaccine, even though it broke the very Code of Conduct in research that was used to get the vaccines approved for use in the first place. Dr. Carlos Fierro who ran one of the clinical trials, says every participant was called back after the FDA authorized the vaccine. "During that visit, we discussed the options, which included staying in the study without the vaccine," staying a member of the control group even though they were now un-blinded.

He says, "and amazingly, there were people, a couple of people who chose that." Who chose to stay a part of the control group, even though they were now un-blinded and understanding we have blinded controls because of the influence of just our psychology on the response of our biology? Our thoughts create chemistry in our bodies, so now our perception of the medication that we may or may not have taken is going to be influenced, our bodies are going to respond differently, knowing whether or not we're actually taking said drug. So, there are multiple layers here, and even though they chose to not get the vaccine and to remain a part of the control group who are unvaccinated, now their psychology has shifted and that's playing a part as well. Again, this is the clinical trial data that the pharmaceutical companies were using

to get approval from the FDA, and they were just like, you know what? We're not going to finish this out like we said we would. They intentionally un-blinded the test subjects out of the kindness of their hearts to give them the new vaccine, and by doing so, intentionally eliminating some of the most vital data that was promised to come from these trials.

Dr. Steven Goodman, a clinical trial specialist at Stanford University says, losing both control groups make it more difficult to answer some important questions about COVID-19 vaccines. "We don't know how long protection lasts." And he says, "we don't know efficacy against variants for which we definitely need a good control arm, and we also don't know if there are any differences in any of these parameters by age or race or infirmity." Now, he was talking about the vital data that could be gathered about protection against variants, about how long does protection last, and other major things that could be gathered from clinical trials that simply were not done. This deceitful decision happened months ago before we found out that the promised protection doesn't last very long before we found out that their subpar efficacy against variants before we saw how clearly that these vaccines don't reduce transmission in a substantial way versus being unvaccinated. Could we have learned a lot more if the placebo group remained a placebo group? Absolutely. The report goes on to say, "Clinical trials that include a placebo group are the surest and most definitive ways to gather information about vaccine effectiveness.

Things are getting crazy. Already, we're seeing that there's an issue here with the very beginning of the data being submitted to the FDA and things not really panning out as promised. So, let's just start here. If you actually want to see how two sets of people fare in this pandemic, those who are vaccinated versus those who are unvaccinated with true controlled variables, then it's fraudulent to suddenly pull the plug on the placebo group, but fraudulent behavior isn't anything new to Pfizer. Pfizer was convicted of criminal activity in order to pay the largest healthcare fraud settlement in the history of the Department of Justice, in the history of the United States Department of Justice for fraud. This isn't made up. It is. Pfizer was ordered to pay \$2.3 billion for their fraudulent activities, and this is only what they got caught doing. Trust and believe, they have the most powerful legal team in the universe. Aliens, the aliens, the people who see it today, the alien footage, the aliens are coming to study pharmaceutical company's lawyers, alright, they're just like, these folks have the power over the globe, right?

But seriously though, Pfizer also pushed... And so, this is them getting convicted of a massive healthcare fraud, but Pfizer also pushed Prempro to the market, a drug used to treat symptoms of menopause with questionable safety data and ended up causing breast cancer in countless victims and eventually paying out over a billion dollars for their crime, which again, to them, it's nothing, it's nothing. Now I want you to keep in mind, it takes a minor miracle to

get justice for the people who are injured, who have their lives destroyed, or even die from the negligence of pharmaceutical companies and the entities that profit from them. This is just how our system works and we're going to talk more about that. What does the actual data show? The peer-reviewed evidence on this statement. Now, just this week, as of this recording, another one of Pfizer's billion-dollar drugs was finally pulled from the market, being that smoking is a significant cause of cancer, the smoking cessation drug from Pfizer called Chantix was a massive hit. Take Chantix to help you to quit smoking, so that you can reduce your risk of cancer, but Chantix was pulled from the market this week because it... You guessed it, increases your risk of cancer. This is poetry. You just can't make this stuff up.

Now, you hear stories like this, and it makes you wonder, were there any warning signs, were there any early warning signs from the clinical trials that got Chantix approved in the first place? And I'll let you check it out for yourself. Check out this commercial from Chantix and yes, this is a real commercial.

*Herb quit smoking with Chantix and support. Talk to your doctor about Chantix and a support plan that's right for you. Some people have had changes in behavior, hostility, agitation, depressed mood, and suicidal thoughts or actions while taking or after stopping Chantix. If you notice agitation, hostility, depression, or changes in behavior, thinking, or mood that are not typical for you or if you develop suicidal thoughts or actions, stop taking Chantix and call your doctor right away. Talk to your doctor about any history of depression or other mental health problems which can get worse while taking Chantix. Some people can have allergic or serious skin reactions to Chantix, some of which can be life-threatening. If you notice swelling of face, mouth, throat, or a rash, stop taking Chantix and see your doctor right away. Tell your doctor which medicines you're taking as they may work differently when you quit smoking. Chantix dosing may be different if you have kidney problems. The most common side effect is nausea. Patients also reported trouble sleeping and vivid, unusual or strange dreams. Until you know how Chantix may affect you, use caution when driving or operating machinery. Chantix should not be taken with other quit-smoking products.*

*The urges weren't like they used to be and that helped me quit.*

*Talk to your doctor to find out if prescription Chantix is right for you.*

**SHAWN STEVENSON:** Most of the commercials was side effects. The side effects aren't just pulled out of the air, these are things that the red flags get raised during the clinical trials. It was mostly side effects. Hopefully, you watched the video of this episode so that you can see the studies on screen. You can also see these commercials with yourself because it's definitely entertaining. Go to [themodelhealthshow.com/booster](http://themodelhealthshow.com/booster). That's where you're going to find the

exclusive video for this episode, [themodelhealthshow.com/booster](http://themodelhealthshow.com/booster). Now, that commercial reads a bit like a suspense movie as they're breaking down all the possible things that can go wrong. And speaking of suspense movies, we've got another commercial from Chantix, this time with movie star Ray Liotta. Yeah, Ray Liotta, from Goodfellas, from Unlawful Entry, from Cop Land. Check out what Mr. Ray Liotta has to say about Chantix.

*Ray Liotta: I'm Ray and I quit smoking with Chantix. I tried cold turkey, I tried the patch, they didn't work for me. I didn't think anything was going to work for me until I tried Chantix.*

*Chantix along with support helps you quit smoking.*

*Ray Liotta: Chantix reduced my urge to smoke. I needed that to quit.*

*When you try to quit smoking with or without Chantix, you may have nicotine withdrawal symptoms. Some people have changes in behavior or thinking, aggression, hostility, agitation, depressed mood, or suicidal thoughts or actions with Chantix. Serious side effects may include seizures, newer, worst, heart, or blood vessel problems. Sleepwalking or allergic and skin reactions, which can be life-threatening. Stop Chantix and get help right away if you have any of these. Tell your health care provider if you've had depression or other mental health problems. Decrease alcohol use while taking Chantix. Use caution when driving or operating machinery. The most common side effect is nausea.*

*Ray Liotta: I can't tell you how good it feels to have smoking behind me.*

*Talk to your doctor about Chantix.*

**SHAWN STEVENSON:** Some of the side effects can be aggression and hostility. We don't need Ray Liotta with any more aggression or hostility. And as Ray is taking Chantix, he has no idea that it increases your risk of swimming with the fishes. It's now pulled off the market after making billions for Pfizer due to it being a carcinogen, a source of carcinogens, cancer-causing agents. Now, again, it's a revolving door of dangerous drugs being sold to trusting citizens, then massive amounts of people being injured or even killed, but this isn't just Pfizer, this is an industry-wide system of corruption by drug companies. A report from the International Journal of Health Services found that in a recent 17-year time span in the United States, unsafe drugs were prescribed more than 100 million times before being recalled. This is just the stuff that they caught, a hundred million times before the drugs are recalled. The EJS Center for Ethics at Harvard University states that properly prescribed drugs, properly prescribed drugs cause nearly two million hospitalizations every year, and another 840,000 hospitalized patients are



given inappropriate medications that cause serious adverse reactions. For a total of nearly 3 million serious adverse drug reactions every year, every year.

The Harvard researchers reported that approximately 200,000 of Americans die every year at the hands of pharmaceutical companies. Approximately 200,000 Americans die every year from prescription drugs here in the United States. How often do you hear anything about that? The Center for Ethics at Harvard states "The FDA does not acknowledge these facts and instead gathers a small fraction of the cases." And that's the thing, pharmaceutical companies don't do this kind of damage alone. Health care providers, government officials, the media, and of course the FDA have all been complicit in the damage that pharmaceutical companies are doing and the billions in profits that they're making annually, and they're all getting a hefty slice from it. This is not just conjecture. We did a master class recently on the FDA, so definitely check that out if you haven't done so, it is incredibly eye-opening. But some of the key points from that. You would think of the FDA would, "crackdown" on these deadly incidents. Again, 200,000 Americans killed every year from pharmaceutical drugs. They crack down on these incidents to protect US citizens, but then you'd be failing to realize that pharmaceutical companies actually provide the FDA with nearly half of their overall budget, and pharmaceutical companies provide upwards of 75% of the FDA's scientific review budget.

In fact, pharmaceutical companies provide billions of dollars in funding to the FDA every year. Not millions, not hundreds of millions, billions, with a B. The very organization responsible for regulating drug companies is massively funded by those same drug companies, and we talk more about why that is in that masterclass on the FDA, but here's an analysis that was published in the Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics titled Institutional Corruption of Pharmaceuticals and the Myth of Safe and Effective Drugs. The study states, "The pharmaceutical industry has corrupted the practice of medicine through its influence over what drugs are developed, how they are tested, and how medical knowledge is created, and heavy commercial influence has compromised Congressional legislation to protect the public from unsafe drugs." The report goes on to state that, "The authorization of user fees in 1992 has turned drug companies into the FDA's prime clients, deepening the regulatory and cultural capture of the agency. Industry has demanded shorter average review times and, with less time to thoroughly review evidence, increased hospitalizations and deaths have resulted. Meeting the needs of the drug companies has taken priority over meeting the needs of patients. Unless this corruption of regulatory intent is reversed, the situation will continue to deteriorate."

What are some of the other results seen by this corrupted system where the FDA is funded massively by pharmaceutical companies itself? Well, the FDA's rejection of new drugs has plummeted since they began being financed by pharmaceutical companies, and they've also

during this time span approved some of the most deadly drugs in history, including the opioids that have killed about half a million American citizens. Not only do pharmaceutical companies provide the FDA with massive amounts of funding that would clearly be a conflict of interest, the FDA and pharmaceutical companies also engage in a revolving door of sharing employees. People leaving the FDA and getting cushy jobs at pharmaceutical companies or going from pharmaceutical companies and coming on board at the FDA, and all of this insider information innately being there. For example, the former FDA commissioner, Scott Gottlieb, left the FDA. The FDA commissioner left the FDA and joined Pfizer as a member of its board of directors, just prior to the beginning of the pandemic in 2019. And overall, nearly 30% of FDA employees leave the FDA and get high-paying jobs at pharmaceutical companies.

This would logically make you wonder what the FDA employees may be doing to ensure their cushy jobs later to get in the good graces of pharmaceutical companies and the rewards that they're seeing later on. Now, there's also an approval board of physicians working with the FDA, who are responsible for reviewing the pharmaceutical company's data for their drugs and clear the drugs for approval if they choose. That's what we're talking about today. The approval board for the FDA looking at these booster shots. Now, an analysis published in the Journal of Science found that nearly 40% of the physician advisors on FDA approval boards received money from pharmaceutical companies at some point after they approved a drug. It might have been three months later, it might have been a year later, but somehow money from the pharmaceutical company lands in the pockets of the physicians in the form of cash payments, grants, or other means. Money was also found changing hands when certain drugs were not approved. The report also tracked payments received from the competitors of drug companies seeking approval.

Now, this unethical behavior is so business as usual that the numbers aren't even hidden. This is not difficult to find. And it's become such a part of that culture where it's just like, we're not paying you to vote to approve our drug right now because that would be too obvious. Six months later though, funny enough, the pharmaceutical company sends some money or provides a grant to that FDA advisory member. So, it's just like, oh, nobody... It's nine months later. It doesn't count. And this is how you start to see how the game is played, unfortunately. And if you look at what are the results of that, and you look at the phenomenon of so many drugs getting approved that are later recalled because they end up killing people, this is not a rare occasion, this is happening daily. And these foundational principles that are guiding and controlling these systems that we're all looking to right now, we're looking at the headlines to see, what's the FDA say? It's a foundation, it's an undercurrent of corruption and unethical behavior, and it just... It is. It is.

Now, what about government officials who also helped to create the policies that enable drug companies to get away with this stuff, and also enable the drug companies to profit mightily from our society's collective sickness, and enable these drug companies, as mentioned, to avoid punishment for the vast majority of crimes that they commit? Because this is a fact. These legal teams, the vast majority of crimes that they commit, the vast majority of people that they harm, they get away with it. So, what about the government officials who help create these policies? Well, approximately, this is a new report, approximately two-thirds of all US Congress members received payments from pharmaceutical companies in 2020. Come on. Come on. They make it too easy. They make it too easy to call 'em out. I mean, it's just again... How are we allowing this to happen? It makes no sense whatsoever. Except people... They have their own agenda. It's not to say that these politicians aren't bad people, but they have their own agenda. They're trying to push their policy through, they're trying to get elected, trying to do whatever it takes, so they can help people. Many of them have that perspective. So, if that means that they're getting some money from pharmaceutical companies, so be it. The pharmaceutical companies are supposed to be helping and serving and all those good things.

They don't know, they don't know the data, and if they do, and they still take that money, that's when I have a problem. Now, while the drug industry gave money to a broad range of candidates, it focused in particular on those on key committees that oversee healthcare legislation. Now, what about the media? Why aren't major news networks exposing the corruption and all of the damage being done to US citizens? Why isn't this getting exposed? Why isn't this front-page news? Why isn't this breaking news? Well, major news networks receive billions of dollars in funding from pharmaceutical companies. They're paying their bills. You don't bite the hand that feeds you. That's not going to happen. Nearly every major news network in the United States also shares at least one board member with at least one pharmaceutical company. Former Washington Bureau Chief and Professor of Political Science at Harvard University, Dr. Paul Weaver states, "The news media and the government are entwined in a vicious circle of mutual manipulation, myth-making, and self-interest. Journalists need crises to dramatize news, and government officials need to appear to be responding to the crises. Too often, the crises are not really crises but joint fabrications. The two institutions have become so ensnared in a symbiotic web of lies that the news media are unable to tell the public what is true, and the government is unable to govern effectively."

The news, public health officials, the FDA... Taking advice from any of these entities or anyone spouting off the talking points of these entities is very close to insanity. It's like grabbing your running shoes, slipping them on, and then tying both of your shoes together, tying them to each other, and then taking off on a full sprint. It's abandoning logic. And you're going to bust your ass. That's what it's like, taking the advice of public health officials, of the FDA, of the news, and unfortunately, millions of our citizens are so inundated with these voices, with these

corrupt entities perspective about how things should be done, that they can't even see that they're tying their shoes together. So, the first thing is for us to make sure that we're not tying our own shoes together, alright? Maybe we don't even have shoestrings, maybe we have the slip-on joints, maybe we do some slip-on for the jogging, to go jogging. But from there, we can start to demonstrate so that others can see that we're not tying our shoes together. That's much more efficient way of getting to where you want to go, right? And maybe we can start to instruct them on a better way to do it, once they see like, "Hey, you're getting different results than I'm getting over here." We have to have patience because if you've ever taught a little one to tie their shoes, you got to have patience.

We think that we're so evolved, but the way that we're operating, a lot of times, especially today, is just like big grown-up babies, so having some patience, having some understanding, and most importantly, doing the right thing ourselves. Not taking advice from corrupt entities because it's just illogical. Now, the latest incident that we're analyzing is the expedited approval of largely unproven booster shots for tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions, of Americans. What do I mean by unproven? Well, a new drug, especially one that is as untested for safety and efficacy as the proposed boosters, would require a large study group of thousands of people and, ideally, years of safety and efficacy data. Well, that was already skipped for the first round of vaccines to get approved, so Pfizer obviously felt that the door of low standards for approval would remain open, and so what safety and efficacy data did they bring to the table for this FDA advisory meeting, to get the boosters approved? Was it thousands of test subjects? Nope. Was it thousands of test subjects? Uh-huh. The booster trials only included 329 people. They included substantial amount of elderly participants, 65 and up, who are considered the priority population for boosters.

They only included 12 elderly test subjects. Did they at least track the data for 6-12 months to ensure some semblance of safety and efficacy of the booster? Mm-mmm. There's only two months of data, just two, just two. Study data like this proposed to be used for boosters for millions, tens of millions, potentially hundreds of millions of citizens. This kind of data should be laughed out of the building, yet it actually made it to a vote. And a plethora of experts had to weigh in and plead with the FDA to not approve these boosters based on the concerning safety data that we already have. From the initial vaccine campaign, the vote went forward and the panel of advisors of the FDA recommended against approval of the Pfizer booster vaccine for people 16 years and older, with a vote of 16-2. Now, it may seem like logic reign supreme with 16 of the FDA advisors voting not to approve the boosters for citizens 16 and older. But what concerns me is, that two of the FDA advisors, despite the massive lack of safety and efficacy data for the boosters, still voted to approve them. But my concern isn't unwarranted because this system is going to do what it always does, ignore reason and experiment with the health and safety of the American people.

We've already covered this, that was all tracking up, going through, and looking at historically, how have these situations functioned to get us to this point? Because, after voting 16-2 not to approve the vaccine booster for people 16 and older, the FDA advisors took a pause during the meeting, and voted again, this time unanimously, all 18 votes to approve the booster for people 65 years and older, as well as people who are at high risk for severe COVID symptoms. Now, who's at high risk for severe COVID symptoms? People who are overweight or obese, people who have heart disease, diabetes, and other pre-existing conditions, basically, couple hundred million Americans would qualify as high-risk and qualify for the booster, approved for the elderly and "at-risk people here in the United States", is a loophole big enough to drive a fleet of trucks through that are filled with vaccines. They actually did many of the same sleights of hands to approve these vaccines in the first place. I already detailed how they corrupted the placebo group in the vaccine trials by actually giving them the vaccine instead. But what most people have no idea about is, though the vaccines were promoted to reduce severe symptoms, that was not what was demonstrated in the clinical trials. The vaccines were found to reduce the risk of mild symptoms.

There's a great review on this in the BMJ, one of the most prestigious peer-review journals in the world that we'll have for you in the show notes. We're going to do more on this to break this down because, for a time period, all the headlines were touting a pandemic of the unvaccinated. So clearly, the vaccines were as promoted even though it wasn't seen in the clinical trials as reducing severe symptoms in folks who were ending up in the hospital. To the tune of 99% of folks hospitalized were unvaccinated. That's what the headlines were saying, though that is factually not based on controlled unbiased data, it's based on observational data and an unethical manipulation of numbers. An article published in the New England Journal of Medicine titled, "Placebo-Controlled Trials of COVID-19 Vaccines-We Still Need Them." That's the title. I didn't add the "We still need them." The title of the paper is "Placebo-Controlled Trials of COVID-19 Vaccines-We Still Need Them." And it states, "Observational studies are subject to substantial biases and are much less amenable to unambiguous interpretation." Substantial biases, number one, easily manipulated biases, and less likely to be clear interpretations. That's what their statement means.

This is basic science stuff. What? This doesn't have to be controversial; this is basic science stuff. If it was true, that's great. But again, we've already broken down the entities that are saying these things. How on Earth could you believe them even for a second? Why would you believe them? They've shown you who they are. When they show you who they are, believe them? That's what you should believe. Now, another big part of this that was seen in the clinical trials for the mRNA vaccines to get approved was highlighted in an analysis by Dr. Ron Brown in his work in epidemiology. And we actually had Dr. Brown here for The Model Health Show

audience to kind of break down his peer-reviewed study, analyzing the results from the Pfizer and Moderna clinical trials. And hopefully, you listened to that episode or watched that episode, but essentially... And this was the peer-reviewed study titled "Outcome Reporting Bias in COVID-19 mRNA Vaccine Clinical Trials," because what was used to thrust this forward and hit all the headlines was that Pfizer had a 95% effectiveness and Moderna had a 94% effectiveness, which sounds amazing. And truly, again, when I heard this, my first inclination was like, "That's pretty remarkable." And I also have a degree of experience in understanding these entities, and so I hold my skepticism as well.

But both are optional. This can be successful, okay. My skepticism that they're doing the same thing they usually do, okay as well. Let's just follow the science here. Actually, follow the science, not just because it sounds like a thing to say, but actually follow the science. And so, Dr. Ron Brown was doing science, he was really using his experience in epidemiology in breaking down the data. And he did find, yes, Pfizer does have a 95% relative risk reduction. Relative risk reduction in the clinical trials. Moderna has a 94% relative risk reduction in the clinical trials. Yes, absolutely. But the relative risk reduction is not what actually equates to the individual's risk reduction in the real world. That number is the absolute risk reduction. The absolute risk reduction is your risk reduction as an individual taking the vaccine in the real world from the clinical data that they were able to compile. So, for Pfizer, the relative risk reduction was 95% but the absolute risk reduction, your risk reduction as an individual, based on their own data, was not 95%, it was not 70%, it was not 50%, it was not 10%. It was 0.7% risk reduction. Less than 1% absolute risk reduction.

Now again, these things should be everywhere. This data should be everywhere, just to bring some perspective, okay? Because it's not untrue that there is a 95% risk reduction, that's the relative risk reduction. And don't think that these multi, multi, multi, multi-billion-dollar organizations and scientists who are running these trials and publishing the data, don't know the difference, 'cause they know. They're just not going to share that with you because it doesn't sound good. It isn't good. For Moderna, 94% relative risk reduction, check. True. Absolute risk reduction, your risk reduction with the Moderna vaccine, your absolute risk reduction in the real world as an individual, 1.1% risk reduction. Note, 94% versus 1.1%. Which of those numbers is going to be compelling to someone if they find out, "Oh, this is 1% risk reduction? Why would I do that?" There's no context. There's no education about, "How do these things fit together?" It's not that the relative risk reduction means nothing, there's some potential benefit here. But does the benefit outweigh the risk in having a healthy risk-benefit analysis? That's not being done either. There's so many things that are shrouded in confusion, in mystery, in corruption. Historically, this is what they do. And the same thing is taking place here.

Now, we'll talk more about how things have been framed as though hospitals have been overflowing with unvaccinated citizens in an upcoming episode because it's going to blow your mind. Again, I was open to that being a reality, I just looked at the data. I just look at the data. And it's true that some hospitals, just to give you a little preview, some hospitals have had a higher ratio of unvaccinated citizens. But it's equally as true that other hospitals have had a higher ratio of vaccinated patients. And other hospitals have had populations where they're closer to equal. They're all true. They're all true. We'll get to that, again, in upcoming episode, because it's going to take a lot to break all the data down but the 99% of hospitalized patients being unvaccinated it's absolutely insane to believe. It's just so far-fetched and inappropriate. But to look at who that tag line is coming from, who's telling you that? If you believe... Come on. This is what I'm calling forward today for now and forever, always, and forever. From this moment, from this moment on, shoutout to Shania Twain from this moment on. This is the time for us to truly maintain control of our mind and our logic and cultivate a higher level of skepticism for the entities that have a proven track record of corruption, of literally being complicit in killing people.

It doesn't sound good because it isn't good. And it's difficult for our logical mind to accept the fact that the entities that are entrusted with managing the healthcare of our citizens, here in our seemingly evolved and advanced society, that they would be corrupt, they would be complicit in murder. But it's real. This is crazier than any blockbuster movie you're going to see. And the sooner we can really embrace that and understand that the sooner we can change it. But we can't go on acting like this isn't happening. Now, I already reported in a previous episode that the CDC, I will put this up for you to see if you're watching the video, the CDC actually... And this is on their site, they said it themselves. The CDC stopped counting the majority of breakthrough COVID infections in vaccinated people. They stopped counting them. They stopped counting the majority of them. In the report, it states, "CDC transitioned from monitoring all reported COVID-19 vaccine breakthrough infections to investigating only those among patients who are hospitalized or die."

That's kind of funny because around nine out of 10 COVID cases are mild or asymptomatic. So, since they're not tracking, we have no idea how much vaccinated citizens have been contributing to these new waves of the pandemic. We have no idea. We do know based on the data, there's about an even likelihood of a vaccinated individual and an unvaccinated individual to contract a COVID infection and to transmit it, but this haze has just come over our policies and our public that have just put it all on people who aren't following the rules and making sure that they're getting vaccinated and it's their fault, and not looking at every step along the way, there's been things that just don't logically make sense, and one of those being, why would the CDC stop tracking the majority of the cases, especially if people are out there transmitting this virus? And yeah, we can say that one is... Yeah, we're looking at, okay, who's

hospitalized? So again, about nine out of 10 cases, they're not going to be hospitalized, and so that's proof positive, that's showing that the vaccine works, right? Prior to the vaccines being in existence, almost nine out of 10 people who contracted a COVID infection were asymptomatic or had mild symptoms, they were not hospitalized.

Even prior to the vaccines being in existence, the numbers are very, very similar, but there's no context. And it is. It's just what is. Now, they also reported that in the CDC, is coming from the CDC that quote, the number of... They say this themselves; the CDC is saying this themselves, they decided to stop tracking the majority of cases, and here's what they say, "The number of reported COVID-19 vaccine breakthrough cases is likely a substantial undercount of all the SARS-CoV-2 infections among fully vaccinated persons". It's simply an illogical thing to do to stop, literally, to admit that they're just stopping counting the majority of cases, and so they're wanting to track the activity of unvaccinated citizens, but vaccinated citizens can equally be transmitting this virus and encouraging potential mutations and all these other things that we've talked about on recent episodes as well. So definitely check out the episode that we did on antibody-dependent enhancement, just some of the peer-reviewed evidence on that as well.

So again, it's an unethical decision to literally say, "We're not going to count breakthrough cases in the majority of vaccinated individuals". There's no way to explain. And this is the craziest thing about our time right now, is that we are allowing things to just be explained away, "Oh, there's a justifiable thing". Not really, not really, it's incredibly illogical because when a cluster of people are actually tested, both vaccinated and unvaccinated, the story is very different from those headlines touting that 99% of the hospitals are being overrun with unvaccinated citizens. And one of those clusters took place in an outbreak in Massachusetts, and this is published by the CDC. And they grabbed this cluster of individuals and tested everybody in this outbreak that they could, and they actually were able to test 469 cases of COVID-19, associated with this public gathering that took place. And what they discovered was something really interesting. They found that after grabbing this cluster of people in this outbreak, they found that 74% of the people who contracted COVID-19 in this cluster were vaccinated individuals, and out of these 469 cases, five of them had to be hospitalized, and four out of five of them were vaccinated, individuals.

Riddle me this Batman, how does that happen? You would see this story everywhere if it was the other way around. If it was the other way around, proving positive to reaffirm the headlines without context, without data to back up what they're saying or manipulated data, this story would have been everywhere, but most people, until I really pushed it out there, didn't know about this, this particular study, this cluster where they're taking a cluster and actually testing everybody. Again, finding 74% of the cases were unvaccinated individuals, and four out of five



people hospitalized were vaccinated. It tells a very different story from the narrative that's being force-fed to our citizens. Now, is this the case for everywhere for every hospital, for every cluster tested? No, but guess what, it's pretty much one of the only clusters that were actually done. So, with that said, it's some of the best data that we have, unfortunately, and it doesn't look good for the narrative that again, is being force-fed to our citizens.

The most vaccinated place on Earth, Disney is the happiest place on Earth, the most vaccinated place on Earth is Israel. Israel has been ahead of the curve of the United States as far as vaccinating the population and being able to see the trends that we are following behind, as far as the waning effectiveness, that they're calling this waning, waning effectiveness of the vaccines, the transmission rate, the breakdown and seeing higher rates of hospitalizations among vaccinated citizens, they've already seen the trend happen. Because now the headlines here, even in the United States, are changing from 99% of the hospitalized, it's changing or they're just not spouting that out anymore. But here's what happened with Israel with their vaccine campaign and hospitalizations. A report published in the journal Science featured a recent hospital cluster analyzed in Israel and found that 59% of hospitalizations were in fully vaccinated individuals.

Now again, we could explain it away because the population is heavily vaccinated, we could explain it away, but this should still put up some red flags like, whoa, that's still... That's pretty significant. What's happening? This is why Israel was lightspeed getting those boosters out because they saw, hey, this ratio is shifting. Not just a third, a fourth booster. We're going to keep boosting, we're going to try and boost our way out of this, we're going to try and drug our way out of this situation. Now, again, if you look at the results of what has been done thus far, something is off here. Now, one of the things that's truly remarkable that's coming to light, thanks in large part to the FDA's vaccine Advisory Committee meeting and more scientists asking questions and finding creative ways to get the data out, even though unfortunately, if it's not fitting the narrative, the data has been censored, which again, should put up a massive red flag that if peer-reviewed evidence, if credible scientists, if they're just getting censored or they're getting blocked or they're getting hidden, their data is getting hidden because it doesn't fit into the narrative that, hey, Pfizer's got your back or the FDA is truly an efficacious organization, and our government officials are not receiving money from pharmaceutical companies, that kind of twisted reality.

It doesn't exist. That reality doesn't exist. We live in the real world where the FDA is massively compromised and funded by pharmaceutical companies. They have a revolving door of sharing employees. Pharmaceutical companies provide massive amounts of... Billions of dollars in funding to major media and news channels. Pharmaceutical companies are also providing massive amounts of income to our elected officials. In what universe would this not be a

system of corruption? And this incestuous nature where so many people either knowingly or unknowingly are profiting off of America's sickness, profiting off of the farming of sick humans. But good things are coming to light. More balance and creative ways to get the data out there, and one of them is the influx of scientists sharing the actual safety data on these new vaccines. Here's a segment from the FDA's vaccine and related biological products advisory meeting from viral immunologist, Dr. Jessica Rose.

*Dr. Jessica Rose: My name is Dr. Jessica Rose and I'm a viral immunologist and computational biologist. I've taken it upon myself to become a VAERS analyst, to organize the data into comprehensive figures, to convey information to the public in both published work and video mediums. Safety and efficacy are the cornerstones of the development and administration of biological products meant for human use. Risk is a measure of the probability of an adverse event occurring and the severity of the resultant harm to health of individuals in a defined population. Safety is a judgment of the acceptability of this risk in a specified situation. Efficacy is the probability of benefit to individuals in a defined population from a medical technology. Refer to slide one, please. This is a bar soft that shows the past 10 years of VAERS data plotted against the total number of adverse event reports for all vaccines for the year 2011-2020 and for COVID-associated products only for 2021. The left bar soft represents all adverse event reports and the right bar soft represents all death adverse event reports. There is an over 1000% increase in the total number of adverse events for 2021 and we are not done with 2021. This is highly anomalous on both fronts. These increased reporting rates are not due to increased strength in injections and not due to simulated reporting. This has been shown using a comparison analysis of influenza data.*

*The onus is on the public health officials, the FDA, the CDC, and policymakers to answer to these anomalies and acknowledge the clear risk signals emerging from their data and to confront the issue of COVID injectable product use risks that in my opinion outweigh any potential benefits associated with these products, especially for children. Slide two. This is a time series plot that shows the total cumulative number of cardiovascular immunological and neurological adverse events for 2021 associated with COVID products. When accumulative absolute counts are normalized for the total number of fully injected individuals in the US, we can see that one in 660 individuals are succumbing to and reporting immunological adverse events associated with the COVID products. The under-reporting factor is not considered here. Slide three. This is a phylogenetic tree showing the emergence of the alpha and delta variants of COVID-19 over time. The emergence of both of these variants and their subsequent clustering arose in very close temporal proximity to the roll-out of the COVID products in Israel.*

*Israel is one of the most injected countries and it appears from this data that this represents a clear failure of these products to provide protective immunity against emergent variants*

*and to prevent transmission, regardless of how many additional shots administered. And this begs the question as to whether these injection rollouts are driving the emergence of the new variants. There's clear and present danger of the emergence of variants of concern if we continue with these alleged booster shots. Thank you.*

**SHAWN STEVENSON:** That data should be pretty jarring for us all. The adverse events from COVID vaccines have over a 1000% higher adverse reaction rate than all other vaccines combined per year for the past 10 years. And she stratified the data and noted that this skyrocketing rate of adverse reactions is not due to increased rates of injections. Dr. Rose was not... Also coming from an anti-vaccine perspective, she's simply requesting that public health officials, the FDA, the CDC, acknowledge the clear risk signals emerging from the data and confront the alarming risk-benefit analysis, this is just a logical thing to do. Most of the logical scientists struggle to understand why this data has to be controversial, if the vaccines are truly safe and effective, and that's what the data shows, so be it. If the vaccines have some alarming adverse reactions and that's what the data shows, so be it. Logic is what's going to help us to be open and rational about the data either way. But unfortunately, as mentioned, there is so much irrational behavior taking place today, and people's identities are so deeply invested in this campaign, in this vaccine campaign. I've never seen anything remotely close to this.

And folks who've screamed from the mountain tops that these new vaccines are safe and effective, and literally shaming people for not running out and getting vaccinated, when they're simply being cautious and wanting to get multiple perspectives. And maybe they get a chance somehow to see some of the data that isn't incredibly biased, or that's being propagated by these entities with a track record of corruption. But we've shifted where late-night talk show hosts and major news networks are just on their platform, shaming people. Friends, family members, shaming their own family for not taking, based on the data, for not following suit and getting vaccinated when they don't understand anything about absolute risk reduction. They don't understand anything about the real safety data, because it exists, it isn't just made up. And so, if these folks are screaming from the mountain tops that these new vaccines are safe and effective, then the data shows that their belief is inaccurate, or the data shows that their belief is unjust, it takes sometimes a minor miracle for someone, especially a public figure to admit that they're wrong or even entertain that the reality is different from what they believe.

This is the human condition at this current time, and this is why you see the merciless tendencies to just explain inconvenient facts away or to censor them. To "fact-check" with these same organizations, if we look at the funding going to these organizations doing the fact-checking, oh my... You can't make this stuff up. You can't make this stuff up. Then Dr. Rose's analysis with rates of adverse reactions being higher than our reporting system has ever seen,

her logical assessment was that the risk significantly outweighs the potential benefits with these new vaccines, especially for children. That's what hit me, especially for children. She's merely highlighting the thousands of stories, including many young people, including children, the thousands of stories of people like John Stokes. This young man who had a serious adverse reaction, myocarditis, potentially life-threatening reaction after getting vaccinated. And fortunately, I was able to grab the video of John Stokes, sharing his voice before it got taken down because it was inevitable that it would get taken down. Let's hear what John has to say.

*John Stokes: I am in the hospital right now with heart complications from the COVID-19 vaccine, and I want to inform as many people as I can about the risks from taking the vaccine that I wish someone would have told me. So, I am a Division 1 student-athlete with no prior health issues, and I got the second COVID shot Tuesday, and within four days, I have been diagnosed with myocarditis and was told that I probably won't be able to play my senior season now. It is a side effect from the COVID vaccine, and it's really not being reported or addressed, and it is a serious issue that we should all be informed about before making this decision. It isn't right for people to be forced to take the vaccine because there are actual side effects like this that could happen to you. And NCAA should not mandate student-athletes to get the vaccine because of what could happen to so many fellow student athletes' health issues which has happened to me. Everyone should be informed of the side effects, and no one should be forced to take something that could cause what has happened to me, and no one knows the long-term effects and what's possibly going to happen from this.*

*And it's kind of uncharted territories because everyone else with the same heart issues from the vaccine as me, we're all being tracked and monitored, we're basically like test subjects from the vaccines. Hence a very serious issue that really needs to be spread. And I've spoken with some other student-athletes that have also had to have either heart surgery or have had heart issues from this, and it's very scary stuff. And a lot of people in our age group apparently are at higher risk for heart issues from the vaccine, and it really does need to be talked about.*

**SHAWN STEVENSON:** He's just one of the many young men experiencing Myocarditis from the mRNA vaccines. Young men between the ages of 16-19 appear to be the most susceptible to this potentially deadly inflammation of the heart. And it's been well documented, repeatedly again, in a wide range of age groups, but our kids are especially at risk for this. And it's not okay for us to make our children test subjects for this when we do not know what's going to happen, and we damn sure don't know what's going to happen long-term. We have no idea. We have no idea, but yet, public health officials and people who have just taken on this mantle, that this is so righteous, they're acting as though they know what's going to happen, a year from now, two years from now. Could this potentially evoke an abnormality in cell replication? Absolutely. Know what that means when there's abnormalities in cell replication? That's the

seed of cancer. Would there be increased incidence of cancer? We don't know, but if it didn't happen right after getting the injection, just chop it up to something else. And this is what happens for young men like John Stokes, people explain it away.

Most people don't, most people don't, contrary to popular belief, most people are like, "Hey, we need to pay attention to this", but then there are people like, "You know what? Certain amount of young men were perfectly healthy, get Myocarditis out of the blue anyways. It just happens, so he's probably in that number, just COVID can do that to him anyway, so still the vaccine was a good idea." They just explain it away because it doesn't fit their paradigm, and I'm just looking... I mean, for me, I'm just being a logical human. Risk-versus-benefit, just let me see just a clear risk-benefit analysis, and we can choose. That's it. Is that too much to ask? Now, being that this is with our children, now the logical thing would be to ask... And this is where I'm at. If this Myocarditis is happening from this new mRNA vaccine technology, wouldn't we want to ask, "How is it having this side effect in the heart? How is this new vaccine...? What is it doing to the heart? How does it do that? It isn't supposed to do that. How is it doing it?" And if we suppress these stories, we fact-check these stories, we explain it away, we'll never know.

I mean, you know how we do it, we'll definitely uncover why it's happening, and this is still just based on basic principles of biology, but if we explain it away, we can't get to literally the heart of the situation. But there's also, of course, now they're finally putting some funding into studying why so many women had abnormal menstrual cycles post-vaccination, which just was explained away, became a footnote because that's not supposed to happen. But if enough of us are standing up asking questions, demanding that these things are investigated, and slow down this reign of idiocy as if everybody knows what's going to happen, we've got to take back again, take back control of our minds and our bodies. I have so many more stories like this and much more that I'm going to be breaking down of the FDA's Vaccine Advisory Committee meeting, and to get access to that, make sure to go to [themodelhealthshow.com/connect](http://themodelhealthshow.com/connect), [themodelhealthshow.com/connect](http://themodelhealthshow.com/connect), so that you don't miss a thing. This is where you can get uncensored data so that we can actually be informed and empowered in an increasingly complex situation.

And it's crazy because even this video... This is an episode we're putting out on the podcast platform, the audio platform, but this video can't be featured on YouTube because it would likely get censored. And this has happened multiple times where YouTube is taking videos down, they've hid videos, and people, wonderful listeners of the show, they comment in like, "This video should have a million views, this should be going viral, breaking internet." Now, YouTube has been hiding our stuff, and I'm not one of those people who believe like the shadow banning, but I know some people like, "Absolutely, it's real." But we actually had the opportunity to actually monitor and look at the numbers versus people... Being able to look

behind the scenes at different people's channels and seeing how our viewing time is higher, our retention rate, our click-through rate, all of our metrics are at or better than some of the biggest health shows on YouTube, or just shows in general. And yet, YouTube stopped recommending The Model Health Show, and we're going to change that. We're going to play their game; we'll dance their little dirty dance. We're going to make sure that the uncensored content gets out there on other platforms, and we find a way to make sure that those go viral in other ways, but again, to stay up to date with everything, make sure to go to [themodelhealthshow.com/connect](http://themodelhealthshow.com/connect).

Now, last piece here, and this is another way of explaining things away, is discrediting the VAERS system. The Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System, the VAERS. The VAERS database is a surveillance system. Keyword, it's a passive surveillance system run jointly by the CDC and FDA. And it's well established that neither agency puts any notable resources into managing it. Now, this can be another point where so-called experts explain away the VAERS data, saying that it's not reliable, when in reality, first and foremost, this is the only system that we have. It's the only system for safety data that we have, first and foremost. And the second thing is, it's a federal crime to report anything that is untrue to VAERS. And so, people that would try to explain it away saying that it's unreliable, it's actually unreliable in another way that doesn't fit their narrative, which is, because it's a passive system. Now, this is based on data, this isn't just something that sounds good, because it's a passive system, meaning that it's not mandatory for physicians and the public to report these incidents that take place after getting vaccinated or within a time period after getting vaccinated, because it's a passive system, the vast majority of physicians and patients don't take the time to add their adverse events to the database.

In fact, according to a study published in the journal "Vaccine", a significant number of healthcare providers don't even know what VAERS is. They don't even know it exists. And if they do, the majority of them in this report, again, published in the journal titled Vaccine, and even if they do, the majority of them don't actually report adverse reactions into the database. For healthcare providers in this study to actually admit that, especially people who their ego is such that they have to know stuff, for them to admit that they don't even know that this is the thing or that they aren't following the rules, that's really fascinating. So, chances are the numbers are worse than what we're sharing here. Now, what does this look like? According to a study published in toxicology reports, some of the best estimates show that upwards of 99% of adverse reactions from vaccinations are not reported in VAERS. They're not reported to the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System. Add this probability to the skyrocketing rate of adverse events noted by Dr. Rose, and the numbers are far worse than already demonstrated. So, what do we do with this information? Speak up. Speak up. Remain centered and rational,

even when things around you seem highly irrational. Logic... I know it, I feel it. It will eventually supersede everything, it has to.

Things have been just going around business as usual, and these corrupt systems have been controlling things, now so much is getting brought to light, and that's a thing to celebrate, but you have to share your voice. Stay open, of course, to the vaccine campaign having benefits. That's okay, we don't want to just be totally against anything. We want to be pro-logic, we want to be pro-intelligence, pro-signs, looking at all sides of things, accepting things that might not be things that fit into our worldview, but also remain... Have that thread of skepticism, especially when we're dealing with corrupt entities with a track record of corruption and fraud and bribery and coercion. So, keeping that, keeping that place of peace where we're aware like, Okay, I'm hearing this bit of data from them, chances are, it's probably not accurate based on their history. But still remaining open. So again, we want to stand firm, logically firm in the reality that these are substantial risks being proactively downplayed and even censored by entities that are far more likely to be profit-driven than to be driven by ethics. Contact your representatives, contact your representatives, share this data, share the data with decision-makers at work, at schools, at schools for your children, and other organizations that you're a part of.

Share the data, speak up. Don't sit on the sidelines with this, we can actually change how these systems have been operating, but this is our opportunity to do it, and most importantly, stand up for our children, that is a big driving force of why I'm doing this work today. Why I'm standing here before you today is because of our children, they're counting on us, they are counting on us to keep them safe, they're counting on us to do the right thing, they're counting on us to not make them a social experiment. This is the time to stand up and speak up. Again, you can find the full video of this episode, and I highly encourage you to check it out at [themodelhealthshow.com/booster](http://themodelhealthshow.com/booster), and of course, make sure to stay connected and you get more from the FDA vaccine advisory meeting via direct communication with me, via email uncensored at [themodelhealthshow.com/connect](http://themodelhealthshow.com/connect). We've got some incredible, powerful, absolutely essential master classes and incredible guests coming up very soon, so make sure to stay tuned. Take care. Have an amazing day, and I'll talk with you soon.

And for more after the show, make sure to head over to [themodelhealthshow.com](http://themodelhealthshow.com), that's where you can find all of the show notes, you can find transcriptions, videos for each episode, and if you got a comment, you can leave me a comment there as well. And please make sure to head over to iTunes and leave us a rating to let everybody know that the show is awesome, and I appreciate that so much and take care, I promise to keep giving you more powerful, empowering, great content to help you transform your life. Thanks for tuning in.