

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

Speaker 1 ([00:04](#)):

Welcome to the Bill Walton show, featuring conversations with leaders, entrepreneurs, artists, and thinkers, fresh perspectives on money, culture, politics, and human flourishing. Interesting people, interesting things.

Bill Walton ([00:24](#)):

Welcome to the Bill Walton show. I'm bill Walton. Well, a little over a year ago, I opened my show with Jay Richards with this statement. "It's now October, 2020, and it looks like the worst of the virus is long behind us, and yet we were still in the midst of a pandemic of fear that is far worse than the virus. And it's a crisis that has basically divided the country into two camps, open America up, or keep it shut down."

Bill Walton ([00:57](#)):

Well, that was then, and this is now and now see aim worse. And it seems to have morphed from government measures to stop the spread of an unstoppable virus into some existential threat, and that's an overused word, but I do think it is an existential threat to our liberties, liberties and civil rights, not just here in the United States, but worldwide. Joining me to talk about this is James Patrick documentary filmmaker, whose film Planet Lockdown is coming out January 15th in 2022 and Jay Richards, frequent guest, author of Price of Panic, who is now the William E. Simon senior research fellow with the heritage foundation and is the author of more than a dozen books. James, Jay, great to see you.

Jay Richards ([01:52](#)):

Good to see you.

Bill Walton ([01:52](#)):

Jay, why don't you kick us off? Give us some context for where we are right now as you see it.

Jay Richards ([01:57](#)):

Absolutely so as you said a year ago, when we wrote The Price of Panic, it was focused mainly on the unintended consequences of the lockdown. People assumed that lockdowns were some tried and true measure to prevent the spread of a respiratory virus, in fact, they were a hypothesis waiting to be tested and the human race ended up being the subjects of the experiment. I think we showed and a lot of people showed since then, that in fact, the lockdowns don't correlate to a reduction in the spread of the virus, it just don't work. That's that's the moderately bad news, the really bad news is that they do a great deal of harm. So they're all pain and no gain, but that's what we were really talking about, fall of 2020, we were talking about the problems with the lockdowns.

Jay Richards ([02:40](#)):

Now, of course, we're talking about heck of a lot more. We've got the vaccines we've got vaccine mandates, and now we're hearing tell of vaccine passports in which people can't exercise their basic rights unless they've been properly vaccinated and that of course is a moving target. And as you said, I do, I think this is an existential threat to our liberties and to our freedom and here's the problem as I see it, there's never a good time to put your foot in for an incremental tyranny.

Jay Richards ([03:13](#)):

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

We always expect tyranny to come in one fell swoop, the troops march across, the Maginot line or something like that, that now it's time. But this is an incremental tyranny in which each little detail doesn't seem like that big a deal. Well, just wear this silly mask. Well, don't go to the grocery store, just get a shot. There's never any obvious time and so I think it takes a bit of discernment to understand what's happening in the big picture. And I think at this point, my hope is that it's gotten so far along that more and more people will be aware of that.

Bill Walton ([03:46](#)):

Well, I think if we do our job and keep getting the word out, maybe we can nip this, I won't say in the bud, long past the bud, pretty long and branch. James, your film is extraordinary, very well researched and you've traveled the world to get the leading experts, to bring their stories forth and their points of view forth. Talk about that, what gave you the idea how to bring about, how long did it take to make?

James Patrick ([04:17](#)):

Yeah, it took about a year and a half now. And yeah, I was just very upset when I heard lockdown and it seemed to me more of an economic take down measure to, to help big business and destroy small business. But within a few weeks of the lockdown I was seeing advertisements for immunity passports. It looked like tens of millions of dollars were being pumped into these companies, talk of these vaccines and I could tell this was headed in a very dark direction. So after a few months sitting at home like everyone else, I was just restless and so upset about what was going on. I said, "I have to do something about it." And so I decided to make a film about it and put 40 grand on zero interest credit cards, buy the equipment and set out to do it and by Christmas... The situation was developing so quickly, I decided to just release all the full interviews in full. And I think Christmas, I started putting them out a year ago and they'd been getting millions of views and I put out 40 interviews.

Bill Walton ([05:21](#)):

But we talk about civil liberties and our rights and speech, a lot of these got pulled.

James Patrick ([05:29](#)):

Yeah, a lot of them, half of them at least.

Bill Walton ([05:32](#)):

So YouTube.

James Patrick ([05:34](#)):

YouTube sensors, planet lockdowns, like a bad phrase on most of them, most of the platforms.

Bill Walton ([05:41](#)):

Maybe we won't use that in the title to the show.

Jay Richards ([05:45](#)):

We'll sneak it in.

James Patrick ([05:46](#)):

Yeah you mean that one too.

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

Bill Walton ([05:47](#)):

So do you want to show us the opening?

James Patrick ([05:50](#)):

Yeah, sure. Let me take a look at the soft opening.

Bill Walton ([05:53](#)):

Really give you a sense of how I can't believe this is \$40,000 worth of movie making because it looks like a lot more so kudos. Let's take a look at this and

Speaker 6 ([06:04](#)):

Yeah, in a strange place, in the Corona lockdown, you know, that would be the opening.

Speaker 7 ([06:24](#)):

I have never seen the great land so empty, this is not life. The government is destroying people's lives. Just creating fear, making people behave rationally.

Speaker 8 ([06:44](#)):

I was very puzzled since the very beginning and I was alert to the fact that what we were living was not quite right.

Speaker 9 ([06:56](#)):

It was like a program, an orchestrated action, which was almost in the same way, all over the world.

Bill Walton ([07:12](#)):

True words. So how much time did you spend traveling around to do this?

James Patrick ([07:21](#)):

Maybe six months.

Bill Walton ([07:23](#)):

And where'd you find all... You've got some of the leading experts, who are the three people we just talked about here?

James Patrick ([07:30](#)):

That's Kanu Vokowski in New York, he's the top world class epidemiologist who worked at Rockefeller University for 20 years. But he retired, I think, or did his own stuff three years prior, so he's free to talk. And then Alexandra, she's a very high level geneticist in Paris. She's I think was the former research director of the French NIH. And then this is Bishop Schneider who's outspoken on the topic.

Bill Walton ([08:02](#)):

And where's he based?

James Patrick ([08:04](#)):

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

He's he's the adjunct...

Bill Walton ([08:07](#)):

Auxiliary Bishop of Kazakhstan.

James Patrick ([08:09](#)):

Kazakhstan, yeah, but travels a lot, the guy travels all the time.

Bill Walton ([08:13](#)):

And then you had this extraordinary expert Jay Richards on, later on.

James Patrick ([08:19](#)):

Yeah, so it was quite the odyssey going around meeting these people and hearing their perspectives and it was quite an experience.

Bill Walton ([08:31](#)):

How did the making the movie change you in your views and how will it change the people who watch it?

James Patrick ([08:39](#)):

I think it's almost like when we've been watching the world fall apart. So it's like you go through these stages of grieving. Like Kubler-Ross is like, "there's denial and there's bargaining." And so I think I, like everybody else, has gone through that and so I've come out the other side now. And I think it's important to understand that this whole thing is really trying to take everything from everybody, they're going for everything. So I really would encourage people not to give in to this measure then the next one, because it's going in a direction where you don't want to go, in a world you don't want to live in. So people think, oh, I'm just going to go along, I'm just going to do this thing they're asking. But it's just incrementally more and more and then you're not going to get your freedom back by continuing to go along with this whole narrative, it's just getting weirder and weirder.

Bill Walton ([09:40](#)):

Jay, how dangerous has this virus actually been?

Jay Richards ([09:43](#)):

Well, it's depends on who we're talking about, so it's very low risk for young people, there's about a thousand fold difference between it's risk for young people versus old people. So if you're over 70 and you have so-called comorbidities, which means things like heart disease, type two diabetes, obesity, then it can be bad. It's still about a 95% survival rate even then, but that's severe compared to very mild effects for the young.

Jay Richards ([10:12](#)):

And we knew this within weeks, we knew this in March and early April of 2020, that the right way to deal with this is not to lock everyone down, but to focus on the people that are at the greatest risk from sickness and death, as a result of infection, but we didn't do that. We basically ignored all the actual data we had about this. And so I think, the problem is you can't say, "well, it's just like a mild cold." Well,

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

it's like a mild cold for most people, and that it's more dangerous than the flu for older people. But that's just what we learned about the virus. So I forgive people in March that didn't know, but by April, informed people should have been able to figure this out.

James Patrick ([10:53](#)):

Yeah, by early May last year, some studies came out from Stanford and other places showing that it was a flu level infection, fatality rate, but there's just a total disconnect between that and the level of fear and then all these statistics thrown at us. So it's quite messy and hard for the average person to make sense of it all.

Bill Walton ([11:15](#)):

But when you and I talked over a year ago about this, there was a lot, there's still, the jury wasn't in a lot, but now we've got Sweden, we've got Florida, we've got actual data about what different techniques used to mitigate this virus worked or didn't work.

Jay Richards ([11:29](#)):

Yes, absolutely. Well, our book is filled with statistics about the effects or lack thereof of those lockdowns, that was the nice thing that happened. Nice thing about federalism is that we had 50 states, most had some form of lockdown, but they started at different times, they opened at different times and we could actually look at the spread of the cases and hospitalizations and things like that. And there's just no correlation between the lockdowns and what the virus did, which is not at all surprising. But what's interesting is that James early on was noticing the vaccines. Whereas I could say, we all dip into this differently, but the way I entered into this was that I was aghast to realize that international public health officials were following an UN tested predictive computer model to figure out how dangerous a virus was that hadn't been tested.

Jay Richards ([12:18](#)):

It was entirely speculative we learned very quickly that this Imperial College London model that the head of the World Health Organization was following was just completely useless for telling us the actual risks of the virus. It was just, all the assumptions get plugged in, and guess what, the model tells you what you told it to tell you. So that's what interested me and my co-authors is that this is going to be a really bad policy because it's not based on reality. We weren't really focused on the vaccines. I wasn't focused on the drug companies or anything like that. And I do think there's a sort of deeper worry about what was happening beforehand and why so quickly we pivoted to talk about the vaccines that I think in the film does a great job of laying out.

James Patrick ([13:03](#)):

Yeah and I think it raises fundamental questions, we can get into the conversation of how deadly is it or do the vaccines work or these kinds of things, but I think we should step back and look at it like, do they have the right to lock us down? To take these measures, even if we had a 50% mortality rate disease, I don't think the government has the right to take the actions it does. Or even if the vaccines do work, can they force that on people? Do we own our own bodies? And that's a fundamental principle of civilization of the society. Do you own your own body? Are you a slave? I would encourage people not to get bogged down in this minutia, but really see this as a civil rights issue. And, and we don't... The governments around the world in tandem ratcheted it up their control of people and in a way that's really disturbing.

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

Bill Walton ([14:01](#)):

It's a civil rights issue. This is the Bill Walton show, I here with Jay Richards and James Patrick filmmaker, Jay's at heritage foundation and we're talking about how this whole virus issues morphed to the civil rights issue, but it's also morphed into a speech issue. And as we were joking, or maybe not joking, before we started talking about this on air is that, there are just an awful lot of things you're not allowed to talk about. You're not allowed to talk about Ivermectin, you're not really allowed to talk about whether the vaccines work or don't work. You're not allowed to talk about the pharmaceutical companies and whether they've got an agenda. There's all this forbidden speech that's being monitored by the social media companies among others, but also the regular mainstream media.

James Patrick ([14:51](#)):

Yeah and it's just totally arbitrary sometimes. I did one interview with Howard Berger, who's the chief epidemiologist of Austria and interviewed him in Austria, and they called it medical misinformation, took it down. And he's the chief medical authority of the country that I was doing the interview.

Bill Walton ([15:13](#)):

Well, my favorite was that the, you, you got a hit piece written about your film by The Washington Post, the almighty Washington Post. But you looked through and in the article, there was an assertion where James says this and that's wrong. James says that and that's wrong too. And it goes on and on. So I looked up who the author was and it's just this nice little girl who got a degree in journalism from her English, from UCLA and journalism from Columbia. And her beat was the Metropolitan beat. She doesn't know anything about this and yet she's pronouncing and it comes with the authority of the post.

James Patrick ([15:56](#)):

That's right.

Jay Richards ([15:57](#)):

Yeah and the post comes with the authority of public health agencies. The irony is that the corporate media, rather than speaking truth to power is actually speaking authorized truth for power, that's the irony.

James Patrick ([16:14](#)):

That article makes a lot of claims that she clearly didn't watch the video she's criticizing. She was just ordered to do that and then she's referencing these Hopkins sites and you go to that, they're making unsubstantiated claims that are invalid. The way this is working is, the media is not responsible. The public health agencies, they're all doing their role and no one's really can be held accountable for anything, like Johns Hopkins has done a lot of damage in this and the link in that article, if you go read that site, they're making unsubstantiated claims that you would need several year long trial to prove. And yet the post is they are just, "oh, refer to that." But it's fraudulent, it's troubling. It's confusing for the average person, just dipping their toe in it, trying to understand what's going on and they see these fancy names there, but they're being misled.

Jay Richards ([17:10](#)):

I mean, Bill, I think this has been the key intellectual question from the beginning for lots of people. And I talk to people all the time that say, "look, Jay, everything you're telling me makes sense, but are you

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

saying that I should just not believe all these authorities that I'm hearing. Public health authorities or media now, people aren't actually checking the CDC website, if you press them, usually what they know about what the CDC says is what the headlines on the right hand corner of their screen on Twitter is. And so what they're actually getting is a consolidation of certain claims by social media or it's almost ideal, it's better if they're at least reading the pages of The Washington Post, what they're actually doing is they're reading headlines that have been highly curated.

Jay Richards ([17:57](#)):

And so it's not like they're actually accessing the official statements, but this has been the question from the very beginning. If public health authorities were speaking outside their authority, if media were serving the role of these actors and had no idea what they were talking about, if there was a social contagion that was justified under terms of public health, how would you tell? That's the question we ought to be asking. Well, I wouldn't want to go along if it was just this crazy social contagion by saying, "well, this is what the public health authority said." And so I think it's the prior philosophical question. How would you tell if you're in the middle of a crazy social contagion in which you thought all the official voices, what they were saying, actually, wasn't true. And that's the prior question we all need to ask ourselves. And those who, for whatever reason, were less inclined simply to believe these people based on their authority, I think we're more likely to wake up early than not.

Bill Walton ([18:56](#)):

Well, I think the public trust issue is enormous. If anything is done, I can't think of anything has done more to destroy public trust the way they've handled this. You look at the CDC and this issue of herd immunity. The standard thing about virus is, we all know this is, it gets into the population, enough people get it and all of a sudden everybody's immune because that's the way it works. Well, the CDC changed the definition of herd immunity. The new definition focuses on vaccines only and they took away the part about building herd immunity through previous infections, it's gone.

James Patrick ([19:38](#)):

Yeah the WHO as well, they did it a month before they released the vaccines, last November or so.

Jay Richards ([19:44](#)):

So how many little details like that should a person need before they say, maybe I need to rethink my prior trust of these authorities these... [crosstalk 00:19:54].

Bill Walton ([19:54](#)):

Unfortunately I've got six pages of details.

Jay Richards ([19:56](#)):

Exactly, so how many do people need? [crosstalk 00:19:59] How do you rethink that implicit trust.

Bill Walton ([20:01](#)):

But the conversation that we're having right now is not... If you go on the six o'clock news, you're not hearing this conversation.

James Patrick ([20:08](#)):

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

And how like intertwined industry is with these agency and how huge portions of their budget... with WHO it's like over half and CDC even, there's a CDC foundation.

Bill Walton ([20:20](#)):

They get over half of the WHO budgets from pharmaceutical industry or healthcare.

James Patrick ([20:25](#)):

Public private partnerships or

Jay Richards ([20:27](#)):

People's Republic of China.

James Patrick ([20:31](#)):

These found, give money for project dedicated tasks. And so it's over half the budget and it creates a huge conflict of interest. So they have inordinate sway over what the organization does, so that's why you see all these games with redefining things.

Bill Walton ([20:49](#)):

Well, that's one of the principle way... For China is many ways. One of the things they do is they give a lot of research dollars to scientists and medical professionals, and they basically buy influence by sponsoring their work.

Jay Richards ([21:02](#)):

That's right and this is in some ways, the most depressing part of this story is to discover this because I believe that markets work when incentives are aligned properly. And a lot of people think, "well, this is private industry and they're competing for vaccines and things like this." This is the most sort of collusive croniest market that can possibly be imagined. If you actually look into the relationship between say the FDA and private drug companies, this is not a functioning market. One simple example, the fact that drug companies are immune from being sued, for instance, right. It completely destroys the natural incentive that a business would otherwise have. And so whatever trust you might have in natural market mechanisms, you should not import that trust into this situation because the market is anything but free.

Bill Walton ([21:55](#)):

Repeat that, we can't sue the drug companies?

Jay Richards ([21:57](#)):

We can't sue, so the drug companies are immune. They've been granted immunity by the government with regard to these vaccines.

James Patrick ([22:05](#)):

Yeah. So if you're injured, you can't sue them. I think in US, there's one fund that'll pay out injuries, but it's extremely low how many there are.

Jay Richards ([22:16](#)):

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

It's a sweet deal, if you can get it.

Bill Walton ([22:20](#)):

As a creature of wall street, as a creature of private equity and default mode as businesses. I've got to behave well, because you'll kill your a reputation if [crosstalk 00:22:30] behave egregiously. So I discounted the pharmaceutical theory.

Jay Richards ([22:35](#)):

Well, because you think killing your customers is really a bad business model under normal circumstances, right?

James Patrick ([22:41](#)):

And then they're putting out questionable products and then they're getting the government to do all the marketing. So for all these products, it's the White House, the media and the CDC marketing the products and then like this Comirnaty product, they didn't even have a website for it.

Bill Walton ([22:58](#)):

I don't know what Comirnaty is.

Jay Richards ([23:00](#)):

So that is the branded version of the Pfizer vaccine.

James Patrick ([23:04](#)):

So the company can't be said to market a questionable products. So they have the government market it and it's very clever.

Bill Walton ([23:13](#)):

Let's do Pfizer, you don't think they're in it for the money? I didn't, I changed my mind and the report came out last, I don't know, three or four weeks ago, Pfizer had earnings and more than doubled in the last quarter. And they had earnings of 7.7 billion dollars up 133% from a year earlier. And so they've made three or 4 billion in just 90 days alone and so if you're the executives at Pfizer, that's what you're paying attention to.

Jay Richards ([23:45](#)):

That's a huge incentive, but I'd say if a drug company invents a drug that cures cancer, I want them to respond to incentives and to make a lot of money, but that's not what's happening.

Bill Walton ([23:57](#)):

But that brings in ivermectin, because there are a lot of people among them who believes ivermectin works. Ivermectin has been around forever, the guy invented it won the Nobel prize. It's a so-called off label drug, it was meant for this one thing, but it also works well with the virus. And yet you're not allowed to not only talk about it, it's tough for physicians to prescribe it.

James Patrick ([24:22](#)):

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

The whole reason behind that is the emergency authorization of the vaccines is only valid if there's not a treatment available. So to get these vaccines rushed and on the market, they got an emergency use authorization. And that's only by law that can only happen if there isn't a treatment available for the issue. So they have to suppress all the treatments and Alexandra called this treatment neoism. So they say, "okay, vaccine only, we all have to..." And they're still telling everyone there's no treatment for COVID -19. So they put out this protocol saying, you shouldn't do any treatment at all and then you wait and then you get to the hospital after a week, if you're sick, and then they're giving people this Remdesivir drug, like sedatives, Remdesivir and intubation. And a lot of doctors I interviewed think that, that what's killing a lot of people in the hospital. So Remdesivir it's a highly shady drug it's... There was one trial in 2018 Fauci funded that killed half the people in the trial. So it causes kidney failure, you should not let anyone...

Bill Walton ([25:40](#)):

Is that hyperbole or is that literally half the people in the trial?

James Patrick ([25:43](#)):

In this study in 2018 yeah. It is a very toxic drug to give the... It's like a chemo, so to give that to a flu patient is pretty irrational. But there's huge vested interest, Gilead has this, it's \$4,000 for a dose and then Medicaid's giving a 20% kickback to the hospital. So it's huge financial interest. Whereas ivermectin is, I don't know, \$30.

Jay Richards ([26:13](#)):

Ivermectin is out, you can get it generically and so the financial incentive to use that apart from the emergency use authorization, which I think is really what's behind the campaign, not to allow off-label use of any drugs, lots of drugs that people are taking are being taken for off-label use, it's usually up to the doctor and yet they're prohibited in this one case. I think it was because the emergency use authorization and I think there's natural incentives is that the alternatives coming online, you can make a lot of money with them, nobody's making much money with ivermectin.

Bill Walton ([26:46](#)):

This is the Bill Walton Show and I'm here with Jay Richards and James Patrick. And we're talking about everything you wanted to know about the drug companies, but were afraid to ask. Because then I've gone from skeptical about them to pretty upset about their behavior.

Jay Richards ([27:05](#)):

Well, they're responding to incentives, the trick is that...

Bill Walton ([27:09](#)):

People market [crosstalk 00:27:11] libertarian, you say that but...

Jay Richards ([27:13](#)):

But the incentives are absolutely wrong, this is the problem. My trust in the market mechanism, isn't based on my trust in human nature, it's that markets, when they're working properly, incentivize people in beneficial ways, but in this case, drug companies and the actors are incentivized to curry favor with the regulators unfortunately

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

Bill Walton ([27:35](#)):

Let's talk about what's next, vaccine passports, vaccine mandates. Lloyd Austin, head of the defense department, just to say that if you don't get vaccinated, he's going to ask you to leave the military. This is happening right now, thousands of members of the exemption to any member of the arm services has been granted. And so if you think about the effects of this, basically we are going to purge people who have moral or religious objections and actually have the strength of their convictions and have moral courage, we're going to purge them from the military,. That's an extraordinary thing, especially when you think the average member of the military is not at high risk from this fire.

James Patrick ([28:25](#)):

Well in the medical system too, that's really harming that they're firing everyone, who's a doctor or nurse who doesn't want to take the vaccine. So you're making the industry a lot more dogmatic.

Bill Walton ([28:36](#)):

Now, did you talk to some of those people during making your film?

James Patrick ([28:40](#)):

Which?

Bill Walton ([28:41](#)):

The medical professionals who don't trust the vaccine.

James Patrick ([28:46](#)):

Some yeah, a few doctors.

Bill Walton ([28:48](#)):

And they said?

James Patrick ([28:52](#)):

What were their points on the vaccine?

Bill Walton ([28:54](#)):

Yeah.

James Patrick ([28:55](#)):

I think they just said they're seeing a lot of injuries that they don't think it's efficacious. I didn't go heavily into the vaccine in the film. It's more like 12 minutes in there. I go into the mRNA technology and put a lot of clips of the CEOs of Pfizer and Moderna talking about it. It's very experimental, it's like going in and putting in these foreign RNA and getting your body to produce these spike proteins. And then they say, it goes away after some time, but it's...

Bill Walton ([29:34](#)):

It's a rabbit hole of complexity. [crosstalk 00:29:37]

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

James Patrick ([29:37](#)):

It's not clear and I put a clip of Borla the CEO of Moderna. They're saying from January this year saying, "if they work, if they do what we think they'll do." And here we're deploying it to millions of people.

Bill Walton ([29:48](#)):

So my sentence is a three of us will agree of this statement. We're not sure about whether vaccines work or don't work, but it's up to the individual to decide whether it works for them.

James Patrick ([29:59](#)):

Well, these aren't really vaccines... Gene therapies and they got the CDC to call them vaccines. Because then you get the immunity, you get the 1986 protection liability. It's more of a gene therapy and I threw in a clip with a Bayer president saying that he's like, oh, if we didn't have a pandemic, no one would want to be taking gene therapies.

Jay Richards ([30:22](#)):

And if you look at the way they were initially authorized, it was for reduction in symptoms. And now all the official people are now saying this. A year ago, they were referring to these as vaccines as if they conferred some kind of fundamental immunity. We now know that that's not what happens. My sense, looking at the data, is that these vaccines for people that are not in any way injured by them, it probably does confer some kind of benefit in terms of reduction of symptoms. It's just that that benefit itself wears off quickly. You have to keep re-upping and people should be able to make decisions based upon their personal life situation as to whether that's a risk reward calculation they want to make, as opposed to this, the one size fits all for 330 million people.

James Patrick ([31:07](#)):

But the rush trial criteria to get these passed doesn't even... It was just for Moderna and Pfizer was just passing one PCR test after a week and the reduction of one flu symptom. So you could put anything through that trial and get passed. The original trials to get them authorized don't test for immunization of anything they could have done T-cell immunity. They could have done a proper trial that would see if the things were conferring immunity, that wasn't done so that they never really claimed to be immunizing against anything.

Jay Richards ([31:41](#)):

But they knew by calling them vaccines, that people would make the mental connection and that's what almost everyone does. I have Catholic churchmen and bishops who issued statements bill on the assumption that these are immunizing vaccines. So they didn't even manage to get the basic science right.

James Patrick ([32:00](#)):

Yeah I think people are taking them thinking they're getting immunization and that claim was never made by the manufacturers. But the media is confusing that in people's minds, the government is confusing that in people's minds. And when you look at the original, the documents and the filings, they don't make any of those claims at all. So there's a real disconnect between what the documents are showing and then what's the public perception. I don't think people also... Anyway, there's there a

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

whole rack of other issues we could get into with... There appears to be evidence that not all the vaccines are the same. So they could be dosage testing on the public...

Bill Walton ([32:45](#)):

Same label, different vaccine inside the bottle?

James Patrick ([32:47](#)):

The various data does seem to show that one, 1-5% of the vaccines are highly toxic, over a thousand times more toxic than the other 95%, and that's where most the injuries are occurring. So that would indicate there's variation in the products and you don't know what you're getting. This one guy made a site where you can look up the batch numbers, see if you are in the toxic batch, but that raises a whole lot of questions.

Bill Walton ([33:19](#)):

Jay what's Heritage's position on this.

Jay Richards ([33:22](#)):

So Heritage, the policy position has been fine with the vaccines or the drugs said, "if you want to take them great." But very opposed to vaccine mandates or to drug mandates of any kind, for everyone, not just for ourselves. So we're challenging the district of Columbia and the federal government on these initial mandates. But we think it's just a fundamental violation of people's civil rights and it's also vast over reach about what the government ought to be doing.

James Patrick ([33:51](#)):

Yeah, you don't want the president of the government saying they can force you to take an injection or medical intervention, it violates all kinds of...

Bill Walton ([33:59](#)):

James you brought up an Nuremberg code in your film. The Nuremberg code that's like after the Nazis performing experiments in the concentration camps.

James Patrick ([34:08](#)):

How can you have Informed...

Bill Walton ([34:09](#)):

So what's the Nuremberg code.

James Patrick ([34:11](#)):

That people need... After the Nazi episode that it was said, that it was... The Nuremberg code was that people have to have informed consent if they're engaging in the medical experiment, the person has to know what they're getting into. And with a lot of these products, the ingredients aren't published, long term effects aren't known. It's a complete question mark. And the issues I was raising, people aren't aware of the products they're taking they're just going and getting, them assuming they're...

Bill Walton ([34:39](#)):

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

And the pushback on that from the people who think these mandates are great, is they say, "we're not making them do that." True, except if you want to have a job yeah, go to a restaurant, get on an airplane.

Jay Richards ([34:53](#)):

You're still free, like you're still free in North Korea to believe whatever you want to believe inside your head.

James Patrick ([35:00](#)):

If you're taking someone's rights away, to travel, to have a job, to enter businesses, to have any sort of public life, that's forcing, that's coercion. So creating a new apartheid of exclusion it's really scary, evil thing that's going on. And it's all in the name of, "oh, we're helping you." This is diabolical, it's not... People need to wake up to what's going on, because the rhetoric is getting weirder and weirder and crazier and more aggressive. And now they're saying, "oh, we're offering it." But I've seen a lot of pundits or experts say, "well, the force is coming, but now we're in the offering stage." But the rhetoric is getting crazier and crazier.

Bill Walton ([35:48](#)):

This going to be nice now, but [crosstalk 00:35:49]

Jay Richards ([35:50](#)):

If this is what they're offering, what does force look like?

James Patrick ([35:53](#)):

Yeah, we got to put the foot down here because it's only going to get worse. People are like, "oh, I'll do it, it'll get better." It's not going to get better.

Bill Walton ([36:00](#)):

New Zealand has internment camps.

James Patrick ([36:02](#)):

Yeah in Australia, and they're openly saying it's for unvaccinated people.

Bill Walton ([36:08](#)):

And didn't New York just start have people going into restaurants to see where the people had their...

James Patrick ([36:15](#)):

Pulling people out...

Bill Walton ([36:16](#)):

And the kid in me thought, well, we used to get fake ID's to buy beer, we'll just do a fake vaccine mandate.

James Patrick ([36:26](#)):

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

I'm assuming. I mean, there's a bunch of those floating around already.

Bill Walton ([36:29](#)):

Well, but they made it a federal.

James Patrick ([36:30](#)):

Oh, is that right?

Bill Walton ([36:31](#)):

They've made it a felony, it's not just a mis... I can't know what penalties are, but it's not some little thing. Chicago, I think, made it a felony.

James Patrick ([36:42](#)):

Fortunately they don't enforce the law in Chicago.

Bill Walton ([36:47](#)):

This is the one law. [crosstalk 00:36:48] Like in DC, the only thing they get right is parking tickets.

Jay Richards ([36:52](#)):

That's right, parking tickets and jaywalking.

James Patrick ([36:54](#)):

Now it's just these paper systems, but I know all this was proposed, I'm not sure if it was passed to make a federal vaccine database for us. Because now it's distributed there's no central records of anything. It's done state by state. But now it's just these paper and informal systems, but the Rockefeller and Gates foundations are funding blockchain immunity record so that there'll be this... You can't hide, it's an indelible record. This is really Orwellian or way worse than Orwell. This is really making the Nazi period look like a cakewalk, what's coming,

Bill Walton ([37:32](#)):

This is the Bill Walton Show I'm here, which James Patrick and Jay Richards and we're talking about, there are Orwellian aspect of all these mandates and these passports and the things that are coming. Let's we let's take the last segment here though, to talk just about what we see happening with regard to civil liberties and also where we think how we might be able to get out of this. You talking about the Nazi Germany, China today has got social credit system, they've got facial recognition, they've got artificial intelligence that can, basically if you get on a camera within about 30 seconds, a computer in Beijing can do facial recognition to tell you what you are and if you're doing something they don't approve of you get a black mark on your social credit register.

James Patrick ([38:21](#)):

Yeah and in Europe, they're deploying these systems, Israel just announced the same system.

Bill Walton ([38:27](#)):

What are they doing in Europe? The same facial reco...

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

James Patrick ([38:30](#)):

Well the social credit, there's a bunch of patents that were filed this last summer. Talking about that using your contagiousness, your threat level of this phony virus threat, social credit score. So they'll say, "oh well, we deem you higher threat, so you're not allowed to have any rights or go here or there. So it's like this virus narrative is being used to voice this social credit system in the name of this virus. But none of this stuff is about a virus, I think that's the cover story or the distraction to the real main act, which is an economic and political takeover. And the virus is to scare people into going along with it.

Bill Walton ([39:17](#)):

Okay, well, I'm not a conspiracy guy, but it's hard not to think about that. But a conspiracy requires coordination among a few people. And this seems to be thousands of actors and different types of actors. The winners here run from Amazon and Microsoft and Apple and all the digital, the whole digital world's a big winner here. Governments are a winner because they've increased their power, pharmaceutical companies obviously. Who are the other winners here that have a stake in seeing us lose our freedom?

James Patrick ([39:48](#)):

I think the big banks and holding companies, seeing the economy just consolidate into all the little, medium size businesses going away. And it's just a lot more industry around this technocracy, around these digitizing everything, making everything recorded. It's pushing society in a direction we don't want to go.

Jay Richards ([40:12](#)):

Yeah and I don't think that the virus was intentionally released or anything like that, I do think, and in fact, I would bet money, that it was leaked from a lab.

Bill Walton ([40:23](#)):

I will not take the other side of that thing.

Jay Richards ([40:27](#)):

No, but that's separate from being intentional. I do think that a lot of people saw the pandemic as a wonderful opportunity to deploy their ideas. Klaus Schwab at the World Economic Forum said this quite explicitly. You're not supposed to talk about this great reset, but it's not a conspiracy, it's on the internet, it's right here. The great reset is restructuring of global capitalism for the 21st century in a much more... It always sounds nice and more human centered in a sustainable way and which the robots will do all the drudgery and we won't own anything, we'll all be very happy. But he quite explicitly said that this is an opportunity for us to restructure things. And so this is not some tin foil hat crazy conspiracy, it's exactly what he thinks. That doesn't follow Klaus Schwab orchestrated the whole thing, it does mean that he and people like him are very happy for this opportunity.

James Patrick ([41:23](#)):

It looks like an attempt to create a world communism, where if they have everything digitized, then they could get it to work. Communism collapsed because you can't... Soviet Union collapsed because they couldn't coordinate prices, but now if they can literally tell everyone what to do and micromanage everything digitally, people like Schwab's think that it has a shot at working.

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

Bill Walton ([41:49](#)):

So I'm trying to get at a definition here. It's not a conspiracy in sense, you've got the little guy behind the curtain in Oz with the machine out front, but it is an elite consensus?

Jay Richards ([42:01](#)):

See, this is the thing [crosstalk 00:42:02] That's the way to think of it is that there's need for a single person to orchestrate things, if you have a lot of powerful people, all of whom think exactly alike, then it's a conspiracy of consensus. And so if everybody can be expected to do the same thing and to think the same way you get what looks very much like coordination, you don't need three guys controlling all this, besides none of these guys are all that smart, they can't actually have predicted what would happen. In fact, I think most people thought that lockdowns wouldn't work, I think most of the people that have implemented the lockdowns two and a half years ago would never have imagined that Americans would be so compliant. I would never have guessed it, but boy, we have been very compliant. I think

Bill Walton ([42:45](#)):

They didn't work to shut to stop the virus, but they did work to show how compliant people are.

James Patrick ([42:51](#)):

Absolutely, I think it's important to... I like to encourage people to stay away from the debates of the lab leak or the alternative treatments or the virus of this, the main issue is we're having our rights taken away and all these things are excuses and distractions, we cannot let governments do this to us. And it violates our fundamental rights and whether it's planned or not, or lab or this that, it is really not important. The real issue is they're taking everything from us.

Bill Walton ([43:23](#)):

I've loved lines of action, if we can find one, did a line of action come out of your film.

James Patrick ([43:29](#)):

Yeah. I think boycott businesses that are asking for these passports, sue the government protest, don't go along with this stuff because you're not going to win anything from it, you're just going to lose everything.

Jay Richards ([43:44](#)):

The good news about this is that almost all of it's happened because the masses have been compliant. I think it ceases to happen when the masses cease to be compliant, that's not a called violence. It's simply call to basic resistance. The other thing is if you notice that...

Bill Walton ([43:59](#)):

You just not going to go get in the back of the bus.

Jay Richards ([44:01](#)):

Yeah, just don't do that, just refuse to do it and be willing to take a couple of personal hits for that. If everyone is willing to do that, if everyone's willing to just say, "this is an inopportune time to get up and walk to the front of the bus, but by golly, I'm going to do it." The second thing is that the courts have not

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

been, for the most part, very friendly to any of these things. So these mandates, especially that the federal government is trying and that President Biden is trying, I think are very shaky ground legally and so there's a heck of a lot of law fair still, I think, to be implemented. And I think there'll be more positive court cases coming down The PI.

James Patrick ([44:37](#)):

Yeah, it's funny, I interviewed this lawyer in Rome and he was saying the supreme court, the constitutional court was corrupt and was ruling for them. But all the lower courts were deciding that it wasn't constitutional and the constitutional court was these corrupt ones and they were. But I think if people fight it... I interviewed a guy in Virginia who is a small business owner and he sued and he won. And I think people will win in court, if they fight it.

Jay Richards ([45:07](#)):

They do. Todd Zywicki, who won with George Mason.

Bill Walton ([45:12](#)):

We had talking...

Jay Richards ([45:12](#)):

You had him on your show, he's a perfect example, he had naturally acquired immunity it was an irrational policy. But then the ruling that, the school basically granted him an allowance, but it wasn't general decision. But the point is he's the only one that's tried this, why aren't there thousands of professors, they've had it, why aren't they doing it? And this is part of the problem, this is part of the problem in Washington, DC, it was left to one little Baptist church to decide that this crazy requirement that only 50 people can come in was an unreasonable call. And it turns out that the court agreed with them, but it was one little one church that did this. Why wasn't it every church? Why wasn't the was Washington Archdiocese it's because almost everyone is compliant.

James Patrick ([45:57](#)):

Yeah and so I get into this in the end of the film as, what does it take to say, no...

Bill Walton ([46:02](#)):

Let's wrap up here, with that let's... Continue.

James Patrick ([46:06](#)):

Because to say no is difficult, you have to know who you are. You have to look inside, have the inner strength and courage, and it's scary for a lot of people to go out on your own. So I explore this in the end of the film on, what does it mean to say no? What does it mean to know who you are and to have that strength and courage because it's a spiritual question of what are we here in... Alive on earth now? Why are we incarnated here to living our lives, to have these experiences?

James Patrick ([46:37](#)):

If we remove the individuality and if we just go along with these technocratic things, we lose the very meaning of life. So it's important for people to look inside and realize who they are and have the courage to be themselves. And that's the most fulfilling thing anyone can do. And I've had to do that in

Episode 167: The Great Reset with Jay Richards and James Patrick

making this film and a lot people I interview they have had to do that. And you might lose friends, but you you're going to gain just as many who are also saying no and it's a really fulfilling experience.

Jay Richards ([47:14](#)):

I hate to say anything else after that, but that is exactly... If people forget everything else, that's the message. Just be willing to exercise personal courage, moral courage, do the right thing and resist this. And if millions of us do that, I think it ends.

Bill Walton ([47:31](#)):

Jay Richards, senior fellow, the William E Simon, senior research fellow Heritage Foundation, and James Patrick filmmaker extraordinaire of the film passport... What are we lockdown planet? Planet lockdown, it's coming out January 15th, we can look for it on the internet.

James Patrick ([47:54](#)):

It'll be at [planetlockdownfilm.com](#), it's released for free. I'm going to release it in 10 languages, so it's international film for an international problem.

Bill Walton ([48:04](#)):

Okay, this has been the Bill Walton Show, and thanks for joining us. You can find us on the [billwaltonshow.com](#) and YouTube and Rumble and all the other major audio podcast platforms. Hope you learnt something today, I know I did, and looking forward to have you back again. And I mentioned YouTube optimistically because I think we've further to debate here, Mr. YouTube, and we think we ought to keep this debate up on the channel. Let's hope we follow community guidelines guys. Alright thanks.

Bill Walton ([48:38](#)):

I hope you enjoyed the conversation, want more? Click the subscribe button or head over to the [billwaltonshow.com](#) to choose from over a hundred episodes. You can also learn more about our guest on interesting people page and send us your comments. We read everyone and your thoughts help us guide the show. If it's easier for you to listen, check out our podcast page and subscribe there. In return we'll keep you informed about what's true, what's right and what's next. Thanks for joining.