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[00:00:00] What's

**Marty:** up freaks. Welcome back to TFTC. Really excited for this episode. Sam, I was just mentioning, I'm a bit embarrassed that it's taken me this long to find your journalistic work and came across my radar a few weeks ago when you were, I believe, uh, at a state department press briefing and USAID

IDs, uh, funding of the Wuhan lab, uh, and Ralph Baric's connection particularly, uh, and that really piqued my interest because we've been covering, uh, COVID here over the last three years, three and a half, or almost four years now since, uh, It was unleashed on the world. And that led me to reach out to you to invite you on the show to talk about this particular instance in this particular question.

You ask, uh, uh, the press secretary. And then that led me to do research on all the work that you've done, not all of it, I'm sure, but a lot of the [00:01:00] work you've done throughout the years. And you've been on the front lines of trying to hold the power structures, feet to the fire, asking really hard questions, whether it be, uh, about the war in Iraq, the anthrax.

False flag, I think you would define it as, um, and most importantly in recent years, the, the narrative around Covid, um, and you've been on top of it, uh, based off of my research since, since Covid again was unleashed on the world in early 2020 and been skeptical about the mainstream narrative. Um, so yeah, that was my monologue saying I'm embarrassed.

I didn't find You've been doing great work for decades now, and I appreciate you joining us on the show today.

**Sam:** Thank you very much. Um, it's, it's a testament to the power of shadow banning that, uh, that you and lots of people don't know about my work, but I'm delighted to be with you.

**Marty:** So you're pretty sure you're shadow banned?

**Sam:** Oh yeah. I've documented how I'm, I'm sometimes [00:02:00] uniquely shadow banned. Uh, um, uh, once documented right after Musk took over Twitter. I put out a piece critiquing his stance about freedom of speech, not freedom of reach, and then right after that I was shadow banned in a way. I'd never been shadow banned before.

Like you would if I click, if you put, I put out a tweet and then you responded to it and you looked at your response, my tweet would disappear. It would just totally freaky. I mean, I'm, I think I'm still shadow banned to some extent. Um, but for a while I was like shadow banned, like I'd never seen anybody

**Marty:** shadow banned.

**Sam:** I was able to document that, you know, when that happened. Yeah, well

**Marty:** tweet made it through the shadow ban because I'm really excited for this conversation. I think we can start there just with your questioning of the press secretary about USAID's involvement with the potential [00:03:00] funding of the Wuhan lab and the connection between Ralph Baric, I believe out of North Carolina.

Yeah. And the research that was going on, particularly around gain of function with the coronavirus specifically, and, uh, again, you've been on this since the early days of COVID February, March, 2020, uh, what sort of tipped you off to the mainstream narrative, not being aligned with what The things that you were saying,

**Sam:** um, I've written about this, um, big chunk of what tipped me off was Francis Boyle, who's a law professor who wrote the U S implementing legislation for the bioweapons convention.

Um, I actually got an email from him sometime in late January. Of 2020, um, after the outbreak started and, um, he was saying, you know, somebody should check to see if there's a lab in Luhan, um, because he was suspicious because he, you know, he's been through so many of these [00:04:00] outbreaks and occasionally, you know, you know, determines or.

You know, thinks that they would be connected to a lab. Um, and then a couple of days later, uh, there was a news story that, you know, said, Oh, thank goodness. There's a lab in Wuhan that can help assess the situation. Um, totally. Getting the, uh, structure of the issue backwards, um, and, you know, uh, Francis shot me an email and said, bingo, um, he, he, he's had a small list that he sends stuff about bio warfare, you know, people who have expressed an interest in, you know, I've done some work, uh, on the anthrax attacks, as you mentioned from, Uh, 2001, they, for folks who aren't familiar, um, uh, following 9 11, there were letters with anthrax in them sent to, um, major media and members [00:05:00] of Congress, um, the two members of Congress that they were sent to that we know of, uh, were Daschle and Leahy, who were the two members of Congress who seemed poised to Challenge the implementation of the Patriot Act.

Um, so they, Congress had to be shut down. Uh, there was a nationwide panic. You know, 9 11 was sort of a discreet event. Um, so the anthrax attacks following 9 11, um, were sort of, you know, set off a genuine national panic. People were afraid to open their mail, which back then was a really important thing. Um, and, uh, So, um, and that's when they launched the Afghan war as well.

Uh, the anthrax letters came with, you know, letters written on them saying, you know, uh, death to America, death to Israel, praise to Allah. So they were obviously [00:06:00] intended to have people point fingers at Arabs and or Muslims, specifically Iraq and or Al Qaeda, and that's how they got played in the major media.

Um, And you had anonymous sources telling ABC's Brian Ross that they traced the anthrax to a strain that was from Iraq, which ended up being, of course, complete disinformation. And Brian Ross has continued to protect the anonymous source who fed him that false information. Um, so, um, uh, but it turned out after serious forensic evidence was done that it was the AIM strain, which was connected to U.

S. labs and, or, uh, their allies, most likely either in Britain or Israel. Um, so, um, you know, so that that's the crux of the anthrax case, they ended up pinning it on a series of [00:07:00] individuals and the case fell apart on each of them. And then they pinned it on Bruce Ivins, a lone scientist at Fort Detrick, uh, who committed, allegedly committed suicide and therefore they didn't have to have a trial and therefore they didn't have to produce evidence.

And the FBI just said, no, he did it too bad. We don't have, we can't have a trial. Leahy, one of the, um, Senators who was under attack finally brought Mueller, uh, before the Senate in 2008. This is before Mueller became infamous for his, uh, Russiagate. Um, and like he told Mueller to his face, I don't buy this, I don't buy that one person did all of this.

And there the matter stood and Congress never investigated it. There was one lone congressman who kept saying, maybe we should, you know, find out what happened. Um, so Congress went under a false flag bioweapons attack at a critical time in U. S. history. It helped spawn the Patriot Act, civil liberties [00:08:00] repression, and, um, helped start the forever wars.

Afghanistan was the first invasion, and then you, of course, had Iraq and Libya and Syria and, um. So on and so forth. Um, and it never investigated it. So I, you know, in part contrast that with the whole January 6th, you know, endless talk and speculation and so called investigation and so on. Um, so that, that, that's part of the background that got me interested in this general subject and the unique features of bio weapons and what, what that they can do and what they can do in terms of having a mass panic, um, people become very frightened, um, as they did after 9 11, as they did after the anthrax attacks, as they did after COVID and it hinders Many people's capacity to think and think critically.

**Marty:** [00:09:00] Yeah. And I'm having a bit of pattern recognition here because again, I was a bit shocked doing research on your work on the athrex, uh, the aftermath of the anthrax false flag, I think is safe to say now at this point, but I don't

**Sam:** remember. I mean, whoever sent those letters was either from a U S I mean, whether it was Bruce Ivins or a wider conspiracy.

Um, you know, it was, they intended to make it seem that it was coming from an Arab or Muslim source. Wasn't so it was a false flag.

**Marty:** Yeah, and this is where the pattern recognition comes in cuz I'm 32. I was 10 11 when that happened and obviously 20 20 years have passed 21 years and I Not I'm going to admit like I never knew that there was that deep of an investigation into anthrax.

It was successfully swept under the rug and something that I wasn't aware of until I was researching your [00:10:00] journalism on that particular event. And it seems like bringing this forward to COVID and the potential that USAID and I haven't heard you mention it, but I'm sure you're aware of like the NIH funding the Wuhan lab.

It seems like something similar is being attempted in real time right now in regards to COVID in terms of brushing everything under the rug, not answering any legitimate questions and just trying to make people believe that. This was actually something that, uh, was animal born and was a natural phenomenon that, that took over the world.

**Sam:** Yeah. Um, and, and by the way, there, and I, I, I plugged it on my sub stack that there have been a number of writers, Whitney Webb, Uh, Alexis Bader Mayer, who's, who've made additional connections between the anthrax attacks and, um, the, uh, uh, and COVID in terms of personnel involved, uh, as well as, as well as, uh, institutions and other things.[00:11:00]

Um, there was a tremendous, uh, propaganda blitz at the beginning of, uh, the pandemic to pretend that it couldn't have come out of a lab. Um, this was done, there were sort of two pillars to this. Well, first I should say, before those pillars came out, I was at a news conference, which really sort of sent me down this path at a press club where I used to have an office.

Um, And, um, the CDC was there and they, uh, talking about the outbreak. Uh, this was before it was declared a pandemic, uh, February 11th. Um, and I, you know, I asked, you know, is it the CDC's contention? I had just learned about that the lab existed in Wuhan a couple of days before this, and I said, you know, is it the CDC's contention that this has no relationship to the lab in Wuhan?

Uh, it's the only BSL 4, that's the highest level lab that we know of, [00:12:00] um, in all of China. Um, and they gave a very disingenuous answer, and I followed up, um, you know, specifically saying, you know, even if it looks like it came out of nature, it still doesn't mean that it might not have come through the lab.

That is, it could have been collected. Um, and then, um, you know, you know, housed at the lab now through the lab to me that obviously lab origin if you take something from a cave where nobody is and it's not hurting anybody and then you put it in the city of several million people, you're doing something there.

Um, and they again gave it a very disingenuous response. So that sort of set me into starting to look at this. Um, and then in the coming, um, weeks and months, there were two pillars put out. One was the letter in the Lancet, Peter Daszak and, um, who's head of EcoHealth [00:13:00] Alliance, which funded the lab in Wuhan.

Um, and, um, uh, Jeremy Farrar, who was head of the Welcome Trust, which is sort of the Gates Foundation equivalent in Britain, and he now is Chief Scientist for the WHO which is now in the process of juicing up its treaties and the UN now is meeting to further this to further empower the WHO in terms of What it can do during a pandemic.

Um, these provisions will likely further erode, uh, democratic processes, individual countries and their sovereignty. Um, uh, so that was one pillar from the lancet. And the other pillar was, uh, from. Um, nature medicine, uh, the, the, the, the, the Lancet letter said, we condemn conspiracy theories that this came out of a lab, which is a lunatic [00:14:00] statement to make a lunatic statement at best.

It's actually a very disingenuous manipulative statement in order to hinder people from critical thought from saying, hold on, could this have come out of a lab to call it a conspiracy theory? Um, and then shortly after that, the other major pillar, uh, that came out was a nature medicine article. Um, and, um, that was signed by Robert Gary and, uh, Christian Anderson, uh, to U.

S. based scientists at Tulane and Scripps Research, respectively. Um, some of us speculated at the time that other people who didn't sign it were behind that, uh, limited FOIAs that have come out since from the group U. S. Right to Know. Um, show clearly that, uh, Fauci, um, as well as Jeremy Farrar had a substantial hand in molding.

That, uh, [00:15:00] that article, uh, which, you know, again, both of these had major echo chambers throughout the major media and online and so on. Um, so they, um, and that article said that COVID could not be a laboratory construct and it purported to be a scientific article. It wasn't, um, disingenuously. tried to dismiss the possibility of lab origin.

Um, I started finally getting some stuff published at that point. This is before I had my sub stack. I got a piece in salon and I hooked up with the people at independent science news and they've been publishing some of my stuff. Um, and then one of the things that I did was, um, document the money going from, um, EcoHealth Alliance, uh, for going to EcoHealth Alliance from the NIH, as you [00:16:00] said, but far more than the NIH, which got some publicity, they got far more money from the Pentagon.

And even far more money from USAID. USAID, the NIH money was, I would think, around 3 million. USAID over the years had given them, um, upwards of 60 million. Um, and so, uh, I've periodically been able to get into the State Department briefings, and so I've been pursuing that. I've asked at the State Department four times now, um, over the last year when I've been able to go back there again.

Um, and I've never gotten a straight answer, uh, from them, not even an acknowledgment that they did fund the lab in Wuhan. Um, that some of their money made it there. They have not acknowledged that. Um. To the best of my knowledge, other people have made that charge, including former government people who I don't necessarily take their statements at face value.

For example, Redfield, the former head of [00:17:00] the CDC, has said that the USAID funded the lab in Wuhan, but they won't confirm it. Um, and, um, I'm going to continue to try to. Get that information out of them, um, in terms of how much funding and to force them to disclose documentation because it's critical, you know, you know, people have a lot of mythologies about bio warfare.

They say that bio warfare is a poor man's weapon. Uh, they've even, you know, the people, the Republican Congress had some hearings, which had some decent information on them. And they had some, this guy from MIT. On it. He was like, why is the US and China the great powers? Why are they engaging in this stuff?

This is this is a poor man's weapon. It's not a poor man's weapon. It has a unique attribute which is deniability nice country You got there. It's a shame. You just had a swine flu outbreak. [00:18:00] Maybe we can help you with that Biowarfare

Um, is a unique weapon and it can be used by so called great powers for very destructive purposes, um, because they can claim that they are not responsible. They're not responsible for it. So, um, I don't know if you want me to keep going. There are other things, other paths that my research took me to.

**Marty:** No, I mean, I'm just sitting back.

Not only is it, it's a very nefarious weapon too, because it's almost like humans trying to play God with nature and who knows what the unknown unknowns

**Sam:** are that, yeah, and it kills civilians, uh, for the most part, um, it's an incredibly nefarious weapon. Um, and I mean, another unique attribute of it is, you know, um, the one good thing about a nuclear war is that, you [00:19:00] know, that it happened, you could be under a biological weapons attack and you wouldn't necessarily know it because you don't know if it's a weapon or if it's a natural outbreak, especially if you're being disinformed about the possibility that Came out of a lab.

And if it came out of a lab, then it could well be a weapon. You know, the Bioweapons Convention prohibits this kind of work and they've tried to in effect do workarounds and exceptions to say, Oh, it's only for defensive purposes. It's actually not a legitimate argument because the Convention and the associated US law Doesn't have the word defensive in it as an exception.

It says peaceful purposes. So Francis Boyle, the law professor who wrote it, You know, makes us think about that. And I think legitimately, um, but, uh, they pretend that they're doing this work for beneficial purposes, but it's all a statement of intent, right? It's like saying the U [00:20:00] S invaded Iraq because of Iraq, because of alleged weapons of mass destruction, because they allegedly wanted to bring democracy to Iraq.

The statement of purpose, uh, just a pretext that's not to be taken seriously. So for them to. Take viruses and then make them more deadly. So we're only doing this, you know for You know, humanistic beneficial reasons. Well, that's, that's what you say. Uh, there's no reason to take that at face value.

**Marty:** Now, and then bringing this back to the USAID and their funding.

I mean, you mentioned the FOIA request that sort of brought to light the fact that Fauci was emailing with others to sort of form the narrative in the early days. And that's a direct paper trail to prove some type of literal conspiracy to conspire to drive a narrative into the public's consciousness.

Um, But there have been individuals who've come out and said USAID has funded the Wuhan lab in the [00:21:00] past and the NIH. I believe there's paper trails of the NIH that we can point to. Yeah, that

**Sam:** was established early. Yeah, I don't bring that up because that was established and conceded early on. Mm

**Marty:** hmm. And so there's no paper trail that shows direct funding from USAID to Wuhan.

It's just hearsay

**Sam:** at this point. It has not been made public yet. Yeah. And they will not, they have, they have thus far refused to acknowledge it on the four occasions that I've asked about it at the state department briefing. Why, why do you? And I've emailed them, which they usually respond to my emails when I do an immediate request for something.

Actually, they, they responded once with just boilerplate material about the subject, but not answering the question. Um, so. Does the

**Marty:** USAID have some special protections where they're not an agency that is forced to give up information? Like, could this information be FOIA

**Sam:** requested or? It could and it has been.

That was actually one of my questions at the State Department, the fact that U. S. Right to Know filed [00:22:00] FOIAs with USAID. Early on during the pandemic and they never responded. So earlier this year, I harangued Ned Price who was their spokesperson. He lost his job shortly after this And you know, when are you gonna, you know, why haven't you released these documents?

It's been three years and you wouldn't wouldn't give a meaningful response. So I harangued him about that for a while.

So Yeah. So, so we don't know that, you know, this is why, and you know, again, some Republicans have made some decent noise. Sometimes, you know, they overly blame China for things from my point of view. But what they haven't really done is use their subpoena power, right? The Republicans, um, you know, in, in the House, um, have a majority and they could use their subpoena [00:23:00] power and they could force these agencies to turn over documents.

They could force individuals to testify and they have not meaningfully done that. Um, so you, you have, you know, there are so many aspects to the failure that's gone on here, uh, from. You know, the stonewalling by the agencies themselves, the complete disregard for the facts by the Democrats and even many so called progressives.

And the fact that the Republicans really aren't using the tools that they have available.

**Marty:** Why do you think they're keeping everything so close to the chest and trying to brush it under the rug?

**Sam:** I think the U. S. is dominated by political factions who have two goals in mind. One is to target China to some extent, and the other is to ensure that you continue, um, the, uh, what is effectively bio warfare work.

And there are personnel behind the scenes, some of whom I've been able to [00:24:00] track. For example, Uh, Robert Kadlec, uh, had a role in the anthrax attacks. He was in the Bush administration at the time, and then he became, he was over at HHS, um, Health and Human Services, and he effectively ran Operation Warp Speed, uh, uh, which rolled out the vaccines, so called vaccines, the jabs, at the beginning of the, uh, you know, during the Trump administration.

And now he's over at the Senate. Effectively directing traffic as to what the, uh, Republicans, um, in the Senate do and don't do. So, um, that's a problem right there. Um, that's going to hinder what the Republicans do and don't do, at least on the Senate side. And I imagine it has some effect over on the House side.

And there might be other constraints there that I haven't been able to figure out yet. Um, [00:25:00] so, I mean, there is a deep seated U. S. establishment and there are a lot of layers to it. Um. I, and other people are doing our best to peel away.

**Marty:** Yeah. Yeah. They're really good at protecting the establishment. And it's weird.

It's like, whether it's anthrax, weapons of mass destruction, or what we're discussing now as it pertains to COVID, there's just a ton of gaslighting and it's effective. People again, going back to anthrax, like I was unaware of the, the followups on the anthrax attacks until I was doing research for this interview.

And that's what I worry about in the context of COVID is that happens and all this time passes and it just gets swept under the

**Sam:** rug and yeah. COVID stuff already is being memory old. Um, and there's a lot of stuff out there. Another case that I've investigated, I mentioned. Um, the second pillar of propaganda, um, uh, the proximal origins paper [00:26:00] that said that COVID could not be a laboratory construct written by Robert Gary at Tulane and Christian Anderson at Scripps Research.

Um, so I started doing research about the two of them. Why are they doing this? Um, now, as we said, since then, you know, there's been documentation that came out regarding Fauci and Farrar playing a role. Um, In that article, but they themselves had a very insidious motivation to lie about the possibility that COVID had lab origins.

And that is that they are respectively the president and vice president of a thing called the Viral Hemorrhagic Fever Consortium. This is a collection of labs, um, U. S. labs in West Africa. At the time in 2014, um, they, um, You had the [00:27:00] 2014 Ebola outbreak, which killed 11, 000 people, and it was probably the largest, um, international crises of that year.

Um, Africans at the time said that it, uh, that they were concerned that it came out of the lab, out of the U. S. labs there, that the Ebola did. Uh, and they were treated as nut job conspiracy theorists, simpleton Africans who don't know anything about anything. Uh, I did a very deep investigation about this with Jonathan Latham at Independent Science News.

He's a virologist. Um, and we came to the conclusion that there was a very serious case, uh, to be made about this. Don't want to, you know, go on and on about the specifics of part of our work relied on the work of Chernobyl, um, who's a journalist from Sierra Leone. He actually is in the U. S. now, just got his Ph.

D. at Northwestern. Um, [00:28:00] and he, um, he pointed out lots of things and we built on top of them. For example, the, um, U. S. labs were in, um, in Sierra Leone. Um, and the claim was by many of the same individuals who later played a role in COVID. that the outbreak happened just over the border in Guinea. Uh, and they pinned it all on this child, uh, little Emil, who they claimed was two years old for playing with bats.

In fact, he was only 18 months, probably too young to be playing with bats. They claimed that he died of Ebola. The workers in the village... Uh, say, and his father saying, no, he died of malaria. Um, the, uh, German team, um, by Fabian Linders, who, as I indicate, also played a role in COVID origins and working with Peter Daszak.

Um, he, uh, um, couldn't find any Ebola in [00:29:00] the vill in the village. They claimed that it came from a burnt out tree where the bats had been, uh, but were no longer there. Um, they admitted in their article that, uh, prior Ebola outbreaks had a die off of the local mammalian species. And there was no such die off in this case.

This is in West Africa, which is a thousand miles away from prior Ebola outbreaks, which had been in Central Africa. Uh, so it's kind of similar to, um, uh, COVID in that respect. That is, COVID breaks out in Wuhan, apparently, uh, which is far away from the caves where you would think that it would be. Um, and there, there was a whole series of.

Things that indicate that this narrative was wrong. When Doctors Without Borders finally got to the area, they complained about a hidden outbreak in Sierra [00:30:00] Leone. Uh, Meta Biota was actually part of the consortium. People might recognize that name. It's had a hand in the Ukraine and with Hunter Biden's corruption and so on.

Um, it's actually also connected to co, to, uh, Google, um, which is an important player in all of this. Um, the surveillance aspects of it. Um, but they, um, uh, metabiotic was apparently undercounting cases in Sierra Leone again to make it seem like the outbreak happened in Guinea. Away from the U. S. Labs that they were constructing a narrative so that people wouldn't think that it, uh, came out of the or had anything to do with the U.

S. Labs. So, uh, another strand of the evidence here is that people might have heard that so called gain of function lab work. Uh, that's the euphemism for [00:31:00] making pathogens more deadly or more transmissible gain of function lab work. Um, it was paused by the Obama administration. Actually, it was paused on October 17th, 2014, which is the exact same day that Ron Klain became Ebola czar.

Ron Klain is a major mover and shaker. Um, in the democratic establishment, um, and, uh, the Obama made him Ebola czar after the crisis, you know, really started heating up. And that was the day, um, that the pause was put into place, the pause for federal funding of gain of function lab work. And there are other indications, other cutoffs of funding that indicates that the Obama administration itself assessed that.

Ebola came out of a lab that that, for that outbreak, um, and we lay that out in, in the article for independent [00:32:00] science news. Um, and, uh, and Ron claimed it just so people might not know, realize who he is. I mean, he was just, he was chief of staff for Biden until earlier this year. Um, you know, basically makes him prime minister, uh, but he's not a household name because a lot of the people who are actually making decisions aren't.

You know, put in front of the camera. It's

**Marty:** Biden's not making the decisions. He's one of the shadowy figures behind him pushing all this and going back to like the gain of function research. I can remember that. And so like with Ebola and Ron Klain stepping in, did they, do you think they realized like, Oh crap, we can't be doing this here.

This is pretty bad. Um,

**Sam:** so I mean, I don't know exactly what happened. I know that's my question, but it looks like they said, holy crap, this could have come out of a lab. We got, uh, You know, distance ourselves from this for whatever reason, maybe, you know, if the truth ever [00:33:00] does come out, they want to say, well, look, we cut off the funding, we paused the work or because they realized the danger, uh, you know, whatever, whatever the reason is, but there was a whole series of things to indicate that they thought that it came out.

**Marty:** Yeah. And this is where like Wuhan and COVID comes back in, correct? Because they shut down funding at places like Fort Dedrick here in the U. S. and then allocated all that research abroad. To places like Wuhan, at least that's what the theory is, correct? Well,

**Sam:** I mean, I mean, Fort Dietrich is very well funded as far as I, I know.

Um, but, um, it, it, it seems that n i h as well as U S A I D and other things, funded, uh, dangerous lab work in other places around the world using EcoHealth Alliance. You know, it sounds like a nice, nice, earthy, crunchy group, uh, but, you know, it's, it has advisors who used to work at Fort Detrick, which is the flagship U.

S. [00:34:00] bioweapons facility, you know, for decades on end. Um, so, um, yeah, so they, they have clearly funneled. This dangerous lab work around the world and, uh, one of the places is Wuhan. Um, you know, there's been some attention and I haven't really dug into this, but the whole thing around the labs in Ukraine, it's a serious issue and the Russians have made a lot of very serious allegations and they deserve to certainly be looked at about US labs there.

**Marty:** Yeah, and that was funny because that was a conspiracy theory until Victoria Nolan was pressed and forced to actually admit.

**Sam:** I mean, I don't know if she was forced, I mean she was asked by, uh, you know, um, what's his name, uh, Rubio, uh, about it and, you know, you don't know what's going on in these people's brains, but he seemed to think that, you know, she would dismiss [00:35:00] this, but that there were these, you know, U.

S. biolabs there, but she didn't dismiss it. Acknowledged it. So, you know, at least that came out. At least that much of it was officially confirmed. But I suspect that there's a great deal more, but I haven't dug into the Ukraine thing. Yeah,

**Marty:** I can't help but think that the federal government and all the alphabet soup agencies that exist below it, whether it's in the intelligence sector or bioweapons sector, there's, it doesn't seem like they have Americans or citizens of other countries best interests at heart.

I mean, having been doing this for decades now. Like, are you completely jaded by the political process and the federal apparatus that exists in this country? And globally, it's sort of pretty interconnected at certain levels.

**Sam:** Yeah, it is. Um, I'm not jaded. I'm, you know, regular [00:36:00] people are, you know, um, you know, not aware of what's going on and there are serious media and big tech mechanisms to keep critical information from the public.

And it's my job to try to understand the information as best as I can and present it as best I can. Uh, yeah, these institutions are. Um, designed to maintain an edifice of empire, um, that the U. S. is an empire, but that they're working in concert sometimes with other powers. So there's a dimension to this where you have the U.

S. and Chinese establishments. Colluding as well as sometimes clashing, even I would say still with the Russian establishment, uh, colluding as well as clashing. Sometimes, um, they're vying for power among sort of like the Democrats and Republicans, right? They, they seem to be clashing at sometimes, but a lot of the time they're [00:37:00] colluding, you know, they're, they're, they're, you know, each saying, you know, pretending to be for the public in different ways while they're colluding with their buddies on Wall Street or Silicon Valley or.

Military and getting the actual programs through that are, uh, diverting us taxpayer money towards nefarious purposes that benefit a very few people. And the most regular people, uh, totally in the dust, if not completely ripped off. Um, it's a familiar pattern, but the job of journalism and the job of citizens and others is to try to understand as best you can and try to expose it and, you know, implement whatever things you can to hold these people accountable.

Um, I think we're in a unique window right now. Um, to hold these people accountable. I mean, I've been very frustrated by the fact that [00:38:00] Jeremy Farrar, uh, who then was head of the Welcome Trust and played a pivotal role in disseminating the false information that COVID could not have come from a lab, is now chief scientist of the WHO.

It's a position he took on just this year. Uh, it's ridiculous, uh, that he's the chief scientist of the WHO. Um, it's particularly dangerous because the WHO a

lot of people had hope in, uh, Robert, uh, Kennedy who put out a book on Fauci that had some good information on it. I read it when it came out. Um, it had some stuff I didn't agree with, but a lot of stuff in it was good. And then he runs for president and now he's suddenly. When he gets on big media, it doesn't talk about pandemic issues.

He doesn't talk about lab origins. He doesn't talk about gain of function. He's not educating the public. At least when you have like, like a sheepdog, like, [00:39:00] um, you know, Bernie Sanders, you know, he was a dead end in a lot of ways, but at least he gave voice to a critical issue, income inequality, Kennedy's not even doing that.

You know, he's, he's running around. He's talking about the border. He's talking about this issue. He's talking about that issue. And he's self censoring it is the best way is the most polite way to put it. And he's like making completely deranged pro Israeli statements as well. Um, that's where his energy is going.

And he's not educating people about getting a functional lab work that poses an existential threat to humanity. Um, on par, if not greater than. Um, uh, you know, you know, climate or nuclear war or anything else, as we've seen, right, we all lived through covid and can see what can happen. And the next one could be worse.

Um, uh, [00:40:00] and Kennedy's, you know, Not not coming out on this, uh, and certainly not when he gets on big media outlets, you know, he gets on Rogan or when he gets on some establishment media outlet, you know, I'm sure he's still doing some small podcasts where he might mention this. That's not my point. He's got.

An opportunity to reach a mass public on this. And he has thus far these many months into his campaign failed to do so. There are some good moves though. I should say, um, you know, I said that next one could be worse. And part of what I'm thinking of that there are scientists at the university of Wisconsin, and we were talking about, uh, Ralph Baric earlier.

And if you want to, we can talk more about him. He's at the University of North Carolina, uh, but, uh, in Wisconsin, um, the, the scientists there, um, uh, did work that made the avian [00:41:00] flu, which is highly, highly lethal, uh, but not easily transmissible. And they made it more easily transmissible. It's estimated that if that got out, we're talking about billions with a B people dead.

Um, uh, but it was government money, uh, as well as funding from the Gates Foundation that funded, uh, the work at the, uh, at the University of Wisconsin that did that. Um, there is legislation now in Wisconsin, state legislation, to try to stop that. Um, so... Why aren't they even working on it? We're scientists and we're curious and we want to know and we think that if we do this work that it will help Prevent the next pandemic.

That's what they say. That that that's what they say [00:42:00]

**Marty:** Again, it's just like completely hubristic man trying to play God Totally

**Sam:** totally and you have other scientists who don't get a lot of press saying it, you know You have prestigious scientists saying this is madness. This is crazy Um, uh, the most prominent person, the most prominent scientist in the United States is probably, uh, Richard Ebright.

Uh, he's at Rutgers. Um, and I imagine that he's at Rutgers and not a more prestigious university precisely because He's taken principled stands on this, um, he's been a scientist, um, and you know, he's been very outspoken in his warning of the dangers of this, of this lab.

**Marty:** Yeah. Yeah, it's very, it's very, I'm, I'm pretty jaded.

It's very disheartening.

**Sam:** I'm sorry you're jaded, but it's, you know, isn't it liberating to at least get [00:43:00] some level of, of, of, of truth about what's going on in the world? You know, at least some level of things to do, right? I mean, I'm saying that there's this thing in Wisconsin. So I don't know if you have any listeners in Wisconsin, um, and they can, you know, help push that.

I wrote an article about it and, you know, I linked to the legislation. People are in other places where this lab work is being done. It's being done in Texas at Galveston. Uh, as I say, North Carolina with Barak, who's probably doing the most dangerous stuff. I mean, he, you know, not the most dangerous, but the most sophisticated, I would say.

Um, Maryland, where I am right now, uh, because that's where Fort Detrick is, it'll be interesting if the Maryland government tried to stop Fort Detrick, which is a federal facility from doing lab work, but that's a fight I'd like to see happen, um, uh, [00:44:00] and, uh, presumably it's scripts and other facilities in California.

Um, uh, Yeah,

**Marty:** well you mentioned the window of time. Uh,

**Sam:** and that's because, you know, because people, you know, you know, pandemic is over, but here we are, WHO is trying to do a power grab, you know, they, they, they could, you know, they could declare a pandemic, you know, two months, two years from now, who the hell knows, and suddenly everybody's in lockdown mode again.

And then, then the repression really kicks in. So we have a relatively open period right now, and the most of it, I think.

**Marty:** Agreed. And that's the scary thing, like, bringing this back to media, which, outside of individuals like yourself, seems wholly... Incapable or unwilling to actually do the hard work and educate the public, like bringing the WHO back into this.

Like YouTube has come out in the last two [00:45:00] months and said, if you say anything on our platform that goes against what the World Health Organization is telling us is correct. We're going to, we're going to remove your. Uh, and, and give you a strike and Logan, my producer and I were just talking right before this.

There's dr. Paul Saladino. He had an episode about raw milk and just the benefits of raw milk and misconceptions around it a couple of years ago, and they pulled that a couple of days ago because the world health organization doesn't recognize. Raw milk is something that people should be able to ingest.

And that's like the scary thing. When you have this supra structure of federal government and large corporations like Google teaming up to really prevent this information from getting out there. It's, it's very scary. And it's part of the reason why we do this show. But we are, we're being honest with ourselves.

We're a gnat on the ass of the elephant that is the mainstream media and this sort of techno Political, [00:46:00] um, super structure that exists out there. Like we're, it's really a David versus Goliath type setup right now for the individuals want the truth and the power structure that doesn't want anybody realizing that truth.

**Sam:** Yeah, no, it absolutely is. It absolutely is. The, the resources on the other side are tremendous. And, you know, like we said, there are different factions of them. And part of the problem there is that they try to make you pick a side, you know, you know, funnel you into the, you know, MSNB, you know, Democrat MSNBC world or, you know, Trump world or whatever, but they both, for the most part.

Lead to the fundamentally same place. So it's it's kind of a con that goes on there So that's sort of overcome that as well. Yeah,

**Marty:** and then you mentioned Elon in the beginning of the episode and Yeah, he's posturing like he's trying to make X this [00:47:00] platform a free speech But I think I've been calling Elon the Manchurian candidate of the private sector Um, for the last few months, because if you just look at his body of work, he's heavily dependent on government subsidies and all of his other lines of businesses.

And to think that he would sacrifice that, that money spigot, um, by allowing people to speak freely on, on axes, um, a bit naive on behalf of a lot of people out there who actually believe that he's really trying to bring free speech back.

**Sam:** Yeah, I mean, in some respects it's, you know, terrible that he's deceiving people, but People know that they need something else, you know, uh, that there's a hunger out there and they don't know what it is.

They're just flailing around saying, maybe Trump will provide an answer. No, he's not going to do it. Elon going to provide it. Is he going to help? That the public is [00:48:00] hungry for, you know, some modicum of, you know, accountability and. You know, actual facts and, um, genuine honesty, I think it's just that you have to peel through so many layers of deceit to try to get to it.

You know, taking care of their kids or parents or whatever, and trying to get by and don't, you know, can't, can't, you know, go through all this stuff. Um, so it's a matter of people can try to present information as clearly and concisely as possible. And sometimes I succeed and sometimes I fail. And other people can pick up the ball in parts of it and do local activism.

I mean, I, I mean, I think that there could be all kinds of opportunities to sort of meld the online world with the. Real world, um, you know, you know, put lawn signs up that, you know, debunk things [00:49:00] and then post them online to encourage other people to do the same thing. Or, you know, um, I'm hoping to set up some projects where I sort of concisely put together.

Information on papers, like literally a PDF file, and then people can pass it out in front of an institution, especially I'm just outside the D. C. So imagine people, you know, firing in effect in front of these institutions to including reaching the employees of the institutions, half of whom don't know what the hell was actually going on in the building that they work, um, uh, to try to disseminate that information.

It's, you know, it's a constant battle of trying to. Get information out and try to, you know, uh, some semblance, I hate to say reform because I think that we need more than reforms, but some kind of a genuinely positive, [00:50:00] meaningful change. Yeah,

**Marty:** we need, uh, we need people to wake up. Number one, I'm imagining a lawn sign right now in this house.

We believe that the NIH funded gaiter function research. Oh, that's

**Sam:** brilliant. That's brilliant. That would be brilliant. Go, you know, I, I really think that there's like money to be made on stuff like that, you know, um, uh, that would be, that would be because most of those lawn signs have disappeared. You'll notice people, people know.

They're not willing to acknowledge, but at some level they know that they were conned, you know, um, so I think something like that, I'm so glad you said that, uh, something like that could take off, uh, you know, can I get, you know, if you go with that, can I get a, you know, 2 percent cut or something? Yeah, you know what,

**Marty:** we've got, we're merch store.

We may need to add a, a lawn sign. Section to the store. [00:51:00] I've got some ideas.

**Sam:** That'd be great. Um,

**Marty:** no, I know we have to wrap up here soon. We only blocked off an hour, but hopefully this is the first of. Many conversations because there's many more rabbit holes. I'd like to dive down with you Sam and Again, I just want to thank you for the work you're doing hopefully This message gets out there and your work spreads to others and you can evade the shadow ban That Elon has put on you because I think the work that you're doing again is extremely important and we need More of this information out there and most importantly, I think that's one of the most impressive things about a way in which you Relay this information as you do it without fear and you're very Straight to the point and you have your facts behind you and it's doesn't come off like some crazy conspiracy theory Archetype that that many people try to thrust on you.

It's very logical and coherent and easy to follow which I [00:52:00] think Does a lot of people trying to get truth out there disservice when they get very passionate about it and aggressive and screaming at people I think doing it in a very Sort of monotone not monotone, but straightforward way following logic and reason

**Sam:** I haven't had the conspiracy theory thing thrown at me that often that I can recall and I think I hope that it's because I If anything, I'm overly conservative in terms of the information that I put out that is, uh, you know, I mean, my speculations, I got to tell you, are far more interesting than any that I generally hear from, you know, whatever groups that are actually engaging in conspiracy theories and so on.

But another thing of interesting about that term is, you know, if you talk to people who follow corporate crime, for example, that they. They, they, they ridicule the term. I mean, they're, they're like, of course there are conspiracies, right? You know, uh, you know what, what, uh, [00:53:00] you know, what Purdue Pharma did with opioids.

That was, you know, you follow the paper trail. That was a clear conspiracy. It was a corporate conspiracy. Uh, as you alluded to the emails between Fauci and Farrar and Gary and Anderson, uh, that constructed the, um, pillar of propaganda, the proximal origins paper, that was effectively a conspiracy to defraud the public, uh, to propagandize them into thinking that it could, that COVID couldn't have come out of a lab.

Imagine if that information got out in. Early 2020. Imagine if the global public understood that this thing, that they're making me stay at home and I can't even go and hug my mother. You know, uh, that this thing came out of a lab. Who are these sons of bitches and how the hell do I beat the crap out of them?

That would have been the question on most of the people in the planet's mind and they [00:54:00] deceive the public. And so I'm saying there's got to be some modicum of accountability now, finally, before the next one. Yeah.

**Marty:** I saw your, your recent tweet, free Palestine, uh, jail Fauci, uh, the rest is a footnote.

**Sam:** Yeah.

You know, I mean, that partially came out of a frustration between. The, you know, um, the people around who are supporting Robert Kennedy and the people who are supporting, uh, uh, Cornel West, you know, that they, they each get sort of half the equation. And a lot of my work has been in trying to get.

Different parts of the anti establishment, you know, I would say like, you know, from Kucinich to Ron Paul, they agree on so many things to get different parts of the establishment working together. And what we're seeing now with the Kennedy and Cornel West campaigns is the further fragmentation. of people in the anti [00:55:00] establishment.

I think that's exactly what we don't need. And I'm disappointed in both of those camps right now. So I hope that they will change as quickly as possible. Yeah. And that's

**Marty:** not to pump around bags here, but that's this podcast is mainly a Bitcoin podcast. And that's one of the reasons why we talk a lot about Bitcoin and try to educate about Bitcoin because we think it's one of these tools that, um, could.

both sides of that fragmentation could agree is, is, is good. It takes money out of the power of the state and the banking sector gives it back to individuals. Um, and that's part of the main thing we do here, but we've expanded TFTC stands for truth for the commoner. And so expanding it behind beyond, excuse me, uh, the monetary aspect of Bitcoin and into other areas like.

The ones that you cover, I think it's important.

**Sam:** I will try to tune in and learn some more. I know very little about that. Thank you so much. Thank you,

**Marty:** Sam. Have a great night. Peace and love freaks.[00:56:00]