

Joe Rogan and Bret Weinstein: COVID-19 Blunder

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

January 21, 2023

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › Bret Weinstein, an evolutionary theorist, discussed some of the most heavily censored topics today on "The Joe Rogan Experience"
- › From the initial allowance of gain-of-function research to the botched pandemic response, Weinstein believes the COVID-19 pandemic is the largest blunder in human history
- › Research published in Science Immunology reveals a "mind blowing" finding that after three doses of mRNA COVID-19 shots, your immune system may be triggered not to fight
- › As SARS-CoV-2 spread through the population, fear was used to make the population compliant
- › Weinstein explores the possibility that a select group may have had advance notice of the impending pandemic and used that knowledge to position themselves for a financial windfall

Bret Weinstein, an evolutionary theorist, author of "A Hunter-Gatherer's Guide to the 21st Century" and host of "The DarkHorse Podcast" was interviewed on "The Joe Rogan Experience," discussing some of the most heavily censored topics today.¹

From discussing why he believes COVID-19 is the "biggest blunder in human history" to how COVID-19 shots may make the human immune system unable to fight off pathogens, the interview is as riveting as it is pertinent to public health.

At the root of the problem is censorship, which has buried information that could have turned the tide of the COVID-19 pandemic early on, and the intentional act of keeping people in the dark, which may have paved the way for massive wealth transfer ahead of the pandemic.

'Zero Is a Special Number'

Weinstein begins by discussing how the narrative has been able to get so out of control, with free speech openly dampened by those in control. He calls the concept "zero is a special number":²

"The idea of zero as a special number is that this narrative control would not work if there was even one newspaper that was dedicated to the job of reporting the news. It wouldn't work if there was even one university that was dedicated to finding what the truth might be. Right?"

It doesn't work if there's one social media platform in a primary position in which free speech reigns, because in any of these cases, if you had the university that was still interested in truth seeking in an era where everybody else was doing their diversity, equity and inclusion thing, every reasonable person would wanna send their kid there, right?

So it would win in competition almost immediately, and the result would be every other institution would have to change their policy to compete. So if you get even one exception, that's enough to break this pattern."

What we face is a corporate stronghold over media combined with a state-run propaganda machine. Countless private-public partnerships between government and corporations bind the two camps together in a pact to dictate "truth" to the public. Weinstein believes [Elon Musk's takeover of Twitter](#) is an attempt to become that single exception, which is why you're seeing so many people publicly announcing that they're leaving the platform:³

"The structure that is controlling the narrative understands that it cannot endure that [Twitter becoming a platform for free speech]. And so far it has failed to shut down Elon.

So their next move is actually to get people on one side of this debate to leave so that they can't prevent Twitter from being a space where people can speak freely, but they can take it out of the position of being a primary social media environment. And in so doing, they will take the number of meaningful exceptions to the free speech control back to zero. That's what they're up to."

They Don't Want You to Know the Shots Are Gene Therapy

Initially, Weinstein didn't think the issue of labeling mRNA COVID-19 shots "vaccines" was a big issue, but he's since changed his mind. "Lots of people were upset by the redefinition of the term vaccine," he says. "I wasn't convinced it was an important issue. I have switched sides on this. I now think the definition is vitally important and we're beginning to see why."⁴

The No. 1 reason why Weinstein believes COVID-19 shots are not vaccines is because they do not create immunity to the pathogen. They also use a very different technology than that used by typical vaccines. But if the government began touting a new gene therapy, people would have questioned it. Weinstein explains:⁵

"What they've done is they've smuggled in a really, truly radically new technology. And they caused us all not to worry about it very much by using the term vaccine, right? If they had said, alright, we've got this pandemic and in order to prevent it from spreading, we're gonna have everybody take gene therapy.

Everybody would've said, what? Gene therapy is that safe? So the point is we had a category and it was called vaccine. And we all thought, you know, there are some crazy folks who are worried about vaccines, but in general, it's safe. So if something carries that label, it's probably safe too."



Download this Article Before it Disappears

[Download PDF](#)

How COVID Shots Made the Pandemic Worse

As Weinstein and his wife, Heather Heying, an evolutionary biologist and cohost of "The DarkHorse Podcast," dug deeper, they realized there was no way anyone could know whether COVID-19 shots were safe. "We looked at these technologies and thought, wow, you are intervening in a nested series of complex systems in a way that you can't possibly predict the outcome."⁶

This brought them to the work of Geert Vanden Bossche, Ph.D., a vaccinology expert and former global director of vaccine programs, including work for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. He's been heavily censored because he's among those who have warned about **immune escape** due to the pressure being placed upon the virus during the mass COVID-19 shot campaign.

Bossche describes a general principle in biology, vaccinology and microbiology that if you put living organisms like bacteria or viruses under pressure, via antibiotics, antibodies or chemotherapeutics, for example, but don't kill them off completely, you can inadvertently encourage their mutation into more virulent strains. Those that escape your immune system end up surviving and selecting mutations to ensure their further survival.

SARS-CoV-2 has a high capacity for mutation but, according to Bossche, if the virus isn't under pressure, it won't necessarily see a need to select mutations to, for instance, become more infectious. But if you put it under pressure, as occurred during the mass vaccination campaign — or as Bossche calls it the "one big experiment" — this changes. Weinstein says:⁷

"What he said is, look, if you vaccinate into a pandemic and you do so broadly across the population, you're going to drive the evolution of variants ... You are going to create an evolutionary arms race, and you were going to cause the number of variants to proliferate.

And, you know, at the time, I couldn't say for sure that he was right, but what I could say was that he was making evolutionary sense. There was nothing terribly complex about his argument, and it was robust. And I think now we are seeing ... that proliferation of variants."

Are the Shots Triggering Immune Systems to Give Up?

Research published in Science Immunology⁸ reveals a "mind blowing" finding that after three doses of mRNA COVID-19 shots, your immune system may be triggered not to fight. "It's a very dangerous discovery," Weinstein says, that has to do with an elevation in the percentage of IgG4 antibodies:⁹

"IgG4 is actually part of a system in which the body attenuates its own response to an antigen. So the mind blowing, and you know, it's an early result, maybe it doesn't get replicated, but ... the implication is that the evolutionary path we have traveled is causing the pathogen now to be able to trigger a response that will cause the immune system not to fight. Nobody knows what happens next ...

So the idea that a pathogen, and mind you, not a normal pathogen, a pathogen that we can now be pretty darn certain was engineered by humans, at least in part, that pathogen is now triggering that signal that causes the immune system not to react anymore, means we're in a whole new landscape."

Another potential mechanism of harm involves Marc Girardot's Bolus Theory¹⁰ and what happens if a COVID-19 shot, or any shot which is intended to be injected into the muscle, accidentally gets injected into a blood vessel, a demonstrated regular occurrence in hospitals. According to Girardot:¹¹

"Say the direct IV injection of a dose of Pfizer [COVID-19 shot] is diluted by 30 by the time it gets to the aorta, you'd have around 10,000 lipid nanoparticles hitting each square

millimeter of endothelium during the very brief passage of the bolus.

Let's imagine 10% of these vaccine particles penetrate a cell when they hit it. That means that up to 1,000 cells will end up destroyed by the immune system. That's more than 100% of the cells in that area! Likely irreparable, similar to a third-degree burn.

In the case of a proper intramuscular injection, the maximum concentration would be 25 lipid nanoparticles presenting themselves to the same 1 sq.mm. of endothelial surface. Only three would be uptaken, or less 0.4% of the surface would end up destroyed. Those three cell gaps would be fixed within minutes of the immune attack. And life would go on.

This brief physical phenomenon, similar to an avalanche crashing through your vascular system, is in my opinion the cause of all the adverse effects we have witnessed these past two years, and that have occurred for decades."

More Clues SARS-CoV-2 Is Not of Natural Origin

Weinstein says he knew very early on in the pandemic that SARS-CoV-2 did not appear to be of natural origin. Further, it didn't appear to be due to a simple laboratory escape either, but rather was a highly unusual pathogen with "unprecedented genetic alteration" — one that was likely enhanced in a laboratory before it escaped. Even the way it behaves in the human body, harming everything from toes to circulation to the brain is unusual.¹²

"There's a reason that a normal pathogen doesn't do the widescale damage that COVID seems to, and that reason is that, in general, pathogens don't have an interest in harming you ... In fact, they do best when you are healthy enough to walk around and spread them.

And so they tend to spare tissues that do not help them to be transmitted. Well, that's not the case with this pathogen. This pathogen seems to invade all kinds of tissues that don't help it to spread."

The presence of a furin cleavage site on SARS-CoV-2, which is what makes it so transmissible and able to invade tissue so effectively, is another smoking gun. "That's something that we knew would take a coronavirus and cause it to be highly effective in humans. We knew that before SARS-CoV-2 ever emerged. So, to find it on this virus, even though no other member of the subfamily has it, is conspicuous," he says.¹³

The lengths that the mainstream narrative has gone to discredit the lab-origin theory also hint at its relevance:¹⁴

"Why are they continually trying to reanimate the explanation that this is a natural spillover event? Because if it isn't, then we know who did it, right? Anthony Fauci was key to circumventing the ban on gain-of-function research that resulted in the Wuhan lab being funded by us [the U.S.] to do this work. So if this was a natural spillover event from a wet market, then Anthony Fauci is in the clear, right?"

If this is the result of ill-conceived gain-of-function research taking place in Wuhan, partially at our direction, that's a whole different ballgame ... those who are responsible cannot allow a full investigation.

I don't know what will happen if the truth were to fully emerge about, not only what was the explanation for how this virus came into the world when it came into the world ... but also what we failed to do, ... we failed to deploy ...

Because we didn't deal with the pathogen properly at the beginning, because we didn't deploy the drugs that we had at our disposal that did work, we ran out the clock on the brief period of time when we might have driven it extinct or at least controlled it."

The Largest Blunder in Human History

From the initial allowance of gain-of-function research to the botched pandemic response, Weinstein believes the COVID-19 pandemic is the largest blunder in human history. He asks poignant questions, like what would have happened if we had treated COVID-19 the way we treat other emerging pathogens — with trial and error and open discussion until the best course of treatment is identified.

"[If] we just let doctors figure out how to treat it ... they would've gotten rapidly better at treating this disease, and they would've discovered all of the compounds that work. And they would've talked to each other about in what way to deploy those compounds, at what dosage. They would've discovered all of that stuff," Weinstein says.¹⁵

Instead, as SARS-CoV-2 spread through the population, fear was used to make the population compliant. Data was manipulated, with COVID-19 deaths including people who died "with" COVID, not from it.

"Those numbers caused us to think the pathogen was something other than it was. And it is obvious to anyone seriously analyzing this that COVID isn't a dangerous pathogen. SARS-CoV-2 is a dangerous pathogen. I'm very worried about where it goes. But the case fatality rate is not one that should have caused us to vaccinate literally billions of people," Weinstein explains.¹⁶

A tweet featured in the interview claimed to be from a doctor who defended her choice to get a COVID-19 shot, saying she did it out of love while antivaxxers were acting out of hate. The tweet turned out to be fake,¹⁷ but its sentiment was not a far stretch from reality, as friends, families and colleagues have been torn apart over differing viewpoints during the pandemic.

This divisiveness is not happenstance; it's very much intentional. "One of the best ways to not look at people as being human is to categorize them as an enemy in some way," Weinstein says, mentioning mass formation, which involves the formation of a hypnotic state around a shared consensus.

"The mass formation appears to be downstream of an industrial strength propaganda campaign," Weinstein says. "A very expensive one designed to create these unsolvable puzzles for people so that they would end up in this mindset."¹⁸ The solution begins with continuing to share and spread the truth, and coming together toward this end. "If we don't do that, then we head into further and further polarization."¹⁹

Who's Profiting Off Keeping You in the Dark?

Meanwhile, Weinstein explores the possibility that a select group may have had advance notice of the impending pandemic and used that knowledge to position themselves for a financial windfall — and a "cryptic, massive transfer of wealth:"²⁰

"There's been lots of talk in various publications at this point about the possibility that COVID was circulating earlier than we knew ... If you know that a pandemic is coming and that it is going to spread around the globe, and it is going to cause all kinds of alterations, you can, you know, short stocks for cruise ships or airplanes, hotels, right? You can invest in pharmaceutical companies that have useful technologies ...

And so the question is, how much of the story here involves something having understood what was coming and having revealed it at a point that it was positioned rather than it having emerged naturally? ... I'm as much an outsider to this as anybody, but I will say

there's a version of the story in which our being kept in the dark is a perpetual source of wealth."

[Login](#) or [Join](#) to comment on this article