

Vax–Unvax: Let the Science Speak –

Dr Brian Hooker interviewed by Jonathan Otto
(first broadcast 23 June 2023)¹

Jonathan Otto [JO]: *Vax–Unvax: Let the Science Speak* – great title! This is an important work: it’s something that has really been a missing link, I think [**Hooker** – “Right”], because we really haven’t had a culmination of all the different studies that do exist of vaxed versus unvaxed [**Hooker** – “Right”]. So you’ve had the guts to put that together, and you, Robert Kennedy Jr and... – anyone else involved in that project?

Dr Brian Hooker [BH]: We started to put together these presentations, and we thought, “Ah well, we’ll find a few studies here and there” – and 13 presentations later, which featured over 60 different publications where we found an unvaccinated cohort... Bobby and I decided, “This is a book! – we need to compile all this together; we can make this into a compendium; we can do more research, extend the number of studies we’ve actually been looking at and looking for”. And the response to the presentations that we put out on Instagram was so overwhelming, we were getting so many hits – we really thought, “This needs to be a book”. And so we actually started the endeavour of putting the book together in 2021 in the middle of covid-19, and I looked for more and more studies featuring vaccinated versus unvaccinated populations, and we came up with a total of over 100 studies.

So the book will feature 102 different studies that look at vaccinated versus unvaccinated groups for things like the entire vaccination schedule, things like the covid-19 vaccine, things like vaccines in pregnancy, thimerosal vaccines, vaccines in the Third World... And so we’ve come up with all these divisions and all these chapters, and we wanted to make a handbook that had very bright, easy-to-read graphics where someone could pick it up with a non-scientific background, they could read about the study, and then they could see directly how did vaccinated individuals do compared to unvaccinated. And we looked at some very controversial subjects: we looked at autism and neuro-developmental disorders as side-effects to vaccines. We looked at mortality rates associated with the covid-19 shot, associated with vaccines that were given to Third World children, like the DTP [diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis] and the tuberculosis vaccine, the live virus measles vaccine; and we’ve really come up with what we consider to be the commensurate handbook to be able to go forward and make logical choices and logical decisions regarding vaccination where we feature the population that’s been marginalised, the populations that have been denigrated – and that’s unvaccinated children. And we really really want to highlight that...

These are studies that the CDC [US Center for Diseases Control & Prevention] says don’t exist. These are studies that say that the FDI [US Food and Drug Administration] and vaccine pundits [*unclear*] say it’s unethical to have unvaccinated children because you’re withholding life-saving vaccines; but we *knew* that the unvaccinated populations actually

existed; and they exist in the United States, they exist in much of the scientific literature... So it was almost like a challenge, because the CDC said, “No, you can’t do this”; the FDA said, “No, you can’t do this”, the National Institutes of Health... – same thing; and we wanted to capture that control group of unvaccinated individuals and immortalise that control group in the book, because there’s honestly an effort to get rid of the control group so the “new normal” will be all these vaccine injuries. And we want to capture that, we want to encapsulate it, we want make [sort of] a time capsule of these studies – and that’s what the book is going to be.

JO: Wow! – and just before you said there’s an honest attack to get rid of all the control groups?...

BH: Well, they’re very blatant in their efforts to get every child vaccinated with every vaccine on the CDC schedule. I believe we’ve uncovered documents in the CDC where they really want to suppress the information around the unvaccinated, and they’ve gone to very very... the depths that they’ve gone to in order to marginalise these studies, in order to reach out... You know, when a publication comes out, there’s a furore amongst the pro-vaccine community to get that study retracted. And in some instances they were very very successful.

There was a paper that we feature by Dr Paul Thomas and Dr James Lyons-Weller that was in the *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* – a vaccinated versus fully unvaccinated children study, and it was retracted because of a lone anonymous complaint – we know who the complainant is; but there was such a furore, such an attack on that journal for publishing that study that it ended up being retracted over false pretenses, over false information. The co-authors of the study came back and showed that the complaint was absolutely and completely wrong-headed and false; but the journal said, “Oh, we’re going to retract your paper anyway”.

And so this is the type of thing that we want to highlight, that we really want to expose – that there are dark forces that really don’t want people to know what we’re finding – and that is that unvaccinated children have less ear infections, they have less pneumonia, have less developmental delays, have less asthma, have less gastrointestinal issues, have less ADD and ADHD, neurological issues in general, their mortality rates are lower. And all of this information, the CDC, the Pharmaceutical Complex are trying to suppress; and they’re going after mandates state by state – mandating vaccines, getting rid of personal-belief exemptions, getting rid of religious exemptions.... And so there are forces out there which don’t want this information to be published. And I’m sure that when the book comes out, it will probably be censored; there will be efforts to take it down off of these major outlets like Amazon.com or whatever because of the contents of the book and because of what we’ve exposed. We want to tell the entire story, and the rest of the story.

And then of course there’s the paper – a series of papers done by Dr Anthony Mawson at Jackson State University. He’s really the predecessor; he did these studies before anybody else. He came out in 2017 with these studies, and they were originally published in a journal called *Frontiers in Public Health*. And the persecution after that paper came

out was so wild that three days after the paper came out, they withdrew the abstract from their website and they put it back to peer review...; why would you take a paper that's already been peer-reviewed, it's already been published, it's already out on your website, and then say, "Oh, we're going to take it back for another round of peer review – we've changed our minds". And so the journal actually withdrew that paper; they said. "Oh, it was never officially retracted because we never officially accepted it" – which is a bald-faced lie, a *total*, in-your-face lie: they had the paper accepted, it was up on their website. But when the heat came, when the pressure came, *Frontiers in Public Health* folded, and then Dr Mawson had to go somewhere else; he went to the *Journal of Translational Science*, who ended up publishing his paper. And so there *is* a marker, there is a publication; but behind all these studies there's some type of saga of the difficulty in getting this type of research published.

JO: It's very interesting that this, then, ends up highlighting something else, that each of these studies has a back story of attack [**Hooker** – "Right, right"], of a mysterious retraction, of a mysterious... recantation... – what is this all about? And so something that was then formed to censor then now becomes a gaping wound or an eye sore, to then say, "Well, this is an unusual trend – why does it happen that everyone seems to keep making these same mistakes; and why do these journals which are supposed to vet things before they publish them, which now actually casts shade on *them* for a process that is faulty. So should I be trusting this other study I'm reading if they just retract things frequently? – don't they have a good process here?". So it brings up these types of questions, but then you start to end up at the conclusion that you and I are that, which is that there's really no explanation which is good, except that this information is damaging for vaccine companies.

BH: Exactly, exactly! This is the information that will cut into pharmaceutical sales, that will cut into vaccine sales, that will cut into the propaganda machine of the CDC in terms of getting your child vaccinated-vaccinated-vaccinated on time – vaccinated multiple times per visit for infants; there are two months, four months, six months, twelve months and eighteen months old: these are little tiny babies, they're getting six needle sticks at a time.... And so you look at the CDC vaccination schedule – that adds up to 21 needle sticks by the time they're one year of age; that's *a lot* of environmental insults to a very very small body in a very very short period of time. And so it's like the CDC wants the public to put blinders on and just [sort of] accept that.

INTERVIEW ENDS

Transcribed by Richard House Ph.D., 4 July 2023

Notes

1 First broadcast on 23 June 2023 in Episode 3 of the docu-series "Disease in Reverse" by Jonathan Otto, transcribed from the video interview with Dr Hooker.

2 Referring to the book of the same title, published by Skyhorse Publications on 15 August 2023 – see tinyurl.com/22dsz7rw.