

NO. 03-19-00811-CV

IN THE THIRD COURT OF APPEALS,
AUSTIN, TEXAS

FILED IN
3rd COURT OF APPEALS
AUSTIN, TEXAS
1/16/2020 10:03:51 PM
JEFFREY D. KYLE
Clerk

ALEX E. JONES, INFOWARS, LLC, FREE SPEECH SYSTEMS, LLC,
AND OWEN SHROYER, *Appellants*,

v.

NEIL HESLIN, *Appellee*

On Appeal from the 53rd District Court,
Travis County, Texas
Trial Court Cause No. D-1-GN-18-001835

APPELLANTS' BRIEF

T. Wade Jefferies
THE LAW FIRM OF T. WADE JEFFERIES
State Bar No. 00790962
401 Congress Ave., Suite 1540
Austin, TX 78701
Email: twadejefferies@twj-law.com
Telephone: (512) 201-2727
Facsimile: (512) 687-3499
Counsel for Appellants

David J. Sacks
SACKS LAW FIRM
State Bar No. 17505700
2323 S. Shepherd, Suite 825
Houston, TX 77019
Email: david@sackslawfirm.com
Telephone: (713) 863-8400
Facsimile: (713) 863-0502
Lead Counsel for Appellants

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL

1. **Appellants:**
Alex E. Jones,
Infowars, LLC, and
Free Speech Systems, LLC
Owen Shroyer

Counsel for Appellants:
David J. Sacks
State Bar No. 17505700
SACKS LAW FIRM
2323 S. Shepherd Dr., Suite 825
Houston, Texas 77019
david@sackslawfirm.com

T. Wade Jefferies
State Bar No. 00790962
THE LAW FIRM OF T. WADE JEFFERIES
401 Congress Ave., Suite 1540
Austin, TX 78701
twadejefferies@twj-law.com

Trial Court:

Michael Burnett
State Bar No. 00790399
BURNETT TURNER
6034 W. Courtyard Drive, Suite 140
Austin, Texas 78730
mburnett@BurnettTurner.com

Mark C. Enoch
State Bar No. 06630360
Mark C. Enoch, PC
14801 Quorum Drive, Suite 500
Dallas, Texas 75254-1449
fly63rc@verizon.net

2. **Appellee:**
Neil Heslin

On Appeal:
Mark D. Bankston
State Bar No. 24071066
Kaster Lynch Farrar & Ball
1010 Lamar, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002
mark@fbtrial.com

At Trial:

Mark D. Bankston
State Bar No. 24071066
Kaster Lynch Farrar & Ball
1010 Lamar, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002
mark@fbtrial.com

Kyle W. Farrar
State Bar No. 24034828
Kaster Lynch Farrar & Ball
1010 Lamar, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002
kyle@fbtrial.com

William R. Ogden
State Bar No. 24073531
Kaster Lynch Farrar & Ball
1010 Lamar, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002
bill@fbtrial.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iv

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES.....ix

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... xiii

ISSUES PRESENTED.....xiv

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS 6

 A. June 25, 2017 ZeroHedge Publication Titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim in Alex Jones Hit Piece”.....8

 B. June 25, 2017, Owen Shroyer Broadcast, Commenting on the June 25, 2017, ZeroHedge Publication 10

 C. July 20, 2017, Alex Jones Broadcast, Commenting on the Censor of the Owen Shroyer, June 25, 2017, Broadcast..... 13

 D. April 16, 2018, Appellee Heslin Filed this Lawsuit 16

 E. April 19, 2018, Appellee Heslin Authorized the Republication of the Allegedly Defamatory Broadcasts Nationally 16

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....17

ARGUMENT 19

I. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN DENYING APPELLANTS’ TCPA MOTION TO DISMISS BECAUSE APPELLANTS ESTABLISHED ALL THREE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS MANDATING DISMISSAL 19

 A. The Purpose of TCPA is to Safeguard Constitutional Rights..... 19

 B. The TCPA Procedure and Standard of Review.....20

C. Appellee Heslin’s Entire Lawsuit and Each of his Claims are Based on, Relate to, and are in Response to Appellants’ Exercise of the Right of Free Speech and the Right to Petition.....22

D. Appellee Heslin Failed to Show, by Clear-and-Specific-Evidence, Each Element of Each of his Defamation Claims Against Each Appellant.....25

1. Defamation *per quod* and defamation *per se* defined.....26

2. The elements of a defamation claim26

3. There are no defamatory statements in the two broadcasts from which Appellee complains.27

a. TCPA Evidence standard applied to defamation27

b. There was no “June 26, 2017” broadcast.....30

c. The June 25, 2017 broadcast is not defamatory31

d. The July 20, 2017 broadcast is not defamatory35

4. There is no clear-and-specific-evidence Appellants had actual knowledge of falsity or were reckless as to truth.37

a. Appellee is a limited purpose public figure.....37

b. Appellee failed to show clear-and- specific, and clear-and- convincing, evidence of malice -- knowing falsity or reckless disregard for the truth..... 40

5. Appellee Heslin failed to show any clear-and-specific-evidence that any statement by Appellants proximately caused any damages.....42

a. There is no unambiguous, sure, and free-from-doubt evidence of defamation per se..... 42

b.	There is no unambiguous, sure and free from doubt evidence of defamation per quod damages	44
E.	Appellants Proved Their Affirmative Defenses, which are Complete Bars to the Defamation Claims.....	46
1.	The statute of limitations for defamation claims is one year	47
2.	Appellee may not recover exemplary damages as a matter of law because he failed to comply with Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem Code §73.055(c).....	48
3.	Appellants’ statements are protected expressions of opinion by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Texas Constitution.....	49
4.	InfoWars is not liable based on undisputed facts	50
5.	Appellee’s defamation claims are barred under the substantial truth doctrine, Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §73.005	50
6.	Appellee’s defamation claims are barred under the fair comment privilege, Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §73.002.....	54
II.	THE TRIAL COURT’S RULING VIOLATES APPELLANTS’ FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION	55
III.	THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO SUSTAIN THE FOLLOWING OBJECTIONS APPELLANTS’ MADE TO APPELLEE HESLIN’S PROFERRED AFFIDAVITS	59
A.	Zipp affidavit (CR:1508-1530, exhibits 1531-1630, Appellants’ objections 1907-1938).....	59
B.	Binkowski affidavit (CR:1658-1669, Appellants’ objections 1939-1971)	61

C.	Heslin affidavit (CR:1693-1697, Appellants’ objections 1971-1974)	62
D.	Carver affidavit (CR:1698-1699; Appellants’ objections CR:1974-1976).....	63
E.	Lewis affidavit (CR:1702-1704; Appellants’ objections CR:1976-1977).....	64
F.	Clayton affidavit (CR:1705-1707; Appellants’ objections CR:1977-1979).....	65
G.	Turnini affidavit (CR:1708-1709 and exhibits CR:1710-1755, Appellants’ objections CR:1979).....	65
IV.	THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO AWARD APPELLANTS’ ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND SANCTIONS AS MANDATED BY THE TCPA. IF ANY OF THE CLAIMS BROUGHT AGAINST ANY OF THE APPELLANTS ARE DISMISSED, THE AWARD OF ATTORNEYS’ FEES, SANCTIONS AND COSTS IS MANDATORY.....	66
	CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED	67
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	68
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	68
	INDEX OF APPENDICES.....	
	APPENDIX 1: Order Denying Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA) Motion to Dismiss, dated October 18, 2019 (CR:3286-3287).....	Appendix 1
	APPENDIX 2: June 25, 2017 iBankcoin publication: “MEGYN KELLY FAILS TO FACT CHECK SANDY HOOK FATHER’S CONTRADICTIONARY CLAIM IN ALEX JONES HIT PIECE” (CR:1395-1399)	Appendix 2

APPENDIX 3: June 25, 2017 ZeroHedge publication:
“Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook
Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit
Piece” (CR:1400-1403)Appendix 3

APPENDIX 4: June 25, 2017 broadcast with Owen
Shroyer: Commenting on the ZeroHedge publication
titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook
Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit
Piece” (CR:1102 [thumb drive containing the video
of Owen Shroyer’s entire June 25, 2017 broadcast],
CR:1104-1130 [transcript of Owen Shroyer’s entire
June 25, 2017, ninety (90) minute, video broadcast],
CR:1109-1110, 1129 [specific portions of the June 25,
2017 transcript commenting on the ZeroHedge
publication])Appendix 4

APPENDIX 5: July 20, 2017 broadcast with Alex Jones:
Commenting on the censor of the Owen Shroyer June
25, 2017 broadcast that commented on the ZeroHedge
publication titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check
Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex-
Jones Hit Piece” (CR:1103 [thumb drive containing
the video of Alex Jones’s entire July 20, 2017
broadcast], CR:1034-1101 [transcript of Alex Jones’s
entire July 20, 2017, three (3) hour, video broadcast],
CR:1069-1070, 1076-1079 [specific portions of the
July 20, 2017 transcript commenting on the censor of
Owen Shroyer’s June 25, 2017 broadcast])Appendix 5

APPENDIX 6: Affidavit of Alex E. Jones from Appellants’
Motion to Dismiss under TCPA (CR:801-804)Appendix 6

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

United States Supreme Court:

Connick v. Myers, 461 U.S. 138, 145 (1983).....57

Gertz v. Welch, 418 U.S. 323 (1974).....57

Hustler Magazine, Inc. v. Falwell, 485 U.S. 46 (1988).....58

Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co., 497 U.S. 1 (1990).....27

New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254 (1964)55

Rosenblatt v. Baer, 383 U.S. 75 (1966).....54

Snyder v. Phelps, 562 U.S. 443 (2011).....57

Whitney v. California, 274 U.S. 357 (1927)55

Texas Supreme Court:

Adams v. Starside Custom Builders, LLC, 547 S.W.3d 890
(Tex. 2018) 20, 21, 23

Bentley v. Bunton, 94 S.W.3d 561 (Tex. 2002) 28, 41, 65

Bos v. Smith, 556 S.W.3d 293 (Tex. 2018)..... 26, 42, 45

Brady v. Klentzman, 515 S.W.3d 878 (Tex. 2017)..... 26, 27, 42

Broders v. Heise, 924 S.W.2d 148 (Tex. 1996).....61

Carr v. Brasher, 776 S.W.2d 567 (Tex. 1989)..... 37, 40, 49

City of Keller v. Wilson, 168 S.W.3d 802 (Tex. 2005).....61

D Magazine Partners, L.P. v. Rosenthal, 529 S.W.3d 429 (Tex.
2017)..... 28, 54

Dallas Morning News, Inc. v. Tatum, 554 S.W.3d 614 (Tex.
2018)..... 28, 29, 35, 36

Doe v. Boys Clubs of Greater Dallas, Inc., 907 S.W.2d 472
(Tex. 1995)45

Exxon Pipeline Co. v. Zwahr, 88 S.W.3d 623 (Tex. 2002)65

Forbes Inc. v. Granada Biosciences, Inc., 124 S.W.3d 167
(Tex. 2003)47

Greer v. Abraham, 489 S.W.3d 440 (Tex. 2016)40

Hersh v. Tatum, 526 S.W.3d 462 (Tex. 2017)..... 21, 24

In re Lipsky, 460 S.W.3d 579 (Tex. 2015) 19, 21, 25

McIlvain v. Jacobs, 794 S.W.2d 14 (Tex. 1990)50

Mendoza v. Fidelity & Guar. Ins. Underwriters, Inc., 606
S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1980)31

Moore v. Leverett, 52 S.W.2d 252 (Tex. Comm’n App. 1932,
holding approved).....29

Musser v. Smith Protective Svcs., Inc., 723 S.W.2d 653 (Tex.
1987)..... 4, 29, 63, 64

Neely v. Wilson, 418 S.W.3d 52 (Tex. 2013)..... 40, 51, 54

Newspapers, Inc. v. Matthews, 339 S.W.2d 890 (Tex. 1960) 63, 64

Suarez v. City of Tex. City, 465 S.W.3d 623 (Tex. 2015).....21

Turner v. KTRK Television, Inc., 38 S.W.3d 103 (Tex. 2000)..... 26, 41, 53

WFAA-TV, Inc. v. McLemore, 978 S.W.2d 568 (Tex. 1998)..... 27, 37, 38

Whisenhunt v. Lippincott, 416 S.W.3d 689 (Tex. 2013)20

Texas Courts of Appeal:

ABC, Inc. v. Shanks, 1 S.W.3d 230 (Tex.App.–Corpus Christi
1999, pet. denied)30

Arant v. Jaffe, 436 S.W.2d 169 (Tex. Civ. App.–Dallas 1968,
no writ) 62, 64

Avila v. Larrea, 394 S.W.3d 646 (Tex.App.-Dallas 2012, pet.
denied)50

Billington v. Hous. Fire & Cas. Ins., 226 S.W.2d 494 (Tex. Civ.
App.—Fort Worth 1950, no writ)29

Bingham v. Southwestern Bell Yellow Pages, Inc., no. 02-06-
00229-CV, 2008 WL 163551 (Tex. App.–Ft. Worth January
17, 2008, no pet.)64

Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union, 466 U.S. 485 (1984).....41

Cavin v. Abbott, 545 S.W.3d 47 (Tex.App.—Austin, 2017, no pet.) 19, 20, 22, 23

Champion Printing & Copying LLC v. Nichols, No. 03-15-00704, 2017 WL 3585213 (Tex. App.—Austin August 18, 2017, pet. denied) 27, 28

Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. v. Penick, 219 S.W.3d 425 (Tex.App. –Austin 2007, pet. denied).....48

Deaver v. Desai, 483 S.W.3d 668 (Tex.App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 2015, no pet.).....47

Durckel v. St. Joseph Hosp., 78 S.W.3d 576 (Tex. App. — Houston [14th Dist.] 2002, no pet.).....30

Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Hines, 252 S.W.3d 496 (Tex. App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 2008, pet. denied).....45

ExxonMobil Pipeline Co. v. Coleman, 512 S.W.3d 895 (Tex. 2017)..... 4, 20, 22, 23

Farias v. Garza, 426 S.W.3d 808 (Tex. App.–San Antonio 2014, pet. denied) 49, 50

Hawxhurst v. Austin’s Boat Tours, 550 S.W.3d 220 (Tex.App.—Austin 2018, no. pet. h.)..... 4, 22, 66

Klantzman v. Brady, 312 S.W.3d 886 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] 2009, no pet.).....63

Main v. Royall, 348 S.W.3d 381 (Tex. App.-Dallas 2011, no pet.) 26, 43

Mayfield v. Fulhart, 444 S.W.3d 222 (Tex.App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 2014, pet.denied)47

Means v. ABCABCO, Inc., 315 S.W.3d 209 (Tex. App.- Austin 2010, no pet.).....29

MKC Energy Invs., Inc. v. Sheldon, 182 S.W.3d 372 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2005, no pet.)27

Ortiz v. Glusman, 334 S.W.3d 812 (Tex. App –El Paso 2011, pet. den.)65

Overstreet v. Underwood, 300 S.W.3d 905 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2009, pet. denied).....29

Tex. Disposal Sys. Landfill, Inc. v. Waste Mgmt. Holdings, Inc.,
219 S.W.3d 563 (Tex. App.–Austin, 2007, pet. denied).....47

Upjohn Co. v. Rylander, 38 S.W.3d 600 (Tex. App.–Austin
2000, pet.den)62

Yiamouyiannis v. Thompson, 764 S.W.2d 338 (Tex. App.–San
Antonio 1988, writ denied).....49

Other:

Lizotte v. Welker, 45 Conn. Supp. 217, 709 A.2d 50 (Conn.
Super. Ct 1996).....49

Rules and Statutes

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §16.00247

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §27.001 22, 23, 24, 25, 66

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §27.00320

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §27.005 20, 21, 22, 46

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §27.00621

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §27.009 19, 66

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §51.014 xiii

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §73.002 18, 54

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §73.005 18, 50

Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §73.055 18, 48

Tex. R. Evid. 401 60, 62

Tex. R. Evid. 40260

Tex. R. Evid. 40360

Tex. R. Evid. 40460

Tex. R. Evid. 40660

Tex. R. Evid. 60860

Tex. R. Evid. 703 59, 60

Tex. R. Evid. 1002 60, 62

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Nature of the Case: Appellee sued Appellants for defamation arising from core political speech. He claims that all the Appellants defamed him in two broadcasts, June 26, 2017 and July 20, 2017. (CR:3175-3177).

Trial Court: Honorable Scott H. Jenkins of the 53rd District Court in Travis County, Texas

Trial Court Proceedings: Appellants filed a Motion to Dismiss under the Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA)(CR:718-1403; 1406, 1803-1809 CR:2006-2035 [First Supplement to Motion to Dismiss] CR:2036-2043; CR:2796-2804 [Second Supplement to Motion to Dismiss]);

Appellee Responded (CR:1451-1802; CR:3191-3280 [Supplemental Response]);

Appellants objected to Appellee's Affidavits submitted in his response to Appellants' Motion to Dismiss (CR:1906-2005);

Appellants requested rulings on their timely filed objections to Appellee's evidence (CR:2850-2954), and later submitted their second, renewed request for rulings on their timely filed objections to Appellee's evidence (CR:2955-3059)

Trial Court Disposition: The Trial Court denied Appellants' Motion to Dismiss Under Section 27.003 of the Texas Citizens Participation Act. (CR:3286-3287). The Trial Court did not rule on Appellants' objections to Appellee's evidence.

This is an interlocutory appeal permitted under Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code

[§51.014](#)(a)(12).

ISSUES PRESENTED

1. The Trial Court denied Appellants' motion to dismiss the Appellee's defamation claims under the Texas Citizens Participation Act.
 - a. Did the Trial Court err in failing to dismiss all Appellee Heslin's defamation claims?
 - b. Did the Trial Court err in failing to dismiss Appellee Heslin's defamation claims based on an alleged June 26, 2017 broadcast [that actually took place on June 25, 2017] because he failed to show any clear-and-specific-evidence of any defamatory act by any defendant on that day?
 - c. Did the Trial Court err in failing to dismiss Appellee Heslin's defamation claims associated with the alleged June 26, 2017 broadcast [that actually took place on June 25, 2017]?
 - d. Did the Trial Court err in failing to dismiss Appellee Heslin's defamation claims associated with the July 20, 2017 broadcast?
 - e. Did the Appellants establish by a preponderance of the evidence that Appellee Heslin's entire lawsuit and each of his defamation claims are based on, related to, or in response to Appellants' exercise of constitutionally protected rights?
 - f. Did Appellee Heslin fail to establish by clear-and-specific-evidence a prima facie case for each essential element of his claims against each of the four Appellants for each of the alleged June 26 and July 20, 2017 broadcasts?
 - g. Did the Appellants establish by a preponderance of the evidence affirmative defenses barring each of Appellee Heslin's defamation claims?
 - h. Did the Trial Court err in failing to sustain Appellants' timely written objections to Appellee Heslin's proffered evidence, notwithstanding Appellants' repeated requests to rule on those objections?
 - i. Did the Trial Court violate Appellants' rights to free speech and rights to petition under the United States and Texas Constitutions?
 - j. Did the trial court err in failing to award Appellants' their TCPA statutory attorneys' fees and sanctions?

INTRODUCTION

This case concerns the First Amendment limitations to civil tort liability for core political speech. United States Supreme Court precedent is very clear that even factually inaccurate, hateful, and even mean-spirited speech that hurts people can neither be suppressed nor punished when the speech involved is political in nature or concerns a public controversy. The Court has created strict barriers to punishment of such speech, and the speech sought to be punished in this case does not come close to the line: it is clearly in the realm of speech that is *immune* from civil liability.

Appellate, Alex Jones, is an electronic media figure known for his opinions about First Amendment [Freedom of Speech] and Second Amendment [Right to Bear Arms], and opinions and criticisms of government and mainstream media [MSM] dissemination of misinformation or concealment of truth. (CR:801-804)[Appendix 6]. It has been his belief that Mainstream Media (“MSM”) and certain government officials have historically worked to limit gun owners’ rights and stifle free speech. For decades, Appellant Jones has opined that these officials and MSM have used deception concerning gun violence to influence elections and the public belief in the need to regulate guns. Accordingly, the media cannot be trusted to disclose or report accurate facts concerning, among other events, school shootings. *Id.* As a result of this distrust of “official” news on gun violence,

Appellants' audience was urged to question official reports and do their own investigation and analysis.

Appellant Jones owns and operates the entity Appellants, InfoWars, LLC and Free Speech Systems, LLC, and Appellant Owen Shroyer is a reporter for Appellant Free Speech Systems, LLC.

Appellee/Plaintiff Neil Heslin is the father of a child who was killed in a mass shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, in December 2012. (CR:3175¶10).

Within two months of the shooting, in February 2013, Appellee Heslin began his public campaign to lobby for gun control, repeatedly appearing at legislative hearings, newspapers and on TV and websites, and with politicians. (CR:809¶19; 864-868, 870-872, 914, 921, 924, 927, 932, 934, 938-939, 941-944). Among other, additional, activities, Heslin went on a 100-day bus tour as part of "Mayors against Illegal Guns" and gave speeches in at least 25 states (CR:1206-1211,1215-1220,1221-1224,2543) and appeared in its advertising. (CR:2524,2533). Appellee Heslin is a limited purpose public figure. *See id. See also* (CR:119-138, 139-347).

Over four years after the Sandy Hook shootings, in June 2017, Heslin gave a televised interview to a NBC reporter, Megyn Kelly, in a broadcast critical of Appellant Jones.

On June 25, 2017, iBankcoin (CR:1395-1399 [Appendix 2]) and ZeroHedge (CR:1400-1403 [Appendix 3]) published articles addressing this nationally televised interview in a publication titled “MEGYN KELLY FAILS TO FACT CHECK SANDY HOOK FATHER’S CONTRADICTION CLAIM IN ALEX JONES HIT PIECE.” *Id.* Both articles are critical of the NBC reporter, Megyn Kelly’s, failure “to identify the obvious contradiction between Neil Heslin’s [the Appellee] account and the official story.” *Id.* ZeroHedge further comments that “Kelly and her network have fanned the very flames of doubt and conspiracy they sought to silence, creating more questions than answers.” *Id.* at 1402 [Appendix 3].

On June 25, 2017, later that same day, Appellant Owen Shroyer of Free Speech Systems, LLC hosted a 90 minute broadcast (CR:1102 video thumb drive of the broadcast; CR:1104-1130 is the transcript of the entire video broadcast [Appendix 4]). During this 90 minute broadcast, Owen Shroyer commented for a few minutes on the ZeroHedge article titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece.” (CR:1109-1110, 1129)[Appendix 4]. It is these opinions and comments regarding the ZeroHedge publication from the June 25, 2017 broadcast that Appellee Heslin complains.

On July 20, 2017, Alex Jones hosted a broadcast that was almost three hours in duration. (CR:1103 [video], 1034-1101 [transcript of the entire broadcast

video)] [Appendix 5]. Appellant Jones commented on the fact that the June 25, 2017, Owen Shroyer broadcast had now [prior to July 20, 2017] been censored and also commented on Owen Shroyer's First Amendment right to comment on the ZeroHedge publications. (CR:1069-1070, 1076-1079) [Appendix 5]. These are the specific passages from the July 20, 2017 broadcast from which Appellee Heslin complains.

The determination of whether the comments in the two broadcasts are even capable of being defamatory is a question of law for the Court. [*Musser v. Smith Protective Svcs., Inc.*](#), 723 S.W.2d 653, 644-55 (Tex. 1987). And, this Court has *de novo* review to make this determination. [*ExxonMobil Pipeline Co. v. Coleman*](#), 512 S.W.3d 895, 899 (Tex. 2017); [*Hawxhurst v. Austin's Boat Tours*](#), 550 S.W.3d 220, 225 (Tex.App.—Austin 2018, no. pet. h.).

The two broadcasts speak for themselves. Once the Court reviews the June 25, 2017 broadcast¹ and the July 20, 2017 broadcast,² dismissal of the defamation claims is the only conclusion for this case.

¹ (CR:1102 [thumb drive containing the video of Owen Shroyer's entire June 25, 2017 broadcast], CR:1104-1130 [transcript of Owen Shroyer's entire June 25, 2017, 90 minute, video broadcast], 2017 broadcast. **CR:1109-1110, 1129** [specific portions of the June 25, 2017 transcript commenting on the ZeroHedge publication]) [Appendix 4].

² (CR:1103 [thumb drive containing the video of Alex Jones's entire July 20, 2017 broadcast], CR:1034-1101 [transcript of Alex Jones's entire July 20, 2017, 3 hour, video broadcast], **CR:1069-1070, 1076-1079** [specific portions of the July 20, 2017 transcript commenting on the censor of Owen Shroyer's June 25, 2017 broadcast]) [Appendix 5].

Both broadcasts contain nothing more than constitutionally-protected political speech, opining and commenting about the ZeroHedge publication critical of Megyn Kelly and NBC's broadcast attacking Alex Jones and the censorship of the June 25, 2017 broadcast. The two broadcasts speak for themselves and are protected by the United States and the Texas Constitutions, along with the TCPA and the Common Law.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

For decades before the tragedy of Sandy Hook, Appellants were ardent and vocal supporters of the First and Second Amendments to the United States Constitution. *See* (CR:801-804 [Appendix 6]). It has been the Appellants' belief that MSM and certain government officials have historically worked to limit gun owners' rights and to stifle free speech. The Appellants opined that these officials and media representations used deception concerning gun violence to influence elections and the public belief in the need to regulate guns. Accordingly, the media could not be trusted to disclose or report accurate facts concerning school shootings. *Id.*

Appellants also opined that those deceptive efforts were intended to improperly sway public opinion toward limiting constitutional rights. As a result of the Appellants' distrust of "official" news on gun violence, their audience was urged to question official reports and do their own investigations and analysis. *Id.* One such public concern that was discussed and debated was the shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School.

On December 14, 2012, a shooter killed students and teachers at Sandy Hook Elementary School. Plaintiff/appellee Heslin is the father of the one of the students killed. (CR:3173¶10).

Within two months of the shooting, in February 2013, Heslin began his public campaign to lobby for gun control, repeatedly appearing at legislative hearings, newspapers and on TV and websites, and with politicians and speaking about the Sandy Hook shooting. (CR:809 ¶19; 864-868, 870-872, 914, 921, 924, 927, 932, 934, 938-939, 941-944; *see also* CR:119-138, 139-321). Among other activities, Heslin went on a 100-day bus tour as part of “Mayors against Illegal Guns” and gave speeches in at least 25 states (CR:1206-1211,1215-1220,1221-1224,2543) and appeared in its advertising.(CR:2524,2533).

Long before the 2017 broadcasts from which Appellee Heslin complaints took place, his activities made him a controversial public figure with some of his critics publicly describing him as a “Gun Ban Lobbyist” with a “troubled past” (CR:1194-1201) who was “profiting from his advocacy for increased gun control.” (CR:2525-2532,2533-2534). Also, before Appellants’ 2017 broadcasts, Heslin was the object of many derogatory statements including allegations that he was a crisis actor “playing the part of the father of a murdered child...” and that he was also a fireman who died at the World Trade Center tragedy. (CR:2802-2804, CR:1695¶24).

Over four years after the Sandy Hook shootings, in June 2017, Heslin gave a televised interview to a NBC reporter, Megyn Kelly, in a broadcast critical of

Jones. Thereafter, media outlets, such as iBankcoin (CR:1395-1399) and ZeroHedge (CR:1400-1403), published criticisms of the Megyn Kelly interview.

A. June 25, 2017 ZeroHedge Publication Titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim in Alex Jones Hit Piece”

The next week on June 25, 2017, a web site called ZeroHedge posted a publication critical of NBC’s and Kelly’s failure to fact check in their “Hit Piece” on Jones.(CR:2009-2016¶2,CR:2012-2016; CR:1400-1403,1102,1109-1110,1129). ZeroHedge is a respected website, favorably rated by *Columbia Journalism Review*, *New York Magazine*, *The New York Times*, *Business Time* and *Time*. (CR:1886-1888¶¶6-10,CR:1890-1900).

In the publication (CR:1400-1403 [Appendix 3]), ZeroHedge quoted Appellee Heslin’s statement in the Megyn Kelly interview. Zero Hedge then wrote:

“Except this does not comport with the official story.

“According to Coroner Wayne Carver, M.D., the parents of the victims weren’t allowed to see the children’s bodies – and instead shown pictures to identify the deceased. Anderson Cooper even interviewed the parents of one of the victims about not being able to see their child.

“While it’s entirely possible that Mr. Heslin had access to his son after the shooting, given the highly contentious nature of the Sandy Hook massacre in which every

aspect of the case has been pored over and dissected - it was incumbent upon Megyn Kelly and NBC to familiarize themselves with all sides of the argument so they could have identified and explained Heslin's statement.

By airing such an obvious contradiction to the official narrative, Megyn Kelly and NBC have lent credibility to Fetzer and other conspiracy researches who often point to inconsistent reports from the [Main Stream Media] to support their theories.

She lied...

...

By failing to identify the obvious contradiction between Neil Heslin's account and the official story, Kelly and her network have fanned the very flames of doubt and conspiracy they sought to silence, creating more questions than answers.

For the sake of all the Sandy Hook parents who weren't allowed to see their deceased children, and to settle this new piece of fodder for conspiracy theorists which **they aired**, Megyn Kelly and NBC have a responsibility to address this giant contradiction to the official story." (CR:1400-1402 [Appendix 3], emphasis in original).

B. June 25, 2017, Owen Shroyer Broadcast,³ Commenting on the June 25, 2017, ZeroHedge Publication

Later in the day after the Zero Hedge publication, Appellant Shroyer, a reporter for defendant/appellant Free Speech, made a broadcast.

Shroyer's broadcast was two hours long and entitled "Exclusive Feds Plan to Drop Russia Investigation Left Plans to Riot." (CR:1391¶4). The total broadcast has a single spaced transcript 27 pages long (CR:1104-1130). For more than 24 pages of the transcript, Shroyer covered topics ranging from American politics, global warming, Russian collusion, Donald Trump, Obamacare, and selling products like T-shirts on the online site InfoWarsStore.com. *Id.*

During the broadcast and while showing the ZeroHedge article to his viewers, Shroyer also presented this sequence (CR:1109-1110):

Owen Shroyer:

So folks now, here's another story. I don't even know if Alex [Jones] knows about this to be honest with you. Alex, if you're listening and you want to ... or if you just want to know what's going on, Zero Hedge has just published a story: "Megyn Kelly fails to fact check Sandy Hook father's contradictory claim in Alex Jones' hit piece." Now again, this broke .., I think it broke today. I don't know what time. Featured in Megyn Kelly's expose, Neil Heslin, a father of one of the victims during the interview described what happened the day of the

³ Appellee alleges Appellants made a June 26, 2017 broadcast that defamed him. (CR:3186). But there was no June 26 broadcast by any defendant. (CR:1391¶4).

shooting. Basically, what he said, the statement he made, fact checkers on this have said cannot be accurate.

He's claiming that he held his son and saw the bullet hole in his head. That is his claim. Now, according to a timeline of events and a coroner's testimony, that is not possible. One must look at Megyn Kelly and say, "Megyn, I think it's time for you to explain this contradiction in the narrative because this is only going to fuel the conspiracy theory that you're trying to put out, in fact." Here's the thing too, you would remember... Let me see how long these clips are. You would remember if you held your dead kid in your hands with a bullet hole. That's not something that you would just misspeak on. Let's roll the clip first. Neil Heslin telling Megyn Kelly of his experience with his kid.

Neil Heslin:

I lost my son. I buried my son. I held my son with a bullet hole through his head.

Neil Heslin:

I dropped him off at 9:04. That's when we dropped him off at school with his book bag. Hours later, I was picking him up in a body bag.

Owen Shroyer:

*** Now, here is an account from the coroner that does not cooperate with that narrative.

Speaker 7 [coroner]:

We did not bring the bodies and the families into contact. We took pictures of them, of their facial features. It's easier on the families when you do that. There is a time and a place for up close and personal in the grieving process, but to accomplish this, we felt it would be best to do it this way. You can control the situation depending on your photographer, and I have very good photographers.

Anderson Cooper [reporter on tape interviewing another parent of another victim]:

It's got to be hard not to have been able to actually see her.

Speaker 9 [the other parent]:

Well, at first I thought that and I had questioned maybe wanting to see her.

Owen Shroyer:

Okay, so just another question that people are now going to be asking about Sandy Hook, the conspiracy theorists out there that have a lot of questions that are yet to get answered. I mean, you can say whatever you want about the event. That is just a fact. So there's another one. Will there be a clarification from Heslin or Megyn Kelly? I wouldn't hold your breath. Now they're fueling the conspiracy theory claims. Unbelievable. We'll be right back with more. (CR:1110).

Near the end of the broadcast, Shroyer said:

Then, of course, you've got the story that broke on Zero Hedge.

Megyn Kelly fails to fact check Sandy Hooks father contradictory claim in Alex Jones' piece. Yes, that's right. Neil Heslin made a statement in the Megyn Kelly hit piece on Alex Jones about an experience he had after the Sandy Hook shooting that does not corroborate with fact checkers, does not make sense. Now you have Megyn Kelly, folks, who did a hit piece on Alex Jones to try to smear Alex Jones and paint an inaccurate picture using Sandy Hook about Alex Jones to demonize him to the public, and then in the attempt of doing that, Megyn Kelly actually adds to the conspiracy theory! So Megyn Kelly is now fanning the flames of conspiracy theory with Sandy Hook with Neil Heslin's account saying he held his son, which according to coroners and past reports is impossible. That's not just something you misremember, is it? Holding your dead child. Somehow, I don't think you misremember that.

Meanwhile, in Venezuela, the communist haven, more riots, more protestors, (CR:1129).

C. July 20, 2017, Alex Jones Broadcast, Commenting on the Censor of the Owen Shroyer, June 25, 2017, Broadcast

The next month, on July 20, Jones did a broadcast that was almost three hours long and covered many topics. (CR:1034-1101). Because YouTube had removed Shroyer's June 25 video, Jones complained about censorship, and about an hour and forty-five minutes into the broadcast, Jones said:

Coming up at the start of the bottom of the hour segment, I will play a video that YouTube says violates their community standards for pointing out an article by Zero Hedge, that pointed out an anomaly in an NBC news report concerning Sandy Hook. (CR:1069).

So we're going to air what YouTube says you're not allowed to see. Coming up, it's only four minutes long, it's Owen Shroyer with a zero hedge [*sic*] headline. (CR:1070).

Coming up the bottom of the hour, I'll show you the letter from YouTube and what they say is not allowed. We're going to play the evil video. Zero Hedge discovers anomaly in Alex Jones's hit piece. And all it is Owen Shroyer playing two clips of the news side by side. (*Id.*)

And then now they claim that I'm harassing Sandy Hook families because the media said I am and the media said I said go harass their families. And then they take down our videos where I actually clarify going back three, four years ago that I simple questioned because our media lied about dead babies in incubators and said they got their brains bashed out and so my listeners didn't buy the official story, so we looked at it and I said, ***"I don't know the truth." I'm not ready to say kids didn't die and point my finger at parents and say they're liars.*** (CR:1076).

Do they get all these conflicting stories in the media? Absolutely. And we have a right to question it. If, if they said there were new babies thrown out of incubators in some country and we questioned it because they've lied before and it turned out that they did actually kill babies somewhere, would I then hate the families that lost their babies? No. ***I'm questioning known liars in the media.*** (CR:1076).

. . . zero hedge [*sic*] discovered anomaly in Alex Jones hit piece. That's what they're saying we're not allowed to question. So let's play the censored report with Owen Shroyer analyzing other people's reports and playing the anomaly and asking the question and quite frankly, the father sees, he needs to clarify, NBC needs to clarify, because the coroner said none of the parents were allowed to touch the kids or see the kids and maybe they meaning at the school, ***I'm sure later maybe the parents saw their children.*** The point is, is that because the media lies so much, you can't blame the public asking questions and you can't ban free speech of people that are asking questions and for us to simply look at the Megyn Kelly public even where someone sat down and was interviewed and to politely discuss it. If you ban that, you ban free speech in total, very, very dangerous. Here it is. (CR:1077).

[Jones's video broadcast replays excerpt from Shroyer's June 25, 2017 broadcast – see CR:1109-1110] (CR:1077-1078 [transcript of the excerpt replayed]).

All right, now that's the full clip that's been censored on YouTube that's hateful and evil they say and that we're harassing people with. It's national television. It's a piece attacking me. Okay? That's a clip from a national piece televised everywhere, misrepresented what I said about Sandy Hook. I'm not allowed to respond to a report about me that isn't even accurate and then you've got CNN and MSNBC both with different groups of parents and the coroner saying we weren't allowed to see our kids basically ever, what they sound like they're saying, but we see a father, a grieving father saying that he dropped him off with a book bag, got him back in a body bag. (CR:1078-1079).

D. April 16, 2018, Appellee Heslin Filed this Lawsuit

Nine months later, on April 16, 2018, Heslin sued Jones, Shroyer and the two company Appellants. (CR:5). Heslin's live pleading is titled Plaintiff's Third Amended Petition. (CR:3173-3190). Heslin claims that all four Appellants committed defamation in two broadcasts, one June 26, 2017 and one on July 20, 2017. (CR:3186, ¶¶55-57).

E. April 19, 2018, Appellee Heslin Authorized the Republication of the Allegedly Defamatory Broadcasts Nationally

Three days after he filed the lawsuit, on April 19, 2018, Heslin and his lawyers appeared on at least two nationally-televised news shows where he authorized republication, to millions of people, of the same broadcasts he alleges are defamatory.

Heslin appeared on the Today Show, again with reporter-host Megyn Kelly, the reporter who was the subject of the June 25 and July 20, 2017 broadcasts. (CR:955 [video]; CR:956-961 [transcription]). Kelly re-played some of Jones' statements on the show. *See* (CR:948). On the show, Heslin said Jones' conduct is something that has been "going on for four years." (CR:949). Heslin's lawyer said what Heslin and the lawyer hoped to accomplish was "to shut down his [Jones'] hateful rhetoric." (CR:949). When the reporter said the news would "continue to follow the story very closely," Heslin said, "Okay, thank you." (CR:960).

On the same day, Heslin appeared on MSNBC and again republished part of the June 25 broadcast. (CR:947 [video]; CR:948-950 [transcript]).

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

First, the trial court erred in failing to grant defendants' TCPA motion to dismiss because Appellants met their evidentiary burdens and Appellee did not:

- Appellants established by a preponderance of the evidence that Appellee Heslin's entire lawsuit and each of his defamation claims against each Appellant are each based on, related to, or in response to defendants' exercise of constitutionally protected rights.
- Appellee Heslin failed to establish by clear-and-specific-evidence a prima facie case for each essential element of each of his claims against each of the four Appellants for each of the June 26 and July 20, 2017 broadcasts.
- Appellee Heslin failed to show by clear, unambiguous, sure, and free-from-doubt specific evidence that:
 - (a) Any specific statement in or the gist of either of the two broadcasts was untrue or defamatory to him.
 - (b) Any statement of fact in the two broadcasts was such that a reasonable person's perception of the entirety of a publication would be that any statement or the gist was false or defamatory as to him.
 - (c) Any defamation *per se* or *per quod* damages or proximately caused damages by any Appellants' statements in the broadcast.
 - (d) Any malice of any Appellant in the making the statements in the broadcasts.
- Appellants established affirmative defenses by a preponderance of the evidence barring each of Heslin's claims. Appellants' evidence established:
 - (a) the statute of limitations for defamation claims is one year;

- (b) Appellee may not recover exemplary damages as a matter of law because he failed to comply with Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§73.055](#)(c);
- (c) Appellants' statements are protected expressions of opinion by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Texas Constitution;
- (d) InfoWars is not liable based on undisputed fact;
- (e) Appellee's defamation claims are barred under the substantial truth doctrine, Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code [§73.005](#);
- (f) Appellee's defamation claims are barred under the fair comment privilege, Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code [§73.002](#); and
- (g) self-publication.

Second, the trial court also erred in not dismissing Heslin's claims based on any alleged June 26, 2017 act because Heslin failed to show any evidence of any defamatory act on that day, as discussed elsewhere, there was no June 26 broadcast.

Third, the trial court erred in failing to sustain Appellants' timely written objections to Heslin's witness affidavits, notwithstanding Appellants' repeated formal requests of the trial court to rule on those objections. Appellants' objected to consideration of these affidavits on specific grounds, including in many instances, that they constituted opinions on questions of law. Without Heslin's objected-to affidavits, the only evidence before the trial court was the two publications at issue and Appellants' affidavits, all of which established by a preponderance of the evidence, the grounds requiring dismissal under the TCPA.

Fourth, the Appellants' First Amendment Rights under the United States Constitution are being violated.

Finally, the trial erred in failing to award Appellants' their reasonable attorney's fees and sanctions, as mandated by Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.009\(a\)](#).

ARGUMENT

I. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN DENYING APPELLANTS' TCPA MOTION TO DISMISS BECAUSE APPELLANTS ESTABLISHED ALL THREE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS MANDATING DISMISSAL

A. The Purpose of TCPA is to Safeguard Constitutional Rights

The TCPA “protects citizens who... speak on matters of public concern from retaliatory lawsuits that seek to intimidate or silence them” [In re Lipsky](#), 460 S.W.3d 579, 579 (Tex. 2015) (*citing* Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §27.001-011) and “professes an overarching purpose of ‘safeguard[ing] the constitutional rights of persons to petition, speak freely, associate freely, and otherwise participate in government’ against infringement by meritless lawsuits. [Cavin v. Abbott](#), 545 S.W.3d 47, 55 (Tex.App.—Austin, 2017, no pet.)(emphasis added). The TCPA is to be “construed liberally to effectuate its purpose and intent fully.” It pursues “such goals chiefly by defining a suspect class of legal proceedings that are deemed to implicate free expression, making these proceedings subject to threshold

testing of potential merit, and compelling rapid dismissal—with mandatory cost-shifting and sanctions—for any found wanting.” The TCPA is broad, must be literally construed, and that courts may not read limitations within the statute that do not appear in its plain text. [ExxonMobil Pipeline Co. v. Coleman](#), 512 S.W.3d 895, 898-901 (Tex. 2017).

“It is conceivable that the Legislature would see fit to *cast this net exceptionally widely- opting for a hand grenade rather than a rifle shot-* perhaps in recognition of a *high value being ascribed to constitutionally-protected expression* that may be subsumed somewhere within the Act’s definitions of protected expression, or in an effort to capture expression-targeting ‘legal actions’ that might otherwise be creatively pleaded so as to avoid the statute’s requirements.” [Cavin](#), 545 S.W.3d at 71 (emphasis added).

B. The TCPA Procedure and Standard of Review

Under the TCPA, a party may file a motion to dismiss a "legal action" that is "based on, relates to, or is in response to a party's exercise of the right of free speech." Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.003\(a\)](#); [Adams v. Starside Custom Builders, LLC](#), 547 S.W.3d 890, 892 (Tex. 2018).

The TCPA requires a three step process. First, the trial court must dismiss the action "if the moving party shows by a preponderance of the evidence that the legal action is based on, relates to, or is in response to the party's exercise of . . . the right of free speech." Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.005\(b\)\(1\)](#). This first step is a legal question. [Whisenhunt v. Lippincott](#), 416 S.W.3d 689, 695 (Tex.

2013). When it is clear from the plaintiff's pleadings that the “legal action” is covered by the TCPA, the defendant need show no more. [Hersh v. Tatum](#), 526 S.W.3d 462, 467 (Tex. 2017). The trial court considers the pleadings and supporting and opposing affidavits filed by the parties before ruling on a motion to dismiss. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.006\(a\)](#); [Adams](#), 547 S.W.3d at 892.

Second, to defeat mandatory dismissal, the nonmoving party must establish by “clear-and-specific-evidence a prima facie case for each essential element of the claim.” Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.005\(c\)](#). The word “clear” in this context means “unambiguous, 'sure,' or 'free from doubt'” and the word “specific” means “explicit' or 'relating to a particular named thing.” [In re Lipsky](#), 460 S.W.3d 579, 589-90 (Tex. 2015).

The “clear and specific” evidentiary standard does not exclude circumstantial evidence. But circumstantial evidence is not sufficient “if the connection between the fact and the inference is too weak to be of help in deciding the case.” *Id.* Likewise, an inference from circumstantial evidence “is not reasonable if it is susceptible to multiple, equally probable inferences, requiring the factfinder to guess in order to reach a conclusion.” [Suarez v. City of Tex. City](#), 465 S.W.3d 623, 634 (Tex. 2015).

Third, even if the non-movant meets this “clear and specific” standard for each element of non-movant’s claims, the court must still dismiss the claim if

movant shows "by a preponderance of the evidence each essential element of a valid defense to the nonmovant's claim." *Id.* See also Tex. Civ. Rem. & Prac. Code [§27.005](#)(d).

This court reviews *de novo* any questions concerning the TCPA's application and whether the "clear and specific" evidence standard has been met on a motion to dismiss. See [ExxonMobil Pipeline Co. v. Coleman](#), 512 S.W.3d 895, 899 (Tex. 2017); [Hawxhurst v. Austin's Boat Tours](#), 550 S.W.3d 220, 225 (Tex.App.—Austin 2018, no. pet. h.).

C. Appellee Heslin's Entire Lawsuit and Each of his Claims are Based on, Relate to, and are in Response to Appellants' Exercise of the Right of Free Speech and the Right to Petition

The TCPA is applicable to plaintiff Heslin's entire lawsuit and each legal action because each is "based on, relates to and is in response to" defendants' exercise of their constitutionally protected right of free speech, right of petition, or right of association. The TCPA's language, "based on, relates to, or is in response to" "serves to capture, at a minimum, a 'legal action' that is factually predicated upon alleged conduct that would fall within the TCPA's definitions of 'exercise of the right of free speech...'" [Cavin](#), 545 S.W.3d at 58. The term "legal action" is defined by the TCPA as a "lawsuit" or "cause of action." Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(6).

“Matters of public concern” (*see, e.g., Adams v. Starside Custom Builders, LLC*, 547 S.W.3d 890, 895 (Tex. 2018) (communications by a resident that real estate developer had “chopped down trees, generally made life miserable for the residents, and engaged in unspecified other corrupt or criminal activity is of public concern”)) includes an issue related to health or safety; environmental, economic, or community well-being; the government; [or] a ... public figure[.]Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(7)(A-E).

“[T]he TCPA does not require that the statements specifically “mention” health, safety, environmental, or economic concerns, nor does it require more than a “tangential relationship” to the same; rather, TCPA applicability requires only that the defendant’s statements are “in connection with” “issue[s] related to” health, safety, environmental, economic, and other identified matters of public concern chosen by the Legislature.” *Cavin*, 545 S.W.3d at 60 (citing *Exxon v. Coleman*, 512 S.W.3d 895 (Tex. 2017)).

The “right to petition” as (i) a communication in connection with an issue under consideration or review by a legislative, executive, judicial, or other governmental body (Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(4)(B)); (ii) a communication that is reasonably likely to encourage consideration or review of an issue by a legislative, executive, judicial, or other governmental body (Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(4)(C)); and/or (iii) a communication reasonably likely to enlist public participation in an effort to effect consideration of an issue by a legislative, executive, judicial, or other governmental body (Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(4)(D)). “Communication” is the making or submitting of a

statement in any form or medium, including oral, visual, written, audiovisual, or electronic. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(1).

“Right of Association” means a “communication between individuals who join together to collectively express, promote, pursue, or defend common interests.” Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(2). Appellants’ statements and opinions are to audiences who are watching their broadcasts because the audiences want to see and hear them, and the reasonable inference is because the audiences, or most of them, share common interests. Those audiences are joining together, albeit technologically in this day and age, to collectively express, promote, pursue or defend common interests.”

Appellee’s/Plaintiff’s claims invoke the TCPA. Plaintiff’s/Appellee’s petition establishes his claim is about defendants’ speech, petition and association.

“[T]he *plaintiff’s petition*..., as so often has been said, is the ‘best and all sufficient evidence of the nature of the action’...When it is *clear from the plaintiff’s pleadings* that the action is covered by the [TCPA], *the defendant need show no more.*” [Hersh](#), 526 S.W.3d at 467.

Heslin complains of Appellants’ speech activities: “Defendant Alex E. Jones... is the host of radio and web-based news programming, ‘The Alex Jones Show,’ and he owns and operates the website Infowars.com.” (CR:3173,¶3). Heslin admits he complains of Appellant Shroyer’s speech activities: “Defendant Owen Shroyer . . . has been a reporter for InfoWars.” (CR:3174,¶6). Heslin

complains of defendants' conduct in TCPA statutorily protected things in broadcasts -- playing videos, saying things likely to encourage or enlist governmental activity or public participation to effect governmental activity, and other speech, petition and associational acts. (CR:956 (“President Trump admitted that he was a fan of Alex Jones’s, and even appeared on his radio program.”); Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(1) (“Communication” is defined as the making or submitting of a statement or video in any form or medium, including oral, visual, written, audiovisual, or electronic); Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(4)).

A preponderance of the evidence shows Appellee’s claims are based on, related to, or in response to defendants' exercise of their constitutionally protected rights. The trial court erred to the extent it failed to hold the TCPA applied to Appellee Heslin’s claims and dismissing them.

D. Appellee Heslin Failed to Show, by Clear-and-Specific-Evidence, Each Element of Each of his Defamation Claims Against Each Appellant

Heslin was required to produce “clear and specific” evidence of the essential elements of each of his causes of action -- defamation and defamation *per se* for each broadcast to avoid the dismissal under the TCPA.

“Clear” means “‘unambiguous,’ ‘sure,’ or ‘free from doubt,’” and “specific means “‘explicit’ or ‘relating to a particular named thing.’” [*In re Lipsky*](#), 460

S.W.3d 579, 589 (Tex. 2015). Heslin did not show clear-and-specific-evidence of each essential element of each of his claims.

1. Defamation *per quod* and defamation *per se* defined

Defamation is a false and injurious impression of a plaintiff published without legal excuse. [Turner v. KTRK Television, Inc.](#), 38 S.W.3d 103, 115 (Tex. 2000).

“Defamation *per se* refers to statements that are so obviously harmful that general damages... may be presumed.” [Brady v. Klentzman](#), 515 S.W.3d 878, 886 (Tex. 2017). A statement is defamatory *per se* “if the words in and of themselves are so obviously hurtful to the person aggrieved by them that they require no proof of injury... If the court must resort to innuendo or extrinsic evidence to determine that the statement was defamatory,” then the alleged statement may, at most, constitute defamation *per quod* and “requires proof of injury and damages. [Main v. Royall](#), 348 S.W.3d 381, 390 (Tex. App.-Dallas 2011, no pet.).

2. The elements of a defamation claim

Appellee Heslin must show clear-and-specific-evidence, that is, unambiguous, sure and free from doubt evidence of four things: (a) publication of a false statement of fact to a third party; (b) that was defamatory concerning him; (c) with the requisite degree of fault, and (d) in seeking *per quod* damages, that the false statement proximately caused him damages. [Bos v. Smith](#), 556 S.W.3d 293,

307-308 (Tex. 2018). Compensatory damages in defamation cases “must compensate for ‘actual injuries’ and cannot merely be ‘a disguised disapproval of the defendant.’” [Brady v. Klentzman](#), 515 S.W.3d 878, 886 (Tex. 2017).

There is no clear-and-specific-evidence of each of these elements of Heslin’s defamation claims.

3. There are no defamatory statements in the two broadcasts from which Appellee complains.

Heslin must prove that Appellants published a defamatory statement. [WFAA-TV, Inc. v. McLemore](#), 978 S.W.2d 568, 571 (Tex. 1998). Heslin alleges two publications – a “June 26, 2017” broadcast and a July 20, 2017 broadcast. (CR:3186, ¶¶51-57).

a. TCPA Evidence standard applied to defamation

Under the TCPA, the court must decide if a publication is defamatory by clear-and-specific-evidence -- that is, unambiguous, sure and free from doubt evidence -- that the publication was an actionable statement of fact. This is a question of law for this court to decide. [Champion Printing & Copying LLC v. Nichols](#), No. 03-15-00704, 2017 WL 3585213, ¶18 (Tex. App.—Austin August 18, 2017, pet. denied) (citing [Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.](#), 497 U.S. 1, 18-19 (1990). "Whether a statement is an opinion or an assertion of fact is a question of law." [MKC Energy Invs., Inc. v. Sheldon](#), 182 S.W.3d 372, 377 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 2005, no pet.).

A statement of fact “is not actionable unless a reasonable fact-finder could reasonably conclude that the statement implies an assertion of fact, considering the entire context of the statement.” [*Champion Printing & Copying LLC*](#), 2017 WL 3585213, ¶18. Likewise, the “statement must also be objectively verifiable as fact.” “*Even when a statement is verifiable as false*, it does not give rise to liability if the ‘entire context in which it was made’ discloses that it is *merely an opinion masquerading as a fact.*” [*Dallas Morning News, Inc. v. Tatum*](#), 554 S.W.3d 614, 624 (Tex. 2018) (citing [*Bentley v. Bunton*](#), 94 S.W.3d 561, 581 (Tex. 2002) (emphasis added)).

In deciding if a statement is “capable of a defamatory meaning,” the court must “construe the publication ‘as a whole in light of the surrounding circumstances based upon how a person of ordinary intelligence would perceive it.’” [*D Magazine Partners, L.P. v. Rosenthal*](#), 529 S.W.3d 429, 434 (Tex. 2017). Whether a publication is “false and defamatory” depends on a “reasonable person’s perception of the *entirety of a publication* and not merely on individual statements.” [*D Magazine Partners, L.P.*](#), 529 S.W.3d at 434 (citing [*Bentley v. Bunton*](#), 94 S.W.3d 561, 579 (Tex. 2002)(emphasis added)). An objectively reasonable person, when considering the broadcast in its entirety, does not place overwhelming emphasis on a[ny] single term,” and does not “focus on individual

statements’ to the exclusion of the entire publication.” [*Dallas Morning News, Inc.*](#), 554 S.W.3d at 628.

To be defamatory, a statement must be derogatory, degrading, somewhat shocking, and contain elements of disgrace. [*Means v. ABCABCO, Inc.*](#), 315 S.W.3d 209, 214 (Tex. App.- Austin 2010, no pet.). A communication that is merely unflattering, abusive, annoying, irksome, or embarrassing, or that only hurts a plaintiff’s feelings is not actionable. *Id.*

Only when the court determines the publication’s “language is ambiguous or of doubtful import” can the fact-finder consider innuendo to determine the statement’s meaning. [*Musser v. Smith Protective Svcs., Inc.*](#), 723 S.W.2d 653, 655 (Tex. 1987).

Moreover, “the innuendo cannot enlarge or restrict the natural meaning of words, introduce new matter, or make certain that which was uncertain, except in so far as it connects the words published with the extrinsic or explanatory circumstances alleged.” [*Billington v. Hous. Fire & Cas. Ins.*](#), 226 S.W.2d 494, 497 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1950, no writ) (*quoting* [*Moore v. Leverett*](#), 52 S.W.2d 252, 255 (Tex. Comm’n App. 1932, holding approved)). When a “statement cannot properly be construed as ambiguous nor in the ordinary and proper meaning convey a defamatory interpretation, such meaning cannot be enlarged by claims of innuendo.” [*Overstreet v. Underwood*](#), 300 S.W.3d 905, 910

(Tex. App.—Amarillo 2009, pet. denied). “Innuendo... does not permit a plaintiff to *change the meaning, extend the meaning, or impose a strained construction on the words.*” [*Durckel v. St. Joseph Hosp.*](#), 78 S.W.3d 576, 585 (Tex. App. — Houston [14th Dist.] 2002, no pet.) (citing [*ABC, Inc. v. Shanks*](#), 1 S.W.3d 230, 236 (Tex.App.—Corpus Christi 1999, pet. denied)). This means if the publication is ambiguous, it *a fortiori* fails the TCPA test of being clear (which requires evidence to be “clear” or unambiguous to avoid dismissal), and the fact-finder cannot use innuendo to “make certain” the ambiguity (*i.e.*, make it “clear”), so a defamation claim based on an ambiguous publication must be dismissed under the TCPA.

b. There was no “June 26, 2017” broadcast

Heslin repeats six times that he asserts defamation in a “June 26, 2017” broadcast. (CR:3173-3190, ¶¶13, 50-51, 55-57). Appellants showed by a preponderance of the evidence no Appellant made a broadcast on that date, although Shroyer did make a broadcast on June 25. (CR:1391¶4). The fact that there was no “June 26” broadcast was repeatedly brought to Heslin’s attention and proved by a preponderance of the evidence by Appellants. (CR:1433,fn. 5; CR:1814, fn. 6; CR:1832¶18; CR:2065,fn.67; CR:2144¶¶40, 41). Heslin never amended his judicial admission that he was asserting a “June 26” defamation claim, and never offered any evidence of a “June 26” broadcast. Heslin is conclusively bound that one of his defamation claims is based on an alleged

publication of that date. [Mendoza v. Fidelity & Guar. Ins. Underwriters, Inc.](#), 606 S.W.2d 692, 700 (Tex. 1980). Heslin showed no clear-and-specific-evidence of an alleged act of defamation by any defendant on June 26, 2017, and defendants conclusively showed none of them made a broadcast on that day.

Defendants' TCPA motion on that "June 26" claim required the trial court to dismiss that claim and award Appellants' their attorneys' fees under the TCPA. The trial court erred in failing to do so.

c. The June 25, 2017 broadcast is not defamatory

Even if the trial court were to have considered Heslin's "June 26" broadcast defamation claim as actually a June 25 broadcast defamation claim, there is no clear-and-specific-evidence the June 25 broadcast was false.

First, the complained of June 25 broadcast involved Shroyer's comments on ZeroHedge's report. Shroyer did not publish any statements of fact, but read from ZeroHedge's report and, while on camera during his broadcast, played only the videos that were embedded in the ZeroHedge article. (CR:2009-2010¶2). As the video shows, Shroyer scrolled through the ZeroHedge article on camera and showed it was ZeroHedge who was making factual statements that Shroyer read:

"So folks now, here's another story. I don't even know if Alex knows about this to be honest with you... ***Zero Hedge has just published a story***: 'Megyn Kelly fails to fact check Sandy Hook father's

contradictory claim in Alex Jones' hit piece.' Now again, this broke... I think it broke today. I don't know what time."⁴

Shroyer identified the source of the article. A reasonable reader would understand that he was not asserting the statements in the ZeroHedge publication as a fact he had discovered, but instead he was stating what ZeroHedge said in its article.

Second, Heslin shows no clear-and-specific-evidence that any specific statement from the June 25 broadcast was a false statement of fact about Heslin. Heslin shows no clear-and-specific-evidence that the broadcast, *as a whole*, conveyed a false impression regarding him. Heslin shows no clear-and-specific-evidence that any other statement in the broadcast was not Shroyer's opinion.

Heslin alleges the broadcasts were defamatory because they were "accusations" that he "was lying" about whether he "actually held his son's body and observed a bullet hole in his head." (CR:3175¶10). There is no specific statement or gist in the June 25 broadcast that accused Heslin of lying. The Zero Hedge article accused a media reporter, Kelly, of failing to investigate and explain how Heslin said he held his son's body but the coroner said (partly corroborated by another parent) the parents were not allowed contact with the bodies, and the coroner instead released the bodies directly to funeral homes.

⁴ Video of Shroyer's June 25 broadcast is on a thumb drive, trial court Exhibit B-36 (CR:1102), relevant part begins at 19:42. (CR:1109)(transcript of the video)[Appendix 4].

In the June 25 broadcast, Shroyer reported “. . . if you just want to know what’s going on, ZeroHedge has just published a story,” and he then quoted the story: “Megyn Kelly fails to fact check Sandy Hook father’s contradictory claim in Alex Jones’ hit piece.” (CR:1109)[Appendix 4]. Shroyer reported that when Heslin gave his interview to Kelly, Heslin “described what happened the day of the shooting,” but that ZeroHedge was reporting that “[b]asically, what he said, the statement he made, fact checkers on this have said cannot be accurate.” *Id.* Shroyer said, “according to a timeline of events and a coroner’s testimony, that is not possible,” *Id.* and “here is an account from the coroner that does not cooperate [*sic*] with that narrative.” (CR:1110).

To show the coroner’s statements that did not “cooperate” with the Kelly interview, Shroyer then clicked on the embedded videos within the ZeroHedge web article. (CR:1109, The embedded videos of ZeroHedge played by Shroyer are no longer available—*see* CR:2738-2739¶2). In ZeroHedge’s embedded video, the coroner said, “We did not bring the bodies and the families into contact. We took pictures of them, of their facial features. It’s easier on the families when you do that.” (CR:1109). Corroborating the coroner’s statement, also in the video, another parent was asked if it was hard not being able to see their child who was killed that day, and the other parent said, “Well, at first I thought that and I had questioned maybe wanting to see her.” *Id.*

Shroyer said Heslin's statement that he held his son's body is "not something that you would just misspeak on." (CR:1109). Shroyer asks the public, "Will there be a clarification from Heslin or Megyn Kelly?" (CR:1110). Shroyer then publically addresses the reporter who had interviewed Heslin: "One must look at Megyn Kelly and say, 'Megyn, I think it's time for you to explain this contradiction in the narrative because this is only going to fuel the conspiracy theory that you're trying to put out, in fact.'" *Id.* [Appendix 4].

This evidence does not show clear-and-specific-evidence, that is, unambiguous, sure and free-from-doubt evidence that Shroyer said any specific fact that was untrue about Heslin or defamed Heslin.

This broadcast does not show by clear-and-specific-evidence -- that is, unambiguous, sure and free-from-doubt evidence -- that a reasonable person, looking at the broadcast as a whole (CR:1104-1130) [Appendix 4], would reasonably conclude (a) that Shroyer was reporting his own investigation instead of that of ZeroHedge, or (b) that Shroyer was unambiguously calling Heslin a liar instead of giving ZeroHedge's or Shroyer's opinion on the quality of Kelly's reporting and her failure to explore or explain how the two "narratives" were to be reconciled.

There can be only one ‘gist’ of the broadcast ([*Dallas Morning News, Inc.*](#), 554 S.W.3d at 629) and that gist was that ZeroHedge had published an article critical of NBC’s/Kelly’s failure to explain apparent contradictions.

As to Jones, Heslin showed no clear-and-specific-evidence that Jones made that publication at all because the evidence shows he was not involved in the June25 broadcast. (CR:1109 at second full paragraph).

The trial court erred in not dismissing Heslin’s defamation and related claims based on what Heslin claimed was a June 26 broadcast of Shroyer and, independently, in not dismissing Heslin’s defamation and related claims against Jones, Infowars and Free Speech Systems for that broadcast.

d. The July 20, 2017 broadcast is not defamatory

Heslin alleges Jones’ July 20, 2017 broadcast was defamatory because Jones accused him of “lying.” (CR:3175,¶10). Heslin claims the following statements made by Jones in the July 20 broadcast are defamatory:

“I could never find out. The stuff I found was they never let them see their bodies. That’s kind of what’s weird about this. ***But maybe they did.*** So I’m sure it’s all real. But for some reason they don’t want you to see [Shroyer’s segment].” (CR:3177,¶24 (emphasis added)).

“Can I prove that [Newtown]... didn’t happen? ***No.*** I’ve said, for years, we’ve had debates about it, that ***I don’t know.*** But you can’t blame the people for asking.” *Id.* ¶25 (emphasis added).

Jones’ two statements are not defamatory. This broadcast does not show by clear-and-specific-evidence, that is, unambiguous, sure and free-from-doubt

evidence that a reasonable person, looking at the broadcast as a whole or at any of the specific statements, would reasonably conclude that Jones was calling Heslin a liar.

Moreover, the context of Jones' quoted statements expressly negates that Jones is calling Heslin a liar. Instead Jones opines that the "media" are the ones who lie. Jones says in the broadcast:

"I'm not ready to . . . point my finger at parents and say they're liars."

"No. I'm questioning known liars in the media." (CR:1076).

"... NBC needs to clarify because the coroner said none of the parents were allowed to touch the kids or see the kids and maybe they [mean] at the school, *I'm sure later maybe the parents saw their children.* The point is, is that *because the media lies so much*, you can't blame the public [for] asking questions." (CR:1077 (emphasis added)).

"The stuff I found was they never let them see their bodies. That's kind of what's weird about this, but maybe they did." (CR:1079).

An objectively reasonable person considers the broadcast in its entirety.

[*Dallas Morning News, Inc.*](#), 554 S.W.3d at 628. No objectively reasonable reader would ignore the explicit statements made by Jones in the July 20 broadcast straightforwardly negating Heslin's claim Jones was calling Heslin or any Sandy Hook parent a liar. Jones plainly said he was not calling Heslin, or any other Sandy Hook parent a liar, but was instead calling "the media" liars.

4. There is no clear-and-specific-evidence Appellants had actual knowledge of falsity or were reckless as to truth.

Heslin is a limited-purpose public figure. To prove defamation he had to prove actual malice by Appellants. A limited-purpose public figure must show that the broadcaster had “actual knowledge that it was false or the statement was made with reckless disregard of whether it was false or not. WFAA-TV, Inc. v. McLemore, 978 S.W.2d 568, 571 (Tex. 1998). Because Heslin is a limited-purpose public figure, he must establish that the Appellants acted with *actual malice*. Carr v. Brasher, 776 S.W.2d 567, 571 (Tex. 1989).

a. Appellee is a limited purpose public figure

Heslin is a limited-purpose public figure relating to the subject matter of the statements of Jones and Shroyer. He voluntarily became prominent in public discussions about Sandy Hook’s role in the heated public debate over gun control initiatives and the Second Amendment.

“[Limited-purpose public figures] are persons who ‘thrust themselves to the forefront of particular public controversies in order to influence the resolution of the issues involved... inviting attention and comment,’ who ‘inject[] themselves or [are] drawn into a particular public controversy... assum[ing] special prominence in the resolution of public questions,’ ‘thrusting [themselves] into the vortex of [a] public issues... [or] engag[ing] the public’s attention in an attempt to influence its outcome.” *Neyland v. Thompson*, 2015 WL 1612155, ¶6 (Tex. App.–Austin, April 7, 2015, no pet.).

The issue of public figure status is a constitutional question for the court to decide. WFAA-TV, Inc. v. McLemore, 978 S.W.2d 568, 571 (Tex. 1998).

The limited-purpose public figure element is a three-part test: “(1) the controversy at issue must be public both in the sense that people are discussing it and people other than the immediate participants in the controversy are likely to feel the impact of its resolution; (2) the plaintiff must have more than a trivial or tangential role in the controversy; and (3) the alleged defamation must be germane to the plaintiff’s participation in the controversy.” [WFAA-TV, Inc.](#) at 571-72. Heslin meets all three tests.

Heslin is actively and voluntarily involved in the national guns rights issue arising out of the Sandy Hook shootings. Days after the Sandy Hook shooting, President Obama used Sandy Hook to advocate for more restrictive gun control. (CR:1225-1230). “Since Sandy Hook, there have been 210 laws enacted to strengthen gun safety...” (CR:1365). A spokesman for Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence told ABC:

“The public, even though they’ve always been in support of strengthening gun laws, it hasn’t always been obvious to the public just how bad our gun laws are... ***So when Newtown happened***, people couldn’t help but notice because it was such a horrific event, and people became more educated, more aware, and became mobilized ***to do something about it.***” (CR:1372).

Heslin has a more than trivial role in this public campaign -- within two months of the shooting, in February 2013, he began his public campaign to lobby for gun control, appearing publically many times in legislative hearings, newspapers and TV and websites, appearing with politicians and speaking about

the Sandy Hook shooting and gun control. (CR:809 ¶19; CR:864-868, 870, 872, 914, 921, 924, 927, 932, 934, 938, 939, 940-942, 944). Among other activities, Heslin went on a 100-day bus tour as part of “Mayors against Illegal Guns” and gave speeches in at least 25 states. (CR:1206-1211). Long before defendants’ statements, Heslin’s activities made him a controversial public figure with some of his critics publicly describing him as a “Gun Ban Lobbyist” with a “troubled past” (CR:1194-1201) who was “profiting from his advocacy for increased gun control.” (CR:1202).

Importantly, long before Appellants’ 2017 broadcasts/statements, Heslin was the object of many widely published derogatory statements including allegations that he was a crisis actor “playing the part of the father of a murdered child...” and that he was also a fireman who died at the World Trade Center tragedy. (CR:2802-2804, 1696, ¶24).

Heslin remains publicly active in the national gun control debate. He has joined other families in suing the City of Newtown (CR:2296-2307) and filed suit against the maker of the firearm used to kill his child. (CR:2296-2299).

Appellants’ statements are germane to Heslin’s public figure activities. First, they are germane to Heslin’s gun control advocacy and the national controversy surrounding the government and mainstream media’s use of national tragedies to push political agendas, including for gun control. Second, Heslin voluntarily

stepped into the national controversy surrounding Jones and his apparent relationship with the President when he voluntarily appeared in NBC's controversial broadcast aired for the purpose of discrediting Jones. (CR:1165-1172,491-493, 494-497, 504, 505-506, 706,¶6).

b. Appellee failed to show clear-and- specific, and clear-and- convincing, evidence of malice -- knowing falsity or reckless disregard for the truth

“Actual malice is not ill will; it is the making of a statement with knowledge that it is false, or with reckless disregard of whether it is true.” [Carr](#), 776 S.W.2d at 571. In fact, the “constitutional focus is on the defendant’s attitude toward the truth, not his attitude toward the plaintiff.” [Greer v. Abraham](#), 489 S.W.3d 440, 444 (Tex. 2016).

“Reckless disregard’ is defined as a high degree of awareness of probable falsity, for proof of which the plaintiff must present ‘sufficient evidence to permit the conclusion that the *defendant in fact entertained serious doubts as to the truth of his publication.*’” [Carr](#), 776 S.W.2d at 571 (emphasis added).

The “actual malice” standard also differs depending on what a plaintiff alleges was defamatory. When a claim for defamation is based on individual statements, actual malice is defined as publishing a statement with knowledge of or reckless disregard for its falsity. [Neely v. Wilson](#), 418 S.W.3d 52, 69 (Tex. 2013). However, if the defamation claim is based on an *entire publication*, actual malice

is defined as publishing a statement that the defendant knew or strongly suspected could present, as a whole, a false and defamatory impression of events. [Turner v. KTRK Television, Inc.](#), 38 S.W.3d 103, 120-121 (Tex. 2000).

“This rule stems from the actual malice standard’s purpose of protecting innocent but erroneous speech on public issues, while deterring ‘calculated falsehood.’” A publisher’s presentation of facts may be misleading, even negligently so, but is not a ‘calculated falsehood’ unless the publisher knows or strongly suspects that it is misleading.” [Turner](#), 38 S.W.3d at 120.

In addition, actual malice in defamation cases must be shown by even an higher standard of evidence than the “clear and specific” requirements of the TCPA – in defamation cases, evidence of malice must also be ***“clear-and-convincing- evidence”*** – that is, “evidence which ‘produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the allegations sought to be established.’” See [Bentley v. Bunton](#), 94 S.W.3d 561, 596-97 (Tex. 2002). And any finding of such malice is independently reviewed on appeal. *Id.*

Questioning of official reports and citing inconsistencies in statements made by others is not evidence of actual malice. See, e.g., [Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union](#), 466 U.S. 485, 512-13 (1984) (choice of language to describe an “event ‘that bristled with ambiguities’ and descriptive challenges for the [speaker] . . . does not place the speech beyond the outer limits of the First Amendment’s broad protective umbrella.”).

Jones and Shroyer neither knew nor strongly suspected that any statement and/or broadcast that either made was false or misleading. (CR:803,¶5; 1394,¶13).

Heslin has shown neither clear-and-specific-evidence nor clear-and-convincing-evidence which “produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction” that any defendant had actual malice in any of the broadcasts.

5. Appellee Heslin failed to show any clear-and-specific-evidence that any statement by Appellants proximately caused any damages.

There is no clear-and-specific-evidence that either of the alleged defamatory publications was the proximate cause of Heslin’s claimed damages. [Bos](#), 556 S.W.3d at 307.

Just as in [Bos](#), where the Supreme Court found that the plaintiff - who had suffered reputational injury from others’ statements - had not “linked [any] of his damages to [defendant’s] specific statements...” so also Heslin has not “linked” any of his damages to any of defendants’ statements. And, just as in [Bos](#), because Heslin has been exposed to an “overwhelming amount of [other] circumstances impacting [his] reputation and mental state”, he failed to show how defendants’ statements were a substantial factor in causing his injuries.

a. There is no unambiguous, sure, and free-from-doubt evidence of defamation *per se*

“Defamation *per se* refers to statements that are so obviously harmful that general damages... may be presumed.” [Brady v. Klentzman](#), 515 S.W.3d 878, 886

(Tex. 2017). A statement is defamatory *per se* “if the words in and of themselves are so obviously hurtful to the person aggrieved by them that they require no proof of injury... If the court must resort to innuendo or extrinsic evidence to determine that the statement was defamatory,” then the alleged statement constitutes defamation *per quod* and “requires proof of injury and damages. [*Main v. Royall*](#), 348 S.W.3d 381, 390 (Tex. App.- Dallas 2011, no pet.).

Heslin shows no clear and specific, that is, unambiguous, sure and free-from-doubt evidence that any of the alleged defamatory statements and/or broadcasts, in and of themselves, were so obviously harmful or fall within one of the categories of defamation *per se*. There is no clear-and-specific-evidence that the statements and/or broadcasts: (1) injured Heslin’s reputation and thus, exposed him to public hatred, contempt or ridicule, or financial injury; (2) impeached Heslin’s honesty, integrity, virtue, or reputation; or (3) published Heslin’s natural defects and thus exposed him to public hatred, ridicule, or financial injury.

Further, there is no clear-and-specific-evidence that the statements and/or broadcasts: (1) falsely charged Heslin with the commission of a crime; (2) injured Heslin in his office, profession or occupation; (3) imputed that Heslin presently has a loathsome disease; or (4) imputed sexual misconduct to Heslin. Therefore, there is no clear-and-specific-evidence to support Heslin’s claims for defamation *per se*.

b. There is no unambiguous, sure and free from doubt evidence of defamation *per quod* damages

Heslin tried to offer testimony on his mental anguish and fear which caused him to incur out-of-pocket damages. He testified about how disturbed he felt about prior videos and how he was stressed after the defendants' 2017 videos and how much he spent because of his mental state. (CR:1695-1697,¶22-31)[Heslin affidavit]. But Heslin offered no evidence, much less clear-and-specific-evidence, that his damages were not caused by events of years ago and by the acts of others.

Heslin says elsewhere that Jones started spreading lies within a month of Sandy Hook, which took place in 2012. (CR:1694,¶2). Heslin said Jones caused this hoax controversy "many years ago." *Id.*,¶4. Heslin said Jones' prior statements had deeply disturbed him. (CR:1695,¶22). Heslin said not only the June 26, 2017 broadcast but also "other 2017 statements" caused fear. (CR:1696,¶25). Heslin said he became aware in April 2018 of the June 26, 2017 video being broadcast, implying he was not aware of it before and thus is could not have caused him stress. (CR:1695,¶17). Heslin said the anguish of losing his son in 2012 "seems just like yesterday," and "the pain and suffering doesn't get any better and doesn't go away and doesn't get any easier." (CR:936). Heslin has previously sued the City of Newtown as well as Remington claiming mental anguish damages from the Sandy Hook shooting. (CR:2296-2299, 2317-2320). Heslin cooperated in two interviews on April 19, 2018, in which Megyn Kelly, and the other in which

MSNBC's Craig Melvin, rebroadcast portions of Shroyer's June 25 broadcast that Heslin now claims caused him damages. (CR:947-948 (NBC-Kelly), CR:261 (video), 262-264 (transcript) (MSNBC-Melvin)). In summary, Heslin failed to segregate his alleged damages proximately caused by the acts of the shooting itself, the acts of others who had previously publicly labeled Heslin as a liar and crisis actor (CR:2799-2804), the City of Newtown and Remington, and his own national re-publications of the Shroyer broadcast on NBC and MSNBC from those damages he claims defendants caused here.

In a defamation action, a defendant's action can be the cause in fact of an injury only if it was "a substantial factor in causing the injury and without which the injury would not have occurred." Bos v. Smith, 556 S.W.3d 293, 307 (Tex. 2018). When there is substantial evidence from the plaintiff himself in a defamation action of other causes of the damages of the plaintiff, a court can conclude the alleged defamatory statements were not a substantial factor in cause in fact of the plaintiff's claimed damages. *Id.*; see also, Doe v. Boys Clubs of Greater Dallas, Inc., 907 S.W.2d 472, 477 (Tex. 1995) ("[E]ven if the injury would not have happened but for the defendant's conduct, the connection between the defendant and the plaintiff's injuries simply may be too attenuated to constitute legal cause."); Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Hines, 252 S.W.3d 496, 505-06 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2008, pet. denied) (finding no causal connection between

defamatory statements and injuries because the evidence showed other, distinct cause of injury).

Appellants objected to this proffered evidence on damages on the grounds that Heslin's proffered evidence did not show the anguish or out-of-pocket expenses were caused by the defamation of defendants and not some other cause in the evidence, a requirement of Texas defamation law. (CR:1973-1974; *see* objections below).

Because Heslin did not differentiate any claimed damages that were actually caused by the other events (his son's death, his previous internet exposure as a crisis actor, the city and the gun manufacturer and the other public controversies he subsequently entered into) from any he claimed were caused by defendants' later conduct, Heslin's affidavit is not clear-and-specific-evidence of an essential element of his defamation per quod claim – pecuniary damages proximately caused by the alleged two publications.

E. Appellants Proved Their Affirmative Defenses, which are Complete Bars to the Defamation Claims

Even if Heslin was able to produce clear-and-specific-evidence of each of his claims for defamation and defamation *per se*, this court must still dismiss each of his claims because Appellants showed, by a preponderance of the evidence, valid defenses to Heslin's claims. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.005\(d\)](#).

1. The statute of limitations for defamation claims is one year

The limitations period for an action for defamation is one year (Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§16.002\(a\)](#)) and the claim accrues when the matter is published or circulated. ([Deaver v. Desai](#), 483 S.W.3d 668, 674 (Tex.App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 2015, no pet.)). The “single publication rule” provides that the “publication” is complete on the last day of the mass distribution of copies of the printed matter. [Forbes Inc. v. Granada Biosciences, Inc.](#), 124 S.W.3d 167, 173 (Tex. 2003); [Mayfield v. Fulhart](#), 444 S.W.3d 222, 227 (Tex.App.–Houston [14th Dist.] 2014, pet.denied). The “single publication rule” applies to online publications, including internet posts and television station’s news reports that are publicly available on the internet. [Mayfield](#), 444 S.W.3d at 230; [Deaver](#), 483 S.W.3d at 675-676.

To the extent that Heslin’s defamation claims are based on any alleged “long history” of defamatory statements described and included in Heslin’s petition (CR:3178-3185) or affidavit references (CR: 1509–1529; 1658-1669; 1698-1701; 1702-1704; 1705-1707; 1708-1709), such claims are barred by the statute of limitations. Furthermore, defamation is not a “continuing tort.” [Tex. Disposal Sys. Landfill, Inc. v. Waste Mgmt. Holdings, Inc.](#), 219 S.W.3d 563, 587 (Tex. App.–Austin, 2007, pet. denied).

The focus of a defamation inquiry is whether any of the alleged defamatory statements (in this case, the June and July 2017 broadcasts) is *in and of itself*

defamatory. Indeed, “the focus remains on whether the specific publication is defamatory at all...” [Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. v. Penick](#), 219 S.W.3d 425, 436 (Tex.App. –Austin 2007, pet. denied).

2. Appellee may not recover exemplary damages as a matter of law because he failed to comply with Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem Code [§73.055\(c\)](#)

Section 73.055(c) of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code declares, “If not later than the 90th day after receiving knowledge of the publication, the person does not request a correction, clarification, or retraction, the person may not recover exemplary damages.” Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§73.055\(c\)](#).

Heslin did not contact defendants about the broadcasts within the 90-day requirement. Instead, Heslin waited until April 11, 2018 (CR:2717-2720), almost a year after the alleged defamatory statements and broadcasts were published, and just weeks before filing suit. (CR:5-23). Accordingly, Heslin’s claim for exemplary damages is barred. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§73.055\(c\)](#). Plaintiff’s Original Petition claims that they are “also entitled to exemplary damages because the Defendants acted with malice.” Because of their failure to follow the statutory ninety-day requirement as described above, this claim against Defendants is barred as a matter of law.

3. Appellants' statements are protected expressions of opinion by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Texas Constitution

Whether a particular statement is a protected expression of opinion or an actionable statement of fact is a question of law for this court. [Carr](#), 776 S.W.2d at 570. “All assertions of opinion are protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and article I, section 8 of the Texas Constitution.” *Id.*

In determining whether a statement is an opinion, “the Court should: (1) analyze the common usage of the specific language to determine whether it has a precise, well understood core of meaning that conveys facts, or whether the statement is indefinite and ambiguous; (2) assess the statement’s verifiability, that is, whether it is objectively capable of being prove true or false; (3) consider the entire context of the article column, including cautionary language; and (4) evaluate the kind of writing or speech as to its presentation as commentary or ‘hard’ news.” [Yiamouyiannis v. Thompson](#), 764 S.W.2d 338, 341 (Tex. App.–San Antonio 1988, writ denied).

When a speaker states a fact upon which he or she bases the opinion, or the opinion is based upon facts that are common knowledge, or the facts are readily accessible to the recipient, the statement is still an opinion. [Lizotte v. Welker](#), 45 Conn. Supp. 217, 709 A.2d 50, 59 (Conn. Super. Ct 1996), (*cited by* [Farias v. Garza](#), 426 S.W.3d 808, 819 (Tex. App.–San Antonio 2014, pet. denied)). Even if

someone could think defendants' statements had not been directed at the media, Megyn Kelly, NBC or the government, at most these statements were rhetorical hyperbole, and thus opinions which will not give rise to defamation claims. *Farias v. Garza*, 426 SW 3d 808, 819 (“secret, illegal and corrupt” and “blatant coverup attempt” were held to be rhetorical hyperbole).

4. InfoWars is not liable based on undisputed facts

The evidence shows InfoWars, LLC has no relationship to Heslin's claims. InfoWars, LLC does not own or operate the domain name or website located at <https://www.infowars.com>, where the publications originated. It has never employed Alex Jones or Owen Shroyer. It has never had authority over or control of the content of the broadcasts including any of the allegedly defamatory broadcasts. (CR:133-134).

5. Appellee's defamation claims are barred under the substantial truth doctrine, Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §73.005

A media defendant can “defeat a defamation cause of action by establishing the ‘substantial truth’ of the broadcast in question.” *Avila v. Larrea*, 394 S.W.3d 646, 657 (Tex.App.-Dallas 2012, pet. denied) (citing *McIlvain v. Jacobs*, 794 S.W.2d 14, 15 (Tex. 1990). “[A] media defendant's reporting that a third party has made allegations is ‘substantially true’ if, in fact, those allegations have been made and their content is accurately reported.” *Id.* Although this doctrine does not

necessarily apply to all broadcasts that publish third-party reports (*see Neely*, 418 S.W.3d at 65 (“But we do not foreclose the possibility that the gist of some broadcasts may merely be allegation reporting, such that one measure for the truth of the broadcast could be whether it accurately relayed the allegations of a third party.”)), it is directly on point with the facts before this Court.

In this case, Shroyer accurately reported (CR:1109-1110, 1129 [June 25, 2017 broadcast transcript – Appendix 4]) the allegations and publications of iBankcoin (CR:1395-1399 [Appendix 2]) and ZeroHedge (CR:1400-1403 [Appendix 3]). The “gist” of Shroyer’s broadcast, which was a report and commentary on the allegations and publications of these third-parties, was that ZeroHedge posted an article claiming that Megyn Kelly and NBC failed to “fact check” Heslin’s statements made on the NBC broadcast. Shroyer’s broadcast is true because ZeroHedge did post an article making those claims as reported by Shroyer. Indeed, the title of the ZeroHedge article was “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece.” (CR:1400-1403).

Further, during the June 25 broadcast, Shroyer stated:

“[F]eatured in Megyn Kelly’s expose, Neil Heslin, a father of one of the victims, during the interview described what happened the day of the shooting. And, basically, what he said, the statement he made, fact checkers on this have said, cannot be accurate. He’s

claiming that he held his son, and saw the bullet hole in his head. That is his claim.

Now, according to a timeline of events, and a coroner's testimony, that is not possible..." (CR:1109).

The Zero Hedge article upon which Shroyer was accurately reporting stated the following:

"... Kelly and NBC aired footage of the grieving father of a Sandy Hook massacre victim which contains a major contradiction to the official story. (CR:1400 [Appendix 3]).

...

Jim Fetzer, Professor Emeritus at the University of Minnesota who wrote a book claiming Sandy Hook was staged, notes that based on the facts of the case, Heslin's statement that he 'held his son with a bullet hole through his head' could not have happened. According to Coroner Wayne Carver, M.C., the parents of the victims weren't allowed to see their children's bodies- and were instead shown pictures to identify the deceased. Anderson Cooper even interviewed the parents of one of the victims about not being able to see their child...

While it's entirely possible that Mr. Heslin had access to his son after the shooting, given the highly contentious nature of the Sandy Hook massacre in which every aspect of the case has been pored over and dissected- **it was incumbent upon Megyn Kelly and NBC to familiarize themselves with all sides of the argument so they could have identified and explained Heslin's statement.**" (CR:1401 [Appendix 3])(emphasis in original).

During Shroyer's June 25 broadcast, he also showed the same videos that were embedded in the ZeroHedge article. (CR:2009-2010, ¶2). Thus Shroyer's

reiteration of the ZeroHedge's allegations is "substantially true" because ZeroHedge actually made the allegations with regard to Heslin's statements in Megyn Kelly's interview and Shroyer fully and accurately reported and portrayed those allegations. Likewise, Jones' July 20 broadcast was also substantially true with regard to Shroyer's June 25 reiteration of ZeroHedge's points. "[A] true account which does not create a false impression by omitting material facts or suggestively juxtaposing them is not actionable, regardless of the conclusions that people may draw from it." [Turner](#), 38 S.W.3d at 118.

Even though others may have held a different view or had different information from what ZeroHedge, or the coroner involved, or Heslin himself had, "[l]ibel law cannot require a news organization to air the interviews of everyone who might speak on a public figure's behalf." [Turner](#), 38 S.W.3d at 122.

Heslin also asserts that:

"In addition, a minimal amount of research would have caused any competent journalist not to publish the defamatory accusation. According to contemporary news accounts, the bodies of the victims were released from the medical examiner into the custody of the families." (CR:3177¶22).

Even if there were "contemporary news accounts" that stated the bodies of the victims were released to families, that does not change the "gist" or theme of either the June 25 or July broadcasts. Regardless of how many other "news accounts" stated that the bodies were released to families, there was in fact a common sense

or common experience inconsistency arising from the coroner's statements that the bodies were not released to the parents but instead to funeral homes and Heslin's statement he held his son's body. Appellants created no false impression of an anomaly because, regardless of what others reported, this anomaly existed.

Persons who question news accounts or the government accounts of any event, when there were other accounts out that do not "cooperate" with the government account, are not liable for defamation to one side or the other who gave the accounts. That is not the law. "*Criticism of government* is at the very center of the constitutionally protected area of free discussion. *Criticism* of those responsible for government operations *must be free, lest criticism of government itself be penalized.*" [Rosenblatt v. Baer](#), 383 U.S. 75, 85 (1966) (emphasis added).

6. Appellee's defamation claims are barred under the fair comment privilege, Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§73.002](#)

Section [73.002\(b\)\(2\)](#) of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code, "provides that a broadcast is privileged if it is a 'reasonable and fair comment on or criticism of an official act of a public official or other matter of public concern published for general information.'" [Neely](#), 418 S.W.3d at 70 (citing Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §73.002(b)(2)); *see also* [D Magazine Partners, L.P.](#), 529 S.W.3d at 441. "Comments based on substantially true facts are privileged if fair." [Neely](#), 418 S.W.3d at 70.

Shroyer's broadcast was not only substantially true, but his comments, based on the ZeroHedge article, were fair and reasonable. (CR:1390-1394). Shroyer's statements are privileged because his comments were made as criticism of a matter of public concern (the Kelly and NBC broadcast that was criticized by ZeroHedge and iBankCoin) and those same comments were published for general information.

II. THE TRIAL COURT'S RULING VIOLATES APPELLANTS' FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

The United States Supreme Court has issued numerous decisions concerning the First Amendment limits to state tort liability. These decisions, taken together, preclude tort liability for the statements Appellee Heslin is complaining about in this case. Accordingly, Appellants' Motion to Dismiss should have been granted, and the trial court erred in refusing to grant it.

A long line of cases have explained that it is a "prized American privilege to speak one's mind," ([New York Times v. Sullivan](#), 376 U.S. 254, 269 (1964)), and "the fitting remedy for evil counsels is good ones." [Whitney v. California](#), 274 U.S. 357, 375 (1927) (Brandeis, J., concurring). For these reasons, even vile, hateful, and factually inaccurate speech is protected, as opposed to suppressing or punishing such speech. The public needs access to all points of view to be

adequately informed in the political process, including whether to support gun control.

Beginning in 1964 with *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964), the Supreme Court explained that political speech needs “breathing space,” to avoid chilling speech related to the political process. In *New York Times v. Sullivan*, it was uncontroverted that some of the statements contained in the New York Times advertisement were “not accurate descriptions of events” that occurred (for example, the dining hall was never “padlocked,” and Dr. King was arrested four times, not seven times. *Id.* at 258-259), and that the “unprecedented reign of terror” described by The Times was grossly exaggerated and factually untrue in numerous places. *Id.* at 256-259.

In order to avoid chilling political speech, the court said that, “erroneous statement is inevitable in free debate, and [that] it must be protected if the freedoms of expression are to have the ‘breathing space’ they need to survive.” *Id.* at 271-272. The court continued, “if neither factual error nor defamatory content suffices to remove the constitutional shield from criticism of official conduct, the combination of the two elements is no less inadequate. This is the lesson to be drawn from the great controversy over the Sedition Act of 1798.” *Id.* at 273.

To reconcile tort liability with the First Amendment, the Supreme Court has made clear that, when public figures are involved, factual errors, negligence, and

harsh opinions do not lift the shield of the First Amendment. Particularly when speech of public concern is involved, the shield is very broad, in order to allow the electorate access to all sorts of views – even vile, hateful, and harmful speech. Harsh and even unfair statements are protected from tort liability, and opinions and “fair comment” on facts and discrepancies in facts are broadly protected from liability.

To this end, in [*Snyder v. Phelps*](#), the Court held that extremely emotionally-charged, hateful, and accusatory speech directed at individuals mourning their military son’s death cannot be actionable in tort where it relates to a public concern, because “speech on public issues occupies the highest rung of the hierarchy of First Amendment values, and is entitled to special protection.” [*Snyder v. Phelps*](#), 562 U.S. 443, 452 (2011) (quoting [*Connick v. Myers*](#), 461 U.S. 138, 145 (1983) (internal quotation marks omitted)). To establish tort liability for speech of public concern, the defendant must actually know it is false or must publish it with reckless disregard for the truth. [*New York Times v. Sullivan*](#), 376 U.S. at 281-283. And, when plaintiffs, like Appellee Heslin, “voluntarily inject” themselves into public controversies, and have access to the media, they must engage in “self-help” such as counter-speech, as opposed to seeking help from the courts, because they assume the risk of harsh attack by choosing to enter into the spotlight. [*Gertz v. Welch*](#), 418 U.S. 323, 344-351 (1974).

Even mean-spirited attacks on persons who choose to speak on public issues are not actionable: “while . . . a bad motive may be deemed controlling for purposes of tort liability in other areas of the law, we think the First Amendment prohibits such a result in the area of public debate about public figures.” *Hustler Magazine, Inc. v. Falwell*, 485 U.S. 46, 53 (1988).

In the instant case, the June 25, 2017 broadcast was commenting on a ZeroHedge publication pertaining to questionable news coverage by NBC’s Megyn Kelly and her nationally televised hit piece attacking Appellant Alex Jones. The discrepancies in the stories are fair to comment on, opining on and address.

The July 20, 2017 broadcast merely comments on the inappropriate censorship of the June 25, 2017 broadcast and the same discrepancies raised by the ZeroHedge publication. All of this content is protected political speech, and none of the content comes close to rising to the level of tort liability.

The Trial Court erred in failing to dismiss Appellee Heslin’s defamation claims.

III. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO SUSTAIN THE FOLLOWING OBJECTIONS APPELLANTS' MADE TO APPELLEE HESLIN'S PROFERRED AFFIDAVITS

Heslin originally submitted seven affidavits with exhibits and three separate exhibits. (CR:1508-1802). Appellants objected to all or portions of each affidavit and the exhibits. (CR:1906-2005). Appellants' objections to all are summarized and supported with line-by-line objections in the trial court. The trial court erred by refusing to rule on and sustain the objections, even though a ruling was formally requested twice and the objections were brought to the trial court's attention twice. (CR:2850-2954,2956-3060; SRR [August 30, 2018]:20 at 7-14, 125 at 10-18).

Appellants' objections are briefed below under each affiant's name, with the first record citations to the record for the affidavit statements, and second record citations to the more detailed objections and authorities for the objection in the trial court:

A. Zipp affidavit (CR:1508-1530, exhibits 1531-1630, Appellants' objections 1907-1938)

Zipp relies on snippets of prior publications many of which are not identified, as the foundation for his opinions as to both the defamatory nature of the publications at issue and reckless disregard for the truth. [Tex. R. Evid. 703](#) allows an expert to rely on data not otherwise admissible if it is of the type of data reasonably relied upon by experts in the field. Zipp's reliance on publications

other than those made the basis of the defamation claims, especially those published outside the one-year limitations period, are nothing more than a “back door” attempt to get those prior publications into evidence. Further, Zipp does not lay the necessary foundation or predicate required under [Tex. R. Evid. 703](#). (CR:1908).

The earlier publications are not admissible under Tex. R. Evid. [401-403](#), [404](#), [406](#) and [608\(b\)](#). *Id.*

His stated description of these snippets also violates Tex. R. Evid. [1002](#). *Id.*

Additional objections:

- “Opinion” “1” (CR:1512-1523); objection - Whether a statement is defamatory is a question of law, expert opinions on questions of law are not admissible (CR:1907 ¶a).
- Opinion “2” (CR:1523-1529); objection - Expert opinion on malice is inadmissible (CR:1907 ¶b).
- Prior publications and publications of others (CR:1509-1511; 1513-1529); objection – not relevant, unfair prejudice or confusion, not admissible evidence of habit or character (CR:1908-1909).
- Exhibits A-1 to A-23 attached to the Zipp affidavit (CR:1531-1630); objections – hearsay, not relevant, prejudice outweighs relevance, violates best evidence rule, no authentication (CR:1909).
- “Scope of Review” (CR:1509-1510); objections – not relevant, hearsay, lack of predicate, vague and ambiguous (CR:1909-1910)
- “Background Knowledge . . .” (CR:1510-1511); objections – not relevant, conclusory, lack of predicate, hearsay, vague and ambiguous (CR:1910).

- “InfoWars’ . . .” (CR:1511-1512); objections – not relevant, conclusory, lack of predicate, lack of personal knowledge and speculation, best evidence rule (CR:1910-1911).
- “Opinions.” “1. InfoWars’ False Statements . . .” (CR:1512-1523); objections – not relevant, conclusory, lack of personal knowledge and speculation, hearsay, lack of predicate (CR:1912-1921).
- “2. InfoWars’ accusations . . .” (CR:1523-1529); objections – not relevant, conclusory, no personal knowledge and speculation, hearsay (CR:1921-1937).
- “Conclusion” (CR:1529); objections – not relevant, conclusory, no personal knowledge, speculative, vague and ambiguous, hearsay (CR:1937-1938).

B. Binkowski affidavit (CR:1658-1669, Appellants’ objections 1939-1971)

Binkowski is not a disinterested “expert.” First, she did not establish any expertise or qualifications as an expert. There is no curriculum vitae listing education, training or experience and she lists no publications, grants, research projects or other data from which to evaluate her expertise. Plaintiff bore the burden to establish her credentials. See [Broders v. Heise](#), 924 S.W.2d 148, 152-53 (Tex. 1996). Opinion testimony lacking the requisite expertise is no evidence at all. See [City of Keller v. Wilson](#), 168 S.W.3d 802, 812-13 (Tex. 2005). Because she is not an expert, she cannot testify to or rely upon hearsay.

Binkowski opines what a reasonable viewer would understand from the June 26, 2017 video (CR:1660-1662), that ZeroHedge is not trustworthy (CR:1662-

1667), that defendants intended to deceive in their broadcast (CR:1667-1669), and that defendants acted in bad faith and in contempt of the truth. (CR:1669). These are issues of defamation. The issue of whether defendants defamed Heslin expressly or by *innuendo* is a question of law. See [Arant v. Jaffe](#), 436 S.W.2d 169, 176 (Tex. Civ. App.–Dallas 1968, no writ). Binkowski’s opinions on the matter are irrelevant. See [Upjohn Co. v. Rylander](#), 38 S.W.3d 600, 611 (Tex. App.–Austin 2000, pet.den).

Defendants also made these specific objections to the Binkowski specific opinions shown in the record:

- Paragraphs 11, 14, 16-18, 20-21, 23-25, 28-42, 44-45, 49, 51-58, 60-72 (CR:1660-1669); objection -- not relevant (CR:1940-1971).
- Paragraphs 11, 14, 16-17, 20-25, 28, 30-72 (CR:1660-1669); objection – conclusory, no personal knowledge, no predicate (CR:1940-1971).

C. Heslin affidavit (CR:1693-1697, Appellants’ objections 1971-1974)

Defendants objected to specific portions of Heslin’s affidavit. (CR:1971-1974).

Heslin asserted that defendants “began spreading lies” after Sandy Hook. (CR:1694, ¶2). Defendants objected that Heslin’s conclusions, without him identifying the statements from which he reached these conclusions, were not relevant and violated the best evidence rule. Tex. R. Evid. R. [401](#); Tex. R. Evid. R. [1002](#); (CR:1971).

Heslin stated he did not want to be “drawn into” the “controversy” or involved in it. (CR:1694-1695, ¶¶4-8,10-12,14,16). Defendants objected on the grounds of relevance because whether someone is a public figure is a question of law for the court. (CR:1972); see [Klantzman v. Brady](#), 312 S.W.3d 886, 904 (Tex. App.–Houston [1st Dist.] 2009, no pet.).

Heslin said what his intent was in his public actions. (CR:1694-1695, ¶¶7-14). Defendants objected to relevance. (CR:1972). Heslin’s subjective feelings, motive and intent are irrelevant -- what he did is what matters.

Heslin summarizes what videos portrayed. (CR:1695, ¶¶17-22). Defendants objected under the best evidence rule. (CR:1973).

Defendants objected to Heslin’s proffered defamation damage testimony (CR:1695-1697) on the basis of no proper predicate since Heslin failed to separate damages he claimed was caused by the defendants’ acts and those caused by the acts of others. (CR:1973-1974).

D. Carver affidavit (CR:1698-1699; Appellants’ objections CR:1974-1976)

Paragraphs 3-10, 11, 12-13, 14-17, 18, 19-21 (understands meaning of videos) (CR:1699-1700); objection – not relevant (CR:1974-1976). Whether the statements referred to Heslin or someone else is a matter of law for the court. [Newspapers, Inc. v. Matthews](#), 339 S.W.2d 890, 893 (Tex. 1960). Whether a statement is defamatory is a question of law for the Court. [Musser v. Smith](#)

Protective Svcs., Inc., 723 S.W.2d 653, 655 (Tex. 1987); Bingham v. Southwestern Bell Yellow Pages, Inc., no. 02-06-00229-CV, 2008 WL 163551, ¶4 (Tex. App.–Ft. Worth January 17, 2008, no pet.). The test is how the statement would be construed by the average reasonable person or the general public. See Arant v. Jaffe, 436 S.W.2d 169, 176 (Tex. App. – Dallas 1968, no writ).

Paragraphs 11 (comments caused pain in community), 18 (Heslin could have held son if he chose to) (CR:1700); objection – conclusory without identifying factual basis; “personal involvement” is too vague to comprise an adequate basis for his opinion (CR:1974, 1975).

E. Lewis affidavit (CR:1702-1704; Appellants’ objections CR:1976-1977)

Bullet points 5-10 (CR:1703-1704); objection – her “understanding” of broadcasts not relevant or probative (CR:1976). Whether a statement is defamatory is a question of law for the court. Musser v. Smith Protective Svcs., Inc., 723 S.W.2d 653, 655 (Tex. 1987); Bingham v. Southwestern Bell Yellow Pages, Inc., no. 02-06-00229-CV, 2008 WL 163551, ¶4 (Tex. App.–Ft. Worth January 17, 2008, no pet.). The test is how the statement would be construed by the average reasonable person or the general public. See Arant v. Jaffe, 436 S.W.2d 169, 176 (Tex. App. – Dallas 1968, no writ). Whether the statements referred to Heslin is a matter of law for the Court. Newspapers, Inc. v. Matthews, 339 S.W.2d 890, 893 (Tex. 1960).

F. Clayton affidavit (CR:1705-1707; Appellants' objections CR:1977-1979)

Paragraphs 6-13 (CR:1706-1707); objections – relevance (CR:1977-1979).

Opinion that 2017 publications are defamatory is a question of law for the court.

See [*Bentley v. Bunton*](#), 94 S.W.3d 561, 580 (Tex. 2003).

Paragraphs 6-13 (CR:1706-1707); objections – conclusion without stated basis; opinion not tied to the facts of the case (CR:1977-1978). [*Exxon Pipeline Co. v. Zwahr*](#), 88 S.W.3d 623, 629 (Tex. 2002).

Paragraphs 6-13 (CR:1706-1708); objections -- evidence of routine or habit must establish a regular response to a repeated specific situation. (CR:1978-1979).

See [*Ortiz v. Glusman*](#), 334 S.W.3d 812, 816 (Tex. App –El Paso 2011, pet. den.).

G. Turnini affidavit (CR:1708-1709 and exhibits CR:1710-1755, Appellants' objections CR:1979)

Turnini tries to sponsor website agreement pages (CR:1708-1709). Defendants' objection is relevance. (CR:1979). The websites agreement has nothing to do with whether the June or July broadcasts made the basis of this case are defamatory or any of the sub-issues (*i.e.* public or quasi-public figure, malice).

IV. THE TRIAL COURT ERRED IN FAILING TO AWARD APPELLANTS' ATTORNEYS' FEES AND SANCTIONS AS MANDATED BY THE TCPA. IF ANY OF THE CLAIMS BROUGHT AGAINST ANY OF THE APPELLANTS ARE DISMISSED, THE AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, SANCTIONS AND COSTS IS MANDATORY.

The TCPA requires the trial court to award court costs, reasonable attorney's fees, and other expenses to the movant upon dismissal of a "legal action" under the TCPA. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.009](#)(a)(1); *Hawxhurst v. Austin's Boat Tours*, 550 S.W.3d 220, 232 (Tex.App.–Dallas 2018, no pet. h.). Similarly, the TCPA requires the trial court to award sanctions against the non-movant for the dismissal of a legal action. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.009](#)(a)(2). The TCPA defines a "legal action" as, among other things, a single cause of action. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code [§27.001](#)(6). Thus, should any one of the numerous causes of action brought by Heslin against any of the Appellants be dismissed, an attorneys' fees and sanctions award is mandatory.

Accordingly, Appellants request that the court remand this case back to the trial court for an award to them of attorney fees and costs incurred in defending this civil action. Tex.Civ.Prac. & Rem.Code [§27.009](#).

CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED

1. Appellants are entitled to the dismissal of all Appellee claims under the TCPA because:

a. Appellants established that the TCPA applied to Heslin's suit and each of his claims;

b. Appellee failed to provide clear-and-specific-evidence of each element of his claims against each defendant. This is especially so, since the trial court should have sustained defendants' objections to plaintiffs affidavits; and

c. Appellants' established their affirmative defenses by a preponderance of the evidence.

2. Appellants are also entitled to the dismissal of all Appellee's claims, as all Appellants' political speech was protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitutions.

3. Appellants are also entitled to an award of attorneys' fees, sanctions and costs, as provided by the TCPA.

Appellant/defendants request the court dismiss all of Appellee Heslin's claims and remand the case to the trial court for an award of Appellants' attorneys' fees and sanctions under the TCPA, costs of court and for such other and further relief to which they may be justly entitled.

January 16, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

T. Wade Jefferies
THE LAW FIRM OF T. WADE JEFFERIES
State Bar No. 00790962
401 Congress Ave., Suite 1540
Austin, TX 78701
Email: twadejefferies@twj-law.com
Telephone: (512) 201-2727
Facsimile: (512) 687-3499
Counsel for Appellants

/s/ David J. Sacks
David J. Sacks
SACKS LAW FIRM
State Bar No. 17505700
2323 S. Shepherd Dr., Suite 825
Houston, TX 77019
Email: david@sackslawfirm.com
Telephone: (713) 863-8400
Facsimile: (713) 863-0502
Lead Counsel for Appellants

**ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER,
ALEX E. JONES, INFOWARS, LLC, and FREE SPEECH SYSTEMS, LLC**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of this *Appellants' Brief* was filed electronically and served on all counsel below via electronic service through eFile.TXCourts.gov on this 16th day of January, 2020:

Mark D. Bankston
KASTER LYNCH FARRAR & BALL, LLP
1010 Lamar, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77002
Lead Counsel for Respondents
mark@fbtrial.com

/s/ David J. Sacks

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this document was produced on a computer using Microsoft Word 2010 and contains 14,986 words, as determined by the computer software's word-count function, excluding the sections of the document listed in Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.4(i)(2).

/s/ David J. Sacks

INDEX OF APPENDICES

1. **Order Denying Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA) Motion to Dismiss**, dated October 18, 2019 (CR:3286-3287)
2. **June 25, 2017 iBankcoin publication**: “MEGYN KELLY FAILS TO FACT CHECK SANDY HOOK FATHER’S CONTRADICTIONARY CLAIM IN ALEX JONES HIT PIECE” (CR:1395-1399)
3. **June 25, 2017 ZeroHedge publication**: “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece” (CR:1400-1403)
4. **June 25, 2017 broadcast with Owen Shroyer**: Commenting on ZeroHedge publication titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece” (CR:1102 [thumb drive containing the video of Owen Shroyer’s entire June 25, 2017 broadcast], CR:1104-1130 [transcript of Owen Shroyer’s entire June 25, 2017, ninety (90) minute, video broadcast]. CR:1109-1110, 1129 [specific portions of the June 25, 2017 transcript commenting on the ZeroHedge publication])
5. **July 20, 2017 broadcast with Alex Jones**: Commenting on the censor of the Owen Shroyer June 25, 2017 broadcast that commented on the ZeroHedge publication titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece” (CR:1103 [thumb drive containing the video of Alex Jones’s entire July 20, 2017 broadcast], CR:1034-1101 [transcript of Alex Jones’s entire July 20, 2017, three (3) hour, video broadcast], CR:1069-1070, 1076-1079 [specific portions of the July 20, 2017 transcript commenting on the censor of Owen Shroyer’s June 25, 2017 broadcast])
6. **Affidavit of Alex E. Jones** from Appellants’ Motion to Dismiss under TCPA (CR:801-804)

APPENDIX 1:

**Order Denying Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA) Motion to Dismiss,
dated October 18, 2019 (CR:3286-3287)**

OCT 18 2019 RT

At 4:16 P. M.
Valva L. Price, District Clerk

CAUSE NO. D-1-GN-18-001835

NEIL HESLIN
Plaintiff

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN DISTRICT COURT OF

VS.

TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS

ALEX E. JONES, INFOWARS, LLC,
FREE SPEECH SYSTEMS, LLC, and
OWEN SHROYER,
Defendants

53rd DISTRICT COURT

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CONTEMPT UNDER RULE 215 AND
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS UNDER THE TCPA**

On October 3rd, 2019, the Court heard Plaintiff's Motion for Contempt Under Rule 215 and Defendants' Motion to Dismiss under the Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA Motion). After hearing the arguments of counsel and considering the record, the Court finds that the Motion for Contempt should be granted and the TCPA Motion should be denied.

It is hereby ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 215.2(b)(3), the matters regarding which the August 31, 2018 order was made (Plaintiff's burdens in responding to Defendants' TCPA Motion) shall be taken to be established in favor of Plaintiff for the purposes of the TCPA Motion.


It is further ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 215.2(b)(8), the Court must require Defendants to pay the reasonable expenses, including attorney fees, caused by the failure to obey the August 31, 2018 order because the Court does not find that the failure was substantially justified or that other circumstances make an award of

expenses unjust. The Court orders costs and expenses of \$25,875 to be paid by Defendants, to be taxed as costs of court.

It is further ORDERED that Defendants' TCPA Motion is in all respects DENIED.

It is further ORDERED that even without taking Plaintiff's burdens in responding to Defendants' TCPA Motion to be established in favor of Plaintiff pursuant to TRCP 215.2(b)(3), Defendants' TCPA Motion must nevertheless be, and is, DENIED.

So ORDERED October 18, 2019.



Scott Jenkins
Travis County District Judge

APPENDIX 2:

June 25, 2017 iBankcoin publication: “MEGYN KELLY FAILS TO FACT CHECK SANDY HOOK FATHER’S CONTRADICTION CLAIM IN ALEX JONES HIT PIECE” (CR:1395-1399)

Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook
Dr. Fly 8

Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook
Dr. Fly 3

Futures Are Way Higher, Get In Here and Tell Me Why Stocks Are Going Lower
Dr. Fly 4

MEGYN KELLY FAILS TO FACT CHECK SANDY HOOK FATHER'S CONTRADICTIONARY CLAIM IN ALEX JONES HIT PIECE

zeropointnow Sun Jun 25, 2017 2:25pm EST

Last Sunday's exposé of Alex Jones on NBC's *Sunday Night With Megyn Kelly* was considered by many to be a tasteless and heavily edited attempt to smear the Infowars host and vocal supporter of Donald Trump. Despite a week of heavy promotion, the segment backfired – sending Kelly's ratings further into the toilet a week after her embarrassing interview with Russian President Vladimir Putin – an encounter which director Oliver Stone said she was 'not prepared for.'


This lack of preparation was obvious in the Jones interview – as Kelly and NBC aired footage of the grieving father of a Sandy Hook massacre victim which contains a **major contradiction** to the official story.

Neil Heslin

Prominently featured in the exposé is Neil Heslin – a father of one of the victims. During his interview with Megyn Kelly, Heslin described what happened the day of the shooting when 20 year old Adam Lanza murdered 20 children and six adults at Sandy Hook Elementary school before committing suicide.

I dropped him off at 9:04. That's when we dropped him off at school with his hook bag. Hours later I was picking' him up in a body bag.

I lost my son. I buried my son. I held my son with a bullet hole through his head.



<http://ibankcon.com/zeropointnow/2017/06/25/megyn-kelly-fails-to-fact-check-sandy-hook-fathers-contradictory-claim-in-alex-jones-hit-piece/#sthash.4...> 1/5

Except this does not comport with the official story

Jim Fetzer, Professor Emeritus at the University of Minnesota who wrote a book claiming Sandy Hook was staged, notes that based on the facts of the case, Heslin's statement that he 'held his son with a bullet hole through his head' **could not have happened**. According to Coroner Wayne Carver, M.D., the parents of the victims weren't allowed to see their children's bodies – and were instead shown pictures to identify the deceased. Anderson Cooper even interviewed the parents of one of the victims about not being able to see their child.

While it's entirely possible that Mr. Heslin had access to his son after the shooting, given the highly contentious nature of the Sandy Hook massacre in which *every aspect* of the case has been pored over and dissected – it was incumbent upon Megyn Kelly and NBC to familiarize themselves with all sides of the argument so they could have identified and explained Heslin's statement.

By airing such an obvious contradiction to the official narrative, Megyn Kelly and NBC have lent credibility to Fetzer and other conspiracy researchers who often point to inconsistent reports from the MSM to support their theories.

She lied..

While Megyn Kelly can be heard weeks before the interview on a leaked recording promising Jones that the segment wouldn't be a 'hit job,' a promo released by NBC revealed **she lied** – as it was obvious Kelly was going to focus on statements made on Infowars about the 2012 massacre at **Sandy Hook Elementary School** in Newtown, MA committed by Adam Lanza.

She's a lawyer. It was a total cross-examination. And when I said that I believe children died at Sandy Hook, as I've said for years, she kept coming back with answers saying "you believe nobody died! You believe Anderson Cooper was involved!" and I said "NO! My listeners questioned it, I had debates with both sides, and I played devil's advocate." -Alex Jones

As a result of NBC's decision to air the piece, several corporate sponsors pulled advertisements, Megyn Kelly was disinited to an anti 2nd Amendment event, and Jones implored NBC not to air the segment on Father's Day – citing the inappropriate timing.

Sandy Hook Questions

The final report on the Sandy Hook shooting concludes that Adam Lanza, 20, was a socially awkward lone gunman with unmedicated Obsessive Compulsive Disorder whose mother gave him negligent access to firearms – however several inconsistencies in the official report have led many to speculate that the incident was a hoax or a 'false flag' staged to justify gun control measures.

Among the questions people have:

- Why were there reports of men dressed in camouflage who fled into the woods – one of whom police allegedly detained?
- Why does Sandy Hook father Robbie Parker appear to 'get into character'?
- Why does the Sandy Hook Elementary website have no internet archive for four years? Was the school even open?
- Why does it appear that several charities were set up before the December 14th shooting?
- Why weren't the Victims' parents allowed to see their children's bodies?

While several Sandy Hook questions have been debunked -- such as the missing internet archives, the massacre remains a hotly contested topic across the internet.

Alex Jones' official position is that he believes children died in the shooting -- in fact, during a 2014 account of a hearing before the Newtown Board of Education, an Infowars journalist "did not dispute that Adam Lanza had perpetrated the shooting."

Yet despite Jones' official position, he and Infowars have played devil's advocate along the way -- presenting facts and narratives which disagree with the official story.

And while Jones has presented a number of angles to the Sandy Hook massacre, Megyn Kelly and NBC chose to distort the facts through their lens of propaganda to fit their case against the Infowars host, while failing to fact check a gaping hole in the story in their quest to destroy Alex Jones.

This needs to be addressed

By failing to identify the obvious contradiction between Neil Heslin's account and the official story, Kelly and her network have fanned the very flames of doubt and conspiracy they sought to silence, creating more questions than answers.

For the sake of all the Sandy Hook parents who weren't allowed to see their deceased children, and to settle this new piece of fodder for conspiracy theorists which *they* aired, Megyn Kelly and NBC have a responsibility to address this giant contradiction to the official story.

If you enjoy the content at iBankCoin, please follow us on Twitter



7/5/2018

Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father's Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece – ZeroPointNow
Uber Just Lost Its Third Executive In Several Weeks

Page 1 of 1

<http://ibankcoin.com/zeropointnow/2017/06/25/megyn-kelly-fails-to-fact-check-sandy-hook-fathers-contradictory-claim-in-alex-jones-hit-piece/#sthash.4...> 5/5

APPENDIX 3:

June 25, 2017 ZeroHedge publication: “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece” (CR:1400-1403)

Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father's Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece




By ZeroPointNow
Sun, 06/25/2017 - 15:35

EXHIBIT

tabbies

D-2



Content originally published at iBankCoin.com

Last Sunday's exposé of Alex Jones on NBC's *Sunday Night With Megyn Kelly* was considered by many to be a tasteless and heavily edited attempt to smear the Infowars host and vocal supporter of Donald Trump. Despite a week of heavy promotion, the segment backfired – sending Kelly's ratings further into the toilet a week after her embarrassing interview with Russian President Vladimir Putin – an encounter which director Oliver Stone said she was 'not prepared for.'

This lack of preparation was obvious in the Jones interview – as Kelly and NBC aired footage of the grieving father of a Sandy Hook massacre victim which contains a major contradiction to the official story.

Neil Heslin

Prominently featured in the exposé is Neil Heslin – a father of one of the victims. During his interview with Megyn Kelly, Heslin described what happened the day of the shooting when 20 year old Adam Lanza murdered 20 children and six adults at Sandy Hook Elementary school before committing suicide.

I dropped him off at 9:04. That's when we dropped him off at school with his book bag. Hours later I was picking' him up in a body bag.

I lost my son. I buried my son. I held my son with a bullet hole through his head.

<https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2017-06-25/megyn-kelly-fails-fact-check-sandy-hook-fathers-contradictory-claim-alex-jones-hit-p>

1/4

Except this does not comport with the official story

Jim Fetzer, Professor Emeritus at the University of Minnesota who wrote a book claiming Sandy Hook was staged, notes that based on the facts of the case, Heslin's statement that he 'held his son with a bullet hole through his head' **could not have happened**. According to Coroner Wayne Carver, M.D., the parents of the victims weren't allowed to see their children's bodies - and were instead shown pictures to identify the deceased. Anderson Cooper even interviewed the parents of one of the victims about not being able to see their child.

While it's entirely possible that Mr. Heslin had access to his son after the shooting, given the highly contentious nature of the Sandy Hook massacre in which *every aspect* of the case has been pored over and dissected - it was incumbent upon Megyn Kelly and NBC to familiarize themselves with all sides of the argument so they could have identified and explained Heslin's statement.

By airing such an obvious contradiction to the official narrative, Megyn Kelly and NBC have lent credibility to Fetzer and other conspiracy researchers who often point to inconsistent reports from the MSM to support their theories.

She lied...

While Megyn Kelly can be heard weeks before the interview on a **leaked recording** promising Jones that the segment wouldn't be a 'hit job,' a promo released by NBC revealed **she lied** - as it was obvious Kelly was going to focus on statements made on Infowars about the 2012 massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, MA committed by Adam Lanza.

She's a lawyer. It was a total cross-examination... And when I said that I believe children died at Sandy Hook, as I've said for years, she kept coming back with answers saying "you believe nobody died! You believe Anderson Cooper was involved!" and I said "NO! My listeners questioned it, I had debates with both sides, and I played devil's advocate." - Alex Jones

As a result of NBC's decision to air the piece, several corporate sponsors pulled advertisements. Megyn Kelly was disinvented to an anti 2nd Amendment event, and Jones implored NBC not to air the segment on Father's Day - citing the inappropriate timing.

Sandy Hook Questions

The final report on the Sandy Hook shooting concludes that Adam Lanza, 20, was a socially awkward lone gunman with unmedicated Obsessive Compulsive Disorder whose mother gave him negligent access to firearms - however several inconsistencies in the official report have led many to speculate that the incident was a hoax or a "false flag" staged to justify gun control measures.

Among the questions people have:

- Why were there reports of men dressed in camouflage who fled into the woods - one of whom police allegedly detained?
- Why does Sandy Hook father Robbie Parker appear to 'get into character'?
- Why does the Sandy Hook Elementary website have no internet archive for four years? Was the school even open?
- Why does it appear that several charities were set up before the December 14th shooting?
- Why weren't the victims' parents allowed to see their children's bodies?

While several Sandy Hook questions have been debunked - such as the missing internet archive, the massacre remains a hotly contested topic across the internet.

Alex Jones' official position is that he believes children died in the shooting - in fact, during a 2014 account of a hearing before the Newtown Board of Education, an Infowars journalist "did not dispute that Adam Lanza had perpetrated the shooting."

4. A man from Infowars did not dispute that Adam Lanza had perpetrated the shooting. Instead he emphasized how law-abiding gun owners in Connecticut and elsewhere are being "penalized" because of Sandy Hook, and the importance of the Second Amendment to freedom and the American way of life.

Yet despite Jones' official position, he and Infowars have played devil's advocate along the way - presenting facts and narratives which disagree with the official story.

And while Jones has presented a number of angles to the Sandy Hook massacre, Megyn Kelly and NBC chose to distort the facts through their lens of propaganda to fit their case against the Infowars host, while airing a gaping hole in the official story in their quest to destroy Alex Jones.

This needs to be addressed

By failing to identify the obvious contradiction between Neil Heslin's account and the official story, Kelly and her network have fanned the very flames of doubt and conspiracy they sought to silence, creating more questions than answers.

For the sake of all the Sandy Hook parents who weren't allowed to see their deceased children - and to settle this new piece of fodder for conspiracy theorists which they aired, Megyn Kelly and NBC have a responsibility to address this giant contradiction to the official story.

Follow on Twitter [@ZeroPointNow](#) & Subscribe to our YouTube channel

60026 0 0

Sponsored Stories

07/16/2018

Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father's Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece | Zero Hedge | Zero Hedge

10 Abandoned Luxury Cars From Dubai >


Revealed: The Top 20 Worst Car Parking Fails Ever! >

Simple Method 'Regrows' Hair (Do This Tonight)

World-renowned International Folk Art Market
Arlington

Is Cybercrime Bigger in Texas?

Teach These Female Celebrities How To Get Out
of a Car >



More Stories You May Like

10 Most Stolen Vehicles In The US >

10 Most Powerful Cars You Can Buy >

Yellowstone Supervolcano: The Steamboat Geyser Just
Went Off Again!

IG Report Confirms Obama Lied About Hillary Email
Server

5 Car Brands to Buy and 5 to Avoid From Consumer
Reports >

Here's What Would Happen If A Nuclear Bomb Was
Detonated On The Ground In NYC

31 Massive Engineering Fails >

Rand Slides To 6-Mo Lows As South Africa Unveils
'Affirmative Action' Mining Charter

Teach These Female Celebrities How To Get Out of a Car
>

Trump Blasts "Punch Drunk," "Very Low IQ" Robert De
Niro Over Tonys Rant

The 10 Strangest Things Ever Seen on Our Roads >

America Is Unprepared For The Coming Jobs
Apocalypse



Discrimination Notice Cookie Policy

Copyright ©2009-2018 ZeroHedge.com/ABC Media. 10


APPENDIX 4:

June 25, 2017 broadcast with Owen Shroyer: Commenting on the ZeroHedge publication titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece”

(CR:1102 [thumb drive containing the video of Owen Shroyer’s entire June 25, 2017 broadcast], CR:1104-1130 [transcript of Owen Shroyer’s entire June 25, 2017, ninety (90) minute, video broadcast], **CR:1109-1110, 1129** [specific portions of the June 25, 2017 transcript commenting on the ZeroHedge publication])

41. Attached hereto marked as Exhibit B-36 is a thumb drive containing a video of a true and correct copy of the entire Owen Shroyer broadcast on June 26, 2017 that is the subject of Plaintiff's defamation claim.

Appendix 4



Speaker 1: You've found it: the tip of the spear. It is the Alex Jones Show with Owen Shroyer.

Owen Shroyer: This is Sunday broadcast of the Alex Jones Show. Alex Jones is out today. Owen Shroyer filling in. All kinds of news to go through today. We'll take some of your calls. We've got some guests: Roger Stone and Shiva, who is running against Elizabeth Warren. Dr. Shiva is going to be joining us, both of those guys, in the second hour. So, you've got the Democrats that are absolutely failing right now. You've got the left media, specifically CNN, that is absolutely failing right now. Totally in a tailspin. You've got the Russia narrative that is not only collapsing on its face, it is now being looked at to be dropped.


So you say, "Well, wait a second ..." And I was talking with Alex about this before the show. Obama, they printed a big story talking about how Obama blocked the Russia investigation. The Democrats tried to use this to say, "Oh my gosh, there could've been more there." Now they're scapegoating Obama. It was smarter for him to drop the investigation or stop any investigation at that time because it was the Democrats that were actually colluding with Russia. So they're going to play this thing off slowly but surely and the Russia narrative will die. Then there might be some hearings for some other collusion that might be going on.

Soon, Loretta Lynch, maybe John Podesta, and then the list goes on and on. I'd like to get Obama, Hillary Clinton. I mean, I don't understand this. If Russia is hacking into our infrastructure while Barrack Obama was president and while Hillary Clinton had a private server with classified documents that was probably easily accessible and access to those accounts, why aren't they being investigated? Of course, you know the answer to that. The deep state doesn't want to investigate that. The whole investigation is a witch hunt into Donald Trump. So keep your eyes for not just the Russia narrative to continue to fail, but also to be dropped in the Senate and in the House and all of these committees and all of these hearings.

So you've got that, and meanwhile, you've got Trump who is returning the energy sector to the United States, saying that he wants to be the global dominating force in energy. The Democrats can't have a victory. This is all going on and you wouldn't even know it. You wouldn't even know it if you watched liberal media. You wouldn't even know that any of this is going on if you watched television news. They're going to tell you Trump's getting impeached. They're going to push propaganda to assassinate Trump. That continues to happen. The investigation is ongoing. Trump colluded! None of it's true!

Meanwhile, this is actually the biggest PSYOP I think that's going on right now. You have mainstream news that is trying to not only portray an inaccurate picture of Donald Trump. We already know that that's going on. But they also want to dominate you and intimidate you from believing in yourself, from believing in the movement, from believing in Donald Trump. That's what they're trying to do. They're trying to oppress our victories. They're trying to oppress

Appendix 4



Donald Trump's victories. They're trying to oppress the fact that we are taking this country back. We are going in the right direction.

It might be small steps here or there. There might be some big steps here or there. There might be some leaves. There might be some knocks back, but we're going in the right direction and Trump is leading it, but they don't want you to know that. They don't want you to believe that. They want to oppress you. They want to intimidate you. They want to bully you with fake news and they want to tell you that you're not winning, Trump's not winning, the investigation is ongoing, Trump colluded, he's getting impeached, assassinate here, assassinate there, and it's all failing. It's all failing, folks, so just remember that. Fellow Americans, we are winning right now. We are kicking ass. The Democrats are failing. CNN is failing. Trump is winning. We are winning. That's the story, not what they try to tell you on the fake news.

Alex Jones:

Look, I'm not going to sit here and say, "See, I told you so," that communist Chinese-style net censorship was coming to the web because it's already here. It's being announced. The way you keep the internet open and free is you get involved more than ever. Go to InfoWars.com/app, the new battleship in the fight. InfoWars live, available right now. We're looking for a crew to manage. You want to sit down and play games and be a trendy or are you going to be a part of history? Don't sit by and let the internet and free speech be stolen from you. Take action!

Speaker 1:

And now the tip of the spear, leading the fight to take back the nation. It's Owen Shroyer. You're listening to the Alex Jones Show.

Owen Shroyer:

Do not, do not let the fake news get you down. Do not let the fake news control the way you think, feel, and see the way politics are going, the way this country is going because they want to paint an inaccurate picture. They want to bully you. They want to suppress the victories that we're having. This is proven in spades, folks, when you just look at the amount of coverage and the type of coverage that Donald Trump gets.

Now, I tweeted this out on Friday night because I just noticed it's just unbelievable because this is probably what the vast majority of the sheeple are ingesting to get their view of reality. If you open up the "news app," it's Apple's factory news app. If you would've opened it on Friday night, you would've had a extremely inaccurate picture of reality. Their top story was, first of all, from BuzzFeed. BuzzFeed gets their top story: in days before election Democrat lawmakers urged Obama to retaliate against Russia. Again, Obama didn't want to do anything because he knew a real investigation would show collusion with Clinton and Podesta and the Democrats.

Even so, though, even so, they still run that headline to pretend like, "Oh, there's something there!" Well yeah, there is something there. It's on the Democrat's side, though. See, that's how they twist it. That's how they twist their narrative, that's BuzzFeed, and then the Apple News app puts that as their

top story; a total fake news spin. But it gets worse. Then you have other links up there, "Extreme Heatwaves Will Change How We Live: We're Not Ready," as if anthropogenic global warming is going to kill you when there's real anthropogenic climate change going on. It's called chem trails in the sky. Then you've got "Conservatives Turn on Trumpcare," demonizing Trumpcare, demonizing everything Trump is doing.

Then the trending stories, the trending stories, who's shocked by this? Imagine Paul Joseph Watson's shock. Trending stories number one: CNN. Number two: New York Times. Number three: The Washington Post. Number four: Huffington Post, the most discredited, literally ... If you had to say the four most discredited, disgraced news websites on the internet, even, I mean ... It's CNN, New York Times, Washington Post, HuffPost. Literally the most discredited fake news on the planet and the Apple News app runs it as their trending stories, folks. This is the deep state working to control your optics, to control the narrative. It's all fake. It's a façade. They are losing. They are losing desperately, and that's why they're shoving it in your face to make it look like you're not winning when you are. This is the great PSYOP that's going on right now and the Russia narrative is a part of it.

Alright. I need to give out the phone line. We're going to take your phone calls. 1-877-789-2539. 1-877-789-2539. We're going to take your calls in the next couple of segments. I've got some stories here. Where to begin? Let's start with some news here. Again, from Bloomberg, Trump to call for US dominance in global energy production. This is Donald Trump. I think he actually tweeted about this too today. And energy week. Trump is dubbing it energy week, and he's going to dedicate, I guess, this week to the United States dominating the global energy production. I wonder if he'll talk about the solar wall.

A liberal would literally put a solar panel anywhere except on the border. Then this new study comes out actually from the head of a solar department that says solar panels on the roof actually are not energy efficient, so how do you like them apples? I'm just pointing out facts here. I'm not staking my claim into either side. Now apparently, we have a vote coming up on the healthcare bill this week. Maybe it's going to be July 4th. Even the Republican side, Ron Johnson and then crazy Bernie Sanders who, by the way, you know what? Real quick on the healthcare.

We'll see if they vote this week. I think it's going to lose. I don't see how this pass is. There's too much opposition on the Republican side, which I don't like this bill anyway. I don't know why. Why do we have to replace? Why can't we just repeal? I really don't understand. Why isn't somebody saying that? How about just repeal? That'd be a nice start. But you know, I mean hey, we got to worry. We don't want to take healthcare away from the poor. We don't want this bill. This is a death bill. The Republicans are the death party. Folks, we are taking money from the poor and giving it to the rich with this bill.

Elizabeth Warren says that this bill is blood money. But wait a second. Wasn't it the Democrats that just spent close to \$200 million to lose for special elections? Was that the Democrats or was that Republicans? Who do you think, in that equation, between the people that donate to the Democrat party and the people that receive the donations, who on that end of the spectrum do you think you would consider poor and who do you think you would consider rich? The Democrats are the ones that take from the poor and give to the rich.

So just like the whole Russia thing, the Democrats are the ones colluding. The people, like John Podesta and Hillary Clinton are the ones that colluded with Russia, so then they blame Trump, say he did it when they did it. They're the ones that rigged the election. The Democrats are the ones that rigged it for Hillary Clinton, so they turn around and say Russia rigged it for Trump. This is how they operate. The Democrats are the party that bleeds the poor dry to get them more desperate, to turn them into victims to get their vote. So the Democrats take from the poor and give to the rich, folks.

Now, how about this? Again. Where's the real collusion? Where is the real corruption? Why are we talking about President Trump being the bad guy? FBI opens investigation into Bernie Sanders and his wife for bank fraud. So this continues to go on and on and on and on. This lawsuit is ongoing. Just to put things in perspective: Donald Trump gets a million-dollar loan from his dad and turns that into a billion-dollar empire and a very successful family and a successful run to the United States' presidency. A capitalist, an American, a winner.

Bernie Sanders, a socialist, a loser, gets a \$10 million bank loan, his wife gets bank loans to run schools and then the schools get shut down, Bernie Sanders loses his run for presidency, and now they're being investigated by the FBI. That's just a nice little ditty, isn't it? It's literally all the Democrats. Everything that they're saying about Trump is literally the Democrats, so from now on, if they look at the TV, whatever they say about Trump, you can assume that the Democrats are doing that. We'll be right back with your phone calls on the other side. More news.

Speaker 1: Waging war on corruption. It's Alex Jones coming to you live from the front lines of the info war. And now your host, Owen Shroyer.

Owen Shroyer: Alright. I've got so much I want to cover. I don't even know where to begin. Because of the PSYOP that they're trying to force down our throats right now, trying to steal our victories, trying to pretend that we're not winning, that's why Donald Trump, in my opinion, needs to keep tweeting. If you notice, some of the things that Donald Trump tweets actually end up pigeonholing his enemies. I mean, just look at how brilliant that tape sweep looks still to this day. It's aged quite nicely. Also a tweet that he made, he predicted to a T on the date when the housing bubble would return. Pretty incredible, and you wonder if those internet theories that Donald Trump is a time traveler are true.

But anyway, that's why I like the fact that Donald Trump is tweeting and putting out the victories on Twitter because they're not going to report the victories on the mainstream news. And they're not going to tell you that Trump is the president of the United States because we haven't had a president of the United States in some time. It's been the president of foreign conglomerates, private international groups, the Bilderberg Groups electing presidents. I mean, it just goes on and on. But no, Trump actually wants to be the president of the United States and he wants to make America great again. That's why this story is so key, and you can see it already happening in the coal industry.

Trump to Call for US Dominance in Global Energy Production. So I think right now, I haven't actually broken this down based on the timing, but I would say if you want to make a baseball analogy, we're probably starting the second inning right now of Trump's first term. We're just starting the second inning and it's off to a nice start. The first inning came to a bad close for us. We had Steve Scalise get shot by a leftist terrorist. It was terrible, but that's how the first inning ended, and I think now we're moved onto the second inning. Steve Scalise, by the way, has been released from the hospital, I believe, and Trump is now calling for US dominance in global energy production and we probably could do that, folks. Then more people will have jobs.

Rush Limbaugh just had a classic line and I just have to say it. Because they're talking about Obama saying people ... They're all saying this! Hillary Clinton is saying that the Republicans are the death party now. Elizabeth Warren says that this healthcare bill is a blood bill or there's blood on their hands or something, blood in the water, Elizabeth Warren. Then you have Obama coming out saying, "This is just taking from the poor to give to the rich." What money are the poor getting? What is this money that the poor is receiving right now that they need so much that is being taken from them and given to the rich because of this bill? I would like to know that. What is that money? What is that money? Where is that money?

"This is a bill. This is a Republican bill that's going to take from the poor and give to the rich! I can't believe Donald Trump would ..." How? How then? Please, explain that. Nobody's ever asked Barack Obama this. What money is being taken from the poor and given to the rich? Where is this money? Where is this healthcare? Because if you notice, Donald Trump brought people into the White House. He brought people to Washington, D.C. He brought people from the private industry, small business owners, individuals, families, mothers, fathers to talk about their experience with Obamacare, and all of their premiums went up. Some of them couldn't afford healthcare. The White House is tweeting out how many of these states now, the majority of counties, you only have one or two providers to choose from.

So Obamacare has turned into monopoly-care, meant to rob you and take your money, bleed you dry, and they're sitting here saying, "The Republican bill is going to take from the poor and give to the rich. The Republican bill is a death bill." You're just sitting here looking at the facts of Obamacare, looking at the

fact that they said you have to pass the bill to see what's in it, then the Democrats complain and say, "How dare the Republicans want to pass a bill we haven't seen?" Then the Republicans actually release the bill and the left is silent, and then they twist their narrative to call it a death bill.

See, first it was, "Release your bill. Release your bill. What do you have to hide?" Then they release the bill and they say, "Oh, it's a death bill. It's the death party!" I mean, unbelievable. Hillary Clinton, Elizabeth Warren. Not even a month after Steve Scalise is shot, these people get right back on the attack. That's why Donald Trump needs to go on the attack. That's why we need to start getting some of these people like Hillary Clinton, Barrack Obama, John Podesta, upcoming Loretta Lynch in front of a Senate committee to ask them some questions. They're asking questions left and right about Russian collusion. Well, let's ask Podesta what he knows. Let's ask Clinton. Let's ask Obama. I mean, after all, don't we want to know what's going on here?

So folks now, here's another story. I don't even know if Alex knows about this to be honest with you. Alex, if you're listening and you want to ... or if you just want to know what's going on, Zero Hedge has just published a story: "Megyn Kelly fails to fact check Sandy Hook father's contradictory claim in Alex Jones' hit piece." Now again, this broke ... I think it broke today. I don't know what time. Featured in Megyn Kelly's expose, Neil Heslin, a father of one of the victims during the interview described what happened the day of the shooting. Basically, what he said, the statement he made, fact checkers on this have said cannot be accurate.

He's claiming that he held his son and saw the bullet hole in his head. That is his claim. Now, according to a timeline of events and a coroner's testimony, that is not possible. One must look at Megyn Kelly and say, "Megyn, I think it's time for you to explain this contradiction in the narrative because this is only going to fuel the conspiracy theory that you're trying to put out, in fact." Here's the thing too, you would remember ... Let me see how long these clips are. You would remember if you held your dead kid in your hands with a bullet hole. That's not something that you would just misspeak on. Let's roll the clip first. Neil Heslin telling Megyn Kelly of his experience with his kid.

- Speaker 4: At Sandy Hook Elementary School, one of the darkest chapters in American History was a hoax.
- Neil Heslin: I lost my son. I buried my son. I held my son with a bullet hole through his head.
- Speaker 4: Neil Heslin's son, Jessie, just six years old, was murdered along with 19 of his classmates and six adults on December 14th, 2012 in Newtown, Connecticut.
- Neil Heslin: I dropped him off at 9:04. That's when we dropped him off at school with his book bag. Hours later, I was picking him up in a body bag.

Owen Shroyer: Okay, so making a pretty extreme claim that would be a very thing vivid in your memory, holding his dead child. Now, here is an account from the coroner that does not cooperate with that narrative.

Speaker 6: [inaudible 00:22:19] for the bodies that families [inaudible 00:22:21].

Speaker 7: We did not bring the bodies and the families into contact. We took pictures of them, of their facial features. It's easier on the families when you do that. There is a time and a place for up close and personal in the grieving process, but to accomplish this, we felt it would be best to do it this way. You can control the situation depending on your photographer, and I have very good photographers.

Anderson Cooper: It's got to be hard not to have been able to actually see her.

Speaker 9: Well, at first I thought that and I had questioned maybe wanting to see her.

Owen Shroyer: Okay, so just another question that people are now going to be asking about Sandy Hook, they conspiracy theorists out there that have a lot of questions that are yet to get answered. I mean, you can say whatever you want about the event. That's just a fact. So there's another one. Will there be a clarification from Heslin or Megyn Kelly? I wouldn't hold your breath. Now they're fueling the conspiracy theory claims. Unbelievable. We'll be right back with more.

Welcome back to the Alex Jones Show. Thanks to your support out there, we are able to expand this broadcast and expand our store as well. InfoWarsStore.com is constantly expanding, getting new products. Right now, we have a 4th of July summer mega special going on. Free shipping store-wide. You've got to love that, folks. Free shipping store-wide, especially when you're getting some of those big ticket items like emergency food supplies. But how about coming up for the 4th of July, you're going to be out. You're going to be out on a lake. You're going to be out camping. You're going to be out shooting fireworks. About how the Emric's Essential Outdoor Pack, which is 40% off right now? You can get your bug spray and you can make sure you're not getting bit by bugs when you're out shooting out fireworks at the lake or the camp or whatever it is with the kids.

That's not all too. 30% off Brain Force. 30% off Super Male Vitality. 30% off Survival Shield X2. 30% off Z-Shield, and that storable food, that emergency food that I mentioned earlier, which is imperative. We also have 30 to 40% off of retail on that as well. Again, you combine that with the free shipping. You're saving hundreds of dollars. Hundreds of dollars of savings for the 4th of July Summer Special, mega special to InfoWarsStore.com. Support this broadcast. Celebrate free speech. Help us blow up like ramparts, like fireworks on the 4th of July right in the face of the globalists. Be sure to get to InfoWarsStore.com. Take advantage of those specials while they last and while supplies last and check out the whole store. Tee-shirts, all kinds of household items, coffee mugs,

patriot attire. It all goes towards supporting what we do here at InfoWars.com and expanding to the next level.

Alright, we're going to get to some of your calls here in this segment and in the next. But it is not an exaggeration to talk about the complete miserable failure that is the Democrats, that is CNN right now. Even BuzzFeed is now having to admit it. CNN is imposing strict new rules on its Russia coverage. CNN is just a absolute dumpster fire right now, and they're retracting news, apologizing for fake news, deleting stories entirely. All of their narratives are just falling on their face. Now that even BuzzFeed is calling them out, I think that really shows you that CNN is an absolute dumpster fire right now.

As are the Democrats. You have Nancy Pelosi who's up there trying to explain how successful she is. She's literally in the face of ultimate defeat. Literally. The Democrats are getting crushed and they're losing seats in the House, they're losing seats in the Senate. They lost the presidency. They've lost their minds. Then Pelosi gets up there when these rumors start to swirl about her being relieved from her post. She comes out and she's like, "I'm a great legislator. I've done so much for the Democrats. Look at all the victories I've brought us." People are scratching their heads like, "What planet do you live on, woman?"

You don't even live in reality. She's still stuck in 2004. She still thinks Bush is president. She doesn't even know what's going on. But that's the Democrat leadership, you see. Then Trump trolls them on Twitter like, "Oh, I hope Pelosi doesn't go anywhere. She's great for the Republican party." Oh, and then, by the way, the continued failure of the fake dossier against Donald Trump. Sketchy firm behind Trump dossier is stalling investigators. Well yeah, it's a totally fake dossier and probably, depending on Trump's urge to litigate, you could have some serious, perhaps, libel and slander lawsuits for this dossier. That'll be interesting to keep an eye on. Again, Trump calling for US dominance in global energy production, a big story.

Alright, so we've got some other news we'll get to. We're going to be joined by Dr. Shiva who's running against Elizabeth Warren. We're also going to be joined by Roger Stone as well. But let's take a couple phone calls here. Let's go to David in San Francisco. Go ahead, David.

David: Yeah, I've told my wife to buy that shampoo and those of us, especially myself, I've never bought anything from InfoWars. I'm going to start buying the shampoo, the toothpaste and stuff because it's something you always use.

Owen Shroyer: Yeah. It's a household item and I've got to tell you. You're not just purchasing a product to help us. You're going to get a great product. It'll be the last toothpaste you ever use. I don't know how people are about shampoo. Maybe it's a little different there, but I use the shampoo and the toothpaste. Both great products. I'll continue to use both of them.

David: Well, good. Now, it's interesting in regards to Oklahoma City. I had some shirts made up asking people to Google Alex Jones, John DeCamp, and the Franklin coverup. Two guys played a very, very important role. It was John DeCamp and Alex Jones in Oklahoma City. It's really interesting because Senator DeCamp, who represented several of the patriots that were falsely accused, he saw the building being brought down. He said, "Man, I didn't authorize that." He was shocked by it himself. He didn't authorize the destruction of the crime scene like that. It was Alex Jones, not Sean. Sean Hannity's doing a great job, and Rush and Michael Savage are doing a great job and all that, but it was Alex Jones that interviewed Officer John Browning and the other cops that were there firsthand knowledge. [crosstalk 00:29:55]

Owen Shroyer: Well, if you want to share some stories, you can tweet at me. Tweet at me some links or some stories if you want me to cover that or get more into that. But you mentioned something there. You mentioned some of the names in the conservative media, really pro-America media. Alex Jones, Sean Hannity, Michael Savage, Rush Limbaugh, people that people would say are on the right wing or you'd call it conservative media. You think about those people. Regardless of what you think about their political views, these are people that have captured the minds, captured the hearts of many and they're leaders in a sense. They're leaders. You can just look at the things that callers say about Alex Jones when they call into this show and they thank him, and the support that they give to this production.

The left doesn't have that. They have nothing. Who are you going to go to if you're going to leadership on the left? Lena Dunham? Oh my gosh. What, are you going to go to Maxine Waters? Keith Olbermann? So they have absolutely nothing and they have no future, to be perfectly honest with you. Thank you, David, for the call. Let's go to Will quickly in Rhode Island. Will.

Will: Yes. I know you guys were covering Bilderberg. I was down there for Demand the Truth. We had Wilbur Ross, McMaster going down there. What's your takeaway on that? What do you think Trump thinks of Bilderberg? Was he infiltrating? Are these guys part of the swamp? What's your takeaway from the Bilderberg group? Then also, as far as all the conspiracies that we're always bringing up, how is it not possible that Christianity is a conspiracy theory perpetuated by an elite, then, to just control us? I mean, we've never had any evidence.

Owen Shroyer: I'm sorry. Say that again. What a conspiracy theory?

Will: Christianity itself. It could've just been a control theory created by somebody thousands of years ago just to trick us just as well.

Owen Shroyer: You're just talking about overall religion as a conspiracy to control the masses, which I think is absolutely the case. Just look at the Catholic Church and the Vatican, so I'm not going to argue with you on that, but I'm certainly not going to say Christianity or the Christian faith is a conspiracy theory. As far as Trump

and infiltration into the Bilderberg group or the members of his staff and cabinet that went to the Bilderberg meetings, we never really heard much from that. We never heard them talk about it. Trump never mentioned it, so any opinion or any feelings I express are really based in absolutely nothing. I guess there's just nothing there.

I don't know if McMaster's reported back to Trump. I don't know if Trump was interested in what went on in the Bilderberg meeting. There's literally been nothing, no coverage of it, no questions, no interviews, absolutely zip, zilch, nata. Unfortunately, there is nothing for me to even create a hypothetical off of. Which is unfortunate, which is unfortunate. I think Trump could've had a major win to call out the Bilderberg group or to ask those people what they've done in those meetings that come from America to make the country great again. We'll be right back with more of your calls. Alex Jones Show. Sunday show.

- Juliet Huddy: Talk show host is Alex Jones. He's a conspiracy theorist.
- Speaker 13: Radio talk show host Alex Jones.
- Speaker 14: Alex Jones.
- Speaker 15: Jones is the wildly popular conspiracy theorist.
- Conan O'Brien: Radio talk show host and conspiracy theorist Alex Jones.
- Speaker 17: Deeply, I think, racist.
- Alex Jones: I just got called racist by MSNBC.
- Speaker 18: I don't want that man to have a gun.
- Alex Jones: 1776 will commence again if you try to take our firearms!
- Speaker 19: The Alex Jones Show. Watch the free stream live at InfoWars.com/show.
- Speaker 1: You're listening to the antidote for fake news. It's Alex Jones.
- Owen Shroyer: Remember what I said earlier about the Democrats and everything that they accuse Trump of they're guilty of? Just more proof in the pudding. Now, they want to say that Trump is trying to obstruct justice. Trump is an obstructionist. No, it's actually you, the Democrats, that are the obstructionists. Here's Donald Trump addressing that.
- Donald Trump: Their theme is resist. Their theme should be, "Let's get together, envelop. Let's get together." But the theme is resist. It's obstruction. The problem is they become obstructionists and the voters ... I happen to like it from the standpoint of running for office, but I think it's a terrible theme in terms of getting elected.

More importantly, I think it's a terrible thing for the people of this country. Resist. Obstruction. That's not what they want.

Owen Shroyer: Well, we wanted to resist Hillary Clinton and obstruct the globalist resist to try to bring this country to this knees. But that's why we elected Trump. Again, they try to spin that and try to steal it from us, but they have no momentum and they've completely failed. What Trump is trying to say is it's not helping the country. You're resisting yourself, basically, when you try to resist Trump. You're only handicapping yourself, but you're handicapping everybody else with you. When you've been victimized your whole life, when you believe you're the victim, of course, wouldn't you want that then? Of course you would. That's the state of the left right now. Let's go to Harold in Texas who wants to talk about the obstructionist party, the Democrats. Go ahead, Harold.

Harold: Hey. It's good to see the wild man besides Alex there. I like the way you deliver the news. I also wanted to talk about two things, if you don't mind. First of all ... Yeah, I can hear you. I want to talk about your nutraceutical. I want to talk about Brain Force. My mother was in dementia. She couldn't remember nothing. I went and I took a chance and I bought her some Brain Force. She can think now. She can remember things. She's got her mind about her again. She's also taking the iodine and it's working wonders on her. I just wanted to thank you all for doing that because it gave me my mom back. The only thing is that I ordered some-

Owen Shroyer: Wow, what a powerful testimony, guys. Cut that out. Clip that out.

Harold: I ordered some on the 6th of June. I got my order but she never got her order. I had an order sent to her place too and she never got it.

Owen Shroyer: I actually get this complaint a lot from people. Sometimes when you order things on the same day, depending on the product, that it might to arrive the same day. If there's an order that you haven't gotten yet, just be patient. It's probably on its way. That's been the case, I think, a hundred percent of the time when people address me this issue. I would just be patient on that. We have a customer service, here, department. Great people. They'll take care of you if you still haven't gotten it after a while. Anything else you want to talk about? You said you'd called about the obstructionist party.

Harold: I do. I'm very upset now. I understand the Democrats. They're trying to do their job. I don't like the way they're doing it, but they're trying to do their job. But these turncoat Republicans who think that he ran on their party and they're over there, never Trump and getting in the way of everything. Especially that kinky John McCain. I hate his guts and I really wish that he would just ...

Owen Shroyer: Yeah, he's terrible.

Harold: I'm sorry. I'm being terrible.

Owen Shroyer: No, he's absolutely wretched. I honestly believe that the guy is colluding with ISIS. I mean, my god.

Harold: Also [inaudible 00:38:17]. I don't remember what [crosstalk 00:38:19].

Owen Shroyer: But here's the thing about what you're addressing, the Republicans, and thank you for the call. Thank you for that testimony. That was great. I'm so glad to hear that your mother back to a good state of mind. Here's the thing about these Republicans that Harold was talking about. I think that they're falling for the fake news. I think they're falling victim to the PSYOP that we're talking about here on today's show. The Reince Priebuses, the Paul Ryans, these people, I guess they aren't critical thinkers or they're not really incisive. They're just soft as butter people. I don't know how to really explain it, but I think that they fall for it. I think that they see all the mainstream news. I think that they see the fake news on the Apple App. They see all of this just flooding them constantly.

They're scare for their own political wellbeing. They don't get it yet. They don't have the fundamental understanding that the status quo of this country has changed. They have not understood yet that the Trump movement is real, that the Trump movement, the MAGA movement is real and is the majority. They don't know it yet. They cannot accept it. They fall victim to the PSYOP. They see the fake news, and they don't understand America doesn't fall for it. That's not what America is thinking. That's what I think the problem with some of these Republicans are. You know what the answer is? Get them out. Get them out! The mid-term elections in 2018 will be just as important now that Trump is in as the presidential election was for our movement. You don't want soft-as-butter Paul Ryan? Vote for Paul Nehlen in Wisconsin. That's how you do that.

Oh, oh and don't you worry. Don't you worry. The Democrats will be dealt such serious defeat in 2018 if they continue the path that they're on. They might even be dead before the 2020 election. They already tried to run a corpse, but they might actually be a dead party now trying to run a president in 2020. We'll continue to see how that goes, but that's the answer for the soft-as-butter Republicans right now that just do not understand the heart and soul of America right now. Let's go to Frank in North Carolina. I like Frank's idea. He says, "Call into shows and call them fake news." Call into the radio shows that want to hate on Trump. Ask them to explain their claims. Call into C-Span and talk to those people. Let your voice be heard. Go ahead, Frank.

Frank: Yeah, and call into your local media as well, like your local talk radio shows that are part of the deep state that support ... You know, the deep state and all the propaganda media that's being put out, and also that attack and try and defend the lies that come out.

Owen Shroyer: It's amazing that you say that. I am honestly one of the biggest news and radio junkies probably on earth. I have to tell you that here in Austin, I won't say their names, but there's a couple local radio hosts. They've had some changes here on the local conservative station. They changed the morning show. It was a

terrible decision. Now you've got Michael Kilmeade on there who's milk toast on Trump at best. Then in the afternoon, you've got an absolute loon who doesn't even belong on the radio. Then you've got a evening slot that you have some conservatives on that, from my measurement, were always straight shooting. I always enjoyed their content, didn't always get along, but felt that they had the right ideas.

Then all of a sudden, out of nowhere, once the station started making some changes, now they're anti-Trump. Now they want to call out Trump. Now, I'm even hearing people in local radio that are responding to Rush Limbaugh's show and calling out Rush Limbaugh. Folks, Rush Limbaugh has never been more accurate, in my measurement, in his history of broadcasting except maybe since Clinton was in office. It's just really weird what's happening. I guess that's why you're offering the answer, which is call in. Take the narrative over. Challenge them on their ideas.

Frank: Yeah. Even if you can get through to the people working behind the scenes, the guy answering the phone, let them know, "Hey. You work for fake news." One other thing, two bones of contention. I'm really disappointed in it, but we're not covering the 50th anniversary of the attack on the USS Liberty. I mean, that was the predecessor to the attack of 9/11. Also, I want to disagree with something that I heard Alex say recently. I've been trying to get through to him. I disagree. I have never heard Duke, David Duke, say anything hateful towards Alex. He's only opened his arms. He just wants to talk to Alex. [crosstalk 00:43:23]

Owen Shroyer: Unfortunately, I am just not the person to address that. I don't know anything about David Duke or his relationship with Alex, and I'm not Alex, so I don't even want to comment on that and I don't follow David Duke. So I can't really corroborate anything you're saying. Thank you so much for the call, Frank in North Carolina, though. I do like the idea that Frank has to steal the narrative of some of these local talk shows or to steal the narrative from people that are spouting fake news on C-Span. I've got to tell you, and again, it's part of the PSYOP that we have to defeat. We have to remain with the ideas of victory in our head and that vision. It's just amazing.

You hear these people call into local radio or call into C-Span and they literally spout fake news. They literally spout it's the hearsay mafia and you just shake your head and you're like, "Oh my gosh. I just want to save your soul! I just want to save your mind! I just want to bring you back to reality." Roger Stone on the other side. This is the Alex Jones Show, Owen Shroyer filling in on a Sunday. We'll be right back.

Welcome back to the Alex Jones show. Free shipping right now at InfoWarsStore.com. Take advantage of the July 4th specials. I am now joined by Roger Stone, who had an interesting cameo at a free speech rally earlier today. We'll talk about that in a minute, but let's bring Roger on. Roger, what is the biggest thing on your mind as you join me on this Sunday evening? Nice hat, by the way.

Roger Stone: Thank you. We're in the seersucker season, so if one does not do it now, when would one do it? First of all, let me say, that your caller Frank is absolutely right. The USS Liberty was attacked by the United States government in cooperation to a reluctant Israeli government with the approval of President Linden Baines Johnson. This is a lunatic move that would cost the lives of Americans, but it was a false flag that was intended to inspire a war. The caller is absolutely right and the mainstream media has blocked this piece of history out. There's an excellent new book out by Philip Nelson, the man who wrote the quintessential two-volume biography of Linden Johnson, very much like my own book, *The Man Who Killed Kennedy: The Case Against LBJ*, which in the paperback edition has two chapter on this woeful and disgraceful chapter in American history.

Owen Shroyer: That certainly sheds more light on the reason as to why they had to remove JFK from office as well.

Roger Stone: It does. It's interesting because CNN has egg on their face this week. Being forced to essentially retract a story that alleged improper influence pedaling or maneuvering for favor between Trump associate Anthony Scaramucci and the president himself. The CNN had to completely withdraw their question. Scaramucci, who was widely admired and liked among conservatives and among the Trump movement leaders was blocked, initially, by Reince Priebus who clashed with him during the campaign. I think Priebus' problem was Anthony's direct access and the great affection that the president has for him. He is now demanded this retraction, and congratulations to him. I expect him to be now moved to a suitable government position. That's the genesis of this embarrassment for CNN. Meanwhile, there is chaos at Fox. You were just talking a few minutes ago about that other cable news network, Owen.

Owen Shroyer: Well, want to hear your take on a narrative that I'm building up during this show. I think that there's a big PSYOP going on right now in the mainstream media colluding with the Democrats to, with fake news, try to oppress our victories, suppress our victories, suppress our momentum, suppress everything that we're doing to think that we're not winning, we're failing, when we are kicking ass right now. I'm thinking that certain installments of the Republican party with now, specifically Reince Priebus and Paul Ryan are falling for that narrative, falling for that fake news, and thus not getting behind President Trump. What do you think of that?

Roger Stone: Well, it's possible or they are aware that Trump may be more popular with the grassroots than they concede but that he's just bad for business long-term and short. There's a lot of egos here.

Owen Shroyer: There's maybe a little greediness involved as well.

Roger Stone: The point here is that Donald Trump never kissed the dairy airs of these exalted leaders, harrumph. I mean, Washington is broken. The best thing for a majority congressional Republican would be to have a Democratic president. Now, you're an actual player.

Owen Shroyer: The Democrats are hopeless right now. They're eating their own. CNN is failing. Nancy Pelosi is failing. We're winning. We're literally winning and they're trying to tell us we're not! It's unbelievable. Devastating victories left and right with every hearing and they still don't get it folks. We'll be right back with Roger Stone.

Speaker 1: You've found it, the tip of the spear. It is the Alex Jones Show with Owen Shroyer.

Owen Shroyer: Well, there was a free speech rally today, patriots marching against political violence. To no one's surprise, Antifa wanted no part of that. The Democrats wanted no part of that. They're actually pushing political violence right now, endorsing that. Roger, you actually had a bit of a cameo at that rally. Roger, I'm glad that you stand against political violence. Thank you for that.

Roger Stone: I, unfortunately, based on some conversations with those in law enforcement, decided now to go because of planned violence. Yes.

Owen Shroyer: Are you saying you had some intel that there might've been somebody planning some violence against you?

Roger Stone: We believe that based on some conversations I had with law enforcement, and I frankly don't want to endanger other people. Then we do have, I must tell you, an exponential spike in the number of weekly death threats I get since the success of the Netflix documentary Get Me Roger Stone. It is a manifestation of that. There's a very, very ugly piece by some woman at The Huffington Post this week. I won't tell you her name or the name of the piece, you might go read it, but it's horrific and vicious in its scope. An ugly piece by a fellow name Kelly, Mike Kelly at the [inaudible 00:50:50]. When people start to resent our success, and this case I think my role in helping the president, the crazies come out.

Owen Shroyer: Well, it's pretty obvious and when you can't even go to a free speech rally because of violence threats from the left, we've reached a tipping point here and I think something needs to be done. Who knows where this goes next? We rolled the b-roll of you being on the phone with Jack Posobiec actually. You're still able to make your speech, but it's just amazing to me that we can have all of these people in Hollywood, all of this media portraying the assassination of Trump. I think the final showing of Julius Caesar is tonight. President Trump getting assassinate every night for like two weeks straight in that despicable performance. Where does this end, Roger?

Roger Stone: No, I mean, it is naked in their use of the media to incite, to provoke, and to promulgate violence. You're a hard charger. You remind me very much of a young Richard Dickson when he had communist spy [inaudible 00:52:00] in his sights. I think you understand this is a two-pronged punch. First, they promulgate this lie that is consistent with radical Islam, then they censor our ability through the internet, through their entire [sur-pus-sion 00:52:16]

campaign to censor the internet. Miranda says fake news and use other manipulations of our algorithms, a dozen other smart computer tricks to limit our reach to the patriots out there who would rise up and support a Donald Trump.

Owen Shroyer: It's so true. I mean, what you said is so true, but it goes beyond that. Not just trying to suppress the truth on the internet or suppress and censor patriots on the internet. They are literally trying to suppress reality. They are literally trying to censor reality. They are literally trying to intimidate us from bringing reality to the people. Roger, we're actually joined by Alex Jones now. We've got a master Jedi council on board now as Alex Jones joins us. Alex, what's on your mind this evening?

Alex Jones: Well, I'm just here with my family half-way taking the day off and listening to you guys. I just wanted to call in. When we won the election on November 8th, I looked at Roger and I said, "The war has just begun." So I'm not somebody that's overly positive. Roger's like, "Hey, celebrate a little bit." I said, "No. Now they're going to hit us with everything they've got." They've been arrogant before, putting out their fake polls, believing their own propaganda. But I can tell you, Trump killing PPP, Trump killing the carbon tax, the Paris Accords, Trump cutting back the illegal coming across 43%. That's the old number. The new numbers are even higher, reportedly coming out next week, exposing the election fraud, making the big banks loan to small businesses and individual people, bringing 3 trillion plus back on the stock market. Now it's 400 billion in new jobs in just five months. Six months.

This is unprecedented. So I'm not some love affair with Donald Trump. Quite frankly, when I used to half-way pay attention to him, I thought he was some hotel owner and some guy that was hanging with the Clintons. I didn't like it. It's what's being delivered and how the enemies are so upset and how they're panicking and how they're going crazy and how they're going insane. I called Roger this morning and I said, "Will you come on with Owen?" He said, "Sure." I said, "This is a big victory laugh." They're saying in major news articles, Associated Press, Philadelphia.com that yeah, okay, Roger Stone wasn't a Russian agent. The Democrats want the Russian agent stuff dropped. They know it's killing him.

Scaramucci they said was with Stone and some Russian agent totally made up. The Pissgate deal is totally fake. The Democrats won't give the FBI any of the info because it's all fake. They're the ones. It's coming out that they were the ones. It's coming out Obama wouldn't allow the investigation because he knew that Hillary and himself were up to their eyeballs in it. This is huge victory laugh. Our problem is, as libertarians, as patriots, as conservatives, we don't victory laugh. We're always moving onto the next thing, but we have to sit through and celebrate this. We hear all this news that we're being defeated and we're being shut down. That's the last gasp of them trying to affect the weak-minded. We're having absolute devastating victories right now across the board.

American energy's coming way back. That devastates. I'm not against Russia, but I'm sorry. It's business. That hurts the Russian economy, helps ours. It hurts Saudi Arabia, helps ours. Trumps doing everything for America. That's why the globalists are so absolutely, completely pissed. It's all these special interests that thought they had dominated America, mounted our head on the wall. They're just mad that we have a president that isn't out to get us. This is a time for celebration. This is a really big deal happening, and of course they're doubling down and saying that it's the end of the world for us and it's all over and blah, blah, blah.

We have more listeners and more revenue than we had a month ago before the stupid Megyn Kelly all-out media assault. They hit us with everything they've got. They're hated. They're despised. The American people have broken with them. They're like desperate clowns pushing all the rape narratives and the rest of it. Back to you guys breaking all this down, but this is a really, really important time. The problem is they may launch some big false flag to try to blame the patriot movement and some other things. Back to Roger Stone, Owen Shroyer, and all InfoWars family.

Owen Shroyer:

That is a typical move if you look at history. If you're facing in an absolute defeat in illegal activity that you've been doing, you try to stage some big event or start a war in order to deflect the attention away from you. Roger, I want to hear your opinion on this that Alex just brought up talking about the DNC, not willing to cooperate with the FBI or the DHS. How is it? I mean, have you ever seen in your history of being involved in American politics, have you ever seen a situation where if you're looking at something, say Russian hacking or Russian collusion and you separate things onto a partisan level, and you have one side waging against the other side, pointing the finger saying, "Russian hacking, Russian collusion," when there's none there; meanwhile it's all sitting on their side. They're the ones obstructing justice. Based on all the testimonies, everything we've heard, the DNC won't cooperate with DHS or FBI into the investigation of this, but they want to find out about this Russia thing, when is reality going to hit home? When is the DNC going to be called to task?

Alex Jones:

Well, I think it's a superb question. Also extraordinary this week, stunning really. Bombshell proof of Russian influence in the presidential campaign of John McCain. Seems that according to Circuit News, in a stunning piece, they learned from multiple credible sources that the intelligence services twice warned the presidential candidate McCain not to meet with a certain individual that they deemed to be a Russian asset. The gentleman was brought to the table by none other than Rick Davis, McCain's campaign manager, and former associate of my friend Paul Manafort. Later on, a Russian asset would end up at the Republican institution under John McCain, and ultimately, when this became public, would be discharged. John McCain has been a harsh critic of Donald Trump saying that there's collusion by the Russians in the Trump campaign. I think he's driven by bitterness and a demand for revenge because I really saw the CNN story and this story on McCain in the two big stories this week.

Owen Shroyer: Well, McCain meets with Russians. McCain meets with "moderate rebels" in Syria. Who else is John McCain meeting with? What else don't we know about John McCain? Maybe it's time for McCain to take the stand.

I'm now joined by Dr. Shiva Ayyadurai. He is running against swamp creature Elizabeth Warren, a real Indian versus a fake Indian. It is quite a story going on there, and Dr. Shiva is going to help us drain that swamp. ShivaforSenate.com, VAShiva.com. I would read you his resume, but it would take the entire segment, so I'm just going to bring Dr. Shiva on with me. Doctor, the last time we spoke last week, it feels like it was light years ago now, the way that I'm like a speeding bullet through the news timeline. I just want to bring you on and let's get to it. What do you think is the biggest thing? What do you want to talk about? In fact, how about this? The last time we spoke on air, you issued multiple challenges to Elizabeth Warren. You offered to challenge her to a debate. You offered to donate your lab to her team to prove her claims or at least the claims being made by some of her donors about GMOs. Have you gotten a response from Elizabeth yet?

Dr. Shiva A: No, we've gotten not response, Owen, because the reality is I think she's extremely afraid of a competitor like me. She would rather have some career politician go head-on-head against her. I think the word you use, drain the swamp, and it means really draining the swamp of Elizabeth Warren, lawyer, lobbyist, career politician, fake, a liar who essentially presents herself as a fighter but hasn't really fought for anyone except herself. Then similarly, you have the career politicians who do the exact same thing. I think Massachusetts is literally, and I say we're behind enemy lines here. Our office is literally in Cambridge. I have this beautiful building that I own. In fact, downstairs, we rent it to a Democrat, Katherine Clark, I'm happy to take her money, but the reality is we're literally behind enemy lines.

Owen Shroyer: How dare you, you evil capitalist?

Dr. Shiva A: We did this before I decided to run, but I think the key point here is that Cambridge, Massachusetts, which is sort of the center of the global elite in many ways and delivering a blow to them right here against Elizabeth Warren I think is really going to help what President Trump is trying to do at the national level. The fight that's going on between the establishment and against Trump I think is a historic one, and I think we'd really like to support that. The fact that an entrepreneur, inventor, a scientist, not a career politician is running against Elizabeth Warren is a significant one because it basically goes back to the founders of this country. The founders of this country were not career politicians. They were soldiers. They were blacksmiths. They were artisans. They were entrepreneurs and they really wanted to create a country for all of us. What we now have is a forgotten people whose voice is not being heard. By beating Elizabeth Warren right here in Massachusetts, I think we deliver a significant blow right into the belly of the beast.

Owen Shroyer: Yeah. I don't know if you saw her recent comment calling the Republican healthcare bill a bill for blood money. Did you see that?

Dr. Shiva A: I saw that. This woman has no solutions for anything. It's purely just random attacks and I really wonder if everything's okay in her mind because if you read her attacks, it's all about spending money, ranting on what we are, we're not doing against the Russians and the use of allegory, which is about blood and et cetera. I think the woman is actually off her rocker and is becoming unhinged, which is a good thing for us.

Owen Shroyer: Yeah, I completely agree. I completely agree. She's completely lost her mind. A lot of the Democrats really have. You're seeing this. I don't know if that's fear of them losing their command post that they've never really had or it's fear that maybe there's some justice that might be coming down on them, but it really is despicable for these people for Elizabeth Warren to come out and say blood money. I mean, again, especially in the midst of all this political violence being done against conservatives, I mean, Steve Scalise just gets shot. He was just released from the hospital. I will just say this.

I really believe that, and I know that we discussed this. You were born outside of the country, but I believe that you would actually be president of the United States material. I mean, your resume, everything you've done, the views you have on this country. To get you in to replace Warren would not just be getting a swamp creature out. I mean, I'm not just here to fluff your feathers. I think it would be great to get a mind like you in there, someone like you in there, an ideas person. For example, I don't think Elizabeth Warren has the capability to offer her lab for science to anyone. Does Elizabeth Warren have a lab that she's going to run the testing on the GMOs?

Dr. Shiva A: I think what Elizabeth Warren has is basically the backing of the Hollywood elites and the academic elites who, really, the anger that we see from Elizabeth Warren and the "liberal Democrats," the anger is not really against Donald Trump but what he represents. He represents the fact that everyday people, the forgotten people rose up and they voted for a guy who's actually done things. That's bugs them because they've lost control over their narrative. This is a fundamental problem that they have. Getting to solutions, Owen, our campaign ...

By the way, we're coming to our end of June 30th deadline. Elizabeth Warren has raised close to \$6 million. She already has a little mini war chest. We are out there doing direct to people, so anyone who wants to support us, whatever you want to give, it's at ShivaforSenate.com. Primarily, we are running our campaign as an entrepreneur would do. We're not paying high paid consultants. We're not going to go do massive ads on TV, which we know most people do not trust TV anymore. Fox News, what Alex does is probably the last beacon of truth that's out there, at least certain elements of Fox News.

Our view is this campaign is really about winning the future for you. Winning the future for you, what does that mean? As you said, Owen, my journey, everyone who's listening's journey, it was my parents were poor, low-caste Indians from India. We came here. I came here as a seven-year-old, went through the public school systems of New Jersey, amazing public school, dedicated teachers, great mentors, great coaches, like every American out there has experienced. That's what makes America great. Fortunate to go to MIT, did a bunch of degrees, four degrees, got my PhD. More importantly, I had the opportunity to create jobs and give back.

What we're seeing right now is we have ... You look at the resume of Elizabeth Warren. You look at the resume of any of these career politicians. It's incredible that they go out there and have the audacity to say, "I'm going to create jobs. I'm going to fix things." None of these people have done any of that, so I find it very hard that they can do any of those things because they haven't had an experience doing that. I think the opportunity is one of the things, when we look at this entire campaign that we're fostering, we want to bring a lot of people into this, Owen. Even people in the Warren camp and the Bernie camp. People have been disenfranchised, have been completely sold out. Both of these people voted for crooked Hillary completely. Hillary should be in jail.

Sanders voted for her, want to remind everyone listening, plus Elizabeth Warren. Both supported her and sold out their base. One of the key areas we're looking at is clean food. Clean food, clean air. Elizabeth Warren voted for the Monsanto Protection Act, which allows the executive division of this country under Obama, Department of Agriculture, to overrule federal court judges who want to impose injunctions on genetically engineered food, if they're found to be bad for us, which they have been through [inaudible 01:06:45] et cetera. Elizabeth Warren, I'll repeated, voted for the Monsanto Protection Act. All of you people in Hollywood who eat your organic foods in Malibu, all of you people go to the organic farming out there know this candidate, who you may have been bamboozled into giving money, actually supported the Monsanto Protection Act.

I, on the other side, my entire life has been spent learning how you integrate traditional and Indian medicines. One of the key things we're looking at is, we've actually shown, as Owen has pointed out, that Monsanto and genetically engineered foods actually hurt us and we've shown that-

Owen Shroyer: Hold it right there. We'll be back with Dr. Shiva on the other side of this break.

Speaker 1: As First Lady and co-president, did Hillary Clinton order the Waco siege that left 18 children dead? Find out in The Clinton's War on Women.

Owen Shroyer: InfoWarsStore.com 4th of July summer mega specials. Store free shipping store-wide free shipping right now. Rainforest plus 30% off, Super Male Vitality 30% off. Survival Shield X2, 30% off. Z-Shield 30% off. Our storable food, 30 to 40% off. The Emeric's Essential Outdoor Pack, 40% off retail. That's a very timely

special right now with 4th of July coming up, summer activities. Get the bug spray. Get the SPF30 sunscreen. All natural products. Really think about the bug spray that you put on you, folks. If you look into the ingredients in bug spray ...

Look. I had a buddy who worked at the engineering plant that manufactured, I won't say what bug spray, but the big leading bug sprays, and he said that working there, he never went anywhere near bug spray again because you see the chemicals that they put in there. Well, let's see. The bug spray is meant to, I guess, it's so disgusting that the bugs don't want it. Why would you want it on your skin? That's why Emeric's Essential B-Away Spray is all natural ingredients, not the toxic chemicals that they put into the mainstream bug spray. Get your outdoor pack 40% off right now. If you order that today, you could probably have it definitely by the 4th of July. Pretty timely getting these products to you. Take advantage of the 4th of July mega specials. Take advantage of the 40% off of the Emeric's Essentials Outdoor Pack, and stop putting toxic bug spray on you and your kids' skin. Use the Emeric's Essential B-Away Spray.

Alright. I'm joined again by Dr. Shiva. He said something to me that actually creates a new story, to be honest with you in my mind. I'd like to hear him clarify. He talked about how he's running his campaign from an entrepreneurial point of view, not wanting to spend a bunch of money in TV ads, not wanting to spend a bunch of money on advisers, this, that and the other thing. I'm just curious. Are you looking at ... I don't know if you want to phrase it this way. I'll phrase it this way, and then I'd like to hear what you think. You're looking at a low-budget campaign.

You're not really looking at it from the standpoint of "we need to spend all this money on advertising and everything." What you're going to see here is, if you're successful, and we're already starting to see this, but if you dole it out to be, "Hey, we're going to do a low-budget campaign because we're not going to waste the excess dollars, like the millions that the Democrats are, on TV ads, on the advisers, on the this, on the that, on the lawyers." Now you have a situation where, if you're successful at running a campaign low-budget, I think that scares these politicians. I think that scares the mainstream lifelong politicians because that's their bread and butter, baby! That's their bread and butter. They need that big money campaign. You could smash that entire thing is what you're saying.

Speaker 1:

Yeah. Look, Owen, the opportunity here, many of the businesses I've started ultimately, to technology, that brings in many ways ... levels the playing field. What you have right now, if anyone in the audience wants to run for office, they will right away get hit by the small clique of local consultants. I mean, we've been hit by them all here, all telling how they can do this, that for us. All attempting to essentially sleaze their way in to get their next gig. As a part of that getting their next gig, they start convincing you how much money you have to spend. Part of what we're doing with this campaign is we're using technology. Modern technology, some of the stuff I've built, that, in fact, technology that I

did called EchoMail, which actually helped the Bush campaign back in 2000 which we've advanced.

The issue is these tools, if we really want democracy, should be made accessible to anyone who runs. But what these guys do, they own their intellectual property of mailing lists, they own intellectual property of technology and all the little methods on how you actually even get on the ballot. In Massachusetts, we have this whole delegate process that you even have to get on. It's all controlled in little fiefdoms. The reality is we're coming in as outsiders, we get in front of many of these town committees and people are wondering, "Where have you been? You're the only one who can beat Elizabeth Warren." In fact, the establishment is getting very, very concerned about it, but it's very exciting because what I see happening out of this, not only we're going to beat Elizabeth Warren, but the tools and methodologies we create, we want to give them back to the people on how we won because we need to really completely revolutionize the way these campaigns are run.

To your point, Owen, it's a rigged system, and Elizabeth Warren is part of that rigged system. Establishment politicians are part of that. None of them ever talk about any significant issues. Yes, we need lower taxes. I mean, this is duh. That's all they do. Lower taxes, higher taxes. If you take the situation all over this country, which President Trump is starting to address, same situation in Massachusetts, and that's this situation. We have a solution for that. For every 17 skilled job openings, Owen, only one skilled person can show up. Think about that. We have millennials who are listening to this. Many of you know you have 30, 50, \$100000 loans that somehow you were bamboozled to go to college, take "student loans," which never went into your bank account. They went into the pockets of your university officials. Then you graduate, and what skills do you have? You're not even employable.

What we've done in America is created an uneducated, or educated bunch of idiots in many ways, unfortunately. That's what's happened in this country. Many of those people, millennials are waking up and they're saying, "Why did I do this?" One of the big opportunities is going back to the good old days of how work got done. You did apprenticeships, which President Trump is promoting. Here, we believe we need to unleash vo-tech schools. In many ways, the school I went to, MIT, was really a high-tech vo-tech school. We need to make sure people have skills. If we don't do that, they're going to go to China and other countries. That's the fundamentals of increasing the economic base of a country. You need skilled people.

The other piece that we're talking about is we need to unleash technology. You look at the way in Massachusetts, Owen, what's phenomenal is at the state convention, which is coming up in April, where they nominate their candidates, you'll be amazed to know still done all paper. All paper, which means the local politicians manipulate things, make things up. In the last state convention, as we understand, paper ballots were being shredded. Things were being rewritten. This is how politicians are running, as though they own the politics of what goes

on and not we as people. We don't really have democracy in this country, and Trump's winning was a big win for that.

My winning, and us going on this journey together is going to be a big win for all of us, so we have to beat Elizabeth Warren. She's raised 6 million bucks. We want to raise more. We're doing it organically. We believe we can do it at one-tenth in which she's done it. So anyone who's listening out there, whatever you can give, five bucks, one buck, go to ShivaforSenator and donate because this is really about us and this is really about winning the future for all of us.

Owen Shroyer: Yeah, and you getting in there is a representation of us infiltrating that rigged system. That's what they hate. They hate the outsider even being able to get in. I think that they're scared of that. Bernie Sanders tweets out this weekend saying, "Why can't government come together on healthcare?"

Speaker 1: He's a complete idiot.

Owen Shroyer: As he's literally stealing money. But they don't understand this notion, and it goes along with what you were saying about the higher education in America failing right now. People don't even understand. America is running into a shortage of doctors right now. Alright?

Speaker 1: Exactly.

Owen Shroyer: This whole healthcare thing, this whole magical unicorn healthcare plan that you think everybody can just go to the hospital, see a doctor and get healthcare is completely ludicrous. We don't have the doctors. If we had an excess of doctors, maybe we could solve that problem. That is not the case. Final word from Dr. Shiva.

Speaker 1: Yeah. I think you said it. Elizabeth Warren's out there talking about a healthcare is a human right. What's a human right is choice. The reality is because of the Obamacare bill, tens of thousands of doctors have gone out of business. The private practice where your doctor sees you, looks at your hands, looks at your tongue. That's where healthcare happens. Most of those doctors have gone out of business and have had to join large hospitals. We all know, you go into a hospital. There's a two out of five, three out of five chance you're going to get unhealthy. We're not discussing healthcare. It is through food, nutrition, not eating pesticide-ridden products. That's how we get healthy.

Owen Shroyer: Exactly. Dr. Shiva, thank you so much. ShivaforSenate.com. Support the outsider getting in.

Alex Jones: Dr. Shiva Ayyadurai is our guest. He's got four degrees from MIT and others as well, patriot, and he's running for senate against the fake Native American. Of course, they thought they found India so they called the Native Americans Indians, but he's actually an Indian, so he's the real Indian running against the

imposter. He's kind of used that as one of his slogans. Getting into the campaign to run against this lady, let's break down her record and what she's really up up.

Dr. Shiva A:

As you may know, Alex, India has a very oppressive caste system. My parents had this very futuristic vision and they made it out of there and they came to America because the founders of this country had a very different vision for America, which was through your hard work, through your bravery, through your resilience, you've created things. That's what this country is about. The idea of the founders was that between us and our Creator was not supposed to be monarchs, the nobles, the priesthood. It was about us having a direct connection to our God and our Creator. That's what makes this country great.

Elizabeth Warren and the self-serving elitists, Harvard and all these Ivy League institutions and the big institutions, fundamentally believe that they know better, Alex. I know you know better. I know we know better. But that's a fundamental reason, so my journey as an entrepreneur, scientist, engineer has shown me that, ultimately, those people who actually work for a living, produce things, entrepreneurs, people like yourself who create things are the ones who make this country great. People like Elizabeth Warren, the establishment politicians and political hacks, they fundamentally add zero value.

I've been fortunate, because of this great country, Alex, to have accumulated wealth. I've been able to get educated. I could not have done that in the oppressive caste system of India, so I believe I owe something back. I love this country, and Elizabeth Warren is what I call the not-so-obvious establishment. When we look at the arc of political history, we have the establishment, the populace movement, those people on the streets wanting a better day for themselves and their family. Then you have the not-so-obvious establishment, which is what Elizabeth Warren, Bernie Sanders, these people represent. They speak a good game. As you talk about, they're very, very clever with PR. Revolution, hope, change.

But fundamentally, they want to suck out the populace movement and drive it back to the establishment. As a student of systems, as a student of science, I fundamentally want to stop these guys. More importantly, I want to drive a massive defeat to Warren. I know I can do this right here in Massachusetts. I think people like Elizabeth Warren need to be stopped and I believe that I was, in many ways, my hard working grandparents sending my parents and this great country and the fathers of this country put me and gave me this opportunity, this point in history, to stop someone like Warren, to basically support this new American revolution.

Owen Shroyer:

Alright. We're going to do a news blitz here in the final segment. Please support InfoWars. Got to InfoWarsStore.com. Take advantage of all the mega specials right now at the store, including free shipping store-wide. InfoWarsStore.com. Alright, I'm just going to do a news blitz all across the board here. Let's start here. Sadiq Khan, the mayor of London, London-istan, that says terrorism is just part and parcel to your life, get used to it backs amnesty on Grenfell Tower

illegal immigrants. This story just gets weird and more interesting. It's really just sad as that building stands there in London.

Somehow, this building was a raging inferno for, what, hours and hours and didn't fall, hint-hint, wink-wink. But now it just stands there, a burned carcass of its former self, an eyesore that stands in London. Maybe a sign. Maybe a sign. Think about it. This is a building filling with immigrants, gets burned, torched. They claim it's from a refrigerator. I don't buy that from a second. Then magically, all the immigrants that were living there are now about to become legal citizens because Khan is going to give them amnesty. And then on top of that, you have a nice eyesore, a nice building burned sitting there in London. Part and parcel, folks. All part and parcel.

Yeah, how about this? Now, I saw this earlier. "Iran unveils countdown clock to the destruction of Israel," so apparently now, Iran is just openly running a countdown clock to when they're going to destroy Israel. Then you see this story in the Jerusalem Post. "Massive Iranian funding for anti-Israel terror groups revealed." Now, I'm not going to take any political stance on this, okay? Where do you think they got that money? Where do you think that massive funding came from? \$400 million cash from Barrack Hussein Obama? Think about that, folks. You want to talk about an investigation, how can we not get Obama on the stand for a cash deal to Iran that is now funding terror groups and claiming they're going to destroy Israel? Now matter what you think about these countries politically, this is sick. This is twisted. This has Barrack Obama's fingerprints all over it. All over it! Wow.

Fake hate: Muslim arrested for torching her own mosque in Iowa. Honestly, it's strange because think about it. The multiple times now that we've had these mosque attacks, the story gets buried real quickly. Have you noticed that? I think that's because we continue to see this trend, that they're staging these hate attacks, folks. This is like the fifth story I've seen of this now. They all end up being staged.

Now just to go back and remind you, the FBI is still investigating Bernie Sanders and his wife for bank fraud. This is the same Bernie Sanders that called Donald Trump a fraud. You are the fraud, Bernie Sanders, and your wife. That's why you're being investigated. I hope justice befalls the Sanders family. They would like that, though. Sanders are for justice. Right, Bernie? You're all about justice. You're all about justice, Bernie. Bernie! Oh, Bernie! Isn't Bernie Sanders all about justice? "I mean, folks, we've got people that are poor. We've got the poor people out there, and then we've got the millionaires and billionaires. The millionaires and billionaires are against the poor people, and so I'm for justice for anyone that would ever take advantage of poor people and keep poor people down that has millions of dollars. I'm Bernie Sanders, and anyone that would try to obstruct justice from coming down on somebody that wants to steal from the rich and give to the millionaires and billionaires, well, we're going to stop that."

Hey, Bernie, you're a millionaire and you're being investigated for bank fraud. "Nothing to see here. Nothing to see here. This is just a minor mistake. Minor mistake here. The FBI will find nothing." Bernie, do you want justice in the FBI investigation into you? I wonder. I'd like to hear someone ask that, Bernie. Bernie, would you like to have justice into the fraud investigation that is being looked into you and your wife right now? Would you like to see justice in that? For some reason, I highly doubt it. I think Bernie doesn't want that justice. Then, of course, you've got the story that broke on Zero Hedge.

Megyn Kelly fails to fact check Sandy Hooks father contradictory claim in Alex Jones' piece. Yes, that's right. Neil Heslin made a statement in the Megyn Kelly hit piece on Alex Jones about an experience he had after the Sandy Hook shooting that does not corroborate with fact checkers, does not make sense. Now you have Megyn Kelly, folks, who did a hit piece on Alex Jones to try to smear Alex Jones and paint an inaccurate picture using Sandy Hook about Alex Jones to demonize him to the public, and then in the attempt of doing that, Megyn Kelly actually adds to the conspiracy theory! So Megyn Kelly is now fanning the flames of conspiracy theory with Sandy Hook with Neil Heslin's account saying he held his son, which according to coroners and past reports is impossible. That's not just something you misremember, is it? Holding your dead child. Somehow, I don't think you misremember that.

Meanwhile, in Venezuela, the communist haven, more riots, more protestors, oh by the way ... By the way, folks. The millionaires and billionaires in the communist haven of Venezuela are still eating lobster, still eating steak, still going about their lives while the rest of the public in the magical communist land of Venezuela is literally eating pasta with crap. That's not a figure of speech. It's now in the news. People in Venezuela are using excrement to eat pasta. That's nice.

I just wanted to remind our friends right now that are missing Barrack Obama. They're missing Barrack Obama. "We're missing Obama!" Look at these charts, folks. Look at these nine charts right here. This tells you the Obama legacy. Student loans skyrocket. Food stamps skyrocket. Federal debt skyrockets. Money printing skyrockets. Health insurance costs skyrockets. All record highs. All record highs. Labor force participation rate drops. Worker's share of economy drops significantly. Median family income drops significantly. Home ownership falls off the grid. That's Obama's legacy. That's from the federal reserve bank in St. Louis. There's your Obama Legacy, and now Trump has called for US dominance in global energy production. Now, I want to play this clip before we get out of here. Rand Paul talking about the "Trumpcare bill" being worse than actual Obamacare. Roll Rand Paul. Do we have-

Rand Paul:

Well, what we can do is, if they cannot get 50 votes, if they get to impasse, I've been telling leadership for months now that I will vote for a repeal. It doesn't have to be 100% repeal. For example, I'm for 100% repeal. That's what I want. But if you offer me 90% repeal, I'd probably vote for it. I might vote for 80% repeal.

Speaker 26: What percent is it now?

Rand Paul: But realize, hey just one second. Realize that the Obamacare subsidies in this bill are actually greater under the Republican bill than they are under the current Obamacare law. That is not anywhere close to repeal.

Owen Shroyer: You know, it's almost ... I'll try to put a silver lining on this. I'm hoping that this is literally a troll bill. See, I don't think there's going to be any victory with this bill. I don't think it really has a shot, even though the Republicans celebrated it. I really don't think there's a shot at victory. Now Rand Paul points out that this bill in some ways is actually worse than Obamacare, so why would Republicans be passing it? Maybe this is a way for Trump to identify the people inside the party that are really frauds or really ignorant or ... Because it doesn't make sense. It's not going to pass, and you know that Donald Trump always likes to have victories and he's basically setting himself up for failure with this bill. So it'll be interesting to see what happens. Apparently, they're going to vote this week. It will fail. I don't see any way that that vote is successful.

Alright. Well, thanks to everybody who tuned it. Thanks to everybody who goes to the store, InfoWarsStore.com. Please take advantage of our specials, folks, the best products, the best prices. We're trying to get you bug spray and sunscreen that's all natural, trying to get you bug spray for the 4th of July celebrations, fireworks, your family that's not going to force you to rub toxic chemicals all over your body. Go to InfoWarsStore.com. 40% off, 40% off the Emeric's Essentials Outdoor Pack. This is how you support our broadcast. This is how we got to the next level.

More than anything, this is how we're able to be a free and independent media company because we answer to you, who buy our products, and then we get five-star reviews on everything. By the way, before we go, who knows what's going to happen with this? Anonymous now claims NASA is about to announce evidence of alien life. Based on my understanding, they've already declassified many of those documents. We'll see if there's anything there. Could be a PSYOP.

Speaker 27: Protect your skin with SPF30 sunscreen lotion by Emeric's Essentials. Perfect for face and body, this natural, unscented sunscreen can be worn at all times of the day whenever you need sun protection. We source ingredients from nature, producing a product free of harmful chemicals and toxins. This natural lotion contains 21% zinc oxide, which is the largest particle size used, and we do not use nano-particles. The larger the particle, the safer it is for your body. The organic oils help hydrate the skin, leaving it nice and smooth. The truly natural, fragrance-free sunscreen for the most sensitive skin. Emeric's Essentials wants you to enjoy the sun and strives to bring you organic products to enhance your life. Naturally protect your skin with SPF30 sunscreen lotion by Emeric's Essentials. Stop exposing yourself and your family to toxic ingredients. Visit InfoWarsStore.com and learn more about the new SPF30 sunscreen lotion.

APPENDIX 5:

July 20, 2017 broadcast with Alex Jones: Commenting on the censor of the Owen Shroyer June 25, 2017 broadcast that commented on the ZeroHedge publication titled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece”


(CR:1103 [thumb drive containing the video of Alex Jones’s entire July 20, 2017 broadcast], CR:1034-1101 [transcript of Alex Jones’s entire July 20, 2017, three (3) hour, video broadcast], **CR:1069-1070, 1076-1079** [specific portions of the July 20, 2017 transcript commenting on the censor of Owen Shroyer’s June 25, 2017 broadcast])

42. Attached hereto marked as Exhibit B-37 is a thumb drive containing a video of a true and correct copy of the entire Alex Jones broadcast on July 20, 2017 that is the subject of Plaintiff's defamation claim.



Speaker 1:	00:00:02	Waging war on corruption. It's Alex Jones. (singing)
Alex Jones:	00:00:09	Ladies and gentleman, this is such an incredible time to be politically alive. So much change, so much being discovered, so much good happening, but also so much bad. Riveting! Amazing! We've seen the death of David Rockefeller. We've seen the death of Zbigniew Brzezinski. David Rockefeller was the modern architect of corporate world neocolonialism, crony capitalism, world government. Dead 2017. His top henchman, his top operative Brzezinski dead, and now John McCain fighting for his life, whereas I never wish any harm on a living creature and have empathy. This is a man that funded Al-Qaeda in Arab spring that killed over a million people and blew up hundreds of churches, killing hundreds of thousands of Christians. So he has lived a life of serving death and serving the destruction of America, and now he is in line to meet his maker, and I hope he gets right with God. Talking about Russia hysteria, Mueller's expanded probe to Trump businesses. This is a witch hunt to infinity and beyond. Here's some of the Democrats and Republicans in their hysteria.
Bob Barr:	00:01:17	If it weren't serious it would be funny, uh, some of the what I call the, uh, the post-factual statements that, uh, that the left, uh, makes continuously. The problem partly is that if you say something, whether it is true or false, whether it is outrageous or rational, if you simply say something over, and over, and over again people actually start to believe it and will act on it.
Speaker 2:	00:01:45	Fox is a propaganda network. It- it functions off of the idea of breaking people up into teams, so they are aiding and abetting the enemy. They are aiding and abetting those people we are currently at war at with, uh, the Russians.
Howard Stern:	00:02:00	If I hear one more conservative talking about, like, all of this ... I don't know what happened to conservatives. They were the guys who were anti-Russia, who were like, "Well, it's not so ... The Russians aren't so bad." You know, because they're defending Trump, and I'm like, "Are you out of your ... mind? This guy kills journalists for having an opinion or for d- digging into the facts or disagreeing with them.
Speaker 3:	00:02:21	[crosstalk 00:02:21]
Howard Stern:	00:02:21	They back, uh, terrorist governments. They ... hate us. They're our enemy.

Appendix 5



Alex Jones:	00:02:27	That's McCain that backed the terrorists.
Howard Stern:	00:02:29	And you know what? Do not be talking to Russians and getting any kind of help from them.
Speaker 3:	00:02:33	That's the [crosstalk 00:02:33]
Speaker 4:	00:02:34	How dare you take a phone call.
Speaker 3:	00:02:35	You don't talk to them.
Howard Stern:	00:02:35	Right.
Speaker 3:	00:02:35	Say-
Speaker 5:	00:02:36	I think what we're learning, uh, with the Trump Junior meeting is when you meet with any Russians you're meeting with Russian intelligence and therefore, President Putin.
Speaker 6:	00:02:47	This is a reality that will become the only reality until this country rids itself of Donald John Trump. He is not a President. He is a puppet put in power by Vladimir Putin.
Maxine Waters:	00:03:00	Uh, so many of us are attempting in every way that we possibly can-
Alex Jones:	00:03:04	No, you're the puppets.
Maxine Waters:	00:03:05	... uh, to-
Alex Jones:	00:03:06	You're the enemies.
Maxine Waters:	00:03:07	... unveil the criminal activity, the unconstitutional activity of this President and his family.
Alex Jones:	00:03:15	Russia kicked out the oligarchs.
Maxine Waters:	00:03:17	I have dubbed them-
Alex Jones:	00:03:17	That's the only things we have in common.
Maxine Waters:	00:03:19	... the, uh, criminal clan a long time ago, and as many of you know, I stepped out a long time ago and said I thought he should be impeached.
Speaker 7:	00:03:28	The- the investigation, it- it's not ... uh, nothing is proven yet, but we- we're now beyond obstruction of justice in terms of

what's being investigated. This is moving into perjury, false statement, uh, and even into potentially treason.

Speaker 6: 00:03:41 The nation and all of our freedoms hang by a thread, and the military apparatus of the country is about to be handed over to scum who are beholden to scum. Russian scum.

Alex Jones: 00:03:53 Yup, they had their foot on the neck of Russian for a long time, the Hollywood crowd, the globalists, and now they want us.

Speaker 6: 00:04:01 Resist. Peace.

Alex Jones: 00:04:03 Ladies and gentlemen, thank you so much for joining us on this live Thursday global transmission. The 20th day of July 2017. We've known that Mueller is a operative of the deep state who covered up the Clinton's, the Bush's, and the globalists committing unbelievable crimes. He sat back as FBI Director, as did Comey, while the Clintons got tens of billions of dollars to specifically sell out US infrastructure, US minerals, US energy, US technology, including defense. We're talking about nuclear reactors, an ICBM launch and re-entry technology to China and North Korea, and that's all mainstream news. That's confirmed.

Illegal servers. Unbelievable crimes. Pedophile parties. None of it, none of it being prosecuted. And now Trump got the word yesterday, and he came out and he said, "Listen, your special council investigative powers are to look into Russia collusion in the election," which there is none. It's not collusion to have his son meeting with somebody about dirt on Hillary. That's called doing your job. The Democrats all did that and they admit that. But now Mueller announces this morning on the heels of Trump, Mueller expands probe to Trump business transactions, and now it's a criminal investigation to find out if Trump or any of his associates ever had contact with a Russian, including renting Russians apartments in New York, DC, Miami, Florida. You name it.

I mean, that's the proof now. Now it's gonna be they rented apartments or sold apartments to Russians when Russia, since they become quasi-free-market have thousands and thousands of millionaires and close to 100 billionaires buying ships, buying yachts, buying helicopters. They've bought 'em from all the different elites. They gave Hillary Clinton 100 plus million dollars into her foundation. 30-something million to the Podestas for uranium, but none of that matters. Those are deals where Hillary's in the email saying, "I'm gonna meet with the Chinese ambassador. Put the money in the account, and I'll meet with

him on policy." Boom! Arrest her! That's when she was Secretary of State.

If Trump gets caught doing something like that, caught with the Chinese ambassador or the Russian ambassador saying, "Give me money." If he ... Uh, if- if Rex Tillerson, the counterpart of Hillary, was in meetings and in- and in Wikileaks saying, "You give the money to the foundation and I'll meet and get that policy done with you next week," you put the money in and you get the policy out, classic bribery, I would call for Rex Tillerson to be put in prison for 50 years. If you give somebody military secrets it's called treason and you get your next hung 'til your vertebrae pop, until you crap your pants and die.

But it doesn't matter. I've got three clips from yesterday, David Knight and Owen did a great job, I was listening to the show, uh, workingcation, and there are the clips with Democrats on TV saying the entire administration, Rex Tillerson, you name it are all guilty of treason for trying to go into Russia and get great deals on all their rare earth minerals, their oil, their gas, their brains, their engineers. Of course, we should be working with Russia! We're capitalists. That's what we do. They're capitalists now.

But all the left that was always in love with Russia back when they were communist ... Hollywood, Howard Stern, all of it, literally say, "You don't talk to Russians. Any Russian is a Russian agent. Any Russian is like talking to Putin." These are quotes from CNN, MSNBC, Congressman Quigley, Howard Stern.

And now Trump shuts down CIA program to arm Syrian rebels that the Pentagon five years ago told Obama to stop doing, and said, "We're not going to go along with your military invasion of Syria because you are putting in Al-Qaeda, Al-Nasra, which is all the same group, now ISIS. And you are throwing a quasi-Christian country, one of the only Muslim countries that actually is inclusive and is secular, you're going to overthrow that when they didn't attack us? An-" And does what the military, what the Pentagon is saying ... The Pentagon's telling him, "Sir, the CIA, at the top," not in the middle and the bottom, a lot of those folks are actually Patriots, but at the top is big globalist foundation, big New World Order, anti-America. Carnegie, Ford endowment, skull and bones, Yale, Harvard. That's who set up the CIA in '47. It's a shadow globalist government. That's declassified. That's admitted now.

Barry Goldwater talked about it in the '50s and '60s. And so they said, "Mr. President, you wanna beat ISIS and not have our

soldiers, green berets, and people getting killed every week over there fighting ..." There's been lots of training accidents with Navy SEALs and Army soldiers dying. Lots of plane loads going down and blowing up, which is a classic tactic to cover up the real number that are dead. I don't think it's even needed to be done. Just report on what's happening. And Trump's like, "We still have agencies funding the rebels when 98% in congressional hearings they've confirmed 98%, the intel is unanimous, are Al-Qaeda, are Al-Nasra, are Wahhabists?" Wahhabists out of Saudi Arabia, the dominant religion of Islam, the dominant sect, that's what Al-Qaeda, Al-Nasra, ISIS is. It's all the same black flag, all the same Arabic g- uh, writing. All the same slogans, the same people, the same system, the same plan, the same global operation, the same cancer.

So Trump kills that yesterday and they go even more ape. Look at this Washington Post Headline. Trump Ends Covert CIA Program to Arm Anti-Assad Rebels in Syria: A Move Sought By Moscow. Yes, five years ago, General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, went to Obama on Saturday night, we reported it a year before it was in the news, it was confirmed, our sources, both on and off air. Colonel Shaffer was one of them. And they come to them and they say, "We're not gonna be the Al-Qaeda's air force," and then Senator Cruz comes out, and Rand Paul comes out and says the same thing. And they say, "This is wrong. We've got a deal with the Russians to let them come in, kick Al-Qaeda and ISIS out, then they will remove themselves but they'll keep their deepwater port they've always had in the Mediterranean, their only one, and then Assad will step aside after elections."

We're now five years later and Assad is now making noises of stepping aside after elections. They gotta deal with what's left of America in the Pentagon to not be immoral and to not put Al-Qaeda in charge of there. That's what happened, and then they turn around and act like Trump's a Russian again. Well, yes, they're ... A deal was made by our military and by people in our government with Russia. We told you first. Sy Hersh, Pulitzer Prize winner has been on three years after we broke it to say we broke it, we were right. I'm not bragging. It's just that's a hat tip. Do you understand?

They think you're stupid. They've launched a bunch of fake chemical attacks to blame it on Assad. Because Obama said, "I'll go in if you use chemicals." Why would he ever do that when he's winning and now ISIS is almost beaten? And now they're coming out pushing this garbage, and saying now they're looking into all his finances. Oh, did ... Was there any campaign

finance violations. The FBI's looking into that. Not about Russia. They're looking at bank accounts. They're looking at transactions, they're looking at everything to "find money laundering", to find any discrepancies in campaign money, and they'll call any mistakes they find money laundering.

Hillary can openly commit mass crimes. Go to Morocco and get 12 million and then sell out her whole phosphate industry, and use taxpayer money, as we reported, to send 90 million there to pay to move our jobs. That's okay, but Trump actually turns our economy on, restores our republic, follows what the Pentagon a- actually has a plan to defeat the globalists, and they call him a Russian agent. The only truth is Russia pulled out from the control of the globalists. Russia is breaking free of the New World Order partially. We are too and other nations are saying, like the UK, and Iceland, and Sweden, and Denmark, and Australia, and Brazil, and all these other places are saying, "We wanna be free too! We want a nation-state that's for our interest, not to be looted by robber barons like Zuckerberg and Bezos."

And then they call it Russia. Russia, to make it something foreign so every nation trying to pull out from globalism, be it Italy, Greece, Spain, Catalonia, they can say, "Oh, you don't really wanna pull out. The Russians made you do that." And they build the Russians up like they're superheroes. When we come back we're gonna look at McCain and his brain tumor.

Speaker 1: 00:14:05

KDR-

Alex Jones: 00:14:06

I'm gonna get into John McCain and his fast-acting, very aggressive brain tumor he had removed yesterday, and how Tim Kaine calls him the- the chairman of [inaudible 00:14:19] operations, uh, because that's exactly what- what he is. That's coming up. But something I wanted to mention to everybody here and I want it to sink in for the listeners of this transmission, we're on over 200 radio stations, and we're on Facebook, and Google, and YouTube, and a lot of other video platforms, and on every platform the Democrats and the liberals have organized into groups that go around making false copyright claims and false community claims. Now, I've announced, and I don't wanna do this 'cause I'm litigious, I have to. The next person that files a slap suit, the next person that files a fake suit for publicity, I'm gonna come down on them like a ton of bricks to defend my free speech and my rights.

'Cause people sue me to get publicity and then they wanna drop the suits right away. In fact, they wanna pay me money to drop

the suits, but it has to all be secret. That's how this works. And then there's this whole meme put out that I'm fake news and all this garbage, so I understand now I can't get out of the suits, I've gotta counter-sue people. So whoever wants to line up next, I'm going to sue you, and I mean really sue you. Depositions, everything. And I'm gonna announce this. The next person puts a fake copyright strike, I swear to God on my children I am going to sue you and I'm gonna sue your companies, and I am gonna come after you politically with 100% of the law. You got that?

'Cause during the break, they didn't tell me when I was doing my workcation we had the community guidelines, a whole swarm of folks come through and they're ... YouTube is announcing that they're looking at shutting down and- and- and basically kicking us off YouTube for people complaining that I've reported on Sandy Hook and had Wolfgang Halbig, a former school, uh, safety administrator on, for a debate about whether the official story was true or not. Then the media misrepresents what I say, saying that I say it never happened, when I've looked at both sides, but it doesn't matter.

I have my right ... If I was an idiot, black nationalist, racist, I could be a racist black person. If I wanted to be a KKK person, an idiot, I could be that as long as I don't hurt innocent people. And if I wanted to say that I don't believe that babies out of incubators and had their brains bashed out to get us in the Iraq war, which is true, didn't happen, it's my right to say it. And then I can question big PR events like Sandy Hook when there are major anomalies like them saying none of the parents were allowed to see their kids that day at the school. Then they had people on NBC saying they held their kid dead at the school.

People see that. They see blue screens. They see kids going in circles in and out the building. They say it looks like a drill. Why were no rescue choppers sent? Why were port-a-potties there an hour later? Uh- uh- uh, I'm not saying it didn't happen because I'm not sure. I don't wanna go that far. I've gotta be sure. I have a right to question that. But regardless, they wanna shut our channel down because of three-year-old videos, but see, I can't find out who did that specifically. I can sue, and they know ... They know I've already got the law firm that's in DC and others ready. They know I'm going to sue whoever files a fake copyright claim again.

I am going to sue you. I cannot wait. Because people put these fraudulent claims out constantly. It's amazing, and I'm done. I'm done playing games with all these people because I'm gonna

defend the First Amendment and I'm going to come after the people that violate it. This is a microcosm, uh, going back 10 years ago. I was even on access TV anymore here in Austin where I started 20-something years ago, but they were getting rid of free speech. They were banning libertarians and conservatives, and I sued them, got the evidence what was happening, and out of that came a criminal investigation, and the director of it was found guilty of embezzling over \$300,000 and sent to the state pen in East Texas. Huntsville. He only spent a couple years, but ... And it went higher than that in the city, but they killed the investigation.

So I'm- I'm not a litigious person, but if I do come after you legally you're going to- you're going to understand. And Google got caught hiring a company to de-list us, and- and they got caught and they had to pull back. They admitted they did it, and they had us de-listed two weeks ago where you couldn't see Info Wars at the top. And I told them, "I'm gonna sue you privately," and they put it back up at the top because they understand I have the audience not just the money and we're gonna expose you bullies. You understand? Next person, you're sued, so line up. You wanna get in a big, fat lawsuit with me, whoever you are, I don't care who you are, you make up crap, you lie about us, you try to take my free speech and gag me, and take my speech so you can have your way with my family and my children, it isn't happening anymore.

Now, we got a little comfortable around here too with just having our rights taken. We're like, "Yeah. Well, yeah, they're bullying us, saying we have no free speech. Let's just go back to sleep." Wake up everybody. We're in a fight against the globalists. They're trying to put our pri- our- our president in prison. They're making up ... They're funding radical Islamists and terrorists and saying our president's a Russian agent because he didn't wanna fund Al-Qaeda. If they're able to shut us down, they're gonna shut everybody else down. If they're able to say Trump's a Russian agent with no proof, they're gonna go after everybody. It's gonna be a new inquisition. This is a total war, people!

Ladies and gentlemen, the way the new globalist system works is if anyone is offended by what you say or do, there's no judge, there's no jury, you're kicked off YouTube, you're kicked off Facebook, you're kicked off Twitter. And then under the Chinese model that's Zuckerberg's pushing, you have an internet ID that puts your real-world activities that are tracked digitally by companies and corporations, from your gas bill to, you know,

going to eat at McDonald's into an algorithm and then it gives you a score about what type of person you are.

Last year they made a, uh, black mirror special, a show basically about how nightmarish that future would be, but this is their plan. So later in the broadcast, we're gonna have an article on infowars.com about strikes on Info Wars blocking our live streaming right now on YouTube, on our regular YouTube channel, the Alex Jones channel, with millions of views because we had the headline Zero Heads Discovers Anomaly in Alex Jones' Headpiece. And it's us showing Megyn Kelly talking to the father of one of the victims, saying he went and held his dead son there at the school. And then it cuts to the coroner and everybody saying no one was allowed to go in and see the kids.

Now, we just said, "See, that's why people ask questions." It's a very nice little piece, but see, oh, you're not allowed to even sit there and point that out. And then there's other ones from years ago. Sandy Hook Victim Dies Again in Pakistan, which shows the photo of one of the kids with people in Pakistan holding up his picture saying he died in a terror attack over there. Clearly showing that was some PR event over there where they were just printing off images of kids and using it. We weren't even saying that- that man's child didn't die. We're saying, look at how there's these other PR events just like the dead babies in the incubators.

But they're using Sandy Hook and they're using the victims and their families as a way to get rid of free speech in America. That's the plan. Hillary said it back during the campaign. She was gonna get into office. This was gonna be their move. They called for, you know, ongoing criminal investigations, uh, the FBI last week into myself, Matt Drudge, and Breitbart with no proof at the Federal Elections Commission. And then the Republicans on the commission killed the ongoing congressional hearings but still, they have the FBI going around doing a counter-espionage investigation to see if we're funded by Russians. Welcome to the witch hunt, folks.

People say, "Wow. How are you taking it?" I'm taking it great because the ... I mean, I'm engaging the globalists that have high-jacked our country. I'm engaging the globalists that are trying to bankrupt us, and turn our power off, and- and jack up our prices, and make us feudal serfs. We're fighting for America in a 21st-century war, ladies and gentlemen, and it takes getting past the intimidation and getting in their face. That's where the victory is. Getting past the political correctness, getting past being called names.

It's not our fault they call us names. It's their fault. They discredit themselves. They're the scum. They're the anti-fallout beating up peaceful people in the streets of America and shooting cops in the back. They're the ones engaging in this, not us. They're the ones that wanna get rid of free-market. They're the ones that hate Christians. They're the ones that call us flyover country and better clingers. They're the ones pushing racial division, not us, and worldwide humanity's awakening. The tide of globalism's going out. Corrupt neoliberalism is hated worldwide and globalist owned publications admit that they're in trouble, but they say, "We've gotta stir up even greater division now."

This is a rearguard action while they basically escape the countries they've destroyed. The New World Order is dead and signifying that is David Rockefeller, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and now John McCain. I wonder if they'll announce soon that there's a very fast-acting brain tumor in George Soros.

The world is watching. The world is waiting as the clock ticks down on judgment on these type of individuals. I wish no harm upon them, their miserable souls, but they've dealt death. They've dealt corruption. They've dealt anti-American activities, anti-Christian activities. I mean, McCain openly funded the Al-Qaeda ISIS rebels, met with them, and now he's got a fast-acting brain tumor. I'm gonna talk about that in a few minutes.

But listen, the fact that they're trying to shut us down, the fact that they're trying to ban our speech, the fact that they're trying to set those precedents, that's a badge of honor. That's a badge of courage. That will only make Info Wars bigger, this entire Streisand Effect. If our enemies are successful shutting one of our big YouTube channels, I guarantee you it will only make everything we do and everything we cover that much more explosive.

Our YouTube channels, with a combined four billion views, and if you count all the other videos out there it's tens of billions that other people have on their platforms because I'm copyright free, you can post our material as long as you don't try to monetize it or take it out context. And I- and I even leave that alone 99% of the time. As long as you're fighting the globalists, I-I ... people post it. And every time they try to suppress us we only get bigger.

I mean, just last week looking at six or seven videos that we produced or videos I was in, we had over 30 million views just of videos I was in last week. They don't have any way to compete

with that. They don't know what to do. Take PewDiePie, last time I checked he has close to 18 billion views on one YouTube channel and almost 60 million subscribers, and he was never political but they tried to call him racists, and evil, and bad to- to- to prepare to shut him down because the big network executives and folks are jealous that he is able to actually have his free speech and do what he wants. And they're scared he might start becoming political, he might do something.

Just like in China they put you in prison or execute you if you're caught Photoshopping Winnie the Pooh with the Chinese president. That somehow became popular over there. It was friendly. It was nice. Folks thought it was cute. You go to prison for that in China. Well, they don't like PewDiePie, but his YouTube channels, one channel has almost 16 billion, the other has a couple more billion. Almost 18 billion views. They are threatened by 18 billion views.

Nickelodeon's average show only has a couple hundred thousand people viewing, but young people and teenagers watch PewDiePie. They don't watch all the Disney programming as much as they watch PewDiePie over in Sweden who's his own guy. Of course, PewDiePie's big crime is playing my videos and Paul Watson's videos, and that's the type of thing that scares them, so they say, "Oh, we're gonna demonetize you. Oh, we're not gonna let people share your videos," and it only backfires.

So I'm gonna get into McCain and the rest of it, but here's the bottom line. When I saw you need to spread articles, and videos, and material, and information we put out, folks, it's a war. They're actively, in mainstream news, talking about how they need to shut us down and how we're dangerous. They're in Washington Post admitting yesterday that we're wildly popular and are exploding as old media's dying. They don't know what to do, and a lot of new media says, "Oh, great. We'll be bigger if Alex Jones isn't around."

That is the most ignorant thinking on the planet. We're in a non-zero sum game. Everyone that is promoting libertarian free-market ideas is only expanding and making the world a better place culturally, economically, spiritually. We're in a war against authoritarianism. We're not in competition. I'm not in competition with Sean Hannity. I'm not in competition, uh, with Matt Drudge. I'm not in competition with WorldNetDaily. I'm not in competition with Breitbart. I'm in a total war against the globalists allied with orthodox radical Islam that admits it wants

to extinguish the free-market open free societies classical liberalism, and they wrap it all in the term liberalism.

We're in a total and complete war and we're beginning to win, so the enemy's going from their stealth approaches to openly saying, "Silence us," openly saying they're gonna gin up evidence the everybody that opposes them is a Russian agent, or if you don't back Al-Qaeda or ISIS you're a Russian agent. That's in the Washington Post today, and you say it doesn't make sense. They don't care. They only wanna cover for their own people to say we're outsiders and we're bad and to persecute us.

This is classical authoritarianism, so I'm gonna tell you right now, if you wanna fight the globalists, take every article on infowars.com, take every video, copy them to your channel. Put them on your own platform. Play them on your local radio station. You're a station owner, take our broadcast if you're- if you're re-airing it at night put it on primetime. And listeners, support those local stations. We're in a war. Even if it's just calling them and letting them know or sending them \$100 dona-

PART 1 OF 6 ENDS [00:30:04]

Alex Jones:

00:30:00

More. Even if it's just calling them and letting them know or sending them \$100 donation. And buy products at infowarstore.com so we can do more to have our own platforms. It costs me like 50 grand a month on average just to stream out to millions of people every day at infowars.com with our own streams that we're about to upgrade and make even better. They're pretty good but I'm going to make it even better. We're about to renegotiate a whole nother deal for our streams.

And try to get a better price. The point is, it costs money. People say, "Oh, well just have your own videos or have your own social network or do your own thing." We, we're, we're trying here, we're fighting as hard as we can but we need your financial support and we make it easy. Great supplements, great nutraceuticals, great patriot apparel, great water filtration systems, great air purifier systems, great game changing products at very competitive prices. Most of it made right here in America. Infowarstore.com.

And ladies and gentlemen, we have the summer mega specials that are going to have to end today. I have a whole new group of specials tomorrow, but if you want DNA force's 20% off, if you want X two, if you want these products, if I had the specials

I was going to do, and Jiminy Cricket, somebody came in here and got in my pile. Here, I found it right here, I'm in a bad mood right now folks. Super male vitality and survival shield X two specials are ending today. Quantities are running low so act now and save 30% off, and we have shipping through the month of July, but it's about to end, and I had to already end the product ... the brain force plus. Already had to end that special because it was close to selling out. I'm going to have to end the super male vitality, or female vitality, the X two survival shield, and a bunch of the other products that are 20 to 40% off right now at infowarsstore.com or by calling toll free triple 8, 253-3139.

We have a little bit of brain force left, it'll be probably a month or so until more comes in so I, I, just before stuff sells out now I just go back to regular price, which is already discounted 10%. We've also got some other new products also now available at infowarslife.com, uh, like our new whey protein that is made by the, one of the largest, biggest respected organic suppliers in the country and five to 10 dollars less that you'll find for the very same whey, we're private labeling that you can buy in major health food stores. But whey is known as the best protein there is from milk. It's organic, it's supercharged, it's got the glutathione and some of the other amazing things in it, but it's got the type of glutathione you can actually absorb. Glutathione is absolutely critical. Find out why going back to the time of Hypocrites, thousands of years ago, the father of modern medicine, he said whey was the most important food and one he prescribed to his patients.

True whey protein contains nine essential amino acids your body needs but cannot produce itself. So, check it out for yourself ladies and gentlemen, it's got CLA, it's got so many other great products and it's supporting American dairy farmers right here at home and it's also grass fed with non GMA RBGH, that's the growth hormone, free. Infowarslife.com or triple 8 253-3139. But as I said, we're going to have to end the specials, this is 25% a- off out of the gates with the new info wars whey protein, we also have 25% off out of the gates of Cave Man, the ultimate bone broth formula that's been sold out for months, it's now back in stock as well and it's also, uh, chalk full of bee pollen, chocolate mushroom, tumeric root and many other super foods and it is the most concentrated, from our research, bone broth formula out there. The ancients were obsessed with bone broth, this is truly amazing, it comes from chicken bones and this is now the number one bone broth seller in the country. Research it for yourself, Cave Man is now back in stock

at Infowarslife.com or triple 8 253-3139. That's triple 8, 253-3139.

We'll have some new specials tomorrow on some of the other supplements that we do have in stock, uh, but I'm going to have to end that special today. Again, if you want the X two or if you want super male vitality or some of the other products that are 25 to 40% off, infowarslife.com or triple 8 253-3139. You can, uh, again, just know this, they hate us, they hate our guts, Hilary hates our guts, Obama hates our guts, they're all coming after us, doing everything they can to destroy us and I just have faith in God and I have faith in you, but beyond financially supporting us and getting great products you need, if you'll just commit on your email list and on Facebook and on Twitter and on YouTube and on every platform to just point out Info Wars is under attack, Info Wars is the tip of the spear, if they can shut them down, if they can shut them up they'll shut everybody up.

And in the face of this, that's why I'm launching all these new broadcasts and all these new shows and all these new Facebook channels and all these new YouTube channels and we're launching Periscope channels and we're launching other third party channels and we're keeping our video streams and expanding them and we're launching a new website tomorrow, I'm going to make that announcement now and I'm going to come back in the next segment and, uh, announce the \$20,000 winner of the meme contest, just to honor you, the great memes you've made that are fighting the globalist.

But whatever you do, get in the information war today, and expose these enemies because they are now openly expanding the, uh, quote espionage probe of Trump to all of his financials, all of his associates of financials and saying anything, a check that bounced, they're going to try to move for impeachment against the president, but he has the house, the senate, the legislative, obviously the executive, the judicial, so these scumbags don't matter, unless they can brain wash us into accept it, he needs to move against them for their criminal activities now. They're sell outs to communist China, they're sell outs to Russia, he needs to take the gloves off right now and the word is, he's getting ready to.

So Hilary and Obama and Clapper and Brendan, all you, you want to fight, get ready for a fight, McCain.

Speaker 8: 00:36:35

In a land of timeless beauty, he was a man of piece.

Speaker 9: 00:36:42 Fake media tried to stop us from going to the White House but I'm president and they're not.

Speaker 8: 00:36:56 But when they threatened his world and the woman he loved, he was driven to war.

Speaker 10: 00:37:07 I don't like [inaudible 00:37:16] they turned the freaking [inaudible 00:37:19].

Speaker 9: 00:37:07 Get them out of here. Get out.

Speaker 11: 00:37:24 Go home to mommy. Go home. Bye.

Speaker 9: 00:37:34 You are fake news.

Alex Jones: 00:38:12 Trump Nation made both these great memes. [inaudible 00:38:16] the winner. If you're a radio listener, infowars.com/show.

Speaker 12: 00:38:20 Super hero landing. You're going to do a super hero landing. Wait for it.

Alex Jones: 00:38:25 Remember, they're trying to sensor all this you're saying.

Speaker 12: 00:38:28 Super hero landing. That's really hard on your knees. Very impracticable, they all do it. You're a lovely lady, but I'm saving myself for [inaudible 00:38:35] that's why I brought him.

Speaker 13: 00:38:36 I prefer not to hit a woman, so please-

Speaker 12: 00:38:44 I mean, that's why I brought [inaudible 00:38:51]. Oh no, finish your Tweet. It's na- that's fi- just give us a second. There you go, hash tag it. Go get them, Tiger.

Speaker 14: 00:39:04 The season premier begins tonight.

Alex Jones: 00:39:10 That's Trump Nation and I want to get whoever made those videos on and I want to hire you. I told Paul Watson he could pick the winner and personally, I think the Brave hart one is the winner, I would say the one you're about to see that won is second place and then the last one, with the dead pool, that'd be third place, but Trump Nation did not win, but Trump Nation, I want to hire whoever did the editing. I want you working for us. You work for Trump Nation, too, they're great folks, but David Knight didn't win a report contest five years ago, but he did win a reporter job, now he's going to launch his big syndicated show that the word is, well over 50 stations are

ready to pick it up the first week when it starts on August 22nd. It'll probably get hundreds of affiliates. So very, very excited. See where he is now? So just because you enter and don't win doesn't mean that you lose. So we're going to go to break and come back and I'm going to play the winner, according to Paul Watson, and I think it's excellent, it's very well done, it's a very close second, I don't think it's the best, but you know what? Paul Watson was the judge. Believe me, we got thousands and thousands of video memes, thousands and thousands more, something like eight plus thousand once the contest, uh, you know, time ended last Wednesday. So we're going to now start going through all these and posting them, promoting them, and exposing the globalists and fighting for free speech. The answer to them trying to shut us up is to just intensify what you're doing.

But listen, don't take the broadcast for granted. I keep explaining that. They are doing everything they can to take our sponsors, to kick us off YouTube. It, it, it is just out of control what's going on. And then I'm going to get into McCain, all of it. There's these huge new second hour, tell everybody tune in, it's an active resistance. We can overpower them.

Speaker 15: 00:39:10

You are listening to GCA-

Alex Jones: 00:41:08

But you've gotta take action, [crosstalk 00:41:11]- the animating [inaudible 00:41:12] of liberty. You are the resistance and I salute you. Feeling good, feeling right. All right, I gotta stop it. Yeah, these ladies, they had a plan. (laughs) Dennis Hastart had a plan too, didn't he? Grab your kids and rape them. So does the pope's deputy. He got over 100 kids reported. Procured them out to all the little devil worshipping rape gangs. Those devil worshipers love to get those priest robes and rape kids. It's all part of defiling everything, overthrowing reality, destroying the, the flower of the youth.

Until they die and enter hell. Now, let's get to the winner. Drum roll ladies and gentlemen. The winner by contested decision, Chris Killer did a great job putting this together. He's launching a new YouTube channel, don't dox me, bro, that is a great name. I want to work with this guy. I want to work with him, too. I want to tell you, he's a close second, but he, he's the winner, \$20,000 to don't dox me, bro.

Name of the video, he only sent it to us, he never uploaded it yet, now he's doing what we did, uh, it is official Info wars CNN meme war 20k winner. I'm going to reupload it to Facebook with a cool name, I mean, what is it? Trump is our Toto, Trump

broke the Matrix, um, Trump flipped the paradigm. Trump exposed that we're living in a false reality? I mean, I don't know. Here is the winner of the 2017 round one meme war.

20K winner announced.

Speaker 16: 00:43:39 [inaudible 00:43:39] You are fake news.

Speaker 17: 00:43:40 How?

Speaker 18: 00:43:40 He is the one.

Alex Jones: 00:44:29 Once you know they're a joke, it's all over. You're a better cleaner. I'm just going to make sure you got sterilized. Break the floor up. No, who do you think you are? The world belongs to us. I went to this late. We're going to come back and play it all, we got a special guest, we got a ton of news, we'll talk about McCain straight ahead.

Micheal Snyder is with us for the next 30 minutes. The founder and one of the owners of Compound Media who just went to Iraq to actually witness the final days of Al-Qaeda and Isis under President Trump and the military's bombardment. He'll be joining us as well. Micheal Snyder's written a story today that's up on infowars.com and on his website, Micheal Snyder for congress dot com. Getting Trump elected was not enough. We need 1000 liberty candidates to run for office all over the nation and he's doing it. I think it's in Utah. With his millions of readers and followers. And whether he wins or loses, he wins by participating, by educating people in the process.

The democrats are in the news today swearing they're going to take Texas. Yeah, by fraud. So realize what we're going to live under if the globalists win. The republican establishment has killed the appeal of Obama care, because they wrote it. [inaudible 00:45:43] democrats. Big banks wrote Obama Care bipartisanly to screw you. They're on CSPAN bragging saying, "Thank God you're so dumb."

Health care is worse than it's ever been. It's designed to wreck it. In fact, here's Senator Rand Paul talking about it.

Rand Paul: 00:46:00 The insurance industry doubled their profit under Obama Care. They made six billion a year before Obama Care, they now make 15 billion. My concern is that we're going to pass a republican bill and we're going to make their profits 30 billion a year. It's not the job of government to be doling out money to private

industry, so what I've said is that, if you insist that you want it, they should put that on a separate bill that the democrats like, democrats typically like spending bills, put it on a spending bill and put the repeal, make it more of a repeal bill and I'll vote for it. But, uh, and I still think it's not perfect, but I'll vote for something less than perfect as long as it's not obnoxious, and obnoxious to me is subsidizing rich corporations.

Alex Jones:

00:46:41

That's right, that use government to make you buy it and then limit competition to jack the price up and then the left runs around ... one year after Obama Care got partially implemented three years ago, I was reading the Wall Street Journal on an airplane and it was, it was insurance companies bragging. It was like headline, "Lobbyist love Obama Care." It was like, globally, our profit's up 47% just on the America people's backs. Worldwide, 47% increase in profits. It was like 2015. I mean, galactic level screw jobs.

Now joining us is Micheal Snyder who is so on target. I mean, I saw CNN with the headlines, "Trump's done 900 plus tweets since he was elected six months ago but no major legislation." Because most of what they've done is executive tyranny. TPP, open borders, carbon taxes. He's devastated them. We've got a supreme court justice that isn't a total communist. We've got 69%. It was 63%, down illegals coming across and felons are down even more.

Deportations of felons way up. Uh, the economy trying to battle back. I mean, I don't want to just sit here and cheer lead Trump, but it's a total war. They have the FBI, former director, brought in by the democrats and the globalists, uh, put in there, uh, by Sessions that I guess balked and chocked and I gotta agree with Trump. I mean, you know, Sessions has been going after them for all the crimes they committed. We're a five or six special counsels or criminal counsels, uh, special prosecutors, not just counsels, should be all over Hilary because if Trump did something, which he hasn't, it, it, it's like a microscope finding a little dot of dirt while a whole cess pool, uh, sewage treatment plant which is oceans of sludge, uh, it, it, it makes the hedge spin.

And now, Mueller is saying that they're looking at all the finances of all his campaign, all his associates, all his businesses, you're going to find something. I've got 70 something crew members, they're great people, I bet people bounce checks, I bet there's some folks smoking some pot, I bet somebody did something wrong before. I mean, imagine if you had tens of thousands of employees. This, this is a new word for dragnet,

fishing expedition, witch hunt to infinity, Micheal Snyder, this is an incredible time to be alive, is it not?

Michael Snyder: 00:49:10 It really is, Alex, and you know, people need to understand that we are in a war because the establishment, they want to destroy Donald Trump, it's kind of like a foreign body has invaded the system and they want to get that foreign body out of their system-

Alex Jones: 00:49:22 And they know they're losing, they know they're losing, so they're going to go after everybody. Once they get him, it's everybody else. This is a death battle. Sorry.

Michael Snyder: 00:49:30 Oh you're right, Alex, that's why they're going after you. They want to shut Info Wars da- down because they know how effective you've been. They want to shut me down, the economic collapse blog, they want to shut all of us in the alternative media down. They want to get rid of us because they saw the power we had in the last election. So we're actually in a war for the future of this country and we don't have to settle for the future of the globalist. You know, I lik- I talked to a lot of people that are awake and they're saying, "Oh, the globalist, they're too, they're too powerful, we can't defeat them. One world government is coming."

Well you know what? We don't have to settle for that. We don't have to, we don't, we don't have to just sit back and take whatever they take. You know, our founding fathers, if, if we would have had a defeatist attitude back then, if our founding fathers had said, "No, we can't take on the mighty British empire." The rest of the world thought we were crazy when our founding fathers said, "We're going to take on the mighty British empire, we're going to declare independence." They put everything on the line, and because they did, because they were willing to risk it all, the United States of America exists today.

Alex Jones: 00:50:24 Take, take, take Vietnam. Ho, Ho Chi Mihn first wanted to be, be a, uh, capitalist, he was a communist, uh, during world war two, he was our ally, they didn't want to make a deal with him because the, the french and others wanted the opium and to exploit the classically free market, Vietnamese. And so despite the fact that we spent the equivalent of trillions of dollars, uh, hundreds of thousands of [inaudible 00:50:47], we couldn't beat them because they refused to submit and they had a communist ideology.

If you refuse to submit with a Christian, conservative, libertarian, free market, Renaissance, you cannot be defeated.

Michael Snyder: 00:50:59 That, and that now, that's what we need to do, we need to work together and that's why I love Info Wars so much, because you're all about working together. Those that love liberty, those that love freedom, those that love the constitution. If we work together, we can win. Donald Trump showed us that, that we can win the presidency. Here in Idaho, if everybody listening to this program today that lives in my district votes for me, I'm going to win no matter what. We just gotta get everybody out to the poles and involved because we are going to win because we have the numbers. We're waking more people up every day. My websites, your websites, your show, people all over the country, we're raising up an army and we can do this, if we work together.

Alex Jones: 00:51:35 And by the way, uh, you know, I have a small crew, I've been meaning to do it, will you call my crew today? I want to carry your books, uh, because I've read several, they're all excellent, but, uh, you're living a life that really matters, things like that, and you're doing just such important work and again, I'm so glad that despite the fact you had been successful in your own private business and successful in education, and successful, uh, you know, in news, that you're running for congress. I mean, this is really such a manly thing to do, and I don't mean to be cheesy, being manly means putting your family on the line, putting your name out there, and, and getting engaged and involved.

Because you've got a great family, I know, so we just admire what you're doing, Micheal.

Michael Snyder: 00:52:13 Well thank you, Alex, and even though I just announced I'm running officially two weeks ago, the attacks are already coming in. They're already attacking me, they're attacking the people I'm associated with, and, and so, I'm already ... it's kind of like walking into a hornet's nest, but we've gotta do this, because, they, I believe this is the most critical time, if, if, if they end up, if the democrats take control, if they impeach Trump, if they get rid of him and they, you know, they start shutting down alternative media, we could lose everything. But, if, if 1000 people all over the country start running for office, taking back state legislatures, taking back congress, taking back the powers of structure all over the country, we could have a revolution and turn this country back to limited government, liberty, freedom, the second amendment, the things we care about, the things we've been fighting about for seven years.

You know, Alex, my articles have been appearing on Infowars.com for seven years now. We've been fighting

together, we've been fighting this battle, we've been trying to wake people up, you know, and now we need to go to the next stage because now the war has got hotter than ever before and if we don't win, the, the, the elite, the globalists, they are going to try to en- entirely destroy us.

Alex Jones:

00:53:24

You're absolutely right, Micheal Snyder, let's talk about the Mueller situation because Trump has gotta go with his instincts. He's absolutely right. They got bamboozled, they got hoodwinked, they got stampeded, and I really like Senator Sessions into this recusal so that his deputy could then put Mueller in. If it was somebody else that wasn't best friends with Comey, didn't cover up for the Bush's and the Clintons, then I would say, "Okay, have a special counsel"

If Mueller presided for a decade over some of the greatest abuses bipartisanly we've ever seen, he took off the list radical Islam and would not let the FBI investigate radical Jihadis and basically ordered them to stand down, that's confirmed. This guy is a globalist. You've got Brennan, you've got Clapper, they're all just incredibly arrogant. I want to get into that, but first let's get into McCain.

I don't wish harm on anybody and I've had family that have had cancer and brain tumors. It's no joke. I also know from a friend who had a brain tumor and didn't make it, they got very aggressive, very paranoid the last year of their life before they even knew they had a brain tumor and it killed them in about two months once they learned about it. Uh, McCain has been acting very erratic the last year, he's been acting very crazy. Remember back at the Comey hearing people said, even his own supports said something's wrong with him.

But this is a guy that was part of the Keating Five. This is a guy who want's to say that everybody that's against him is a Russian agent. This is a guy who funded Al-Nusra, Al-Qaeda, and Isis and went and met with them in Syria and admitted it. This is a guy on the news who is proxy saying Trump's a Russian agent. That's in the Washington Post today, uh, because he, eh, is working with Russia to take out Isis and Al-Qaeda, that predates Trump getting in. The Pentagon made that deal. So now battling radical Islam and you're supposedly Isis, or, or, or battling radical Islam, you're supposedly, uh, a, a, a, a Russian agent, that's the Washington Post saying that today, this has reached new levels. He's got this brain tumor, some people might say it's foul play, they do have viral based weaponized cancer. You can actually spray on somebody and they can breath and it actually does create these type of cancers in the cerebral context, but you

know, McCain's old, and, uh, this is probably naturally occurring, uh, though brain cancers of this type have magically increased. SV-40 that's in a lot of the, uh, vaccines, uh, you know, has also been linked to this. That's one reason this cancer has increased.

So we can use his tragedy to hopefully inform some people you know, I hope McCain get right with God, I don't wish any harm against any living thing. I don't take pleasure, uh, uh, you know, out of a cow dying even if I eat a steak. Uh, but you know, and, and I don't take pleasure in an evil person having a brain tumor because I still have empathy for them but talk about an omen. David Rockefeller, the founder of modern world government, founder of the modern UN, uh, David Rockefeller dead this year, [inaudible 00:56:22] one of this generals, uh, for world government dead and, and now we see, uh, McCain, you know, the current ... Tim Cain called him the leader of their movement, their, their chairman, and he his quarterbacking the attempt to stop, uh, the make America great again movement, so this is an omen.

What do you make, uh, and I just wonder, will George Soros get fast acting cancer, not delivered by patriots and the CIA, but by God?

Michael Snyder: 00:56:51

Well Alex, a lot of these, [inaudible 00:56:52] comes a lot of these globalists, they are getting older, they're dinosaurs now and they, they're starting to die off, they're starting to retire and so we need to replace them with fresh blood, with, but with McCain, I found it interesting that he has brain cancer because something else that's been linked to cancer are cell phones and what I've been finding out is that, a- as I've been digging into this a- you know, what you, members of congress, they spend more time out of their day on the phone than anything else. In fact, when new members of congress, when they go, what they're told is they're supposed to spend about two hours a day on the floor and in committee actually doing their jobs, and they're actually supposed to spend about four hours a day on the phone, dialing for dollars, 60 minutes did a big expose of this where what they do, they spend more, our members of congress, when they're working, they spend more time during the day, uh, dialing for dollars, they spend more time during the day, uh, calling people up asking for money than anything else.

And that's when they're working. Members of congress only, uh, for example, the house will-

Alex Jones: 00:57:50

Exactly, and Johnny Cochran died from the type of brain tumor that's associated with cell phones. It was concerned decades

ago in rat studies that it does heat up the DNA, it causes it to rattle and then it breaks the chains, then that causes mutations in the brain tissue. Everybody should be using hands free. No one should let their kids, uh, you know, be on these unless they're using a hands free or blue tooth and it's still dangerous. Uh, you're absolutely right, but notice, the Atlantic can say did it give him a brain tumor because they're establishment media. If we say cell phones are linked, it's a conspiracy theory, but they are having that debate now.

Michael Snyder: 00:58:24

Oh, it's very true. And, and so people, people need to be aware, when you're holding that cell phone up to your head for you know, endless hours, you're literally cooking your brain on, at a very low level. But, uh, you know, me- but these members of congress, they spend more time on the phone than anything. If that's when they're working. Er, the, the, the house of representatives, Alex, will only be in session for 147 days this year. That means they have 218 days off. They work, they work for less than three days a week, and when they're working, like I said, most of the time they're on the phone. The republicans and the democrats, they're not allowed to make calls directly from their own offices, so they've got these giant call centers very close to the capital.

And what they do, wa- the reason why you almost always see the house chamber or the senate chamber empty, because they're all over at these call centers, they're calling people trying to raise money for the el- next election, trying to keep the establishment in power, that's how congress really works.

Alex Jones: 00:59:16

That's right, and major courts have ruled that cell phones are causing brain cancer. It's a fact, just like glyphosate literally grows cancer, but they told us it was healthy to drink. This is incredible. Why have the elites allowed glyphosate, cell phones, all of this, all this wifi, all of it, when they know specifically it rattles DNA into pieces, then when you have DNA in pieces, that is a mutation, cancer of course is the most classic mutation with malignant tumors.

Michael Snyder: 00:59:43

Well I think for the sa- some of the same reasons why they are putting fluoride in the water. They know fluoride is a neurotoxin. They know that it has effects on the development of young children, they know that it's dumbing down the population but they're putting it in there anyway. They say, oh, it's good for our teeth, when it shows no, it actually causes some very serious conditions for teeth, now we-

PART 2 OF 6 ENDS [01:00:04]

Michael Snyder: 01:00:00 So, no, it actually causes some very serious conditions for teeth. Now we got children all over the country with those little white spots on their teeth. That's from the fluoride in the water.

Alex Jones: 01:00:09 And the American Dental Association says children under six should not brush their teeth with fluoride and the media calls me a conspiracy theorist when that's the American Dental Association, six years ago, forced to come out and say that in like 2011. People can pull that up. And admitting it increases bone cancer in boys. Admittedly causes lower IQ's, Harvard study. But they don't care, they just call us conspiracy theorists.

Michael Snyder: 01:00:34 Yeah or Alex, vaccines in California, where they passed that bill making it mandatory to have vaccines if you want to go to a public school. Now they want to bring out a bill where it's gonna make it mandatory for every child in California to get vaccines. You know what, and these, these laws are starting to spread all over the nation. There's talk that they want to start pushing 'em here, in Idaho a deeply red state. We've gotta fight this we've gotta let people know. These vaccines, you know, uh, uh, that, why, why has autism just exploded because of these vaccines. Kids are getting shot with these, these vaccines, and one day-

Alex Jones: 01:01:04 And by the way, there are thousands of studies admitting that Thimerosal causes autoimmune results in the brain and other things and they just say conspiracy, conspiracy, our vaccine is safe and effective. Never hurt anybody. The, the, the insert say's it can kill you or cause an autoimmune disorder or give you type I diabetes by killing your pancreas. On and on and on and on and on and on and on. But people won't read the insert. They just say conspiracy theory! It doesn't matter while you were talking we put Scientific American on. We put even the Washington Post on. Even CNN on. Even Newsweek, admit all this now. We've been totally vindicated.

But they pre-tell you it won't hurt you to make you comfortable so that your brain decides it's safe, like them tellin' folks cigarettes were good for your lungs in the forties and fifties. Even though they knew it caused cancer. So that you go ahead and get addicted to the cell phones. Go ahead and give em to your kids and then later to cover their ass, they tell you actually, it kills ya. So I tell ya, very diabolical plan by these lawyers.

Michael Snyder: 01:02:03 Yeah and then something else that's in our water Alex is all the pharmaceutical drugs. Where, you know, We're the most drugged up society in the history world. But all that gets in the water and so a major study was done not to long ago where they looked at the water, they looked for traces of

pharmaceutical drugs and they found that more than half of the water systems in the entire country have more than twenty four different pharm ... traces of pharmaceutical drugs in them.

Alex Jones: 01:02:27

And it's causing massive mutations in mam ... mammals, amphibians, fish, you name it. And they make big jokes out of that as well. Since you mentioned it, let's go ahead and go to this clip. Former director of National Intelligence, James Clapper totally sold out the country. Trump is making Russia great again. Uh, uh in, in Ukraine, I mean, Soros overthrew an elected government. They started a civil war. Russia jut took control of the east and their pipelines, this is making Russia great again. Here it is.

Chris Matthews: 01:02:55

Do you think, uh, our President's helping, uh Russia be great again?

James Clapper: 01:03:01

Uh, in a, in (laughs) yeah in a way I guess, he is. Uh, particularly, if, uh, as Putin, you know gets his way in a Syria. And if nothing is done to push back on the Russians in the Ukraine um, yes.

Alex Jones: 01:03:21

Helping the Russians push back in Ukraine when George Soros and the State Department of Obama over-threw the elected government. Look at this Washington Post headline "Trump End's Covert CIA Program to Arm Anti Assad Rebels in Syria, A Move Sought by Moscow." A, sought by our Pentagon that testified to Congress in close session five years ago, that we then had guests on and was later confirmed. Uh, yes. Russia is against radical Islam too. Yes, we shouldn't be funding the very rebels were fighting. I mean, again, if Trump puts his shoes on right, they claim the Russians did it. If Trump doesn't want everybody to live under Islamic rule, it's the Russians. Yes the Russians are against radical Islam too. What do you make of this, Michael Snyder?

Michael Snyder: 01:04:03

Well I'm so glad that Trump made that move. It's a giant step in the right direction. But you know what the neo-cons, both Democrats and Republicans, they want us to be the police of the world. And that's why we need more people like Ron Paul who says we can't be the police of the world. First of all we can't afford to do that and secondly when we keep poking our nose in everywhere, then we have to send our boys and girls over there to bleed and die, and you know and, and, and the rest of the world starting to hate us 'cause we're constantly interfering or constantly starting wars. Were constantly the military industrial com, com, complex, constantly wants more war. They constantly want more ...

Alex Jones:

01:04:36

And finally Trump is over there cleaning up Obama's mess in the middle east, cleaning up the North Korean mess. It's a president pragmatically, actually pro free market and not a pedophile and not out to get us. Michael Snyder for congress.com. Folks should support ya. And get involved in that. It's we the people that are backing you if you win, not the Russians. Again they're telling us we're all losers. You didn't know the Russians had your wife have that baby too. And when you breathe Mr. Snyder, it's not you breathing, the respirator is provided by the Russians as well. And when I got up this morning and made eggs for my family, that was the Russians as well. Ladies and gentleman you didn't elect Trump, it was the Russians. Michael Snyder, thank you so much. We have the founder of the Rebel Media straight ahead, stay with us.

(singing)

Only way the globalist can win is if you remain asleep.

(singing)

I'm committed.

(singing)

Sworn to avenge.

(singing)

I'm Alex Jones, your host.

(singing)

And I am the sentinel. We're all, no matter what color we are or where we came from, if we want justice. If we love truth. If we love to take care of the innocent. If we want to be honorable. If we wanna be strong. If we wanna take on bullies. Then that's the spirit God put in ya. That's the light shining out in the dark. Were all brothers and sisters in that fight.

We're getting our next guest on. Got a bunch of other guests today. Ton of news to get to. But there's no doubt now, their coming after Trump. The corrupt, evil Mueller, who covered up for just outrageous Islamic terror, crimes, Clinton corruption, espionage for the communist Chinese. Is now saying their going to look into every bank account, every transaction stuff that's non-Russia related. Tryin to bring down President Trump,

because he told the special interest that had hijacked our country and transferred the power to the TPP and to NAFTA and GATT and these international agreements. He said "no! We're not turnin off all our coal when nobody else does. We're not gonna have wide open borders and order the border patrol not to stop people comin across illegally." And that's down sixty-nine percent. And so they're panicking.

Now briefly, we've got free shipping until the end of July. And we're selling out a lot of the best selling items like Super-Male Vitality, uh, X2, Brain Force Plus. So I'm already stopped selling Brain Force Plus at thirty percent off. I ju, just had to, 'cause we're about to sell out. Probably be out of it for like a month. Um, so those specials are gonna end today on Super Male on X2, the good halogen, that goes in and obviously blocks the bad halogen fluoride. It's amazing. It's the cleanest, purest Iodine out there from deep earth crystal sources. We have Caveman it's the ultimate bone broth, Paleo diet formula. And by Paleo diet, I mean what the ancients ate across the board knowing the bones, uh, had all the trace minerals, the elements in it. The co-factors, the stem cells, all of it. Then you got the chaga mushroom and the rest of it in there. It's simply the very best out there. The tumeric, the bee pollen and many other high quality ingredients that help. For healthy muscles, bones, fights free radicals and so much more.

Caveman is back in stock after being sold out for months and this is now the top bone broth seller in the country. And bone broth as you know is very, very hot. But compared to just something you cook on your stove this is very, many, many, many, many, many times more concentrated. It is chocolate naturally flavored. It's all organic. Infowarslife.com. Caveman is back in stock and, and other brands of bone broth formulas are, in some cases twice as much. Usually about 20 percent more. So it's also a very, very good deal, then you're funding this operation, our expansion.

Infowarslife.com, infowarsstore.com or triple eight, two-five-three, three-one, three niner. But a lot of the specials are going to have to end today, the free shipping continues throughout the month. Take advantage of that. We now have one of the top manufacturers of organic whey. From grass fed non GMO cattle. With none of the growth hormones, non of it. We now have one of the top brands in the country, lets us private label it and again it is way less expensive than it would be in stores. Buying it direct from us, private label, true whey protein.

We know we're under a microscope plus we want you to get great products so you come back and get em again. It's a win-win. This is one of the top makers in the country. We private label it. It's super high quality totally tested. True whey protein, premium quality with nine essential amino acids just came out today. Infowarslife.com or triple eight, two-five-three, three-one, three-nine.

And they do have community guidelines, like the old Soviet Union. Oh the community doesn't like you, you're gone now. And, and, and google's in trouble for doing this. They got anti-trust suits going on where they let leftists groups and they expunge the internet for Hillary and cover up all her corruption and Obama and the rest of it. Where they let these little knighted groups, these little super mods go round and say "oh we find this offensive," "we find that offensive." And then just put a strike on your account and their set to shut down our channel. Which is, I've already told google before and the last time they pulled this and they backed off. Lawsuits ready. We've got your internal documents, where you hired the company to de-list us, we've got a bunch of other stuff too. Which is fine.

And I know it's a big, huge corporation and everything else, you let your little communist mods go around and do that. You give us the standing take down the channel with billions of views and you are going to have a big publicized, big fat juicy successful lawsuit on your butt. And you think the stuff in Europe's big, just get ready. And I, I don't want to sue people, but it's all ready and I'm done. So you people thinking your having a victory out there trying to shut us down, just get ready. And the next person puts a false copyright claim in too. I'm, I, I, I promised and it's ready. And I'm going to sue you. It's gotta be done. I've made the decision. I'm done.

Oh and people that like to sue us and then secretly pay us to, to drop the lawsuit. I figured that scam out where you want to make it look like were fake news, you're gonna get sued too. Anybody else false lawsuits you're getting sued. Guaranteed! Set your watch and warrant by it, put it in the bank, you can guarantee it! You can guarantee it!

Now joining us is an individual who was successful in libertarian, conservative media in Canada. And of course inside shenanigans went on to blow that up, uh and he joins us, Ezra Levant, founded therebel.media. It reaches hundreds of millions of people, now, every month. They've had their share of folks tryin to censor them and shut em down. They're international. I really admire their lineup of folks. From Tommy Morrison, right

through to Gavin McInnes and so many others. But again I'm not in competition with the rebel, I'm glad they're there. We're in this together. Therebel.media subscription base, just like you buy our products to support us, you just subscribe with them. And you're building a new media and the more of us there are the better. The safer it is. (laughs)

So he just got back. We almost sent Joe Biggs to do this but it fell through. And, and, and other groups were involved. To go in with other former special forces and some patriots, we'll just leave it at that. Uh, I don't know about other groups, not this particular one. Uh, but, I know for a fact Eric Prince does good stuff out there. They call him a mercenary, he's not in my view. To expose the pedophile rings, you name it. I don't know if that's the group financed him, but to go in and actually save Christians being murdered, slaughtered, put into sex slavery, in the few cities left that ISIS slash Al Qaeda has control of, so that's something I know Erik Prince has been doing for years, behind the scenes. Saving thousands and thousands of Christians every few months. Well this gentleman went into Iraq into the most dangerous areas. Ezra Levant, he just got back so uh we wanna thank him for his courage and what he's doing to talk about this.

And the Washington Post saying Trump's a Russian agent today, basically, for going along with the Pentagon program that's five years old, of not backing ISIS and telling em the Democrats "no." They're now saying that that's a Russian program helping Moscow, that we're not backing the lobbyists, ISIS Al Nusra, Al Qaeda. Well you just came back from there, where they admittedly sometimes rape little girls to death! So Ezra Levant founder of therebel.media, thanks for joining us.

Erik Levant:

01:13:16

Well Alex, it's a pleasure to be here and, and first of all, thank you for your kind words about the rebel. You're a real trail blazer in alternative media and that's what we need these days. To cover stories that are off the official narrative. And Alex, the media and politicians and diplomats never stop talking about Muslim migrants, they call them Syrian refugees. Most aren't Syrian, most aren't true refugees. But ignored are the Christian refugees who are actually at risk of genocide. Here's a quick fact for ya. In two-thousand seventeen, the official United Nations budget to help Muslim refugees is four point seven billion dollars. But no one is waging a genocide against Muslims. There's no ethnic cleansing of Muslims. But there is ethnic cleansing of Christians in the middle east. And they're not even allowed to go to these UN refugee camps 'cause those UN refugee camps are dominated by Muslim extremists. The

Christians, if they flee there, will be violently assaulted there. So these Christians are forgotten and we went to these ancient Christian towns where they're literally being ethnically cleansed by Muslim terrorists.

Alex Jones: 01:14:32

Break it down because this is simply amazing. These are the forgotten people.

Erik Levant: 01:14:36

Yeah. I mean these are ancient Christians who actually still pray in Aramaic, that is Jesus's language. Some of these Christian communities have been there for fourteen hundred, fifteen hundred, sixteen hundred years. And it used to be a Christian area. Just like Egypt used to be Christian, just like Turkey used to be Christian, Istanbul used to be called Constantinople. But over time, wave after wave of Muslim jihad, has ethnically cleansed the Christians. They kill the men and they take the women as rape slaves. Because that is officially permitted in the Koran. And so we, I met a Yazidi woman in Germany, when I was on another trip, Yazidi's are not Christian's. They're not Muslim's they're, uh, uh individual ethnicity. But they have blond hair and blue eyes, Alex. So the Muslim terrorists prides these women as rape slaves. I met a Yazidi rape slave, who said she lost track after she was raped two hundred and forty times. And ya have to understand in the Islamic state that's not a crime. That's actually officially sanctioned. That's one of the ways they pay their terrorists is in stolen property-

Alex Jones: 01:15:55

And Linda Sarsour won't even come out and criticize it.

Erik Levant: 01:15:59

No. And what breaks my heart Alex, is I went to these Christian towns and I saw these all Christian refugee camps. These people are completely ignored. Politicians, the media, diplomats, NGO's they favor the Muslim refugees but they ignore the Christians. I say, we've gotta sort the lambs from the wolves, Alex. Most of the people flooding into Europe are not lambs. They're wolves.

Alex Jones: 01:16:26

Well even Interpol admitted eighty percent are military aged men, but expanding on that, I've seen the statistics. Where less than one percent, in fact it was just a few sub-points of the refugees are Christian, and then Obama jokingly about a year ago, said "well we just can't only let in the Christians. We gotta let in the Muslims." But in truth he laughed about it, because he knows the U.N. program discriminates and doesn't even let Christians get out, because they're slated for extermination. Why is that?

Erik Levant: 01:16:56

Well it goes back to the Koran, the Koran talks about converting any infidels. And so when we were in Iraq we saw an Islamic

state edict. Remember the Islamic state is like a proto country, so they have judicial announcements they're called fatwas. And any Christians in these little towns, these little towns that have been there for more than a thousand years, Alex, they, they're given an ultimatum. Either flee, uh, pay the jizya tax out of submission or be killed by the sword. So this is rooted in the Koran. And they kill the men, they rape the women. I went to a church in the little Christian town of Batnaia, that was conquered by ISIS, held by, for two years and only recently liberated. The Christians have not yet returned to this ancient town. I went into the church and I saw anti-Christian graffiti, like "we will kill you," "leave or be killed," "this is muslim property," "there are no Christians allowed in the Islamic state." It was written in arabic, but it was also written in German. And that tells me Alex that there were German muslims that went to Iraq to rape and plunder and desecrate these churches.

Alex Jones: 01:18:22 And under this whole Islamic rebellion Arab spring that the democrats, the globalists, NATO and others, the UN have been behind publicly. Military aged men go like on hajj basically, but jihad were it's like a pillaging, raping vacation where they go out to earn their bones and have their rights of passage, raping, killing, murdering. I mean this is all admitted and the UN brags that this is all a part of their replacement plan for Europeans. I mean, why is the left so in love with orthodox Islam?

Erik Levant: 01:18:59 Well, I suppose it's the same reason why the left was so sympathetic to the Soviets during the cold war. Leftists always side with the most acute enemy of western civilization. Until the fall of the Berlin wall, leftists sided with the Soviets. Um, because they thought, well that's the counter-weight to western civilization. Today it's radical Islam. It, so it's not just that the radical Islam is the enemy of the west, it also is an opportunity for these virtue signaling leftists to show how open minded they are that they will tolerate their own enemies. Which, so, what's so ironic to me, and this is what I never understand Alex-

Alex Jones: 01:19:38 That's why we've seen a lot of these leftists women go to be the sex pleasure objects. Including quite attractive women from all over Europe and the US, go to literally live in fleas and ticks with guys that wipe their butts with their left hands and just stink like pig demons. But they just, women just go and worship the filthiness and worship the, the, the fleas and ticks and lice. I'm no- I mean I'm not kidding, these women are just loving this. Because I guess, their so cuckold from men groveling and kissing their butts in the west and putting em on a pedestal, they don't like that. But to be savagely just treated like slaves, they love it.

Erik Levant: 01:20:14 It's terrifying in Mosul, which is the big city that the Islamic state recently lost to allied forces. There were some Canadian women who voluntarily went out there. They either go to be halal prostitutes to service these men or their duped in some way or they're, or they want to be part of the jihad. It's really troubling, but you make a good point. A lot of these, uh, terrorists, they come from the west, go to Syria and Iraq. They get a taste of terrorism, rape, murder, defacing Christian objects-

Alex Jones: 01:20:50 And then they come back to Europe and go to the anti racism concerts to openly rape and the police just stand there and guard the raping and then judges rule, well this is a muslim, he's allowed to rape it's his culture.

Erik Levant: 01:21:01 Well and the thing is their coming back as battle hardened veterans in a way. Because they, they did it in Iraq and Syria, so they've tasted blood and whatever moral compunction they might have had, they're over it, so they're numb to violence, they, they love it, they practice it and now they've returned to the west. And throughout Europe and we've seen this terrorist attacks in Belgium and France in particular have been from Isis terrorists who learn their trade in Iraq and Syria and have come back to the west-

Alex Jones: 01:21:34 And you know what's crazy? We have Ezra Levant the founder of the rebel.media, amazing uh, uh, television, radio network, news-site that's reaching tens of millions a day now. We were not exaggerating. I can't come up with words to describe how much worse it is than were saying because by the minute more insanity comes out. I mean we have videos at in Sweden and Germany of them holding women down and lines of men raping them and the police are fifty feet away and do nothing. I mean, it, it's, I, I mean they literally rape little kids in pools and the police say well that's their culture. I, I mean it is just insane asylum. Ins-eh-ye-I-I-I'm just wondering, and meanwhile, their saying Trump's a Russian agent because he just killed the Obama program to arm Isis.

We'll be right back, stay with us.

Ezra Levant, (singing) therebel.media, the founder of it. He's heading back on soon about his whole story, you know having his successful, uh, kind of the Fox news of Canada but more libertarian. Uh that all got shut down and then it was successful and he started this a year and a half ago or so. But, but just getting back to Iraq and what's happening, as the final cities of the liberal globalists Saudi Arabian backed ISIS Fall. We have the Washington Post saying "Trump Ends Covert CIA Program to

Arm Anti Assad Rebels in Syria, a Move Sought by Moscow." Well the Pentagon said stop doing it five years ago, to Obama. So, just because Russia is aligned, not wanting to back radical Islam, blowing up every church, sex slavery-ing everyone. How does that make Trump bad? I've got democrats all over the news saying no one is allowed to talk to Russians. Why Trump at a dinner at the G20 talked to Putin? It was a dinner! They seated his wife by him! The G20 did it on purpose probably to say Trump was some agent. They're trying to paralyze the president. How do you think all this is going?

- Erik Levant: 01:23:29 Yeah, well, I tell ya, it has been terrifying that all of these so-called militias in Syria, they have undermined Basher Assad who I'm not gonna say he was a good man in any way, but he was at least a protector of the Christians. Same way, eh I mean, without him look at the anarchy. Same thing in Libya. Muammar Qaddafi not a liberal civil-right's lover, like we expect in the west, but at least he held back the Islamist wave. Same with Hosni Mubarak in Egypt. So we ... we made the perfect the enemy of the good. I'm not saying I would like to live under any of these Arab dictators. But the hell that was unleashed when they were toppled, was far worse, and let me say the Christian community in Iraq, it really is being ethnically cleansed. That's why we went over there. Alex, I'm a jew and so I looked at this ethnic genocide against Christians through the eyes of someone who understood the holocaust and I see so many analogies. And-
- Alex Jones: 01:24:36 Or the Armenian genocide. It touches everybody's heart to just see people being, whole families hunted down, the men killed the women raped, murdered thrown away.
- Erik Levant: 01:24:46 Well and that's the thing. Armenia was just north of there. So these Christians have a really tough go. So we went there to document the Christian genocide and to bring a little bit of humanitarian relief. And if people want to see our videos they can go to savethechristians.com, we've put up about fifteen videos, including from these destroyed churches. You can see them at savethechristians.com and if you want to help with our humanitarian efforts, you can do that too. It's a, and, and I want to tell the story of these Christians, 'cause so many people ignore it. They're obsessed with the muslim refugees. No one's killing muslims in an-
- Alex Jones: 01:25:22 You're absolutely right and again, the UN is basically not letting Christians get out. We should do another video, remember Obama laughing last year going "hah we can't let the Christians

out, we can't just take care of them." No he's blocking them on purpose, because he is a closet Islamist. It's been proven.

- Erik Levant: 01:25:39 Yup. Well, and, and hopefully those numbers will change now that Donald Trump is, a, choosing the refugees. But so far-
- Alex Jones: 01:25:45 But like you said, the Christians can't go to refugee camps to begin with, 'cause they'll be killed by the religion of peace!
- Erik Levant: 01:25:51 Yeah, that's true. Well, listen Alex, I, I appreciate you spreading the word about this and thank you for your kind words. We're gonna keep up this fight, because it's the one group it's okay to demonize in western civilization is Christians and it not, it ought not to be that way. And I know you stand up for their civil rights and we do to my friend.
- Alex Jones: 01:26:10 Absolutely. Well, uh folks can find out more again at therebel.media, and I absolutely for the nightly news wanna get you back on and review some of the boil down or highlights of the amazing video you've got posted, this is real journalism and dangerous. So thanks for doing that, uh Ezra Levant.
- Erik Levant: 01:26:29 Thank you my friend.
- Alex Jones: 01:26:29 Alright, hour number three. Were gonna get to a ton of news items ahead, more on McCain, more on the witch hunt against Trump. More on the economy, so much more-
- Speaker 19: 01:26:39 Thank you for listening to [inaudible 01:26:39].
- Alex Jones: 01:26:38 We've got John Rappaport comin up too, stay with us.

At the bottom of the hour, I'm gonna take some of your phone calls. We're gonna be joined by Jon Rappaport comin up here in the next segment [inaudible 01:26:47] and the host of Fourth Hour.

John McCain, you know I'm not a fake, and so, I'm not gonna sit here and tell you that I am having nightmares over the fact that John McCain has a big fat brain tumor, or had it removed and that it's probably not gonna be operable. And that he won't be with us for too much longer. So not gonna lie to you and tell you I'm losing sleep over it. But I'm also not gonna tell you I'm glad he's dying. 'cause I'm not. I'm very sad for John McCain. He's a very, very twisted person. He's been compromised since the Keating Five, which was totally illegal. Ripping people off with fake bonds. And you go back to Hanoi Hilton where he was

taken care of for given em all the secrets. That's been confirmed. The guy is not a hero in my view. Of course Donald Trump knows that when he said that McCain's no hero. His dad was an admiral. The head of the pacific fleet. He's a consummate insider. But that said death is the great equalizer. And I don't take pleasure when I heard David Rockefeller died. I don't take pleasure when I heard Zbigniew Brzezinski died. I won't take pleasure when I hear that George Soros is dead. But I'll tell yeah this, I will feel relief. Because these are very, very, very, very bad people.

And I'm not gonna play along with everybody, that's virtue signaling saying oh, our hopes and prayers go out to John McCain ... and just for the mere reason of sounding like I'm a loving compassionate person, because its hard to say nice things about john McCain when he's so evil and funded Al Qaeda and funded Isis and get all this. The bible says, pray for your enemies. So I can't help but say pray for John McCain. But I don't even like saying it, I'm just being honest. But I guess pray he wakes up. Pray he, ya know, jus, turns around, and that there's some good left in him. And that he, repents for funding and, and, and supporting the massive middle eastern destabilization turning radical Islam loose on other muslims Christians, you name it.

I mean it's just, the guy he quarterback, as Tim Caine said, he was, is the chairman. Let's pull up Tim Caine's tweet. I saw it last night at about seven thirty, right when it went out. I was searching McCain news, when the brain tumor news broke. There it is. Thinking about my hero. My chairman. My friend John McCain. Stay strong. His chairman. 'Cause let me tell you something. He is chairing, not just committees, he's chairing the operation to bring down the Make America Great Movement and to put the deep state back in full control. And he's all about bringing in radical Muslims and going after our guns and he supported original Obama care.

But of course we haven't seen Obama care repealed. Because it's what the republican scumbags at the top wanted. They're the same ones against Trump. The never-Trumper filth. The, the, they have some good rhetoric. They have some good talk.

PART 3 OF 6 ENDS [01:30:04]

Alex Jones:

01:30:00

Th- th- th- they have some good rhetoric, they have some good talk, but they don't deliver. So, the media will probably edit what I've said about McCain, take it out of context and say I'm glad he's dying. I'm not. I've told you what I really think. It's

nuanced because it, the world is complex. I don't like McCain, but on a spiritual level, it feels like bad luck to me to say, you know, he's getting what's coming to him or something like that hypothetically because I don't take pleasure in it, but when somebody is a convicted pedophile or been caught with hundreds of kids, like Sandusky, uh, and, and, and, and the deputy pope and people and they're particularly in priest robes because you know they love to care out the satanism that way because it's more blasphemous and it, they're just such defilers that ... I mean, I'm glad when pedophiles die.

I'm glad when child kidnappers die. And I'm not a violent person, I don't enjoy violence but my very instincts are very sharp towards these people and I've always said, you know, when they convict these folks of pedophilia, they convict these people of kidnapping kids, I personally, I will flip the switch to run electricity through their brains.

800-259-9231. Coming up at the start of the bottom of the hour segment, I will play a video that YouTube says violates their community standards for pointing out an article by Zero Hedge, that pointed out an anomaly in an NBC news report concerning Sandy Hook. And so I'm going to air this again and I'm going to challenge that it doesn't violate, uh, the rules as being selectively enforced and that's it's a form of civil rights violation of the first amendment and discrimination. It's just like a big, uh, credit card processing company that we're looking at suing, I just have to do this. I have to start some lawsuits against violators just to, just to fight for my rights.

They told us, "We're not going to let you process credit cards and debit cards with us even though you have a, you know, Triple A standing, five star rating, absolutely established 22 year credit card processing company, that has the other big three credit card processors hooked into our system, not just PayPal, we're not going to let, do business with you," and they were dumb enough in emails to say, "Because of our political views."

You think a gay couple can sue and win money because somebody wouldn't make a cake but then you guys say because of my political views and what's misrepresented that I am not allowed to engage in commerce? You people are crazy. I've run this by litigators, top law firms, it's win, win, win, win, win. And I don't want the money from these suits. I don't want two years and then they get to depose me and I get to depose them. But, I'm going to, I'm going to subpoena CEOs and people. I'm gonna start going after folks because I can't put up with it anymore.

So we're going to air what YouTube says you're not allowed to see. Coming up, it's only four minutes long, it's Owen Shroyer with a zero hedge headline. And we're going to go to your phone calls with our guests, John Avaport. But hey, good luck guys because I'm launching more shows, more video platforms, our own video platform has millions and millions of viewers, every few days, we're not backing down, we're not giving up, we're getting more affiliates across the United States because America is done being intimidated. America is done bowing. America is done being called racists because you didn't want Obama Care written by insurance companies and republican fat cats to screw everybody over with the democrats.

American's across the board of every political strip, of every skin color, of every religious background including Muslims that don't want to be under radical orthodox Islam are sick of oppression and we want freedom and we want it now. Coming up the bottom of the hour, I'll show you the letter from YouTube and what they say is not allowed. We're going to play the evil video. Zero Hedge discoveries anomaly in Alex Jones's hit piece. And all it is is Owen Shroyer playing two clips off the news side by side. And if they can sensor that and if they can shut us down for that, they can shut anybody down and Twitter announced today< "We've begun 10 times the censorship we were doing last year of anybody criticizing people we don't like." They can have the left sing kill Trump, kill me, whatever, but let me tell you, you call somebody a liar, you call somebody an idiot, oh, they're going to shut you down. They got their trendy CEO up there. They got their trendy ... yeah, click on that for TV viewers. This is how it's happening.

Notice YouTube and Twitter and Facebook are all announcing the massive censorship launches now. Well, Google, we have the internal purchase order, millions of dollars to shut down Info Wars, saying Ron Paul's not credible, saying that the Syrian rebels were caught launching their own chemical attack and reading a UN report. No, it's that Ron Paul is credible and they said, 'Due to him opposing a Syrian war, and Jones having on these guests, we're going to delist him. But we're going to do it secretly because it's not credible.' And they listed Ron Paul and that I then played a clip of a congressman, and that it was, that it was too influential. They said, "He, he plays a congressman and then he plays Ron Paul and then he, he has a Sy Hurst clip and it's just not credible."

Because it's admitted that the Syrian rebels launched at least three chemical attacks. Congress has had hearings on it and confirmed it. The UN admits it, be se- because it was so credible

that I went bam, bam, bam, here's the clips, and said, "We shouldn't get in a longer war and deep state wanted, that." Then they shut it down. There it is, Ron Paul, zero chance Asad behind chemical weapon's attack in Syria, likely a false flag. I played that clip, I play Cy Hurst and I played a sitting congressman saying the same thing, and because it had consensus and because they showed the UN report, and then we showed the rebels admitting they did it, because it was so credible, they put out a multimillion dollar contract to delist me. And then guess what? Congress is investigating it and so is the White House for antitrust, that case.

And you notice now, that contract's been canceled and google came out a week later and said, "We did that on accident, we're canceling that contract." And then they started relisting us. Well, does Google think I'm dumb? When you've got your little knighted social justice warriors that are given these little chevrons? They actually give them little shield symbols and their email that they're super mods and then they can go ban our videos. (laughs) I can't wait to depose them. I can't wait to get their ISPs and drag them into court. You unamerican trash.

You want to shut us up because we are credible. You want to shut us up because you know we're pulling back the curtain. Look right here, Trump ends covert CIA program to arm anti Asad rebels in Syria, a move sought by Moscow, the Washington Post. Our pentagon five years ago on record, went to Obama and said, "We're not going to be part of being their air force." And said no, and then worked with the Russians to clear out the bad rebels and now Asad's preparing to have elections and leave.

And because our patriot military didn't go along with the deep state, we stopped a wider war. Now YouTube calls them YouTube heroes where you gain points going around shutting down free speech and you get directives, Google owns YouTube, they hire an outside group that then goes and then gives the orders to the mods so that Google can claim they weren't behind it. It's like hiring somebody to rob your neighbor's house or I guess kill your wife or something.

So, so, but you didn't do it yourself, you see. And they admit all this like we're idiots. Don't you know people, even though these are encoded emails are giving us the information? Showtips@infowars.com, whistleblowers@infowars.com, if you're working as part of these groups to do this, send us the data. This is how we're going to defeat deep state.

(laughs) Joining us is Jon Rappoport at nomorefakenews.com, he had that name 15 years ago for his website. He worked for some of the biggest TV and, uh, networks and news gathering and news papers as investigative journalist until he got de-disgusted with it over 20 years ago, he's a film maker, author, artist, you name it, nomorefakenews.com, and he joins us to break this down. What do you call this moment we've reached? Because they're coming for us, but every time they do, it causes a Streisand effect.

- Jon Rappoport: 01:39:17 Yeah, that's exactly what it is. And because more and more people are waking up, and coming to the defense. You know, seeing what's really happening. They're fading. They keep trying and trying and trying but you know, these poles that show that six percent of the people are really interested or concerned about this whole Russia collusion insanity story that's being promoted and so on, all this give them a clue. They're operating in this gigantic echo chamber and hoping to convince people that because they all tell the same lies to each other, that other people are interested. Well it turns out that most of the people don't care.
- Alex Jones: 01:39:59 I have a name for that. It's called a circle jerk.
- Jon Rappoport: 01:40:01 Yeah. They don't give a crap about any of this. (laughs) You know? And so this gets exposed time and time again and the liars keep on lying. They can't turn back now. You know, it's like when you're, you've already jumped off the cliff and now you say, "Gee I wish I hadn't jumped off the cliff. I don't think that was such a great idea. Is there any way I can turn around in space and walk back up to it?" No, you're already falling. So what are you going to do on the way down? You're just going to keep screaming the same lies over and over and over again until you hit bottom.
- Alex Jones: 01:40:34 So it's like Wiley Coyote when he runs out on the edge of a cliff and realizes he's already run too far and a second later-
- Jon Rappoport: 01:40:40 Right.
- Alex Jones: 01:40:40 He drops. They've already kind of hit that point, but what do they have to lose?
- Jon Rappoport: 01:40:43 (laughs) Your guys are really quick here. They're putting it up and the screen already. Yeah. There is he is off the, uh, too late. Couldn't do it. Couldn't come back. Hovered in midair for a second.

Alex Jones: 01:40:57 You said three or four years ago with Piers Morgan that it was a crack in the façade, it pulled back, people got deprogrammed for a moment, Trump's like a 10,000 times better than that moment, they are so panicked, don't they get that even if they destroy him, Toto already pulled the curtain back?

Jon Rappoport: 01:41:11 Yeah, they don't, they're hoping that's not true, but it is, you see, because as I keep saying, time and time again, it's, don't just think it's Trump. You know, it's everybody. It's everybody who wants freedom and demands it, freedom from surveillance, censorship, oppressive laws, child protective services, medical cartel, mandates that you have to get vaccinated with poisons. I mean, you can just stretch out the whole nine yards. It's everybody who's sick and tired of the government intruding on their lives and causing them pain, suffering and death saying, "We've had enough. Now we want something positive." Those people, all of us, we're not going anywhere. Where is there to go?

Alex Jones: 01:41:58 And there's nothing the globalist can do to convince us to go back with them. It's over.

Jon Rappoport: 01:42:03 Yeah. There's no way that you know, they can say, "Well come back on our side because we didn't really mean that or you know, we're not as bad as you think." No, they're worse than we think and we know that. I mean, we've had them in our sights for a long time.

Alex Jones: 01:42:17 How many top Catholics and university heads are caught running giant child rape operations?

Jon Rappoport: 01:42:23 Yeah, how many do we need before we understand the whole picture there?

Alex Jones: 01:42:26 These are literal devil worshipping pedophiles, folks. That's why they're into GMO and fluoride and poison and cancer and evil, because they literally are demon possessed. And I'm, I'm not kidding. I mean, it, when you come down to it, these are, these are just evil people. We'll be back.

Ladies and gentleman, we are back live, I'm your host Alex Jones, Jon Rappoport's our guest, he's got a bunch of issues he wants to get into. You know, Bill Clinton invited Russia to interfere on a US presidential election publicly. (laughs) Tell them to have the EU, the Saudi's, the pope, uh, all these foreign companies saying, "Don't elect Trump." I mean, it's just crazy that they keep pushing, pushing all of this, but just minutes ago,

OJ Simpson walked out of his parole hearing, it's over, uh, and the word is they're probably going to go in, deliberate and then decide to release him after nine years in prison for stealing back some of his me- memorabilia in a, in a robbery, and I, I'm not an OJ Simpson fan, I, I'm just telling you folks that he spends nine years, Dennis Hastart rapes little boys, procures them for the republican party and others, they cover it up and he gets 13 months in federal prison and then is suing one of the people that he admittedly raped.

He carried the kids across state lines, reportedly. Uh, but he wants his money back. So again, what's wrong with this world? It's not that Simpson's black that he's been persecuted, uh, compared to Hastert, it's that he's not an elitist. You better believe if Simpson's crime was rapping little kids, he probably never even would have been in prison.

Instead, his crime is being an average citizen pretty much, uh, and not being involved in an elite type of criminal operation. What do you make of all this, Jon Rappoport of No More Fake News?

- Jon Rappoport: 01:44:19 Well I think there's ... oh God, where do we start here? I mean, it's basically about Hastart and all the other pedophiles. They protect each other. They're in positions of power. They are the ones who can take a priest from here, uh, let's move him to Tasmania or you know, the arctic so that he's never prosecuted. Let's collude with politicians, fellow politicians who are also involved in the pedophile networks so that the case never goes to court or some small time bit player gets sent to jail but none of the elites ever get to jail.
- Alex Jones: 01:44:56 So it's a big club and we ain't in it-
- Jon Rappoport: 01:44:57 Exactly.
- Alex Jones: 01:44:57 Why historically in every ancient culture is there a cult that takes over, whether it's African, meso-america, Europe, Asia, in certain periods, cults take over, build temples, and then rape and kill children. You know, in the bible they talk about different tribes taking virgins and killing them. Well virgins just means children. Why does this keep, uh, through sociology, anthropology, psychology, archeology, why does it keep raising it's ugly head? What's at the bottom of the rabbit hole?
- Jon Rappoport: 01:45:28 You know, you said these people are evil. I don't think you really have to go much further than that. I mean, you can analyze why

and so on and you can give lots of reasons, that's easy to do. But evil people turn out to be evil. That's what they are.

Alex Jones: 01:45:46

And the more they get away with, the more they do.

Jon Rappoport: 01:45:48

Yeah, of course. And then it piles up. In other words, whatever thrill they get out of being evil, it's not enough so they have to go further. And they have to keep on going. This amount of control and destruction is not enough. We have to expand it. And that's where they actually commit suicide. Because it gets to a point where the people are fed up and have had enough because they see what's actually going on and we're at that cross road when we talk about what the globalists are doing.

Alex Jones: 01:46:18

I agree, because you said they're in their own echo chamber, they even admit that now. Everyone's even turning ... I mean it was like 20 something percent a few months ago thought Russia was important, now it's six percent in their own Gallup poles, everyone I know knows it's a total joke and, and, and so what comes next? They're in their echo chamber, they're getting more extreme, they're going to try to remove Trump, what's going to happen?

Jon Rappoport: 01:46:39

Well they're just going to continue to beat the drum any possible way they can. I'm sure that they're going to get some more psychiatrists to try to come forward and say that he's mental ill and he's incompetent to serve, uh, the reason that they're not filing impeachment proceedings is because they know they don't have a chance. So they're looking around desperately to try to find something and all they can do right now is to keep on screaming about the Russia story because they don't really have anything else. And when it's reported that fewer people are coming across the southern border, for example, and certain you know, progress is being made along that front, because with open borders, you just can't vet who's coming into the country, uh, then there's a whole lot of people that are very, uh, ha- happy about that. So that makes it even worse for them. They don't know what to do.

Alex Jones: 01:47:34

That's right, because, because, eh, they can't kill the economy quick enough to blame Trump, plus they now know they're getting the blame anyways for trying it, but they can't help themselves, like you said, they're Wiley Coyote ran over the edge. When we come back though, Muller has said, "Okay, I can't find any Russia stuff." He's going to look at every Trump associate, every campaign person's finances, total drag net, total fishing expedition, what does Trump do at this point with this rogue element, what do we do?

All right, we got well over two million subscribers on just one of our YouTube channels that a fan made five, six years ago, Dave Thomas, not of Wendy's, his name's really Dave Thomas. Great guy, he, he works for us now. From Oregon where he's a chicken farmer with his family. Who's your daddy. Does he live in a free country like me? It always, during the break, I was talking to the crew, they're like, uh, we're, uh, they're glad I'm really considering having to sue Google and YouTube and other people that put in false copyright claims because this isn't Russia during the old Soviet Union, this isn't communist china, we have free speech in this country. And I'm sick of people with false copyright claims they never back up once I file, once I file a challenge to it, they never put up or shut up and file suit on me.

And then now they claim that I'm harassing Sandy Hook families because the media said I am and the media said I said go harass their families. And then they take down our videos where I actually clarify going back three, four years ago that I simple questioned because our media lied about dead babies in incubators and said they got their brains bashed out and so my listeners didn't buy the official story, so we looked at it and I said, "I don't know the truth." I'm not ready to say kids didn't die and point my finger at parents and say they're liars.

Is there a blue screen when Anderson Cooper's face disappearing? Are there kids going in circles in the video shots? Did they hold back the helicopters? Did they have porta pottys there in an hour and a half? Did they run it like a big PR operation? Do they get all these conflicting stories in the media? Absolutely. And we have a right to question it. If, if they said there were new babies thrown out of incubators in some country and we questioned it because they've lied before and it turned out that they did actually kill babies somewhere, would I then hate the families that lost their babies? No. I'm questioning known liars in the media.

But in the 1990 event where they said hundreds of babies had their brains bashed out and their skulls kicked in, there were no babies. There were no incubators. It was a red shirt to bring us into a war and now over a million Iraqis have died of starvation, a half million under the Clinton's intensified sanctions that were children.

But see, we don't humanize those Iraqi children and we overthrew a secular government that had swimming pools and movie theaters and Play Boy sold in the stores. I'm not saying that's a great thing or a good thing or a bad thing, the point was it was becoming westernized. The globalists don't want that.

They destroyed it. And they put radical Islamist in charge. But see, I'm not supposed to sit here and have a big thought like that. I looked at the five videos that they have said are evil and bad, and put a strike on us to shut the channel down, zero hedge discovered anomaly in Alex Jones hit piece. That's what they're saying we're not allowed to question. So let's play the censored report with Owen Shroyer analyzing other people's reports and playing the anomaly and asking the question and quite frankly, the father sees, he needs to clarify, NBC needs to clarify because the coroner said none of the parents were allowed to touch the kids or see the kids and maybe they meaning at the school, I'm sure later maybe the parents saw their children. The point is, is that because the media lies so much, you can't blame the public asking questions and you can't ban free speech of people that are asking questions and for us to simply look at the Megyn Kelly public even where someone sat down and was interviewed and to politely discuss it. If you ban that, you ban free speech in total. Very, very dangerous. Here it is.

Owen Shroyer:

01:52:01

So folks now, here's another story. You know, I don't even know if Alex knows about this to be honest with you. Alex, if you're listening and you want to, uh, or if you just want to know what's going on, Zero Hedge has just published a story Megyn Kelly fails to fact check Sandy Hook, Sandy Hook father's contradictory claim in Alex Jones' hit piece.

Now again, this, this broke, I think it broke today. I don't know what time, but featured in Megyn Kelly's expose, Neil Heslin, a father of one of the victims, during the interview described what happened the day of the shooting and basically what he said, the statement he made, fact checkers on this have said cannot be accurate. He's claiming that he held his son and saw the bullet hole in his head. That is his claim.

Now, according to a timeline of events and a coroner's testimony, that is not possible. And so, one must look at Megyn Kelly and say, "Megyn, I think it's time for you to explain this contradiction in the narrative because this is only going to fuel the conspiracy theory that you're trying to put out, in fact." So, and here's the thing, too.

You would remember ... let me see how long these clips are. You would remember if you held your dead kid in, in your hands with a bullet hole. That's not something that you would just misspeak on. So let's role the clip first, Neil Heslin telling Megyn Kelly of his experience with his, with, uh, with his kid.

Megyn Kelly:	01:53:52	At Sandy Hook elementary school, one of the darkest chapters in American history, was a hoax.
Neil Heslin:	01:54:00	I lost my son. I buried my son. I held my son with a bullet hole through his head.
Megyn Kelly:	01:54:07	Neil Heslin's son, Jesse, just six years old, was murdered, along with 19 of his classmates and six adults on December 14, 2012 in Newton, Connecticut.
Neil Heslin:	01:54:19	I dropped him off at 9:04 that's when we dropped him off at school with his book bag. Um, hours later, I was picking him up in a body bag.
Owen Shroyer:	01:54:33	Okay, so making a pretty extreme claim that would be a very thing vivid in your memory, holding his dead child. Now here is an account from the coroner that does not collaborate with that narrative.
Speaker 20:	01:54:49	Uh, we did not bring the bodies and the families into contact. We took, uh, pictures of them, um, uh, of their facial features. You have, uh, uh, it's easier on the families when you do that. Uh, there is, uh, a time and a place for up close and personal in the grieving process, but to accomplish this, uh, we felt it would be best, uh, to do it this way and, uh, you can sort of, uh, you can control situation, uh, depending on your photographer and I have very good photographers. Uh, but, uh-
Speaker 21:	01:55:28	It's gotta be hard not to have been able to actually see her.
Speaker 22:	01:55:34	Well, at first I thought that and I had questioned maybe wanting to see her.
Owen Shroyer:	01:55:44	Okay. So just another question that people are now going to be asking about Sandy Hook. The conspiracy theorist on the internet out there that have a lot of questions that are yet to get answered, I mean, you can say whatever you want about the event, that's just a fact. So, there's another one. Will there be a clarification from Heslin or Megyn Kelly? I wouldn't hold your breath. (laughs) So now they're fueling the conspiracy theory claims. Unbelievable. We'll be right back with more.
Alex Jones:	01:56:10	All right, now that's the full clip that's been censored on YouTube that's hateful and evil they say and that we're harassing people with. It's national television. It's a piece attacking me. Okay? That's a clip from a national piece televised everywhere, misrepresented what I said about Sandy Hook. I'm

not allowed to respond to a report about me that isn't even accurate and then you've got CNN and MSNBC both with different groups of parents and the coroner saying we weren't allowed to see our kids basically ever, what they sound like they're saying, but we see a father, a grieving father saying that he dropped him off with a book bag, got him back in a body bag.

And, and, and, you know, regardless, Bloomberg said they don't let a good crisis go to waste. So did the White House Chief of Staff Robert Manuel at the time. And, and bottom line there was massive PR around this. This was used to blame the American people to say gun owners were at blame for this and to, and that we had killed these children. So that's why America rejected it and said it was fake because in total, saying gun owners are responsible for what somebody on Prozac does is, is, is not true. If I kill somebody with a car on purpose, it's not your fault because you own a car that I did something wrong with a car. Like, if I stabbed my neighbor with a butcher knife, or you do, then we're not guilty for, for what another person does. So we're sick of this.

Do mass shootings happen? Absolutely. Can I prove that New Haven didn't happen? No. So I've said for years, we've had debates about it, that I don't know, but you can't blame people for asking. But now, in a national Megyn Kelly NBC headpiece that another publication, very respected, Zero Hedge, comes out and breaks, I'm not even allowed to report on a report about me from NBC and Zero Hedge with my other reporter who didn't harass anybody. That was a month ago. He said, "I wouldn't hold my breath looking for a response." We've not seen a clarification. I'm the one that called him up after I saw the show that night and I said, "You know Owen?" And we're going to go back to our guest, could be that, you know, we need to get clarification on what went on, and I couldn't ever find out. The stuff I found was they never let them see their bodies. That's kind of what's weird about this, but maybe they did.

So, I, I'm sure it's all real. But for some reason, they don't want you to see those clips together.

Nomorefakenews.com, he hosted an hour a week, going to be hosting a lot more soon, I gotta get it set up with him, uh, but, uh, he's here with us, of course it's Jon Rappoport, Jon what do you make of this?

Jon Rappoport:

01:58:54

(laughs) Just, report on the report on the report on the report is suddenly you know, licenses to take away access. You can't do that. Absolutely not. Absolutely inappropriate. Inappropriate,

right? Because there is an unanswered question. So where does that leave us? Well, let's say that somebody decides to publish on YouTube a whole list of the ingredients in vaccines. You know, here it is from the CDC. And I have a question because if you'll notice, there's aluminum, aluminum, aluminum, aluminum, aluminum, and now here is a statement from official organization, medical organizations about how neurotoxic aluminum is that's being injected this way and I'm asking questions about this. Well, that ... let's throw that away, too. That's no good. We can't have a video like that. We can't have that either. I mean, as you say, if they're going to th- if they're going to throw out that-

PART 4 OF 6 ENDS [02:00:04]

Jon Rappoport: 02:00:00 That either. I mean, as you say. If they're going to throw, if they're going to throw out that video by Shroyer, then everything is up for grabs. You can't say anything that wouldn't be censored if somebody wants to censor it.

Alex Jones: 02:00:14 Well, I'm not supposed to ask you because of this intimidation. What do you think about Sandy Hook? I mean, I said it has more holes in it-

Jon Rappoport: 02:00:14 Yeah. Right.

Alex Jones: 02:00:19 Than ... I said it has more holes than Swiss cheese. I'm not personally attacking anybody. Just like, as I said, if a new baby incubator story came out, I would question it. It may come out that the new attack on babies is real. But am I bad? Am I attacking individual parents because I question the media that runs hoaxes?

Jon Rappoport: 02:00:38 And here's the other thing because they have to find their hook to come after you. You know? You've covered what? In all the years you've, you've been in in it for what it is? I don't know. 15,000, 20,000 stories. Okay. So let's find one that we can twist. Make it incredibly controversial. And make it sound like he's some sort of an inhuman monster. And now let's push that on national television. And say, "You see folks. You see what we're dealing with here. With the so called independent media." I mean, that's the other aspect of this. Which is completely insane. You know?

If there was anybody rational at any of these networks, they would sit down with you and they would say, "Well, apparently you're a very controversial figure. And also apparently you have

untold millions. I mean, it just keeps getting bigger of listeners. So what is it that you stand for? Why are you so popular? What are you saying?" And, you know, a long forum interview. And then they would bring in and say, "Well, here's a story you covered. And this is what you said."

Alex Jones: 02:01:50 Listen I told them I thought the kids probably did die and that we were simply questioning because the babies in the incubators, they wouldn't put it. They won't let me even say that-

Jon Rappoport: 02:01:50 That's right.

Alex Jones: 02:01:59 That, that, that they've twisted it and I, because they want to take off what I really said. And then say false things about me so I can't respond.

Jon Rappoport: 02:02:06 Exactly. So if you say, "Well, let's compare the Sandy Hook thing to the incubator baby thing." They're not even going to put that on television. They don't want to hear that. They don't want to say, "Well, gee. He does have an analogy. No. No. We don't want to even consider that because people are going to realize hey. Well. Yeah. That was a totally fake story about how the, the war in Iraq was, uh, promoted and launched. So he has a right to question what happened at Sandy Hook or what happened anywhere about anything." I mean, come on. What's, what's the story here? You ask a question. You ask a number of questions. And all of a sudden you're censored for that.

These people want you to get down on your hands and knees and pray to ABC, NBC, CBS, CNN. Etc. Etc. That's what they want. Just like Chris Como says on CNN, in what has to be for me one of the most insane things ever uttered by anybody. "You the public don't have a right to look at these leaked emails. Only we the media can. And then we tell you what to think and then you accept it."

Alex Jones: 02:03:18 (laughs). He actually said it just like that.

Jon Rappoport: 02:03:20 Right. And people, you know? The, the people all over the world. Like if I was walking through an airport where they have these contracts from CNN and I heard that, I'd say, "Forget about my flight. I'm dropping my bags. I got to watch this idiot. This is unbelievable." Right? You know? Where does this guy come from?

Alex Jones: 02:03:37 He goes further. He goes, "You're not allowed to. It's illegal. No. No. We're allowed to and then you get it from us." I mean, he actually the most, when I saw that clip first the day it happened, I thought it was a joke. And we went back and found the full context.

Jon Rappoport: 02:03:50 (laughs).

Alex Jones: 02:03:50 I mean he really talked to them like they're three year olds.

Jon Rappoport: 02:03:53 Yeah. He really means that. You say well, this is a guy that, you know? Megan. Hello. Interview Chris Como. Okay? Find out what makes this incredible moron tick. You know? I mean, where did you come up with this idea? We the media will tell you what it means. Otherwise you have no access to it. I mean, where did, where was he hatched? How did he come in to being as some sort of reporter? I mean, do they just, I know his name is Como so he's from the political family. Right? But I mean, they just grab them off the street and say, "You're our anchor." When you say something like that? I mean, there we see what the media is actually thinking about themselves.

Alex Jones: 02:04:40 Exactly. I want to go to some phone calls. I'm going to skip this break so we have some more time with John Rappaport. But just briefly, Pooty Pie has like 15 plus billion views on one channel. And a couple billion on another. And other channels. I mean, it, it's, it's 18 billion views. And it's bigger than all comedy channels, entertainment stuff together. And he never was political. I'd only seen some of it. But they hate the fact that his main demographic is about 18 and younger. But I've seen his stuff. It's pretty funny. Even when he makes fun of me.

Uh. Regardless in the, in the, in the, in the marketplace of ideas, he's winning. They begin to call him racist, Hitler, say shut him down. Because the big executives are jealous. The Zucker's of the world. That he has something they don't have. He has the real star appeal. They've all failed. Nothing they force feed works. So I've talked to a lot of these folks. Not Pooty Pie. But others. All these big channels. Including a lot of big kind of main line, uh, liberal channels that are independent. They're getting targeted and shut down. And it's a bullying. And then YouTube comes along behind the scenes and says, "Work with us. Start doing a few things we want. We'll fully monetize you and help you." So it's muscling. Stop saying that Pootie Pie and others.

They're scared of you because they saw you putting down our stuff at Watson's. They know you could turn around and somebody like you could be a thousand times more successful

than even myself or Donald Trump. They don't know who the Pootie Pie is that's just kind of doing their own thing. Whose, who then clicks because there's this algo rhythm awakening. So Pootie Pie needs to know they're always going to envy you and try to shut you down. The answer is really take your destiny in your hands. Don't just be super popular and have all the super hot girlfriends. And make 30 million dollars a year. Or whatever. Really change the destiny of the world. And, and, and if it's not going to be Pootie Pie, it's going to be somebody else. Because I turned down 10 million dollars a year. 16, 17 years ago. Sounds like a lot of money. It's nothing. Money means nothing once you get self sufficient.

They use it to control you. To always feel like you're going to arrive someday if you were just with them. Now it's not saying money is bad to have. It's just that it is not your God. They try to keep money limited. Resources limited so they can be the gatekeeper between that. Right now though OJ's verdict is coming in. Dennis Hastert goes free after 13 months. We'll see if, uh, OJ does for, uh, robbery. Uh. Already serving nine years. Let's go to that feed live.

- Speaker 23: 02:07:10 And I concur with Commissioner Corda. And grant parole. And in addition, our decision, although difficult, is fair and just.
- Speaker 24: 02:07:22 I concur with the Commissioner, uh, Corda and agree to grant parole.
- Speaker 23: 02:07:29 Um. Mister Simpson. Before I cast my vote. Um. I want to let you know that we believe that we're a fair board. We believe that we're a consistent board. Um. I will let you know that that consistency also goes to parole. And, um, we do not look kindly upon parole violations. Um. And if I cast my vote to grant and it, and it concludes the hearing, uh, our expectation would be that you not violate even the simplest condition of parole. Having said that, um, I am prepared to cast the vote. I am prepared to ask the commissioners to set conditions. Um. If, if that happens, um, we will produce an order sometime in the next 15 to 20 minutes that will be faxed to you or presented to you at the institution. And it will become a public record. So based on all of that, um, Mister Simpson I do vote to grant parole when eligible. And that will conclude this hearing.
- OJ Simpson: 02:08:37 Thank you.
- Alex Jones: 02:08:37 You know? Simpson looked arrogant and somewhat corrupt before. But after nine years in prison, he looks very genuine. Very contrite. And he looks very, like he has a lot of, I never

studied his genetic background. But I think he has a lot of native american in him or something. Because he looks, uh, a lot of native american now that he's lost a lot of weight. Uh. But, uh, but there you go. Nine years in prison for robbing back some of his own memorabilia. I'm not defending what he did. But there was a dispute. Um. And then I've never done it myself. But sometimes in business you get a little bit mad. People screw you over. And I'm not saying that's what happened there. The wife thing. All that. Both sides. They tried to set him up. He probably did it. It's just a mess.

Crime of passion. Yeah. I mean, basically cut their heads off. Or I mean he was found civilly guilty. The point is it's hard to hate him when these globalists are committing all these crimes. John McCain's funding Al Qaeda and ISIS. They're murdering Christians by the hundreds of thousands. And then all these pedophiles are going free. Um. We haven't scripted this. We're live. We're going to go to your phone calls. Shawn, Josh, Andrew, Dustin, and others. But what is your view John Rappaport?

Jon Rappoport: 02:09:45 You know I just thought what would happen if he put up a YouTube video with Hastert being released. Next to OJ. See maybe that would be censored too. Oh. Oh. Oh. Oh. We don't want any comparisons of this. No. No. Just side by side. The last two minutes of this from Simpson. And Hastert pedophile, he gets off. Let's present that. Let's show, you know? What do you think of this folks? You think this sounds fair? Does this sound equitable? Does this sound like the justice system is actually working? When this guy serves nine years and this guy serves, what? 13 months? Really. Unbelievable.

Alex Jones: 02:10:27 Well, I know if you look at Simpson, you can't fake that. He looked real humanity, really upset. Really wanting to get out. I mean, you, you can't hide that. That was real. And then you look at somebody like, like, uh, you know? Mister blue eyes over there. At, at the republican party. Paul Ryan. He just radiates I'm a psychopath.

Jon Rappoport: 02:10:44 (laughs). Yeah.

Alex Jones: 02:10:47 We're going to go to break here in a moment and take a few calls. John Rappaport. No more fake news dot com. Before we go any further, ladies and gentlemen, we need your financial support. They're trying to shut us down. I want to expand. Not just stay the same size. Because we're going to expand or be destroyed. It, it, there is no staying the same size. We need you to go to infowarstore.com. Where we have amazing [inaudible

02:11:04]. Free shipping for another 10 days or so. And a bunch of the stuff. Like super male, which is this great concentrated herbs. The X2. The amazing good, uh, halogen. Uh the deep Earth clean iodine. Not the garbage iodine that you get in the store. You know? Probably eat holes in your belly. Infowarslive.com has it all but it a lot of the specials got to end today. Just like brain force had to end a few days ago because it's about to sell out.

I'll have some new specials tomorrow. But these are our best sellers. They're still no sale right now infowarslive.com. Or triple 8-2-5-3-3-1-3-9. But that's how we fund ourselves. Over 75 percent of the funding is you buying products. CNN is fake news. On the back, infowars is real news. Great shirt to meet like minded people, to spread the word, to stand up for free speech. Caveman is back in stock. [inaudible 02:11:52]. Knock out the fungus and stuff in your gut. [inaudible 02:11:55] the probiotic. It's back. Now we've got our new super high quality whey. That I haven't even had time to get into yet today. It's our new product launch today. Haven't even launched it because so much is happening.

So we'll take your phone calls coming up. I appreciate you holding. We don't get to everybody, I'm going to send everybody a keg of this, uh, new premium whey protein. It's from one of the biggest high quality manufacturers. Hormone free, grass fed, uh, cows would produce the milk. True whey, uh, protein. Super high quality. Infowarslive.com. Or triple 8-2-5-3-3-1-3-9. No reviews yet because it just came out today. But we have tens of thousands of reviews by third party site power reviews and others. On average four point eight stars. No one else that we've seen has it. Infowarslive.com. Infowardsstore.com is the umbrella site.

But even if you can't buy the product from us to help support the broadcast, just spread the link. Spread the articles. Spread the videos because we are fighting everyday to simply stay here and keep putting the truth out. And we'll change the world because of your support. Hour number four. With your calls. Anthony Cumia. The conclusion of no more fake news dot com with John Rappaport. Stay with us.

Alright look. I hogged the airtime. I gave the number out 30 minutes ago. I haven't gone to your calls. I apologize. It's Rappoport is our guest. Let's talk to Shawn in New York then Josh in other. Shawn, you're on the air. Shawn? We're going to let you go. Let's go to Josh in Colorado. Josh, you're on the air.

Bob Barr: 02:13:28 Hey guys. Uh. Long time listener. Um. I just wanted to talk to you about future technology. Um. I'm an independent researcher. I led an energy movement. And I, I'm seeing something that's coming. Um. There's a break away civilization. And they have revolutionary energy technologies. They're going to build three printed robots. They're engineering robots into bio mechanical with dogs. I had to leave the movement because of the weird stuff I was starting to hear. There is something really strange going on in this world. And-

Alex Jones: 02:14:02 Yeah. I know. They got computers that predict the future. I mean they've got computers that predict the future. Then you can control the future. They've had [inaudible 02:14:09] for 30 plus years they admit. And, and now they're admitting it all but, but not showing it so that's the big question. Have we already reached the Atlantean moment? Whatever they've discovered they're on such power trips. They act like we just don't even exist anymore. Then there's Trump in the middle of it trying to rally billions of people against it. Uh.

Rappaport what do you think is going on?

Jon Rappoport: 02:14:32 They have tremendously advanced artificial intelligence in terms of systems. Because that's what they're trying to do to the planet. Here we've got these systems and we're going to impose them on you. You are the little units that we put in to the slots of our systems. So naturally when you have that viewpoint and that's what you want to make the world into. One gigantic machine. Then you're going to use artificial intelligence and robots and androids and everything automatic that you can get your hands on.

Alex Jones: 02:15:04 And I said they're using the artificial replacement of us to make us obsolete as a way to dictate the terms of our surrender to the technocracy. This has been designed to make us obsolete. To dictate what's left of the middle class. Accepting the extermination and phase out of the general public. And that's the admitted plan. Josh?

Bob Barr: 02:15:24 Well, it's, it's being shown in Hollywood if you have the eyes to see what the new energy technologies are going to be. And how actual natural energy works. They, uh, they've actually really engineered it. They don't want anybody that's done it independently to be funded. They're funding their own people to come up through this system. And they're going to put the information out that the, the way they want it to-

Alex Jones: 02:15:47 Sure. I mean, that's what they do. They always have quote, you know, the billionaire guy. The Bill Gates. The whatever. The Zuckerberg. That pops up. That's been partially declassified as the free market front so people don't even understand what's happening. It's all Trojan horsed.

Bob Barr: 02:16:00 They can actually synthetically create most elements nowadays with nano technology and nano super [crosstalk 02:16:07].

Alex Jones: 02:16:07 Well, when I was a kid, in, in, in third grade they talked about those big machines they've got that create the new elements. I mean, alchemy is now real. You want to comment on that Rappaport?

Jon Rappoport: 02:16:16 Yeah. You can go all they way back to IG carbon. The infamous Nazi cartel of the 1930's. That was their whole program. To be able to synthesize, you know? They were talking about oil and rubber and so forth. But basically these guys that they had over there wanted to synthesize anything from anything else. That was their plan. That was their program. That's the whole idea is the synthesize existence basically.

Alex Jones: 02:16:43 We're seen as like an infestation of weavles or something that's eating their resources. But then they've trained us to be like the weavles. So that, so that we follow that form. And I'm just like, whoa. This is uncool.

Jon Rappoport: 02:16:54 Yeah. Who wants that? We want individuals who are free, strong, alert, creative, independent.

Alex Jones: 02:17:01 Hey Josh. Give us your name and number. If you want to give us documentation because I want to start talking to more deep tech people not just deep state. Because deep tech is the bottom of deep state. So if you want to give us your info I'd like to see documentation and have you on. I mean, hell. They tried to hire my dad to build cyborg's in the 80's. It wasn't even that special. They were trying to hire all the top oral surgeons that were doing implants at the time because that was new. Uh. Am-, amazing John Rappaport. Thank you so much my friend. We'll talk to you soon.

Jon Rappoport: 02:17:26 Thank you Alex.

Alex Jones: 02:17:27 Powerful always to have him on bantering back and forth. I'm going to introduce Anthony Cumia. Of the Anthony Cumia show on Twittercompoundmedia.com. You know? He had big popular [inaudible 02:17:43] syndicated radio. And got kicked off that.

And then of course he, uh, hosted the Opie and Anthony show and he criticized Black Lives Matter. Killing cops literally. And he was fired off of that. So now he's got his own compound media with a lot of other hosts that's very, very popular and successful but the reason I raise that is YouTube, for us showing Megan Kelly interviewing one of the fathers of a Sandy Hook victim saying he held his son after he was shot. Then we show CNN and MSNBC saying the coroners didn't let people get to their kids. And we said, "That's why people question."

We're not even questioning that kids died. That's been questioned. Our listeners question it. We're simply saying this is why people question it. Showing a zero edge story. That's been removed. And they said they're looking at banning us on YouTube. That story is up on infowars.com. If they do that to us, they can do it to anybody. So we've got to stand up against this. And we've got to understand they're doing this because we're destroying them because of their own lies.

Six percent of Americans in a big gallop poll think Russia's a big story but this globalist that took radical Islam off of the FBI's list when they're investigating a mosque or Al Qaeda or ISIS. They can't even say they're investigating an Islamic group. Mueller who covered for the Clintons. All of it. Bush. All of it. Saudi role 9-11. All of it. He now has expanded it to all of Trump's associates. All his businesses. All of his buildings to see quote if they rent any condos or sold stuff to Russians. Or campaign money. Or just money laundering period. Which they could call bouncing a check.

So it's gone from witch hunt to the greatest fishing expedition that history has ever seen. And our pentagon five years ago came to Obama when we first broke this. They said we're not going to be Al Qaeda's air force. This is ISIS. And Trump comes in and he's like we're going to defeat ISIS, which he said he'd do in 2016. Now six months in, it's basically in two cities. 95 percent defeated. Trump ends covert CIA program that was Obama and McCain funding these cribs to arm anti Assad rebels in Syria. A move sought by Moscow. And of course they said that at the G20 event two days of dinners and lunches, that G20 sat Melania next to Putin. And then Trump came over and talked to him in front of world leaders with a Japanese, uh, interpreter that could speak Russian and English. And asked a few questions. And, and, you know? Talked to him. And they're calling that a secret Russian meeting.

That's what you do at diplomatic dinners. And so now the new talking point from Howard Stern, heaven love him. Not a bad

guy. Been on his show. Whatever. To CNN and NBC is you don't talk to Russians. If you talk to a Russian, close quote. That's the talking points. All over the news. You're a Russian agent. So this is the, meant to paralyze Trump. Anthony I want you to take over and host this hour. It's why you're here. [inaudible 02:20:54] media dot com. But it's not working. But they don't care. They're just going to continue to move forward to try to impeach the president. And I agree with him.

Sessions, you know, shouldn't have recused himself. And Sessions has been a good guy on many fronts. But I mean where are his juevos? Why aren't we seeing special prosecutors or indictments of the Clintons when they got money from Russia? I mean, I've got an article right here. Bill Clinton, remember back when he called for Russia to interfere in our elections? I, I mean these, everything they say Trump's done, they've done. And I'm sick of putting up with them and almost no one supports him. You know?

It came out that the bots, the computers, the Google algo rhythms knew that Trump was going to win. He was 15 points ahead. Hillary tried to steal it but failed. And now they're saying, "Oh he's only, you know, 55 points of 50. Or 47 points in the polls." You know it's 60, 65. In fact the corporate bots show he's at about 60.

They have put a dent on him with some people. But it doesn't matter. I mean, this is so epic, what do you expect him to do now? And I'm turning it over to you. Go ahead my friend.

- Owen Shroyer: 02:21:56 I'm stunned that anybody still looks at what is main stream media traditional news. Which, uh, by the way is newscertainment. Uh. That anybody believes this is news anymore. What, what has to happen before everybody in this country says, "We are being so bamboozled by mainstream media that I will not accept one thing." If I saw something transpire in front of me that is, uh, classified as news. And then saw an accurate depiction of it on mainstream media, I still wouldn't believe it. We need people to realize at this point that they are feeding you. They are feeding you an agenda driven menu.
- Alex Jones: 02:22:41 Well, they said the sky was blue. I would go out and look at it for myself.
- Owen Shroyer: 02:22:45 I sta-, and if I saw it was blue, I still wouldn't believe it.

Alex Jones: 02:22:48 (laughs).

Owen Shroyer: 02:22:49 They're proving themselves on a daily basis that they are, uh, fake news.

Alex Jones: 02:22:55 So where do they go now? Because I really want to know your opinion on this. I, I just, where do they go now that's six percent believe their BS?

Owen Shroyer: 02:23:00 Uh. Uh. I honestly think people need to go to alternative sources for, for their news. And, and are we supposed to believe the polls? Are we supposed to believe the news after they were proven, uh, liars over the course of the entire campaign and election? Now we're supposed to believe that that Trump is 50 percent or under 50 percent? Or 30 percent I hear in certain, uh, circles? And, and we're supposed to go, "Oh. Oh yeah. Sure."

When, when will we all realize that this is a TV show? All news shows are a TV show.

Alex Jones: 02:23:37 It's the Truman Show.

Owen Shroyer: 02:23:38 Just like Game of Thrones. And everything else you enjoy to watch. They're making money. Putting on a program. And that program is driven by what more people will watch. Has nothing to do with fact anymore. Nothing.

Alex Jones: 02:23:51 I agree. But it's also what the corporations owning that media want because sure. Some of it's for ratings but, and that's come out in the memos. You're right. But it's also about what will get them ratings that the boss's are authorizing? Kind of those two points go together. Because I mean imagine. Uh. True information is super popular. Or people will at least trying to tell the truth. So I think what really handicaps them is they're trying to get ratings with a few things they're allowed to do.

Owen Shroyer: 02:24:16 Yeah. Well, when you see something like, uh, what? Kate, Katie Couric is saying fake news is ripping apart, uh, America at the seams. She's part of it. How, how, they're trying to-

Alex Jones: 02:24:29 They had an MSNBC piece a month ago-

Owen Shroyer: 02:24:32 Take all their personalities because they know-

Alex Jones: 02:24:33 They had, uh, and I'm leaving because i just can't stop listening to you. But I just got to make this point. A month ago they had

Brian Williams with a report on fake news on MSNBC. This is the king of fake. It's like having Hitler running a holocaust museum. I'm sorry. Go ahead and take over Anthony.

Owen Shroyer:

02:24:49

(laughs). Absolutely Alex. It's insanity. The hypocrisy. The, the blatant insult to the American people that they do certain things to say look how stupid you are. That you're actually buying this. And we keep pumping out this garbage. And, and you will buy it. Uh. Its insulting. It's, it's blatant, uh, dishonesty to the American people. Yet so many still eat it up. Uh. And, and, and it, like I said, Katie Couric saying that fake news is ripping, uh, America apart at the seams. Katie Couric was the one, uh, doing, uh, a special on guns in this country. That edited, uh, and took a, uh, comment uh from a panelist that was, uh, in the documentary completely out of context. To change. Absolutely change what the person was saying.

That is fake news. And now she's saying that it's ripping America apart? Their only defense is to go out there and try to make the people believe they're the ones that aren't fake news. And people like Alex. And myself. And, uh, Gavin McGinnis and all the other people that are presenting facts to you and allowing you to voice your opinions on them are the fake news. And we're the dangerous ones. We're dangerous to them. I agree with that. We're dangerous to them. But how is it dangerous to inform the American people. Give them the absolute facts and then let them build their own opinions on it. When you watch mainstream media these days, you don't get the news. You get people's, uh, uh, interpretation based on the company that owns that, uh, news organization. Uh. And what their agenda is.

That's what you're getting. And, uh, believe me it is a far cry from the facts when it finally, uh, reaches, uh, the American people. Uh. And I'm talking about everything. Look, I appear on Fox News. Uh. On, uh, various programs over there. But I am not, uh, one of these people that take everything that goes on over there as gospel either. They have their agenda. Just like CNN and MSNBC and all of them. We really need to separate ourselves from mainstream media. And, and look elsewhere for, uh, uh, the facts of a story. It's not easy. It's not easy to find, uh, factual information on a lot of stories.

But look. That's part of it. It's very easy to sit down and watch some of these shows and see these, uh, uh, beautiful, beautiful stunning talking heads. Uh. Blathering on. Uh. Uh. About uh what, what they, uh, are feeding you as news. Uh. But you're not getting the full story. Uh. Donald Trump's presidency has been, uh, the campaign and the presidency has been just an

amazing example of, uh, the mainstream media saying, "Well, throw it all out the window. We don't care about cred, credibility anymore. What we care about is our agenda. And putting it across."

So when years ago there was this plausible deniability that there was some type of journalistic integrity. Uh. Now it's completely gone. There is no. I can't imagine anyone with any sense or brains in their head actually believing that it's the news. So what you get. Yes. Absolutely. The greatest witch hunt in American political history. We, uh, listen to people. Um. That have, that have absorbed what mainstream media is feeding them on, uh, Trump, the election, what he's done since he's been elected. His accomplishments. He Russia thing. And people actually believe this speculation and innuendo, and outright lies. They believe it as fact. They go on social media. It spreads it's tentacles. And, uh, it becomes the new truth.

And, and people will argue and debate you based on absolute lies. And you try to, uh, uh, inform them. Uh. Because you've done your research. And, and, uh, they don't want to believe it because they've been infected, infected by mainstream media and the, the crap that they're spreading around as, uh, as real news. Uh. Back in a couple of, uh, seconds. Don't go anywhere. Anthony Cumia for infowars.

Thank you. Hey summer specials ending soon. Super male vitality and survival shield. X2 specials ending today. Quantities are running low. So act now to save 30 percent off each product. Caveman is back at 25 percent off. Secret 12 is back. 25 percent off. DNA force is back at 20 percent off. Get, uh, health support pack micro, micro, uh, uh, ZX and biome defense 50. That's 30 percent off. Living defense. 20 percent off. Pro pure G2.0 traveler is 30 percent off Z shield 30 percent off. [inaudible 02:29:55] select stor able food 30 to 40 percent off. Plus free shipping store wide. Many of these products are going to sell out soon so now is the t-

PART 5 OF 6 ENDS [02:30:04]

Owen Shroyer: 02:30:00 ...store-wide. Many of these products are gonna sell out soon, so now is the time to secure your order at infowarsstore.com.

Owen Shroyer: 02:30:10 Hello, people. How you doing? Um, man, if, if, if, if you need any proof that, uh, the media will do anything to make Donald Trump look bad, um you're out of your mind. It's, it's all out there. We see it. Uh, this is no longer, um, uh, uh, a fact finding. This is a, like they said, a witch hunt, a fishing expedition, um,

but something a little more light, something lighter transpired last week when Trump complimented Emanuel, uh, Macron, uh, complimented his wife, the, um, of course, uh, French President, Emanuel Macron. Uh, they were together, over there in uh, in uh, France. And Donald Trump told uh, his wife, uh, told Macron's wife, "Hey, you look good! You're in good shape. Beautiful."

And the media loses its mind. Loses its mind, saying that this was terrible, this was uh, inappropriate, my god, sexist, misogynistic, blah, blah, blah. Um, get this, get this, it's 2017, I believe, right? Yeah, 2017. Complimenting a woman is now just completely off limits. What, does, does it take a lot to really think this through and see how insane this has gotten? And, and, and, and try your hardest to reverse this? I do believe ... now I haven't done much research on this, but I do believe men have been complimenting women for millennia. I honestly believe ... now you could, you could uh, argue why. You could argue, hey is the guy, uh, complimenting the woman uh, because she's uh, beautiful? That he appreciates this? Is he trying uh, does he has some nefarious uh, ideas perhaps? He's trying to uh, go out with her or something?

That's up for debate. But the, the, what isn't up for debate is that for the existence of man and women, men have been complimenting women, I'm sure it happened in a cave somewhere, "Oh dear, you look wonderful. That pelt, that pelt is marvelous on you." Uh, but, but here in 2017 we've reached an insane crescendo of, of political correctness garbage that a world leader can no longer compliment the uh, beauty of another world's, lea- worl- world leader's wife. Uh, so the media lost its mind.

When, when are we all gonna see this? I, look, I'm no amazing visionary here. I, I don't believe I'm seeing things long before, uh, the rest of humanity. So when I see something like this, and see the level of madness that we've reached, uh, not only in this country but in the, in the whole world, uh, I, I, I wonder how many people are also seeing this and what we are gonna do to combat it. Because this is, if this was just one instance, uh, you know, it would be a funny laugh and you'd blow it off and be like, okay. But this is a symptom of a disease that is going on in, in uh, this country and, and the world, of political correctness run amok, fake news, and this, uh, uh, crucifixion of our president, Donald Trump.

Uh, you know when they get to the level of "Donald Trump complimented a woman and that's a problem," that they really

have run out of things to uh, to say about him. Uh, you know, they're still going with the Russia thing, which we'll get into in, in a moment. I love how Trump is handling that. Um, I don't like how he's handling some other things, we'll also uh, get into that. I uh, I enjoy the, the uh, dressing down he's giving Sessions, I like that whole thing. But uh, if you can't compliment a woman in 2017, we're done. We're done as a race of, of, uh, people and humans. Be back in a second, don't go anywhere. Anthony Cumia in for InfoWars.com.

Owen Shroyer: 02:34:46

Welcome back.

Owen Shroyer: 02:34:49

Bad bad thing. Welcome back, uh, Anthony Cumia, InfoWars.com, uh, I wanna talk about um, Trump blasting Jeff Sessions, Attorney General uh, Jeff Sessions. Uh, Trump said if he knew Jeff Sessions was gonna recuse himself from this Russia investigation, he wouldn't have hired him. And again, ah! They're losing their minds in the media, losing their minds. Uh, isn't it refreshing to have, uh, an honest politician at the helm in the presidency? Isn't it refreshing? Uh, the media would have you believe this is one of the uh, biggest liars that's ever held office, uh, Donald Trump. I see him as one of the most honest people ever to hold the office, because he will say, "Look, this Jeff Sessions, if I knew he wasn't gonna be uh, loyal and uh, he was gonna recuse himself, I never would've hired him."

And a lot of people would think, "Wow, maybe you should've kept that under wraps, maybe you shouldn't have said that." I love it. I love that uh, he's speaking his mind and telling the American people how he feels about certain things. And you know what? He's right! You hire a guy as your Attorney General who is supposed to look into uh, he's, he's like the head, uh, muckity muck as far as law goes in the, in this country. And now you have an investigation about Russian collusion, and again there has never been any proof that Donald Trump was involved in any collusion uh, with Russia, to um, influence the election in any way.

So why recuse yourself? It's another instance that we have seen, uh, oh my god so many times, of the GOP bowing down uh, to the Left and the media, and the uh, the mob, the pitchfork and torch wielding mob that uh, will never be satisfied. "Oh you recused yourself, and we'll put this guy in. Yeah, we're still not satisfied." Uh, wow, uh, I am convinced Donald Trump could come up with a cure for cancer, and the headline would be, "Donald Trump Puts Millions of Doctors Out of Work." That seems to be, uh, his destiny, is to just be

criticized on every single thing he's done or wants to do uh, in this country.

But yeah, you got an Attorney General that you uh, you give the job to, you want something called loyalty. Now that is a dirty word I guess, in Washington, I don't know why. Um, it, it, if you put a team together, just calling it a team kind of, uh, makes you think that they would be loyal to, to the, the team, um. You put a team together, you want everyone on that team to be loyal. Not to a point where they're going to break the law for you, uh, or cover up any, anything you've done, but was there any proof that Donald Trump was involved in, in any kind of collusion with the Russian government uh, for the election? To, to influence the election? No.

So then why would Jeff Sessions recuse himself if not for one thing, the pressure from people that want to see Donald Trump fail ... fail. They wanna see him arrested, they wanna see him strung up, um, in some cases I guess uh, thrown off a cliff? Is that what Rosie O'Donnell uh, was doing? She was saying that Donald Trump should be thrown off a cliff and apparently there was some type of um, game where uh, Donald Trump gets pushed off of a, a cliff and uh, she was, she was very excited about that. Again, the hypocrisy on the Left is insane.

Um, but you want loyalty. You want uh, your team to back you and back your uh, policies and ideas. But for some reason, uh, the left sees that as some type of Nazi Hitler thing to do. I don't, I don't know. Things have become bad words. Loyalty, nationalism. Nationalism is horrible. This used to be something that was looked at with pride, there was a pride in your nation. Uh, every day ... I remember going to school, you would never dream of not putting your hand on your heart and, and, and pledging your allegiance to the flag. I didn't even know what it meant as a kid, uh, "And to the republic for which it stands." I used to think, for which it stands was one word. It sound like someplace in Russia, for which it stands.

But I didn't know what it meant, like, word for word, but I knew it, uh, it, it, its essence was that uh, we lived in America, it was a great nation, and we were proud of uh, our country. Well, now uh, that's a bad word too. That's a bad word, to be proud of your country, to be proud that you're American, to be proud of your heritage, for certain people is uh, a bad thing. You're not, you're not allowed to be proud of um, of uh, achievements that people of your heritage have made over the years, because that's, yes, very good everyone, racist. It's racist to be uh, proud of things that your ancestors have uh, have achieved.

We are only supposed to look at the horribleness, uh, and, and pain that we have dished out over uh, uh, the course of our, our history. Um, other people though have free reign to just uh, talk about their, their pride and their culture. Um, which brings me to something else that uh, I just, just remembered that is absolutely insane.

There is a uh, a movie coming out that looks fantastic, Dunkirk. This is the story uh, in 1940, right about, it's uh, you know, sort of the beginning of World War II, um, British sol- soldiers were trapped on the beach by the Nazis, and um, uh, it was about uh, 400 thousand of them. And they were, their backs to the ocean man. That is the worst position you wanna be in. And uh, and uh ... people from England, from uh, the U.K. came over, on their own personal boats and anything they could carry people in and evacuated all those British uh, soldiers, off of the beach. Just an amazing story, I'm so glad it's being told and done, uh, in this fashion. I love historic movies like this.

Well, there's a problem folks, there's a problem. Uh, the problem is, not enough diversity in the cast! No women, and no people of color. Someone in USA today actually wrote this as a review of the movie, that that was an issue. Again, we've reached this insane point in our, uh, uh, history where an accurate depiction of a historical event is not good enough because it's being portrayed accurately. (Laughs) Is this a hate movie? Is this hate cinema because there aren't enough women or people of color in it?

I gotta tell ya, I wasn't there, but I've uh, done a lot of uh, research on old W W II, and um, that beach was full of a lot of pasty skinned Brits that uh, needed to get off the beach. And a lot of pasty skinned Brits went and got them, that's about it. And as far as the enemy goes, well, they were Nazis. Not gonna find a lot of uh, people of color, uh in that Messerschmitt, Messerschmitt that's uh, flying over the uh, beach. But again, it's a problem.

Diversity for the sake of diversity. It ... they, it makes no sense, uh, especially with a, a movie that is trying to uh, base itself in fact. Um, but again, that's where we are. That's where we are. We, we ... we are constantly told that we need diversity, that diversity is our greatest strength, and um, if it, if something works out well with a diverse group of people, that's wonderful. But that isn't because it was diverse (laughs), you see. Why are we, uh, always being led to believe that that's um, that's the truth.

Uh, yeah, there it is, the complaints that people again- look at that picture, uh, let me try to see, that's an actual picture of some of the soldiers from, uh, back in 1940. Uh, yeah, I don't see many women, I don't see many people of color. Yeah, yeah, wow, an accurate depiction is now a terrible thing. Do you see how we're being lied to? And do you see this indoctrination- we always think of college campuses as being the place that this indoctrination is going on, and oh it is. But college kids, let's be real, are stupid.

They're kids. Uh, they're gonna say dumb things. I never went to college, but I was a dopey kid, and I did stupid things, I believed stupid stuff, and I said stupid stuff. So you can almost cut them some slack for their moronic statements, and this, their moronic belief system, uh, of what this country and world is all about.

When you see things like this, and things that are advertised on uh, uh, TV commercials, TV shows, that is an indoctrination that is being fed to everyone, not just impressionable children. We are being told that um, straight white men are the dumbest people you'll ever find. I have uh, wonderful, uh, evening text sessions, with the, uh, inimitable Gavin McInnes. On a nightly basis we trade videos (laughs) and uh, texts of commercials and TV shows and stuff that just depict straight white men as the world's idiotic little clowns, walking around incapable of doing anything.

Something as simple, I believe there's an insurance company, uh, that's doing a commercial now, where a guy suggests this ... obviously he's married to the woman, he's white and he's a man. Straight white male. He makes this insane assumption that he might've been able to fix a leaky pipe in the ceiling. Well his wife has to say, "No!" Cuts him off, yells "No" at him, and he's just kinda, "Yeah. Yeah I'm a guy, I couldn't possibly fix a pipe or paint a ceiling."

And again, you might go, "Oh Anthony, why be so serious? Why get so worked up over?" Because it's constantly happening. There it is. Look, look, he's just trying ... he looks at the pipe, with a dumb face of course, he's like, "I might be able to fix that." And then "No!" She just yells no. Like he's gonna try to perform brain surgery. "Maybe I could cut our kid's head open and perform br-" "No!" It's a pipe, lady, relax.

But this is constant. It's a constant, uh, uh, nonstop buffet we're being fed of this uh, propaganda and indoctrination. Nothing and no one could be honest to, uh, the American people. Uh, another prime example of this, uh, John McCain. John McCain

is, I'll say it, pretty ill. (Laughs) he's pretty sick. Um, we just learned he has brain cancer. Uh, God bless. Uh, he's got brain cancer.

Now, every single time a politician goes into the hospital, for anything, we are told, "Everything's fine. He has a splinter in his head, we pulled it out and he's joking with the staff already." You know, it's always some nice, funny scenario. And then as time goes by, they feed us the inevitable horrid truth that uh, you know, he's got one foot in the grave and another on a skateboard.

Uh, but they cannot be honest with us. The politicians and the mainstream media are incapable of being honest with us, and I feel it's because they deem us too stupid, and uh, sensitive to accept the truth about anything, so it has to be fed to us in, in stages like you would, like you would tell a, uh, a child about an impending divorce of their parents. You don't just go, "Yeah! Me and your mom are splitting up." It's gotta be done gently. They treat us like children.

Um, and this has been done constantly. If you remember when um, Ronnie Reagan was shot, uh, years ago, we uh, we were pretty much told, "You know, he caught the bullet, he threw it, he joked with the staff and uh, was back at the White House." Uh, for a while, for a while we were, we were told that. And it turns out that guy was just about dead. Uh, when you watch documentaries on the Reagan uh, attempted assassination now, you realize it was a grave situation. But even as far back as that, they just lied to us and um ... it hasn't stopped, it has only gotten worse. Only gotten worse.

The investigation that's going on, the Russia investigation by um, Mueller, the um, guy in charge, the, the uh, guy in charge of the investigation, there he is, Robert Mueller. Um, he's now investigating Trump's business dealings and uh, business transactions. Where did this come from? How is this relevant uh, to the investigation? Did they find something that made it relevant to the investigation? That's, that's important, I believe. Uh, if they did find something, oh, uh, Trump colluded, he said, uh, "We'll take this info and I'll give you this, and we will exchange, uh, things that are valuable to each other, and uh, that'll be great." Yeah, that would be a problem.

I've heard or seen nothing that proves that happened between him, or Trump Junior, or anyone else in Trump's organization that that happened. You'd be hard pressed to um, to find that on mainstream media though, they're making all kinds of uh,

accusations and speculations that are being fed to you on social media as fact. But uh, now they're looking into business dealings. Does anyone remember uh, what Trump did before he was president? Anyone? You? Who should I pick, you, alright you, who? What did he do?

That's right, he was a business man! He did business! He wasn't a career politician, that's why he won the election by the way. Being a businessman, a world, global businessman, he did business with, anyone? Yes, world leaders and world organizations! Absolutely, very good. So (laughs) so you can't then say he was uh, doing anything inappropriate just for doing business with other uh, countries. That's what business people do. Now again if there were any um, illicit or inappropriate dealings, that's another thing. Again, nothing has come forward that shows there was.

So if you have a life politician, lifetime politician that is doing business with foreign governments, that might get you like, "Huh, maybe something's going on here." But if you have a businessman doing business, that's called success. That's called doing what he was supposed to do. And the fact that they are now, they got their grimy, uh, paws in, in that whole thing is um, par for the course, and astounding. But typical of what we've seen. Uh, we'll be back in a very short moment, don't go anywhere. Anthony Cumia in at InfoWars.com.

Thank you so much, deep voice guy. Love that guy. Uh, yes, welcome back, Anthony Cumia in at InfoWars.com. Uh, I wanna finish up uh, today with uh, praise the Lord and pass the ammunition, OJ's out. The Juice is loose, ha ha! Uh, he's not out yet, I believe uh, they have to ... boy that's gotta be tough, huh? Like you know you're out, I believe October, beginning of October OJ will be released. He's been paroled after nine years in prison for um, armed robbery, kidnapping, knocking down people's mailboxes, driving through back yards. Got a girl in the car, that's a [inaudible 02:53:04]. Uh, Sheriff [inaudible 02:53:06] Justice. Uh, yeah, he's um, he's gonna get out, he's been paroled.

Uh, the parole hearing was interesting. Uh, OJ does not shut up. He's gonna, he's gonna be arrested for talking people to death uh, when he gets out, it must be um, it must be odd after nine years you're gonna be out and about and famous. Like you know, most people, they get out of prison and uh, might remember an old guy named Brooks. They put him in the uh, in the grocery store, he was bagging groceries. Then he went back

to his house and uh, carved "Brooks was here," and then hung himself. Uh, I don't see OJ doing that.

But it's gotta be weird, you get out of prison, you're on parole, a probation, um, and, uh, uh, and your paroled, and um, you're famous, you're OJ. That's crazy! But uh, he is out and he's gotta wait now, what is it July through August, September ... he's gotta wait like a couple of months. That's gotta be the hardest time. Remember when Quint in Jaws was talking about when uh, that big old PBY came flying down, and he goes, "That's when I was most scared. Thinking it was my turn." Like, right before you get on the plane you think that last, you're the last one the shark's gonna get? Like, OJ's gotta be scared that he's gonna get shanked or something.

He better not skew, steal any um, any of the white supremacist's cookies or anything in, in prison. He just better do some, some easy time. Or could you see if he gets in a fight and winds up killing somebody? Like OJ has to kill somebody in prison, and they're just like, "Yeah, you're in there forever now OJ, sorry. You killed someone." Um, well OJ Simpson paroled after nine years, uh, the, the humorous note, he did kill two people, remember? Remember when he killed two people?

Uh, I, I didn't think he was gonna get out, I was watching the hearing and uh, OJ does not seem to place uh, responsibility on himself. He went off about the episode that happened in that Las Vegas hotel room where him and uh, a bunch of other guys uh, burst in the room to co- reclaim what he said was his sports memorabilia, uh, with a guy with a gun, uh, they held people against their will, and uh, took this merchandise back. Um, and from what I was watching on the hearing, OJ seemed to blame everyone in the room except OJ (laughs).

But, you know, in the uh, wisdom of the uh, panel, that uh, was in front of OJ, uh, they let him go. His uh, daughter made a statement saying that uh, OJ is um, a great guy, just wants to spend time with his kids. And the victim of the crime testified in OJ's defense, and said that in the interim between the crime and now they have, re uh, kindled their friendship and everything is uh, hunky dory. So I am really looking forward to OJ on Twitter, Facebook OJ. OJ actually said, uh, he might do a podcast or uh, a web, uh, show of some sort. A bl, b- a vlog. I am ... I am there, regardless of what this maniac, murderer does, I will watch.

Uh, thank you so much for tuning in. Thank you to Alex Jones for having me. Um, Anthony Cumia, over at

compoundmedia.com, in right now and uh, loving every minute of it at InfoWars.com, I'll see you in a couple of weeks.

PART 6 OF 6 ENDS [02:56:46]

APPENDIX 6:

**Affidavit of Alex E. Jones from Appellants' Motion to Dismiss under TCPA
(CR:801-804)**

NEIL HESLIN,
Plaintiff,

V.

ALEX E. JONES, INFOWARS, LLC,
FREE SPEECH SYSTEMS, LLC, and
OWEN SHROYER,
Defendants

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF

TRAVIS COUNTY, T E X A S

261st JUDICIAL DISTRICT


AFFIDAVIT OF ALEX E. JONES

STATE OF TEXAS §
 §
COUNTY OF TRAVIS §

BEFORE ME, the undersigned notary public, on this day personally appeared Alex E. Jones, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed below, and who on his oath, deposed and stated as follows:

1. My name is Alex E. Jones. I am over the age of 21 years, have never been convicted of a felony or crime involving moral turpitude, am of sound mind, and am fully competent to make this affidavit. I have personal knowledge of the facts herein stated and they are true and correct.

2. I regularly criticize the mainstream media (MSM) for what I view as biased reporting intended to sway public opinion in a liberal direction. In my July 20, 2017 broadcast, I criticized YouTube and Google for refusing first amendment rights by accepting false copyright claims to remove posts. I criticized MSM for claiming I was harassing Sandy Hook families and telling others to harass those families and for



Appendix 6

removing my own videos. I then continued to criticize CNN and Anderson Cooper, mentioning that MSM had a history of false reporting. One of the videos that MSM had censored was Owen Shroyer's of June 25, 2017 in which he reported others' criticisms of NBC and Megyn Kelly for failing to fact check aspects of NBC's broadcast of June 18, 2017 and sloppy reporting.

3. The entire context of my remarks was within my expression of my opinions about the lack of honesty and integrity from MSM and our government. This is consistent with my firm and long shared beliefs in defending the First and Second Amendments and my criticisms of MSM's and the government's exploitation of tragic and notorious events, such as the Sandy Hook shootings, to restrict free speech and gun ownership in this country. I have long believed and opined that MSM and our government will report "fake news" in order to mislead people and manipulate public opinions.

4. In addition, NBC's broadcast with Ms. Kelly's voice overs and editing was intended to and did unfairly and inaccurately portray and criticize my own beliefs and opinions and was also intended to criticize many others who similarly question our government and MSM reports. I also believe that NBC also intended to create and profit by controversy surrounding me, my companies and my opinions. They intentionally fanned this controversy by slanting their reporting of my interview and by including interviews with others to criticize and rebut what they intended to convey to their viewers as my opinions. One of their goals appeared to be to cast my views and reporting as "fake news" just as I have criticized NBC and other MSM companies for reporting fake news.


What is and is not “fake news” has been an extremely contentious topic and controversy in and among the media and general population for the past several years.

5. During the July 20, 2017 broadcast about which Plaintiff complains, I did not know that any fact I stated was false nor did I intend to convey any false impression with regard to Mr. Heslin. Prior to the broadcast, I became aware of Owen Shroyer’s comments on June 25, 2017 when he reported and commented on an article published online by Zero Hedge entitled “Megyn Kelly Fails To Fact Check Sandy Hook Father’s Contradictory Claim In Alex Jones Hit Piece.” Prior to the July 20 broadcast I saw no reports that stated the bodies had been released to the families in contradiction to the reports described and referred to in the Zero Hedge article or the videos that Owen showed. I did not know that the article’s reporting or that any source’s facts contained therein was false when I discussed the Shroyer broadcast and showed it during the July 20 broadcast nor at the time of the that broadcast did I have any serious doubts as to their veracity.


6. I am the sole member of Defendant Free Speech Systems, LLC and the sole member of Infowars, LLC.

7. Neither I nor Owen Shroyer has ever been an employee of Infowars, LLC.

Further Affiant Sayeth Not.


Alex E. Jones

SWORN TO and SUBSCRIBED before me by Alex E. Jones on July 13/14,
2018.


Notary Public in and for
the State of Texas

My Commission Expires:

4-21-2022

