

16 November 2023

<https://youtu.be/BhlsOXkk9rw>

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: Renate, so tell us what's going on because it seems like something is happening, more than something happening, someone is trying, looking ahead, and seeing that something has gone wrong with the Elite's plans, and someone is saying "Ok, but why do I have to go down with you?" and says that the deals were clear. As for us, we'd already said certain things. You're the one who interpreted that, and we gave you a hand, and you took the whole arm and told people that the politicians, in cahoots with the Big Elite, exploited the whole situation. That's it and so it would seem that even the EMA basically said certain things before and so you in your battle are shedding some light on the defense of health care workers and the people who were forced onto a certain path and basically, the documentation is slowly coming out. Tell us what's going on.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: Yes. So what's going on, given that from the beginning, I tried precisely to get the truth out based exclusively on institutional documentation that was part of precisely these authorization procedures because I realized from the beginning that arguing on the basis of individual studies, even though they might be the most authoritative, obviously didn't lead anywhere while the documentation from the authorities that were ultimately in charge of the authorization process for these so-called covid-19 vaccines at the time could not be negated.

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: Sure.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: And as you know, Fabio, during this beautiful broadcast that you do and that luckily exists, we brought up the EMA Assessment report several times. That is the assessment report that the EMA had to do for each of these substances as part of the authorization process, and where it precisely said from the very beginning, "Look, we have no evidence that these substances can inhibit viral infection." To tell the truth, I showed it to judges during trials, but they were only interested in the rulings of the Constitutional Court, even though this didn't take into consideration at all the documents that really matter, which are the documents of the EMA, the European Commission and the manufacturers, and not those of the Ministry of Health, of the AIFA, of the Superior Institute of Health because in these authorization processes, the Italian authorities had to, they should have carried out with accuracy what was indicated in the documentation that comes from the centralized authorization process at the European level. Instead, they didn't do this. And the indisputable confirmation has just come out and they will have to take this document into account because it is a response sent by the European Medicines Agency to a group of European parliamentarians who, in a letter of October 4, asked very specific questions and that letter of October 18 will be published *in toto* after the press conference that will take place on November 21, that is next week, and which I will also attend and where every aspect of this response from the EMA will be commented on.

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: Excuse me. Excuse me, Renate. So let's clarify, so the EMA issued a formal response that will be presented at a press conference on November 21 in the European Parliament.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: Yes, in Strasbourg.

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: In Strasbourg. You're going to be there. What we've seen, what we're seeing, even for those who are watching us even on TV, is the first page of this document here.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: Exactly. It is this document here, and on this first page, the EMA gives a fundamental answer and that we anticipate here today because it is of such a diriment importance for so many pending trials here in Italy. And precisely what is it about? The first question the

parliamentarians specifically asked the EMA was, if in their opinion, these so-called covid-19 vaccines did not have the efficacy to prevent viral infection, then the policy that was used was illegitimate, absolutely inappropriate, if precisely their opinion was correct. You see under the point "the authorized indications," I'll now read the response given under point one, which you see here in the original English language translated into Italian is what the EMA responds to this group of MEPs.

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: So let's repeat the simple, precise question so that everyone can understand what the parliamentarians' question was...

RENATE HOLZEISEN: The question to the EMA is summarized in the answer. So reading the answer, we understand exactly--

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: You understand the question. Well, okay. Please continue.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: -- the question. So the EMA says, "With respect to your question concerning the authorized indications"--what does indication mean? Every medicinal product, this must be anticipated, every medicinal product, when it is specifically authorized to be marketed, therefore for use on patients, on people, therapeutic indications must also be established. And in this case, the parliamentarians specifically said, it is our opinion that the policy implemented, namely imposing vaccine obligations, green pass, therefore direct and indirect obligations, was based on the grounds that it would inhibit-

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: --the disease, transmission.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: Indeed, it has no basis in the in the papers that we have seen and that are part of the Union's process.

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: Here we summarize, sorry, we always summarize so that all the Maries listening, that's an example of course, you always use that name because it's the most common one in Italy. Then a drug, when it's put into circulation, so it's cleared basically to circulate, the pharmaceutical company always issues the characteristics and also what it's for. That's the point. What does that drug do? Because otherwise what do we get it for, I mean what is the purpose of a drug? Okay, it's to treat a disease, prevent something, this also has to be certified. That also has to be proven. Because it's not like we produce something, we put it out there and say it does something. Well, doesn't it? That is not possible. There has to be a minimum of proof. In this case, when these so-called vaccines were put on the market, actually, actually the pharmaceutical companies had said things that are emerging that are totally different from what we were fed. And which were taken as the basis for some obligations that erased constitutional rights! Furthermore, those rights could not have been erased even if those drugs actually did what these politicians said they did. All right? But even, it's coming out of these documents that Renate so stubbornly is getting, credit of course to her and other people like her and her collaborators who are lending a hand in this very tough battle. Okay, here it is. But it's even emerging that not only it would have been absurd, I repeat, I repeat it incessantly to myself, it would have been absurd, illegitimate, and unconstitutional even if they had, if those drugs had done what the politicians promised, the politicians! Attention! The politicians were making the promises! Not the pharmaceutical company or the EMA! Because it's coming out that neither the pharmaceutical company nor the EMA ever made those promises, who today are saying, "What do you want from us? We told you so!" So much so that even in other hearings, like those involving Pfizer, they made fun of the politicians! "What do you want from us? We told you something else. It is you then who have gone further." Sorry, I'm translating into popular language, Renate, but that's how it is. Did I say something wrong?

RENATE HOLZEISEN: Yes, that's how it is, and now let's read the answer.

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: All right. Please continue.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: So the EMA, directly addressing the parliamentarians, says, *"You state that in view of the authorized indications, vaccines should be inoculated only to people who seek their own personal protection and that the vaccines are not authorized for the purpose of reducing transmission or the rate of infection, so-called transmission control."*

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: Yes, of course.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: *"You also state that the licensed indication does not correspond to the uses promoted by pharmaceutical companies, politicians and health professionals. In fact, you are right to point out that covid-19 vaccines have not been licensed for the prevention of viral transmission from one person to another. The claims refer only to the protection of the vaccinated individual. The product information for covid-19 vaccines clearly states that the vaccines are for active immunization to prevent covid-19. Also from the Assessment reports, we have precisely said before that they are the EMA's assessment reports, in the authorization of the vaccines, there is a clear lack of data on viral transmissibility. The EMA will continue to be transparent about the authorized use of covid-19 vaccines and identify areas where misunderstandings need to be countered."* So apart from the fact that obviously you have to blame the EMA as well because its transparency could have been expressed a little bit more explicitly, because obviously pointing it out only on one page of the Assessment reports and not making a press release right away when it was, I mean, all over the web, all over the media, that in certain countries, and especially in Italy, these substances were being used for a stated purpose which, however, had not been authorized, that had not been indicated in the authorization of these substances. Let's say that this is something that obviously shows that the EMA now, because even the EMA itself, and the EMA managers will have enormous difficulty to exonerate themselves for other aspects which we will not talk about today.

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: We're not going to talk about that.

RENATE HOLZEISEN: Regarding the indication that these substances did not have precisely the purpose specifically proclaimed, touted, especially in Italy, remember when Don Draghi said, "If you don't get vaccinated, you die and you kill others." Okay? This is true. It was apparent from the very beginning from the Assessment reports, precisely that documentation that I also showed several times in this broadcast and elsewhere. I remember the fact that at the request of the Constitutional Affairs Committee of the Senate of the Italian Republic, I at the end of January 2022, so at a still very hot phase of direct and indirect imposition of the covid-19 vaccine requirement, I had made explicit reference always pointing to the links of the EMA sites and so on also the Assessment report pointing out to the senators that these substances absolutely did not have the efficacy that would be needed for the purpose propagated in Italy. So, we are faced with a glaring case of a violation of even the regulations on the legitimate off-label use of a drug, because we know drugs have to be indicated according to the therapeutic indications stated in an authorization and they may then also be used, under the direct responsibility of the physician, when he believes a drug that has not been authorized for a certain indication may have benefits in the treatment of a patient, he may use it. However, he has to explain to the patient that he intends to use the drug off-label.

RADIO RADIO - FABIO: Off-label, and he can do it. Excuse me Renate, let's stop there for now. We'll come back to it later. You're a highly respected lawyer moreover your résumé speaks volumes and so, let's also analyze the legal issue because to me, it really seems like there's some kind of subversion of the democratic system on this issue. Bear with me! Let's talk about the off-label drugs

that can be given by physicians and those physicians who did it expecting it to be off-label with their patients that they saved from covid at the beginning with drugs. They were suspended, banned, etc., etc. Instead, these people take a drug that has absolutely no information. They not only administer it but they oblige everyone to get it or else they lose their job and are excluded from society, sent to the ghettos. But man, fµking A, we need to talk about the Constitutional Court. What are we talking about? When the rulings go against the most basic of common sense? Not only can they be criticized but in my opinion they really need to be revised as well!