

Actionable intelligence to live a Free & Inspired Life



The Solari Report

September 17, 2020

Special Solari Report:

Covid-19: Ohio Stands Up –

Jon Rappoport Interviews

Attorney Tom Renz



Jon Rappoport: This is Jon Rappoport, investigative reporter at www.NoMoreFakeNews.com, and this is being brought to you by www.Solari.com, Catherine Austin Fitts. I'm here with Ohio attorney Tom Renz, who has filed, what I believe, is a stunning, astonishing, much-needed lawsuit in Ohio on behalf of plaintiffs against Governor Mike DeWine and the State of Ohio for their declaration of a state of emergency and the damages that have ensued as a result of that declaration, including business closures, lockdown, etc.

But that is just the beginning of this, as you will see, as this conversation ensues. So, Tom, thank you for being here. Having read through your lengthy court filing, to say that I was pleasantly surprised would be a vast understatement because you're not only basing this case on Constitutional facts and freedom, but on the science underlying the declaration of the state of emergency, which I believe is absolutely essential.

Can you say something about that? I think that, not only should the audience be taking notice of this, but other attorneys out there should as well.

Thomas Renz: Thanks for having me, Jon. I'm honored to be here.

You are right. When we were looking at this, we talked to our clients, and they wanted to get back to normal – real normal. They didn't want to get back to 'new normal' or 'Venezuela normal'; they wanted to get back to being Americans and living in a free republic.

We looked at how we could do this, and one of the things that became apparent was that there were many great attorneys out there who were challenging things. The problem is that many of them are challenging this on various bases where they may get an order or two orders struck down, but it's like cutting the head off Hydra; once you do it, two more heads come up.

So we looked at this and said, "If we really want this to go away, we need to show that this shouldn't be here in the first place. We have to challenge the premise."

It's a tough thing to do in a court and for an attorney. If we could do math, we

would be engineers; if we could do science, we would be doctors. Instead, we are attorneys.

The thing about it is that we had to do plenty of work to take this science – the real science – and boil it down to something that was useful and digestible in both the courts and for us to be able to argue. So we did that, and the idea was that if the science and the facts that underlie this entire action are false, then we shouldn't be doing what we're doing.

Rappoport: Just to restate what you are saying in summary terms, if I, for example, as a governor say, “I’m declaring a state of emergency because we have a very threatening, dangerous situation here, and this justifies the following actions that I am taking: Stay home, don’t go to work, wear a mask, etc.,” then somebody like you and your clients have the right to come along and say, “Whoa! Wait a minute. What are you basing this declaration on? What are the underlying facts and science that you think gives you the reasonable right to declare this a state of emergency in the first place?”

Renz: Yes, essentially, the power to declare an emergency is important. If we get invaded or if we have a bio-attack, the governors have to be able to react. So, we don’t question that they have a right to react, but they have to have a basis for reacting, and it has to be a factual basis.

That hasn’t been tested thoroughly under the Constitution. The Supreme Court did give us precedent to say that we absolutely have the right to challenge an ongoing emergency. That came from a case during the Great Depression back then. It’s not quite as old as Jacobson, which all the governors are relying on for this, which is amazing because Jacobson, as a case, does not justify any of this, but that case allows us to challenge the premise. It allows us to challenge whether this emergency should be here.

There are many new things in this constitutionally, but that is somewhat a summary of it.

Rappoport: If I am the Governor and say, “We have 16,000 new cases in the last four weeks, which is a tremendous threat, therefore this justifies my lockdown order,” and you could show in court that the 16,000 new cases are

actually 34 new cases, then this would be relevant – to say the least.

Renz: Very, very relevant. Ultimately, this is something that your viewers and listeners should be afraid of. There is not actually a very well-defined precedent for what you have to do to have an ‘emergency’. That is terrifying to me.

There are also many things that happen once an emergency has been declared that have not been very well-tested in the courts. So, we don’t know some of that. We think that we do, and we certainly believe that in America, the Constitution prevents these people from just ‘going crazy’. But you know what? Ultimately, you are dead-on. It boils down to this: If we say as governors that we have 190,000 deaths and we have to start taking actions to save our country, and these actions mean that we can do whatever we have to do, but it turns out that there are only 40,000 deaths, that certainly doesn’t support that. It’s very relevant in court.

Rappoport: Absolutely. I won’t say that this is completely missing from people’s minds, but they’ve been treated to such a terrifying amount of ‘news’ media – what I would call propaganda with public health officials spouting off pronouncements from high places – that the public seems to be hypnotized by all this and to accept it without question.

For instance, I don’t know what you want to hear and exactly how much detail, but let’s take – for example – the diagnostic test for COVID-19; the PCR test. You are prepared to argue in court that this test is not what it seems to be.

Renz: Absolutely, and I definitely want to talk about that, but let me hit upon something that you said first that is actually critical to this. You mentioned the propaganda. This is why people like you are so important. Honestly, that is intentional. We have documents from the CDC, we have evidence, and you don’t even need to look at our evidence.

Run a Google search for: Public health motivational theory and fear. If you run a Google Scholar search and look into this, you will find that since the 1960’s, this is just part of public health education; this isn’t conspiracy theory. When you want to become a public health specialist, this is what you learn: If you want people to follow public health dictates, you have to scare them. This is

intentional.

We have a document from a CDC spokesman talking about how he needs to partner with the media, how he needs to create high levels of fear and anxiety in the public to promote what, in this instance, was a vaccination. He wanted to have everyone taking the flu vaccine. He was talking to industry executives about how to increase demand on it. It was a ‘mind-blowing’ presentation. It was so frank and honest; it really was amazing.

They talk about partnering with the news media and putting out this information where the ‘glass is always half empty’. They are able to spin it so that there is some basis of truth, but they always have to present the ‘glass as half empty’ so that you can scare the population into action. That is truly both unethical and no more than a manipulation of the public. That is underlying much of what we are hearing in the news, and I’m not sure why there aren’t more people like you who are actually investigating this far enough to find out the truth.

The truth is there; you do have to do some digging, but there is plenty of journalistic malpractice in this.

We need people like you doing this, and I am grateful for that. That is why I am grateful to be here. If we don’t get the word out, then we have a narrative created by people who are making millions of dollars off promoting the narrative.

The funding that has been going to the CDC from promoting this narrative is ‘mind-blowing’.

This isn’t some person talking about a conspiracy theory; this is reality. If you search and do any homework on public health and public motivational theory, and getting the people to do what they need to do, much of it is based on fear.

In our case, we actually have a separate document from a couple of public health professionals who find that approach in this to be somewhat unethical, and they argue against the problems that it is going to cause. Ultimately, when people find out that the facts of this case are what they are – the ‘true facts’ –

and they find out that they have been lied to, then what happens the next time when we have a real public health emergency, nobody believes the CDC because they've destroyed their credibility.

That becomes a real crisis, and then we could lose many lives – all because it was more convenient, and we received the funding this time to promote it. That is a critical part, and it is something that I think is really important to point out when you ask that question.

Rappoport: The narrative that you are talking about is a narrative that claims to be talking science.

Renz: Yes, it does.

Rappoport: In other words, it is invoking fear – that is the purpose of it – but it is doing it with numbers, statistics, and ‘take this test’ or ‘trace here’ or ‘stay home because of the transmission of the virus’ and so on. The narrative is built on these bricks of so-called science, which actually, when you look below the surface, is not science at all.

Renz: Right. I have people tell me, “You’ve been fact checked, and that has been debunked.” Well, here is what you have to know: If I lie in Federal court, I lose my license. So if I don’t believe what I’m saying, it doesn’t work well for me.

I have documents; I have evidence; I have evidence that will be presented to the Federal court. For example, we have the Director of Public Health in Illinois on record stating that the number of people in the death count is people ‘with COVID’, not ‘from COVID’. We have a similar statement from Dr. Birx herself. So when we hear about these 190,000 deaths ‘from COVID’, that is not ‘from’. This is an example of how they manipulate it. They change the death tracking for COVID. This came out in a CDC document, and we can site it, as we do in the case. Before I get letters about conspiracy theories, review the CDC documents.

The 190,000 number is the number of people who have died ‘with’ COVID. I don’t know I believe that is even the number of people who have died with

COVID because the testing for COVID is nonsense. But that means under CDC guidelines if you get hit by a bus and die, and you die from being hit by the bus, but you had COVID when you were dying, you would be counted as dying ‘from’ COVID.

We have absurd examples of people who were listed as COVID deaths when they obviously didn’t die from COVID, but they died with COVID. So legally, they are allowed to be listed as a COVID death.

This deception and this misleading of the public – between the ‘with’ and the ‘from’ – is a critical thing. My scientists who have evaluated the data on the CDC and who have done their homework, and these people are smarter than any person should ever be, are estimating that the total number of people who have probably died ‘from’ COVID (not ‘with’ COVID) to be in the 25,000 to 35,000 range, which is not even a really severe flu season.

Rappoport: So to summarize the ‘with’ and the ‘from’, if I happen to be diagnosed with COVID and then have a motorcycle crash and die on the freeway, then somebody writes ‘COVID-19 death’ on my file, and that counts as a COVID death. That would be COVID ‘with’ the virus supposedly, as opposed to, “No, the virus actually caused the death, which is death ‘from’ the virus.”

This, to put it very politely, is a confusion of ‘from’ and ‘with’ that would cause the actual death count in the United States who are said to be dead from COVID-19, to plummet to levels that are at the level of a mild flu season. Of course, we have never had any lockdowns or states of emergency or mask-wearing mandates or social distancing or anything like this from an ordinary flu season.

Renz: That is true.

Rappoport: So, talk about the PCR test, which is supposedly the gold standard. This is what is used to say, “You’re a case; you’re a COVID case; you’re infected; you have the virus. We now count you as a COVID case because you tested positive on the diagnostic test, which is called the PCR.”

Discuss that.

Renz: I've had many doctors spend plenty of time educating me on this PCR test, and we've looked at this from every angle. What we've done is taken the worst-case scenario for our case and our view from that position. We have to do that because we would rather argue and win big than the other way around.

So, the PCR test was invented by a person who won a Nobel Prize for the test. He's brilliant, and specifically said, "This test is wonderful for labs and should never be used to diagnose illness."

He said that because it doesn't work; you can't diagnose illness with a PCR test.

When this all started, everybody talked about tests. "We don't have tests, we don't have tests, we don't have tests."

So, they came up with something – anything – because that is what politicians do. This wasn't anybody's fault; this was just reality. No one ever tests for population-based viruses like this that are not super-super severe. There just isn't anything; we don't test everybody in the population for the flu.

So, they came up with this PCR test, which doesn't work. In Ohio, Governor DeWine tested positive before he tested negative over the course of two days or three days or something like that. He tested positive, and then he had two more negative tests the next two days.

How could that happen in a gold standard test? I'll tell you how it could happen: The PCR test looks and sees whether or not there are any fragments of the virus that causes COVID-19-fragments!

We go through our life every day, and my doctors have explained to me that we have numerous viruses and bacteria and all sorts of 'nasty things' that are in our system all the time. They float around in the air; they are a part of the world, and that is why we have an immune system. Our immune system wins almost all the time.

So, having a fragment does not mean that you are sick, nor does it mean that

you are infected, nor does it mean anything else; it only means that you have a fragment. This test is super-hyper sensitive and can tell whether or not you have a fragment.

If you have a fragment and, depending on who your test-maker is, because the CDC has not set a standard for what it means to have COVID-19, there is no national standard. Instead, every one of the 100+ manufacturers of the COVID tests set their own standard. So if you take it with one test, you may have it, and if you take it with another test, you may not.

So, these manufacturers all set the standard because there is no national standard, and once you run it, you could have a fragment of this virus in your system that is completely meaningless; you may never get sick, you may never have any issues, but you can still be diagnosed as a COVID case under this gold standard type of a test.

You have the potential for a massive number of false positives, and it just depends on how you run the test. It's interesting to see them talk about how there could be false negatives, but they don't mention the false positives. It doesn't really matter whether there are negatives or positives because the test doesn't work and it doesn't mean anything.

Rappoport: To establish that in court – and I know exactly what you are talking about because I've written extensively on the PCR – you will have to call expert witnesses. Actually, before that, you will be doing discovery, which means bringing people in who are reputed experts who are the officials giving us the official line, and questioning them at great length in detail under oath.

Renz: Yes.

Rappoport: So I'm assuming that this would mean you would have people sitting there, and you would say, "Okay, now we are going to enter this area of discussing the PCR test because you have made many statements about the test and what it means and how we must rely on it and base our decisions on it to lock down, etc. So, we want to get your statements on the record and ask you very serious questions about the veracity and reliability and accuracy of the test."

So, I presume that in this discovery process, a great deal of highly significant information is going to come out.

Renz: That is absolutely our hope. I will tell you that coming into this case, probably the number one most strategic aspect of this case was getting to discovery; discovery is everything.

I'm a normal man from Ohio; I'm not special. I'm an attorney, and do my best; I'm fighting for a cause. There are better attorneys than me and better people than me and smarter people than me. I know that.

My goal here, though, was that if I got to discovery – which we are getting there now, and will have discovery – then that means that I can start bringing the facts to light. This is the real facts, no spin; I get to see the real data.

It's an interesting thing because in Ohio, we've had elected officials from the Ohio general assembly be ignored when they ask for data on this from the Governor's office. No one is sharing any of the data. I don't know what they have to hide. I know that you don't typically hide something unless you have something to hide.

But as we get to this data from the CDC, and from the Ohio Department of Health, and from all these different groups and we see the real data, we will be able to make public – God willing – this information. As soon as we get this information and get it ready, we will submit it to the court, which typically becomes public record. People will be able to see what the truth is.

There is no question about conspiracy; there is no question about whether it's real or not, it's just based on their data.

We have done everything in our case based on their data, but they have hidden a lot of it. So, we couldn't do any more.

I welcome more of it, but discovery will allow us to find out the 'real truth'. It will also allow us to find out who knew what and when they knew it. Who has been lying? When did they start lying? Did the doctors who were making large amounts of money off Federal funds lie? Did they commit fraud to get that

money? Did the Governor lie? Who lied?

Based on the data that we are seeing, someone is lying. And this is their data, not mine. So, I am very eager for discovery. Ultimately, after discovery, it doesn't matter whether I win or not; somebody will be able to win in a big way.

Don't get me wrong; I will try to win. I'm carrying this to the bitter end one way or another, and I am very eager to do so. But the key here is getting the facts and finding the facts and getting these facts out to the public. Not only do we need to win in the court, but we need to make sure that the public is aware of what has happened so that they are capable of knowing in the future that maybe we shouldn't just say, "Trust your elected officials, trust your bureaucrat," which I keep hearing.

I don't trust them. They need to show me and prove to me that there is a reason to take my rights away before I'm willing to just trust them to take them away.

Discovery is huge, and we are very excited about it.

Rappoport: Discovery could show, for instance, much, much lower case numbers than announced. It could show much, much lower death numbers than announced. The test itself is unreliable. It is useless, in fact. Scare tactics have been consciously deployed in order to frighten people into accepting dictates handed down from government officials. This so-called pandemic, which is used to justify all these harsh, harsh measures, is not really a pandemic at all.

Discovery could reveal all of this.

Renz: Yes, it really could.

Rappoport: You could have Anthony Fauci being there in discovery under oath with you rolling up your sleeves for a very long question and answer session.

Renz: We hope to do just that. I would love to have many of these people explain to me their basis for arguing that we should have our fundamental rights

abridged. I heard them just recently, and Redfield was talking about these masks.

I almost wore a mask to this interview because I thought that maybe it could prevent me from spreading a computer virus, and I wanted to be courteous to you. I figured it would do as good a job of stopping a computer virus to you as it would in stopping coronavirus to someone else. It's absurd.

We have decades of science on masks because doctors have worn them in the operating room 'forever'. They wear them in the operating room, not because it stops viruses from spreading, but if they are operating and happen to get snotty or drooly or something else that is normal and human, it doesn't get into the patient.

The idea that it will actually stop a virus is absurd. It's well known that it doesn't. In fact, it is also well-known in science that if you wear a mask improperly, it is a greater risk than it is a benefit. That is why Fauci and all these people – when this first started happening – said that the public shouldn't wear a mask because they knew it wasn't safe.

I don't know what in 'God's name' they were thinking when they decided to change their mind on all of this. I think that it was probably based on the intent to manipulate people further.

We have an email, and I'm hoping I can get the actual email. It's a screenshot, so I can't use it as evidence yet, but we saw the Governor and one of his doctors talking, and they talked about masks. The comment was made, "Well, at least people can feel like they are a part of the solution."

I don't need to feel like I'm a part of the solution; I don't think that there is a problem. If you want to wear a mask, good, wear one. But don't tell me that I need to. It's absurd.

Rappoport: Why do you think that so many people have fallen into alignment with this? Let's consider masks, for example; you see them everywhere, and if you're not wearing a mask, sometimes you get hostile reactions from people.

Maybe this is outside the scope of the case. I don't know. But what is happening with people?

Renzi: Here is the thing: If I win the case tomorrow and we don't have these conversations, then I still have 100+ million Americans who have been scared and who are going to stay locked in their homes and will never hear anything but the official narrative on it, which will get spun in some 'garbage' way. This is a little outside the case, but it is certainly relevant to winning this fight.

As far as these things go, people trust their doctors, and they should. You should trust your local doctor – YOUR doctor. But he or she has probably been lied to as much as anyone else.

The CDC has a special section where it summarizes data for doctors. You can imagine that it's not always sharing all of the data; it's sharing what makes their case best.

Doctors are busy. They are seeing many patients a day. They have some big health systems telling them that they have to see x number of patients per hour or else. They don't have time to research and study this. Plus, you have to remember that these doctors only see the sickest of the sick.

To them, if you have research that is coming your way from someone who you are supposed to trust – like the CDC or your big hospital system – that says that coronavirus is killing everybody, and then you see only the sickest of the sick, you are going to think that it's trouble and that it's bad.

The problem is that when you get to the data that the CDC is using and sharing with labs and sharing at the highest level, it says something different.

You also have the problem of the fact that if you speak out as a doctor, you may well lose your job. There are many cases of great doctors around the country who have lost their job because they spoke out against the narrative on this. Why is that? It is because these big hospital systems are making large amounts of money from COVID. They lost all sorts of money when the Governor and all these other places shut them down, but the Federal funding ended up being a big deal for them.

So, you have many people who are supporting this narrative, which is making it hard for local people and individuals to know the truth.

I think that the trust for people – between them and their medical providers – is part of the problem. You don't ever question anyone who is a medical provider. I think that went up the chain. When you hear Dr. Fauci and Dr. Birx and Dr. So-and-so all telling you how dangerous it is, how many people can read a scientific study on healthcare? Very, very few because it is complicated. I can't tell you how much time I had to spend learning how to do all this.

The thing is that I think that it's been a very, very well-planned, very sophisticated attempt to manipulate people, and they have done so incredibly effectively. I think that most people just want to go about their lives and didn't have the time or the energy to dig into this.

I mentioned the CDC presentation, and it talks specifically in that presentation about making sure that the media is showing children and people who wouldn't normally be affected and are dying.

Every night, you hear on the news media about the one child who died or the one healthy young adult who died – which is certainly not the norm. In Ohio, the last time I checked, we have not had a single child under the age of 19 die.

They show this on purpose because this is how you scare people. It's a well-placed narrative – and a very well-done narrative – and unless we have someone else out there talking and sharing the truth, why would you question it?

Rappoport: So, I want viewers, readers, and listeners to be reminded again of the double nature of the case that you are filing. This is not only about Constitutional freedoms and the imposed crushing limitations on those freedoms through declarations of states of emergency and lockdowns and closures of businesses and the untold amount of human and economic wreckage that has been caused by incursions on guaranteed freedoms and liberties, but it is also saying that if you are going to declare a state of emergency like this and impose all these restrictions, you are 'on the hook' to explain why. You are on the hook to explain data, facts, and science that justifies this. You can't only say, "The experts all tell us," or, "It's obvious," or, "This is what the

CDC said.”

Your case is coming at it from both angles, and in court, you plan to question the underlying fact and science that is being used or abused to make these emergency declarations. So, you ‘pull the pin’ out from under the whole thing, in other words.

Renz: Absolutely. We believe that the premise is flawed; you have to have a reason.

There are different standards. When you go to court and have to argue something unconstitutional – and I’m not going to get too much in the ‘weeds’ here because it will put people to sleep rather quickly – the court looks at it through a different lens.

If you made a law that was a racist law, for example, the state has to prove that the law is necessary, and it serves a compelling interest, and it’s narrowly tailored. So, they have a high standard to meet.

There are other laws where the states only have to have a rational basis, and certain things can be abridged on a rational basis. But there are arguably three main standards, and what we are saying is that certainly, the facts don’t justify meeting the high standard, the facts don’t justify meeting the intermediate standard, and we absolutely do not believe that the facts justify even meeting the lowest standard to bridge Constitutional rights.

One of the things that has not really been tested enough, in my opinion, under the Constitution is the 9th Amendment. The 9th Amendment lets us be free. It essentially says, “You just can’t make up these ridiculous rules out of nowhere.”

If the 9th Amendment has any meaning, it certainly applies to what has happened here. There are many things that no one would have ever thought they would abridge. We look at the ruling out of Pennsylvania, which was a wonderful ruling, and they brought up a number of situations and questions about rights that no one has ever really challenged in court. The court had to figure out what sort of review they should do on a Constitutional challenge related to these rights. That’s tough, and it’s a ‘big deal’ for a court to do, but the reason they

had to do it is that we've never had anyone try to pretend that this is Venezuela/Communist China. It's ridiculous.

Telling people that they can't go to work, telling people that their local furniture store is not valuable and is not essential, but your big chain furniture store is, and telling people that going to see grandma at the nursing home is not her decision to make anymore; it's now the state's – these are absurd things. No one ever thought we would have to challenge these in court because this is the United States. We are supposed to be free.

We are hitting plenty of new ground here, but ultimately, I think that based on everything I've seen and common sense, that the court will end up seeing things our way. At least that is my hope.

The Pennsylvania case came out well. Ours is a bit more aggressive than the Pennsylvania case. We are challenging much more, but I do think that we are going to end up on very good ground with this.

Rappoport: I certainly hope so.

You want a jury trial. You want citizens to hear what we've been talking about here – this science. What about the tests? What about the case numbers? Are they real, or are they fake? What about the death numbers? Is that real or fake? Do we really have a pandemic or not?

In other words, is there any basis whatsoever for having declared a state of emergency and all the lockdowns and closures and so on? You want citizens to be impaneled as a jury to hear expert witnesses testifying under oath about all of this. Tell us why.

Renz: I think that is critical. Some of this will be before the judge; that is just part of the law. That is the way that works – and that is okay. I believe that we have a good judge who will do what he does.

Contrary to public opinion, I actually have a great deal of reverence for the courts and think that, for the most part, aside from the bad rulings and the few bad people who are in any profession, the courts do try to get justice.

That said, in this case, we think that it is critical to have a jury trial; we want a panel of our peers. “Let me tell you the truth. Let me show you the truth. Let me show you the real data. Let the state argue their side.”

If you think that we are ‘full of it’, okay. But I think that part of the advantage of the jury trial is that when this is done, this wasn’t only decided by a judge. So I think that removes some of the, “It’s just an activist judge.” That’s nonsense. I don’t necessarily believe that that happens as often as others say it does; it just removes it from the equation.

Instead, we have a jury, and I will tell you it’s my opinion that the juries probably – more often than not – get it right. Not always because they do make mistakes, but much more often than not, they get it right.

I think it’s an important aspect of this case. We’re not to the point where that is a guarantee yet, and I’m sure the state will challenge it. I believe that the state strategy in this case entirely will be based on procedure. I don’t know how they can stand up in terms of actual substantive law or fact. So, I think they are going to try to get us thrown out of court at every single turn. I think they will try to object to a jury trial. I think that they are going to try to object to anything that we want to do.

I hope they don’t because if we care about getting to justice, they really don’t have a good reason to object. But they will try because I think that is the only ‘leg that they have to stand on’. I don’t see how else they can argue that this is Constitutional and justified.

As I have said, we are using their facts, not ours.

Rappoport: One of the things that I personally like about the idea of a jury trial is that both sides will be alerted in the courtroom that they have to present information to these people, not only a judge sitting on the bench. It has to be made comprehensible to the people who are the jury.

So, as sophisticated as some of this information is in sorting out truth from lies and so on, the attorneys on both sides are going to know, “Okay, we’ve got to make this understandable to the people sitting here.”

It's not that the people are dumb, but it's that they need to be brought into this. After all, they are the ones who are being affected; we all are being affected. But let's have representatives of the people decide this; let's have that be significant.

In my experience as a reporter for a long time, whenever I've seen a case made journalistically that was clear, rational, concise, and 'upset the apple cart' of official claims, people understood it; they grasped it. If it was presented clearly, they could see, "Oh! Well, in that case, now that you are showing me what is going on, of course they are lying. Now I see it."

I think that a jury would be in for some shattering revelations sitting in the box listening to this all come out in court.

Is there any chance that this trial would be open to the public or videoed or having people sitting there watching it day after day?

Renz: I have no idea; I really don't. I haven't gotten far enough to think about that, to be honest. But I will tell you it would be wonderful if it were. I think this is so relevant to the public that it would be a wonderful thing if people could see it.

From the beginning – and I'll say this publicly-I've said it before, and I'll say it again, "If we are wrong, we ask the state, the CDC, or anyone else to give us full access to the data. We have experts; we will have it evaluated. We will look at it. If we are wrong, I will issue a public apology, and I will go away, and you will never hear from me again. I'm happy to do it".

If not, to your question about the trial being made public, it's typically not in Federal court, but I don't know. I think there would be considerable value in people getting an opportunity to hear the truth and to have this broken down in a way that they can understand it.

Right now, we assert that the CDC, the ODH, and a number of these people have intentionally misled the public. In fact, I saw there was a news story about someone in Tennessee – a mayor and someone else – who were emailing about how they needed to keep the case count from the local bars under wraps because they've shut down the local bars and taverns. However, the cases that

have come out of this have been nearly none.

Someone obtained this email and published it, and did a news story article on it. They were caught red-handed trying to hide this because they didn't want backlash about what they were doing.

There is value to people seeing this. If I'm right – and obviously I believe I am, and I wouldn't be bringing this case if I didn't have a good case and believe in it – I think that people need to see it and need to hear it, and need to know the facts.

From our end, we have made everything as public as we can; our evidence is available. Not all of it is available yet because we can't make all of it available immediately. But as we submit it to the court, we will continue to the full extent that we are allowed to make it public; we have made the case public.

I hope that lawyers in every state in the country file this case. Sometimes people worry about sharing their work; well, I will help them. They can call me. I will be happy to help them file this case anywhere they want to file it.

We want this done; we want our freedoms back.

This is why I'm here. I'm not interested in being famous; I'm not interested in my face being everywhere, but I am interested in my freedoms. If we don't educate people, and if I don't come out and do this, and if I don't talk with people and share our story, it will get spun in the news, and it is going to be ripped and shredded, and no one will ever hear the truth. So, I have to do this.

By the same token, if we can have this public in 'any way, shape, or form', I think that it needs to be. Otherwise, even if we win, we still have 100+ million scared Americans who think that it was a political win rather than a win based on actual science and fact.

Rappoport: When you say, "We're taking your freedom away tomorrow," people say, "Why?"

I believe that is what this case is about. You're saying, "Why?"

In the discovery process, you find out much more about 'why' from their side, you question them deeply, you bring out things that they don't want to have brought out, and many things come to light about 'why'.

Then in court with your expert witnesses, the case becomes accentuated and emphasized and you show, "When they said they are taking away your freedom, and you said 'why', guess what? It turns out there is no good 'why'. In fact, there is a very bad 'why' and it involves misleading, lying, obfuscating, hiding, emphasizing this, but taking that away, etc."

This is so fundamental to the country and what it is based upon that this case has to go forward.

Renz: I absolutely believe that. I'll tell you that one of the things that is amazing to me is the 'why' hasn't been asked more. Ultimately, I see people say, "Well, this isn't that bad. You should be okay with it."

Here is the problem: This is setting a precedent. If we allow this precedent to be set, you may not care about the rights that you are losing now, but what about the rights that you might lose in the future?

Let's take this, and put this in another setting. I think that one of the most important things that has happened in the 20th century was the civil rights movement. So, let's go back to the 1960's in Alabama and some of these other places where they were saying, "Civil rights, no good."

Imagine if the governor back then could have declared a public health emergency and said, "These marches in Selma and all these different marches are not allowed. It's a public health emergency. We don't want these marches."

Imagine what that would have done to our nation; imagine where we would be today.

Right now, you may not care about having to wear a mask, but the thing is: Should you be forced to do it? Should someone be allowed to force you to do it? Because what if you got a new governor in the future who doesn't care about the rights you care about? What happens then?

Right now, you say, “Well, I don’t care.” But guess what? You may care in the future. And once the precedent is set, it’s set. We have to fight for this to ensure that our future is safe.

It’s amazing; this is politicized – naturally. Clearly, in the news media if you believe that you don’t wear a mask, you are considered a right-wing zealot. I don’t understand that. I see the protests, and no one is wearing masks. I support the right for these people to protest, but I don’t have to agree with what they are saying in all cases. In some cases, I do, and in some cases I don’t. But what I believe is they have the absolute fundamental right in this country to protest – no question about it.

They’re not wearing masks, though. These governors could easily have shut this down and said, “Sorry, you can’t protest-public health-we have a COVID problem.”

If that had happened, where would we be? Would these same people who are politicizing this on the left say this is okay then? And how is it any different?

We have the 14th Amendment; we have equal protection of laws. Why is it that we are allowing people to gather for protests but they can’t gather for church? I don’t understand that.

The thing is: I think they should be able to gather for protests, but they should also be able to go to church. It is your decision in this country. And once we start giving up our freedoms, where do you draw the line? The price of freedom is eternal vigilance; we have to watch and we have to fight. It’s not about whether you care about the freedom you’ve lost today; it’s about whether you might care about the freedom you will lose tomorrow. So, that is where we are at on this.

Rappoport: It seems that now in the era of science, this is somewhat the hypnotic effect. “We are talking science, so we can declare a state of emergency on that basis, and there is nothing to argue about because you wouldn’t understand it anyway, and our people are the smartest people. Just trust us because this information is very technical, but it is very true. So you must do the following, and you can’t do this and you can’t do that, and we are shutting

everything down.”

This becomes a major, major problem as one of the most significant ways to take away people’s freedoms by declaring states of emergency and destroying the Constitution – which it does.

If you can declare a state of emergency based on a whim at any time a governor, a President, a premier or a prime minister wants to, then whatever has been enshrined in documents guaranteeing rights and freedoms is automatically destroyed. It’s gone, as if it never existed.

In the modern age, the way that this is normally justified has something to do with science. People tend to accept grandiose statements about science and generalities. It’s almost like a religion now; therefore, this is a great way for governments to declare emergencies.

People say, “Well, the experts must know.”

Renz: That is absolutely right. I can’t claim to be the person who should lead the legal profession by any means; I’m just that guy from Ohio, right?

That said, I am firmly of the belief that lawyers need to be willing to challenge more than only what they normally look at. It’s a scary thing. I have somewhere in the vicinity of 2,000 hours on this case. It’s an obscene amount of time. I had to learn so many things that aren’t taught in law school. This is a critical thing, and I can’t just learn them; I have to know them. That is a tough, tough thing.

But if we believe in justice, and if we believe that our Constitution is worth fighting for, and if we believe that we should be free people, the lawyers have a duty – in my opinion – to do more.

I ‘put my money where my mouth’ was on this. I did it because I believed in it, and I have children. I have a mother in a ‘nursing home jail’ right now. My brother calls it a petting zoo because he can look through a window and wave at her, but he can’t see her in person because my mother apparently is not capable of making her own decisions in Ohio. She can’t decide whether she wants to take the terrible risk of visiting with her grandchildren and children while she’s

in the nursing home because Mike DeWine has decided that she is not capable of making that decision.

As I look at this, this is a fight that we have to have. I hope that other people will have the courage to put the time and effort into this.

With lawyers, we talk plenty about access to justice and pro bono work, and I think that both of those are very important things.

I have my pro bono hours this year, and I think I'm good on that. I am getting paid, but that is not the point. I am also giving much towards this, and the reason is that is what we have to do; we have to give to this.

I believe in access to justice. Everybody deserves a good lawyer when they are in trouble with the law because the law is complicated. But part of this is when we talk about access to justice, we as attorneys, understand that everybody deserves 'a fair shot' with the law. If you don't have a good lawyer, well, then you probably aren't going to get a fair shot.

Here is the thing: Science has become the way of things. Now what is happening – and I've seen this more than just with COVID – is apparently nonsense things have been pushed, and those things have been pushed under the guise of science. Everybody just says, "We can't question it; it's science."

Okay, well, what if the scientists are lying? How many of the scientists who are saying that it is science are getting paid for saying that it's science? These are questions that we have to ask. You can't just blindly trust that people are going to be honest all the time. I believe that most people are honest most of the time, but you start waving millions of dollars of grant money in front of someone, and they are going to write the study the way that you want the study written.

Right now, this serves as a case study, and the idea is that we really have to question science. Just because someone says that it is fact, doesn't mean it is.

Attorneys have to question that. If they don't, then I think they are really missing out. I think that is part of what has happened here.

I find it amazing that six months into this, the best that we could come up with is some person from Fremont, Ohio, and another person from Lorain, Ohio, to take on this fight. There are two of us; there are two attorneys and an intern on this case, and we are both just regular people. We will do our best and fight until the bitter end, but this should have been taken on by the biggest law firms in the country immediately. Where is this? Where are these people? Why are they not stepping up?

I support these people. These people are my peers, and they are probably better lawyers than me, but where are they? That is something that I think is a question that we have to ask ourselves. We've watched our Constitutional freedoms be stomped on like never before. Are you telling me that the legal profession didn't think it was good to question this? Really? Of all professions? This should have happened a week or two weeks or a month into it, at the most.

When they decided to do statewide house arrest, this should have happened.

I challenge anyone to look at the lockdown order that occurred in Ohio and set it next to the criminal definition of house arrest under the Ohio Revised Code and tell me that they see a big difference.

We had a statewide house arrest without due process in Ohio – nothing. It was only, “You are all confined to your house unless there is an emergency or something necessary.”

No one questioned this. I'm just incredulous about that. How could you not question this? Unless someone is walking down my street firing a machine gun at someone else because we've been invaded, don't tell me that I have to stay in my house. That is absurd. But yet we don't question it; no one even asked, “Is the science real?”

It took months before anyone took action on this, and now you're stuck with me. Really? I can't fathom this!

Rappoport: Not being able to fathom is a major strength. I can tell you, what you are saying, I would echo about journalists.

You mean that after a month, two months, three months, virtually no mainstream journalists are seriously criticizing or questioning the lockdown orders, the house arrest, or the science behind this. It's their job to investigate that down to the core, and not to trust officials just because they are making pronouncements and not to say 'the experts' or 'the authorities', etc. without any explanation?

Finally, I want the viewing or reading audience to understand that as this case moves forward in discovery and in court, you have several expert witnesses on your side – scientists – who will challenge every significant piece of data that has been used to justify the lockdowns and the house arrest and so on.

Renz: Yes, we do; we have some brilliant, brilliant people.

Rappoport: What this tells me – and should tell everybody – is never believe that there is only one stream of science, although it's made to look that way. You can watch on television that there is a press conference. At the press conference, a doctor who has a prime position can step forward and make some pronouncement that everybody sees. Don't assume that this is all there is to science or that is the only point of view a true scientist would have.

As we will see, as your case progresses, there are many, many very bright scientists who see this 'pandemic' in a whole different light.

Renz: There are many brilliant scientists. There are scientists who have spoken out and lost their jobs for doing so. There are people who have done everything they could to get people to pay attention to what is really happening, and at a great personal sacrifice. There are many people who recognize that this is nonsense, and here is the one common trait that I have found with the people who are telling us that we are all going to die from this: They all are getting paid huge sums based on that.

I'm not going to tell you that I know the motive for this because I don't, and I don't need to. My case isn't about motive; it's not a criminal case. All I have to do is show that this was unconstitutional and why. I say that as though it's a small feat!

I don't need to know motive, but I challenge everyone to follow the money. Where is the money going? How is it getting there?

Remember, the first thing we did when this disease was developing is passed an \$8 billion funding bill to decide what to do with the CDC-EIGHT BILLION DOLLARS!

When we talk about the trillions of dollars like we do, that may not seem like much, but think about what you can do with \$8 billion. Do you think that if you gave the CDC \$8 billion to find out what to do with coronavirus, they will come back and say, "It's not a big deal? Don't worry about it?"

So, then we passed more. Naturally, all the groups who are getting money through Federal funding – the groups who are doing the testing, the groups who are doing this, the groups who are doing that – do you think they are going to speak out against this?

The medical profession, outside of the good doctors who are speaking out or are trying to take care of you and don't know, have been bought and paid for on this. There are great doctors out there. I have some friends who are doctors, and there are some great doctors who are on my team. They are out there, but some of the groups that are running the profession – the bigger groups and the big systems that are making all the money on it – convinces you to ask yourself, "Do you trust someone who is getting paid millions of dollars for this? Do you want to trust your freedoms to someone who has a very good financial incentive not to give them to you?"

It seems like a bad idea to me. I think that we should be asking questions here.

Rappoport: What can people do to support this case – the plaintiffs and you – moving forward?

Renz: Ohio Stands Up is the group, which is as grassroots as possible. These plaintiffs are just amazing patriots and good people. They put this together, and are are putting this together as we speak. It is still being developed, and it is under development every day.

This is an expensive case; there are 'no two ways about it'. That's not only because of me. It's expensive to try a Federal case, especially one of this magnitude. The more money we have, the more that we can do.

You can look at my website, www.Renz-Law.com where there are links to Ohio Stands Up. We need financial support. We also need people to talk. We need you to become educated and share your information.

I'm asking that people don't say to the next person who is wearing a mask, "You're an idiot." It won't do any good. You're not going to change any hearts or minds that way. There are some brilliant, brilliant people who believe this whole thing; they believe it 'hook, line, and sinker'. We have to start educating them. We have to let them see the truth and come to their own conclusions. We have to get our country back to normal. That doesn't happen from being confrontational and angry with people; it happens from educating people and sharing the truth.

Financially supporting this is great. Talk about it; share it; share the information; get this out there. That is why I'm on this interview and all these other interviews. I have to get this information out there. If we win and everybody is still scared, it helps, but it doesn't do what it needs to do. So, share the information.

For those of you who believe in it and do it, we take prayers. Beyond that, get active and get involved. We are hoping that this gets filed in every state. I'm working to get infrastructure together so that we can help support that happening in every state. It's not there yet; we're in process.

You have a man from Fremont and a man from Lorain, Ohio. Neither are big places, and we are working our 'tails off' to do this with an amazing group of plaintiffs and incredible support people who are working around the clock volunteering.

As we get it going, please start finding attorneys who will fight for this in your state. We will help them in any way we can.

Educate, fight, and stand up. If we don't fight for our freedom, it won't be here. We need to do that, and I urge you all to do so.

Rappoport: Tom, thank you so much. I really appreciate your time. More than that, I appreciate your taking this case on and what it means for all of us. You should know if you watched the last hour what it means; it means everything.

Thank you again, Tom. I'm sure that we will be talking soon once more.

Renz: Thank you, Jon. It's been a real honor, and I do appreciate it.

MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.