

WhatsApp log

[6:26 PM, 7/31/2022] Steven Kirsch: This is steve kirsch

[7:32 PM, 7/31/2022] Saar Wilf: Hi there! How's it going?

[7:33 PM, 7/31/2022] Steven Kirsch: Shouldn't you be asleep?

[7:34 PM, 7/31/2022] Steven Kirsch: How big is your staff at reclaim?

[7:34 PM, 7/31/2022] Steven Kirsch: Rootclaim

[7:39 PM, 7/31/2022] Saar Wilf: I work late... about to go now...

[7:39 PM, 7/31/2022] Saar Wilf: we're 6

[8:33 AM, 9/22/2022] Saar Wilf: Hi Steve! How's it going?

[9:13 AM, 9/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: Great

[5:41 PM, 9/22/2022] Saar Wilf: excellent. the team is looking into your list, checking if we can build an analysis on one of them, and then apply to the challenge.

they have a few questions:

1. what is the criterion for winning 'masks don't work'?
2. which masks are included?
3. vaccine deaths - what is the time period in which deaths are counted?
4. how would you count a death in which the vaccine or the virus is only a partial contributor or accelerator?
5. this will probably take us a month. if after that we find an opposite conclusion (and I'm far from certain we will), I believe we'll likely win the challenge. at that point would you prefer to retract the offer or still allow us to apply (perhaps seeing it as a donation to promoting rationality)?

[5:44 PM, 9/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: Which is 5

[5:44 PM, 9/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: ?

[7:01 PM, 9/22/2022] Saar Wilf: doing a full probabilistic analysis on one of the issues.

[7:03 PM, 9/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: Which issue is 5

[7:04 PM, 9/22/2022] Saar Wilf: we will study and choose the weakest one

[7:04 PM, 9/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: Oh you're saying those are your questions. When you say you win the challenge what do you mean? That one of my statements is wrong? Which one?

[7:04 PM, 9/22/2022] Saar Wilf: i'm saying i'm far from certain we will find a wrong conclusion.

[7:05 PM, 9/22/2022] Saar Wilf: the question is what if

[4:31 PM, 9/23/2022] Saar Wilf: what do you think?

[1:09 AM, 9/24/2022] Steven Kirsch: My bet is available

[1:09 AM, 9/24/2022] Steven Kirsch: I'll take your money ;)

[5:09 AM, 9/24/2022] Saar Wilf: Hehe.

Ok. Let's see if we even get different results first...

WhatsApp log

[5:09 AM, 9/24/2022] Saar Wilf: Can you answer the classification questions?

[6:44 PM, 9/25/2022] Saar Wilf: hi again. we have another question: a vaccine killing more than it saves, could have two meanings:

1. individual level - a person taking the vaccine will increase his chance of dying within that time period.

2. population level - if the vaccines were not administered at all, we would have less deaths overall.

for which one is the challenge, or can we choose?

[6:50 PM, 9/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: Means the intervention kills more people than it will save from the disease

[6:51 PM, 9/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: I claim Vax has negative net benefit

[6:58 PM, 9/25/2022] Saar Wilf: i understand but which of the two options do you mean by this, or can we pick one?

[9:51 AM, 9/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: my claim is the vaccine kills more people than it will save from dying from COVID. You have no chance of proving that.

[9:51 AM, 9/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: i'm wrong.

[9:51 AM, 9/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: it's not even close.

[9:51 AM, 9/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: death benefit for COVID deaths is about 0.

[9:51 AM, 9/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: all cause deaths are huge

[9:51 AM, 9/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: i don't make bets i can't win

[9:58 AM, 9/26/2022] Saar Wilf: I understand. I don't yet have any evidence you're wrong. Just want to decide if it's worth building an analysis for.

[9:58 AM, 9/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: no chance it would be.

[9:59 AM, 9/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Could be...

Let me know if you can answer the clarification questions above.

[10:01 AM, 9/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: 1. what is the criterion for winning 'masks don't work'?

convince a 3 judge panel mutually selected.

2. which masks are included? surgical, cloth, and N95 worn by the general public.

3. vaccine deaths - what is the time period in which deaths are counted? 1 year post vax

4. how would you count a death in which the vaccine or the virus is only a partial contributor or accelerator? as vaccine implicated in the death.

5. this will probably take us a month. if after that we find an opposite conclusion (and I'm far from certain we will), I believe we'll likely win the challenge. at that point would you prefer to retract the offer or still allow us to apply (perhaps seeing it as a donation to promoting rationality)? i'm not charitable :)

[10:04 AM, 9/26/2022] Saar Wilf: thanks!

1. I mean what do i need to convince the panel of?

WhatsApp log

2. Really? So if two people are in a room, one of them sick. You expect the same probability of infection, whether they both wear N95 or not?

3. Same for the virus?

4. Same for the virus?

5. Got it. I mean if the analysis finds a claim is wrong, and after reading it you agree, will the challenge still be available?

[12:31 PM, 9/26/2022] Saar Wilf: are you available for a quick chat?

[1:02 PM, 9/29/2022] Saar Wilf: so we did a quick review of masks, and seems like you're right. so we're now checking vaccine deaths...

[1:06 AM, 10/1/2022] Steven Kirsch: you will find I hate losing bets ;)

[7:03 AM, 10/1/2022] Saar Wilf: Who does? (:

Let me know when you got a few minutes to clarify the vaccine claim.

[8:26 AM, 10/1/2022] Steven Kirsch: Now

[8:27 AM, 10/1/2022] Steven Kirsch: It's simple. Died versus saved. Why is it so complicated?

[1:57 PM, 10/24/2022] Steven Kirsch: can your team serve as judges for my debate offers? I need NEUTRAL judges.

[3:51 PM, 10/24/2022] Saar Wilf: in general yes, but we first want to make sure we're not applying ourselves. do you have an application already?

[5:05 PM, 10/24/2022] Steven Kirsch: No just getting prepared in advanced

[5:09 PM, 10/24/2022] Saar Wilf: cool. we'll know in a week or two.

[3:10 PM, 10/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: How does Rootclaim adjudicate claims you are wrong? who makes the call on whether YOU win or lose on YOUR claims?

[3:47 PM, 10/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: ok, i read the syria description. mutual agree on judges. did you find a few that are good?

[5:29 PM, 10/28/2022] Saar Wilf: so far no one applied, so didn't really put it to the test.

for covid stuff, i had in mind the following smart people who are not afraid to take both establishment and counter-establishment positions: john campbell, yuri deigin, roger seheult

[10:16 PM, 10/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: yuri is a very bad choice.

[10:17 PM, 10/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: campbell would be too busy because he earns a fortune on YouTube.

The negotiation starts here

[8:50 AM, 11/17/2022] Saar Wilf: <https://blog.rootclaim.com/rootclaim-accepts-500000-challenge-on-covid-vaccine-safety-efficacy/>

Good luck man! This is something important we're doing.

[9:41 PM, 11/17/2022] Steven Kirsch: Good work. I see you read my updated notice, so it's up to me as to whether I want to accept or not how do you possibly think this has saved more lives than it costs. What do you believe the numbers are?

[9:43 PM, 11/17/2022] Steven Kirsch: I may except the bet anyway

[9:43 PM, 11/17/2022] Steven Kirsch: Accept

[9:49 PM, 11/17/2022] Steven Kirsch: I could always use an extra half \$1 million

[12:37 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: Hehe. I'm sure you would...

I fully realize there is a good chance i will lose here, but I think it's worth the risk. Even if we lose, I would see it as a donation to promoting public discourse and providing clarity to this pressing issue.

As a reference: The most effective charities in the world save one life for around \$5000. I think having a high-quality public debate on this issue, whatever the outcome, could easily affect behaviour and policy in a way that would save at least thousands of lives, so it's much more effective.

I also suggest we dedicate like 10-15 minutes at the beginning to discuss all the issues we agree on, and calling out all the "experts" not willing to take a risk like you and me. This may advance these life-saving issues as well.

So what's the next step? Putting an agreement in place?

[3:32 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: Let's chat when I awake. It's 3am here

[6:57 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: The first question is how many people do you think have been killed by the vaccine and how many people do you think have been saved by the vaccine? Maybe I'm missing something here but I definitely don't want to be spreading misinformation.

[6:59 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: i think the whole idea is to discuss this in the debate. no?

otherwise we're undermining the whole idea of the public debate challenge, we're both trying to promote.

it won't be worth much if anyone can make it, and then retract once someone invests resources and applies. right?

[7:01 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: It all depends on what your goals are. If you have a great argument, wire, be shy about making it? so if you figured out that the vaccine is so effective, you should just tell everybody why and what your argument is because you'll save lives. That should be everybody's primary goal. Then if I disagree with your line of reasoning, then we can debate it.

[7:03 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: For example, you could make an argument that the vaccine caused the virus to mutate into less virulent variance. Those less virulent variance killed fewer people per year therefore the vaccine saves lives not because it protects people, but because it drove the variation of the virus to a less deadly form. That clearly wasn't in mind when I made the bet.

WhatsApp log

[7:05 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: Such an argument would explain why you asked me all those questions about what the terms meant. So it seems like you're gaming the expression of that, rather than the underlying intent.

[7:06 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: oh i see what you mean. no, that's not the intention at all.

we analysed the claim as you made it, and think there is more than 50% chance it is wrong, so the debate is a worthwhile investment.

if you feel the criterion i submitted is not representative of your claim, feel free to change it.

[7:14 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: I want to hear your argument. Maybe I will agree with you!!

[7:14 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: we can do something similar to an RCT:

Suppose we were to find out today that a million random people in the US actually got a placebo and not the real shots (and boosters if taken), then the question is whether the percent of people dead among that group as of 25-Jul-2022 is higher or lower than those who got the real shots.

Does that solve your concern?

[7:22 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: we don't really have an argument. we just looked at the studies, and found those claiming benefit to be more reliable.

[7:41 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: How do you explain Wayne roots data?

[7:52 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: i don't think we've seen that, but anyway, the idea is to discuss the data in public.

[7:53 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: let's close the criterion so you're satisfied we're not attempting to win by manipulating definitions, and let's do it. it's important.

[10:21 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: We can do it without monetary risk. What's your angle though? You need to be able to calculate the number saved and the number killed. How are you gonna do that?

[10:21 AM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: Can you give me a number for both?

[11:09 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: I'm sorry but I'm not comfortable sharing information before the funds are in escrow.

I'm also afraid we will insist to execute the challenge as publicly declared and committed for 500k. Backing out on the challenge will send a very negative signal regarding what it is we're trying to promote in public discourse.

Additionally, we have invested significant resources based on that.

I would really prefer we do this openly and honestly, for the benefit of humanity. Taking risks is a part of life when trying to make a major impact.

[11:10 AM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: One of us is wrong and should own it publicly with skin in the game.

WhatsApp log

[1:38 PM, 11/18/2022] Steven Kirsch: This is about saving lives, not grandstanding. If we are wrong, we'll happily stop telling people to avoid vaccination. Time is of the essence. Show us we are wrong.

[7:10 PM, 11/18/2022] Saar Wilf: Exactly, in order to save lives, there needs to be a clear signal that everyone can understand.

Me convincing you will change nothing.

There are hundreds of debates on youtube with no stakes, and they too change nothing.

A debate with expert judges where \$500,000 are on the line will set a clear signal on how to treat mRNA vaccines.

The idea is to set a standard for how claims are made in public: Only people who are putting skin in the game should be listened to, and the rest simply ignored.

I'm sorry, but we are going to insist on moving forward according to the public commitments you made. You clearly stated "I don't treat it as a joke", and we went to significant investment based on your word.

You made a great impact by being the only one willing to...

[11:15 AM, 11/19/2022] Steven Kirsch: If you convince me, you'll change everything

[3:17 PM, 11/19/2022] Saar Wilf: I think a public high-stakes judged debate is much more impactful, but we'll agree to disagree. That's fine.

So, I wish to move forward as planned. Please let me know the details of your attorney so we can get the terms signed ASAP.

Thanks!

[11:30 PM, 11/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: Tell me how many people have been killed and saved

[1:26 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: What is the purpose of this question?

I want to continue as planned towards a public respectful debate, where we work together to show the world how these issues should be settled, and ridicule all the "experts" and "authorities" not willing to put skin in the game.

[1:27 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: I really don't understand why you're backing out. This will turn out bad for everyone.

[4:38 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: i need you to be open with me. i'm here to help.

if it's an amount you can't afford - we'll change it.

if you're concerned about the publicity - i guarantee we'll do it in a respectful way, that is about finding truth together, and emphasises this is only one of many issues, and being found wrong on only one is amazing and

WhatsApp log

far beyond any of the coward "experts" not willing to put their public statements to the test. i hope you will do the same for us if we lose.

just be open.

[10:51 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: What's make the bet for 10 bucks then?

[10:52 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: Or if I lose that you return the money but we won't tell anyone publicly. If you're so concerned about the high stakes public event.

[10:53 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: You're making me believe that there's something clever that you're doing because you're refusing to disclose even what the numbers are. That makes me very suspicious.

[10:53 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: Why are you so afraid to tell me the numbers?

[11:15 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: I'm not doing anything clever. We researched the issue and believe there's >50% chance the claim is wrong. that's all.

That's why we have lawyers - they will make sure the debate is fair and won only based on the evidence.

The reason I'm not sharing is that it's not required according to the terms you set. It seems like you are not standing behind your word, which makes me suspicious. I came to this with a very open and cooperative approach, viewing this as a win for both of us against the cowards not willing to take a risk on their word. You have greatly disappointed me, making me less interested in cooperation.

I will gladly share all our research and demonstrate we are approaching this in good faith, if you provide a guarantee that once I do that you will stand behind your commitments.

[11:21 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: My offer was revoked before you accepted it.

[11:21 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: If you want me to agree to your terms, you need to tell me what the numbers are

[11:22 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: Most smart people don't make bets on a 52% chance of winning. You're not being honest with me

[11:23 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: you know well this will not stand in court.

[11:23 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: i think it's around 80% we will win.

[11:25 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: gladly. do you guarantee we will continue to debate once i share the data, and demonstrate there are no tricks?

[11:25 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: i'm really disappointed this is the direction this is going. we're on the same side here.

[11:26 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: if you have concerns, that's fine, me too. That's what attorneys are for.

[11:29 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: So I propose that Bret Weinstein and Chris Martenson be the judges. Are you agreeable to that?

[11:30 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: we have a process for choosing judges. you committed to it, and i accepted.

[11:31 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: i'm also fine agreeing among ourselves on the judges. people with relevant expertise who have shown flexibility to take pro- and counter-mainstream opinions.

[11:31 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: The process is mutually agreeable. I just suggested some judges that I agree with. Do you consent?

WhatsApp log

[11:31 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: We can't even start the process unless you tell me the number of people you think the vaccine has saved in the number of people you think the vaccine has killed

[11:32 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: i agree with what you wrote: "picking people with a strong anti-establishment bias would also be biased."

[11:33 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: can you just explain why you want to have this deviation from the procedure? if it makes sense, i'll gladly do it.

[11:34 AM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: You should make your research public if you have discovered were wrong. Will happily read it and if we agree, you're right, we'll stop spreading misinformation.

[11:39 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: We will make it public in the debate. As I explained, we believe this to be more impactful than just convincing one person. We additionally have the goal of demonstrating the importance of skin in the game - showing how only people that take risks (like you and me) should be listened to. Last, there was an investment of 5 analysts for 3 months that needs to be justified.

[11:41 AM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: If you think a video call is a better way to reach agreement on next steps and reduce concerns, I'm open to that.

[3:55 PM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: You haven't answered my question. How many people have been killed by the vaccine. How many people have been saved by the vaccine. If you know the answer to these questions, you should make them public immediately and save lives. If you are correct, I'm sure that all of my misinformation spreader friends will be convinced and they in turn will convince their followers and we will all be eternally grateful to you for opening our eyes to the truth. If your evidence is so compelling, I am amazed that you would have any issues at all with having Bret Weinstein and Chris Martenson as judges.

[4:00 PM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: you are assuming we have some secret information.

we don't. this is all based on studies that are already public, and failed to convince these people.

but after spending weeks studying them, i think that in a lengthy discussion with competent judges i can convince these studies are more reliable than those claiming the opposite.

i could definitely be wrong, but willing to take the risk, and even if i lose i'm fine paying the \$500k because it would have a very positive effect.

if i just send people the studies they will just dismiss them and nothing will be achieved.

[4:03 PM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: as to using judges that have already committed to one side: we have provided very strong evidence that the Syrian government did not conduct chemical attacks.

not one of the "experts" who tied their career to the opposite conclusion have changed their mind. people with strong biases cannot be convinced. that's why i wholeheartedly agree with your judge selection process.

[4:09 PM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: why don't you try convincing us first with your evidence and analysis? If you fail to convince us, then I am much more likely to put money on the line as your originally wanted. Trying to goad me into believing I have an obligation to honor an offer that I publicly withdrew BEFORE you accepted is unethical.

[4:15 PM, 11/21/2022] Saar Wilf: you withdrew while knowing we are working on it, with the stated reason of lack of applicants. any court will see that as extremely suspicious.

i'm sorry, steven, i'm going to insist that you stand by your commitments.

WhatsApp log

i thought we can do it as gentlemen. celebrate whoever wins in good sportsmanship, then together declare that we were previously in agreement on 95% of issues, and now it's 100%, and then work together to improve public discourse, and ridicule all those making overconfident claims without skin in the game.

i'm still willing to go that path with no hard feelings. up to you.

but under no circumstances will i give up the debate, as that is the key to everything i'm trying to achieve.

[5:09 PM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: I'm not gonna repeat myself anymore

[5:09 PM, 11/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: Have a nice day

[4:20 PM, 11/23/2022] Saar Wilf: Hi Steve,

I would like to schedule the "two hour record session to try to resolve the dispute", which we need to do within 10 calendar days of application, according to item 3.

Is next Monday good?

Thanks

Saar

[12:32 AM, 11/24/2022] Steven Kirsch: you need to answer my questions about # killed by the vaccine and # saved by the vaccine. why are you unable to do that? If you can't do that, I can't imagine how spending time with you would be productive.

[1:50 AM, 11/24/2022] Saar Wilf: Because i don't understand why you want to deviate from protocol.

But in the interest of time, will you jumpstart the process once i share the estimates?

[7:56 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: I might. This will go nowhere without it.

[8:08 AM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: You keep avoiding your commitments and expect me to agree to your requests to deviate from protocol.

But OK. Let's see if this will help move things along.

Studies estimate lives saved in the US at mid 100k's.

Deaths are harder to estimate but we think it's in the 10k's at most.

[8:20 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: How can that be ? The randomized trials showed 1 person saved per 22,000 vaccinated?

[8:21 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: So the deaths in vaers are just background deaths?

[8:21 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: Who do propose as judges?

[8:25 AM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: We think most of them are.

[8:25 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: On what basis?

[8:26 AM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: I think John Campbell is good.

[8:26 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: How about my readers as the judge? You convince a majority of my readers and you win

[8:27 AM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: That's the profile i think we should strive for. Smart professionals not afraid to take pro and counter mainstream positions

WhatsApp log

[8:27 AM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: We need 3 judges who are professional and unbiased. I'm also fine with 1 or 2 judges.

[8:33 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: Who else? Campbell is biased since he can't speak against the narrative or he gets deplatformed

[8:34 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: If your argument is compelling, you should be able to convince my readers

[8:52 AM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: I don't think it's compelling enough to convince your readers. So let's proceed with the original procedure and choose a consulting firm for that. There are two firms specializing in finding experts. Need to look up their names.

[10:11 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: How about doctor drew? He's very in the middle

[10:13 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: Vinay prasad is another truth teller

[10:13 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: Vinay still thinks the vaccines are safe

[10:46 AM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: From a quick review Vinay looks very balanced and professional. Drew seems to have only anti vaccine positions on his channel.

[11:47 AM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: How about John ioaniddis ?

[1:07 PM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: He looks like someone who won't be biased, but i see he made some bad analyses recently so probably OK but i think we can do better

[3:36 PM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: Such as?

[3:58 PM, 11/25/2022] Steven Kirsch: Good work. My team is excited to take this on assuming we can agree on judges. Would you like it to be unanimous in order to get a decision or do you want a 2/3 required to win the bet?

[4:31 PM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: 2 of 3 sounds good. We can also do 2 of 2 to save costs.

[4:32 PM, 11/25/2022] Saar Wilf: I remember when the Santa Clara study came out. It was pretty bad.

[1:41 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Prasad and Campbell 2/2?

[1:43 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Sounds good.

[2:34 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Ok you may have convinced me

[2:46 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Cool. This is a good thing for the world whatever the outcome.

So next stage is signing an agreement?

[3:03 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Let's agree on key terms first

[3:04 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Having 3 2 hr sessions spaced 3 days apart work for you?

[3:04 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: This gives you time to research any claims

[3:05 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Perhaps day 1 let's do 4 hours. And also allow the judges to extend in case there's something unclear they need to follow up

[3:07 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Any limit to num of experts on each side?

[3:08 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: I didn't plan to bring experts. Just me. What were you planning?

WhatsApp log

[3:10 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Haven't decided yet. Joel smalley and Mathew Crawford

[3:10 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: James Lyons weiler

[3:11 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Don't see a problem with that

[3:11 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Depends on who I need

[3:12 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: It shouldn't be a one and done. This shouldn't be won on a surprise attack

[3:13 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Agree. Should have time to bring rebuttals for new evidence

[3:16 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Livestream the sessions?

[3:16 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Of course

[3:24 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Each side equal floor time in total? So if I use an hour the first time in years, two hours, then I have an hour the next time that I can carry over.

[3:25 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Agreed

[3:25 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: And we can ask judges questions and vice Versace

[3:25 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Versa

[3:26 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: How about 3 hrs for first session?

[3:27 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Max floor time limit at a time before a rebuttal?

[3:27 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Judges can ask questions, but what would you want to ask them for example?

[3:27 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Ok

[3:27 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: What do you mean

[3:28 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: That means I can't talk for 90 minutes straight

[3:28 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: For example

[3:39 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: Think senate filibuster

[4:09 PM, 11/26/2022] Saar Wilf: Makes sense. 20 mins max?

[4:43 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: sure

[7:59 PM, 11/26/2022] Steven Kirsch: I'll try to reach out to both of the judges. It may take awhile to get them to respond

[8:10 AM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: i will try as well

[8:20 AM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: any feedback on the criteria?

Suppose we were to find out today that a million random people in the US actually got a placebo and not the real shots (including boosters if taken).

WhatsApp log

Each judge needs to issue one of two responses after the debate is completed: "the best estimate of the percent of people dead among that group as of 25-Jul-2022, is [higher/lower] than the best estimate of the percent of people dead among those receiving real shots as of 25-Jul-2022"

[3:40 PM, 11/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: that looks fair, but let me get a second opinion. When are you going to reveal your "argument" for this? In front of the judges?

[3:42 PM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: we're now preparing the 30 slide presentation you requested. i guess would be a good idea we both share all the data once the agreement is signed and money is in escrow. makes sense?

[3:44 PM, 11/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: sure.

[3:46 PM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: Great. Anything else to agree or can we draft the agreement?

[3:48 PM, 11/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: You can draft an updated term sheet and send it to me for review before we get the lawyers involved.

[3:48 PM, 11/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: You seem to have more time on your hands than I do.

[3:48 PM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: Roger

[6:34 PM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: i see we need to draw for who talks first.

this site publishes every day random numbers. the last one is a yes/no. if tomorrow is a yes you start, if no i start. sounds good?

[6:34 PM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: <https://avkg.com/en/daily-random/>

[6:36 PM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: we can also play rock paper scissors at this link (:

<https://www.rpsgame.org/room?id=9sn20>

[6:44 PM, 11/28/2022] Steven Kirsch: Sure

[6:52 PM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: i assume that's for the first offer? i'm waiting at the second link now if you prefer that.

[7:04 PM, 11/28/2022] Saar Wilf: never mind. we'll see tomorrow.

[4:53 AM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: we got a no, so we start.

[4:53 AM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: great.

[4:54 AM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: i'm writing that every new session it alternates.

[12:35 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: Sure

[12:38 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: Do you believe that overall the world was better off if everyone had the mRNA vaccines vs nobody got the vaccines? So compare two cases

[1:10 PM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: what do you mean?

[1:19 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: I'm not sure how I can make it any more clearer than that. If you were the President of the United States, and you had a choice of deploying, a vaccine or not, which choice would you make? You have one of two choices: you deploy the vaccine or you don't play the vaccine. Which one do you choose?

WhatsApp log

[1:20 PM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: like for everyone at the same time, all ages?

[2:15 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: Let's keep it simple: did the mRNA COVID vaccines in the US result in a net saving of lives in the US? Yes or no. Ok?

[2:18 PM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: the problem we had with that is that it doesn't eliminate indirect effects, like behavioural changes and emergence of variants. that's why we went for the placebo scenario

[4:21 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: The indirect effects can help you. And that's what matters at the end of the day. Otherwise this is an BBC academic debate of no practical significance making it a useless exercise which is a waste of your time and mine

[4:21 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: Not sure how BBC got there. Ignore it

[5:27 PM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: i agree it probably benefits our side, but it just makes the debate far more complex with many sub-issues we'll need to cover.

the problem you want to solve is that the current definition is too scientific and detached from real world considerations?

[7:52 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: I want to encourage people to vaccinate if I'm wrong. There is no point of this exercise if it isn't a clinically significant result. That's what you wanted right? Otherwise money changes Hans and nothing else changes.

[7:52 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: Hands

[7:54 PM, 11/29/2022] Steven Kirsch: You can argue all the other effects benefit you

[7:54 PM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: i agree. therefore i think the correct question is whether this is the correct decision at the individual level, rather than analysing population level patterns. that's what the random million sample achieves.

[7:56 PM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: i can try wording it in a way that would be more understandable to a wide audience. that may solve the problem.

[8:14 PM, 11/29/2022] Saar Wilf: let me know all your requirements for the judgement criteria, and we'll try to figure something that meets them and is not overly complicated to judge and understand.

[5:56 PM, 11/30/2022] Saar Wilf: just to remind i'm awaiting the requirements.

[8:19 PM, 11/30/2022] Steven Kirsch: I am waiting to hear confirmation from Joel before responding

[12:45 AM, 12/1/2022] Steven Kirsch: Why Jul 25 in your spec? That sounds very odd

[2:04 AM, 12/1/2022] Saar Wilf: It's when you announced the challenge

[10:30 AM, 12/1/2022] Steven Kirsch: Ok that's fair

[7:39 PM, 12/1/2022] Steven Kirsch: hopefully i'll be able to contact joel tomorrow.

[7:49 PM, 12/2/2022] Steven Kirsch: Still discussing. We are trying to get to something that is meaningful that no one can dispute

[8:05 PM, 12/2/2022] Saar Wilf: sure. feel free to consult. i think what we have now is pretty stiaight forward. it's like a giant RCT.

[1:44 AM, 12/3/2022] Steven Kirsch: yes, i get that but it is not verifiable. the judges have to guess which makes the result less compelling since someone can argue it could have gone the other way.

WhatsApp log

[11:05 AM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: Ok I'm good with your criteria so long as it is to expressed intent. SoFi showed that the vaccines have killed massive numbers of people more than have been saved so that there's a net mortality increase since the vaccines rolled out that is caused by the vaccines I win the bet. Ok?

[11:05 AM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: Those two guys were impossible to get a hold of. Perhaps we can have a random panel similar to what was done for the Taibbi debate.

[11:06 AM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: How about that?

[11:15 AM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: I am anxious to move forward as soon as possible

[11:18 AM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: In the works. I should have a version to send tomorrow

[11:18 AM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: What is Sofi ?

[11:19 AM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: We also failed to reach them. I'll try to get you alternatives.

[11:19 AM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: Let me check the taibbi debate

[12:14 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: Couldn't find the debate. What was it about?

[12:22 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: Munk debate

[12:25 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: I much rather have professionals. Anything that's open can just attract a large crowd of zealots who would manipulate the result. I'll try to find some good candidates

[12:26 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: SoFi was voice dictating error

[12:26 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: No problem on the judges

[12:26 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: Oh got it

[12:26 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: ;)

[12:27 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: I don't want to have this we decided on a technicality, but on the big issue

[12:31 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: I understand. The other concern is the debate going into all the indirect effects of vaccines that are not the original intent of the challenge.

[12:32 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: We can just ask the judges to ignore those if you don't like the placebo version i made

[12:33 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: so the criteria could be something like:

[12:35 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: the mrna vaccines have caused more deaths than lives saved.

in considering this, the judges should disregard indirect effects, such as behavioral changes of people being vaccinated, or virus mutations due to antibodies etc.

[12:38 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: The placebo criteria would be an example of the intent.

[12:39 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: what do you mean?

[12:41 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: The intent to show is that the cure is worse than the disease in terms of deaths caused. Your randomized expression is one way to show it

[12:41 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: so you're ok with the placebo language?

[12:42 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: As an example of one way to win

WhatsApp log

[12:43 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: Concept though is deaths from Vax > lives saved from a COVID-CAUSED death

[12:44 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: got it. will adjust

[12:45 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: So my claim is Vax intervention was more harmful than helpful set death

[12:45 PM, 12/13/2022] Steven Kirsch: Wrt. Not set

[12:45 PM, 12/13/2022] Saar Wilf: Got it

[7:02 AM, 12/19/2022] Saar Wilf: Hi Steve, I shared the term sheet with you. Good luck!

[7:31 AM, 12/19/2022] Steven Kirsch: How?

[8:14 AM, 12/19/2022] Saar Wilf: google docs. you should have received an email

[9:29 PM, 12/19/2022] Steven Kirsch: great will look for it... too many things on my stack, but this is a priority. thanks!

[10:48 PM, 12/19/2022] Steven Kirsch: got it just fine. thanks. nice job. i'm running on 5 hours of sleep, will try to respond tomorrow

[8:53 AM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: you aren't going to back out of this are you? I'm certainly not! I'll be prioritizing the agreement today. Can I share it publicly?

[8:53 AM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: the propopsed agreement that is

[8:57 AM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: i'm ready to sign today

[8:57 AM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: let's share it only after signing

[10:42 AM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: great. i'll look at today.

[12:22 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: judges decide at the COMMENCEMENT of the debate?

[12:24 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: judges can say evidence is unclear. I present compelling evidence , you present. they basically can be confused. so that has to be an option.

is the standard clear and convincing evidence, i.e, that the judge is "reasonably certain" the got the right answer or "absolutely certain" ?

[12:25 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: so i propose judges decide AFTER the debate, rather than before the we speak

that their standard would be overwhelming evidence

[12:28 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: secondary effects shouldn't be excluded. this is a TOTAL measure of the intervention. Was the intervention a clear NET mortality benefit or a clear NET mortality loss. that's the criteria. So you split the world in two... one world deployed the vaccine, the other world did not. which world had fewer deaths.

[12:29 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: this is because my evidence doesn't separate out the secondary effects so you'd disqualify my evidence.

WhatsApp log

requiring certainty means the debate has public value.

[12:29 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: typo. fixed

[12:29 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: otherwise its judging noise.

[12:29 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: yes, i see that. thanks.

[12:29 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: my other points apply

[12:31 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: the judges will detail their reasoning, how confident they are etc. but eventually must each issue one of two decisions.

[12:32 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: what i don't like in secondary effects is winning by luck. for example, perhaps the vaccines by accident caused a weaker variant to emerge and therefore it worked.

[12:32 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: no, because they can be confused. it has to be tri state.

[12:33 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: i don't want to allow them to weasel out.

[12:33 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: this is NOT real world. the debate would be meaningless.

[12:33 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: the real world doesn't allow collection of such non confounded evidence.

[12:33 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: in the real world people are uncertain.

[12:34 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: let's close one issue at the time.

[12:34 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: you want to win. so your jueges should be cerertain. otherwise you proved nothing. you aren't doing it for the money... you are doing it to show the world it is CLEAR you are right

[12:34 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: sure. which issue.

[12:34 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: let's do judges decision first. i'm afraid that if we allow them to say 'maybe', they'll just choose that, take their fee, and go, because that's the lowest risk for them.

[12:35 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: first: must be tri state: it was better, it was worse, or we're not sure.

[12:35 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: if judges do that, you picked the wrong judges

[12:36 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: ok. i'll accept that, but if one judge says 'unsure' and the other 'x wins', then x wins.

[12:37 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: no, neither wins. to win, you have to win convincingly. i hold myself to the same standard as you. I'm open to more judges, e.g., you win if you get 3 out of 4 votes.

[12:38 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: are you doing this for money? or are you doing this to beenfit the public??

[12:38 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: specifically in this part of the discussion i'm focusing on the money part.

[12:39 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: ok, i'll think about this. now to the issue of secondary effects.

[12:41 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: i think answering the question "were the people who decided to not take the vaccine better off?" is just as interesting, but has the advantage of being much easier to evaluate than "would a hypothetical world where the vaccines weren't given have more people alive?"

WhatsApp log

[12:44 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: for example, suppose the vaccine is very effective, but it made people overconfident and careless, resulting in more net deaths (but people having more freedom, more economic activity etc). that's a case where the claim that vaccines are harmful and ineffective is wrong, but your side wins on a technicality.

[12:44 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: the judges can consider both, but the criteria is basically the same: was the vaccine a good idea w.r.t.. mortality. So you shouldn't just limit yourself to preventing deaths from COVID... if the vaccine prevented deaths from strokes, you should get credit. So i'm making it easier for you to win.

It should be a societal benefit... did the vaccine result in greater loss of life or less loss of life. How about that?

[12:45 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: what i just wrote is the REAL LIFE benefit. this is the whole point of the debate to question the public intervention as good or bad w.r.t., loss of life

[12:46 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: But this is a case that the intervention was good but resulted in more deaths

[12:49 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: then it's a bad intervention isn't it. You said you were interested in public interest. a good intervention saves lives. that's my focus. what's your focus? winning a bet?

[12:53 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: allow me to explain: this is a case where people who took the vaccine were much better off, it allowed them to take greater risks, and the extra risk caused the excess deaths, not the vaccine.

[12:53 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: it's a case where "vaccines are safe and effective", but "there are more dead in the world where vaccines are given"

[12:55 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: the issue is the evidence I have doesn't separate things out so neatly. and it's not convincing to the public that hey the vaccine was good but it killed half the population. no society would vote for that.

[12:56 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: Let me make it simple from my side we need to have three things:

1. judges can rule in 1 of 3 states:

[12:56 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: 2. it should be whether intervention saved lives, not sure, resulted in net loss of life

[12:59 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: i'm open to what the final criteria for who wins the debate so long as it is CLEAR decision of the judges rather than they were 51% certain.

SO if you have 3/4 or 3/5 judges ruling that YOU had clear and compelling evidence and was 65% certain or more that they made the right decision, you win.

[12:59 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: otherwise, this is going to be a random exercise and risky.... like flipping a coin 5 times. nobody will be convinced.

[1:00 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: to be clear, i think this increases my chance of winning, but makes the debate complex and irrelevant. what will happen at the end is that you will win because of the risk taking

WhatsApp log

factor, or i will win because the vaccines stopped transmission for a few months of Delta, allowing the weaker Omicron to emerge. both cases irrelevant to the big question of whether vaccines are safe and effective.

[1:01 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: so you want 2 judges agree with 65% confidence?

[1:02 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: again, my evidence takes into account ALL these factors.

I'd prefer the winner must convince 4/5 judges who must be at least 65% certain.

I'd prefer 80% certain.

nobody should win a bet on uncertainty.

[1:03 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: if you want to go for 5/5 are 90% certain, I'm all for that. then your win will be VERY meaningful. that's what you want right?

[1:05 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: or use criminal standard, even better, convinced beyond a reasonable doubt

[1:05 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: the monetary win is unrelated to the judges certainty.

[1:05 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: it's related to your motivation. are you trying to save lives? or win a bet?

[1:06 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: that's what i'm saying. for saving lives it doesn't matter whether the prize was awarded. two separate questions.

[1:06 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: john ioannidis at stanford can appoint 5 judges. each of us has 2 vetos. this is the best way to pick judges.

[1:06 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: is he willing to do so?

[1:06 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: you keep avoiding my question: what is your goal? to make money? or to save lives?

[1:07 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: i haven't spoken to him. He might be. otherwise we pick another scientist who is truth teller like vinay prasad.

[1:08 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: my primary goal is to set a standard for rational public discourse. if the prize is rarely awarded, then it doesn't provide for serious skin in the game.

[1:08 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: each of us should really fear losing.

[1:13 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: we should do it on a coin flip then if you want to fear losing. that should not be the test.

standard for public discourse that makes a difference is 5/5 judges rule using "beyond a reasonable doubt" that you are right. You have then a clear and convincing victory. After all, your evidence is SOOOOOOOOOOOO compelling.

WhatsApp log

I'm agreeable to this. why aren't you?

[1:18 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: because the probability of losing money is very low, and therefore doesn't create the necessary incentives.

[1:19 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: can we close this at 2/3 65%?

[1:22 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: incentives for who? for the parties to present their case? I'm totally incentivized at 5/5 at beyond a reasonable doubt. How could you not be? I have a very compelling case that is impossible to explain if the vaccine is safe. I want a clear and convincing victory and I am incentivized to win.

[1:25 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: the idea is to set a standard so people will know that when someone says "i'm offering a kirsch-rootclaim style debate on my claim", then everyone knows they mean business. if anyone can say it for any issue that is not 99% certain, knowing they can't lose, then we achieved nothing.

[1:25 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: anyway 2/3 65% good?

[1:30 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: no. i want to win this convincingly otherwise it's not worth your time or mine. 5/5 criminal standard. I can meet that. Otherwise, i win and then am accused of low standard of proof. 500,000 lives are at stake.

[1:34 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: you are confusing two separate issues.

one is about winning convincingly. that can happen regardless of the threshold for the prize. we can say 3/5 65% for the prize, and in practice you win a decisive 5/5 95%+.

the second is about setting a standard by which people take real risk with their public statements, and that requires the threshold to not be crazy high.

[3:02 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: no, if I lose or win, I want to win convincingly.

[5:06 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: i understand. unfortunately, we have different goals here.

i suggest we agree on everything we can, and do a live streamed discussion with the person who will choose the judges (e.g. Ioannidis), where we together decide how to close the gaps, with your original term sheet serving as a guideline, and the goal of extracting the most valuable signal to society from the debate.

[5:08 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: the goal is central though. i don't see that changing anything. i want to save lives. don't you care about saving lives?

[5:09 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: i do, but i'm also looking at the lives saved (and other value generated) in establishing a standard for future debates.

[5:09 PM, 12/20/2022] Saar Wilf: so i suggest the guideline is your original term sheet + finding the parameters that benefit society the most

[9:14 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: Finding the parameters of benefit society, the most is a much more difficult problem to solve. I only claimed that the vaccine intervention was a big mistake. That's what the bet is on. And I think I can win it with a very high standard of evidence. It doesn't seem you're very confident in your argument, which is why you're backing down from the high standard of proof.

[9:15 PM, 12/20/2022] Steven Kirsch: If you are confident you can't win with a high standard of proof, then this is a waste of your time and mine

[3:10 AM, 12/21/2022] Saar Wilf: there are issues you didn't cover in your original offer, and need to be well defined. it's perfectly natural for us not to agree on some of these items. let's use the procedure above and get there quickly.

WhatsApp log

are there any other issues with the term sheet or can we move forward?

[7:59 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: as long as we have 4/5 judges beyond a reasonable doubt criteria and I can prove vax created a negative net all-cause mortality benefit, I'm good. judges should be appointed per criteria i suggested by a mutually agreeable person. OK with that? If so, I'm more than happy to move ahead.

[8:00 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: ASAP!

[8:02 AM, 12/21/2022] Saar Wilf: like i said. 4/5 reasonable doubt is a new demand which didn't appear in the original terms, and therefore needs to be mutually agreed. as i prefer 2/2 at >50%, we should resolve this in good faith, e.g. using the procedure above.

we also need to define the fine details of net benefit.

so once these two are agreed, we have no further disagreements?

[8:05 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: you should WELCOME a high bar. You don't want to lose, do you? the high bar is mutually beneficial. It is astonishing to me you are not agreeing to this.

[8:06 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: correct your termsheet witht the message above about the thresholds and criteria explanation (net mortality benefit or not).

[8:06 AM, 12/21/2022] Saar Wilf: i see i'm failing to explain in writing. can you talk?

[8:07 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: you should think about it. the terms govern both of us. when I bet, i bet on sure things which is why I know I can meet the burden of proof.

[8:07 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: can't talk now. in about 30 min

[8:07 AM, 12/21/2022] Saar Wilf: ok

[8:43 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: now

[8:50 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: call me when you are ready

[9:06 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: i don't want to be accused of being a grifter by winning with a low bar.

[9:07 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: My evidence is VERY VERY solid on this.

[9:07 AM, 12/21/2022] Steven Kirsch: It's overwhelming. why would I want a lower standard of proof?

[8:29 PM, 12/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: Status?

[8:30 PM, 12/22/2022] Saar Wilf: Preparing something. But you'll need to accept that we don't see everything the same way and show some flexibility.

[8:33 PM, 12/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: Happy to look at your proposal as I can use the funds!!

[8:38 PM, 12/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: Flexibility as to what?

[8:38 PM, 12/22/2022] Saar Wilf: The parameters

[8:41 PM, 12/22/2022] Steven Kirsch: Be specific

[8:42 PM, 12/22/2022] Saar Wilf: Yes will send soon

[7:16 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: So we discussed it internally in detail. The main concern is that people are really reluctant to give very high confidence numbers, even when they are in fact very confident. It's just a common human weakness.

WhatsApp log

Here is the most we can think that is realistic to achieve, when one side makes a very convincing case.

For a \$500,000 prize

2 out of 3 judges are over 80% confident

or 3 out of 3 judges are over 65% confident

For a \$150,000 prize

2 out of 3 judges are over 65% confident

or 3 out of 3 judges are over 50% confident

[7:35 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: How about to win you get 5/5 judges that believe it's more likely.... So 50% theshod.

[7:35 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: That should be easy for you

[7:36 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: we're having problems getting 2 judges...

[7:38 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: Not with new process

[7:38 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: Let do 6 judges 3 are vaxxed 3 are unvaxxed

[7:48 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: what's the new process?

[8:03 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: Ask Ioannidis for 3 vaxxed and 3 unvaxxed

[8:04 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: i'm fine with having ioannidis choose, but are you reaching him?

[8:04 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: Yes I've talked to him in the past

[8:05 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: please stop adding new requirements. judges need to declare they will examine the evidence professionally and without bias. the personal health choices they made based on information available at the time is irrelevant.

[8:05 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: it's starting to look like you're finding a way to get out of the debate.

[8:07 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: This ensures no bias. If I want to get out of debate, I wouldn't be wasting my time. My requirements ensure neutrality

[8:07 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: If you don't want a neutral panel, you should back out

[8:08 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: the unvaxxed requirement is new. i already asked you if there are any more requirements and you said no. so i won't allow it. sorry.

[8:08 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: every time i accept something you bring something new up

[8:08 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: this has to end

[8:08 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: i sent you the last offer to close all open issue. please accept it as is, or tell your followers why you declined.

WhatsApp log

[8:19 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: Why don't you make it easy? Show me your evidence and if changes my mind you've won. No money involved. But you will save lives. Why don't you do that? I will happily publish this entire stream so people can decide for themselves. If you have evidence I'm wrong, you shouldn't be sitting on it. That puts peoples lives at risk.

[8:20 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: i have answered this question multiple times.

this has to stop.

[8:20 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: I have your permission to publish this entire conversation right?

[8:20 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: yes

[8:20 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: Perfect. I will do that

[8:24 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: good. i believe you will get clear feedback that it looks like you are just trying to find a way out of the debate (or paying the money), starting from your choice to retract the term sheet at a time you knew we were working on an application, with the weird excuse that no one is applying.

hopefully that will get you to accept the very reasonable terms currently offered, and we can move ahead to the benefit of everyone.

good luck

[8:29 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: Nope. It won't. Now that the bet is off, I suggest you publish your findings and save lives by showing the world we got it wrong. Will you do that? You already made your deck.

[8:32 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: We will likely do that, but it will have negligible impact this way. No one will be convinced by yet another compilation of studies.

Anyway, we will now go to the legal path. This will likely just end in you paying the \$500,000 without any debate. I also recommend you talk to your attorney, as your retraction indicates low confidence in your public claims, which may open you to lawsuits in the \$100 millions, similar to the Dominion lawsuits.

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2022/dec/11/rupert-murdoch-fox-dominion-lawsuit-deposition>

[8:33 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: i recommend you take a few days to think this over, discuss with your followers, and think if this is really where you want to go. I don't.

[9:31 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: What is your cause of action?

[9:38 AM, 12/23/2022] Saar Wilf: Let's talk after the weekend

[9:45 AM, 12/23/2022] Steven Kirsch: looking forward to hearing from you