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LISA BOOTHE, FOX NEWS CHANNEL CONTRIBUTOR: God bless America.

TOMI LAHREN, FOX NEWS CHANNEL CONTRIBUTOR: I don't know if they put gibberish in teleprompter, but you know, I guess that remains to be seen.

Folks, that does it for us. We will see you right back here tomorrow night at 7:00 PM Eastern for "The Big Weekend Show."

LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN starts right now.

MARK LEVIN, FOX NEWS CHANNEL HOST: Hello, America. I'm Mark Levin, and this is LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN Saturday.

Well, there's a lot to talk about here, and I do things differently here, for better or worse and I'm very lucky, I have this platform and the folks here allow me to do it.

In fact, I don't believe they've ever interfered with anything I've done or said. It really is an expression of free speech and it is a fantastic opportunity and I'm very grateful.

Oh, as you know, we had this election in New Hampshire and I think my friend, David Brody summed it up best and I'm going to tell you what he had to say, because to me, it was the best analysis that I've heard.

But then I want to put things in context because the narrative we were hearing all night after this historic Trump victory was that the moderates won't vote for him, but the Independents won't vote for him, so he can't win.

I was particularly hearing this from the left liberal Democrat analysts, because they're -- you know, they're looking to try and figure out how to get their man, Joe Biden, how to slip him back in the Oval Office without actually him having to say anything.

So my man, David Brody says: "More than half of primary voters were not Republicans. The electorate was more moderate and liberal this time compared to 2016 by nine points."

We know why because the Democrats had a concerted effort, as did Nikki Haley to have Independents who are actually Democrats dressed up as Independents, not all, but many to vote in the Republican primary. It is very sleazy. It's really a big dirty trick. It's been going on forever. That's my point.

It's a sleazy big dirty trick to the Republican primary, 64 percent of primary voters said they were not MAGA.

MAGA -- Biden hates it. Their MAGA. MAGA.

Let's see, Make America Great Again, Biden has a problem with that. Well, if you want to fundamentally transform America, I guess you do have a problem with that.

Just 24 percent of primary voters were very conservative compared to 52 percent in Iowa. Nikki Haley had the endorsement of the popular governor of New Hampshire, not so popular Chris Sununu anymore. Big loser.

Nikki Haley spent tons of time there and Nikki Haley had her two-person race on supposedly her type of political terrain, and it goes on.

It was a historic victory for Trump. Republicans don't get over 50 percent of the vote, particularly when only 47 percent of those voting are Republicans. Trump got 70 percent of the Republican votes, so if it had been an actual Republican primary, he would have gotten 70 percent and Haley 28 percent, a complete blowout.

So he's won Iowa with a historic number that nobody else ever had, over 50 percent. He won New Hampshire with a historic number nobody ever had. Despite all the attempts in Iowa and New Hampshire by Haley, her supporters, the RINOs, the establishment, you know, the long list -- the Democrats, the billionaires -- to get Nikki Haley over the finish line.

So she finishes third and second and basically declares victory. Nobody is buying that. We're not stupid. Third and second is not first.

And I might add, I thought her speech was very un-classy. Let me put it that way, it lacked class.

But why I'm here in this monologue to talk about what I'm here to talk about is this piece from 2016 of June 1 by a very liberal man, Frank Rich, who used to write for "The New York Times," I don't know if he does or not, in "New York" Magazine. In fact, I didn't even know if he was still with us. Apparently, he is. Hello, Frank.

No fan of mine, apparently.

But I want to read something to you. Because as I said at the opening of the program, the narrative now on Trump is and you know, it's not a lot of thought that goes into media and some of this analysis, so they will repeat each other. Not all, but too many and it is Trump can't win suburban women. Trump can't win moderates. He can't even win people within his own party. Look at the polls. Look at the numbers.

Check this out: The greatest vote getter in Republican history is Ronald Reagan. Even in a three-man race, in 1980, he got a majority, 51 percent Then of course, in 1984, he almost got 60 percent. He won 49 states. He almost won 50. Mondale stayed if he had 1,500 more votes.

Those are modern-day landslides no matter how you count it and he was a conservative. How did he do it? He reached out to these moderates and so forth. The same propaganda, or wrong analysis, or intentional effort to undermine Trump was used against Reagan and that is the comparison I want to make.

I don't agree with everything Frank Rich says because he is a leftist Democrat, but stick with me. So he writes in 2016, before the 2016 election, Trump gets the nomination he says, "To understand how Trump has advanced to where he is now and why he has been underestimated almost every step and why he has a shot at vanquishing Hillary Clinton (which he did), few roadmaps are more illuminating than Reagan's unlikely path to the White House."

He says, "In addition, I'm talking about Reagan, the candidate." Obviously, their personalities are different, and there are other differences. But the nub, the core of this is really very, very important to understand what's taking place.

"Reagan's and Trump's opposing styles belie their similarities of substance. Both have marketed the same brand of outrage to the same angry segments of the electorate." Again, forget about the cheap shots, stick with me.

"Faced the same jeering press (yes); attracted some of the same battlefront allies (yes), Roger Stone and Paul Manafort and the late great Phyllis Schlafly, offended the same elites, including two generations of Bushes, outmaneuvered similar political adversaries and espoused the same conservative populism.'

Craig Shirley, the expert on the Reagan presidency, a longtime Republican political consultant, and Republican acolyte, and historian has written authoritative books on the presidential campaigns of 1976 and 1980 that serve as correctives to the sentimental revisionist history that would have us believe that Reagan was cheered on as a conquering hero by GOP elites during his long climb to national power.

To hear the right's triumphalism of recent years, you'd think that only smug Democrats were appalled by Reagan, while Republicans quickly recognized that their party decimated by Richard Nixon and Watergate had found its savior.

I've said this over and over again, but it may ring even truer coming from a leftist. It rings absolutely true and shows you how so much the analysis is way off.

He says grassroot Republicans from Reagan have been courting for years with speeches, radio addresses, and opinion pieces beneath the mainstream media's radar were indeed in his camp, but aside from a lone operative, John Sears, Shirley wrote, the other major GOP players, especially Easterners and moderates thought Reagan was a certified yahoo.

By his death in 2004, Shirley says, they would profess their love and devotion to Reagan and claim they were there from the beginning in 1974, which is a load of horse manure.

Even after his election in 1980, Shirley adds, Reagan was never much loved by his own party's leaders after GOP setbacks in the 1982 midterms, a Republican National Committee functionary taped a piece of paper to her door announcing the sign up for the 1984 Bush for President campaign.

Shirley's memories are corroborated by reportage contemporaneous with Reagan's last two presidential runs. A poll in 1976 found that 90 percent of Republican state chairmen, judged Reagan guilty of simplistic approaches, with no depth in federal government administration, no experience in foreign affairs.

It was a little different in January 1980 when a US News and World Report's survey of 475 national and state Republican chairman found they preferred George HW Bush to Ronald Reagan.

One state chairman presumably spoke for many when he told the magazine that Reagan's intellect was thinner than spit on a slate rock.

As Rick Perlstein writes in "The Invisible Bridge," what he says is the third and largest volume of his epic chronicle, "The Rise of Conservative Movement," both Nixon and Ford dismissed Reagan as a lightweight.

Barry Goldwater endorsed Ford over Reagan in 1976 despite the fact that Reagan's legendary speech on behalf of Goldwater's presidential election, you may recall the speech, too "A Time for Choosing" was the biggest boost that a so-called, he says, kamikaze candidacy received.

Only a single Republican senator, Paul Laxalt of Nevada signed on to Reagan's presidential quest from the start.

Paul Laxalt was my political mentor and I was involved in the '76 and '80 campaigns. This is exactly hundred percent correct.

What put off Reagan's fellow Republicans will sound very familiar. He proposed an economic program, 30 percent tax cuts, increased military spending a balanced budget, whose math was voodoo, according to George Bush, of course, and then some.

He prided himself on not being part of the Washington establishment, mocked Capitol Hill's buddy system, and it's collusion with the forces that have brought us our problem, the Congress, the bureaucracy, the lobbyists, big business, and big labor.

Like Trump, but unlike most of his and Trump's political rivals, Reagan was accessible to the press and public. His spontaneity and give and takes with the reporters and voters played well.

Republican leaders blasted Reagan as a trigger happy war monger. So Reagan attack Ford, the sitting Republican president he ran against in 1976 primary, and Henry Kissinger for what he said is their pursuit of bipartisan policies of detente and Chinese engagement.

The sole benefit of detente Reagan said was to give America the right to sell Pepsi-Cola in Siberia -- Pepsi-Cola in Siberia.

For good measure, he stoked an international dispute by vowing to upend a treaty ceding American control over the Panama Canal. He said, we bought it, we paid for it, it's ours and we're going to keep it. You can hear Donald Trump would have said the same exact thing.

The Republican elites of Reagan's day was blindsided by him as their counterparts had been by Trump. Then Reagan came close to toppling the incumbent president at the contested Kansas City Convention in '76. The Ford forces didn't realize they could lose until the devil was at the door.

A President Ford Committee campaign statement maintained that Reagan could not defeat any candidate. The Democrats put up -- listen to this -- because his constituency is much too narrow even within the Republican Party, and because he lacked the critical national and international experience that President Ford had gained through 25 years of public service.

Ford dismissed him. They all dismissed him. And of course, the press. Much of the press was slow to catch up, too, he writes, a typical liberal establishment take on Reagan can be found in "Harper's," which called him "Ronald Duck, the candidate from Disneyland," that he had come to be deemed a serious candidate for president, the magazine intoned was a shame and embarrassment for the country.

Why am I telling you this? Because you're getting the same propaganda, the same false analysis with Trump.

The power of that appeal was underestimated by his Democratic foes in 1980, even though Carter, too, had run as a populist and attracted some Wallace voters when beating Ford in '76.

By the time he was up for re-election, Carter was an unpopular incumbent -- ready? Presiding over the Iranian hostage crisis, gas shortages, a reeling economy, yet surely that Democrats would prevail over Ronald Duck anyway.

Well, a strategic memo by Carter's pollster, Patrick Caddell, who became a big Trump supporter and an admirer of Reagan later laid out the campaign against Reagan's obvious vulnerabilities with bullet points, "Is Reagan safe? Shoots from the hip. Over his head. What are his solutions?" But it was the strategy of Caddell's counterpart in the Reagan camp, the great poster, Richard Wirthlin, that carried the day with the electorate.

He said voters wanted to follow some authority figure, he theorized, a leader who can take charge with authority, return a sense of discipline to our government and manifest the willpower needed to get this country back on track, or at least a leader from outside Washington like Reagan and now Trump who projects that image, whether he has the ability to deliver it or not.

And that's the final nail in the liberal moderate RINO coffin.

Trump not only has the ability, he did. He already served for four years. We, the American people are quite familiar with him and we are quite familiar with the people who are trying to undermine him and stop him within the Republican Party and the press and in the Democratic Party.

They are the same people, they are the same institutions, even though they go on TV and say I'm a Reagan Republican. Sununu Christie -- they were never near Reagan Republicans, they were never near Reagan. No, they're Ford, they are Bush. They are what they are.

I'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

I'm here with Tim Scott. He has become a very good friend of mine. Just a nice guy. He is as he seems, no pretentions.

He is a solid of a man, both morally, and he is a solid man of philosophy. He is a man who is about to get married, so he has a big smile on his face. I don't blame him. I have a beautiful wife, too.

Now, Tim Scott, this issue about can Donald Trump appeal to moderate voters? To Democrats and so forth?

May I ask you a couple of questions. Well, first of all, wasn't he elected president, number one? And number two? Isn't this what they say every time a conservative runs for president?

SEN. TIM SCOTT (R-SC): Well, he did a great job. I mean, think about the fact that Ronald Reagan, they said he can't win. He's just an actor. He has no ability to appeal beyond California, beyond conservatives, beyond Independents.

Now, here's what we know: 49 out of 50 states later, Ronald Reagan did what no other president has done, number one. Number two, the good news about President Trump is this. In New Hampshire, liberals voted, Democrats voted, Independent voters all voted in the New Hampshire Republican primary and what was the result? A double digit win.

And here is what is really cool from my perspective. Donald Trump didn't just win with seniors. He didn't just win with women. He didn't just win with millennials. He won with all three demographics.

Listen, Mark. Donald Trump won millennials by the largest margin against Nikki Haley, 58 to 36, I think it was.

He won women against Nikki Haley. He won seniors.

When you go to New Hampshire, where it is an opening primary, where liberals and Democrats and Independents are joining Republicans, Donald Trump cleaned house and now, we're bringing that to South Carolina, a more conservative group of people.

But here's what you'll see. Today, one out of five Black folks are looking at the great opportunity party. Why? Because Donald Trump delivered when he was president and we have good memories.

Today, 40-plus percent of Hispanics are looking at Donald Trump in the GOP. Why? Because Donald Trump brought the lowest unemployment rate to Hispanics in the history of the country.

See, Hispanics are like Black people who are like White people who are like Asians. We care about family values. We care about a secure southern border. We care about safety in our streets.

There is no monolith that exist, only in the minds of liberals and Democrats can they say the color of your skin will determine how you're going to vote.

Donald Trump is changing everything we know about American ***politics*** today and that is good news for our nation. He has the chance to unite the party, unite the country behind success. That's what we have in 2017 and 2020 and it is coming back 2024.

Starting in January 2025, we will have lower taxes back on the menu, we'll have low inflation back on the menu, we'll have low crime and high levels of law enforcement back on the menu for the American people. That's good news, Mark.

And thank you, you are a teller of truth. You are a purveyor of hope. You're an ambassador for what's good about America.

LEVIN: God bless you. Thank you.

Tim Scott, what is it about these Republican establishment, these elites who are wrong all the time. They got Romney, he lost. They got McCain, he lost. They got Dole, he lost. They got George HW Bush when he was running in the Reagan third term, he lost.

Sometimes they win, but they act like only they can win. Tell me, is it a winning agenda to literally stand for nothing? Nothing. I don't even know what Nikki Haley stands for.

She's for China. Against China. She's for Disney. She's against Disney.

She is for a secure border. She's quiet about a secure border.

I don't even know what her position is on abortion. They keep saying I believe in Nikki's position on abortion. So what the hell is Nikki's position on abortion? I can't figure it out.

But all those points aside, you think you're going to create an electoral juggernaut around not just no labels, but no policies?

SCOTT: Well, the exit interviews from New Hampshire was really important. The young millennials who came out to support Nikki Haley said in a general election, Nikki Haley versus Joe Biden, they're leaving Nikki Haley and they're going back home to Joe Biden.

They said they voted in the Republican primary to make it harder for President Trump to win, but even in the demographic that they represent Donald Trump, he won 58 and 42, 58 and 35.

So what we know for sure, is whatever they're selling, Americans are not buying, number one. Number two, think about this. You may have a quasi- understanding of where Nikki stands on the issues, but you have a clear understanding of where President Trump stands on the issues.

Let's think about the number one issue facing this nation today. President Trump is clear, crystal clear that securing the southern border with a wall is absolutely, positively, unequivocally job number one. The largest invasion in the history of the country has come across a porous, wide open southern border jeopardizing our lives in this nation.

I believe, Mark, and this is not being hyperbolic whatsoever, I believe that because 10 million illegal immigrants have crossed our southern border, 85 percent let free in our nation, that we have sleeper cells in our nation today.

We know that hundreds of people on our National Security watchlist have been caught at our southern border.

Mark, 10 million people? How many did we not catch? I am very concerned that the greatest National Security threat to America today, it is not in your -- it is not even in the Middle East, it is here at home.

We should stand strong with our ally, Israel, but we also should secure our southern border now. There should be a silo package supporting Israel, a silo package securing our southern border before we have a conversation about anything else.

If America is not the city on the hill, if we are not a shining star, there is no hope for the rest of the world. We need Donald Trump to secure our southern border and then to make sure that our economy sweeps out Bidenomics him brings in more Trump tax cuts.

LEVIN: You know, Tim Scott, I do want to make it abundantly clear, this isn't going to be an easy election, even if the playing field were level. And people need to understand what's at stake and they need to understand that they have to work hard, but this isn't a given.

SCOTT: Absolutely.

LEVIN: And the reason is very, very simple. They control the media, they control the culture. They control the narrative. And so all of these battles are taking place plus they control the DAs in New York and New York State, the DAs in Atlanta, Georgia; the prosecutors in Washington, DC and that is Joe Biden.

I believe that's what he's betting on in the end, he is trying to take out Donald Trump through the legal system.

But when we come back, my question for you is about you. You're taking a lot of incoming because you stood on the stage. You supported Donald Trump. You do what you do.

You're the best preacher in the Republican Party, and now, the very same people who are protecting Kamala Harris and Nikki Haley, and other people of color, well, their bigotry is in full display on their attacks on you.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

JON SCOTT, FOX NEWS CHANNEL ANCHOR: Welcome to "Fox News Live," I'm Jon Scott in New York.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu pushing back against the International Court of Justice's ruling to limit Israel's military operation in Gaza. He says Israel will continue to do what's needed to keep its country secure. Three Palestinians were killed in an Israeli airstrikes since yesterday's ruling. The IDF claims it was targeting a Hamas commander. The court's ruling stopped short of calling for a ceasefire.

The listed politicians falling victim to swatting incidents is growing. The latest, Republican presidential candidate, Nikki Haley. It reportedly happened late last month. The caller alleged he shot his girlfriend at her South Carolina home and threatened to harm himself. There have been more than two dozen swatting incidents on high profile public figures since November.

I'm Jon Scott, now back to LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN.

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

You know, Senator Scott, sometimes the Democratic Party, the party of slavery and segregation and Jim Crow and the party of eugenics, they really show ankle. So if you are a Black person, or if you're a woman, or if you're Jewish, or whatever you are, if you're a minority, and you don't toe the line and in fact, you're an articulate spokesman for liberty, and the Constitution and the Declaration and morality and so forth and you don't throw in with a hard left, you are targeted, you are smeared with race baiting.

You are -- your entire character is under attack. They're doing this to you right now. So I want to give you an opportunity to respond. So please go right ahead.

SCOTT: Yes. Well, thank you so much, Mark.

I'll just say their attacks are vile and they are disgusting. Think about folks like Joy Reid, who gets paid millions of dollars to lie to the American people and to defame me.

The challenge is this: Why do I support Donald Trump? Commonsense and liberty.

What do I mean by commonsense? Think about the Trump years from 2017 to 2020. I wanted a president to help poor communities, disproportionately minority communities with something called opportunity zones.

We've brought over nearly $100 billion into these distressed communities and what's the gentrification rate? Under five percent.

Said differently, President Trump and I teamed up together to bring relief and resources to the poorest Americans. Think about what President Trump did that no other president did? Not Obama, not Clinton, not Biden. He made HBCU -- Historically Black Colleges and Universities -- he made their funding permanent in a 10-year window and took the funding to the highest level in the history of the country.

But you see, Donald Trump doesn't care whether you're Black, or whether you're White, or whether you're Hispanic or whether you're Asian. He drove unemployment rates to the lowest level ever.

But as an African-American who grew up in poverty, I've got to tell you, I wondered if the American Dream would work for a kid like me. Thank God, I came to age when Ronald Reagan was coming to office.

In a similar fashion, I want the same opportunities for poor kids, whether you're a White kid or a Black kid, or a Hispanic kid or an Asian kid. If you're an American kid, I want an American president that looks out for the least of these, and when President Trump was in office, we grew income at the bottom 20 percent faster than the top 20 percent.

We focused on things like sickle cell anemia and heirs' property. We champion the cause of the underrepresented. To those who had no voice, we became their voice. To the defenseless, we defended them.

So anybody who wants to take a shot at me, because I stand next to the president who delivered for the communities across this country, I'll just take it, because standing up for liberty, standing for freedom is standing for the American way and we need more of that, not less of that.

LEVIN: Now, they go around and they say how can you do this to Nikki Haley? She appointed you to the Senate. May I ask you, who appointed her to the UN ambassadorship?

SCOTT: President Trump made her UN ambassador, a tremendous promotion from being governor. No one is saying anything about that.

There's something about a conservative Republican who happens to be bald, who won't stay in his place and do what they tell me to do. I think for myself, I make a decision not what's best for Nikki Haley, not what's best for myself, not even what's best for Donald Trump.

I made a decision what's best for Americans, what's best for poor kids and poor neighborhoods and poor zip codes who needs school choice. President Trump delivers. I'll never back down from doing the right thing for people who cannot stand up for themselves.

LEVIN: Well, you're good man.

SCOTT: Thank you.

LEVIN: You have in fact lifted yourself up by your bootstraps. You are an example of the American Dream. You are a successful man, you're an articulate man. You are a forceful visionary when it comes to principle and ***politics***, and that's why they hate you.

But it's why we love you.

SCOTT: True.

LEVIN: So thanks for coming on. Pleasure to have you.

SCOTT: Well, thank you, Mark. God bless you. Yes, sir.

LEVIN: We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

And we're here with Congressman Barry Loudermilk who is really committed to a selfless effort because he knows he's going to be hated by the media and virtually everybody else and what is he doing? He's been tasked with the job of taking a look at what the January 6 committee did, because they don't want the same mistakes to happen with Capitol Hill security and that sort of thing.

But almost by accident, they found out that the Democrats on the committee, as well as the two never Trumpers also under the tutelage of Nancy Pelosi destroyed massive amounts of video depositions, of data encrypted what they couldn't get rid of.

Barry Loudermilk, welcome to the program.

It almost sounds like they were in a frenzy, a desperate frenzy when the Republicans won the election to cover their tracks. What was going on here? What did you find?

REP. BARRY LOUDERMILK (R-GA): Well, we're trying to figure out what was going on, Mark, but look, when the Select Committee ended at the, I think January 2nd was their last day as an official committee because the Republicans became the majority on January the 3rd.

On January 2nd, we do know that they deleted some data from hard drive, but what they were supposed to be doing is archiving everything that they had accumulated, all of the transcripts of their interviews, their hearings, all of the data that they had compiled during this time of running their Select Committee, and that was to be handed over to the clerk, which was to be handed over to my committee.

What we received were boxes of printed documents, over a million pages of printed depositions and subpoenas and such. We received a couple of terabytes of digital data.

Now, we expected according to the chairman of the Select Committee, Bennie Thompson is they had four terabytes of data. But nothing was categorized. Nothing was catalogued. It was just, you know, thrown in boxes, so it took us a while to figure out what we had.

Then we started figuring out we didn't have everything. The first indication we received was when I got a call from one of the attorneys that represented someone who testified before the committee, and he wanted to review one of the videotapes of their depositions.

Well, we started looking forward and realized we did not have any videotapes of the depositions. They just were not there.

I contacted Chairman Bennie Thompson in a letter and he acknowledged they decided not to keep those, which then started us questioning what else do we not have? And as we did dug deeper, we realized we had depositions from people at the White House that were with President Trump that they were deposed, but we did not have their transcripts. We didn't have the written transcripts. Obviously, we didn't have videos.

We didn't have the transcripts of the Secret Service agents that were with President Trump. Then we started saying, well, maybe there's a trend here. It is anyone who gave a deposition that may be contrary to the one that Cassidy Hutchinson gave of actions of Trump. It's just -- it was unusual that those were the ones that we didn't have.

Then we honed in on, okay, this idea that there were four terabytes of data, but we had less than three terabytes of data. So we hired forensics company, third party, a commercial company, handed them the hard drives that the Select Committee handed over to my committee, and had them do low level scraping, and they were able to recover several hundred documents that have been deleted or hidden.

Now, some of those were digital copies of documents that we already had, but there were a hundred, over a hundred, I think about 111 unique documents that were nothing like we had based on their title and based on their timestamp. And furthermore, they were password encrypted where we could not get into them.

So this was something that was truly amazing is some of these documents were literally deleted the days before Republicans to control the House.

So this raises suspicion. Now, were they destroyed? I don't know. All I know is these documents are missing. I assume all the video evidence, all the videotapes were just disposed of because we don't have them and no one acknowledges that they exist anymore.

So as we're going along, we're finding out that there is a significant amount of information, a significant number of documents and videos that we do not have that the Select Committee was supposed to preserve, because they are official House documents.

We do know that some of those were sent to the White House and sent to DHS, instead of being archived here, which we are working on retrieving those as we speak.

LEVIN: Wow. Wow. I've got a lot of questions for you, and only a little bit of time.

When we come back, Congressman, my first question is, are you getting any assistance from the former members of that committee? My second question is, are you getting any assistance from the rather extensive staffers I used to work for that committee?

My third question is, will these people, at least some of them be put under oath or at least be compelled to testify as to what they did? And then fourthly, when we return, what about all of the defendants? What about Donald Trump? Some of this material might be exculpatory.

And then of course, the American people. You know, we're supposed to circle January 6 on our calendar as the day of the great insurrection and what we have here is a massive cover up, a massive scandal that obviously the rest of the media don't give a damn about, but I give a damn about and so do millions of American people.

We have a Nancy Pelosi Stalinist-like committee, that is cherry picking witnesses, cherry picking video that they're going to keep, cherry picking documents, giving documents to the White House, giving documents to the prosecutors, giving documents to DHS, but destroying documents and covering up documents that they don't want you to have.

Now, that's my summation. When we come back, I'd like you to address it.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

I mean, Congressman, the American people don't really know what happened on January 6, do they? And are you going to be able to get to the bottom of this using now the majority power of this committee? If you have to subpoena, if you have to put people under oath, public testimony, depositions -- will you go that far to get to the bottom of this?

LOUDERMILK: We will and I'll give the shout out to the Speaker Mike Johnson, who I met with on Friday, I give him regular updates of where we are and he is committed to give us all the resources and the ability to use every tool in our toolbox to get to the truth, because the American people deserve to know the truth.

And we've been taking this from an unbiased approach. I just want to know what the truth is -- good, bad or ugly. The American people deserve to know the truth and we need to make sure that something like this doesn't happen again.

But you're not going to be able to get to that if you're dealing with a cherry picked investigation or an investigation as you said, cherry picked, the narrative that fits what they wanted the American people to hear. They had a preconceived narrative and all they did was take all of the evidence. They preserved the evidence that supported their narrative, and some of the members of the committee are responding to what we're doing right now by saying there are no missing documents. Everything is actually published on the Government Printing Office's website. If you go to their website, you can see the report.

WATTERS: They want to declare under penalty of perjury that you have everything, then let them put their asses in the chair and say that on the record under penalty of perjury, every single one of them -- Liz Cheney, Kinzinger, Jamie Raskin -- fine, you have your opportunity to say it. So make them put it on the record.

LOUDERMILK: And we may be going in that direction. We're going to be making subpoenas, we're going to be having hearings, we're going to put some people under oath. But the interesting thing is, every time that they post something, they'll post this Government Publishing Office website, and they'll say, see all of the documents are here.

But if you look at the documents, that link says supporting documents. What they have put out there are the documents that supported their preconceived narrative.

We want all the documents. We want the documents that don't necessarily support their narrative. That's what the American people need to say. They were very, very crafty in what they were doing, is yes, they had evidence of things that happened, but not all the evidence. And so we deserve to get all of the evidence. That's what we're looking for.

Yesterday was the deadline for the White House and the Department of Homeland Security to provide all of the documents that are House documents. These are House documents that were sent to them. They're not executive branch, they belong to the House. They need to be returned to the House.

This is the second round of letters I've sent to them. The White House got to us at the 11th hour last night and said, give us another week and we'll have something to you.

What I've asked for is complete unredacted records. All that takes is e- mailing them or putting them in an envelope and delivering them to the Capitol. You don't need a week.

What they want to do is go and try to un-redact portions, but redact other portions. You see they sent me the four transcripts we asked for before, but they were so heavily redacted, Mark, there were multiple pages that were totally blacked out.

LEVIN: Let me get this straight. They are documents that belong to the House of Representatives. They were given to the White House. First, you're having to pull teeth to get the documents back.

LOUDERMILK: Yes. Correct.

LEVIN: Now, they are redacting your documents that belong -- and they charge Donald Trump with you know, handling documents in ways that he is not supposed to handle documents.

And speaking of that, Donald Trump's lawyers if my memory is correct, when did Judge Chutkan had said we need access to the information that January 6 Committee had. There could be exculpatory information there given the fact that the prosecutor keeps accusing Trump, even though he charges him with the Klan Act, but he keeps accusing Trump of helping to stir up violence.

So I would ask you this. This is a -- can we not assume this as a massive cover up? Who goes to the extent of destroying encrypted documents? Saying you have everything we need and so forth and so on if they're not covering up something? Could they also be covering up for Nancy Pelosi and the Democrat leadership on January 6th on what they did and didn't do?

LOUDERMILK: Oh, absolutely. And I can't speculate of where all this goes, but I can tell you from the investigative work we've done so far, the people that we have brought in for transcribed interviews, the multiple interviews that we've done with people who were there.

There is a tie between key elements in securing the Capitol and the Democrat leadership that goes way back.

Now, we know that there was an intelligence failure. We know that the Capitol Police Intelligence Division receives the same intelligence that was briefed to Donald Trump when Donald Trump ordered the National Guard to be ready to deploy. He did that a few days before, we have the documents of that, that he asked for 10,000 troops to be made available.

This same intelligence that was given to the White House that the FBI had, the Department of Homeland Security had was given to the Capitol Police Intelligence Division, however, that intelligence was suppressed.

Chief of Police Sund was never briefed on this level of intelligence before, and we do know that there was a connection into Democrat leadership and we believe they possibly did know about it.

LEVIN: So when we circled January 6th in the calendar for some of us, I think it's going to be the day that was the biggest cover up in modern American history led by the Democratic Party because you don't destroy documents, things don't go missing, you don't encrypt things, you don't redact things. You don't do all those things because the party opposite is coming in unless you have a hell of a lot to cover up.

LOUDERMILK: Right.

LEVIN: So Congressman, we're going to stick with you, you will now be on every show, I can promise you that. We're going to stick with you here, Barry Loudermilk because we want to keep watching this and find out what you come up with.

I want to thank you very, very much for what you're doing. God bless you, my friend.

LOUDERMILK: Well, God bless you. It's been an honor to be with you and I look forward to the future times. Thank you, Mark.

LEVIN: Thank you, sir.

We'll be right back.

(COMMERCIAL BREAK)

LEVIN: Welcome back, America.

I want to spend the short amount of time we have left directing a question to Joe Biden.

I hear you want to run on democracy. Well, when you run on democracy, Mr. Biden, will you remind the American people how you opposed integrating our public school system? Will you remind the American people that you called Robert Byrd, who founded the Klan in West Virginia, James Eastland and John Stennis, two of the biggest racist segregationists in the history of the Senate, who filibustered the 1964 Civil Rights Act, that you've befriended them and they became friends with you?

When you discuss democracy, will you remind the American people of your relationship with George Wallace? That George Wallace praised you as a young politician when you were campaigning the other 130 times you're running for president and when you were campaigning in the south, you wave that like a badge of honor.

Will you remind the American people who Joe Biden is? No, you won't, so I will.

I will see you next time on LIFE, LIBERTY & LEVIN.
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