

Transcript
The End of COVID
Session 2 - Setting the Stage, Part 2

SPEAKERS

Leslie Manookian, Alec Zeck

Notice to Viewers ([00:00:00](#)):

This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed in whole or in part without express written permission. This information is not intended to diagnose, treat or cure a condition; nor is it to be considered medical or legal advice, opinion or recommendation.

The purpose of this presentation is to educate the public on everything there is to know about “the pandemic”, and all the pandemics before it. That way, we can finally end this fictional show that’s been on air since screens looked like this.

Alec Zeck ([00:00:29](#)):

Leslie, thank you so much for joining me. You know, we covered in the first session of the setup some of the things that were occurring, like operation lockstep and things like this, but you take this set up from a financial and political lens showing the puzzle pieces that were put together to lead to this whole charade in 2020. So I want to turn it over to you now to give your presentation discussing all of these things.

Leslie Manookian ([00:00:55](#)):

Okay. So, I think it's really important that people understand that there was actually some financial and political need for the great reset to happen when it did, I always ask people, well, why didn't they launch this in 2015? Or, why not in 2025 or 2030? You know, why 2020? And there's some very, very clear reasons for it, which we will touch on. So I just wanna kind of weave together all the different puzzle pieces so you can understand that there was actually a financial, a political, and an agency capture backdrop that facilitated everything that happened in the last three years. It didn't just happen out of the blue. So, um, the real issue is that we, we have a major motive from the major governments of the world in the Western, uh, western world. And that is that they have failed, essentially, they've been borrowing, um, into oblivion, and they have no intention of ever repaying, which is why, you know, I mean, listen, Trump added, I think, \$7 trillion to our budget deficit.

([00:01:52](#)):

It's a huge number. And, um, um, if you look just in the last few years, it's just skyrocketed. And the same things happened in Europe to such a, such an extent that there is literally an untenable situation. And these governments are promising things to get votes that they know that they will never, ever deliver on, and they are borrowing when they know that they will ever never be able to repay it. Uh, one of the most amazing things to understand is that the us, the Congressional Budget Office, is actually budgeting that our deficit annually will exceed \$2 trillion all the way to 2030. And there is no attempt to do anything about that. Isn't that incredible? They literally just wanna, I believe that the real objective is to just spend as much money until the system collapses, and then they will have, be able, been able to, the people who get the benefit of purchasing, of, um, printing all this money will get the benefit by buying assets and things like that.

([00:02:51](#)):

So when the system collapses, they can transfer over into the new system and be very wealthy. And this is what's really going on. But, so in order to do, what you need to have happen is you need to destroy small and medium sized businesses, which employ roughly two thirds of the American workforce. And it's not quite as high in European countries, but it's close. So they are the primary driver of employment. And think about what happened, what did they do? They shut down all the small and medium sized businesses, and they allowed all the big businesses to stay open for no real reason, um, except that it facilitates the consolidation of power to the top and to the center. Um, so they destroy all these small and medium sized businesses. They consolidate control, they get, uh, their hands on all the assets, all the natural resources and everything, and then ultimately, they're able to pull the strings.

[\(00:03:40\):](#)

So we're on this, like literally this fairly rapid march now. It's been a slow march for a century, but it's a more rapid march towards a more socialist kind of, uh, system than the one that we've experienced in our lifetimes. And part and parcel of this is taking away the power from the people and transferring it to unelected unaccountable bureaucrats. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>. And this is super important issue. And I think most people feel that, you know, how many of us voted for GMOs? I mean, who wants GMO salmon? Who wants pesticides everywhere, right? Who, who voted for any of this? We don't want any of this, but they ram it through because they can. Um, so they're cementing the structure in place because history teaches us that when systems fall, those who are in power, who've literally created all the problems, oftentimes get lynched or hung, drawn and quartered, they get drug out in the street and taken down.

[\(00:04:40\):](#)

And these people are trying to, um, I believe conduct a controlled demolition of Western civilization in order to stay in control so they can replace it with a new system that they are at the top of. And part of this, like I say, is disenfranchising the citizens, but ultimately it's about them retaining power after as and after the system implodes. Because if they don't stay in power, they don't control the narrative, they don't control the, um, strings of power, ultimately they will lose it because they will be held accountable. So if you look at just what's going on, I'm gonna break this down into different perspectives. There's a kind of a global perspective from which this is, this is happening, a US view and a European view. And I'm gonna start with the financial situation in the us. Um, I'm not gonna cover the entire, you know, last a hundred years because it's just too much.

[\(00:05:30\):](#)

But I think the, the, the whole problem really came to a head during the 2008, nine financial crisis. And the writing was on the wall at that point that something needed to be done. And it's interesting 'cause lockstep those then was introduced, I think in 2010 or 2011, right? So we're, we're in this area. So in 2008, 2009, you had this massive real estate crisis that happened not just in the United States, but all over the world, especially in the, um, developed countries of the West. And it was all because, um, the banking system was literally encouraging people who had no business buying homes with no background checks or anything like that, no financial credit necessary, and giving them expensive homes. And then they were repackaging those products and selling them off as though they were high quality assets to investors. And the whole thing came undone, and the whole system was going down, which is why they bailed out so many of the, um, banks and institutions in the United States.

[\(00:06:29\):](#)

Now, even before that, you look at what's happened in the United States, there is no effort whatsoever to curtail our spending. Why is nobody? I, I mean, it's, it's doesn't matter which side of the aisle you're on, they're all for spending. They're all for war. They're all for, um, things that are actually against what

the people want in many ways. And if you look at the history of our country from, let's just say 1776, when we had no debt, it took 200 years to get to the point where we had a trillion dollars in debt, a trillion dollars. It took only 40 years to get to \$30 trillion. Now, why and how did that happen? It happened, as I said, because there's no intention to ever repay this debt, and because of all the promises that they're making. So if you look at the United States, um, going into 20, uh, 19, the United States had a public pension liability of \$4.9 trillion.

[\(00:07:25\)](#):

That's an extraordinary amount of money. If you look at California alone, it was darn near a billion dollars. And it's over, um, sorry, over a trillion. It was almost a trillion dollars in California alone. And it's over a trillion now. So this is a major problem, because what happens when people lose their pensions? What do you think is gonna happen if the, um, governments of California or New York or Illinois says, sorry folks. I know we promised you all this stuff and you worked for 40 years for us, and we gave you these pensions, but they're gone. What's gonna happen?

Alec Zeck [\(00:07:59\)](#):

Similar to what happened in France recently, right?

Leslie Manookian [\(00:08:01\)](#):

Yes. It will be very interesting. And like I said, Alec, what happens historically is that people seek revenge on those who've perpetrated this on them. Um, that's a very dangerous, uh, predicament for those in power. So you've got that going on. You've got 30 trillion in debt. You've got, um, 5 trillion in unfunded public pensions. So these are pensions from school districts and states across the country where they have promised their employees that they're going to get these pensions, but they don't have the assets for it. They have never put aside enough money in order to actually meet their obligations to these pensioners. Okay? And then in 2019, something really interesting happened, um, in 2019, there was something called the repo market crisis. And this happened in September of 2019. And what happened was, US banks like JP Morgan and Citibank, these big banks, they started, um, getting nervous about interacting with their European counterparts, in particular institutions like Deutsche Bank.

[\(00:09:07\)](#):

Deutsche Bank was at the time the largest, uh, European financial, uh, institution. And what happened is, so there's something called the overnight window. And the overnight window is where banks can lend to each other at the risk-free rate, which is the rate that the Fed sets as it's risk-free rate. So they can, one of them has just made a hundred million dollars loan, and so they need some cash, they may borrow from another bank overnight, and then they will do another transaction. So it's all managing their cash flows and their balance sheets. But what happened was the US banks stood back and they said, you know what? We don't wanna deal with Deutsche Bank because they've got trillions of dollars of undisclosed liabilities on their balance sheet, these super risky kinds of derivative assets, and we don't wanna deal with them because the European, uh, the German government had said that it would not support Deutsche Bank.

[\(00:10:01\)](#):

And so what happened was these rates that are supposed to be darn near zero, skyrocketed to 10% for overnight money. And what happened was the Fed had to step in and say, we will guarantee the trade. We will guarantee you borrowing from Deutsche Bank or lending to Deutsche Bank. So what essentially happened in 2019, in the fall, right before this whole thing happened in China and in, you know, the, the military games and all these things, was that the writing was on the wall. That the system was on the

verge of collapse, and the Fed had to step in and become the central bank to the world. This is a major difference. Up until that point, it had just been acting in order to prepare or to protect US institutions. But at that point, it knew that if it didn't step in into this overnight window and guarantee these loans, then the US banks would not transact with European banks, and there was gonna be a major problem.

[\(00:10:58\)](#):

And so they stepped in 10%. So think about 10% is just the amount that they would pay to borrow overnight on an annualized basis. Multiply that by 365 roughly. Okay? And there, this was all compounded by the problem that the US had gone to very, very low interest rates. After, uh, 2008 nine, we'd gone to, I think, 50 basis points. I'm not sure if we ever got down to 25, we might've gotten to 25 in Europe, it went to negative. But, um, rates got very, very low. And this is a problem because US pensions and all pensions need to invest their assets. So if you, um, you know, invest in an I R A or a 4 0 1 K, they take that money and they invest it into certain assets. Or if you work for, um, CalPERS as one of the biggest pensions in California, it's the California pension for California State employees.

[\(00:11:52\)](#):

They will take the, and they will invest it in different kinds of bonds and stocks and things like this in order to reap a yield from their investments. The problem is, these pensions need to, um, receive about seven to 8% in returns on their investments every year in order to service their liabilities, meaning pay the pensions. Okay? So think about it. If you are, if US bonds are yielding only 25, uh, uh, a quarter of a percentage point or half a percentage point, you're nowhere near seven to 8%. So the pensions are basically going broke. They are almost insolvent. I shouldn't say they're going broke. It's not like they have no money, but they're almost insolvent in that they, well, they are insolvent in that they have fewer assets than they do liabilities. So this is the backdrop. And what happened was these emerging market, emerging market countries started borrowing in dollars, and US pensions would invest in those bonds.

[\(00:12:53\)](#):

So they would, you know, I mean, pick a country, Ecuador, Costa Rica, they would issue a bond. US pensions would buy it, it would be a higher rate because it was a different kind of a risk being a small emerging market country. And then the country would repay the loan. But what's happened over this period is that the dollar has gone up, despite all the people saying the dollar's going down, the dollar's been going up for a long time. And what happened is now you've got a peso, and instead of you having to repay at a certain rate, the dollars now doubled in terms of pesos, and now you have to pay back twice as much. So the emerging market countries are in serious, um, trouble as well. And so the Fed has stepped in, kept rates low in order to try and relieve some of the stress on the system. This is just an amazing graphic of what's happened, <laugh>. Um, you can see we didn't cross, um, into a trillion until I think it was 1980, and then we hit 30 trillion by before 2020.

Alec Zeck [\(00:13:55\)](#):

Yeah, this exponential rise, that's really concerning.

Leslie Manookian [\(00:13:57\)](#):

And, and think about this, if you look at the number that you see in 1952, I mean, that's a few hundred billion is what it's, you go all the way back, you know, to 1776, that line is basically flat. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, you know, it just goes straight back. So let's talk about Europe now, because Europe is similar but worse, far worse. So the us, um, the Federal Reserve in the United States, which is our central bank, requi, required US banks to write off all of their bad debts after the 2000 8 0 9 crisis. And

they kept interest rates low to help them. They also injected cash into the system by buying securities that they held. So they have more liquidity, but they just sat on it in order to rebuild their balance sheets, basically to improve their financial security. What happened in Europe though, is that Europe's a very different structure than the United States.

[\(00:14:47\)](#):

You have 27 countries, and they're all in something called the European Union, which is the supposedly financial union, but they never took all the debt from all the different countries and consolidated into one class. So France can issue European or Euro denominated debt, and so can Greece. France pays a lower rate than Greece does because it's a different credit. And the point is that France is responsible for its debt, not the eu. Spain and Greece are responsible for their debt. Well, the Spanish economy, Italian economy, Greek economy, Portuguese, and all of their banks are not as strong as the French and the Germans. And so what happened was the banks in Europe, because of the structure, did not write off their bad debt. They've been working on it, but they haven't for years and years. And this is one of the reasons why Deutsche Bank was in dire straits in 2019, because not only do they have all of these risky assets, but they also never wrote off all their bad assets.

[\(00:15:50\)](#):

So they didn't shore up their balance sheet in order to improve their position. They didn't just say, let's write it off, it's a loss, we're done. Let's move on. Because they weren't strong enough to do so. But also because the European Central Bank, which is the equivalent of the Fed, is not allowed to intervene in any one country and give money or bail out banks in that country without the permission of all the 26 other countries. And the European countries don't wanna bail each other out, especially if they're the richer countries like Germany. They've said, you know, we're not doing this. And so you can understand that this is a very precarious situation for them. So the next major problem that happened was that the E c B, the European Central Bank set interest rates to negative. They had negative interest rates from 2014 until this past year, eight years.

[\(00:16:43\)](#):

So they didn't just have low interest rates, they were negative. What does that mean, <laugh> that bonds prices go, um, even higher, that there's a, um, it's, it's, I'm not gonna explain it here because it's too much, but basically if you were gonna put your money in the bank, you had to pay to have it there. They have negative interest rates. Crazy, right? So it's the exact opposite of saving, which is usually a positive thing for an economy. So they went to negative interest rates. But what investor wants to get no yield, what pension wants to get no yield, no one. They were literally thrown under the bus for eight years with negative interest rates. And now they've gone back to neutral. Or maybe they're a little bit positive, you know, as the Fed has raised rates recently. But what happened was, because investors want to, investors who buy bonds, they want yield.

[\(00:17:30\)](#):

That's why they buy bonds. They want a, an interest rate. They want a return that is guaranteed. Whereas if you invest in the stock market, the stock can go up, it can go down. You don't know what's gonna happen. A bond guarantees you a return and an, and an interest rate every single year. So if you're getting negative interest rates, you're not what you need or what you want as an investor. And so what happened was the European Central Bank had to step in and start buying all of the European bonds to shore up that market. And when those bonds would expire, the countries would have to issue new bonds. But who was there to buy them? Because they're issuing them at negative interest rates. Who is there to buy them? Nobody. So the European Central Bank is buying them. So what happens is twofold.

(00:18:17):

One is there's no marginal buyer of European bonds, but there's another problem, which is that when you raise rates, bond prices go down. So when you raise rates from a negative standpoint, your bond prices are gonna going to go down a huge amount. And so that destroys the balance sheet of the European Central Bank. They basically painted themselves into a corner that they couldn't get out of. Um, on top of that, they have a massive unfunded public pension liability. So there's a much, much deeper, broader social welfare state in Europe than there is in the United States, or at least used to be. Um, and this amounted to over 50 trillion Euros. It was about 50, almost 55 trillion euros if you include the uk. So this is amount of money they are never, ever going to repay. Never. It's just not possible. And this, I believe, is one of the very legitimate reasons that the people in power think, gosh, we're in, um, in dire straits.

(00:19:18):

We need to do something about it. We need to reset the system. And so what they wanna do is they wanna have a, a debt forgiveness, a debt holiday. But this is the kind of financial backdrop backdrop here. You can see the European area government debt. And this is an unbelievably, um, uh, compelling chart. What's in in pink is the private and funded pen pension entitlement. So those are the amounts of money that they have that actually backs up their promises that they have made to people, to the public in these countries. Look at Luxembourg, the blue is how much they owe, but have no assets behind. So they have promised five more than 500% of G D P in, in Luxembourg to the people. How are they ever going to make that come? Right? It's not possible. Look at all these countries. I mean, Austria, France, they literally have no money in their pension system, nothing backing it. It's all this is relative to G D P. So literally, their whole G D P is not even close to enough to cover by three to 400% in most of these countries. Two to 300, 400% staggering, isn't it?

Alec Zeck (00:20:37):

It's unbelievable to see that chart.

Leslie Manookian (00:20:39):

Yeah. So I mean, it is, just remember, the US had 5 trillion, um, and in public pensions that were un uh, unfunded Europe is literally at 55 trillion, and we have a bigger economy than all of them do together.

Alec Zeck (00:20:57):

Leslie, a question before we go to the political legislative backdrop is, do you think this was a just continual kicking the can down the road by all these nations? Or was it unintentional collapse over time?

Leslie Manookian (00:21:12):

I think it started out, I mean, it's funny you say kicking the can, because that's the phrase I use all the time. They can't kick the can down the road any further. I think that originally, well, it's really hard to say, and it's pure speculation. Mm-hmm. <affirmative> for sure do not believe that they always, that, that everybody was on the same page kicking the can down the road this whole time. I think it got to a place where I think people woke up and were like, oh gosh. Wow. We're in deep dooo. What do we do now? So I think that there was a, a, an, you know, it was 20, the Clinton administration, they had a balanced budget. They were trying to address this, right? So, and I think you can divorce the financial aspect from some of the political, because I think that the political agenda has been there all along, but I don't think the financial there was there with them

Alec Zeck (00:22:00):

Financial effects everyone at some level, so that that would make sense.

Leslie Manookian (00:22:04):

Yeah. And so I don't think it was, but I think that after 2008, nine, they knew that the system was over, it was too far extended and that something was going to have to happen. And when 2019 happened, when the repo market crisis happened in the, in September, it was like game over. I mean, literally, I cannot impress upon you enough when you, when JP Morgan will not deal with Deutsche Bank, one of the biggest banks in the world, the system is on the brink. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, that's it. And the only way that things move forward was because the, I mean, when those repo rates go to 10% for overnight money, you are literally game over. If the Fed had not stepped in and did what it did, the system would've frozen right then and there. And what would've happened would've been catastrophic for all of us.

(00:22:47):

So let's turn to the political and legislative, because this, I think, has been a much, much longer game plan. I think that, you know, as I mentioned, I use the term kick the can all the time, and, and that with the financial, that they, um, there's no doubt that politicians make promises that they know they'll never keep. There's no doubt that they borrow, knowing that they are not going to repay it. But I think that that didn't get out of hand until the last two or three decades, I guess is how I'd phrase that. So let's go to the political, because this is definitely a long run, <laugh> really long run. So to end, um, the first World War, there was some called the League of Nations, and all these nations came together and it was supposed to be this, um, supernational body that was going to wield power and make sure that there were no more wars.

(00:23:38):

But the problem is it didn't have any teeth. That's what the people who wanted it to succeed say. It didn't have any teeth. It wasn't so nobody participated. So it folded not long afterwards. And then what happened was you had the UN introduced at the end of World War ii. Now, I would argue that the League of Nations failed because the western civilizations just were not ready to, to yield their sovereignty to a global governance system. And rightly so. I mean, you know, I'm deeply opposed to anything like that. Um, but what happened was they signed the UN charter in 1945. There were 51 nations. And the original intended purpose was just to keep peace and stability, basically cooperate, and it wasn't supposed to be binding on anybody. And then, and they actually said, you know, we're gonna move. So it wasn't binding, but if you read what was written about it, they actually said things like, we're gonna move from tribes to nations and from a national consciousness to a one world consciousness. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>. So the seeds were there from the beginning, even if that was not overtly stated and was not overtly intended. I believe that the background intention was there.

(00:24:52):

And then you look at what's happened with the UN over the decades, and, you know, it started out as this advisory role, and then it kind of morphed into this peacekeeping security, human rights and all these kinds of things. And, and then in the more recent decades, now, it's all about sustainable development and climate act, climate action, you know, stuff that was never part of its remit from the beginning. So it's just expanded. It's basically, to me, it's a perfect illustration of the phrase thin end of the wedge. So if you take a wedge, right, or you, you know, crack the door, you get your foot in the door, and once you've got your foot in the door, then they just expand. They just expand. They just expand. And this is what's been happening with all this stuff for decades. So it went from this very basic

body initially, and then it became, um, a much more, uh, you know, it had much deeper tentacles into our society.

[\(00:25:43\)](#):

And of course, the most recent thing now justified by the Covid crisis is that the UN will be part of global governance with the World Health Organization, which is part of the UN having a global pandemic treaty and the International Health Regulations, which will, if they are passed, and it looks like that's what the Biden administration wants to do, is bypass the normal, um, treaty approval process, which happens in the Senate. Um, but if it does happen, then it means that the UN that the World Health Organization will actually have a say to dictate how we monitor, um, any kind of disease or outbreak of any kind, um, any kind of illness, you know, anything like this. And then how we react to it as well. So this is just, it's, you know, starts out as this tiny thing, and then it morphs into this bigger and bigger thing until you get to the point where it's literally attempting to supplant our own domestic, um, responses and monitoring of any kind of public health issues. And they wanna do it for climate too. Let's be

Alec Zeck [\(00:26:48\)](#):

Honest, it's interesting 'cause it, on the previous slide you showed that it was one world, uh, you know, using terms like national consciousness to one world, it all sounds good. It's the, it's this feel good, sound good language that they're co-opting to get people and nations to comply with this agenda.

Leslie Manookian [\(00:27:07\)](#):

Yeah, a hundred percent. And here's the other thing. This was not there stated, one world wasn't stated, right? It wasn't overt. It was, you know, just sort of whispered in the, in the scenes mm-hmm. <affirmative> or who, who goes and reads all the treaties and the charters or who, who reads what the people who write these charters have to say, most people don't. So this is what they're talking about when you're not paying attention. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, yes. It's all about, oh, you know, do the right thing. I mean, sustainable development. It sounds nice, doesn't it? Humanitarian aid, all of these things, you know, agenda 2030, I mean, 2021 agenda 2021, and then agenda 2030, these sound beautiful when you read them. It's only when you drill down and understand that they actually don't want you on the land. They want you in their, in their bizarre high tech cities where they can control anything and everything that you do, that you start to actually see the dystopian nature of it all.

[\(00:28:00\)](#):

So, um, UNESCO was another piece of this, and I find it interesting that the UN, that UNESCO was launched literally only a few months after the UN was launched. And this was supposed to, um, focus on educational things, scientific issues and cultural stuff so that they could focus on rebuilding the world after, um, the devastation, uh, wrought through World War II. So you can understand very, very good things, rebuilding schools and, and, and libraries and museums and all these things. These are really positive things we want, you know, to preserve our cultural heritage. And you wanna see people be literate. But here's the thing, is UNESCO the right vehicle for that? I am totally in support of helping people who are disadvantaged, helping other countries. I just think it should come from the private sector, because otherwise what happens is when it's government or NGOs like the World Health Organization, or UNESCO and N G O is a non-governmental organization, they get donations from vested interests, and then they do what they want.

[\(00:29:05\)](#):

So they get in, they get investments and donations from our country, or from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and then they go and do things that you don't want them to do. And I think it's much better

if we as individuals are empowered to donate, where and when we see appropriate to the organizations that we deem worthy of our investment and donations, and also who are pursuing the causes that are near and dear to our hearts, we are much better placed to, to dictate and direct that. And so, you know, I'm not opposed to helping other people out, it's just that this is the wrong way to do it, in my view. And the very reason that I believe it's wrong is illustrated in what's going on right now, which is that our governments do not answer to us anymore. That's just the simple fact of the matter.

[\(00:29:47\):](#)

And these, these, um, NGOs have been used to subvert the will of the people all over the western world. So this is the same kind of roadmap that happened with the U Un, where they start out with, you know, well-intentioned ideas, and then they morph. They started out their first year with only an eight and a half million dollar budget, a billion dollars by the 1980s. I mean, this is crazy, right? 30 years you've gone from this little tiny thing to this behemoth. And I didn't look it up. I don't know what it is now. It's crazy. But here's the other thing. They started out as supposedly trying to help these other countries, these developing countries, and helping the western countries rebuild. And then, you know what they did? They started seriously attacking Western values. They started undermining capitalism, and they started literally, um, promoting socialism in their mission.

[\(00:30:41\):](#)

Wow. So, um, this is very different from what their original intention was. And this is what happens. This is the thin end of the wedge. It starts out with this kind of, you know, rosy picture, and then they morph it into something else. What's really interesting is that the United States actually left UNESCO in 1984, and then a year later, um, the UK and Singapore did, because the people in the United States were frustrated that the un, that UNESCO was so socialist and anti west. And so they were like, we're not gonna participate this. But you know what, all three of those nations went back in, um, not very long afterwards. Very interesting. Very interesting. So I think that kind of gives you a sense of how our cultures were changing. And when the US did what it did, then the, um, you know, it was full court press in order to try and, um, shift public opinion about these things to get us back on board.

[\(00:31:38\):](#)

So this, I I, I, you cannot talk about UNESCO without talking about Julian Huxley. Julian Huxley was the, um, the grandson of a guy named Thomas Huxley, who was one of Darwin's, I think they called him Darwin's, like Pitbull or something like that. A complete Darwinist. Um, meaning that they, you know, believe, um, in evolution, lots of people may, um, and they, but this is, they a hundred percent believe in natural selection, that there's no other, they don't believe anything bigger than them. They are literally, they say they're agnostics. And his grandfather actually came up with the term agnostic. They're really truly atheists. Um, but they're also eugenics and socialists. And they have played a very, very, um, let's just say a significant role in undermining the fabric of society. They wanted free sex and open relationships. Huxley wanted that in his marriage. And I'm Huxley this one, Julian Huxley.

[\(00:32:36\):](#)

Julian Huxley was the first director, general, general of unesco. So his grandfather was this guy who was all these things. And then he had all these children and grandchildren, and, um, they were, um, they were, they adhered to his, his ideas and they pursued these. Julian Huxley is also the brother of Aldi Huxley, who wrote Brave New World. Mm-hmm. <affirmative> this dystopian novel that, um, basically shows, uh, what will happen, which is that, um, people will be medicating themselves asking for antidepressants and things to keep them peppy, no matter how bad things get. I mean, if, if you haven't read it, you have to read the book. It's just incredible. And it, it marries very well with 1984, I think, to give a, a kind of an overview of what's going on in our country today. But this guy, I have to show you

some of the quotes, because he was the first director general, he had a huge influence on what was going on. And this is the person that the people who put UNESCO in place hired to run it. He only stayed in position a couple of years because the US and some other countries revolted. But the point is, the people who were planning UNESCO at the UN knew what he was all about, and they hired him to run it. Okay. Um, the lowest strata are reproducing. I can't see it 'cause it's behind the, um,

Alec Zeck ([00:34:01](#)):

I can read it for you real quick.

Leslie Manookian ([00:34:02](#)):

Too fast. Okay. Yeah. Therefore, they must not have too easy assets. Go ahead. You can read it, Alec.

Alec Zeck ([00:34:07](#)):

Yep. The lowest strata are reproducing too fast. Therefore, they must not have too easy access to relief or hospital treatment, lest the removal of the last check on natural selection should make it too easy for children to be produced or to survive long unemployment should be a ground for sterilization. Wow.

Leslie Manookian ([00:34:26](#)):

If you're poor, you should be sterilized. And we need to get the poorest people from reproducing basically to get rid of them. This is the guy <laugh> who led unesco. Here are a couple of others. I mean, there, I, I'll just go through them really quickly. This one just shocks me. The implications of the transfer of full sovereignty from separate nations to world, to a world organization, political unification in some sort of world government will be required. That was their intention from the very beginning. And then this is a separate quote. And I mean, these people are eugenics. Now, just so people understand, they believe that the, one of the things that's important to do, and that they are entitled to do is to make our gene pool stronger and healthier. Okay? So they believe that if you are, um, if you have down syndrome, you shouldn't be allowed to live.

([00:35:18](#)):

If you are poor, you shouldn't be allowed to live. It's some kind of a genetic problem. So they want to, and this is, this is what they were all about. And so you think that it was only Hitler who was involved with Eugenics, but there was a super strong eugenics, um, program in Britain and in the United States in the early part of the 20th century. And Huxley took that vision into unesco. And so he specifically said that, um, any radical eugenic policy will be for many years, politically and psychologically impossible with the greatest care. The public mind is informed of the issues at stake. So that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable. We see this happening in our world today. Right? And this is, I find, just jaw dropping. The last line of, it's so important. It talks about taking away economic and political freedom, allowing people's sexual sexual freedom to flourish, basically create this sort of immoral, nihilistic society.

([00:36:21](#)):

And ultimately, <laugh> let the people be distracted under the influence of dope movies and radio, because it will help to reconcile these subjects to their servitude, which is their fate. This is what these people were about. Um, and one of the reasons that he says that he liked Origin of Species, which is Darwin's book and Darwinism and natural selection, was because it got rid of God. It got rid of God and all the morality that went along with God so that they could have sex with anybody they wanted and live in open marriages. So, um, that's the kind of international backdrop, right? The United Nations, unesco

and all that stuff. Now, I wanna drill down on what happened in the United States because it's very, very fascinating and it's very telling as well. So in the early part of the 20th century, there were, um, thousands, tens of thousands of, of medical practitioners.

[\(00:37:19\):](#)

And these medical practitioners hailed from all different backgrounds. There were herbalists and homeopaths and doulas, and, um, yes, there were doctors, like medical doctors, what we know of medical doctors today. But there were all these different disciplines, acupuncturists and stuff like this. And it was not expensive. It was not expensive. And what are known as medical doctors today were not revered. They didn't have the god-like status that they have today. They were not above society. They did not make more money or anything like that. In fact, the American Medical Association was founded in response to the American Homeopathic Association. I forget what its exact name was, which was the very first medical, um, society in the United States. And the person, the people who founded the A M A said, listen, we don't have a problem with homeopathy. We just don't like that. Whenever they move into our area, they take away all of our patients.

[\(00:38:10\):](#)

Well, why do they take away all their patients? Because it's successful, it's effective, it's non-toxic, it's non-habit forming, and it's inexpensive and anybody can use it and do it. So they sought to get rid of it. And the Flexner report was the vehicle through which they did that. The FLEXNER report was a, a report commissioned by John d Rockefeller, and I think it was Andrew Carnegie was one of the Carnegies. And it was a report that was actually drafted by the American Medical Association, but they knew that they couldn't submit it to Congress because it would look very obvious that this was an attempt by the medical, um, people to sideline their competitors. And so, uh, John Rockefeller, who invested in petrochemicals, wanted to use the Flexner report in order to solidify chemical-based medicine pharmaceuticals as the default medical system in the United States. And they used the Flexner report to do this.

[\(00:39:06\):](#)

They submitted it to Congress. One of, um, the brother of, uh, Carnegie's, one of his senior staff members wrote it. And, um, they submitted it to Congress and it called for standardization and licensing. We need to standardize everything we need. The problem is that our, and there were no problems, but the, they said that the problem was, oh, well, there's quackery. Well, quackery was the medical guys. It was the ones selling the chemicals, you know, the ones who were doing bloodletting and, and giving, um, mercury, uh, to people in order to cure diseases and things like this. It was the doctors doing this, not the homeopaths and the acupuncturists and the herbalist. That's not who was doing it. It was the medical guys. But Rockefeller and, um, and Carnegie had other ideas because they saw chemical-based medicine as a path to greater riches. And so they asked Congress to standardize pass laws to standardize and license medical schools.

[\(00:40:05\):](#)

And then what happened once they had done that was they put all of the money into marketing and funding the medical schools, and they took away any interest. There was no support for any of the other groups. Um, there were 20 homeopathic hospitals back then, and, um, I forget how many homeopathic medical schools, but many. And they took them, they basically just didn't fund them. So they withered away. And they also simultaneously put out hit pieces and smear campaigns on anything that competed in order to undermine the public's view of these things as quackery and snake oil. When the true snake oil salespeople were the doctors pushing these chemicals on people, arsenic, they used to give people arsenic, you know, I mean, <laugh>. Um, so this was a really important piece of the puzzle that helps

explain why we are where we are today. And then what happened was in 1913, we had three literally catastrophic events happen in the United States.

[\(00:41:08\)](#):

So the Constitution never said anything about the federal government taxing individual Americans. Any taxation was only allowed to be done at the state level, not at the federal level. There were no federal income taxes. And the 16th Amendment, the Federal Revenue Act, changed all that. It allowed the federal government to levy taxes against the people as, as they wish, essentially, literally. But here's something that most people have no idea about. When they passed the Federal Revenue Act, they actually wrote an exemption for the super rich to put their money into private foundations where they could grow their wealth tax free.

Alec Zeck [\(00:41:45\)](#):

Wow.

Leslie Manookian [\(00:41:46\)](#):

Yeah. So this is what Rockefeller and Carnegie think about all the giant foundations in this country, Rockefeller, Carnegie, gates, Ford, all of these, these, this is all facilitated by the 16th Amendment with had, which had a loophole for the super rich staggering, isn't it? And then it, it gets worse because the 17th Amendment also passed in, um, 1913, took away states' rights. And the way that it did that was that up until the 17th Amendment was passed, there was a balance of power between the states and the federal governments. That's the way it was supposed to be. And the way that states rights were represented in Congress was that senators, US Senators were actually selected by the state legislatures to go to Washington DC and to represent the state's interest in DC basically to act as a check on the power of the federal government. What they did was they changed it so that senators were elected the same way as Congresspersons. So there is no difference aside from the fact that there's only two per state, and they have a different term of six years instead of four. But basically, can you see how it just eviscerated the state rights? Yeah, absolutely. Now, there's nobody literally going to bat for the states and saying, Nope, you can't do this. There's no one in the who represents the state legislature in DC saying, we're not okay with this. We don't wanna do

Alec Zeck [\(00:43:14\)](#):

This. It's, it's almost like that is the switching point between a constitutional republic and a democracy at that point.

Leslie Manookian [\(00:43:23\)](#):

Well, I don't know if I would say that. Okay. 'cause because we're still represented, but I think it's more about the federalist nature of it. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, we went from being less of a, uh, of a, a Federation of States to being basically the balance of power shifted from the states

Alec Zeck [\(00:43:40\)](#):

Centralized rather than decentralized.

Leslie Manookian [\(00:43:42\)](#):

Exactly. Yeah. Yeah, exactly. So, um, I mean, it was literally devastating. And we're seeing this now, you know, you call up your senator or you call up your congress person and they will say, what's the

organization you work for? They don't care. They don't work for the state legislature anymore. Whereas the senator could have been recalled, the senator, the Senate, could have been senator, could have been impeached, right? If they were not doing the bidding of the state legislature. Now it's just another figurehead, a representative for you in dc. But, you know, listen, you're Californian 40 million people there, and you have two state senators. How close do you think they are to the people? And how much do they answer to them? And how could you possibly even get a meeting with them when there are 40 million people vying for their attention and their interests?

[\(00:44:28\)](#):

Major shift of, of power. And then the last thing, which was really the kind of linchpin of the whole thing, was they passed the federal re, uh, reserve Act and the Federal Reserve Act created the Federal Reserve, the US Federal Reserve, which is our fed, our central bank, which is not federal. And it's not a bank, it's a consortium of, um, I believe it's 12 banks that own it. And no one's ever audited. Nobody knows what exactly goes on. No one owns it or anything like it. But what ended up happening was this was the way that the, um, central government, the federal government could intervene in the markets. So the treasury issues bonds, the US Treasury, the Federal Reserve then plays in the markets. It intervenes in the markets buying and selling those bonds with cash that it prints in order to, um, maintain interest rates and market stability. So you've got two mechanisms, but this really seriously changed our world.

[\(00:45:33\)](#):

So in Europe, you have very similar things. You've got this, it's, it's very concurrent with what's been going on in, um, at the global level with the un, the unesco, et cetera. And, and that is that they have tried over and over to, um, federalize Europe, but Europeans don't want it. And so they're like, well, don't worry, we won't federalize it. We'll just create an economic union that can compete an economic block that can compete with the United States. And that's what they said they were going to do. But here's what's happened. The European Union President is not elected. The European Union President and the European Union Commissioner are both selected by the heads of state of all the European countries. They're not accountable to the people. And the people who are in charge of these bodies are connected to the World Economic Forum. So Ursula of Underline, who is the eu, um, I think she's the EU president.

[\(00:46:28\)](#):

She is one of Schwab's, you know, proteges essentially. And then you look further, an M e P is a member of the European Parliament. These people are elected in their, um, own countries. So you have a member, you, you, like in Britain, you elect the Bri Britain's not a good example 'cause they're no longer in the eu. But, um, you elect a member of Parliament in France and you also elect a member of the European Parliament. And that person goes to represent your interest in Europe. But here's the catch, they can vote, but their votes aren't binding on anybody. They literally have no power. So do you see how the system literally is designed to disenfranchise the people? It's designed to move to a situation where there's more power consolidated at the top, and the people have no say.

Alec Zeck [\(00:47:19\)](#):

This is an interesting point. Um, and, and there's of course so many different perspectives on whether our votes actually count and whether our elections are fair in the United States. But what it looks like per the way this is set up is in the European Union, it's, it's, they're just flat out saying like, yeah, you have no say over what's done across the European Union. This is only the leaders making the decisions at this point

Leslie Manookian (00:47:45):

Completely. Now, they would say, well, but they, you know, you still get to as you get to, um, you get some say so in your country. But listen, they are pushing through anything and everything, and what they say is then binding on these countries. So it's, um, it's, it's, it's a really, um, you know, frightening development. And it's been in process for a long time. You know, Margaret Thatcher was, um, the prime minister of Britain, gosh, in the 1980s around the time, you know, that Reagan was in office here in the United States, and she kept resisting a European union of any kind. They tried to create, um, a European, what was it called? The, um, before the Euro? There was the, uh, European and ecu, I think European currency unit. And there was something else. I forget now, it's funny. I mean, I was involved in all this stuff in the, when I was working on Wall Street, but, um, she kept resisting and she kept saying, this is purely an attempt to federalize Europe through the back door, and the UK will have no part of it.

(00:48:45):

And she was dead right? Dead right. So what's, what's worse, if you take all this is like, okay, so you've put in place the European Union, but what's happened is that the European Union also, or sorry, that the eu, the European Central Bank, the United Nations, the World Health Organization, the I M F, which is the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, are all connected to Klaus Schwab in the World Economic Forum. He's got his, um, fingers in all of these. And all of these people are, all of the, you know, leaders of these groups, um, are connected to World Economic Forum. Um, I think the I M F may be actually appointed by the United States, but independently, but the World Economic Forum has its tentacles everywhere. So, and of course they're in league with the Trilateral Commission, um, the Council on Foreign Relations, and of course, gates and Soros and all of these other globalists.

(00:49:43):

This is a concerted effort. So it's not a, a short-term thing, and it's not a, um, it's not just happenstance that we find ourselves where we find ourselves. So let's keep going in the United States, because in my view, our founders were so brilliant the way that they constructed the United States. They were truly prescient. And the big problem for the globalists is the United States. We are the obstacle to their one world government dream. And they, the only way that they're going to make this happen is by subverting the United States. And so how do they do that? Well, I talked to you a little bit about the private foundations before there were, um, hearings in, in the 1950s under the Reese Committee, which investigated these private foundations. And there was a guy named Norman Dodd, who was a, a lawyer of impeccable repute who headed up the investigations.

(00:50:36):

And he went and he visited with the heads of all these foundations, and he, you know, met privately with them. And he said to them, you know, tell me what are your true objectives? And you won't believe this Alec. I mean, this is staggering. But they actually answered him honestly. They's like, do you really wanna know? And he said, yes, of course. And he said, to install collectivism in America, collectivism is socialism. It means that everything is owned and controlled by the centralized central government, you know, at the top, by everything. That's what they're trying to do. This is not about an, this is not about philanthropy. We have to get over the idea that these foundations are philanthropists. It is about an agenda. And the agenda is to destroy our system of government and our system of, and our economic system, basically take away all of our freedom and install a system where they decide what you will do, where you can go, how you will work, all sorts of things like that. Everything, how you'll live your life. And the way that they've done this is through capturing all these different pieces of our social fabric, academia, um, the educational system. This is why all these crazy things are happening to kids, right? Because they subverted our educational system decades ago, scientific and medical research, um, our

non-governmental organizations in the United States, these groups give money to them, and then they control what their agenda is. Crazy. Huh?

Alec Zeck ([00:52:05](#)):

Proponents of communism are open about this, that they have said they'll be able to take over the United States without firing a shot because they'll subvert all of our institutions or education systems, et cetera, et cetera.

Leslie Manookian ([00:52:16](#)):

Yep. And they've been doing it for a long time. Yeah. So, um, in the 1970s, there were further investigations. Now, this isn't exactly, um, the legislative piece that I've been talking about and the political piece, but it's super important that people understand that there was a senator, one of my, my senator from Idaho Frank Church, and he, um, was concerned about the activities being, uh, conducted by intelligence in the United States. And so he investigated their activities and he found out that they had infiltrated the CIA had back then 400 agents assets installed in the media in 1975. How crazy is that? They say that they stopped it <laugh>, but of course, that's, you're right. You know, well,

Alec Zeck ([00:53:07](#)):

Didn't in 2013 it become legal to propagandize the American people.

Leslie Manookian ([00:53:12](#)):

I'm gonna, I'm gonna get to that in a second. Job dropping. Yeah, Alec, I'll go through all that. Yeah. So basically, I want you to understand that these people have, there are intelligence agents all over the country and are acting as journalists. They're acting as, you know, a a person who you think is, is conducting their role in good faith, but they're actually subverting our country. And they are disseminating information. They actually have done things like, you know, MK Ultra, the Mind Control Ultra Project, which they drugged and tortured American citizens. They wanted to see what they could do if they could destroy their psyches and then program them to do something to like be a killer if they heard a trigger word and things like this. They infiltrated civil rights and, um, you know, black Panthers and all these groups and they assassinated people.

([00:53:59](#)):

Um, they were surveilling and really doing some horrible things. And these were people who were just trying to further civil rights and act in the best interest of, of human beings. And they were being subverted by those at the top. And the church committee revealed all of this, and it was shut down as the Reese committee was as well, because those in power didn't want this happening. Um, so let's talk now. All these things that I'm talking about from the financial to the legislative and the political stuff wouldn't, um, happen if it weren't facilitated by something. And what's facilitated, this is the whole medical complex. Um, it's a major part of this. So the World Health Organization was created in 1948. Um, something else I wanna mention, I don't have this in here, but the Public Health Services Act was created in the United States in 1944. What was going on in 1944, Alec,

Alec Zeck ([00:54:55](#)):

World War ii.

Leslie Manookian ([00:54:58](#)):

And we thought that what was really important was to create a, like a literally nation changing piece of legislation that would facilitate what is called the administrative state that we have today. C D C F D A, all these kinds of things. Literally that was passed in 1944.

Alec Zeck ([00:55:14](#)):

You know, it's so interesting because you see this type of thing happen all the time where something really major is occurring that is taking all of the media coverage and then behind the scenes over here, they're doing these other things.

Leslie Manookian ([00:55:27](#)):

A hundred percent. A hundred percent. So they create the World Health Organization. They say, you know, we're just gonna coordinate things. Public health, try and help people for big issues like malaria, developing countries where they can't handle it. Um, tuberculosis, stuff like that. But they had no authority over any nation. But, you know, how do you change that? Well, you have a problem <laugh>, you elicit a public reaction and then you introduce the solution. And so what's the, who now going for? Well, they want the Global Pandemic Treaty and the International Health Regulations, which will allow them, as I already mentioned, to intervene in individual nations, um, to dictate, um, you know, monitoring of, uh, any kind of public health issue and responses to it, basically to destroy sovereignty. Why? Because they want all the control at the top where there's this one world government that's not elected, it's not accountable to anybody. There's nothing you can do to get rid of it anymore, and they dictate what's best for you.

([00:56:28](#)):

So, um, a cornerstone of this whole project is the pharmaceutical, um, industry and just the medical complex. And it's strongest in the United States because we pay the most for drugs. We don't really have any checks on how much people pay for drugs. Um, we allow direct to consumer advertising by pharma on television. And, you know, so many journals are from here and all this. And it's just, it's the biggest lobbying group in the world. In the United States. It's one of the most profitable, um, and strongest industries on the planet. But it was going through a rough period. So when I was on Wall Street, I remember being taught by our pharmaceutical analysts when I was at Goldman Sachs, that pharma was basically getting to the point where it was gonna go X growth, meaning that it was, its growth prospects were going to decline. And why was that going to happen?

([00:57:23](#)):

Because they didn't have, um, because we don't have a lot of unmet medical needs. That means that most of the drugs that are being created today are for created diseases. Literally. This is how they make you think, you know, uh, I won't go into detail, but like the whole cholesterol thing, cholesterol is mm-hmm. <affirmative> a myth. It does not cause, um, it is not from eating saturated fat. And the reason that you have cholesterol in your arteries is not because the cholesterol accumulates there and hardens because you eat in fat. It's because your body sends it there in order to put a bandaid on the inflammation in your blood vessel. But we've been sold this bill of goods that if you take a statin, then you know, it will resolve this issue. And it's just, it's just not accurate. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, I mean, they basically manipulate the science, but they did it because they didn't have any more blockbuster drugs.

([00:58:15](#)):

They're, um, patents. Their big blockbusters were going off patent, and once they go off patent, so they'll have a period of seven to 10, sometimes 15 years depending, and they can extend it a bit. But

once it goes off patent, then they get generic competition. And so their profits can go from 10 billion, um, for a huge drug to a fraction of that. And so, um, they had to create new things. Isn't that interesting? And, and so we're, we've gone from a place where you can see, we were up here, this, um, the dark line that goes up and down. It started out with the, um, industry sales growth of 12 to 15% back in the nineties and the early two thousands, the early knots, and now it's trending down to less than 5%. So the C A G R CAGR is called the compound annual growth rate. The pharmaceutical industry used to be one of the highest growing industries in the markets, and now it's declining to a place that it's closer to the general, um, economic growth. And what happens when that happens is then investors who invest in stocks and businesses that are growing and they're trying to buy those stocks because they think they've got good growth, prospects won't buy them anymore.

Alec Zeck ([00:59:33](#)):

And just for clarification, when you say now it's declining, we're talking about up until 2020, correct?

Leslie Manookian ([00:59:40](#)):

Yes. Oh, a hundred percent. The chart ends in 2020. Got it. My point is, this is part of the backdrop, the pharmaceutical industry. Yep. Was going X growth. Yep. How interesting isn't that? So in 2020, you can see that the decline was down to 5%. It had been up at 12% early on. According, it had a dip in 2012, 11, 12, because that's when some major drugs went off patent. That was one of the worst years, but then they kind of climbed up again, but they've never gone back up to the 10, 12, 15% again. And it was starting to trend down again until 2020.

([01:00:20](#)):

Okay. So, you know, you're a pharmaceutical industry leader, and what do you wanna do? Well, you wanna grow your revenues and your profits, and Hmm. How do we do that? Well, maybe, maybe a pandemic with <laugh>, a new technology would help. Right. So, um, let's talk a little bit now about the legislative stuff, because this is so important. Um, in 1980, the Biologics Act was passed, and the Biologics Act allowed scientists working for federal health agencies to retain the patent rights to the products that they developed off of taxpayer's backs. So they're paid by, you pay their salary, but now they get to retain the patents and they can make money off of 'em, up, up to \$150,000 a year on the patents that they develop. This is what Fauci and his team have been benefiting from mm-hmm. <affirmative> in developing all the different products they've developed over the years.

([01:01:12](#)):

And this is why N I H and N I A I D, um, in specific developed, I believe they own half of the Moderna patent. Um, I, and it's literally Fauci S Group. They make tons of money off of this. So up until this point, any federal scientist didn't, couldn't make more than their salary. And after this, everything changed. Crazy. Huh? So, um, in 1992, the Prescription Drug User Fee Act was passed. So basically they were losing scientists, sorry, with the bilac, they were losing scientists who were going to, um, to private industry, and they didn't want that to happen. And so they, um, they changed this. That's what, that was their story. That was their cover story for why they changed this. Okay. And then in 1992, you had the Prescription Drug User Fee Act passed. And this was, um, literally one of the most insidious things ever passed.

([01:02:07](#)):

This was to facilitate the pharmaceutical industry introducing new drugs for unmet medical needs. So if there was nothing out there, they could introduce this drug and they could ask that it be fast tracked and they could pay the f d A to fast track their drugs. The problem is, it's now morphed in anything that

they want practically they can label to be, um, for an unmet medical need. And they get it fast tracked. And it started out as a hundred million dollars program. And it's, um, I think it was 2022, actually, not 2021, that it was \$2.655 billion. I think it's actually in 2022 or three, no, 23. It's gonna, it's \$2.8 billion. And this is literally money that the pharmaceutical industry is paying directly to the F D A and it amounts to 65% of the drug approver's salary. So who do you think those drug approvers feel beholden to?

[\(01:02:59\)](#):

Taxpayers, the public, or those who are paying their salaries? It's crazy. And it used to be until a couple of decades ago that, um, it was roughly 21% of all the drugs that got, uh, approved by the F D A, um, ended up getting a, being removed from the market within a couple of years, or getting a black box warning on them. It's now gone up to 27% in recent decades since the Prescription Drug User Fee Act. What does that tell you? It tells you that the drugs are less safe than they once were. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, I don't really like drugs at all. I don't think most drugs are safe. But the point is that if people are going to use drugs, there are some drugs that are very helpful in certain very specific situations and emergencies. But the point is, if you're going in a direction where they're less safe and you're needing more drugs to be removed, more than a quarter of drugs are removed or get about black box warning, F D A is failing the people. And this is happening by design. I can't believe that the prescription drug F uer Fee Act was just an accident.

[\(01:04:03\)](#):

So it's not just F D A, all of these groups. C D C has a private foundation, <laugh> the C D C Foundation, and, um, they take tens of millions. I think in, in the last few years, it's been several hundred million dollars from the pharmaceutical industry, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and other vested interests. The N I H takes money. They collaborate directly with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation on things. I mean, these are not public health agencies. I have an idea, um, in my mind about, um, writing some plans for the future for a future government. And one of the things is that there can be zero private donation to any kind of, uh, zero. Yeah. Zero. It's prohibited by the Constitution. And then of course, as I mentioned, they own these patents and they earn billions, billions in royalties, not just a little bit billions. And there's a revolving door, the head of the C d C under Obama for eight years left, and her name was Dr. Julie Julie Gerberding, and she went and she headed up Merck Vaccines globally less than a year or about a year after she left office. Scott Gottlieb, he was Trump's f d a head or was he c d C? No, he's f d a, wasn't he? And now he's, he was

Alec Zeck [\(01:05:14\)](#):

The commissioner of the F D A from 17 through 19. Yep. And

Leslie Manookian [\(01:05:17\)](#):

Now he's on the board of Pfizer making three or 400 grand a year to be on the board.

Alec Zeck [\(01:05:21\)](#):

You know, what's an interesting point on that is that there is an article that came out in, I wanna say, 2019 at the end of his tenure as the Commissioner of the F d A, that said, while commissioner of the f d A, he had his hand in expediting the approval process for experimental drugs. And then what do we have when he's on the board of directors at Pfizer?

Leslie Manookian [\(01:05:42\)](#):

Yep. Exactly. Exactly. So, um, a next piece of the puzzle is the Patriot Act. So, you know, there's this horrible event, um, nine 11, and what happens, as I mentioned before, the Gelian dialectic problem reaction solution. What happened in response to nine 11? Well, within a very short period, in fact, 45 days of nine 11, the Congress had passed the, the Patriot Act. And what did the Patriot Act do? It did lots of things, but the most important thing it did was that it actually allowed for the first time ever that US citizens could be surveilled. So it allowed warrantless searches of us. And remember, they started listening to our phone calls and stuff like this. And I mean, this is outrageous. I mean, this is a violation of the First Amendment. Um, and, um, I forget which other, which is the one about against Warrantless Search and Seizure Fourth Amendment, maybe.

Alec Zeck ([01:06:40](#)):

Yeah. I don't remember that one, but I know exactly what you're talking about.

Leslie Manookian ([01:06:43](#)):

The point is, this is constitutionally protected. Right. And the Patriot Act facilitated this because as the saying goes, um, never let a good crisis go to waste. And when people are afraid, they will allow government to, um, make changes that were unthinkable under normal terms, normal circumstances, and this is what's happened. And so the Patriot Act literally just eviscerated one of our most cherished rights, which is that we are innocent until proven guilty, and we cannot be searched or surveilled without a proper cause and a warrant. And that changed. It's just huge. Some people think, oh, well, what a big, you know, no big deal. It was a very, very big deal. And we are seeing that now. Without this, there could be no contact tracing. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, think about that.

Alec Zeck ([01:07:31](#)):

And you're correct. It was the Fourth Amendment.

Leslie Manookian ([01:07:33](#)):

Okay. Then we have the Model State Emergency Health Powers Act legislation. This legislation, let me tell you, <laugh>, two weeks after the Patriot Act was passed, this was introduced. And guess what it did, Alec, it accords extraordinary powers to state health departments and state governors in the event of a public health emergency. Isn't that convenient? It's just jaw dropping, isn't it? Yeah. So this has been passed in whole, or in part in 43 states. So basically, whenever there's some kind of an emergency, now they can do, um, extraordinary things. In fact, they can suspend the law. They can, um, suspend pieces of legislation. They can, the governor can literally can just assert power and act like a dictator. And that's what happened. That's what happened. And it was under this. And here's the thing. These people, everyone's terrified after what happened. You know, they keep showing the planes going into the buildings over and over and over again.

([01:08:36](#)):

What does that do? That, in my view, installs based on all of the, the reader reading and research I've done about psychology. It installs a kind of a trauma pattern on the brain of the individual. And then that trauma pattern can be reactivated by something else that's terrifying. And think about what happened with the Covid crisis. What did they do on television? A ticker tape of cases and deaths to constantly keep you afraid and remind you that something catastrophic is underway. Right? And so people then go there is post-traumatic stress is a real thing, right? And so this is what it does. It, it puts you back in that place. And, um, anyway, so these things, you know, the model State Emergency Health

Powers Act legislation coming right then on the heels, literally two weeks after the Patriot Act, I find very interesting, in 2005, then remember there was all the anthrax scares and all these kinds of things.

[\(01:09:35\)](#):

Then they passed the Prep Act, and it, we found out that the stuff that was being sent to members of Congress and stuff was actually being sent from the inside. There was a person in government who was doing this. It was not just some random person, it wasn't smallpox or anything like this. They were saying all these things, right? And so, but that was justification to frighten the people for the prep Act. And what did the Prep Act do? Well, the Prep Act, um, allowed for the declaration of a public health emergency. And when a public health emergency is declared, then what happens is any business that creates what's called a medical countermeasure, like let's say a test, a mask or a vaccine, have no liability for those products.

[\(01:10:20\)](#):

So, I mean, we have a couple of years of really, um, kind of world's changing legislation in the United States that, um, are affecting us tremendously today. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>. So the Prep Act, there were other aspects of it, but I think that's the most critical, um, the most critical aspect is that these entities, these businesses that are creating these medical countermeasures have no liability. And so they have no reason to not just profit and not to make, um, sound or safe products or anything like that. It's crazy. And this other bullet point seems like a non-sequitur, but it's really interesting and important to understand that this is happening in the early knots. And during this time. So in the late 1990s, Bill Gates and Microsoft were found guilty of, um, uh, antitrust, of breaking antitrust laws, meaning that they were, um, conducting anti-competitive practices in trying to drive out any of their competition.

[\(01:11:20\)](#):

And, um, Gates, and Gates was ordered to step down as president. And, um, he, but it was really a slap on the wrist. I think he was fine. Microsoft was fine, \$300 million, which is nothing to this company. But what's interesting is that shortly thereafter, Gates decided that he was going to, um, start his nonprofit. He started the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and he started giving tons of money to the media in the first decade. He gave a billion dollars to the media to, and he, I mean, there's an article written about this in the Seattle Times where he says it's about, um, training the media to report properly on his <laugh>, his pet projects and pet issues. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>. And then, I believe it was in 10 20, 20 10 when he said that it was going to be the decade of vaccines. This is, you know, very interesting timing of all of this stuff.

[\(01:12:17\)](#):

So you've got, uh, now a very compliant media because they're being paid by Gates. And there was a more recent update that he paid about \$350 million to the media in the last few years. That was a couple of years ago. I don't, I'm guessing that it's much, much bigger, but no one's doing, done an updated report since the Seattle Times did in, uh, the late, um, I think it was around 2011. So this whole agenda has really accelerated since, um, nine 11. Um, we just talked about some of the issues, but now let's get to <laugh>, the stuff that just eviscerates what it means to be an American. So habeas corpus, the writ of habeas corpus is the right to appear before a judge and protest against wrongful imprisonment. So when the state arrests you and puts you in jail, you have the right to appear before a judge who will listen to you and say, you know what? You can go free. Either you're being wrongfully held, or you can, you know, be out on bail or whatever. There's something called the National Defense Authorization Act. And this is the mechanism by which Congress funds the, the Pentagon every year, and the N D A A, the National Defense Authorization Act in 2012, suspended the writ of habeas corpus. If

you are deemed an enemy combatant, and it's super vague language about what that means, you can be held without, um, access to a judge indefinitely.

[\(01:13:53\)](#):

Now, habeas corpus has been around since the, um, oh my gosh, I can't, I think of it. It's from the 14 hundreds, the, um, <laugh> Magna Carta. Okay? This is, this is a universally recognized right for human beings to be able to, um, uh, you know, protest against wrongful imprisonment. And you can understand why it's so important. So the 2012 N D A A also repealed something called the Smith Mut Act, and they called it the Smith Modernization Act. The Smith Month Act had been in place for about 70 years, and it prohibited intelligence in the United States from, um, uh, propagandizing American citizens. So they said there, critics were saying, this is dangerous. We shouldn't be doing this. You know, this is, this is nuts. Um, and they said, you know, don't worry, we're just repealing it. We're not going to do anything with it.

[\(01:14:55\)](#):

What this means is that, so, you know, the c i a historically has been allowed to disseminate, deliberately disseminate false information propaganda to foreign countries, to the citizens of foreign countries. This is what Radio Free America and other things did. But with the repeal of the Smith Mu Act, it allowed the, the intelligence in the United States, the c i a, to deliberately disseminate propaganda to American citizens. Okay? Propagandize us. Meaning that they know that they're putting something out that is not accurate or correct, and that it's designed to influence you in the way that they intend. So they repealed this, and they reassured the critics by saying, don't worry, there's no program set up, and there's no funding for it. <laugh>. Well, in 2013, they set up the program, and then they funded it in 2016. Yeah. So the upshot of this is, Alec, is that anything that you see in the mainstream media could be a lie.

[\(01:15:51\)](#):

Yeah. Anything. So, my recommendation to the people is unplug from the mainstream and only look at, um, independent media that you trust, that you have vetted and you trust. Okay. So I'm trying to, you know, paint this picture that there are all these things that have been happening simultaneously in order to facilitate everything that we experienced in 2020. And it, it would've been unthinkable 20 years ago. There's just no way. And it would've been clearly considered illegal. Now, it's also unconstitutional in my view, but because all these laws have been passed, facilitating it, it's not a lot of, it's not technically illegal anymore. Right. Doesn't make it constitutional but

Alec Zeck [\(01:16:31\)](#):

Unlawful. But Ill, but still legal. Exactly. Makes a difference.

Leslie Manookian [\(01:16:36\)](#):

Exactly. So, um, truly, um, critical to the entire agenda is, as I mentioned, the influence of the pharmaceutical industry and just medicine in general. And I really wanna paint this picture about how, um, influential this industry is, 30 million to Congress every year, 250 million lobbying. Okay? And this giving, these are just the donations that they make, right? To <laugh> to their campaigns and things like that. Um, almost all of them have taken money from Congress. Look at that. 97 US Senators have taken money from the pharmaceutical industry, and they've got twice as many lobbyists as there are members of Congress. I mean, this is just a bad situation. Um, but that's not all. Um, if you look, as I mentioned before, the pharmaceutical industry is only allowed to advertise direct to consumers in the uk, and, sorry, the US and New Zealand. And, um, they spent 5 billion on TV ads in 2018.

[\(01:17:40\)](#):

They paid Pharma 3 billion, just pay them in things unrelated to research. Now, what do I mean by paid them? Well, they bestow what are called honoraria and titles and things like this on prominent physicians in order to push their drugs. So they pay them to do these things, but it's not really a contract. They just give them the money and say, oh, we wanna give you this award. And it's, you know, it's not an out and out quid pro quo. It's an award. And, you know, the unspoken truth is that you'll talk favorably about whatever our drug is. Um, they fund a huge portion of what are called continuing medical education credits. Um, and this is where, you know, you go to a conference to learn about, I don't know, the new gold standard of treating of heart disease in Cancun <laugh>. And they pay for it. Okay? Have you seen dope Sick? Have you seen dope sick? Yes. Do you remember how the pharma's rep is getting, he's like, why don't you come to Vegas? Why don't you come here and why don't you do this? This is how they do it. Okay? Um, this is just jaw dropping. In 2020 alone, they spent an estimated 35 billion on ads. I mean, that's more than the G D P of a lot of countries in the world. Most countries in the world we're talking extraordinary sums of money. And, um, so they have extraordinary control.

[\(01:19:11\)](#):

And it's not just the advertising and the stuff that you see out in the public domain. It's what they do in the, you know, how they have subverted research. There are these private foundations, the pharmaceutical industry, the N I h fund, the hospitals, they fund the research at, uh, you know, the, the, the teaching hospitals and research centers, they fund the universities. These major universities rake in so much money from these, from the pharmaceutical industry, from the N I h and from these private foundations. It's more than they get intuition in many instances. So they are literally like teaching, you know, college students on the side. What they're really doing is this pharma funded and n I h funded operation to generate research into their pet projects. And the reason I say that, that there, that there are these pet projects, is that let's just say you are, um, you have, um, ascertained that aluminum in vaccines is very dangerous.

[\(01:20:18\)](#):

Okay? You have to get that funded. And even if you're a tenured professor, do you know that you still have to bring in your own money? You actually just being tenured doesn't mean that you're safe. You have to get grants. You have to actually fund your lab. Well, how do you do that? Is the N I h going to fund something that casts doubt on vaccines? Is the Gates Foundation going to fund that? Is the pharmaceutical industry gonna fund it? Of course not. They're not going to fund these things. And so what ends up happening is that the projects they want to move forward get funding. And the projects, they don't don't. And the researchers know this, so they do stuff that's safe. They do stuff that's acceptable to the powers that be, and the things that really matter to the people get left to the side.

[\(01:21:06\)](#):

It's really outrageous. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>. Um, I wanna drive home just how important n i H is in all of this. Tens of billions. Look at that. Almost \$50 billion is the n I h budget. So they're giving out almost \$50 billion. And who are they giving it to? Scientists at research centers, at hospitals, and at universities. I mean, this is just, it's not only in the United States, it's global, but this is how they clo control globally as well. Um, the University of Washington Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation was given a grant of \$279 million by the Gates Foundation. A couple, um, I think it was in 20 18, 20 16, 17 or 18, you, the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation was one of the primary groups modeling the Covid crisis and telling us how many people were gonna get sick and die and all these kinds of things. Imperial College took 133 million from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 79 million of which was in January of 2020.

[\(01:22:16\)](#):

And this was the model that said that 500,000 Britts would die, and 2.2 million Americans would die. And M I t I mean, listen, this is just from Gates alone, okay? And it's unbelievable. It doesn't, it is unbelievable, isn't it? And on top of this, the pharmaceutical industry literally just pays journal editors. They just give them money, they pay them. And when I'm talking about journal editors, I'm talking about major prominent journals, and then they do something else, which are something called reprints. So you're a pharmaceutical company. You get a, um, um, your drug, you get a study published on your drug in the New England Journal of Medicine or the Lancet, okay? And then you want that study printed again, but pulled out of the journal and reprinted as a standalone with the journal cover on top that amounts. They, then, what they'll do is they'll say, you know, print me 20,000 of these. And it, it, so now it says The Lancet, it's just got their drug and the study on their drug that's positive. And then it's sent out to 20,000 physicians around the world, okay? 41% of the lancets revenues, and 53% of the Journal of the Medi American Medical Association's revenues come from reprints alone. You think it's doctors paying their whatever, \$200 fee, annual subscription. No, staggering, isn't it?

Alec Zeck [\(01:23:46\)](#):

Yeah. It's

Leslie Manookian [\(01:23:46\)](#):

Insane. So the journals are owned, they are owned. And Professor John ide, who is one of the most published and esteemed scientists in the world, he's at Stanford, he says specifically that 90% of medical research is not accurate. He says they don't use proper placebo, that you don't use proper controls, you can't trust it. And it's not, it's not valid. It's not valid. And then the editors of New England Journal of Medicine and the Lancet, um, they have said that it's basically a coin toss.

Alec Zeck [\(01:24:17\)](#):

Yeah, that was, that was Marcia Angel and, uh, Richard Horton. Both, both of them were chief editors of the New England Journal of Medicine and the Lancet, respectively. And they both have said that both the, uh, majority of research published is likely false. And that also that the pharmaceutical industry has severely captured Yeah, the medical, uh, the peer

Leslie Manookian [\(01:24:41\)](#):

Review process. And they've been, I mean, Horton hasn't been pilloried so much, but Angel has been, I don't know, is it Angel or Angel? I know. I'm not sure which

Alec Zeck [\(01:24:48\)](#):

One. Yeah, Marcia Angel, angel Angle, something like that. Yeah.

Leslie Manookian [\(01:24:51\)](#):

She has been pilloried for her CRI critiques. Pilloried for it, you know, so you get this picture, you think that your doctor is giving you the best information. You think your doctor is telling you whatever is the gold standard in treatment. And you think that this is unbiased, but it's actually all directed, controlled, and funneled through these channels so that you get highly curated information about what they want you to know, not the truth. So, um, the Codex Ari Commission, um, this is, this is a, a group that was founded back in the sixties, and this is why you have to really wonder, this is supposed to create global

standards for food safety and supplement safety. And it's been passed in Europe. It's not been passed in the us. We have fought it over and over and over again. Um, and what it's been, what has happened as a result of it is that, that have now standardized supplements in Europe.

[\(01:25:56\)](#):

And you can't get their therapeutic doses of supplements because it's a com, you know, competing product to the pharmaceutical industry. So they basically put this forward under the pretext of, we wanna standardize and we wanna make it safe, and we wanna make sure it's all regulated and everything's good, and that you're, you're safe as a, um, as a consumer. But what ends up happening is that it's really so that the pharmaceutical industry can eradicate any competition to its products, and that you can be deprived of the ability to keep yourself well without a drug. So they want you to not be able to take vitamin C or vitamin D in a dose that's actually therapeutic. They want you to only get what they deem appropriate, which is like enough to keep you alive. So they wanna take away your independence. That's what they're doing here.

[\(01:26:43\)](#):

So most of these trade groups, like the American Medical Association, people have to understand, um, that that is a front group for, that takes money from the pharmaceutical industry and supposedly represents doctors, but they take millions from the pharmaceutical industry. This is a front group. Would you listen to what the coal industry has to say about the safety of coal? No. You know, their trade group, but that's exactly what this is. And somehow these trade groups have been elevated to these like almost pseudo-government kind of status. You know, I mean, the whole, you know, think about the image of doctors, right? It's carefully, carefully, um, cultivated over decades. The white lab coat the stethoscope, who else gets called doctor or a, a title right? In society, nobody but them. And it's so that you will defer to them because they're an authority figure, and then they can, you know, push the agenda.

[\(01:27:37\)](#):

They, we, they know what they're doing. It's, it's really deploying a psychological operation against the people. So, um, there are all these different organizations that are AstroTurf organizations, these national associations that, um, no child left, left by two, meaning that every child's been vaccinated by two. You've got the National Meningitis Foundation, it's funded by the meningitis vaccine makers, okay? These organizations, you really have to go and look, you think they're grassroots, you think they're parent led. They're usually a parent whose child has been injured, who's paid now by the pharmaceutical industry. So like someone whose child died or something from, from meningitis, and now they're a spokesperson for the meningitis vaccine. Yeah. It's not a grassroots at all. It's AstroTurf and they are putting out whatever the pharmaceutical industry wants them to put out. And then of course, to just, you know, round the whole thing out.

[\(01:28:32\)](#):

You, you have the big tech, the fake fact checkers colluding with intelligence and the pharmaceutical industry in order to, uh, um, control the messaging and the narrative. I only put this in here because I want people to understand that going to the doctor, especially to the hospital, is not benign nine. Now, I'm not saying don't go to the hospital if you get in a car crash, or if you have a heart attack or something like that. I'm just saying that, you know, what we call modern medicine is actually carries serious risk in the United States alone. I've seen a couple of studies. One says it's 250,000, another one says it's 440,000 preventable deaths from medical errors in our hospitals every year. They're the third leading cause of death. But it's not actually included any of the statistics that the c d C puts off puts out.

[\(01:29:24\)](#):

And there are, you know, millions of cases of harm by hospitals every year. There was this one study that was done in 10 hospitals in North Carolina, and they found that 18% of hospital patients were harmed by the medical care. They retreated that they, that they received. And in two and a half percent of the cases, the patient died with 8% of hospital admissions having a life-threatening issue. I mean, that's staggering, right? This is supposed to be helping you. It's supposed to protect you. It's supposed to. I mean, I think one of the biggest, um, biggest, uh, uh, what do you call it? Own goals, soccer and, um, anal, uh, uh, analogy, an own goal is when you score on yourself, right? Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, shoot yourself in the foot. Mm-hmm. <affirmative> is that more Americans and more people in Europe are not going to hospitals anymore because they actually fear Yeah. And have a, have their eyes opened about the pharmaceutical industry. Yeah. And the dangers of going into the hospital and how, and, and how they've been treated.

Alec Zeck ([01:30:23](#)):

You know, an interesting point on that too, with this being the third leading cause of death, the first and second are heart disease and cancer. And an argument could definitely be made that, that was improper treatment or improper, uh, guidelines on nutrition and lifestyle and mindfulness and these other things that may have led to many of the, uh, you know, cancer diagnoses and, and heart disease diagnoses.

Leslie Manookian ([01:30:48](#)):

Totally. So, Alec, the, um, there is research showing that it's the number one cause of death, but the study that I chose is the most conservative. I don't wanna be accused of sensationalizing for sure. And so, yes, you can actually make an argument very easily that modern medicine iatrogenic, um, harm is the leading cause of death in the United States.

Alec Zeck ([01:31:09](#)):

Exactly.

Leslie Manookian ([01:31:11](#)):

Okay. So this number right here, the 106 death, 106,000 deaths from properly prescribed F d A approved drugs, that thing is so old. It's from the Starfield report that was done decades ago. That number surely is much higher. So if you include that, it's probably more like 250,000 now. And then you include all the hospital errors and stuff than you are over the 600,000 heart attacks and the 550,000 cancer deaths. And what causes all those cancer deaths too, <laugh>, the drugs, the heart attacks, the, you know, the drugs. A lot of them. I just want, you know, to impress that, that our medical system is not what it's purported to be. 40,000 medical errors every day in the United States. I mean, that's just crazy. And where's the, where's the concern? Where's the alarm about this? Where's the emergency? It's business as usual, these people know.

([01:32:09](#)):

So, um, this is Wanis, um, from Stanford. What I, um, he's saying that 90% of the published medical information is flawed. And then this is, um, I didn't actually, I took out the, uh, other two lancet. So what's the whole reason for all of this? So I, you know, hopefully helped you flesh out this idea that there's financial reasons and political, um, uh, foundation that had been put in place in order to facilitate a change. So there's a financial reason that we're in this place, and that 2020 unfolded the way it did. And then there's all these political and legislative, um, steps that have been put in place in order to facilitate the response to the crisis. But what's the real objective of it all? Well, the re the objective is what we all know of is the great reset. And I'm not gonna go into huge detail about this.

[\(01:32:59\)](#):

I just wanna talk about the kind of particulars that relate specifically to what I've already spoken about so people really can, you know, sort of, um, uh, close the circle on that. So it's all about concealing the financial mismanagement by government over many decades. And in particular, concealing the pension failure that I spoke about in the early part of the presentation. But one of the things that they wanna do is have what's called a debt holiday. Um, this means canceling all debt. So there was a document that leaked out in Canada in the early part of 2020 that said that the, um, that what was going to happen was that they were going to tell all the citizenry that you can get rid of your debt. You can, um, cancel your credit card debt, your car loan, your house mortgage, any debt that you have.

[\(01:33:47\)](#):

Um, in exchange, you'll give us your assets, okay? And if you don't give us your assets, or if you don't get the shot, then we will seize your assets and you will be put into one of these camps. This is what, this is what this document said. But this idea of canceling debt, having a debt holiday, I believe is one of the ways that they will try and make it palatable to the public. Because the public, the government defaults onto debt, everyone's gonna panic. But if they say, oh, listen, we're just gonna cancel all your debt and we're gonna create this new wonderful system, and as part of that we have to get rid of the government debt as well, then people will think they're getting something really positive. And whatever's being it's replacing, they'll just accept it. Does that make sense? And so this is part of the plan, I believe.

[\(01:34:40\)](#):

And, um, we already see that there's, so this is I think another reason why they're spending with like, I mean, they're reckless, right? <laugh>, six or \$7 trillion in the last, well, actually now it's probably been 10 trillion in the last five or six years. It's been crazy. The amount of money they spent the United States, and it's happening all over. They're spending like, there's no tomorrow, because actually there is no tomorrow from their standpoint, they know that there's going to be a reset. That's the whole point. And so part of that means canceling debt. But the thing is, what do you have to give in order to get your debt canceled? You are going to buy into their system. You are going to have to comply with all of their edicts. You are going to get a digital identification and all these kinds of things. It's not gonna be pretty.

[\(01:35:22\)](#):

And you're gonna get a digital central bank, a central bank digital currency. But this requires, in order to do all the stuff I'm talking about, requires collaboration, being between the government, the media, pharmaceutical, big techs, all these things. So you see why I touched on all those different pieces is because they're all important players in this giant production. And ultimately they will get control of everything, the internet, energy, um, money, banking, finance, medicine. And the thing is, if they control those things and they control your employment, your travel, how you engage in society, and whether you do, um, how have they been achieving this for years, there has been a project in Australia called Caius for criminals. And we're talking five or six years, seven years. It goes back caius for criminals. Think about this. So, and they've been telling people, yeah, yeah, they, they put this out there. Cash is for criminals. You know, use your debit card, use your credit card, use whatever a, uh, plastic are. Now digital.

Alec Zeck [\(01:36:23\)](#):

I was at a restaurant in California a couple weeks ago where, I mean, we've seen all over the place in the US that people, or that restaurants and different businesses will no longer carry cash. But this one was specifically saying they're no longer carrying cash because it thwarts any criminal activity, which was really interesting to me. 'cause that stuck out quite a bit.

Leslie Manookian ([01:36:44](#)):

That's very interesting. Yeah. So I don't know if you remember, in January of 2020, what was the news reporting? There was so much fear, right? And what was the media saying? Cash. They found that the cash in China carries the virus. It survives for nine days, they said, and then they said 14 days. And they said, no, wait, wait, it's 26 or seven days. Right? Problem, reaction, solution. People voluntarily get rid of their cash and slide into the new digital system, digital prison that they are building for us. So you can see this is a highly sophisticated operation. Um, what's also been happening in many countries is they've been canceling high denominations, a thousand euro, 500 euro, um, bills. They've done this in Canada. In fact, Trudeau gave himself the power to just outright cancel currency at the beginning of 2022, I believe it was.

([01:37:45](#)):

And no one knows, no one said a word about it. India has canceled cash. Europe is canceling high denominations. I mean, it's, it's crazy what's happening. There is a, and this has been going on for years, so it's not a reaction to Covid, it was happening before the Covid crisis. You can't argue that this is just, oh, a natural progression. And there have been white papers that have been written for years by, um, uh, different European countries, Sweden, the UK, other countries about digital currencies, central bank digital currencies. And the UK has been working specifically on something called programmable money. Have you heard about that? So programmable money is digital currency that will be, um, uh, a way to control you. So it's programmable. Let's just say, let me just go to something. Yeah, I'm gonna, I'm gonna go into programmable money on that. I'm gonna come, I'll come back to it.

([01:38:41](#)):

So let me just finish up here. So, um, um, they've been canceling the currency. They are restricting cash based transactions. So you cannot do a transaction over a certain amount in the, in the EU, I think it was like originally 10,000, then they moved it to maybe seven and then 3000. Now I think it's only 900 or a thousand euros. And in the US they're doing the same thing. You know, if you create, if you conduct any transaction for \$10,000 or more cash in the United States, it's reported. And, um, this is happening all over. Why? Because they want to condition you to accept control. So I talked earlier, I just touched a little bit on all of the, um, the fact that these small and medium sized employers employ two thirds of the US workforce. And if you really wanna control the people, you have to take away their livelihood.

([01:39:36](#)):

And, um, so I don't think that there was any kind of accident that they, you know, destroyed all these small and medium sized businesses. I mean, just, I don't know how many businesses have been lost in the last three years, but we're talking millions, I believe. And you also though have to have a way though for people to still pay their bills. And so you introduce universal basic income. Universal basic income is also known as U B I. And this is how, um, these, these programs have been in pilot programs for many, many years in the United States and in Europe. And this is basically just government handouts. It's all, it's, you don't do anything for it. You just get paid by the government. Okay? Think about it. It was like the Covid relief project, um, uh, programs where they just gave people money to pay their bills because they couldn't work.

([01:40:24](#)):

So, in my mind, what happened as a, as a result of those covid relief projects was that people, the, the idea of being on the dole taking money from government was destigmatized. So the public now accepts that it's okay in some ways to take money from the government. They've been doing it in Sacramento for years. A pilot program. Now, universal basic income, marries perfectly with programmable currency, which I just mentioned, pro programmable currency is the ability to put some kind of software

program into the con the currency to dictate how you use it. So let's just say what's going to happen. Their plan is that every American is gonna get two or \$3,000 a month universal basic income, okay? They're gonna get u b l of \$3,000 a month. Here's the thing. They program it so that it expires every month. They program it.

[\(01:41:20\)](#):

So you can only use 2% to buy red meat. They program it. So you cannot use more than a small percent to, to purchase fuel for your car. They, they program it to do all kinds of things so that it controls your behavior. If you're friends with Leslie Manukian online, you get, well, you don't get 3000, you get 2,500, you get it taken away from you, right? So it's programmed, you see how it works together. They introduce universal basic income that's facilitated through the Central Bank digital currency. And this is the marriage of banking, big tech and the Fed. And then you program it and you control their behavior. You control everything. You went outside of your 15 minute city. You don't get your, you don't get as much money. And here's the big thing, by having it be programmable so that it, um, that it expires at the end of the month, it prevents individuals from saving. Saving is how we better our lives because we save, we invest, and we then build a business or something like this. It means that we will all be subsistence. That's the net effect of it. And it is terrifying, frankly.

[\(01:42:38\)](#):

And then of course, it also allows them to track every single thing you do. So they're gonna track all of our, um, financial transactions, but they also wanna track us. Because if you go outside of your zone that you're supposed to live in, or you, um, let's just say there's a public health emergency, and you get together with family or friends that you're not supposed to see, then they wanna, they wanna control that. And so they need to track it. Well, how do they track you through low earth orbit satellites? Elon Musk and Bill Gates both have their pet projects, starlink and Earth now, and their objective is to blanket the entire earth in real time live, um, satellite surveillance. So basically, Musk, the last time I checked, had launched over 3000 satellites and gates about a year and a half ago was up to a thousand, I think.

[\(01:43:33\)](#):

I haven't checked it very recently, but basically, Musk is gonna launch 10,000 and Gates is gonna go somewhere near there. And their idea is that there will be not a square inch of Earth that is not being surveilled in real time. You cannot away from it, right? And this is literally the total control system. And then they want to, um, um, this is another reason for five G as well, because everybody's probably heard of the Internet of things, the iot, the internet of things. Um, the reason that they want five G is that it connects with the satellites, connects with the whole five G system, but it also connects every single appliance and device in your home so that they can monitor that. So think about programmable money and in this context as well, oh, you can't use your washing machine at this time. Oh, you, you, you, your refrigerator is sucking up a lot of energy. No, no, no. Oh, you have two Fri you have a spare refrigerator or a freezer? No, no, no. You can't have that, right? So they use this, this whole network, they, they conduct the surveillance and then they have the five g, um, system to connect to every single device on the planet, and then they can control them. And I don't know if people know this, but in Colorado last summer, people have those Nest and other, you know, um, uh, digital five G devices,

Alec Zeck [\(01:45:00\)](#):

Amazon, Alexa, uh, things like this, right?

Leslie Manookian [\(01:45:04\)](#):

Yeah. Well, Colorado, the state of Colorado went into those people's homes remotely, didn't enter them, and they adjusted their thermostats to 78 degrees in the summer, last summer. So you couldn't have it at 76 or 72, it had to be at 78. So, I mean, this is literally authoritarianism like no human being has ever imagined. Now, I know that's only the thermostat, but that's just the most recent manifestation of it. The point is, mm-hmm. They will be able to control your whole life. And here's the most twisted and most spooky and scary part of it, is that there's now something called the Internet of Bodies. And they talk about wearable devices. Well, they also talk about chipping people, putting things into people. And you know, there are many people who say that there's some kind of sophisticated technology in the shots. I'm not gonna talk about whether or not that's true or not, but I do know this is a fact that the military has been developing different kinds of technology for a long time that can be injected, that can be implanted, that then has an influence on your brain, on your thoughts, on your behavior.

[\(01:46:13\):](#)

There's an amazing presentation that you can watch about this, but I'll post that on our, um, I don't know if you guys want, I can give it to you. It's, it's fascinating. So this is going to a very, very dark place, very, very dark place. Um, and it's about complete control. I mean, listen, <laugh>, Aldi Huxley and George Orwell, they didn't go far enough, right? They didn't have a clue as to what, where this would really head. And so, of course, uh, a crucial component of this whole agenda is the vaccine that people have been conditioned to accept through their vaccine card that they got for their covid shot. And, um, although I have to say it's very positive, you know, the f d uh, the C d C tries to say that 92% of Americans got the shot at least one dose. I don't believe that for a second.

[\(01:47:06\):](#)

There've been independent polls done that say it's more like 68 to 72%. That means that about a third of Americans said, forget it. And then if you look at the second dose, it declined at least 15% from there. So there are a lot of people who've cottoned on to what's going on or just, you know, bucked the system from the very beginning. And I think we should all be very encouraged by that. Um, they have been developing things like ID 2020 and trust stamp for years. This is, um, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation funds the, um, global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations, Gavi. And they've been working with MasterCard for years in Africa to create digital identifications connected to their vaccine cards, and then also money. So they've, they've trialed, um, they, another group trialed ID 2020 in Bangladesh, which is connecting your digi your health records to your, um, financial records and in money, things like this.

[\(01:48:04\):](#)

So this is what they're doing. They've been doing it for a long time. And, um, the, you know, I've talked about all the different groups that are involved in it, and I just mentioned the, some of this technology, I mean, nanotech and stuff in Sweden, 3000 people have actually voluntarily gone and gotten a chip in their hand. And they're like, well, I can just swipe my hand across the, um, you know, to get into my building or into my office or whatever. It's so convenient and wonderful. Yeah, it's, it is convenient. I'm not sure. It's very wonderful. But, um, the way that they have done this, and one of the reasons that you should know that this is, um, nefarious, is that they've used fear and guilt to manipulate you, right? They didn't just say, Hey, here, this stuff is, choose it if you want it.

[\(01:48:47\):](#)

They literally herded us like sheep into their agenda through fear and guilt. Do it for grandma. Save your grandma. Don't be a grandma killer. Wear a mask. It's a small ask. All the things they said, 15 minutes to slow the spread. 15 minutes or 15, 15 days. Sorry, I misspoke. All of these things, I mean, they weaponized language. I, I wrote a blog about weaponizing language against us, and I really drill it down

on that stuff in there. But they basically used very sophisticated tactics in order to manipulate us into the desired outcome in the UK. They actually had something called the Nudge committee, which was got together and deployed psychological operations in order to elicit the appropriate, the desired response from the public. This is sick, this is sick. And they, and if you think they only did it in Britain, you're crazy. They're doing this here.

[\(01:49:45\)](#):

Um, so here's the thing. That is the plan. Those are their objectives. I do not believe they will win. I really truly don't. I think we've already seen that with the shots. And I think that one of the reasons that they have been accelerating this agenda is because so many Americans didn't take the shots. Um, I read recently that the, um, gun over ownership of American women has spiked to an all time high. I think that's very interesting. The biggest issue is that I think is really, really positive, is that Americans are more engaged than they have been in decades. Listen, this kind of stuff wouldn't have happened if Americans hadn't been apathetic and asleep at the wheel. And that's been the case for a very, very long time, for more than a century. And the thing is, we can re-engage. We can actually rebuild our communities.

[\(01:50:36\)](#):

We can, um, learn to learn homeopathy. We can learn herbs. We can learn to grow our own food. We can do all these things to increase our own resilience and our own independence. We can build our own schools. We can homeschool our children. We do not have to go to these government, um, propaganda institutions, which is what they are. We have the power to do what we want to live our lives. The the way that we want and all that it takes is for us to stand up and work together to do that. That's it. Let's not forget that there are 8 billion of us and I don't know how many, few thousand of them. So if we all get together and, um, really truly take charge of our lives, I don't think it has to be a bleak outcome. And I don't think it will be a bleak outcome. That doesn't mean it might not get worse before it gets better, but I fully have faith in humanity and in the, um, huge pendulum swing that we see going towards local communities, that we are going to find our way out of this, and that we are going to, um, actually create a better way forward for all of us.

Alec Zeck [\(01:51:48\)](#):

Amen. So well said, Leslie. I think this was the perfect amount of information to contextualize where we're going with the rest of this event, getting into the deeper details of what happened over the last three years. So thank you so much for joining me. And if you enjoyed this session, please click below to subscribe to Leslie's email list and please check out her organization, health Freedom Defense Fund.

Leslie Manookian [\(01:52:19\)](#):

Thanks so much for having me, Alec. It's a pleasure and an honor to be with you.

This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed in whole or in part without express written permission from The Way Forward, LLC.