

Grand Jury - Session 5

<https://odysee.com/@GrandJury:f/Grand-Jury-Day-6-en-online:7>

Reiner Fuellmich
Ana Garner
Leslie Manookian
Viviane Fischer
Virginie de Araujo Recchia
Patrick Wood
Rui da Fonseca e Castro
Dexter Ryneveldt
Björn Pirwitz
Christian Kreiss

00:13 Rui Da Fonseca e Castro:

Good evening. Summary of the fourth day of the grand jury investigation of the court of public opinion, February 19, 2022. Several experts met during the day yesterday to talk about the so-called vaccines. Specifically, Dr. Alexandra Henrion-Caude, Dr. Vanessa Schmidt-Krüger, Dr. Deanna McLeod, Dr. Sucharit Bhakdi, Dr. Mike Yeadon, Dr. Antionietta Gatti, Professor Arne Burkhardt, and Dr. Werner Bergholz spoke about the following: the unprecedented number of adverse reactions to these injections and the increase in the number of humans injected. If the Wuhan variant died out without the vaccine, why are they injecting people for something that no longer exists?

It is not by mistake that for 2 years the only response to COVID-19 has been repeatedly, the vaccines. There was no evaluation of the epidemic dynamics, the injection campaigns were followed by an increase in deaths from COVID-19. The spike protein is not only a hotbed of mutations, it is also extremely toxic. Repeated injections destroy people's immune systems. Knowing that the SARS-CoV vaccine cannot be effective against respiratory viruses, as the lungs have their own immune system, and no mRNA vaccine has been used before in humans, therefore the Pfizer trial should have been invalidated, as it was riddled with manipulations and complete irregularities. There were also several adverse events in the trial that should have been the reason to stop them. Not only the spike protein, but also the lipids in the substance are highly toxic. The spike protein does not stay in the muscle but spreads throughout the body and into the bloodstream.

These effects of the injections are toxic by design, not by mistake, but intentionally. There is a high probability that the contents of the vials are different from one vial to another. Analysis of some vials shows the presence of technologically developed nano-entities. Autopsies performed on dead people show a high probability that they died from the effects of the spike protein in the body.

Then Meredith Miller and Ariane Bilheran talked about the mental health problems of people who submit to tyranny, and the whole cognitive dissonance and Stockholm syndrome that, heightened by confinement, plays a role in the submission to euthanasia that we've seen in the last two years.

That was a summary of the fourth day of the grand jury. Thank you.

3:23 Reiner Fuellmich:

Good evening, good morning. Tonight's session of the model grand jury procedure is on finance and economics. The question is, why? Of course, the Corona is a diversion, a diversionary tactic, and with the help of the Corona, people are made to panic, so they focus only on the Corona and are not able to see anything else. And what is this other thing? The other side, the Davos clique or Mr. Global's megalomaniacal desire to take total control of humanity. One of the ways to take total control of the population, are the measures, especially, of course, the so-called vaccinations, which we looked at last night.

Why is this being rolled out now? We know it's not about health. Why is this whole Corona scare being rolled out now?

Well, it seems to have something to do with the financial system that is on the verge of collapse, after the other side has been looting and pillaging it for decades or more. The financial system appears to be the US dollar and the euro. Both are on the verge of collapse. And that's because the people responsible for the Corona, were responsible for the looting and plundering and thus brought the financial system to the brink of collapse. In addition to the introduction of the digital passport, which is one of the main ways to exercise total control over the people, there is the issue of digital currency. That's why even those of us who have never been interested in finance and economics should now pay attention. After all, we are talking about pension funds that are completely bankrupt and health care systems that are so expensive that only the rich can afford them. That's why a closer look at the finances and havoc wreaked by those who now need the Corona to divert our attention is warranted. We'll begin tonight with Patrick Wood's hearing to explain the basics, the geopolitical or historical backdrop of what we're dealing with, Patrick.

06:13 Patrick Wood:

Okay, I'm here. Thank you. We've got all the technical resources here. I'll share my screen with you, if that's okay?

06:22 Reiner Fuellmich:

Sure.

06:24 Patrick Wood:

And hopefully it'll work the first time. Reiner Fuellmich: Here we go. Very good. I hope everyone can see that very well.

I have a lot to say in my presentation, to start today. I'm very happy to present this information with so many great colleagues, you've all given me new reading assignments, your collective works will be next on my list, I'm sure.

I'm Patrick Wood. I am the editor and producer of Technocracy.news¹, a website dedicated to critical analysis of economic affairs as they relate to technocracy. And I want to start by asking a question. Is capitalism in general, on the world stage, under fire? Is it destined to die?

Well, here is a statement from a prominent member of the World Economic Forum. He is the chairman and CEO of Salesforce, Marc Benioff. And he said on January 24, at the Davos meeting, "Capitalism, as we have known it, is dead."

That's a bold statement. That statement was followed at the same meeting by a presentation by Angela Merkel. And she said that capitalism is the worst of all possible economic systems. You can see the predisposition that exists within the World Economic Forum, which is very closely tied to the United Nations, by the way, and to all the issues surrounding sustainable development. We're going to go through some of them and I'll explain it to you.

It's a little bit difficult to understand because as you guess there's a lot of information. But I just want to say that it really lends itself to questioning. It wasn't until 4 days later, on January 30, 2020, that the World Health Organization declared a public health emergency of international concern. That's when the pandemic really started to spread. And of course, it wasn't until a few weeks later that a pandemic state was declared. It was a multi-step process to get to that point of full declaration, but this is where it all started. It would seem that the people at the World Economic Forum welcomed this crisis, this emergency, because if capitalism wasn't quite dead at that point, it was about to be, the rest of the killing act was about to take place.

I want to take you back in history to 1974. To use a phrase that Klaus Schwab likes to use, "we have to reimagine our world," well, globalization was reimagined in 1974. I think a lot of people have forgotten this, but one of the original founding members, and moreover, one of the very important members of the Trilateral Commission, Professor Richard Gardner, wrote an article in Foreign Affairs called "The Hard Road to World Order". And in that article, he writes, "In short, that the 'world order society' will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down. It will look like 'a big mess' - we might say amen to that today - but action to end national sovereignty by wearing it down piece by piece will be far more effective than the old-fashioned frontal attack.

I want to say that I'm not going to go into detail, you'll have to read some of my books or others, whatever, to understand what these frontal assaults were that took place before 1970 for example. Well, they didn't work, whatever they were. We could talk about that, I'm not going to take the time now. These old-fashioned frontal assaults were put on the back burner for a while to execute a strategy and policy of circumventing national sovereignty. And it wasn't just for America, it was for every nation in the world. This plan has been going on since the time this one was written, it's a major change because they like the frontal attack approach and they just realized that it wasn't going anywhere. We're back to that old era of the frontal attack being preferred over the long term attack, and we see that now everywhere we look.

So I want to talk about the genesis of modern globalization, just for a minute, even if it sounds a little redundant or boring, you'll figure it out as I go along. And I only have 20 minutes now so I'm going to get into it.

11:07

1970, Zbigniew Brzezinski, that brilliant political scientist from Columbia University. Brilliant, I don't agree with everything he says, but he is brilliant. He has published a book "Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technotronic Age". I'm not going to use the word Technotronic here, but rather the word technocratic. But it was this book that set the stage for modern globalization.

In 1873, the Trilateral Commission was founded by David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski to create what they called, at the time, a new international economic order. That's what's in all their literature, those are not my words. And in 1974, less than a year, in fact only 6 months after the founding of the Trilateral Commission, the United Nations adopted General Resolution 3201, you can look it up if you like, called "The Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order", exactly the same sentence. We know historically that the Rockefeller family and the United Nations have had a very intimate relationship. And it was not surprising that the United Nations was the tool chosen to provide the propagation of this doctrine throughout the world to all the other nations of the planet. Thus, in 1978, by way of China, the doctrine was introduced to the world economic scene by Zbigniew Brzezinski, who at the time was the national security advisor to President : James Earl Carter. Carter and his vice president Walter Mondale were members of the same commission, their cabinet, all but one member of the Carter cabinet were members of the Trilateral Commission, they brought them all into our government structure at that time. But it was Zbigniew Brzezinski who brought President Dang back on the world stage on behalf of China.

Then we moved on to the maturing phase of modern globalization. In 1987, the Norwegian Gro Harlem Brundtland, a member of the Trilateral Commission, published a book entitled: "Our Common Future", which was part of the final outcome of the Brundtland Commission, sponsored by the United Nations. And it was she who, since then, has been lauded for creating the doctrine of sustainable development, which has been pushed, in fact since that time, around the world by the United Nations.

So, in 1992, when the United Nations met in Rio de Janeiro, at the first Earth Summit, the doctrine of sustainable development was adopted as Agenda 21, that's how they named it, and you see these different synonyms appearing, sustainable development is equivocal to Agenda 21 and there are other terms as well.

In the year 2000, the United Nations met in New York to create what they called the 8 Millennium Goals, the Sustainable Development Goals, in other words, how to implement sustainable development. They were given a 15-year mandate and of course in 2015, another meeting was held in Addis Ababa to create the 2030 agenda, which would govern the next 30 years, which brings us to the year 2030 since 2015. And they created 17 points of sustainable development goals. We're not going to go into the details of those goals, they're readily available on the internet and you can look them up.

14:50

The next person to appear on the scene in that same year of 2015, is a woman named Christianna Figueres, who was leading the Paris climate change agreement at the time, which was a big deal at the time. She was the one who drove the whole process. She was very dynamic, I have to say she was an outstanding organizer. She brought the nations of the world together to create the global Paris climate agreement. Her title at the time was executive secretary of the United Nations climate change convention. I don't know how you would put that on a business card, but it was quite a title. She gave a press conference in 2015, and listen to what she said and here's the threat to kill capitalism, that's important to establish the motive, and also things like threats, she wrote, sorry, she said, it was a press conference, a verbal press conference, it was transcribed. She gave a press conference in 2015, and listen to what she said, and here's the threat to kill capitalism, it's important to establish a motive, and also other threatening things like this, she wrote notes, sorry, she said, it was a press conference, a verbal press conference, it was transcribed. She said, "This is the first time in human history that we have set ourselves the task of intentionally changing, within a defined period of time, the model of economic development that has been going on for at least 150 years, since the industrial revolution."

Now, these are very pointed words, there's no other way to interpret them, they had an intention. They had a motive and they stated what it was, they didn't, of course, give the timeline, but they also had a timeline. I'm not a criminal lawyer, but if I were, I would be very suspicious of this whole statement, that they just stipulated that there is a criminal intent to, you know, kill, they have a motive, they are paying attention, they have a timeline.

The next question is, do they have the capacity to do it? Of course, we know that now, completely, they have the capacity to do it, and they're doing it right now.

So the 2030 agenda document that was produced at that time, paragraph 28, I just mentioned it in passing, because it confirms what she was saying.

It says, "We commit to fundamental changes in the way our society produces and consumes goods and services."

That was a radical change in the economic system. Nobody really understood it at the time, but sustainability was at the heart of it. And you'll remember in retrospect that for all the emergencies that we had, for example, global warming and climate change, alarmism, etc.... They have proposed only one possible solution for the whole, whatever it is, the whole world, and that is sustainable development. There is never a plan B, and it's always like, "we have this big problem, we have global warming, we have a pandemic, so what we need is sustainable development".

That should tell us that there is something wrong with this picture, because smart men and women always discuss things until there is an option A, B, and C at least, and maybe more, and then they are debated.

18:03

I just want to explain for a second what sustainable development is, so you can get an idea of what's going on here.

The theory in general, I'm summarizing thousands of pages of documents produced by the United Nations, but the claim is that non-renewable resources should be depleted, because after all, they're going to run out anyway, so we might as well let them run out sooner. Whereas newly discovered renewable resources must be managed and allocated to society.

So this is a huge shift in thinking about the economic system, and you'll see some distinctions in the left and right columns of my chart. First of all, the sustainable

development column, which I talk about in my books, is actually a technocracy updated from the 19th century to the 20th century. Sustainable development and/or technocracy, you can use either term interchangeably, proposes a scientific management of resources and consumption, while capitalism and free market economics postulate a free market economy based on prices and determined by supply and demand. This is how the world has worked throughout its history, there has never been anything else, there have been variations, but it is always the same.

Second, FinTech. Fin Tech, better contracted financial technologies, is an underlying financial system that the United Nations has declared to be the financial system for sustainable development. This includes blockchain, digital currencies, total surveillance and a bunch of other things as well. Capitalism, on the other hand, is a base currency that depends on currency-based capital. And that's the underlying financial system that we have today and have had for centuries. Under sustainable development, there is no private property provided. Resources are to be owned, that is, all of the world's resources are to be held in a global common trust, for the use of the world by the companies that would be chosen to produce goods and services to deliver to consumers. On the other hand, capitalism provides for the ownership and use of private property, which is a fundamental right, in a capitalist system, to own property. In fact, the ability to own property has been discussed by many economists throughout the ages. It is the most important factor in economic development throughout the world. Finally, in the context of sustainable development, privacy is not allowed, of course. Privacy in the capitalist free market economy is a fundamental right and is in fact necessary for the proper functioning of capitalism. There are a number of reasons for this, I'm not going to detail them now. But I just want you to have an idea of some of the differences between capitalism and the free market economy and what sustainable development is.

21:09

Having said that, I just want to make it clear that sustainable development, which I think is a technocracy that goes back to the 1930s, is 100% incompatible with the market economy and capitalism. When I say incompatible, I mean that it is like matter and antimatter, like oil and water, they don't mix, they will never mix because they are foreign to each other. It's as if someone from Mars came to Earth and wanted to live there and vice versa, that's what happens. When they collide, when they collide and the economic space, the economic gangrene sets in and there are so many examples of that, and again, in the interest of time, I'm not going to go into it, you can find them easily enough on your own. For example, the Green New Deal, great thing in the world that we have in America. The Green New Deal whenever it hits the traditional concepts of capitalism, or free market economics, quickly gangrene sets in and things start to rot.

Unfortunately, for these usurpers of this new system, capitalism cannot die a natural death, they would like it to die a natural death, that was the case in 1932, when technocracy was originally conceived. The Great Depression was a horrible time, and the group of scientists who created it at Columbia University were certain that capitalism was dead, and that only they could come to the rescue and design a whole new economic system from scratch. This system would be scientifically exploited anyway. Because capitalism just couldn't die a natural death, so we have the following result, signs like this started to appear all over the world: "kill capitalism before it kills the planet". It's a masterful propaganda move. It didn't stop with Mark Benioff at the World Economic Forum, but it spread to the whole alarmist community, or whatever, around the world. And you started to hear, "we definitely have to kill capitalism, it has to die an early death".

23:19

So what are the ways to kill capitalism, to destroy it, and the market economy? I have listed 9 things, I think there are maybe 2 or 3 more, but you will recognize that these are the essential axes of the functioning of any economic system in the world. And I hope at the same time that you will see that all of these areas, every one of them, have been corrupted to some extent, some more than others, perhaps. But here's the first one, "Take the energy out of the economic system - All economic activity requires energy input." This is a no-brainer, I mean it's so intuitive that it doesn't even need to be said. Without gasoline, your car doesn't run, without energy, the economy doesn't work. So if you take

energy out, like, "Hey let's take out coal, let's take out oil, let's take out natural gas, let's take out everything else except windmills and solar panels and whatever else you want to power the world," you find that they take energy out of the system. Here's the next one, "Removing Resources - Creating Product and Material Shortages." God knows we are experiencing this right now. We have huge shortages coming. Not because there are real shortages, I might add. It's manufactured or invented shortages that are being blamed for the economic hardship, but they're being taken away and, for example, the price of lumber is higher than it's ever been in the absence of a spring building season, at least in the north.

24:59

Are there fewer trees in the forest, in North America or Canada? No, there's a lot of trees. There's a lot of wood. But, they tell us there's a shortage. Here's another one "Corrupting the supply chain - goods and products have to be transported". Even if it's just on a local or international basis, it doesn't matter, there has to be transportation. That's the supply chain, which is an age-old concept. But it's been modified to suit modern globalization, so that the supply chain is now a very complex and tricky business, and... if, of course, even if it's reduced, right now, that doesn't mean it's going to die and be reduced forever. Right now, though, the supply chain is totally disrupted, and there's absolutely no question. Secondly, withdrawal of labor, any economic activity requires labor inputs. So what have we had over the last 2 years here? We've had a massive withdrawal of people from the payroll, we've had a massive drop in productivity of the people who have stayed on the payroll, and a lot of people are still hiding at home, scared to death to get out and go back to work in some cases, and because they're currently getting too much money from the government.

The next is the withdrawal of finance and capital. All economic activity requires money flows. So you've seen the policies of the World Economic Forum... and the policies of the United Nations that talk about environmental investment, and its concept of ESG that if your company doesn't invest in the areas that they're telling you they should invest in, then you're going to be blacklisted, where you can't get loans from the bank, in other words, you have to adopt their terms before they'll give you a penny. We've seen that spread over the last 2 years as well.

The next one is limiting consumption. Of course, it is again a kind of oxymoron to say that economic production must be consumed, but there has to be someone to buy the goods and services that are produced. So is consumption limited today? Yes, it is. And you say: Why? Because the middle class, at least in this country, and I think the rest of the world can attest to that. The middle class has been so decimated, that its consumption has been greatly reduced. I read an article the other day, I think in America, that said 67% of Americans are living on a precarious income, and they don't even have enough money for emergencies.

The next point is a bit indirect, but it's about limiting innovation. At any given time, innovation is limited. Products are not created. In other words, a healthy economy requires continuous innovation of products and services. And our innovation is limited in today's world absolutely, formally.

28:16

I've been talking to people in the southwestern region of the United States, who have a new idea for energy production, it's a great idea. I think it's probably a very unique idea. I won't say what it's based on, but they're excited, they're gathering investors right now to invest in this project and see if they can create an energy company that will produce energy in a different way than it is now. These people are afraid for their lives because they know that the cartels are going to come after them, the energy cartels are going to come after them and shut them down. The worst thing for the whole world is that if there was free or very cheap energy in the world, of course, which would stimulate economic activity, they would go out of business. So they just can't let that happen.

Then you have to create a cataclysm, scare people away from producing, spending or consuming. A storm is perfect. I remember a huge earthquake in the Bay Area of California in 1989, I think, early 1990.

It was so bad that the bridges collapsed, the Bay Bridge collapsed, it was a horrible thing, a lot of buildings collapsed etc.... I can guarantee you that I was living there at the time, no commercial activity took place for 6 months in that area, nothing, people didn't want to buy, they didn't want to sell, they didn't want to go out, they didn't want to answer the phone. The printers didn't print, the vendors didn't sell. Cataclysmic events are famous for scaring people into a state of catatonic shock, where they can't and won't move forward on anything.

The last thing that is, again, kind of indirect, but I know that economist-minded people will certainly understand it, is to create a system of malinvestment and disinvestment, that is, to get people to invest in the wrong things, which are not, you know, essential to maintaining the current system. So investing in areas that are counterproductive now, especially because the United Nations, the World Economic Forum are investing in windmills. Instead of, you know, in... Hey, we've got other problems in the world right now, besides, you know, just worrying about how to get a wind farm out of the ocean, which environmentalists are freaking out about now because it's started killing all the fish out there too and the birds if these things are on the land.

So the misinvestment, the disinvestment at this point is robbing the traditional economy of its natural flow of capital. So these are ways of destroying capitalism, I just want to say, in my opinion, each one of them has been put on the table and has been attacked deliberately, I'm not going to back that up now, but you can think about it, just a thought to put in your mind.

31:16

Now let's turn to Klaus Schwab, the founder and executive chairman of the World Economic Forum, of course. You've all heard this phrase before, "The pandemic represents a rare but unique opportunity to reflect, reimagine and reset our world." We've heard it a million times in the media, I'm pretty sure most people read it and go, "Oh, I don't like that. But they don't know why they don't understand what he's saying and they don't really understand why they don't like it. I'm glad that at least they realized that they didn't like it. And of course, another phrase that came out of the World Economic Forum just for 2030, "you will own nothing and be happy". Nobody asked about that either, but I did. So if something exists in time and space, whether it's a car or some other product or a machine or whatever, if something exists in time and space, somebody has to own it. When he says "you will own nothing and be happy", well, somebody has to own all these things. The question is who, and of course they talk about pay-per-use, you know, if you want something, you can rent it, whatever, but we'll own it, we'll let you use it as you need it, if you pay the fee.

Then, of course they talk about the Great Reset and the 32:37" Build Back Better "2 concept. I just want to point it out as a subtle thing, I don't think it's too subtle, actually. But the Great Reset involves starting from scratch. When, for example, you reset your clock, or a counter to zero, it starts over. And then you reach what you're doing, you reset and you start over again, which is what Build Back Better emphasizes. Build back better implies that everything you are going to rebuild from is now reduced to ashes.

I don't know why more people don't grasp that. But you know, if your house burns down, it's a tragic event when that happens, you lose everything, your pictures, your memories and everything. And when your house burns down, you're depressed for a year, you finally get your insurance payout, you live anywhere in a rental or whatever for a while. And at the end of the year, when you've got your indemnity, you say, well, we'll build a new house. You say to your wife, "Honey, we're going to build a new house, but cheer up, because this time, this time, we're going to build back better." That's what they say, when hope returns, we're going to build back better.

So the whole idea, the whole mindset of the World Economic Forum, which has been propagandizing the world for the last 2 years in particular, is giving us a clear signal, as Benioff said at the beginning of this presentation, capitalism is dead. Klaus Schwab says exactly the same thing. We need a big reset. We need to re-imagine everything we do. I don't know how you imagine the world but it doesn't make sense.

34:27

But then to say that we're going to build back better on what was burned is a very serious indicator, in my opinion, these people intend to destroy the current economic system and replace it with another system, the sustainable development system, which I believe is technocracy. Having said that, let me give you a very, very quick definition, the quickest possible definition of what technocracy is. This is from Technocrat magazine in 1938, this is their statement, they said, "Technocracy is the science of social engineering, the scientific operation of the whole social mechanism to produce and distribute goods and services to the whole population." This was their scientific analysis at the time. They went on to say in the same article, "There will be no room for politics, politicians, finance or financiers." It will be direct control over all economic activity, there will be no need for discussion because they believe their positions are so right, they can just dictate them to all humanity and humanity will follow. And it goes on to say that "technocracy will spread through the certificate of distribution available to every citizen from birth to death. Now we can see hints of this in today's discussion of sustainable development and what the United Nations and the World Economic Forum are doing. That's exactly what they're supposed to do, distribute through a certificate of distribution given to every citizen from birth to death.

So technocracy, I want to repeat, is according to them the only alternative economic system in the history of the world. I have studied this, I have sifted through some of the documents in the places where I could consult in libraries, talk to people, whoever the historians are, there is no other economic system, even if an Angela Merkel, for example, said in Davos in 2020, that there are many different economic systems that the world has known, she is wrong. There is no other economic system that was designed from scratch, except for technocracy, and as it was heavily documented at Columbia University in 1932, and from there, in fact, you can go back before that, but it crystallized in 1932.

36:52

So technocracy has turned into the doctrine of sustainable development, there are many other synonyms now that talk about a Green New Deal, a green economy, participatory capitalism, smart growth, agenda 21, the 2030 agenda, etc...

They all refer to the same thing, an economic system based on the allocation of resource management, where they control and or own all the resources, and the people of the world own almost nothing. And that's why Klaus Schwab can say, I'm sure, that's why he can say, "You will own nothing, and you will be happy. Of course, maybe he's just talking to his colleague, I don't know, but somebody is going to own something, somebody is going to be very happy.

Back in the 1930s. That was the caricatured view of technocracy, I want to leave you with that last image. This is what journalists and society at the time... you know, cartoons reflect what's going on in people's minds is what a good cartoonist does. That's how they represented technocracy, how they alluded to it at the time, which they rejected, thank God, at the time. But they understood what technocracy would do and I don't care what you call it today, you can call it the man and the moon if you like. It's a scientifically managed, resource-based economic system, including people in the world, scientifically managed with social engineering. All this stuff they were planning would end and society would be totally destroyed. That's where we are today. It's not a benign, benevolent economic system that's going to solve the world's problems, we'll end up coming to the same conclusion they did in the 1930s with that caricature. That's what it's going to look like if we let it. Having said that, I don't know if I've reached my 20 minutes, but I surrender, capitulate and pass the baton to the next speaker.

39:01 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you, Patrick. This is both impressive and shocking. But that image you show, that last image, I think it says it all. They always say that a picture says more than 1000 words, and this one really does. It should scare us all. We can now move on to questions, as our next guest should have been Edward Dowd, who will not be able to join us tonight, but probably later. Ed Dowd was supposed to explain to us what is going on on Wall Street with 2 particular stocks, Moderna and Pfizer. Both are under tremendous pressure. So on one side we have healthcare, which Moderna and Pfizer represent, and on the other side we have the financial system. Why are these stocks under pressure? Well, it's because, as we

learned yesterday, in yesterday's grand jury investigation, it turns out that Pfizer, Pfizer's trials for example, are a huge fraud. And it's coming out. It's being exposed right now. That's why stocks are under pressure. Ed Dowd will explain later why this has the ability to bring down not just the pharmaceutical industry, but the entire market, the entire financial industry, we'll get to that later. But for now, before we get to the questions, let's take a look at a very short video that was filmed by Project Veritas with a hidden camera, it's an interview, it's an interview with an FDA executive named Chris Cole. It's only two minutes long.

- Christopher Cole, Executive Director of the FDA's Medical Countermeasures Initiative: Biden wants to inject as many people as possible.

PV Reporter: So we'll have to get a covid vaccine injection every year. That hasn't been officially announced yet, because they don't want to piss everyone off.

Christopher Cole: The pharmaceutical companies, the food companies, the vaccine companies, pay us hundreds of millions of dollars a year to hire monitors to approve their products. If Big Pharma can make sure that every person has to get a vaccine every year, that's a guaranteed income for their companies.

Journalist PV: How do you know it's already approved?

Christopher Cole: From everything I've heard, the FDA is not going to stand in the way of the 6-month/5-year vaccination. What I think is going to happen is that it's going to be done in a phased manner. Eventually the school will make it mandatory.

Journalist PV: Why would toddlers need the 3rd dose?

Christopher Cole: For the same reason you and I will need it. The third dose will boost the immune system, and then there will be an annual shot, like the flu.

PV Reporter: For toddlers?

Christopher Cole: Yes, for everyone.

PV Reporter: Right. Including toddlers, they'll have to get it every year too?

Christopher Cole: Probably. I'm not completely in tune with their process...

PV Reporter: What do you mean by that, where do you disagree?

Christopher Cole: Well, not all the tests were completed. I agree that it's important to inject younger people, but we can't provide parents with as many assurances as we normally would. This is an emergency authorization for all age groups, all categories, but over time, this needs to be approved by specific age groups, based on studies.

PV Reporter: In your opinion, is there really an emergency for toddlers?

Christopher Cole: Well, they've all been approved under emergency procedures. The efficacy data don't have to be as high as usual. The standard for emergency approval is that there is more benefit than harm.

PV Reporter: It seemed to me that cases were not that common in the 6 month / 4 year range...

Christopher Cole: That's right, but... because it's related to covid, it falls under the emergency authorization process.

43:29 Reiner Fuellmich:

What can we take from this? There is a parallel that can be drawn between what is happening today, and what happened 12 years ago, at the time of the Lehman Brothers crisis, the housing crisis, which turned into a global economic crisis. At that time, the banking and financial industry, or more accurately the financial mafia, was creating worthless loans. But why were they doing this? Loans were given to people who would never be able to pay them back, in order to buy their homes, which resulted in ghost towns, because nobody wanted them anymore. In fact, the point was not that they would be paid back. The only thing they were interested in was creating these loans, which they then turned into securities, which they then sold to European banks, to stupid German investors some would say, with many German banks involved. They sold these securities that were supposed to be safe investments to little old ladies, convinced that it would give them extra income for their old age.

How could this happen at the time? Because there was a trusted third party, a third party that approved these securities, saying that they were great, that it was a good investment, and that third party was the rating agencies. And what's happening today? There are these vaccines that, as we've seen, don't work and are extremely dangerous. How did this happen? Again, via a trusted third party, which this time is the FDA. What do they do? They are paid by the pharmaceutical industry, by the very people, by the very companies that they are supposed to monitor, and protect us from if something goes wrong. That's why we showed this video. Please ask your questions. I have a few of my own, but I'll let you get started. Your mic is off, Dexter.

45:46 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Thank you very much, Reiner. Thank you very much, Mr. Patrick Wood, for your excellent presentation. From your presentation, from the testimony that you have just given, it is now clear, the jury can see it, that we are confronted - humanity is confronted - with 2 antagonistic paradigms. On the one hand, sustainable development, technocracy, and on the other hand, capitalism itself. Thank you for clarifying this aspect. I would like to have your opinion, Sir, on the hypothesis that this is a convergence of interests, I believe that many members of the jury are familiar with the World Economic Forum, the 4th industrial revolution, since this appears in the foreground regularly. I'd like you to explain to the jury members what this 4th industrial revolution is, and how it relates to COVID-19?

46:58 Patrick M. Wood:

Well, it's actually the front end offense, in my opinion...but let me back up, just for a second. Over the last 20 years, we can identify false starts to this total offensive. There have been times when it looked like someone was trying to push to get something started. Global warming is a good example of that, in particular, but they ran out of steam with that narrative, because everyone realized there was nothing there, move along, there's nothing to see. So the same people who were pushing the climate emergency, got on board with the COVID-19 narrative: the same universities, the same crappy computer models, the same kinds of analyses, that were used to predict the imminent end of the world, and our certain death, that kind of thing. So we could see that this frontal offensive was sought after, programmed to be unleashed, I would say, for maybe 10 or 15 years, at least since the 2007 / 2009 period, which was a perfect example.

But for a whole lot of reasons, capitalism is tough. Until finally, they have enough of a grip to pull off their move, which I think was the case on many levels in 2020. I wonder if COVID-19, or the vaccines we're looking at right now, are ultimately just props. Just the means to an end. It could have been something else. If they had successfully sold global warming to the world to get on board with sustainable development, they would have stuck with it. But it didn't work. They needed something else, something more dramatic. What was missing with global warming was dead bodies in the streets. The polar bears were not dying, as they had told us, and they realized, we realized, that in fact they are doing very well. There are plenty of polar bears at the North Pole.

But with COVID-19 now, there are dead bodies in the streets, in the hospitals, in the morgues, everywhere. So people say they know people who have died, they say, "Oh my

God, this is real! We're all going to die!" And that allowed them to project everything, all their disgusting propaganda, so that it would permeate people's minds, and that's what happened: they panicked the whole world. It was a particular panic this time, so people asked the question, "Wait, how can the whole world start panicking simultaneously?" Well, via the UN. The United Nations had gone around to all the countries of the world beforehand, and had them sign agreements that committed them to do certain things, in the event that the World Health Organization declared an emergency. So when that emergency was declared, the World Health Organization and the United Nations as a whole sent out recommendations to all the countries of the world: "Remember, you agreed to sign, so what you have to do now is follow our guidelines. And they announced, "Oh my God, it's a pandemic!" and they generated fear. And so all of a sudden, the same measures start to spread around the world like wildfire. All of a sudden, everything stops, literally.

My intention is not... the subject of the virus is important, the vaccine is very important, very important. But I just want to show the big picture. It could have been something else, that allows them to reach their goal, because all they care about is reaching the finish line. That finish line is to impose sustainable development, and eliminate capitalism, so that they can own and control all the resources of the world. No matter how they get there.

50:52 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Thank you very much for these explanations. There is a continuity, one can perceive it based on the evidence you just gave, a direct correlation between the 4th industrial revolution and COVID-19 today. You have shown it very clearly, what we are seeing is nothing but the means to an end. They had many other strings to their bow. But they finally decided that this was the right one, the one that would be implemented. So we come back to what you presented. It's a broader framework. It's also a convergence of interests, let me read this again, it's what Dr. Klaus Schwab wrote, because it's consistent with the evidence you just presented, that a pandemic, and I quote, "represents a real and narrow window of opportunity to think, to re-imagine, and to re-initialize the world. Just reading that, to me, is a clear indication that indeed, this is the case, and that there is a clear direct correlation between the 4th industrial revolution on the one hand, and COVID-19 on the other. Thank you sir.

52:05 Patrick M. Wood:

Absolutely.

52:06 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Would you like to expand on what I said?

52:08 Patrick M. Wood:

I would say that if I refer to the book written by Zbigniew Brzezinski in 1970, entitled "From One Age to Another: America's Role in the Technetronic Revolution," he was calling for this 4th industrial revolution. This was his position, his vision. In other words, it's kind of like a bat that sees everything in the valley, all the way to the top of the mountain on the other side. And that's what we're experiencing today, I think many, many writers and scientists have described how this, probably over the years, has come together very well. The 4th industrial revolution is the "scientification" of the planet, essentially. Sorry for the neologism, I don't know if it's accurate. The "scientification" of the whole planet is science running and governing everything, data running and governing everything. People's opinions, the political systems that we have created to moderate our societies, are becoming meaningless, stupid, ignorant, -whatever you want to call them, in their minds. They want to take direct control, and tell everyone what to do. That's the 4th industrial revolution, and Klaus Schwab is pretty clear about that.

53:20 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Thank you very much for your responses and thoughts towards my comments. What I'm getting at, again, is to remind the jury, the audience, that we are talking about natural law here, and from your presentation, I would say that there is now strong evidence, that whatever system they want to put in place, technocracy, it goes against natural law. And

natural law, as we say, is basically sovereignty over one's own body, and the right to make certain decisions, such as whether it's right to destroy capitalism. The 9 processes you have stated I think give another clear proof that this is in direct conflict with the natural law. Would you like to comment on that, sir?

54:16 Patrick M. Wood:

You are absolutely right. Anything that is related to what we're talking about today is an affront to the natural law. Completely. It's not just... there's not even an adequate word for it. It is death. The death of natural law. I've demonstrated in my books many times, in my two recent books on technocracy, "The Rise of Technocracy" and "The Long Road to World Order", that they are certain that they are defending the best possible path, supported by science, and that therefore there is no need to even discuss it. This is the height of egocentricity. It is the height of, if you will, a pathological condition. When someone believes that they have the absolute truth, that you have no choice but to obey them, it is beyond comprehension. And yet that is what this group of people is doing right now.

When someone like Marc Benioff says, "Capitalism is dead," and he runs a single company... who is he to be able to tell the world that capitalism is dead? And don't get me wrong, capitalism does have problems. Only because of the bad actors in the game, I would be tempted to add, but it does have problems, and they need to be corrected. It could be done. But they're not even going to try to do it. They want to set up a new system, with the specific purpose of taking over the resources of the whole world, taking them out of our hands and putting them into theirs, until we are reduced to a kind of new feudal society, where they own everything, while the rest of us languish in the backyard, raising a few pigs, growing a bit of corn, etc., while hoping not to get thrown out. This is not the world that "We the People" voted for. This is not the world they proposed to us, before they actually implemented it. And now they tell us that it is wonderful, benevolent and harmless, that we should just follow them like a Pied Piper blowing his instrument, and that everyone knows, from the story of the children and the rats, we should follow to destruction.

We see through their game now, it is a vast operation of smoke and mirrors that has been implemented for decades. We are beginning to see it, people are beginning to see it. It is not for the good of humanity. It is not for the Human being. It's not for human dignity. It's about crushing the human spirit. That alone is enough to consider it wrong. No matter what measures they present to us, anyone who imposes this kind of attitude on us must be immediately put out of business. There are alternatives.

57:02 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Thank you. Do you not also see a connection to FinTech, because from the evidence you have, we are embarking on blockchain, digital currency, and total surveillance. So obviously, all of this is in essence, and particularly total surveillance, against human dignity. Do you share that view?

57:21 Patrick M. Wood:

Yes. Let's talk about private property. Westerners have the right to enjoy private property. It's been seriously undermined in the last 20 years, but that's what has made the economic system so great, it must be said. It's not quite the property they're talking about, it's only part of it. The next level of ownership is your own person, your own body. So the problem immediately arises, when you claim that your body belongs to you, because it doesn't fit in with their philosophy, which says, "No, your body belongs to us, we're sure of it, and we're going to get it somehow." And even beyond that, to what level can they still push their hold? Quite simply, with what's in your mind: "We also want what's in your mind, we want to take away your ability to think and reason, right down to your own critical analysis of a problem, whatever it is, all for your own good, for your own health."

This goes so much further than what we think of as private property, like owning a car, or any other material object, that kind of thing. If you go down to the ultimate stage of loss of human dignity, it's giving up control of your thoughts. And that's what they want, they

want to make sure that your mind is filled with their own beliefs, they want to rewire your mind, so that you think the way they want you to think. This is pure evil. In my opinion, no one has the right to do that to anyone else, any other human being on earth. I don't care who you are, you just don't have the right to do that. Even a criminal, you might object, "Why not on a criminal?" But no, you still don't have the right to do that. There are other ways to do it. But not by experimenting with "1984" on him, asking, "How many fingers am I showing?", or something like that.

56:17 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Thank you very much, Mr. Wood. No further questions for me.

59:22 Reiner Fuellmich:

Patrick, did I get that right? Whether it's Corona or global warming, these are nothing more than false alarm tools to get the population into a panic, so that they will eventually do what they are told?

59:44 Patrick M. Wood:

Yes. Let me qualify that, though, by adding that there are other purposes for messenger RNA injections. We'll talk about that next week, I think. This is a very important facet of the whole thing as well: why inject messenger RNA into the arms of human beings at this point in history? I think there's a very important issue there, which has its role. And in fact, I'll put it this way: technocracy also requires the restructuring of society, in the broadest sense, as does transhumanism, for the people who live in that society. Do you get it? It's kind of a 2-part package. Why would you want to initiate a 4th industrial revolution, and fill it with old world people? That's not going to work. Winemakers are well aware that you put new wine in new jars, not the other way around. So in their minds, and the World Economic Forum is very transparent about this, they talk about transhumanism and the merging of technology with the human condition, to create an augmented human, an augmented Humanity. Some call it "H+ Humanity", "2.0", etc... And their underlying idea is to transfer these individuals, now augmented and genetically modified, into this new technocratic reset world they are setting up.

So on the one hand, yes, it is a way, in the sense that it opens the way to sustainable development, it is the only option that is offered, we never hear about plan B. There is no alternative to sustainable development. And who is locking this in? The World Economic Forum, in cahoots with the United Nations. They have it all figured out, they say. So there are several overlapping axes here. That's what I'm getting at, it's not so simple that you can say, "Here's the whole picture. There are many other things that came on board at the same time, which leads us to believe that this was all a very carefully scripted and orchestrated event in history, an event in human history, which I'm sure another speaker will talk about.

1:01:58 Reiner Fuellmich:

Virginia?

1:02:01 Virginie de Araujo Recchia:

Thank you sir for your testimony and your expertise. My focus is exclusively on liability. You mentioned Brzezinski, who is famous for his theory of controlled chaos. You also say that he is closely linked to the Rockefellers. Can we say that they are behind this? Behind the tittytainment3 theory, which was exposed in 1995? It seems that it is always the same people who are behind these theories, which they themselves have created in their corner, without the consent of the people...

1:03:02 Patrick M. Wood:

Yeah, I think that's exactly... it's something that's very elaborate, but it's completely cracked. There are a limited number of people behind this whole concept, from day one. In 1973, Rockefeller was the embodiment of the banking industry, he was the chairman of Chase Manhattan, specifically Chase Bank at the time, the current JP Morgan Chase. And his family was, as everyone knows, in the oil business even before the 1900s. They were

part of this global financial elite that we are fighting against today, with the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the central banks, all the way up to the BIS, the Bank for International Settlements. This group of people, including Rockefeller, played a central role in the internal committees of the Bank for International Settlements, for example. They created the monetary regulations for the whole world, they created the economic regulations for the whole world. And we see the same elite today.

At that time, when they created the Trilateral Commission, to put it in the European context, Rockefeller and Brzezinski went to Europe in 1972, to come and meet with the Bilderberg Group, which was meeting in Europe, to launch a trial balloon, to see if it would work there as well, because they were in unknown territory. They didn't want to come just to implement their plan. They came in a collaborative way, and asked questions of the people who were at the Bilderberg conference, which is pretty much the equivalent of the World Economic Forum today. And they gave their full approval. The literature today recognizes that they completely approved: "Go ahead, we'll support you".

They were not the only ones, it was not just the 300 participants on the first day of the Trilateral Commission. They were not the only people in the world who were involved in this. There were other people around, outside, who were saying, "Okay, you guys are like Navy Seals special forces, - to use an American term - and for us, you're going to set up a beachhead, and we're going to be right behind you with the armada of guns, boats, etc., to conquer whatever is left to conquer." And that's what happened over the years. But it was something new at the time. It was conceived in the circles of the banking elite. It seems obvious... My co-author in the 1970s, Professor Anthony Sutton, wrote books about this, which were both censored on the one hand, and widely acclaimed on the other, he wrote about the role of Wall Street, for example, in Hitler's rise to power, or the links between Wall Street and the Bolshevik revolution, or between Wall Street and the national suicide of the United States. He has researched and written about these subjects. These are the same people.

In a sense, you can identify the same modus operandi of this banking elite, they're still chasing that old pet peeve: world domination. Rockefeller, by the way, even though nobody could ask him, he understood that because of the decoupling that had just been decided between gold and currency, especially the dollar, as a monetary expert, he knew that one day there would be an end to fiat currencies in the world. At the same time, any fifth grader can understand, with a calculator and a piece of paper, that there will be an end to fiat money. His dilemma was to be one of the richest bankers in the world: in that case, what to do when money disappears? When money disappears? What to do to maintain one's hold on the levers of power? Quite simply, own the resources directly. If you own the resources directly, it doesn't matter what kind of monetary system you put on top. It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter if it's potato chips or Indian bees. Whatever you call currency, at this point, if you own all the timber, all the farms, all the oil, gas, gold, minerals, nickel, everything that comes out of the ground, if you own those resources, and nobody else can, then you're on top of the world, you own it all. And you win every time. I think that was the idea of the Rockefellers at the time. I also saw what other people in Europe were writing at that time, including people at the Bilderberg conferences. This was something new for them. Because it sort of revealed all the consequences of the debt-based economy, the banking system as it was when the Federal Reserve was first created, and when the other central banks of the world were created. All of these institutions were destined to disappear one day. They were laying the groundwork for their future conquests. That's where we are today.

1:08:04 Viviane Fischer:

I would like to ask a question. In terms of the motives and the timeline of this whole situation, the pandemic, why do you think it was particularly important to set this off now?

1:08:20 Patrick M. Wood:

At the time, in January 2020 actually, I wrote that a technocratic coup was underway. That was based on my observation that the people who were pushing the initial panic wind

were the same people who were pushing the climate emergency a month earlier. I had been observing this for a long time. And we found out later, it immediately struck me, the Event 201 thing. It became apparent that this whole pandemic had been very carefully scripted, by this group of participants at Event 201. I think they had this agenda in mind for quite some time. Remember Christiana Figueres saying, "We have an agenda," in 2015. I didn't know what that agenda was then. Who could have known? We don't have a crystal ball. But the fact that she announced that she had an agenda, and that all of this was happening in 2020, fairly soon after, clearly convinced me that this was it. It was just a hunch in January 2020.

But I think it's largely proven now. When you consider what an organization like the United Nations is weighing, standing behind us, to compel the entire medical community of the world to follow it...it reveals a debauchery of human effort, which cannot be the product of the urgency of the moment, any more than a professional soccer league would be set up in a week, these things take years of planning. And I think they've been planning this for years. If I had to bet, I would say at least from 2015, when Figueres said, "We have an agenda." That implies that this agenda already existed when she said it. I don't know exactly how far back it goes, I haven't found anything related to the United Nations that would tell us how far back it goes. But they did have an agenda to get us out of capitalism. I think that's where it all came from.

1:10:46 Reiner Fuellmich:

Patrick, one last question, maybe. As I understand it, most of the crises we've had, including this one, including global warming, have been staged? Did I misinterpret what you said when you mentioned the Great Depression? Was this one staged too? Is that correct? Was it also orchestrated, in your opinion?

1:11:19 Patrick M. Wood:

Yes. I haven't done any background work on this, but since you bring it up... Indeed, I believe that the Great Depression was organized. The reason I believe that is because people have studied the activities of our Federal Reserve at that time, and they realized that the great crash of 2009, when the base of the stock market collapsed, which produced these images of people defenestrating on Wall Street because they had lost their fortunes virtually overnight. The great crash of 2009 was caused by the central bank taking money out of the economic system, even though it had produced it, and all of a sudden they pulled the rug out from under them, the forced liquidations started to take hold and continued, because people had bought on credit. When they dried up the credit, people had to sell their stocks, and that caused a free fall, which took the market to the bottom.

The Depression followed, and for all the reasons we've discussed, I dare say it was one of the major attacks of this century, in my opinion. It wasn't the only one, but it was one of the major attacks that took place. As was probably World War I, or World War II, Professor Anthony Sutton has written extensively about both. We are more or less on the same precipice today as we were in 1928. I hate to draw that parallel, because it implies that things can get really bad very soon. But right now we are experiencing a manipulation of the monetary systems the likes of which we have never seen before in history. And at this point, the only question is: Will the banking system withdraw liquidity all at once? Whether inadvertently or consciously, it doesn't matter, but if liquidity is removed from the system, prices will collapse. That is an economic certainty. It is such a solid monetary rule that no one would think of questioning it. When you take money out of the system, the system goes into stress, it's just a matter of speed. And if you precede it with a good panic effect beforehand, it will be much worse than it would have been otherwise.

1:13:40 Reiner Fuellmich:

Obviously. Is it true that it's always the same small group of people, the same families, pursuing their goal of world domination, in their megalomania, starting with stealing our property and our money? Before attacking our own bodies, and even our minds? Is this a correct analysis?

1:14:06 Patrick M. Wood:

I think it is. I've come to understand that it's kind of a shortcut to what's really going on, it's really hard to get the full meaning in such a short formulation, but it would still be a correct description. There is a select group of people throughout history who are trying to conquer and dominate others. And that is what we are facing today. We've faced it for the last 150 years, and we're still facing it today, and unfortunately for us, I think they're extremely devious. We know their methods.

This new pandemic scenario, we've never been faced with it at such a level as we are today. We had the swine flu, or other things like HIV, which Anthony Fauci was involved in. We've had other things over time where you could see that they might want to go further than what they've been able to do. But today, it's a higher level. Everywhere you look, you see the same small group of people, and even within the World Economic Forum, by the way, their membership is about, I think, a little over 1,000 companies around the world. These are not all the companies in the world, there are well over 1000! So why aren't they involved? Because there are these families, these companies, these entanglements with executives who sit on multiple boards, and who are bought to create the 4th industrial revolution for their own benefit. They are the ones who can clearly see the project. And even within this group, we already noticed in our investigation of these ramifications, even within this group of 1000 companies, or even at the Bank for International Settlements, with their central bank directors all meeting at the board, there is always a hard core in these groups, in these networks. The World Economic Forum has a hard core, including someone like Marc Benioff, certainly; someone like Angela Merkel, certainly; someone like Klaus Schwab, without a doubt, he initiated it. There is this hard core, which makes the decisions for all the others. A core group of at most 2% or 5%, the other 95% repeating what that 2% or 5% says. That's how it is in the banking world. As you know, the slightest snap of the fingers, and everybody... there's always a core group that controls everything. It's a very small group.

1:16:45 Reiner Fuellmich:

Fortunately, Klaus Schwab gave us a very important indication, because he said there's only a small window of opportunity. Let's close it on his nose. And in order to understand why we need to close it, we're going to watch a very short clip, which I think is indicative of what this is all about. I think that most of the people in this clip don't know what they are talking about. But they are revealing some great secrets, let's hear them.

- Klaus Schwab: One of the characteristics of this forced industrial revolution is that it doesn't change what we do, but it changes who we are.

Unknown voice: The very idea of the human being as a natural concept will really change.

Nita Farahany (Duke University): So far, the debate is about freedom of expression. Once we can access people and their emotions...

Franklin D. Kramer (Atlantic Council): Today's topic is about what is now called the Internet of the Body, involving medical devices and other types of devices embedded in your body. And all of that, along with the Internet as a whole, is the Internet of Bodies.

Mary Lee (RAND Center for Global Risk & Security): The Internet of Bodies, or IoB, is really an ecosystem. It's a collection of devices that are connected to the Internet, that contain software, and that can either collect personal health data about you or change the way the body functions. We think of the Internet of Bodies as this set of devices, along with all the data that the devices collect about you. And in healthcare, the Internet of Bodies has been around for a while.

Eleonore Pauwels (Director of the AI Lab, Wilson Center): The Internet of Bodies: imagine the power of AI. What is artificial intelligence? It's a way to automate computing and cognition. So we can now automate learning, perception, by doing computer calculations. It is a general purpose technology that will be used in all our industries, that

will be integrated into all our business networks, our private networks, our schools, our industries and our offices. What I wanted to illustrate with the Internet of Bodies is this notion that we will be under evaluation, we will be under computational measurement in every aspect of our lives in the future, from what you eat, who you go out with, what you buy on the Internet, how much energy you consume, but also what are your vital signs? What is your health status? What kind of genetic characteristics do you have? What does your genome say about your health, your mental health, how you are doing, how you are aging? What kind of diseases are you susceptible to?

Journalist: There is a little Orwellian aspect to this...

Eleonore Pauwels: A little bit...

01:19:41 Reiner Fuellmich:

So that's the opportunity they're talking about, when they say there's only a small window of opportunity to introduce all this. Let's close it on their nose.

1:19:52 Viviane Fischer:

I have another question. Given that things have already gone pretty far... Do you think they have some sort of plan B, in case this doesn't work out? For example by generating new fears like Ukraine, or like other things you mentioned, supply chain problems, or anything else that can be fabricated. Let's assume it doesn't work out. It seems hard to go back, to get back to some kind of normalcy, without people trying to figure it out, to see what's behind it. With this impression that something has happened in the meantime, because the situation is completely different. If we compare, for example, with what we could call the attempt of the swine flu, or with other events to turn things around, this time it went very far. And the masks have come off, if I may say so. What do you think they have in store, any particular idea, that they might implement soon?

1:20:53 Patrick M. Wood:

That window, their window of opportunity, may close on that, but the danger is that these people have immense power, they have a lot of money behind them. And they have huge networks of people to get things done. When you corner an angry bear, shoot it and hurt it, it doesn't stay cornered very long. They have the means to turn on the person who hurt them, and in very vicious ways. I think we're dealing with an extremely vicious, immoral, amoral, absolutely criminal entity that will do anything in its power to avoid defeat in any case.

So this is a warning from me, personally, that we should always remain vigilant about a possible change of direction from this angry bear. Who knows what that might be? I'm not going to speculate. There are a number of things I'm keeping my eye on. Some of them you're probably all aware of, you're watching, and they worry you a lot, like the war in Ukraine with Russia, etc... Maybe it will happen, maybe it won't. Europe has already experienced two wars, because of these megalomaniacs. One more would probably not bother them more than that, if they stay out of reach. What does it matter if half a million people die in a war? It's just a small thing to them. They have caused the death of many people in history, because of the wars they have started, and they did not even blink. We are dealing with a very dangerous opponent. And the only answer, in my opinion, may still be to stand still. We have to get these people out of the public eye. That is the key. We can't say we're going to go kill them. That's not the thing to do. We can't just go and kill these people. Otherwise we would be like them. But we have to exfiltrate them from all places of public power, everywhere. In every local community, in every province or state, in every national community, in national governments, wherever they are, these people have to be cleared out of positions of public power, where they can dominate others, and do these kinds of things.

It may be impossible to do, it may be difficult, I don't know. It's not my field, but I see it as a solution. Professor Desmond, by the way, I know he's spoken before, sums it up this way: he says that in the face of mass psychosis that generates scapegoating in the broadest

sense, and people turning into Looney Tunes, the only defense, he says, against that mass psychosis is freedom of expression. It blew my mind the first time I heard him say that: freedom of speech. I'm involved in a free speech movement here in America called Citizens for Free Speech. When I heard that, my antennae went up. And I thought about what it is about when the scapegoat is silenced...that's what he said, not me, "When the scapegoat is silenced, the killing begins." It gives me pause, really. So we need to keep the lines of communication open, as you are doing here with this hearing, keep the lines of communication open, and refuse to be silent. It doesn't matter what you're told, "You're going to shut up, we're going to censor you, we're going to ban you from our platforms, we're going to do this, we're going to do that to you." In China, they just make people disappear, which is not the case here fortunately, nor in Europe I think. But we should never, ever keep quiet. Not once, that's not an option. We have to keep talking, no matter who we talk to. We have to keep the dialogue open.

1:24:57 Reiner Fuellmich:

That sounds like very good advice. Thank you very much, Patrick. Stay with us.

1:25:05 Patrick M Wood:

Sure, and I look forward to corresponding with any of you, you have my email address, I know we've corresponded before. I would love to talk to any of you, about anything, hear what you have to say and contribute as well. I'm going to stay and listen to the rest today.

1:25:19 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you very much. Let's go now to an investment banker, Leslie, Leslie Manookian. Your microphone is off.

1:25:33 Leslie Manookian:

I need to figure out how to share my screen before I expand. Can you see?

I'm going to take much of what Patrick said and reinforce it. I am convinced that what we are experiencing is a controlled demolition of our political and economic system. The reason for this is that, to me, most of the measures that are supposed to be about public health, defy logic and reason, and should not be challenged by any scientist or doctor who has a different opinion. I think we all understand that one of the characteristics of tyranny is to silence opposition. If it were really a public health issue, we wouldn't inject children who are not at risk, we wouldn't inject pregnant women who have not been studied, we would protect the elderly. And that's it. This whole crisis, I think, is being used as a cover to do exactly what I said, to collapse the system. Because it is collapsing, and then hoping to reset it so that those who are in control right now, keep that control.

It's very clear to anyone who is in a neutral observer position that this is what's going on, that there are people who are trying to control this, for whatever reason, that has nothing to do with public health. I said it from the beginning, from January 2020, this is not about public health, and it never was. It's about power, money and control.

Now I want to share a little bit of my experience, because although I am the president and founder of Health Freedom Defense, I am speaking as a private citizen, particularly because I worked for Goldman Sachs and Alliance Capital, 2 of the most prestigious financial institutions in the world, and the reason I want to talk about this is because I want to share my experience, because I think it gives a unique insight and perspective on what's happening right now. First of all, when I was an investment manager, I managed our European growth portfolios, and I was also the director of European growth research at Alliance Capital. My job was to interview CEOs of multinational companies. I was able to meet with the CEOs and the entire management team of most of the major European companies, and many of the US companies, especially those in which we had a large stake. The reason I share that is that those management teams would come to us and talk to us. If we weren't happy with what one of the management teams was doing, our own management would tell us: sell your shares, don't own them, don't vote against management, don't exercise your power as a shareholder, just pick another share.

This is really important because the public is led to believe that shareholders act as a kind of check and balance on management, holding them accountable for their decisions and strategy. The truth is, what's really happening is that giant investment managers, like the ones I used to be a part of, are not doing that. They abdicate that responsibility. They vote with management. And if they don't vote with management, they just sell the shares. So there's a total absence of that major check and balance that should exist in the system that doesn't work, because it's removed, in favor of this solidarity between investors and the companies they invest in. I think that's a very important thing, it's the exact opposite of what I learned in business school. I was very surprised by that, but that's what they ask you to do. I only worked for one major investment manager, but that was my experience talking to all the different types of investment managers that I worked with, they were kind of under the same instruction: if you don't like it, sell the stock.

1:30:32

There is essentially no shareholder activism. I think that's not well understood by the public. The next thing I want to share is an experience I had, which I hope will crystallize for anyone listening, exactly what's going on in the minds of these management teams. We were one of the largest shareholders in one of the largest pharmaceutical companies in the world. Their blockbuster stock, their blockbuster drug, which was in Phase 3 trials, was being rumored to have problems in the Phase 3 trials, and that a few people had died in the Phase 3 trials. The answer to that was not to expose it and discuss it. The response was actually something very sinister. What happened was that the CEO, the CFO, the head of R&D, the head of investor relations, all came to our office, and they went to all their major investors. The purpose was to reassure us that everything was fine. They came in, looked me in the eye, and said, "Look, in very, very rare cases, this drug that's supposed to help your heart actually causes a heart problem, and a few people have died from it." The CEO looked at me and said, "The bad news is that the FDA is going to force us to put a 'black square' warning on our packaging. The good news is that we still think we can achieve peak sales of \$7 billion.

I hope this alarms everyone watching because it really alarmed me. It was the first time in my life that I heard someone be so cavalier about valuation, or the trade-off between human life and corporate profit. And to have the CEO of the company say it was an eye-opener. That was actually one of the catalysts that made me decide that, despite the fact that I had a fantastic career, I had to leave.

That was one of the catalysts for me. A few years later, I started planning my departure. It's very important to understand that background and context and then apply it to what's happening today. Because we, as average human beings who care about our families and friends, have moral codes by which we conduct our lives, we have moral codes that direct how we interact with other human beings. It would seem that this moral code is lacking in many of these people I interacted with who are at the top of the business world. It wasn't just the pharmaceutical industry, it was other areas where the management of a company would say, "We're quite sure we're going to get this contract in this developing country." I came to believe that it was because they had bribed the politicians in those countries, so they knew what they were going to get. My point is that I had a front row seat and I am bitter about what is going on in the upper echelons of the financial world.

Now I'm going to present some information. This was sort of my opening remarks. I want to present the information that supports my assertion, and really explains the motive, because I think it is very important that a judge and jury understand the motive behind any alleged crime. I believe that what we are witnessing is a crime. It is so important to understand that what we are doing or experiencing is the demolition of Western civilization. Why is this happening and why is it happening now and not 10 years ago or 10 years in the future?

With that, let me go to my first slide. Actually, this is not my first slide. This is my first slide. I want to go to the big screen. Can you see the whole thing? Okay, great. So basically what's happening is that there's this elite class, the politicians, super rich, media, corporations, who want to keep control of everything they do, everything they have. They are going to lose it because the system is imploding. They're going to try to destroy it to reset it before it collapses. As Patrick mentioned, I want to emphasize again that this is total centralized control of business assets, of natural resources, by unelected and

unaccountable leaders, ultimately, and we're already seeing that transition. It's been going on in Europe for decades now.

1:35:35

What will ultimately happen, I believe, is the creation of an unaccountable elite of the super rich, and then an underclass of everyone else. We will have no recourse as average citizens because they will not be elected, and will not be accountable to us.

The really burning question we all need to ask ourselves is why? Why now? Why is this happening? Basically why did this happen in 2020? I think the origins go back several decades. But it really became a serious problem during the financial crisis that started in 2008, in which we saw the financial securitization of loans, of houses and resold to someone who didn't care. People were making loans. In the United States, this crisis was solved after a few years, because the American banks wrote off their bad loans. That didn't happen in Europe.

But what has happened in the last 8 years, since things have kind of slowed down since 2013, 2014, is that the pension crisis has exploded. The reason that happened is because we had negative or zero interest rates for that entire period. In Europe we had negative interest rates, in the United States we had almost zero interest rates for a very long period of time. And anybody who invests in a bond knows that when you invest, you want to get interest, that is the income that you get from your investment, and pension companies, most of them in the Western world, have to invest primarily in government bonds. So when government interest rates are zero or negative, that means their investment returns are extremely low. Pension funds need to generate an average of 7-8% each year to meet their liabilities. So their liabilities are all the people who have retired. And when I talk about that, I'm talking about public pensions, not private pensions, I'm talking about public pensions that are guaranteed by European governments, or in the U.S., for people who have worked in some way for a government entity, whether it's a school or a state or something like that.

So in the United States, the unfunded pension liability had exploded to \$5 trillion by the end of 2018. That's the amount of money that pensions owe for all the people who have retired or are going to retire that they don't have. So they have to rely on new people coming in. But there aren't enough of them. They're never going to get out of this problem. So that's a major problem.

The other major problem is the explosion of public debt. In the United States, we went from \$1 trillion in 1981 to \$30 trillion a week or two ago. I'll show you a graph in a moment, which will put things in context. But the real problem is that if you're 65, or whatever your retirement age is, and you want to start collecting your retirement fund, and there is no retirement. There may be one for you, but what about the next person, next year? What happens to these governments, when tens of millions of people around the world wake up and realize that their pensions don't exist, that they will never be paid? I would say that what happens is that the central banks, the big corporations, the big technologies are all working together to push everyone into digital currencies, and reset the system before that can happen.

1:39:41

Here's the chart of what's happening with the US government debt. You can see what happened, how it exploded when it was very, very manageable for many, many decades. I mean, it took 230 years to get to 1 trillion, then 40 years to get to 30 trillion. In Europe, you don't have that much public debt, but it's much worse in terms of the financial system and the pension funds.

I mentioned that the American banks have written off their bank debt, but the Europeans have not. They didn't, because the whole structure of Europe is different. No country wants to bail out its neighbor. So what happens is that the banks kept these bad debts on their balance sheets, and there was a financial crisis in October and September 2019. The U.S. banks didn't want to counter what's called the "overnight window" with their European counterparts, because they didn't want what's called counterparty risk. There is a window called the "overnight window" where banks can place funds. The U.S. banks didn't want to deal with European banks like Deutsche Bank, because they have huge debts for all these

bad debts that they haven't written off, and then they also have a huge exposure to derivatives. So the U.S. bank said, we're not going to work with you. The overnight window money went to 10%. Usually it's very close to zero, but now it's gone up to 10%. That means the Fed had to step in and start propping up all the banks, in all the countries in the world, because the system was about to crack. That didn't really go away, that's something that hasn't changed since. It was a real wake-up call, meaning they had to do something, and they had to do it quickly. That was in September and October 2019.

Now let's turn to Europe. As I mentioned, they have had negative interest rates since 2014. What that means is that pensions can't really meet their liabilities, they are broke. In Europe, 44 trillion euros of unfunded public pensions is almost \$50 trillion. The 4 largest economies, Germany, France, Italy and Spain, account for a staggering 32 trillion. There's no way they can ever meet those obligations to, I don't know if it's 100 million Europeans, it's never going to happen, they can't keep driving the debt up. That's why I think everything that's happening is the reason for the big reset, using COVID as a cover. Britain itself is about \$8.7 trillion. They're never going to get out of that. But there's also another element. The European Central Bank owns over 40% of all the national debt in Europe, there is no longer a bond market, because they have destroyed it. So there is no marginal buyer when they have to roll over their debt. In fact, they have put themselves in a bind with their policies.

That's what happened in Europe, it only goes back to 1995, because it's the European Union. Of course, if you go back much further, when these countries were not part of the Union, you'll see that the graph is very similar to that of the United States.

1:43:27

I hope the severity of the financial situation has been taken into account, because it is so serious, it is literally a gun to their head, they can't get out of it without destroying the system or resetting it. They need massive debt forgiveness. What they want to do is tell everybody, we're canceling the debt for everybody in the whole world, they're going to default on their debt, and they're going to allow the public to default on their debt. They'll say it's a "hollyday," that everyone can reset their debt. The reason they need to control the system is that, of course, people are going to be very angry when their pensions aren't there, so they need to get everybody on to what's called Universal Income. That's why they're destroying small and medium-sized businesses, because they don't want people to be employed by independent businesses and earn a living.

In the United States, about two-thirds of all businesses before COVID were small and medium-sized businesses, they employed two-thirds of the workforce. So if you want to control people, and you want to force everybody to get a government benefit, a universal basic income, you have to get rid of all those employers. That's why none of the measures made sense, why small and medium sized businesses couldn't stay open, but Walmart could, it's because of all of this.

We really need to understand that there's not just this financial aspect to what's going on but there's these businesses and more importantly a component of the medical complex. When I say medical complex, I mean the pharmaceutical industry, of course, but also the hospital systems, the NGOs, the research institutions, the NIH (National Institute of Health in the United States) and most importantly, the giant foundations like the Gates Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Open Society Foundation, which is George Soros' foundation. These groups siphon millions and millions of dollars every year from high schools and universities. The NIH and other government institutions, siphon millions and millions of dollars to these same groups, they actually siphon money to newspapers. The newspapers are not independent. And so what you have is total control of what is published, what is censored, what is written.

In the newspapers, what is published is dictated by the same people. The research that is done in the universities and research hospitals is dictated by the NIH and these giant foundations. The universities teach what is dictated as well. And then you have, just to give you an example, the University of Washington, it's very close to Bill Gates' house. He gives them incredible amounts of money. The Gates Foundation authorized a \$279 million grant in 2018, to the University of Washington's Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation.

This institute is one of the largest institutes that was disseminating the terrifying models that millions and millions of people would die from COVID. Another one of the big institutions, which I'm sure a lot of people are familiar with, is Imperial College, which received \$79 million from the Gates Foundation, I think it was in January 2020, and \$133 million in the 2 years before that. That's a massive operation. And that, basically, only happened because the medical complex was put under the thumb of these people at the very, very high level.

1:47:38

The same thing applies to media and politics. If you look at politics in the United States, the pharmaceutical industry is the biggest lobbyist: \$250 million a year. They are the biggest donors, literally 9 out of 10 members of the US Congress get money and 97% of the US Senators get money from the pharmaceutical industry. They have twice as many lobbyists in Congress as there are members of Congress. And then when you look more closely at what's going on in the media, I can't stress enough, the second to last point on the left, the pharmaceutical and health industries spend \$35 billion a year on advertising worldwide. They own all the major media outlets, because they own the largest share of their advertising. If you look at the U.S., just the digital ads alone are \$10 billion. If you look at what's going on, you think: I should trust my doctor. But the truth is that doctors are beholden too, because the journals tell them what to believe as well as their societies, like the American Medical Association, or the American Academy of Pediatrics, which get millions and millions of dollars from the pharmaceutical industry, and a lot of what doctors have to do in terms of continuing medical education credits, is funded by the pharmaceutical industry itself.

So how are they going to do that? I'm going to go through it very quickly. I mentioned universal basic income, I mentioned Central Bank, digital currency. They need total control of finance, of the economy, they need total control of everybody. And they're going to do it through the currency. That's why they're tracking transactions, eliminating small and medium-sized employers and capping cash. The most important thing is to get rid of cash. They are doing everything they can, and have been for several years, to plant the seed that cash is dirty. It came out of China in early January. Remember, they were talking about how it carries the virus. In Australia they have been saying for years that cash is for criminals. They put caps on any kind of transaction, so you can't spend more than ... I think in Europe it's down to a few thousand euros now, to do a cash transaction. In the United States, it's still around 10,000, and in Australia as well, but they restrict and cap cash transactions. And more importantly, they are doing away with cash altogether. Justin Trudeau signed some sort of executive order in early 2021 I think, that allowed him to cancel cash as well. He's already proceeded to cancel high-denomination notes, we've seen the same thing in other countries. In India, we see similar things as well.

So there is this huge program that comes out of all the financial imperatives, and they are using all the tools at their disposal to implement it. One of the big things they're going to use to implement this control system, the video was talking about the Internet of Bodies, through the satellites in orbit, which are launched into space all over the world. Elon Musk's Starlink has placed, I think, 1,700. And Bill Gates has about 500. But basically, the idea is to cover the earth with live surveillance of every square inch so that there is no escape and they have total control of humanity.

1:51:28

I'm not really going to go into it, Patrick has talked about it. But actually we've seen it before, 2 years ago we said there were vaccine passports coming. Everyone said we were conspiracy theorists. We have these digital identifications, and the merging of identification, medical records, financial records, voting ID, your travel, all of these things are all merged into these passes. It's not about health. It's not about a vaccine passport, it's about getting you to agree to give all your information to the people who control the system. I think it's really important to re-emphasize that there is amazing technology. There are already chips implanted in people's hands that connect to their immunization records, their financial records, and in their employment records. There are already nanotechnologies that have been injected into animals that allow us to control their behavior, to monitor their brains and their body functions.

In summary, to conclude, I'm sorry, I was a little fast, but in 20 minutes, there is so much to say. There is essentially no escape from the financial mismanagement that has occurred at the hands of these leaders. There has never been any intention to pay back all the debt that they have borrowed and issued. They never had any intention of keeping all the promises they made to hundreds of millions of employees around the world. And they have no way out of the situation they themselves created, except to cancel all the debts, reset the whole system, and make us all agree to live in Klaus Schwab's dystopian future.

I hope this testimony will help people understand that there is a dire financial situation, which I believe is a very clear motive for these people to have committed all these crimes against humanity in the last 2 years, so that they can keep control of the system, the power they have, and live lives of luxury while they enslave the rest of us. Thank you so much for your time and for inviting me to participate in this incredible process. It was truly an honor to join these esteemed colleagues. Thank you very much.

1:54:20 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you, Leslie. That's brilliant. It's an eye-opener, not just for us, but I hope for the world, for the jury. Essentially, their backs are against the wall. Isn't that right?

1:54:40 Leslie Manookian:

Just to understand, to put some of these things in context, the amount of pension debt in European countries, I think Luxembourg and Belgium have something like 4 or 5 times the national GDP. That's how much they owe the public for pensions, there's no way out of it, they'll never be able to pay it back, just like the United States will never be able to pay back \$30 trillion in national debt, it's impossible. And if you look at what happened ... I haven't even mentioned Australia, Canada, Japan, they're all in the same situation. The UK as well. If you just look at the United States, Japan, Europe, and I think the UK, the central banks of those countries have spent \$9 trillion, which is an increase, if I remember correctly, of 50% of what they had spent in history up to that point. There is simply no way for them to fix that.

What they're probably going to do is create what are called perpetual bonds. George Soros has already sent out newsletters to his readers, he's recommending that this happen, he's already publicly called on Macron in France, to create perpetual bonds. What they will do, if you have an investment in a government bond, they will say: your government bond, we are not paying it back in 10 years, or 20 years, or 30 years, it is now a perpetual bond that will disappear when you die. We will pay you a nominal interest rate on that bond until you die. So you'll get 2% or 3% but you'll never get your money back. This is one of the ways that they're doing everything they can to appease the population, because if they don't, the population is going to do horrible things. They're going to drag these people out into the streets, if history is any measure of what happens when people have been blindly cheated and robbed for decades by their political leaders.

1:57:02 Reiner Fuellmich:

Is that an oversimplification or is it correct when I say that in exchange for the debt that they issued, they took our assets and our money?

1:57:18 Leslie Manookian:

They stole everything that Western civilization created, essentially. That \$30 trillion in debt went into somebody's pocket. Right? And whose pocket did it go into the most? The people at the top, whether it's a defense contractor or a pharmaceutical industry, I think the U.S. government gave \$10 billion to the pharmaceutical industry to create these COVID injections, and now they're making tens of billions of dollars. We'll never be repaid for that. They're buying the school systems, they're buying the universities, they're buying... So yes, this money was issued, it was created out of thin air, and put on the backs of taxpayers. So we've been robbed of all of our future income and productivity, so that the people in power, who created this financial and political disaster, are not held accountable,

because they know full well what's going to happen when people realize that they have no intention of living up to their promises or obligations.

If you look, Reiner, at what has happened in the US, we have more federal national debt than unfunded public pensions. In Europe, they promised people, "oh, we're going to give you these incredibly generous retirement programs." So there is this imbalance. If you look, on the one hand, the US has a very high federal national debt, and in Europe, they have super high pensions. In the US, we have lower pension obligations, and Europe has lower federal debt obligations. But if you look at them in aggregate, the amounts are very similar. They're broke. They promised people for decades, that they were going to give you these generous pension benefits, but they don't have the money to do it. So look, at some point, the buck stops somewhere, right? I don't know if you have this saying in every country, but somehow, at some point, the chickens come home to roost. That's basically what happens. There is no other way to prolong this situation, they have to do something before they start to default. Countries are very close to defaulting on their debt. And when that happens, it's going to spread all over the world and they have to stop it from happening.

1:59:57 Reiner Fuellmich:

In other words, the little window of opportunity that Klaus Schwab is talking about is really a euphemism for saying, we have to run, or they're going to catch up with us.

2:00:09 Leslie Manookian:

100%. I think that financial part reinforces everything that Patrick said about them talking about a window of opportunity. I think they're really struggling because if they gave themselves about 2 years to get there, and we're there, 2 years to get there before 2022. If everybody hasn't been inoculated, if everybody isn't in the system, if everybody hasn't been implanted with something to control them, if they don't have a digital identity to access the internet, and to control their health and their participation in society, then they haven't had enough control to force the last few percent that haven't complied. That's where we're at. So I think their plan is starting to fall apart. What is happening in Canada, if we need proof that what has happened in the world over the last two years is not public health, all I have to say is one word, it's Canada. They have invoked martial law, they are arresting people for exercising their constitutionally protected right to peaceful protest, they are freezing their bank accounts and property. This is not about public health. It's about maintaining control. I think that's evidence that there's a crack in that dam. They are going to have a hard time dealing with it.

2:01:40 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you very much, Leslie. I don't want to cut anyone off. So please, Dexter, Virginia and Ana.

2:01:49 Ana Garner:

I'd like to chime in. I have a question or two. Leslie, what a great presentation, thank you so much. One of the things that hasn't really been discussed, at least from a financial standpoint, in this agenda that some people are aware of, it's also about depopulation. I can understand that with the debt, as far as pensions are concerned, the elderly or the retired are targeted, maybe, but what amazes me is why they are somehow targeting children and the unborn? As we know, pregnant women who get this injection have very high rates of miscarriage, there was a big study on that. Then children who had no risk of dying from COVID are injected with a much higher risk of dying from the injection. Not that it's okay to kill the elderly to avoid facing this debt, but it seems to me that the other would be so counterproductive, even for these pathological agendas that they have. Do you have a comment on that?

2:03:15 Leslie Manookian:

I think that's a very interesting topic, Ana. We know that they were using lethal drugs in the UK, literally killing the elderly. We know that in the United States they denied them treatment. It's a very peculiar situation that they would do that to young people. But you

know, Klaus Schwab said ... and Bill Gates talked about the population problem, it's no secret that these people involved in the World Economic Forum, have a depopulation agenda. They have such a claim that they believe they should decide who reproduces, there is evidence of that. I'm sure Patrick knows more than I do but there is evidence of that.

A lot of the World Economic Forum, a lot of the people involved, Bill Gates, his family, are linked to the Nazi regime and the original eugenics. The UN is linked to that. Everybody knows the book Brave New World, written by Aldous Huxley, but his brother, Julian Huxley, contributed to UNESCO. I think that's a big part of the problem. That's why a lot of this maybe, I'm not an expert on this, I can't give you references in mind, but I know that Bill Gates' father was involved in Planned Parenthood. He was a eugenicist. Margaret Sanger, who was the founder of Planned Parenthood, said that the most compassionate thing a large black family could do was to kill some of their young, to stop making babies. These people have very unhealthy motivations. Again, I think it's important, I said earlier, it's so important to understand that most of us are decent, kind, compassionate, honest, loving human beings who want the best for our fellow man. But there is a percentage of the population that doesn't think like us. It's very difficult for us to get into their minds because we don't think like them, and because it's wrong. What they are doing is unacceptable to us, to all of us who have an ounce of decency in our hearts. And so, Ana, this is speculation, but I think it serves their overall population reduction agenda. They are very concerned. If you wanted to run the world, would you try to control 10 billion people, or would you try to control 5 billion, or would you try to control 500 million?

I think that's probably the explanation. I think there's also an explanation that may not be sinister at all. They're throwing things at us but they have no idea what it's going to do to people. Maybe they do, but let's give them the benefit of the doubt and say they're pushing these things without clear evidence of what they're causing. Maybe they just didn't realize how it would play out in reproduction. Maybe they didn't know. Maybe that's their explanation. I don't really believe it because the distribution studies that were disclosed in Japan, the biodistribution study showed that lipid nanoparticles accumulated in excessive amounts in the ovaries. But that could be a more innocent explanation.

2:07:07 Ana Garner:

Thank you very much Leslie, thank you.

2:07:10 Viviane Fischer:

But, what's weird, if you think about it, if it's the incompetence theory, then it's strange that there's more and more evidence in relation to problems like this, especially for fertility, and it's not being taken seriously. It seems to me that it's a little strange, because otherwise, if you got off on the wrong foot, now you might have to say, "I'm really sorry, we've got to do something, we've got to stop this," like for pregnant women, or also for infants, or whoever they're targeting. There, I think, it's not explainable, I think.

2:07:49 Leslie Manookian:

Vivian, I agree 100%. There is no way to explain the tens of thousands of deaths that have been reported to the CDC and the European Medicines Agency. And yet, all of these products remain on the market. There is no explanation that is legitimate. There isn't, I totally agree with you. I was just trying to say, you know, if you wanted to try to find some legitimate explanation for it, there's no explanation for spending \$30 trillion. There isn't, because it's obvious that it can never be paid back. It can't be done. It's not possible to make all these promises. It has always been about politics and power, without the slightest intention of ever fulfilling their promises. So any thinking person must conclude that what is happening is a global coup. That's it. It's a global coup.

And, you know, I'm sure I'm going to be called a conspiracy theorist or something like that, but there is no legitimate explanation for what's happening around the world right now. None at all. If everything that's happening was legitimate, they would have stopped all the spending, they wouldn't have silenced all the doctors and scientists, they wouldn't have

given this stuff to innocent children and pregnant women, they wouldn't have done anything they did, they would have taken this stuff off the market, we wouldn't have this. They wouldn't have changed the definition of a pandemic, they wouldn't have changed the definition of a vaccine. They wouldn't have done all the things they did if there had been a legitimate explanation.

2:09:25 Reiner Fuellmich:

I agree.

2:09:29 Patrick Wood:

I'm going to send a question back to Reiner.

2:29:31 Reiner Fuellmich:

Sure.

2:29:32 Patrick Wood:

Leslie, you may have mentioned the word "derivative" in passing in your presentation. I'm not... I think I heard that. But could you elaborate just a little bit more on what the Bank for International Settlements estimates? It was, I think, in 2000. Anyway, it was a year ago, that they estimated that the total notional value of the derivatives markets in the world would now be -- let me get the numbers right -- estimated at \$610 trillion. And the function of the derivatives market almost destroyed the financial system in 2008, when Lehman Brothers went into a tailspin and caused a global shockwave; and all of these derivatives contracts were recalled or triggered, and it almost bankrupted the insurance giant AIG, [because of the] claims that were being made against them because of these derivatives contracts. This market is now almost double what it was in 2008, these derivative markets. That's a number you can't calculate. I did, who knows [an estimate of] \$610 trillion. But that seems to me to be a sword of Damocles hanging over our heads that nobody really pays attention to, maybe because it's so hard to understand what a derivative is, to begin with. But do you have a comment here?

2:10:58 Leslie Manookian:

Yes, Patrick, it's such a complex matter and most people don't even understand. A derivative...it's hard to explain. In fact, there are people who don't even understand what a stock or a bond is. And a derivative is something that derives its value from that underlying instrument, but includes notions of time and volatility, etc., that contribute to its value. And the reason I'm sharing this little explanation is so that people have at least a little bit of understanding of what that means. And it's literally a sword of Damocles, hanging over everybody. And this is how it works. 600 trillion, you know, is beyond what any of us can comprehend, because the financial markets have become so huge. I can't remember the size of the global government bond market or the global stock market like that. But I know that the global bond market is five times the size of the stock market. And this number, this derivatives market, dwarfs in size the global bond market.

And the reason it's so big is because of what happens if a bank or a corporation or a government issues a bond; what happens, and this is why there are mortgage problems, is that a bank issues a loan to a borrower, and then sells the bond or the loan to somebody else. And then this other person, this other player takes those loans, puts them in one package, so that they become a super high-yielding investment, puts them in one package and sells them to the public. And what happened is that when people started to realize that these packages were rotten, literally rotten, that they were absolutely not yielding investments. And that threatened to bring down the whole financial system. And now we're up to \$600 plus trillion in derivatives. And it's those same, same factors that are at play. But it's worse, because it's not just in the US or Europe. Now it's been 10 to 15 years that emerging market economies have been issuing dollar-denominated debt. You know what I mean? They issued it in dollars, they have to pay it back in dollars. If one of them goes bankrupt, or, you know, if one of these derivatives, these derivative contracts are breached when somebody bought a put option on a bond, if one of these things collapses, you're going to have a global contagion, which is going to bring everybody to their knees.

So, that's another way that two things happen. One is that they're keeping the system alive with these derivatives. The other is that they're making extraordinary amounts of money, because they're being paid just to buy options, or a derivative on these underlying assets. And so, if one little domino falls, the whole house of cards comes down with it. So, I know I'm trying to keep my explanation as simple as possible. But this is a really important topic that would take a lot of time to explain, and frankly, I don't want to get into every little aspect of how, you know, this plays out in the markets today. But I can tell you that this is something that would create a gigantic problem around the world if you just sold one thing.

There's evidence of that in the past, I used to work in the financial markets in what's called "long-term capital crisis management," which was "one of the brightest people in the room." It was all these mathematical super geniuses who created the models for investing in Russia, saying that they would never default. And what happened was that they did default, and it was contagious. And in all the other markets, the same thing happened. We even saw contagion in the Asian markets, so, to get back to the point, when you have that much money that's not accounted for anywhere, nobody recognizes the risk or accounts for it anywhere. If one or two of these things collapse, and this is exactly why the U.S. banks don't want to deal with Deutsche Bank, because it has too many derivatives, by the trillions, I don't know how much Deutsche Bank has anymore, but they said: "We're not going to deal with you anymore," because they know it's a house of cards waiting to collapse, and all it's going to take is a bank somewhere, or a country somewhere, to collapse, which would trigger a massive contagion on the whole world.

2:15:39 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you for bringing that to our attention. Again, I think it was over 70 trillion at the time. And now it's maybe down to 40 trillion. Bjorn probably knows it better than I do. Dexter and Virginia, you wanted to ask questions.

2:15:58 Dexter N-J Ryneveldt:

Leslie, I just want to thank you so much for your excellent presentation. You really laid out the evidence, specifically and you laid out superbly what Mr. Wood presented to us, in relation to technocracy and truly sustainable development. In your introduction, you mentioned the following: and that is that there is no shareholder activism. So I'd like us to focus specifically on what that means in relation to pharmaceutical companies, and in particular the ones that are being talked about for COVID-19?

2:16:42 Leslie Manookian:

That's a very interesting question, and it will be interesting to see how this plays out as more evidence of clinical trial fraud comes to us. There are allegations of fraud in Pfizer clinical trials, as we all know. That was revealed, I believe, by Project Veritas. But, essentially, shareholder activism is... In fact, the way a corporation is structured is that it borrows money through debt, but it also finances itself through investments, in the form of stock. So the managers of very large investments have a role to play in terms of holding management accountable for having a sound strategy, for investing their money, their capital, because it's their capital. If you invest in the stock of a company, you own a piece of the company. And it is your job, and your right, to demand that the management of these corporations actually manage the company in a way that maximizes your interest as a shareholder.

What happens is that this element of shareholder activism no longer exists, because all of these giant institutions are no longer demanding it of the corporations, but instead are holding their feet to the fire, and then you're going to see some predator show up, who's going to buy the company on the cheap, fire the management, and sell the assets. People have heard of these predators before, but they think it doesn't happen anymore. But when you look specifically at it, it doesn't happen very often. And I would say as well, Dexter, that it's very important to say that it's not that there's no shareholder activism anymore, but it's not widespread. And that, for the most part, I think the most important investment

institution that invests in corporations in the equity market, don't actively criticize management by holding their feet to the fire, they will just sell their shares if they don't like what management is doing. But that's not enough. They would have to, you know, harass them all the time, if they thought they were pursuing silly strategies.

And what's very interesting, if you look at the pharmaceutical industry, let's take Moderna, who are the investors in Moderna? I don't know any of them. But I know Bill Gates is a big investor. I know there are other major insiders in it. And so there's no incentive for them to be active shareholders. Nor is there any incentive for them to be responsible if something goes wrong with the clinical trials. As for Pfizer, it will be very, very interesting to see what happens because there are allegations of fraud by someone who was involved in the clinical trial itself. And if I were a major investor in Pfizer, I would want to check them out and find out exactly what happened, because I could actually sue them. You see, we saw in the Enron scandal that they were eventually sued for fraud. And that is something that could actually happen.

If the allegations that have been made so far turn out to be true, then they should absolutely be held accountable because there was fraud. The biggest problem here is that the amount of assets that BlackRock and Blackstone and Vanguard, and I forget the other really big one, now hold. These corporations are so huge that they make AIG look like a small player in "too big to fail" terms. So they literally own a huge chunk of the system. And it's very unlikely, in my opinion, that they would do anything to hold these people accountable, because they're actually part of what's going on. And the reason I say they're part of it is because they're buying houses, you know, BlackRock, is reputed to have bought 20,000 houses in Florida, they're buying up whole neighborhoods in Texas. Which brings us back to Klaus Schwab's promise that we will own nothing and be happy, and everything will be owned by the people at the top. So I hope that answers your question.

2:21:21 Dexter N-J Ryneveldt:

You've made that clear. So, I'd like to move on to the shareholders. And the question I would like to ask you, in relation to the CDC in the US, the NIH and the FDA, specifically, And here I'm also specifically interested in Dr. Anthony Fauci, who is the NIAID, the director of the NIH, does he have any ownership in any of these Covid 19 vaccines? In any pharmaceutical companies? Do you know anything about that?

2:21:57 Leslie Manookian:

Yes, absolutely. I didn't get into all of that, because it's, you know, we could talk about it for hours. But basically, what we see is that there has been a global takeover of the medical complex by these special interests over the last 10 - 15 years. And two really crucial things have happened. One was in 1980, when a law passed in the [U.S.] Congress called the Dole Act. And this Dole Act allowed those who work for the government and do taxpayer-funded research to keep some of the intellectual property rights to the patents they develop. And Anthony Fauci's NIAID developed the Moderna vaccine, in essence, they developed it and many of the people who work with him, including himself, own patents on the Moderna vaccine, and yes, they can make \$150,000 a year per patent. That's how I see it. So they have patents in other countries, and in other companies, so I don't know if they actually have any shares, but they have a proven financial interest.

But I think we're getting to something even more important, Dexter, and that is that there is a revolving door, and an extremely complex web of funding between the FDA, the CDC, the NIH, the NIAID and industry. At the FDA, the people who are responsible for approving drugs have 60% of their... Oh, I forgot to mention one other thing, when I said there were two; it has to do with the Dole Act, and also something called the Prescription Drug User Fee act that was passed in 1992. And it's very important, because it had the effect of setting up a system that allows the pharmaceutical industry to get their drugs through FDA clinical trials quickly, so that they can get drugs to market quickly for unmet medical needs. And that's what happened. It started at something like \$100 million a year. I think it's now \$1.3 billion this year, and that's about 45% of the total FDA budget.

If you look at just the drug approvers, the pharmaceutical industry pays about 60% of their salaries. On top of that, if you look at the person who was head of the CDC for 8 years, Dr. Julie Gerberding, she left after Obama finished his term, she left and was put in charge of the vaccine division at the Merck global plan, making millions and millions of dollars. Scott Gottlieb, who had been, I can't remember, I think it was at the CDC or the FDA. He's now on the board of Pfizer. So there's a revolving door between these people going from NIH, CDC, or FDA to industry. But in addition to that, there are purse strings. If you look, as I said, the FDA is beholden to the pharmaceutical companies that it's supposed to regulate. And it's even worse, because not only is the FDA beholden, but so is the CDC. There's a thing called the CDC Foundation, which is a public-private partnership, and basically, the pharmaceutical industries and foundations like the Gates Foundation, and others, give millions and millions of dollars to the CDC. The CDC and NIH also both own patents on vaccines. So they have a vested interest. So it's not just about ownership and assets. It's a massive web of conflict of interest and financial interest, at all levels of the regulatory agencies, the pharmaceutical industry and the medical complex. So that if you look at this, you know what has happened in the last few years of crisis. Hospitals have been told, by law, "if you don't do what the CDC tells you, in other words, if you follow our COVID protocol, no one can sue you if you have a mishap. You won't have any liability, you can't be sued. But if you deviate and prescribe ivermectin, for example, you can be sued. So the hospital system is also under control. And then, if you look at the NIH grants, I have a slide on that. But...

I think Fauci, his own budget at NIAID is somewhere between \$4 billion and \$5 billion. But at NIH, his total budget, which he has the upper hand on, is about \$40 billion. That's what supports research in universities, in hospitals, across the country and around the world. So if you're a scientist, or a doctor, if you want to explore something that goes against something the government supports, you won't get any grants; or if you publish something that contradicts government policies, you'll lose your grants. So they have a mechanism to stop the research and control what comes out. And I also mentioned that the pharmaceutical industry also controls the journals.

2:27:37 Dexter N-J Ryneveldt:

So in short, what we can say clearly, based on what you just gave us, is that for the CDC, the NIH, the NIAID, and the FDA, there is clearly a conflict of interest. And that they have a vested interest in this pharmaceutical theater of COVID-19 vaccines?

2:27:59 Leslie Manookian:

Dexter, I would go further. I wouldn't say -- I mean, yes, there's absolutely a conflict of interest. But I would say it's even worse. These are agencies held totally captive by the industry they're supposed to be regulating.

2:28:14 Dexter N-J Ryneveldt:

So my final question will be, the one I wanted to ask you: At the beginning of your statement, you made a very clear description. And that picture that you described so well leads me to ask the reason why you left that investment management position at the time. It was because you were shocked when - and I think it was one of the managers or one of the guys or ladies in power - when that person came up to you, looked you in the eye and informed you that, "Yes, the FDA has a problem. And they're going to put a black label on the drug, but as for the debt, I can tell you," - and this is basically a paraphrase - "that the debt doesn't even bother us, because, good news, we're still going to be able to make billions and billions.

So having said that, and we now have evidence that it's documented, I'd like you to tell the jury, based on this specific experience of yours, what's going on right now is what Pfizer, Moderna, Astra-Zeneca, and Johnson & Johnson are doing right now, and I think the public is aware of that. In some ways, it's common knowledge that they're only now starting to put warnings on vaccines. They can cause myocarditis, pericarditis and so on. But that's not even enough to stop the rollout [of the device]. Can you talk to us on the basis of the scenario you outlined at the beginning? Is it exactly the same for you that even though

there is the warning sticker on the vaccines, it doesn't stop them. And then as a next question, can you tell us if the only solution to stop this would be for the FDA and the CDC to declare that they are toxic and that they should be stopped urgently. Can you please clarify that, and put it in the context that I stipulated? Thank you.

2:30:24 Leslie Manookian:

Yes. So, for your first question, Dexter, the situation is very, very similar. The FDA requires that little black square, and that's a warning. Which basically says, then, the burden of proof is on you. You took this drug, you took it voluntarily, and there's the warning. If you don't pay attention to the warning, then that's your problem. So it's a way to keep, you know, the money machine running without taking the drug off the market, putting pressure on the individual to make the choice. In the end, there may still be lawsuits, as we've seen with Vioxx and so forth, and other drugs, but it's... people need to understand that the pharmaceutical industry over the last 20 years, -it was Public Citizen that gave the information that they've had to pay \$35 billion in fines just in the last 10-15 years, I think that's the period. These corporations are not benign, benevolent entities. They are toxin dealers, literally. The vast majority of these products are of no use to the public; what is of use to the public is to exercise and eat well and take supplements and manage stress levels and sleep well.

You know, I'm actually also a health practitioner and a homeopath. And the pharmaceutical industry doesn't make money [from me]. So when I said that this takeover of the medical complex goes back over 100 years, what that means is that it goes back to something called the Flexner Report, a report commissioned by Rockefeller and Carnegie themselves, with the purpose of bastardizing all the forms of natural medicine that had been around for centuries, and in some cases, millennia, 5,000 years in the case of acupuncture, to put in its place this chemistry and pharmacy-based paradigm. So I think that yes, 100%, what we are experiencing now is parallel to what I experienced just over 20 years ago in this conference room. And I think the only outcome is that it's going to be much worse if there's not some sort of class action, legal action or something major or whatever, something that creates a break, that exposes that there was a lot of fraud. I think waiting for the FDA to do the right thing...it's not going to happen all at once. So, you know, that's the black label warning. Then there's the other part of your question. I actually can't... Can you refresh my memory on what that was? That I'm focusing on it...

Reiner Fuellmich:

How do you stop that?

Leslie Manookian:

How do we stop it? Hm...

2:33:17 Reiner Fuellmich:

Is your mic off, Dexter?

2:33:20 Dexter N-J Ryneveldt:

Yes, excuse me. So, the second part of the question is about the FDA. The best would be, - and you with in a sense, you actually answered in your last sentence, they are supposed to stop because it's urgent. So can you comment?

Leslie Manookian:

Yes, that's right.

Dexter N-J Ryneveldt:

You've already answered but if you want to elaborate, you're welcome to.

2:33:44 Leslie Manookian:

I think the answer to all our problems is local control. Okay? All over the world, in our own communities, we need our own currency, we need our own independent health systems. And I'm not saying that modern medicine shouldn't be part of that. But it should be around

holistic practices. They are safe and they are extremely beneficial and effective. It's just that they're being defamed and silenced by the medical complex that controls everything we've been talking about.

So, to me, the real answer is that we need our own newspapers. Because Gates, the Gates Foundation gave a billion dollars to the media in the first decade of the twenty-first century. These media outlets are all controlled, and we need to, at the grassroots level, create local control. And we need to get rid of all the changes that have been made to the constitutions and founding documents. Because our founding documents are very deep. And I think they fall right in most cases. In most cases, they have been bastardized over the last decades and centuries.

So, for me, the answer is to push them back. And we have to push back at the local level by holding our local politicians, our school boards and everything else accountable, by saying, no, we're not going to participate anymore. And a word of caution, Dexter, as I said at the beginning, I don't think what we're going through has anything to do with public health, nor has it ever had anything to do with public health from the very beginning. I think it's about putting a system of control in place so that those who have the power keep it. And they can only do that with centralized power. So if we start taking back our own communities, they lose that power that they have. To me, that's the answer.

2:35:48 Dexter N-J Ryneveldt:

Thank you very much Leslie. Thank you. No further questions.

2:35:51 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you so much, Leslie, that was really brilliant. Just to put it in perspective, what does that mean? Considering what you just said, it's a gigantic fraudulent system. But what does it really mean? Let's take a quick look at it, before we move on to the next expert, with a couple of very short videos just to show the end result of this kind of corruption because that's what we're talking about, in terms of the end result.

- 2:36:32 Kalila Mitchell:

Hello. I'm a certified nurse in Nashville, Tennessee, and my name is Kalila Mitchell. I'm speaking to everyone about the COVID-19 vaccination. Not long ago, I was vaccinated against COVID-19. After the injection I felt fine, but within 3 days I had to go to the doctor because I had problems with my face. The whole left side of my face, in fact.

I now have Bell's palsy, and as you can see, I can't smile, I try to smile, but (sobs)... I just want you all to know that I think this vaccination is the worst thing ever, and I wouldn't want that to happen to anyone, even my worst enemy. Please, America, they're screwing with us. Don't take this vaccine.

- 2:37:46 Unknown speaker:

Don't try to hold me, it doesn't help. Every time I try to hold my legs bent, the shaking is less. But if I spread my legs, my husband put the clothes on me. Look at my legs. It's crazy, as you can see, I have my whole body shaking, and when I bring them back, it calms down.

- 2:38:55 to 2:39:08 Benita Black, a 41-year-old mother of one, was paralyzed for a short time after receiving a dose of the Pfizer vaccine She was diagnosed with emphysema, a disease that causes the inner lining of the lung to rupture, resulting in shortness of breath. She also experienced chest and joint pain. She also had very high blood pressure.

- 2:39:09 Benita Black:

I received the first dose, the first dose from Pfizer, on August 2, 2021 at Atlas road, Boksburg. We listen to the news, and they tell us it's safe. I was thinking I was going to make a difference.

- 2:39:25 Did you have any pre-existing medical conditions (e.g., chronic illness, disability)?

I was perfectly healthy, my only problem, which I still have, is a stomach ulcer. Yes, just acidity problems, because I am self-employed, as a business owner. First, I had chest pains. I was short of breath, I went to the doctor who told me that my lungs were damaged. He told me it looked like I had emphysema, a type of lung disease. I went home and started taking medication. About 2 months later, I started to feel sick again. I went back, and he prescribed an antibiotic, which left me completely paralyzed. I thought I was going to die.

- 2:40:20 How has the experimental Covid 19 mRNA vaccine affected your health since the vaccination?

My blood pressure was through the roof. I had joint pain. I couldn't... I was cramping. I was shaking. I couldn't even drive. So I decided to self-medicate, obviously, because my electrolytes are so low. I tried to get my electrolytes back up so I could have more energy. To this day, I can't stand for very long. I can't work very long because of my joints, my muscles tend to go into spasm. It feels like I have arthritis. My joints are sore. The news, the media, they don't tell you the truth. This thing is killing people. If I had known it was going to do this to me, I would never have gotten it injected. Never! We were told, "It's safe, and it will help protect you from coronavirus!" Or Covid 19. It's destroying people and it needs to be stopped.

2:42:08 Reiner Fuellmich:

Someone is paying a hefty price, as we've seen. Now let's hear from another expert witness. Björn Pirrwitz is a lawyer and financial expert in Germany. Björn!

2:42:27 Björn Pirrwitz:

Okay, can you hear me well? Let me share my screen... I have to give my approval to the whole recording... So, do you see my screen?

2:43:18 Reiner Fuellmich:

Yes.

2:43:22 Viviane Fischer:

I think that's the wrong screen that we're seeing.

2:43:24 Björn Pirrwitz:

Are you not seeing the right screen? Just a second. Is this the one?

2:43:35 Reiner Fuellmich:

Yeah, I think we're getting closer to what we're looking for. Okay.

2:43:45 Björn Pirrwitz:

Okay.

2:43:45 Reiner Fuellmilch:

There, we can see it. Go ahead.

2:43:49 Björn Pirrwitz:

Right. So, first of all, yeah; I'm going to... I'm going to be very brief, because basically Leslie has already said everything I was going to say and more, obviously, but, in fact, she also touched on some of the aspects I wanted to cover. So I'll be brief. I'll just recap a little bit. But first, I wanted to make 2 comments to what she said. And one of them has to do with the shareholder activist. And it's a nice tie-in to the previous two presentations that we heard from Patrick and Leslie, because it makes a connection between technocracy and the financial disaster, the financial fraud that we're seeing at work, and shareholder activism. I think you could say that, yes, shareholder activism in the classic sense is gone. But what we see today is a different kind of shareholder activism. And this one is presented and promoted under the label of corporate social responsibility. And that's behind all the plans that Patrick alluded to in his first presentation. And it just shows that the investment world and the shareholders, they're all, they're all in this.

What we're doing here, because that's another thing we mentioned, Leslie said we're being called conspiratorial. Now, we're not, I mean, we're being labeled that, but we're just doing what any investor would do with any action, which is act with sufficient information, try to read between the lines, connect the dots, and then draw a conclusion, it's an absolutely normal thing to do. So, with that said, let me jump right in.

Here are the 4 points I wanted to talk about, the monetary system, the historical context to get us to where we are today, why we are still in the unresolved global financial crisis of 2007-2009. And at the end, I'm going to try to wrap it up with what's going on, what's happening a little bit out of the public eye.

So, to begin with, on the monetary system, there's an interesting quote that helps illustrate what we're talking about, and why it's so easy for these people to bring in what they always want to bring in. And it comes from Henry Ford. And he said that, "If people knew and understood the banking and monetary system, I believe there would be a revolution before tomorrow morning. And that's absolutely true. No one, no one knows that when you put money in the bank, that you don't actually have money in your account, that's normal. It's the bank's money. All you have is a claim, receivable against the bank. And if the bank collapses, then, unless you are covered by the minimum amount insured by the banks' association fund, and there are not enough funds, then you will lose all your money. So that's one thing. The other is that people believe that the bank still works the way it did 100 years ago, which means that you bring money to the bank in the form of deposits. And that the bank takes those deposits and lends them out. The world no longer works that way. In fact, money is created by the commercial banks themselves. The moment they write a check, the moment they create a loan.

2:48:35

That's how it works. About 80% of the money in the market today is created by private banks. Roughly, I'm talking about the order of magnitude, the central bank only prints 20% of it. So let's move on from there. Let's try to understand how we got here? How did a completely toxic and insane system come to be?

We need to be aware of 2 key steps. The first is the abandonment of the gold standard by Nixon in 1971. The gold reserves of the United States, which were 75% of the world's gold reserves after World War II and the establishment of the Bretton Woods system, had shrunk dramatically because of the financing of the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and all sorts of other things, which led him to put on the brake and look, we can no longer afford to have people coming into our central bank with dollars to buy back the gold they're entitled to. And from that point on, we have the condition, the creation of what is called fiat money. And he gave the meaning to money that the dollar bill in your hand is worth something because we say so. That's what it means, basically. And as long as people have confidence, it will continue. So everyone understands immediately that once trust is lost, the system is no longer sustainable.

The second major step we took was what's called the deregulation or Big Bang, in 1986 in London, and then in the United States under the Reagan administration, which allowed banks to do things that were previously prohibited. That led to a huge stock market rally that culminated in the dot-com crash in 2000, 2001. And that was the beginning of a huge casino capitalism, as I call it. Leslie already talked about it, it was the rise of the derivatives market, which ended with the collapse of Lehman in 2008. And the great financial crisis that followed.

To give you an example, we've talked about this before, Patrick and Leslie mentioned it, the value of the global derivatives market, I think the number mentioned was \$600 and some trillion here, that's the Bank for International Settlements number in Basel from December 2019, it was still at 558. But that's only half the story. Because that only takes into account derivatives in the exchange and some exchanges. There's a lot of over-the-counter products, custom products between two parties. And the estimate is that it's going to go up to about a trillion. That's a gigantic number. That's about 10 times the global GDP,

which is just under \$100 trillion. So it's just gigantic. What happened between 2007 and 2009? First of all, the subprime crisis and the global financial crisis, the sovereign debt crisis in Europe, basically, the central banks took all the risks that had accumulated on the banks' balance sheets and transferred them to their own balance sheets. It was just a bailout and a transfer of risk to the taxpayer.

And that's where we are today. It also destroyed the revenue model of the banks, because in order to keep the banks afloat, interest rates were lowered, they went down to zero and even into the negative in the Eurozone, which basically destroys the business model of a bank. If you have to pay money, interest on deposits that you have, on an asset that you have and it can't earn interest, then you're really stuck. Sooner or later, it's got to collapse. That's obvious. And also, central banks have started buying up bonds and other assets from banks and corporations. And this is what we call money printing, which has led to a huge expansion of the money supply in the markets, as we can see here. On the left we have the ECB balance sheet as a percentage of GDP and on the right we have it for the Fed. So the euro area versus the dollar area. And you can see that the ECB balance sheet, the orange bars has increased dramatically and has now reached almost 75% of the Eurozone's GDP. That's an absolutely spectacular increase. It has almost doubled in the last 2 years. In the US, the situation is almost similar in absolute numbers, we are for both in the order of magnitude of 8 trillion, for the number that is on the balance sheet.

2:55:52

But the economy in the United States is much larger, which is also due to the fact that the dollar is actually a reserve currency. And the U.S. can count on not only its own economy, but all the rest of the world using the dollar to make dollar-denominated transactions. And that's about 3 times its own economy. That's why their percentage is even lower, and why they have a longer current yield. But you can see that if we continue at this rate, we will reach a point where the ECB's balance sheet, which is basically worthless, I mean, all of these assets are worthless, except for the gold that they own. But that's no more than 5%, and will exceed the amount of GDP.

This debt system is bankrupt. This money printing has also led to huge asset inflation, as you can see, on the right side, inflation has not really impacted the real economy, people have not noticed much. That's why we were told we could print as much money as we wanted. It doesn't really affect your daily life, there's no real inflation. But on the other hand, inflation has happened in different asset classes, anyone who owns real estate and has wanted to buy real estate in the last few years knows that. It has also happened in the stock markets and in the bond markets, everywhere.

So the money that the central banks printed went directly to financial investors. And they actually benefited enormously from that. You can see it here too, this is just a NASDAQ. And you can see that basically it's almost doubled. It almost doubled from the beginning of 2020 with the start of the COVID crisis to today. It's fallen off a little bit from its December high, recently, and that may be the beginning of the fall that we're going to see. But who has benefited? Only the richest of the rich have benefited, of course; the people who own stocks, especially the large shareholders and founders of the big technology companies.

Another interesting key performance indicator, the Shiller PE, invented by a famous economist, Shiller, author of the book *Irrational Exuberance*, who created this index that basically takes the last 10 years' revenues of companies and divides the market capitalization of companies today, the business value by the average revenues of the last 10 years. And we can see here that we are at the 35 level. So 35 times earnings is the trading level of the market today. That was on Friday. And you can see that when Black Monday happened in 1987, we were adjusted to about 17. So this is really dangerous territory. And sooner or later, it's going to break down because no bull market is forever.

So let's get back to that. Here's where we are: asset inflation, wealthy people getting richer, huge central bank debt almost exceeding GDP. That's where we are. And as Leslie has already mentioned, there is no way out because the central banks are already the last ones in sight, there is no one behind them. Which means it's really just you, you and me, and everyone with a bank account, the next model, when there is a crash, will be a bail-in

(confiscation to bail out the bank), remember the Cyprus crisis in 2013. When the deposit holders were, I think, completely sheared off by over 40%, 47%, I think most of them were still assets. Their accounts were wiped out. Because that's the way to recapitalize the bank. So the collapse is inevitable, there will be deflation, there will be hyperinflation, we don't know when. But it will happen sooner or later. And it will happen when people realize that the emperor is naked. Which means once the confidence in the system is gone. Then there will be a run on the banks. And then it's over. But we don't know when, that's the only thing we don't know.

So to summarize, how is this all connected? And why is this happening now? The people in power, who basically own the world economy, obviously know all this. And they're preparing for the day when it all comes crashing down, because you can't just keep kicking the can down the road forever.

3:02:19

There are several things that have been going on in parallel, in the background, out of the spotlight, that tell us that this is obviously premeditated. One is the Alliance ID 2020 digital identity. You see, there are big companies that are in the Fortune 500, and big NGOs like the Rockefeller Foundation, GAVI, of course, is on board, coordinating programs and promoting the idea of digital identity for all and the recognition of a compatible digital identity, which is a prerequisite for the population control that Leslie talked about. And it's increasingly clear that the green passes or vaccine passes that have been introduced around the world at almost the same rate, are our test bed for this digital identity. I put an example of one of these initiatives down on the right, it's a German startup that just created an app where you can integrate your personal data, your national ID card, your green pass, and your driver's license, all in one app. I mean, everything is moving in the same direction, it shows that it's launched.

Another trend that's emerging, already mentioned by Patrick and Leslie, is the global effort to get rid of cash, this Better Than Cash Alliance, also under the United Nations. It's always done in the name of financial inclusion and sustainability. That's kind of the title that's been promoted, it's all these social responsibility agendas pushed by the United Nations and programs that push the socialism that Patrick so brilliantly described in his first presentation. So, just one more point.

And now, the latest emerging trend in recent years, is the push for the introduction of central bank digital currencies. Here's a document from the Bank for International Settlements, which is sort of the central bank for central banks sitting in Basel. And this document is from March 2018. So 2 years already before the COVID crisis broke out, this shows the projects, the status of the different products that are being studied in central banks around the world. And practically everyone is on it, except Africa. Which, by the way, is the main reason why they are pushing. Allegedly financial, the buzzword being financial inclusion, for the effort to get rid of cash, so obviously a contradiction.

What will these digital currencies do? The difference with the other 2 crypto-currencies today, the big difference is that it will be programmable money. Which can be turned on and off at will by the central bank, as Chrystia Freeland, Canada's finance minister, did last week in Canada. And apparently she needed the cooperation of the banks and tracked all the transactions of everybody who financed the Canadian truckers, the truckers themselves, anybody who sold them anything; they can already do all that if all the institutions or the institutions cooperate. So that gives us a glimpse of what it will look like in the future. But it will be even easier. Once you get the money from the central bank, your wallet is on your phone, they can then turn you off and on like that.

So all these things together show that they are aware that the crisis is coming, that the system is going to collapse. And these initiatives are necessary to prepare for the turmoil that's coming and then, as Leslie said, the hand they're going to extend to us is going to be universal basic income or whatever financial aid they're going to offer us; but you have to download this app and that money will be on your phone; but you have to spend it economically, you have to spend it, you can't keep it. If you go out of a 50 kilometer radius

from your house or a 5 kilometer radius or whatever they come up with, then the money will not be available or it will be cancelled. So, these are the things that happen.

And a final testament to what's happening is that the really rich people are preparing themselves by fleeing into land assets. Bill Gates is now the largest owner of farmland in the United States. And he's not the only one, you're seeing the other big rich families doing the same thing. So all of this shows a shift of their assets into land assets. Leslie mentioned earlier that Blackstone and BlackRock are also buying up large portfolios of properties with defaulted loans around the country. This makes them the largest landlords in the United States. And the end result will be that they will be the ones renting to you once you lose everything. And these 2 books by Klaus Schwab that we have already mentioned tie everything together, they are not even shy about revealing their plans. Everything is explained in detail in these 2 books, their plans. And to me it's absolutely clear that in the background they are trying to prepare for the new order. And they are using COVID to divert attention from the financial crisis. So they can blame it on COVID. That said, maybe the narrative is starting to fall apart at the edges, they are pushing for war with Russia and Ukraine. So they need another detour, and they'll probably find more. But that's the plan.

And I'm done. I just wanted to say a few words, because I forgot to say it at the beginning, to establish my credentials, why I am qualified to give this expert testimony. So, as I mentioned, I am a lawyer by training, I have a German and American legal education. I worked in finance and investment banking, I was a director at Lazard and in Germany, before it merged. In 2000 I ran the German office of the pan-European venture capital fund, but we didn't last long because of the market collapse. And then later I started a private equity fund with a couple of partners. The company still exists today. But I left to pursue other projects a few years ago. And, yes, I've been in the venture capital business since 2003. I'm an investor myself, and I'm the president of a venture capital company based in Germany. That's it for me. I hope I was quick enough. And if there are any questions, I will be happy to answer them.

3:12:34 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you, Björn. Again, probably oversimplified, but is it correct that those pushing for the great reset and the fourth industrial revolution, Mr. Global, or the Davos clique are behind a giant Ponzi scheme that we now have to pay the price for?

3:13:00 Björn Pirrwitz:

In my mind, yes, absolutely. I don't have any other ... the data is clear. Obviously, we don't have a written agreement in which these people agree to get together to conspire. But we have circumstantial evidence, and I think it's unambiguous.

3:13:29 Reiner Fuellmich:

All right. Do my esteemed colleagues have any questions?

3:13:36 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Yes, Björn Pirrwitz, thank you very much for the evidence that you have provided, thank you for the clarifications. We'll continue with what was said and make sure that the jury members understand. The question I would like to ask you, Björn, is this: you started your testimony by saying that you had to understand and the jury had to understand where the problem started. And the problem started when we went into a fiat currency system. And then you started to elaborate and you went on to the second factor, which is the total removal of the gold standard. So I want to focus on those two specific factors.

3:14:35 Björn Pirrwitz:

Can I interrupt you, Dexter? I'm sorry, it's one and the same. The abandonment of the gold standard was actually the creation of fiat currency, because you couldn't redeem anymore. Before, when we had the gold standard, with a \$1 bill, you could go to the FED and buy back the gold that it represented. That's the gold standard. And in 1971, the Nixon administration said, we're not going to do that anymore. And so he just said, trust me.

3:15:20 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Right. So that came true at the same time. Thank you for clarifying that. The question I want to ask you, you also mentioned in your testimony that the money that is currently printed, which is fiat money, has no value, do you agree with that?

3:15:37 Björn Pirrwitz:

It has no intrinsic value. And of course it has value because you and I use currency every day, to buy things, and other people then get that money. So it has some value. But that value is exclusively based on our confidence that it has value. Otherwise, it's just a piece of paper.

3:16:03 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Okay, so if I understand correctly, you focused on the inherent value itself, would you say then, in order to solve this financial problem that we're currently facing, what is the best thing to do to get back to the gold standard? Is there a possible solution for the future?

3:16:27 Björn Pirrwitz:

Yes, that's one aspect that absolutely has to be related to this. If you print money, the problem is that if your GDP doesn't increase at the same time by the same amount, the value of your goods and services will decrease. And if you have gold, when you put a lid on it, it's a limitation to that and you can't indefinitely increase the value, the nominal amount of money in circulation. And you know, as a consumer or as a citizen, I can exchange my one dollar bills any day for the amount of gold that that represents.

3:17:39 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Thank you very much, Björn. You also stated and this is basically a clarification, we are talking about inherent value. Now I want to get to all these investors who have invested in the monetary sphere. So, is that correct, can we actually use the same terminology and say that even their wealth is inherent wealth? It has no value? Is that correct?

3:18:06 Björn Pirrwitz:

No, wait, I think there's a confusion, nobody invests in currencies, I mean, you can if you want to speculate, because the external value of one currency against another currency can move, and then you do an arbitrage. But assets have value and you represent them with money, and the more you print, if the quantity of assets stays the same, then obviously, prices go up nominally, your money has less and less value. So holding cash means you lose. And that's why you have to invest in land assets, because land assets are what they are, and you get for them the amount and the currency that they're worth at any given time when you decide to realize them.

3:19:05 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Okay, so the focus is on land assets. That's what we need to focus on.

3:19:11 Björn Pirrwitz:

Yes.

3:19:11 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

OKAY. You also mentioned, and you have evidence corroborated by Leslie, and also by Patrick Wood, that there is absolutely no way out. So in the end, we're going to be facing a complete financial collapse. Do you confirm that?

3:19:33 Björn Pirrwitz:

Yes, there's no intellectual way out of this. I mean, it's inevitable. You can't keep printing more to do this and increasing the amount of money in circulation indefinitely. Eventually, the whole system will collapse because people will lose confidence. That's what happened with the hyperinflation in Germany in the night of 1923, bread cost 130 billion I think, crazy hyperinflation, I mean, in the morning you get the paycheck, and by the afternoon your money was already only worth half.

3:20:16 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Right. So basically, when we go back to Patrick Woods' testimony, he mentioned frontal assault, which means that's as far as you can go. At the end of the day, you will confirm that humanity is now facing the ultimate catastrophe and we need to realize that we are talking about a complete financial crash.

3:20:48 Björn Pirrwitz:

Yes, I think it's inevitable. The only thing is, as Niels Bohr, the famous physicist, said, predictions are very difficult, especially about the future. So we don't know when it will happen. But it will happen eventually. And all of these trends that I've shown, at the end of the day, to me are proof that the people who are out there know this and are preparing for this crash and then picking up the pieces.

3:21:24 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Okay. So based on your experience, your expertise, and maybe I'm asking you now to speculate, and the reason I'm asking you is just so the jury can understand. And I'll tell you why I want the jury to understand; you've given us a historical backdrop for when this started, what the major events were then that brought about major changes, and that goes along with the evidence of Mr. Patrick Wood, and the evidence that was filed on the second day of this grand jury. So what I would like to ask you, when we get to that historical backdrop, and the speculation, and I say speculation, because you've made it clear that you don't know when, if you were to now, based on your expertise and experience, if you were to give a date, let's say maybe for the sake of argument, 5 years, 2 years, 3 years, what would you say? And I mean, obviously, what I would actually say would be speculation, but at least it would give an indication.

3:22:40 Björn Pirrwitz:

Yeah, I mean, I don't think it's going to be five years, I think it's going to be less than that. It will be less than that.

3:22:49 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

So we're very, very close to it.

3:22:53 Björn Pirrwitz:

Well, I can only say that as far as I'm concerned, I try to keep a minimum of cash in the bank, just so you can live your life and pay your bills and all that, and not leave anything in excess in the bank accounts, because it can happen any time and remember the Cyprus crisis.

3:23:21 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

So, are we also correct in saying that this can be imminent, it can happen any day.

3:23:33 Björn Pirrwitz:

I don't think it will be that close. I mean, if we go back to this chart here, I think a critical point will be reached when the bad assets on the central bank's balance sheet, will be equivalent to GDP. So we already had 75%, we've doubled that in the last 2 years, from about 30 to 75%, almost doubled. If we go over 100, then it's like we're broke, because the assets are worthless, except for gold which is only 5% of the central bank's assets. It's their corporate bonds, their government bonds. They are nothing.

3:24:27 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

And the last question I'm going to ask you, we're now in a context of sustainability, capitalism and so forth. But my last question, given the fact that you've now given evidence to say that economic collapse is inevitable, is a game that one can argue. The other side essentially argues, and I think this is the essential argument, that the only way we can avoid this financial collapse is to introduce the fourth industrial revolution, is to introduce technocracy. Again, can technocracy in the fourth industrial revolution really avoid this financial collapse?

3:25:17 Björn Pirrwitz:

No, I think we need to turn this around, I think when the crash happens, these instruments will be introduced, they will reach out to us to supposedly save us, but as has been very ably pointed out before, it's all about control. They will then simply say, "Okay, you've lost everything, we're giving you this indulgence, but you have to accept our conditions, here's the wallet, here's the money, you can spend it every month. You can't save any money, but you have to obey," and so on. I mean, it's kind of a scenario based on the developments that I'm observing that are happening. It's very likely. I mean, that's the scenario, that's what's going to happen, they're going to try. It doesn't mean it's going to happen, because people may wake up, enough people may wake up and not allow this to be introduced, but we will definitely have a crash.

3:26:52 Dexter L-J Ryneveldt:

Thank you very much. No further questions for me.

3:26:56 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you Björn. I'm sorry, Virginia.

3:27:02 Virginie De Araujo Recchia:

Thank you sir, for your testimony. Thank you also to Ms. Manookian, I think people now have the real explanation of what is really going on. My question is very simple. Should we start creating a new local currency to form a parallel system as soon as possible? Should we create new local currencies? To avoid this?

3:27:37 Björn Pirrwitz:

Well, it's already happening. It's the crypto-currencies, although they're trying to crack down on them and regulate them more and more, people are using them... the solution is not the creation of the new currency to begin with, that will come later. First the system has to collapse. And then people will find ways to exchange directly bypassing money which is only a storage of value. Money has lost this characteristic or quality of storing value. And people will find another storage of value, they may be able to exchange directly into gold or silver or whatever they find.

3:28:36 Virginia De Araujo Recchia:

Thank you.

3:28:40 Leslie Manookian:

I just wanted to chime in. First of all, Björn, that was fantastic. I'm sorry, I spoke first. But talking about currency, Virginia, one thing we have in the United States is what's called junk money. These are coins that were made before 1965, I believe. And they are almost pure silver. So they're small values. And they're also, you know, good metal, it's a recognized unit of currency. So there are certainly people who buy bags of what's called junk silver to have a medium of exchange. Because as Björn said, it's just a matter of having a mechanism to change it so that if I grow avocados, somebody else may not want avocados, but I have to have a medium of exchange. And so, it's just something that we agree on. There doesn't have to be a new currency, we could use something like junk money that's already out there. I don't know. I don't remember what the situation is with coins and currency in Europe, whether or not they're silver or something like that. But I mean, it could be shells, it could be anything in the end.

3:30:00 Reiner Fuellmich:

I agree with that.

3:30:02 Björn Pirrwitz:

Money has an advantage and a disadvantage. The advantage is that you can buy it even with a small portfolio, if you want to buy gold, one ounce of gold, boom 2,000 euros. It's gone up in the last few days actually, and silver is just 23. But that's very heavy, right? If

you want to carry the value of an ounce of gold in silver, that's pounds. I mean, you need suitcases for that. But yeah, but you can also buy smaller portions.

3:30:56 Reiner Fuellmich:

Well, let's go back to what happened in the 1930s, let's send huge amounts of money that you think amounts to shooting yourself in the foot, I hope it doesn't come to that. Thank you very much Björn, thank you very much. Now let's turn to our last expert, Professor Christian Kreiss. He's a professor of economics, Christian, there may be another way to solve this problem, I think you have a different view of these things.

3:31:48 Christian Kreiss:

I just turned on my mic, I'm really excited to be able to speak here after these 3 really good and profound presentations. I almost don't know what to say. But this is a very good basis for what I want to talk about. I'm going to try to do it in 20, maybe 30 minutes, I'm going to go over the context a little bit again, but focusing on the inequality and the increasing debt load, which has been mentioned a couple of times already, the role of COVID... Then I'll change it up a little bit and try to look at the actual context, I think. And of course, at the end, I present some possible solutions.

So what we've seen over the last 40 years, more or less, in the beginning, Patrick mentioned in the 70s, is that there has been a change. And you can see that change, this simple graph here, shows that worker productivity has grown more or less in line with hourly earnings. But in the 1970s, there was a change, productivity continued to grow but hourly earnings did not, -so the gap between supply and demand, and inequality grew enormously. This is a global phenomenon. It's not just in the United States, it's in Europe and in most of the industrialized world. And just a hint, if workers' pay had grown at the same rate as productivity today, the minimum wage would be \$26 instead of \$7.25. So we're not talking about peanuts, we're talking about really huge amounts of money.

This increase in inequality has led to increased investment, has led to increased growth because all that money, which went to the top 5% of the population, had to be reinvested, it went to finance, to the banks, to the insurance companies, and led to pretty significant growth. We can see the U.S. Census Bureau data over the last 40 years, up until shortly before COVID. We see a growth in GDP per capita of 86% in real terms, but the median income in the same time frame has only grown by 18%. So median income did not grow at the same rate as mass production. So we had a gap between supply and demand. When I first read these numbers, I almost didn't believe it, but what happened that all those other people could finance those nice new cars, cell phones, etc.? The answer is there, as we have already heard from Björn, for example.

So we've seen a huge growth financed by debt, for example, the real household debt in the Western countries has increased by 6, 6 times between 1980 and 2010. But this is a pace that cannot continue like this. And if you take it the other way, if you put all the mass income of people to buy real goods and services, so if you multiply the increase in median income by the US GDP per capita, you get 0.63, which to me was again a shock, because it means that to provide all the goods and services needed, we could close 1 in 3 businesses, 1 in 3 hotels, 1 in 3 restaurants, etc. Because the average mass income just hasn't kept pace. And that's the very reason, in my opinion, for the financial crisis and the crisis right before COVID. So this increasing level of debt, we've been able to trace it, we've mentioned it before, and Leslie mentioned it as well, the total debt is just going up, up, up. This total debt, as a percentage of GDP, 40/50 years ago, for every \$1 of GDP we had \$1 of debt, today we have \$2.5 of debt for every \$1 of GDP. And here, at the beginning of the first financial crisis, we had 195% debt, so almost \$2 of debt for \$1 of GDP, which was too high and caused the financial crisis.

And the remedy for that debt, which was too high, was MORE debt. That's not fake news, that was really the remedy, that was MORE debt. What we can see here is a huge jump in debt in 2020. As a percentage of GDP, if you add in the financial sector, you get to about 360%. So every dollar of GDP today is \$3.6 of debt, and you can never pay off that debt.

Patrick, Leslie and Björn have already mentioned this. And if you look at the quality of the debt, it has also gone down. Here we have a chart that shows triple B rated debt and high yield debt in the US market only. So the bad debt below the rating has gone up a lot, which for me, as a former investment banker, I was an investment banker for 7 years before I went into academia. And from a financial standpoint, from a banker's standpoint, it doesn't look good.

As I mentioned before, it's not just the debt that's exploded, but also the central banks, we feel the balance sheet of the US FED central bank, it was about 0.8 trillion before the first financial crisis. And now it's up to 9 trillion. So the central bank money, the quantitative easing, the printing of new money, is multiplied by 11 if you put it all in crisis mode. And the same thing applies to the ECB, you see, the central bank, the freshly printed money has increased almost 10-fold in the space of 15 to 17 years.

So what's worth noting, a lot of checks have been written on the future especially during the covid, and I'll get to the Covid in a few minutes. We need to somehow have a split with the money or the debt, it's impossible to pay it off. And there are at least 6 or 7 solutions but I think the 3 most likely are, either we will see inflation, like the US did in 1948 until 1950, when prices just went up and the debt was deflated. Also, a financial crisis, a depression and maybe deflation. Or, war can also be a solution, of course, because we have a huge gap between supply and demand, and you can also close the gap by simple destruction processes, like in 1945, with Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Central Europe, that leads to a decrease in production to catch up and close the gap. So which of these solutions could happen?

Now, what is the role of covid in this structure? What I've told you now was more or less the situation up to the covid. If you look at the history, in 1970 we had a big financial crisis and almost nobody knows about it. I studied economic history. My internet connection is jumping it seems...is it working?

3:40:17 Reiner Fuellmich:

We can still hear you and see you.

3:40:20 Christian Kreiss:

Okay, if you look back, if you look at the crisis of 1907, John Pierpont Morgan owned 141 banks and a huge steel complex at the time, he was one of the richest men in the world along with Rockefeller. He caused this global financial crisis by not committing his loans. On August 22... a huge collapse followed until October. He got rid of his most important competitors. So it was the biggest deal of his life. In my opinion, it just increased his wealth tremendously. What's the message? You can make a lot more money during depressions and even during war, than in peacetime. So there are always people who take advantage of crises. If you look at the situation since covid came to us, every day of containment has brought billions in profits to the big companies, to the big billionaires behind them, to the big players who are like them, like JP Morgan eliminating their competitors.

It's the small and medium-sized businesses like some of the most famous examples. Amazon has eliminated retail stores. Yes, there are more stores closing and Amazon and Jeff Besos are getting richer and richer. But how do you get the government to actually introduce containment? Well, you just have to systematically generate fear of death and disease. That's exactly what's happened because the media, as Leslie said, is in the hands of a few billionaire families. The ownership structure of the media is very, very concentrated. Either the media is in the hands of a few very large investors or families or it's controlled by the government and they're all interested in generating fear and fear of death and disease. That's how it works. In these situations, these crisis situations, money is king and big business and big players know about it.

Last year, the top 3,000 companies in the world increased their cash flow by almost a third. It exploded and the stories from a purely financial perspective, they were simple.

You have huge cash reserves. Small and medium-sized companies don't, you wait for them to go bankrupt and they're yours. You either pay a very small amount, or you get them for free, or you get them to relocate because they just go bankrupt. Our dear Klaus Schwab said exactly that in his book.

In France, in the UK, several industry voices estimate that up to 75% of independent restaurants may not survive the confinements and the social distancing measures that follow, the big chains and fast food giants will, of course, they have huge cash reserves. They know this story. They may know the drill. Exactly the result that would be designed today is that the wealth of American billionaires was raised during the pandemic by 2.1 trillion or 70% increase⁴. That is a huge increase. I don't think it's a coincidence. Today, the share of the richest people in the United States is higher than ever, even higher than the Rockefeller and JP Morgan types. So what we're seeing is a huge increase in financial power, the pyramid is getting much more pointed.

Now, I think we have several options to overcome this debt load that is too high. Either it's inflation, but if you ask yourself how would the very small billionaire companies get the biggest profits to get the best return? You really need to get rid of all these small and medium sized companies and get all their market share back or go to war. As far as I know, DuPont, the big American chemical company increased its profits by 60 times during World War II. So they still make huge profits in wartime. So I wonder, what's the motivation? What's the incentive? What's the motivation for the really rich people? They don't have that much motivation for inflation. But the best, the best thing to make really huge profits is either a deep financial crisis, a depression or a war. Financial power always translates into political power to influence the scientific community, as Leslie has shown very well.

I don't think I need to talk about that, you know, there's a more or less corrupt elite power. That, I think these pictures were taken long before Mr. Trump became president, this time it's your turn, next time it's mine, it doesn't matter who the president actually is. What's behind it that is, for me, new, I want, I want to give you an explanation, a rather spiritual explanation based on Rudolf Steiner's anthroposophical view, which in my opinion, is the best explanation, at least that's what I think.

Rudolf Steiner said, more than 100 years ago, that the aristocracy must be restored, re-established. That is the political objective. You use the term revolution, democracy, you use this mask to achieve as much power as possible. And how do you do it? Private capital of a small group of oligarchs. But he said that almost 100 years ago and I think it's very current. It goes on and on. The most effective way today, to extend power over as many people as possible, is the economic way.

Economic subordination, for example, if you have to look for a job, or if you have a lot of debt... But that's just the means, the end in reality is something completely different. It's about free will, that's the real target that needs to be eliminated. The real goal is to turn the society in which freedom was possible into a society of slavery. Patrick talked about things that are just evil, the dignity, the dignity of man, which is treated very badly. Leslie talked about the deliberate aspect of these inconceivable things that are going on and I want to dig a little deeper into that. There are different tools, the adversary, -now this is getting quite spiritual, these illegitimate princes can choose for example, hunger and social chaos, or physical power, pressure, coercion are used to replace free will of mankind, or simply martial law. If you introduce martial law, if you create chaos, if you create hunger and fear, then your freedom will be reduced to almost nothing, as we cruelly learned in Germany from 1933 to 1945.

So, in my belief, this goes far beyond financial interests, the goal that Steiner stated in 1919, is this very important choice that man is facing today, to become like an animal again, to become more animal than any animal. This is exactly what Mephisto is trying to achieve and trying to absorb, to take our spirituality. I think basically it's a battle, a fight between materialism and spirituality.

If you practice the spiritual path, you know that healthy knowledge can only come from healthy human beings, according to the Latin saying: mens sana in corpore sano⁵. But if you turn it around, if you look at the last two years with covid measures, it is exactly the opposite. Masks, school children running around with masks on even when exercising, no exercise, staying indoors, not doubting the inoculation, all these covid measures make us sick. And in my eyes are destined to make us sick. If the body is no longer healthy, it is more difficult to reach a healthy knowledge, if you turn the Latin saying mens sana in corpore sano, if the body is no longer healthy, you cut people off from their spiritual, divine, religious dimension and I think that is because there are forces behind. And just two small explanations, some examples. Mephisto in Goethe, in Faust, the tragic Faust, says at one point, he calls it reason and it only serves to be more animal than any animal, so we use our intelligence to become even more animal than the animal. There are two good examples to me, for example: porn, porn trafficking...

3:51:41 Reiner Fuellmich:

I think we just lost you... Christian, I think we lost you, you can try to reconnect... that should solve the problem. Let's see if he can reconnect so he can finish his presentation because I think he has a little bit of a different vision for us. I hope it's not the war scenario. I will check with Corvin because he is probably in touch with him.

Corvin tells us he needs to reconnect. There is no other way. So we'll have to wait a few seconds. In the meantime, what do you think, Leslie? What is the most likely outcome? Do you really think it's going to be war? Is that what the Davos clique will choose? Is there any other outcome for us? We all realize that if there isn't, collapse⁶ is inevitable. Can we do anything to stop it? Can we be quick enough to create our own parallel societies, our own regional currency, for example? Or can't we do it fast enough?

3:54:00 Leslie Manookian:

Personally, I see it as... people say to me all the time, "Oh, thank God the covid is going away. It's over." I say, "No, no, no, it's not over. It's far from over." Because they haven't completed their program yet. They haven't? It was never about public health and the agenda is still being developed. I'm someone named Martin Armstrong. I think he's one of the brightest people alive today. He has a model, on all kinds of things. I'm not going to get into the details. But his model predicts that there will be about a decade of conflict.

To me, it seems like that's the most likely outcome, because, you know, look at what Trudeau is doing, the truckers have made it very clear what their demands are, it's been over three weeks and he's not backing down. He won't talk to them. He has now frozen their assets. He's doing all these things. These people are evil. When Patrick was speaking, he said these things so many times that I wanted to say, yes, the word is evil. Yes, these people are evil and they are not going to give up without a fight. So I think humanity has this huge opportunity in front of them, the question is how they will take it.

I just hope that more and more people will wake up and demand freedom and that we will hold these people accountable. So I think it's going to be a very rocky road personally, for a number of years. What happens politically and financially, even during the wars, think about when France was occupied by Germany in World War II, they continued to live, -in fact more than in World War I, they continued to live, there are still black market economies and things like that. So I think it's very likely that there's going to be this huge upheaval, but it's not like we're going into darkness.

How do we get out of it? I think we can do our... I've been involved in my local food community for over 15 years. I'm a health practitioner, I'm a homeopath. I have my own medicine, you know, like we've always done, we've built these things in our own community. I think that's what everybody should do. Because I think that's what's going to help us weather the storm. Eventually, I think there will be, you know, a day when everyone will be held accountable. The question is, how long will that take?

3:56:38 Reiner Fuellmich:

What surprises me is that everyone we've interviewed as expert witnesses, at one point or another, has realized and told us that there's something really important going on, outside of all the statistics, outside of the numbers, outside of our legal efforts and that's spirituality and all of a sudden we have a professor of economics, who's also going in that direction.

So it seems to me... and also yesterday for example, when we interviewed two psychologists, Meredith Miller, she too said that if people understand what is going on and rise up, a higher power will come to our rescue. Now this sounds like something out of science fiction, but it seems that even economists agree on this. There is something other than materialism, there is a spiritual connection between us all. Is that something that... Do you agree with the idea that if we rise up, if we understand what's going on and we rise up, there's another higher power that's going to come to our rescue, that's going to at least help us?

3:57:56 Leslie Manookian:

Well, 100%. First of all, I think what Christian said is very accurate. First of all, Rudolf Steiner said that vaccines would be used to destroy our connection to spirit. He wrote that over a century ago. I think that's a very interesting thing. Have you all heard of Yuval Noah Harari⁷ and seen the video clip where he talks about all of you people who think you are unique individuals, who think there is a soul or something inside you. It's over. That's what he says, "it's over" we can hack you all, it's over. Your idea of being a full human individual, it's over, I'm sending you the clip, I think you should play it.

To me, that's exactly what's happening. We're in the middle of a spiritual war between those who believe that you're nothing but a bag of bones on the one hand and those who believe that we're all individual and unique creations of a higher power, a manifestation of... I would say we're all spiritual beings with a physical experience. I think that's exactly what's going on.

These people who think they can inject us with nanotechnology and control our brains and hack us and, you know, impose AI and all these things on us. That's exactly what's happening. So I believe 100% that there is something bigger than us and yes, just stand in the truth, fight for what is right, for our freedom, ultimately it will bring more of that energy and I believe we will win.

3:59:39 Patrick M. Wood:

Let me just interject here.

From an economic standpoint, right now, this is my favorite topic of conversation. By the way, even though I studied technocracy for many years. I would rather study economics, the problem with economics, modern economics says that the tools we used to use just don't work anymore. They are very unstable and they don't produce results that can guide us into the future. Well, there's a reason for that. It's because capitalism and the market economy have been broken. But we're at the peak of a supercycle right now, that's undeniable in my opinion.

When you see graphs like some of the ones he just showed, we're at the peak of a cycle where we're tipping into a period of not only demographic reduction of humanity and that's helped by the programs today, but there's already demographically a winter ahead of us because the world's population is shrinking. It also highlights the fact that economically we are about to enter the greatest deflationary cycle the world has ever seen. When you explode debt, when companies go bankrupt, when people go bankrupt, when asset values go down, whatever, that's deflation.

Some people confuse that with inflation. But even in the case of Germany in the 1920s. Yes, prices went up. But what happened to that currency? Is it still there today? No, there isn't, it was completely decimated. It was the ultimate deflation when it finally broke out. So we're entering this period of deflation right now and we've got, you know, this so-called

Humpty Dumpty sitting on the wall, Humpty Dumpty gave a little tap, you know, they're pushing them off the wall to make sure that capitalism dies and so on. But what's going to happen when that happens, if the world economy is burned to the ground, what I think is going to happen is there's going to be a great reset of humanity, a great reset of relationships.

Remember those moments in New York when the lights went out? Everybody thought, oh, no, there's going to be anarchy. They're going to kill each other. There's going to be, it's going to be horrible. But what happened? People came out on the street, they started talking to each other, hugging each other. They, they realized, hey, I haven't seen your cousin in six years. They had a wonderful time. It was a wonderful reunification event, humanity. I can see that happening if they burn the world to the ground and they think we're going to come out the other side and say, oh, please help us Mr. Technocrat, I have a feeling that the people who have been reconnected at the ground level, I'm just going to say, "Get out of my sight. We don't even see you around here anymore." They're going to reject it once and for all. It's going to be painful and in many ways for us to go down to the economic hardships that may come.

But I'll tell you, there's nothing more important in the history of the world, the connection of human to human. That's what it's all about. Family to family, human to human. We all discover in the end that we are so much alike. We are so much alike. In the process, we're going to go back to things that meant something to people decades and centuries ago that have been discarded in our current system. That is, for example, you know, things like morality, ethics, things like the Bible, I imagine it will go back and pull any truth from the Bible, I think there's going to be a great resurgence, honestly, of human connection. I think that's a, that's potentially a very, very good thing. Honestly, when I look at it, I said, I don't want to go to where I'm on the street, where the lights are off and all that kind of stuff. But you know, what it could be for our own good. Again, it depends on how you take it.

4:03:31 Reiner Fuellmich:

If I remember correctly, 9 months after these outages, there was an increase in births. It's a different kind of connection, which still seems to work.

4:03:48 Patrick M. Wood:

Absolutely!

4:03:49 Ana Garner:

I wanted to comment to Reiner and Patrick, this is very well said, I think what happens because of the evil that is so in front of our faces and is so apparent is that we have to wake up. When they cause us enough pain, when there is enough pain, we have to change what has happened, because continuing to do the same thing is going to bring about the same result. So we start to wake up. I really feel like that's what's happening all over the world, we can't ignore the evil that's going on here anymore, and they're in the minority. We have to remember that we are the majority. As we wake up and have God's eye on us, I think it's an incredible opportunity for our whole planet to evolve. It's just going to have to reach critical mass, we're not there yet. But it's not that far away.

One of the things I also wanted to caution people about, right before we lost Christian, he mentioned something about this battle between materialism and spirituality. We are spiritual beings having a human experience here. That doesn't mean we have to live in poverty, or that we have to live destitute, I don't think our creator intended that for us.

I want to warn people about the distortion of language and the distortion of propaganda that comes to us all the time. One of them, this whole Klaus Schwab thing, you know, showing this happy 20-year-old "You'll own nothing and you'll be happy". He looks like he's completely drugged. Don't you think? Well, maybe that's part of the plan, too. You know, you legalize marijuana and everyone can be high and happy. But that's not really where we want to go. Their point of view, they'll even infiltrate the language of spirituality and

twist it so that we think something sounds good. "You will own nothing and be happy," "you can always be a wonderful spiritual being connected to God. You don't need to own anything, we will take care of you".

Just like they have spoiled our language with the pandemic, with the cases, with the word vaccine, all these words, sustainability, the only thing that is sustainable is their wealth, it is not sustainable for us. All these words, "progressive" that used to mean an advance. No, not anymore, it means regression of thought. So we have to be very careful not to let their language start to shape what is spiritual for us. And the connections, the human connections that we need, we are social creatures, the fun times that we need, having dinners together, having parties together, entertainment, all of that is necessary for us.

We can have all that. I think Leslie's idea of making it local, extremely local, local food production, local healing, local exchange of everything we exchange as services and goods. I think that's a solution to get down to the local level, where we create and get out of this particular matrix as much as possible because it's dystopian and dysfunctional.

4:07:17 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you, Ana. Christian is back. Do you want to continue Christian? We can pick up where you left off. We're talking about spirituality all of a sudden and I couldn't believe it, because these are lawyers and you're an economist, rational people. All of a sudden we are in spirituality. Please continue, if you will.

4:07:41 Christian Kreiss:

I'm sorry. I'm in Costa Rica, with a complete internet outage in the whole area, apparently. So I was almost done. Honestly, I had a few heartbeats because I normally never talk about any of this stuff. But that's been my approach for 15 years. It made me understand the first financial crisis and the second financial crisis behind the Eurozone. For me, it was just a wake-up call to follow the spiritual path and do meditations and also individual experiences during my meditations and so on, but normally I never talk about it in public. This is almost the first time.

What I mean is that it's not about money, it's not even about power... power maybe, but it's not about money. For example, almost every 12 year old boy in Germany plays Fortnite, which is a war game, all against all, there is just one survivor. One survivor out of 100, they teach them to kill. This type of video game, military game, war game, has been used by the U.S. military for decades before soldiers killed other people. For example, before the first Iraq war, they used exactly this kind of game, it's to dehumanize young men, to take away their empathy. It's not about money. It's really about dehumanization.

That's my central message. I think that's really what Leslie said, it's just evil. No, Patrick said it's just evil. There's no innocent explanation, like Leslie said, it's just... There's no innocent explanation. It's just evil. Whatever you call it, it's Mephisto, Mephistopheles. What I also see is a huge increase in national and international conflicts, I think there will be huge conflicts, not about the increase in competition, the fight for market share. Mephisto is the spirit of war, he wants to destroy and he wants to create chaos in social unrest. He wants the military powers to rule, he wants to eliminate freedom, these powers want to dehumanize us. I think that's the real battle behind, even behind the big players like Bill Gates or whatever, these powers, they have a fight in our heart, in our chest, it's us through which they want to act.

It is us, we as humans, who have to decide which side we are on. So it is never these powers themselves that really exercise power, but it is always through men, through humans, they have to act through humans⁸. That is the power in our hearts, in our minds, in my opinion.

For the solutions, what do we need?

Awareness, awareness and awareness; people just need to wake up, they are just deeply asleep. But how do we do that?

We need a free press. We don't have a free press, we have reduced freedom of speech, we don't have freedom of speech anymore. We need free science, Leslie told us. We need democracy instead of a monopoly of political parties, which are all corrupted by huge transfers of money from these billionaires.

So of course we need to eliminate lobbying, we need free schools, universities, not funded by foundations or billionaires and of course not billionaire controlled media, not state controlled media, it's just not possible, it's just not possible to put all the media power in the hands of a very, very small number of actors who both have huge incentives to activate fear, to produce fear, to scare us.

What we will need in the next few months, the next few years probably, we will need the ancient virtues: courage, power, sincerity, honesty, compassion. This can be developed through spiritual grounding. Where does health really come from? From inner peace, from self recognition. So we should also prepare ourselves for this battle, I don't think it's over, even if now Omicron is over, I think the next versions will come up. I think that battle is not over yet.

If we go through a really big financial depression, or even a war, we will need even more inner strength, so some kind of meditation, some kind of spiritual approach to strengthen ourselves in our hearts and minds. Where is the inner strength? You have to recognize yourself, it's very difficult, because we often lie to ourselves, where we pretend to do things, for good reasons and in reality, they are not good. It is a difficult path, a path of transformation. It is a difficult path. But then we can feel that within us we have such power, you can call it divine power, you can call it spiritual power or whatever. But if you exercise and meditate and follow this path of inner knowing, you feel the enormous power that is within us, within each of us, to find the divine, the divine within us, that comes from inner balance, from grounding and immersion. So I think it's really, it's really about these spiritual issues.

At the end of the day, it's not about money, it's maybe about power, controlling money and dominating the world. Yes, I think there is, there could be huge conflicts between China, the United States and maybe Russia, they are strong nationalisms, I think they will see their big conflict. But at the end of the day, it's about our dignity, it's about the dignity of human beings and that dignity, I think, you can only really appreciate if you see something eternal, in each individual, in yourself, but also in the trees and the birds, if you see those things inside of you, then dignity will come from that and we will really, really treat animals and nature in a really humane way. I think ultimately it's their powers behind and even behind these seemingly all-powerful families, the all-powerful billionaires, I think there are forces within them, there are spiritual forces fighting in their chests and in their hearts. Thank you.

4:16:02 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you very much Christian. It's very surprising to hear that from a former investment banker and an economics professor. But it seems that everyone agrees with you. The most important thing is that you did a good job. The most important thing is that the other side agrees with that too. They know it, they know we have these powers and they don't have access to them. To illustrate that, we found the video that you mentioned Leslie, and we're going to play it now so we can all see that this is what they're fighting. This is what we need to protect.

- 4:16:49 Yuval Harari:

In order to hack human beings. We talk a lot about hacking computers, smart phones, bank accounts, but the big story of our time is the ability to hack human beings. By that I mean that if you have enough data and enough computing power, you can understand people better than they understand themselves. You can then manipulate them in a way

that was previously impossible. In such a situation, the old democratic system has stopped working. We have to reinvent democracy for this new era in which humans are now hackable animals. You know the whole idea that humans have, you know, they have this soul or spirit and they have free will and nobody knows what's going on inside me, conc whatever I choose, whether it's in the election or in the supermarket, it's my free will. It's over. You have to come to terms with the fact that...whatever,,,, that's where philosophy meets computer science.

4:17:57 Reiner Fuellmich:

I would venture to say that this is what real evil looks like. It's just that I'm surprised to hear it from someone from Israel. You know what this image reminds me of? It reminds me of the banality of evil. It reminds me of old images from after the war, when the Israelis caught, I think his name was Eichmann, and tried him in Israel, of evil, pure evil, but also of the banality of evil. I totally agree with what you said, Christian, but I didn't know how true it was. I didn't know. I have nothing to add to that. We have to protect ourselves. We have to find that spirituality in each other and connect with each other. That's what it's all about. Because they don't have access to that. Yes, Leslie.

4:19:10 Leslie Manookian:

We can all look at what's happening in Canada, I think it's a fantastic example, because 80% of the truckers in Canada have done the injection. Yet tens of thousands of them came forward and they came from all walks of life. There are people who are Native American and Sikh and white and European and you know, just a huge mix of people and they're dancing in the streets, they're cleaning up crime, they're feeding the homeless, they're, you know, celebrating freedom and joy, and just coming together joyfully. I think what they're doing shows exactly what our birthright is and what humans should be doing and how we can and should live.

4:20:03 Reiner Fuellmich:

Virginia? Sorry, Ana.

4:20:06 Ana Garner:

Thank you for confusing me with Virginia. (Laughter) What a compliment! So I wanted to say an oft-repeated phrase that I've heard over the years, which is "Be the change you want to see in the world9." So it has to start with us. That's what we're doing here, we are the change we want to see.

4:20:32 Reiner Fuellmich:

Thank you. Now... I'm sorry, Dexter, go ahead.

4:20:39 Dexter Ryneveldt:

Thank you very much. Professor Kreiss, thank you very much for your testimony. I have to say that when you started talking about spirituality, it was really a shift that I didn't anticipate. However, I want to mention the following: when we were assembling this Grand Jury, we came up with a slogan, and I will read you a slogan that is in our media statement. It says "strengthen the public conscience through natural law; injustice to one is injustice to all." So the testimony that you gave from the spirituality angle definitely coincides with what we are doing, what the Grand Jury is doing. So thank you very much for bringing it in and emphasizing it and confirming that we are on the right track. Thank you for your testimony, Professor.

4:21:42 Reiner Fuellmich:

Yes, thank you. Injustice to one is injustice to all, we can see the learned reaction to this formulation, in Canada. The truckers and the people who feed them, who give them gas, who support them. That is humanity. They don't know any of that.

Maybe we should end this session on that note. I am very, very grateful for all of you to be here. I am especially grateful to Dipali for joining us, because I know it is very late in India. I'm also very grateful to Judge Rui de Castro for staying with us for so long. But he's going

to have to summarize this, I think he'll appreciate that. Thank you very much, Christian. Thank you, Leslie, Björn, Virginia, Patrick, Dexter and Ana, thank you very, very much. That was especially important.

Several together:

Thank you all. Thank you all.

4:22:52 Ana Garner:

It was an honor Reiner and all of you to be with you,

5:22:56 Reiner Fuellmich:

And vice versa. Thank you very much!