

The Power of atural Immunity

in Preventing and Healing from COVID-19

Copyright © 2022 · Jonathan Otto and Health Secret, LLC

NOTICE OF RIGHTS: All rights reserved. Except as permitted under the United States Copyright Act of 1976, no part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the author.

DISCLAIMER: The Author and Publisher have strived to be as accurate and complete as possible in the creation of this book. While all attempts have been made to verify information provided in this publication, the Author and Publisher assumes no responsibility for errors, omissions, or contrary interpretation of the subject matter herein. Any perceived slights of specific persons, peoples, or organizations are unintentional. In practical advice books, like anything else in life, there are no guarantees of results. Readers are cautioned to rely on their own judgment about their individual circumstances and to act accordingly. This book is an educational guide that provides general health information. The materials are "as is" and without warranties of any kind either express or implied. The book's content is not a substitute for direct, personal, professional medical care and diagnosis. None of the protocols (including products and services) mentioned in the book should be performed or otherwise used without clearance from your physician or healthcare provider. The information contained within is not intended to provide specific physical or mental health advice, or any other advice whatsoever, for any individual or company and should not be relied upon in that regard. While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy, these contents should not be construed as medical advice, professional diagnosis, opinion, or treatment to you or any other individual, and are not intended as a substitute for medical or professional care or treatment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
The Real Agenda Behind the COVID-19 Pandemic	2
Dr. Henry Ealy	2
Profiting from the Panic	6
Dr. Bryan Ardis	6
Population Control	7
Dr. Bryan Ardis	7
The International Pandemic Treaty - A State of Worldwide Tyranny	9
Sayer Ji 1	1
Mary Holland 2	21
Conclusion 2	25
About Jonathan Otto 2	26

INTRODUCTION



By now it's no secret that the government has used the COVID-19 pandemic to take full control of people's lives and to push a much bigger agenda to get people to take their vaccines. From forcing social isolation and mandating continuous mask-wearing to mandating dangerous and highly experimental vaccines.

The concerning part of this all is how countries around the world have followed the example of the Chinese government, creating a uniform approach to the so-called pandemic. They've ignored the unethical nature of their mandates and the harm they've caused their people and continue to force people to comply with their regulations.

The reality is that this is the beginning of the One World Government Health Treaty because the global government believes that they've been able to get away with their coercive behavior.

Both the government and Big Pharma companies have been exempt from any liability relating to the injuries and deaths that the COVID jabs are causing. And apart from that, the government, Big Pharma, medical authorities, the media, the military, and other officials have all worked together to enforce their larger agenda.

They've manipulated people by threatening their livelihood and their education. And as a result, many have accepted these harmful mandates and have suffered. This pandemic is not about a virus, it's about the global government stripping people of their human rights in an attempt to carry out their agenda to cause harm and profit from the panic.

It's clear that this is just the start of something much bigger and it's time for people to stand together to oppose the government's oppressive rule. Throughout this eBook, we'll analyze the government's real regime and the current developments around their agenda. By being aware of their plans, we are better prepared to stand up for rights, especially our right to medical freedom.

THE REAL AGENDA BEHIND THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

The so-called COVID pandemic is often referred to as the plandemic because there's an overwhelming amount of evidence that points to how it was all orchestrated. The motives behind it are completely inhumane and the global government has made it clear that profit and control matter more to them than the lives of their people.

There are also signs that this is a precursor to something bigger. With many people, groups and experts around the world calling the government out for their tyrannical behavior, they've been forced to drop mandates and much more. But the fight is far from over and there's a good chance they're planning something worse than COVID to manipulate the adult population into getting vaccines.



One of our experts, Dr. Henry Ealy is a huge advocate who is actively fighting against the injustices of this pandemic. He shares insight into the real agenda and talks about part of his journey in filing his grand jury petition.

Dr. Henry Ealy

My cup flows over seeing you here and having a chance to speak with you about this. You know, for me, all of this was before COVID started way back on March 12th, 2020. We had been anticipating for years that they were gonna push a "Go" button, we didn't know what it was, but there were so many hints coming out, that there was gonna be this pandemic. There was gonna be this crisis, this global crisis. And, you know, it's very interesting to me, when you have people who play the role of Nostradamus, you know, 'cause it's like, "How could you know that? How could you predict that?" Well, it's not hard to predict, if you're the one manufacturing the bioweapon if you've worked on it and you've put everything in place.

So, we saw on March 12th, that coming up, the thing was, let's start tracking and seeing if this is actually... Let's look at the data and let's let the data guide us. We had got our hands on some very bad data in China. And so, it was like, "This isn't looking right" 'cause we started building curves. We wanted to see how long was the rise gonna be in cases and hospitalizations and deaths. And, when could we expect it to reasonably fall? So after that, we looked at the Italian data and the Italian data was pristine. It showed us a very clear curve of what to expect. And the Italian data was coming in a couple of weeks ahead of the United States. So, it allowed us to kind of look at it and go, "Okay, we kind of have an understanding of what we're expecting here."

But then, when we looked at the United States data and we started plotting it, something very interesting happened on the new cases. The cases rose, and then they began to fall, but then they started to take an exponential rise

again. And that was like, "Okay, that's not supposed to happen. We haven't seen that happen in other countries, even in the China data, that was bad, we haven't seen that." So, we had to explain why, and that's where we went and we started delving into the CDC's data and seeing that they had adopted certain changes to what constitutes a COVID case. And they did it without public comment. They did it without notifying the Office of Management and Budget that they're required to do, or the Federal Register. They basically broke the law. They broke 3 major federal laws. And, so this was the first sign that, "Hey, they're publishing fraudulent data here and we have to understand and track this so that we can do something about it." But we didn't know at that time what to do about it.

We alerted a bunch of elected officials that, "Hey, there's something very wrong here." And nobody responded. I got on Zoom calls with some heads of State Health Departments. They weren't aware of it and they didn't want to hear anything about it. We approached them also with, "Hey, why aren't you issuing guidance on Vitamin D and nutrition and things of that?" They wanted nothing to do with that. So, it just started feeling very odd. Something was very wrong here because they were telling us, "We're all in this together", right?

So, we ended up publishing some papers to show and say, "Look, we got to bring this information out to the public. They have to be aware of this." And the climate was so volatile, so hostile. Nobody wanted to hear it. It was, if you're not towing this line that the CDC and the government has made up, then you are a bad American. You're a bad citizen. I'm like, "Wait a minute. When did we stop asking questions?" Right? So, we end up publishing a peer-reviewed paper on the death certificates and USA Today picks it up and they try to vilify us and everything, but they couldn't, or they couldn't tack anything that we had put in the paper. So, we started doing, "What's the remedy? How do we solve this problem?"

And, one of my co-authors said, "Well, why don't we send this to a grand jury? If the elected officials won't listen, if the federal agencies won't listen. And of course, they're obviously involved in this on some level, where's a potential remedy for the people." Well, you can't really go through the courts for a civil or a criminal act because we've seen everything that's gone on with that. I mean, there was such a fight just to get a stay of execution in the Supreme Court. And, you saw that even the Supreme Court, Chief Justice Sotomayor was citing statistics that didn't exist. I mean, she was woefully uninformed sadly, and yet she's gonna be making a decision that's gonna impact hundreds of millions of people, right?

So, you know, we saw this, we said, "What's the remedy?" The remedy is, for us, the grand jury system. It's something that has acquired cobwebs and a lot of dust, but it still exists in this country. And the grand jury system has as much power as the judicial system. And better than that, it's made up of regular people. So, you're rolling the dice a little bit because you don't know whether you're getting somebody who's biased, but the duty of the grand jury is to investigate all allegations of criminal activity. And so, what we did was, we put together a petition, and the way you're supposed to be able to access that system is to notify a US Attorney in a district, in a particular state.

So, what did we do? We paid our own money and we sent out paper copies and electronic copies to every single US Attorney in the country in 2020. We got zero responses. Not one response. We couldn't believe it, but it wasn't

shocking, but it was still kind of like, "Wow, not one response?" We reached out to the Trump administration. We know that they reviewed some of our executive summaries, not one question from them about what was going on because we were telling them that, "Hey, this has potential impact on the election. This is giving the justification for these changes and how we are voting." And, it could really open the door for some fraud in there as well. Now, whether that's happened or not, people on that side of it are gonna have to determine, but the potential was there.

We got no response. So, this starts becoming very concerning. It's kind of like that Leonardo DiCaprio movie, Don't Look Up. You're warning people that there is this big thing coming to take us out and nobody seems to care. What do we need to do to get you to care? 2021 rolls around and Senator Dennis Linthicum and Senator Kim Thatcher, 2 senators in Oregon contacted us and said, "Hey, we've been hearing about some of the stuff you're doing. What is it, what's going on?" I said, "Well, I don't want you to take my word for it. What I'd like you to do is, why don't you put together a records request for these things and see what the health department and the state say about it."

So, they put the records request in. These are elected officials, these are state senators and they were denied access to those records. So, what the Oregon health authority was essentially saying is, "We have more authority than you, an elected senator and we don't have to share public information with you upon request." And that opened, I think the senator's eyes. I think they already knew there was a lot of things wrong, but they were like, "Whoa, we've never even heard of that." So, they said, "Well, what can we do?" I said, "Well, we have this petition that went nowhere. Maybe if you all sign it, we'll get somewhere." So, we retooled it a little bit and they put a beautiful cover letter on it and they championed it. And, we sent it to the US Attorney for the District of Oregon, by the name of Scott Asphaug. And, I wanna give him his credit, the honorable Scott Asphaug.

So, what ends up happening is the senators get a real taste of the obstruction. And the obstruction, the access to data that should be public. And they say, "Well, we got to do something about this." And I'm like, "Yeah, let's do something about it." So, when we put the revised petition to Scott Asphaug, what was supposed to happen is upon - See, the fundamental thing we have to understand is that in this country, in the United States, every single person has the right to petition a grand jury, every single person. In fact, the courts have been very clear about judges who have obstructed justice and prevented this process and denouncing it. We have ample case law supporting a person's right to petition. We have 18 USC 3332, which supports citizens' right to petition. It's kind of our duty when we know that there's something wrong to inform the Justice Department, to inform the legal system to remedy this, fix it. We're all supposed to participate.

We've got this misguided idea that participation in governance is relegated to election cycles every couple of years. That's all you get to do to participate. That's not the way the system was designed. So, we get this to Scott Asphaug, and what's supposed to happen is he's supposed to give it to a grand jury foreman so that they can decide whether they want to initiate deliberation or not. Instead, what he does is he sends it up to the Department of Justice and the Department of Justice starts to interact with the senators, basically telling them to kick rocks. And we go, "Wow. Well, now what?" What do you do now? You're going to the exact people who are supposed to do their duty and remedy these type of things, at least investigate them and they won't even do it.

So, we said, "Well, there's another thing we can do." Because there's multiple things you can do and we're doing it in a very specific sequence. The next thing is called a writ of mandamus or a mandamus act. And it's where you're saying to the courts, "I'm not asking you to deliberate on this petition. What I'm demanding that you do is that you get this petition to the grand jury." And that's what we filed today in federal court, we filed the petition. But specifically, with saying, there is no reason or necessity for prosecutorial discretion. You don't get to decide what the grand jury sees and what the grand jury doesn't see. That's not the way our legal system and our laws are set up to work.

The legal system and the laws are set up, so that a citizen who feels a crime has been committed, has an avenue to petition a legal entity, an authoritative entity to investigate that. And, that's where the grand jury comes in. So, what we did today, was we finally got something filed and stamped. I'm so happy about this, where we are saying to the federal courts, "We're not asking for you to decide for us. We're demanding that you hold yourself accountable to the laws that we hold sacred in this country and that you honor the citizen's right to petition a authoritative judicial body, the grand juror, and let them decide whether or not a crime has been committed." And, if they investigate and they deliberate on it, they have as much authority as any judge anywhere in the country. That's the power of the grand jury system.

This is why we got to knock the dust off and clear off the cobwebs off this system because it is a system that can protect the people, because it is by the people. With equal authority to these potentially captured, and maybe just afraid people in these positions of power, that don't wanna deal with cases of this magnitude 'cause this is a big case.

The judges, especially. They're like, "I don't want this in my courtroom. This has no standing." So, they throw it out. Whether it had standing or not, it doesn't matter. They just didn't want it in their courtroom. Too big of a fish or whatever. Who knows? And it's not for me to say, what's for me to say is, I have found significant evidence of fraud. And, I have found significant evidence that fraud has led to ill-gotten gains by a great many people in this country that are profiting off the fraud. And, in this country, we have laws against that. In this country, that's wrong. So, my duty to my country is to bring that to light and that's what we're doing. And we're doing it the right way, peacefully through the existing legal remedies that we have at our disposal. Now, we might get more obstruction of justice. We might get a court saying, "Well, this doesn't have any standing." Well, yes it does. It has a lot of standing, but that's not for you to decide your honor. Your duty is to present this to the grand jury and let them take over from there. And, that's why this is a potentially powerful remedy.

And, like I was talking about earlier today, maybe this doesn't work this time, but we're gonna come and do it again. And we are going to get to the right state, the right federal district court, the right people. And we're gonna make sure that this is heard and gets a fair investigation. An independent, transparent investigation into it, where we aren't beholden to people with biases or fear or even corporate capture. We are doing our duty as Americans to preserve freedom for all and freedom forever. And, we're doing it the right way. We're doing it peacefully within the construct of the system as it exists.

PROFITING FROM THE PANIC

The pandemic led to huge profits for many of the role players who carried it out. Many of our experts have shared shocking information about how people who have pushed the pandemic at the expense of others have received financial compensation for doing so. Hospitals, for example, were incentivized to misdiagnose COVID in order to falsify the real number of COVID cases and COVID-related deaths as a fear mongering tactic. Additionally, Dr. Ardis shares that hospitals have also been incentivized to give COVID patients a lethal drug called Remdesivir as an act of mass murder.

Dr. Bryan Ardis

The hospital, since the pandemic started in 2020, have now been set up with procedures and protocols that are actually incentivized by our federal government and health agencies. The hospitals are being bought off to follow through on all COVID-19 protocols. They're getting bonuses to diagnose you with COVID-19, test you for COVID 19, treat you for COVID-19, vaccinate you for COVID-19. This is what they're set up to do. You just don't know that.

Ivermectin's on the NIH's list of approved under evaluation drugs during this pandemic. It's on the list with remdesivir, but ivermectin has no renal toxicity or liver toxicity. So my question is, is why would all hospitals only be using remdesivir which causes heart failure, kidney failure, and liver failure? Why? This is why, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is incentivizing all hospitals with a 20% bonus payout if they'll just drug all Medicare-aged COVID-19 hospitalized patients with remdesivir instead of the other drugs on that NIH chart.

This is the actual link on CMS.gov's website, The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid services. Under the Cares Act, you'll see here NCTAP claims are those that are eligible for the 20% bonus payout under the 37110 section-3710 Section of the Cares Act. And then, it gives you the codes for this. There's 2 bullet points that are eligible for all Medicare age treated COVID-19 patients hospitalized in America. If you get a diagnosis of COVID-19, Medicare will pay the hospitals, just with a diagnosis, a 20% bonus payout. And they give you the codes here on this chart for all hospitals. Second bullet point, these are the codes for using remdesivir. If you'll just drug our Medicare age patients with remdesivir instead of ivermectin or any other drugs, we'll give you a 20% bonus payout.

I call that murder for hire, personally. You're incentivizing hospitals to use a drug that causes acute kidney failure, liver failure, and heart failure instead of a drug like ivermectin that's FDA-approved and has been for 20 years now, that has no side effects of heart failure, kidney failure, and liver failure. I find this very criminal and I hold this individual responsible. Not only is Anthony Fauci, in my mind, the greatest serial killer of all time on American soil. He's doing it right now too, during this entire COVID pandemic. This is his accomplice, number 2, and they should be prosecuted, I believe. This is Chiquita Brooks-LaSure, she is the head administrator of Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, and everyone should be demanding her resignation and then prosecute her for murder for hire for all hospitals. That is my personal opinion. If remdesivir is the cure-all, be-all, savior for all COVID-19 hospitalized patients in America, why in the world is any organization compensating hospitals with a bribe of a 20% bonus payout to drug innocent Americans with that one drug? If it's really so safe and it is so effective, why do we have to bribe hospitals to use it with an additional payout? Makes no sense to me. Shouldn't make any sense to you either.

POPULATION CONTROL



Apart from incentivising hospitals and mandating the deadly drug called Remdesivir, there are many other signs that population control has been on the COVID agenda. We've got extremely deadly vaccines that are causing injuries and deaths around the world. The global government's response has done nothing but harm people and cause suffering. Dr. Ardis shares his insight on this topic.

Dr. Bryan Ardis

When I did the grand jury, I don't know if you know this, but Dr. Reiner Fuellmich is doing a grand jury right now worldwide. Their third grand jury hearing, the third day was over medical malpractice. And I was asked on Sunday, to be the doctor to start the medical malpractice around COVID-19. At the end of my 1-hour presentation of research and documents about how they're killing people around the world, using drugs in hospitals and in the nursing homes, in multiple countries, and sedative drugs to sedate people and kill them, at the end of it, the actual judge asked me, he said, "Dr. Ardis, is it your opinion that they are actually putting all these protocols in place to cause massive amounts of death and injury?" And my answer is this, I actually said it verbatim, "This is textbook eugenics, your honor." And it is.

There is a superior group of individuals who believe there are other groups of people that are inferior and do not belong. And they have for decades, millennia probably, they have targeted these individuals with an attempt to wipe them out, target them, single them out, and judge them, discriminate against them. And they're doing it right now in all aspects of COVID as well. Blacks and Hispanics are not at high risk than white people are. Do not believe that hype. You're all at risk for them being able to attempt to kill you and murder you with all of these drugs. They just happen to be the 2 races that are the most hesitant and distrusting. And they should be, and they should continue to be that way. And that was my warning for all of them right now.

Jonathan Otto: Wow. It's like the truth is hidden in plain sight. They are at risk. They are potentially at most risk right now because the crosshair is on them. And so, it's not because the disease is more likely to kill you. It's because we're going after you and we're propagandizing you right now, so we're actually telling you the truth. You are the most at risk right now. But it's absolutely uncanny. And I appreciate you speaking specifically like that to the judge so that it doesn't get caught in, "Oh, well, if only they would run some better tests on this, and if only they would perfect the vaccine." And it gets us barking up the wrong tree.

You have to discern black from white, and I'm not talking about skin color. I'm talking about color, or I'm talking about being able to distinguish what is genocide, what is not, because otherwise, we're going to continue to get trapped in different circumstances and we're not gonna respond appropriately. So, that's very insightful. Thank you for that. That is very interesting. So, you don't necessarily think there's any engineering of biological weapons, well



COVID is arguably a biological weapon and the vaccines were biological weapons. And with the history of a program like MK Ultra with germ warfare, there was an interest in biological weapons and race-specific biological weapons, and these things were being conducted. And there were soldiers that were confessing that these things were being done in China, but then they confess later, "No, we just said that under duress because we were captured" and things like that. But if you read their emotion, you really think that when they're giving their testimonies, that they felt responsible for dumping germ warfare on the Chinese. So, we see some of these examples in history. What do you think in regards to is there- Or is it just everyone? Is it indiscriminate? What do you think?

Dr. Bryan Ardis: Number 1, when I said eugenics, there's superiors in the realm of definition of eugenics, it is there's a group of people who believe they're superior to other groups of people who are inferior as they see them. So, throughout this pandemic, they first targeted the elderly. In the UK, for example, they used the combinations of midazolam and morphine and went into nursing homes of people who were not sick, and they injected them with these 2 toxic drugs, and they killed over 40,000 people in 2 months in nursing homes. And then, the chief coroner of the UK told every single person who was overseeing those deaths to call every single one of them COVID-19, when none of them had COVID-19.

THE INTERNATIONAL PANDEMIC TREATY -A state of worldwide tyranny

The Council authorized the start of negotiations for an international pandemic treaty that navigates the world's response to future pandemics. The go-ahead for negotiations was given in March 2022.

According to the Council of the European Union, the intergovernmental negotiating body, tasked with drafting and negotiating this international instrument, will hold its next meeting by 1 August 2022, to discuss progress on a working draft. It will then deliver a progress report to the 76th World Health Assembly in 2023, with the aim to adopt the instrument by 2024.

The international pandemic treaty is aimed at dealing with future pandemics by:

- Ensuring higher, sustained, and long-term political engagement at the level of world leaders of states or governments
- Defining clear processes and tasks
- Enhancing long-term public and private-sector support at all levels
- Fostering integration of health matters across all relevant policy areas

Why is the International Pandemic Treaty a Concern?

There are a few major concerns about such an agreement and it's obvious that this is a step toward a one-world order and it will monopolize the healthcare system. One of the biggest threats this poses is that countries will lose their independence to navigate pandemics on their own terms and will be forced to implement the same approach as the rest of the world. Even if these are oppressive and dangerous.

By coming together as a global government, it'll become much harder for people to stand against their oppressive rule. Not only will the treaty dictate the mandates for future pandemics, but it'll also strip us of our right to medical freedom.

The WHO (World Health Organisation) will essentially have the power to implement vaccine mandates and passports throughout the world. This doesn't only give them power over our medical decisions but it'll impact every aspect of our lives.

They'll have the power to dictate who gets to work, go to school, socialize and go to public places, and more. It'll give them the power to make it impossible to live life without following their mandates. It will be the end of democracy for many countries.

The World Council for Health recently addressed their concerns about WHO's international treaty pandemic in an open letter that states:

The proposed WHO agreement is unnecessary, and is a threat to sovereignty and inalienable rights. It increases the WHO's suffocating power to declare unjustified pandemics, impose dehumanizing lockdowns, and enforce expensive, unsafe, and ineffective treatments against the will of the people.

Another concern is that the WHO will use the international pandemic treaty to impose its rules on other areas of healthcare as well. Some of the recommendations proposed include surveillance systems that would link to each country's national health system; the implementation of universal digital vaccination certificates and guidelines on how each member country would be paying fees to the World Health Organization.

The WHO's response is authoritative and countries who oppose their pandemic treaty are likely to be denied any financial aid in the case of a future outbreak or worse. A clear example of the lengths the WHO is willing to go to in order to get countries to comply with their oppressive power-play tactics is the murder of the president John Magufuli of Tanzania, and the president of Burundi, Pierre Nkurunziza after they refused to enforce lockdown restrictions and mandate vaccines in their country.

According to an article published by Life Site News, President Magufuli made headlines for defying the global narrative and response to COVID-19 since the virus was found in Tanzania. He rejected closing churches, calling on people to pray to God instead of being afraid.

He supposedly died from heart disease. What's disturbing and likely not a coincidence is that Burundi President Pierre Nkurunziza died after suffering a cardiac arrest. His death was also described as sudden.

What's also suspect is that both presidents appeared to show signs of recovery right before their sudden deaths. According to an article published by The Guardian, according to a statement, President Pierre Nkurunziza's health improved on Sunday but "surprisingly, on the morning of Monday, June 8, 2020, his health suddenly deteriorated and he had a heart attack.

According to an article published by Eyewitness News, President Magufuli had first been briefly admitted to the Jakaya Kikwete Cardiac Institute on March 6, but was subsequently discharged only to be rushed to hospital again on March 14.

It's interesting to note that the COVID vaccine is leading to many deadly cardiac events. And COVID-19 has also been shown to attack the cardiovascular system. These stories may be pointing us in the direction that perhaps COVID and the vaccine do contain snake venom and these two presidents were poisoned using the same techniques.

It's a huge concern to see what the WHO is willing to do to get countries to comply with their larger agenda. And one thing is for certain, the implementation of the International Pandemic Treaty will be the end of our right to medical freedom. And based on the harm they've already done, what comes next is unimaginable.

Our experts, Sayer Ji and attorney Mary Holland, go into detail about what the International Pandemic Treaty means for the world and the role we can play in fighting it.

Sayer Ji

Jonathan Otto:

So, when it comes to some of the big plays that are happening, Sayer, what are you seeing is the agenda right now? Where's the push, and what can we do about it? We'll get there in time, but what's some of the big issues you're seeing? I know that these words new world order get rattled around. I referred to the mask as being the uniform of the new world order. And so, there's a... What's some of this new information that's coming out that they're trying to push?

Sayer Ji:

Okay. So, it's helpful for people to understand and that the World Health Organization has been working, really behind the scenes, to create the equivalent of a One Government World Health Order, if you will. And in fact, it was back in 2021 that the World Health Assembly, which is the WHO's 194 member Health Policy Forum. They started to initiate a global process of drafting a new pandemic treaty. And so, essentially what they were doing is building off of already existing international health regulations that were drafted and ratified in 2005. It's known as the IHR, and that instrument is actually legally binding.

What that means is that the World Health Organization, in times of declared global health emergencies such as a variant of coronavirus, in the case of COVID-19, they can essentially preempt the sovereignty of these nationstates who are members, and say that, "Listen. This is a global health problem. You need to lockdown. Or you need to go ahead and surveil your citizens, or mandate testing, and/or other things such as vaccination."

So, we have basically a consolidation of power going on behind the scenes by this global bureaucratic body that actually isn't as independent and governmental as people think because they have primary funders such as the Gates Foundation, which actually was in 2021, they contributed, I think it was \$890 million from their fund to support the World Health Organization. And in fact, the World Health Organization has something called the World Health Foundation. Right? So they have the equivalent of the CDC Foundation, where they can take the money from corporations, private individuals, NGOs, which then have influence on the policies.

Now they wouldn't admit this, but clearly, that's the conflict of interest challenge in this day and age, is if you follow the money, you find that there are billions of dollars that are being exchanged behind the scenes, ostensibly, to support the cause of global health security, and the wellbeing of this planet's inhabitants.

But we know that for the World Health Organization, and through the approach that they've taken during the so-called pandemic, is that they equate health with being injected with experimental gene-modifying technology. So, for them, vaccination is bonafide immunity, for example. This whole construct that is not evidence-based, and quite the contrary, I believe can cause many unintended adverse effects that are far worse than the threat that is being proposed.

So, fundamentally people should be aware that back in December 2021, this process was engaged, and that just recently, okay, on March 3rd, there was a major announcement, which is that they are moving forward in negotiating this treaty. And again, this treaty would legally bind member states, effectuating what is essentially a One World Government when it comes to health policy.

And as we've all seen, health policy isn't some abstract thing that happens in hospitals. It actually affects whether the everyday man and woman can go and make a living because their business might be described as non-essential. Or, maybe they're being told they need to get 4 jabs in order to make a living. So, this is not some abstract process. This is something that is gonna affect probably every human on this planet.

And yet, conspicuously, there is silence on the matter. If you go and look at the news aggregators and you type in pandemic treaty, you'll find a couple articles, all positively spun. But you won' actually get to the heart of the matter, which is that we are losing our sovereignty as a nation by our participation in the World Health Organization and this agenda. And by virtue of that fact, all our civil liberties, our human rights, our individual right to determine what happens to our bodies are also basically being destroyed by this process. So, this is a really important issue, and I'm really glad you're helping me to get the word out about it.

Jonathan Otto: Thank you, Sayer. Man. So, when George Bush Sr. Said, "It's a big idea." I believe this was 1994. "It's a big idea, a new world order, where all states come together, or all states or countries come together in one common cause." Yeah. "Where all countries come together in one common cause." He may say states, but it's inclusive of countries. "Only the United States has the moral power and the means to back it up."

And so, when he was talking about these things when we look on the \$1 bill and it says Novus ordo seclorum, new order of the ages. Right? And then that Inuit, the top two words mean basically an oath of secrecy to create a One World Order or a new world order. So, these kinds of ideas have been very much toted, spoken about in the past. It appears that secret societies- Again, I'm getting to a deep level here, have been pushing these things.

But, whether someone wants to see that or not, on the very surface level, the verbiage that is being used in this treaty is in fact, the words new world order, but it's just got some other words in between it. But it's basically just letting you know so that it's like its own virtue-signaling amongst the elites of saying, "This is what this is. Make sure you support this. This is part of the New World moving forward." So, it's so important for people to know about this, and I appreciate you sharing this. I'd love you to keep sharing more, maybe even screen share if you will, to take us through it, so we can see it face-to-face if possible.

Sayer Ji: So yeah, what I could do is probably do a little screen share here. Let's see. Share, and go ahead and share the screen. Okay so, really quick, we reported on this on GreenMedInfo, and interestingly, there is a analytical piece here that was published in 2020, which was actually titled The International Health Regulations: The Threat of Popularism and COVID-19 Pandemic. And so, what they were talking about in this academic paper was actually that there is a need, this was their argument, for a new global public health world order.

So, they're using this phrase "the new global public health world order" as if it's the answer to all that stands in the way of humanity being in peace and disease-free and working in harmony. And so, there is something to be said then about you referencing this sort of subculture of conspiracy theory around there being some secret group of elites that are trying to create really, a pyramidal control structure, where there's only a couple people on top that are pulling the strings.

And fundamentally, now we're seeing this being rolled out and discussed publicly in academic journals. Now, in this particular paper which was published in the BMC journal, Globalization and Health, they were actually making the argument that the 2005 International Health Regulations, which are now internationally binding as a legal instrument on the 194 member nations of the World Health Organization, isn't strong enough because of popularism, or the resistance among those who ask very simple questions, such as myself.

Initially, I went to the World Health Organization page on mask and community-acquired respiratory illness transmission. And they had a white paper there discussing how it made no sense to mask the public the way that they ultimately did recommend the entire world do so because the masks actually might increase the transmission of a community spread respiratory virus because they're fomites. Right? They accumulate biological debris. They're dirty. There's just no evidence to support this.

So, in that circumstance, you can look at the most respected health organization, right, among conventional folks; and their own papers on the topic were saying, "No, this is a bad idea." But of course, it all became extremely political; and they rolled the agenda out, mandated the masks. And this is the type of policy that they're now trying to institutionalize and make permanent, to the point where if a member nation doesn't follow suit when the World Health Organization declares a new scare, a new variant, whatever it may be, real or imagined, then there'll be severe restrictions put on them, which includes things like sanctions and penalties.

And this is unfortunately why there is a lot of problems here with a One World Government, isn't there? When you have just a few individuals whose funding actually comes from corporations and these massive billionaire funds. They're the ones who are calling the shots. It's not evidence, it's not published, peer-reviewed science. It is arbitrary, and ultimately, those agendas are what is pulling the string.

So, when we see them come out of the gates, declare that they're gonna create a new pandemic treaty because they've already told us that there are going to be more pandemics. There's going to be an infinite number of variants, and of course, they've already set things up where they're developing all these new vaccines in anticipation. This is a pretty bleak picture if we allow them to do this without oversight and public discussion, and an opportunity for us to be able to look closely at what it is they are proposing.

So ultimately, Jonathan, it's because of events like this, people like yourself, the listeners, that we're gonna have an opportunity. This isn't just gonna get rubber-stamped. We're gonna be able to discuss it openly. And because we have national sovereignty, we have a constitution, for example, that cannot be preempted by this bureaucratic body, unless of course, this rolls on forward without us saying anything about it, without us going ahead and taking a positive action. So, that's why we're having this conversation now.

Jonathan Otto: Thank you, Sayer. I appreciate your commentary on this. And, I feel like you're able to explain some of these concepts of understanding how an agenda like a one-world government, like mass surveillance, like controlling people's behaviors from what goes into their body, potentially they obviously, from what we understand, with even the intention to harm. Some deeper agendas that we probably won't hypothesize on at this point, even though perhaps we can give a teaser at some point during this conversation, of why we think this is happening so that people can kind to try to align with some of the values that maybe are the real values that are being attacked here.

Because the freedom of thought and the ability for us to be loving, healthy, happy human beings in families that are self-autonomous, under the- on the basis of people's religious views, but under their own conscience and relationship with God, however, they understand these things. The freedom to practice such things is all part of the beauty and importance of what we really have and cherish and hold dear, what wars have been fought over in the past and presently.

So, I appreciate that the fact that we're really bringing these two worlds together here, in terms of freedom, what we stand for, what we've been, you know, basic, good patriotism and self-sovereignty and autonomy, even as a - These are very deeply Christian values among other religions and faiths as well, and then you have this medical issue and they're obviously trying to take a fear that people have, and then loop people and push people into this agenda. Any commentary you have on some of the thoughts that I put forward there?

Sayer Ji: Yeah. I think it's really important for people to understand. I'll just share the screen real quickly here, is that ultimately, when it comes down to it, what we witnessed in the 2 years of the declared international health emergency, was there was a manipulation of death statistics, such that they changed the ICD codes for emergencies so that if you had someone walk into a hospital or get brought in, and there was no virus test that was administered, there's no confirmation that they have any unique type of viral infection, all it took was suspicion of infection, and you could write them off as dead from COVID.

So, what's happened, is that after millions of people were labeled dead from COVID without actual evidence, they have consolidated these statistics. So right now, the World Health Organization is using this statistic of 6.2 million people having died from COVID-19. Right? Not with COVID-19, not as a bystander, right? Meaning you could sample the microbiome, which includes the virome of a human, and probably find any number of sequences that overlap with what they're calling COVID-19. It doesn't matter. They didn't even try that. They didn't even try it. They basically just used suspicion of infection as their criteria. So now, they're consolidating that-

Jonathan Otto: Something like Epstein-Barr or glandular fever, or cytomegalovirus, very common types of viral infections that people could be carrying and people could basically be then pointed to, "Oh, well, Jonathan died of Epstein-Barr." Even though me having it is not a sign of that it caused my death.

Sayer Ji: That's exactly it. You could have been a lifetime smoker. You could have been exposed goes to radiation. You could have had any number of health challenges, but they claim that one invisible particle that they're not even testing for because they changed the ICD code requirements, killed you. And that's what the World Health

Organization presently has welded into their narrative, which is that 6.2 million people died from COVID-19, which requires that they accrue more power and more centralization of decision-making on the planet for what happens when a new pandemic is "rolled out" or declared.

So, as many of you are aware, thanks in part to the work you're doing, in October of 2019 in New York City, there was an event called Event 201, which was sponsored by the Gates Foundation, World Economic Forum, Hopkins Health. And all of these organizations went ahead, and they ran a live pandemic exercise involving a novel form of coronavirus, and basically scripted out and acted out the very thing that would happen right after that.

So, that's why some out there have criticized this as a plandemic, right? As a scamdemic, as not based on actual reality, because they never again used evidence the way you should to inform health policies and then of course, come up with a narrative based on statistics that are based in reality. They didn't do that.

But what they're doing, is they're taking that narrative, which again was baseless, and now they're stacking the bodies high. "This was 6.2 million people died. We have to make sure that next time, we declare," meaning the World Health Organization declare, and whoever's pulling the strings behind them, the shadowy money influence, "that we will be the ones who will tell you what will happen next."

And we all saw what happened over the past 2 years. Right? The largest transfer of wealth and power in human history, which was barely reported on. So, this is the unfortunate danger of this further consolidation of the WHO's power. And this is why we need together to raise awareness. In fact, what I would love to do, Jonathan is to share the campaign that we have.

Jonathan Otto: Please do. Yeah. That'd be good.

Sayer Ji: Yeah. Because the thing is, it's one thing to hear this development. It's sort of upsetting but another thing to know that there's a lot we can do, which is Stand for Health Freedom, a nonprofit organization has put together a campaign, which was rolled out yesterday, and actually, it already has 20,000 signatures, which is important.

Jonathan Otto: That's awesome.

Sayer Ji: Because the goal is 100,000, which will then be sent to lawmakers and the president, and will be a direct reflection of how important it is that they know that this issue is extremely important to us. That our sovereignty as a nation, and therefore as individuals, is on the line, literally, as the World Health Organization goes ahead and starts welding together this new treaty.

So together, we can send a very clear message that this is not acceptable. If you believe in parental rights, informed consent, bodily sovereignty, you wanna be able to travel freely in this country and between countries, trade with other countries, or have a business yourself in this country. This is what the World Health Organization's new treaty would effectively give them the power to interfere with. And that is why this is such an important issue. So, go ahead and click the link, take the action. It only takes a few seconds. And I think together, we'll have quite an impact on raising awareness about how important this issue really is.

Jonathan Otto: Thank you, Sayer. And I think that when people do that, they take the time to take a few seconds to sign it, it's a great feeling of knowing you're part of the solution. You've taken the time to do that. A lot of people will want certain things, get angry about certain things, maybe complain to their friends and family of all the rights and liberties that have been taken away; but what do we do? And it's what we do that matters and then that's what counts.

And then the other thing is, once people do that and sign that, then they can send that, we encourage you to send that to your friends and family. Encourage them to do it; certainly, those that are believers in what you understand and believe, send it to those people. That's your tribe, and invite them to be a part of it.

The other guys, maybe send them something like my series or something else that is gonna help them to get on board with us and help stand for them. 'Cause, we're standing for them when we do these things, which is a beautiful thing. We stand for those that oppose us because they don't wanna live in a world that they're trying to, and helping and then brainwash to create it. But they don't even want to live in that world. No one wants to live in that world. It's a terrible world; which then makes you start thinking about dark forces or dark energy or dark entities that are orchestrating such events. Because who in their right mind would want this reality? Who wants to live in that and why?

Sayer Ji: Yes.

Jonathan Otto: What do you think? Well, how would you answer that?

Sayer Ji: Well, I think that we're in a beautiful moment, where after going through the past 2 years and seeing the agendas unfold and ultimately fall apart, we are starting to see a lot of people really wake up to what's going on. And you know, ultimately, is still up to us to go ahead, inform ourselves, and share information that is going to actually reflect real issues. And this is a moment where we can learn from the past 2 years, continue to stand up for ourselves and to make our voices heard.

And so, I think that ultimately- You know, in the past, before the days of the internet, this sort of thing happened all the time. Big power grabs would happen, and no one would even know. But we live in a different moment. We have the internet. We are still free in that regard. We have information being shared, and this is a really beautiful thing.

So, it's by no means about telling someone what to do. It's more about informing them of the issues, seeing that there's a real downside, to say it lightly, to what's happening with the World Health Organization. Do you want an international board to make the decisions for your health, for your family, for your child? Do you want them determining what gets injected into them so that they can move freely around the world or make a living?

This is fundamentally what the World Health Organization is wanting and they're doing it because they're saying that they care so much about your health. You know, I always think about this, Jonathan, if these international organizations cared so much about the health and well being, especially of those in really underdeveloped and

poor nations, they would send them all the best vaccine ever invented, right, which is safe food, safe water. This would be a sign that they really care about the health of the world, you know.

And this is to me what, you know, is... we're in this huge transition, where people are waking up, they're seeing now clearly. "No, this isn't really just about health, if at all. And that instead, it's about control. It's about power." And in so far as we're seeing, that's about us standing up and taking actions, you know, being a bit brave here, and going ahead and say things that are gonna be a little uncomfortable perhaps to those who aren't aware. But that's the risk you take when you're really trying to do good

Jonathan Otto: I appreciate you sharing some of the underpinnings there of how we relate as an entire world to other, one, those that are suffering and in poverty in our own countries and those abroad in other countries because that so often gets taken out of the equation as if those people just didn't matter. And, it is one of the greatest signs, the fact that there is so little empathy and love because it's like we have to get very good at discerning what is love and what is counterfeit. And it's interesting, the Bible talks about that. It compares counterfeit love to brass. It looks very similar to gold, but it's brass, and it is of no value, comparatively.

But this is just the hypocrisy that we face and we see it so frequently that it becomes normalized, but we need to rise above that and really think about that. You look at the history of nations, the rise and fall of nations throughout millennia, has actually been in trend with how they treat their poor. When you see society to lack empathy, and you see them disregard those that suffer in their communities, that's when you see them actually get overtaken by the neighboring societies; because they cease to be of any actual value, and they are too controlled by their indulgences and their own desires versus on standing and interest in right, and what is best for others.

Sayer Ji: Alright. So, now here you can see the document itself; and then people can go to the website there to see it. So, some of the key points here: "Together, with WHO Director-General Dr. Tedros, we have proposed an international treaty on pandemics rooted in the WHO constitution. We need to create an environment where every scientist, health worker, and government can band together for a common cause, working together to build new solutions to protect what is most precious, our health and our lives.

Jonathan Otto: It sounds very good.

Sayer Ji: Yeah. I would also just point out, this is the second-ever special session called in the entire history of the WHO. So, this should be international headlines. Right? This is a huge, huge deal. But there's a conspicuous silence, and we've all seen this happen during the pandemic, how they love to just go ahead and distract and create these very catastrophic scenarios, and get the public's attention, while other things are going on behind the scenes. Well, this is another example of that; and that's why it's on us to go ahead and take this very seriously and help share the information and raise awareness. Because they're really trying to not get much attention on this right now.

Jonathan Otto: Interesting. So, they do it, but then not get too much attention, so it just goes forward. And then silence is being complicit in it.

Sayer Ji: Well, here's an example, Jonathan, it's like, I was personally targeted, as you've seen, in the past year and a half, as being one of the so-called Disinformation Dozen. Right? So, 1 of 12 people claimed to have been responsible for the majority of the misinformation about vaccines on social media, which of course it was later found out that was not true. And only 0.05% of vaccine-related content on Facebook was even linked to our accounts, and it wasn't even "anti-vaccine." So, it didn't matter.

There was huge amounts of resources put into this psychological operation, to make it seem as if I was Satan incarnate. Right? And so, you can see that they have the power to push any agenda or narrative they want through the media. And the fact that this is one of the most important, most historical of all meetings, to consolidate power and basically reconstruct the global governance system of the world around biosecurity being the only concern really at this point, preempting all other concerns, all rights of all member nations. If there's a new variant declared, guess what? Lockdown. And this time, there's not going to be as much wiggle room. That's basically what they're saying. They want more power, more centralization and more, you know, it's more of an affirmation of the one world government concept. And that's happening right now before our eyes. So again, make note that the fact that there's almost no coverage on this indicates just how badly they want this to pass.

Jonathan Otto: Hmm. Wow. Thank you for sharing that. I just wanna detail a couple of points here before you go. An historic move, 29th of November, the 1st of December, 2021, I guess. So, as you were mentioning, it's the second time in WHO history that they met a second time in the same year; and that is to assess the benefits of developing a pandemic treaty, launch negotiations. Over 110 countries supported the decision to launch negotiations for a WHO Convention Agreement, or other international instruments on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response.

3rd of March, so this is the date you're referring to, the Council of the European Union gives the green light to start negotiations for the conclusion of an international agreement on pandemic. So, the fact that the European Union has agreed to this is certainly a very sad reality, and something that we should be protesting against, correct? The fact that that step happened.

Sayer Ji: Yeah. Well, once again, if we have any autonomy, any sovereignty as a nation, it's because we have things like the constitution, and we have principles related to basic human rights like we believe in informed consent when it comes to medical decisions. But what's gonna happen is that this international agreement, being that it's legally binding, will preempt those laws and rights associated with them. So, that is what's at stake here. And, you know again, it's extremely important that people know this and take action accordingly.

Jonathan Otto: Yep. And then you've got... What are the potential benefits? Political engagement at leaders' level and global inclusivity via a new legally binding agreement rooted in the WHO constitution, approved equity and access to quality medical countermeasures, vaccines, therapeutics, and diagnostics, you know, PCR tests, gene therapy, marketed vaccines with zero testing, or probably a lot of testing in previous years, and then rolled out to us unsuspecting civilians. Establish principles, priorities, and targets to help countries better prepare for and respond to future pandemics, sharing of monitoring data, genetic data, samples, technology, and their associated benefits. So, no doctor-patient confidentiality when you have this broadcasted, and they have power over you,

like you could have some kind of information that you really don't want public. They have the power over that, correct?

Sayer Ji: Right. There's no privacy. And that leads into this notion that you know, under the sort of, like, justification of early detection, or preemptive detection, that they may require some type of invasive diagnostic technology. And so, that's a big part of what's at stake here, is that where is the boundary between the state and now this global super-national body and in my own self? Is it my skin? I don't know anymore because if I wanna go into a Starbucks, right? I might need to show that I've been quadruple jabbed, and therefore really they can penetrate me. And, it's required for me to even participate in normal transactions in society. So, this is really important, that people realize that part of their plan here, which they're declaring very, very openly, is to focus on sharing of private medical data.

There is gonna be very little, if any privacy, allowed because the idea here is, of course, if you sacrifice that it's for the greater good, you know, you're gonna save grandma if you, you know, share all your medical facts. And you know, there's no privacy any longer, because that's the sort of notion is that you don't deserve it, you know, 'cause you're being selfish, because that I could put someone at risk. And that's the language they're trying to institutionalize as default narrative that we navigate reality within.

And now, that doesn't work for me, because I believe in bodily sovereignty and responsibility for my own health. And I believe no one can penetrate my body without my consent. I mean, that's pretty clear. It works in the case of rape, right? Why can't it work in the case of medical realities?

If the vaccines were bonafide safe and effective, and that was proven, that may be different. But that's not the case. They're experimental. There's no long-term safety trials. Their effectiveness is doubtful. And in fact, the argument has been made, especially recently with the Pfizer data coming out, that the risk of dying from or with COVID is far lower than the risk of dying from the vaccine. So obviously, that narrative is hard to maintain.

Jonathan Otto: Good call. No, I thank you. Yeah. That information that recently came out from Pfizer is very damning. I just went through it with Dr. James Neuenschwander last night and it's good to have your commentary on that, too. And I think, in some of our closing thoughts here, the fact that you and Dr. Henry Ealy, and we were just chatting about that earlier today through text, that the filing of that grand jury petition shows how these things progress. It goes from signatures, and then yes, we approach. And you're talking about sending this to all the lawmakers and to the President. But, you know, people will be like, "Well, what's that gonna do? That's just gonna go on deaf ears." But there's a process. Do you have any information to share on that process and plan of attack?

Sayer Ji: Well, you know, it's a great example of what Dr. Ealy and you recently participated in here, which is the filing for that federal grand jury investigation that's now active, is that these things start off as simple as petitions. And then, they actually have real-world effects that are very profound. So, don't underestimate the power of your intention and your micro-actions in making a big difference in the world.

This is a moment where we have an opportunity to literally interface with the gears of history. I mean, right now the juggernaut is locking in. They've made it very clear what their intention is. Again, this international "treaty" is legally binding, and it would preempt our nation's sovereignty, and therefore your sovereignty and individual rights. So, this is a time we have to step up. We have to make our voices heard because decisions are being made for us, our children, future generations. And by staying silent, we are actually being complicit in many ways.

Jonathan Otto: Thank you, Sayer. And I think finally, the thought that really tax on to what you're saying there, is that... Like, let's say for example, the reason why Henry Ealy, Dr. Ealy called me to say, "Hey, look. Can you come out here to Portland?" And from where I live, it was like a 12-hour flight. It was as if I was flying internationally. It was a 12-hour flight. And it was worth it for me, being the reason why it was worth it, me being there, is regardless of whatever decisions these lawmakers make, or however they come back, the fact that we're documenting their process is keeping accountability, and we're taking that to the public.

And the reason why I'm explaining that is, "Oh, no. But what if they just reject it?" Well, what if they do reject it? What if that rejection or their silence on this issue after so many appeals and the process being followed, then they actually start to lose the trust of the public.

Once the public's trust is lost in them, and they no longer want to take their products in their body, there is no new health world order. That can't roll forward without people being in agreement with it. So, we do seek to win the public domain argument, even though yeah, we get maligned. But there's so much of the world stand with us, because they see these breaches and we just need to voice these truths stronger and clearer to have people come and boycott these systems. What would you say to that?

Sayer Ji: Yeah. I totally agree. I think that this is the moment; we're in it right now. You know, we have a huge amount of opportunity to make a big difference for ourselves, for others. And it's simple. At this point, just go to Stand for Health Freedom, you know, make your voice heard. And we will, I know we will have a huge impact. It's happened before, it's happening now, and it'll happen in the future. I really feel like people are waking up finally to what it really means to be free, to respect one's body, respect one's right to informed consent. It's very basic actually, what we're talking about here. And now I think the public is - They're behind it. We're all behind this movement. So again, thank you for the opportunity to shed light on this, on what's going on.



Mary Holland

Jonathan Otto: Thank you so much, Mary. Now, coming over to the... Are you familiar with this treaty that just got published? What do you think about the treaty? I mean, it has those curious words of new world order captioned in the title of the treaty, and the World Health Organization spearheading this, and the fact that all countries would come under this, and it would certainly surrender the doctor-patient relationship. And, even countries in their own national sovereignty, and let alone the individual. Any commentary on that document, and what it could mean, and how we can fight back against that?

Mary Holland: Yeah. Well, it's a draft right now. The World Health Organization is contemplating a new treaty that would amend its constitution. Even now for decades, the World Health Organization has had international health regulations, which is in fact what sort of triggered the US to announce a public health emergency back in 2020, right? It was that the World Health Organization first announced in January 2020, there is a public health emergency of international concern, and then that triggered the US HHS secretary to say there's an emergency. So, this is very significant, right? And we know that the World Health Organization has been working literally hand in glove with the World Economic Forum. And, we know that Klaus Schwab at the head of the World Economic Forum has been talking about the fourth industrial revolution and about how we are moving by 2030, to a new world order, right? Where you will own nothing, but you will be happy, which should make everybody very nervous that somebody is telling us that they're gonna take all our property away.

I think what we've seen globally in the last 2 years, it was a global coup d'etat. I mean, you can't have 196 countries working in lockstep without there having been planning. I mean, that's clear that there was planning involved, and a lot of that coordination comes through these international health regulations at the World Health Organization. So I think we, as a health freedom advocacy community and a freedom advocacy community, we absolutely have to be paying enormous attention to this draft treaty within the World Health Organization. We also need to be paying a lot of attention, Jonathan, to the whole notion of passports, right? A vaccine or health passports, which is again in a draft form quite far along in the European Union. But even in the United States, even though there's not been an announcement of a federal passport. In fact, President Biden's spokesperson, Jen Psaki who said, "Oh no, we're not contemplating a federal credential."

27 states are already working on an interoperable vaccine credential. And, many important places like the Financial Times are already openly talking about how these passports will be the basis for digital central bank currencies. And I think we got a good glimpse of what that looks like in Ottawa a couple of weeks ago where the government was very unhappy with the truckers who were protesting and they simply froze their bank accounts, right? So, think of what that would mean if basically there's an ID for every person and they know all the information about you, where you are, what you're doing, where your bank account is. And, if your behavior is not sanctioned, poof, they basically cut you off, you are canceled, right? You can't buy anything, you can't go anywhere. That's what we're already starting to see glimpse of, that's where this goes.

And that's why it's so important for people to understand, this isn't really about COVID shots, I think they've clearly, worldwide pulled back from that right now, for the moment. But this is about a much bigger agenda

which is digital central bank currencies. The US just put out an executive order about this. This is about vaccine passports. This is about a new, much more centralized, "public-private" kind of governmental structure, which they euphemistically called stakeholder capitalism or public private partnerships. But really, we are looking at a fascist model. This is corporatism, this is where the global, incredibly, powerful corporations basically control governments. And we see that through the Bill and Melinda Gates and through his work. But, we see this through BlackRock. We see this through Vanguard, these mega global corporations, their holdings, their assets, they dwarf national GDPs, gross domestic products.

So, I think we really do have to try to take in this bigger picture, sort of a corollary to this bigger picture that is starting to really come into view, is how hard big tech and these global institutions, governments, media are struggling to censor people from explaining what's happening, and how much propaganda there is, and how much distraction there is from what's really happening. So, I think this is a time for all of us who have some glimmer that there's real efforts to change the whole structure of the global governance and global economy, we really have to be understanding what's happening and speaking out about it.

Jonathan Otto: Thank you. Now that's really, really helpful. And you've hit several points that I was hoping you'd cover. And now, with the history of some of these companies that are spearheading this, I know that some of them go back to even Nazi Germany with IG Farben.

Mary Holland: IG Farben, yeah.

Jonathan Otto: Right?

Mary Holland: Yeah.

Jonathan Otto: Is IG Farben really in essence, Merck and Sharp, are they...

Mary Holland: You know, they're predecessors. You know, I'm not the best person to speak to this, Jonathan, but what is extraordinary is the United States government, after the victory over Nazi Germany, basically the Soviets took some key executives and scientists, the US took some, the US spirited some to Latin America, but the key ones, particularly in the pharmaceutical industry and particularly in nuclear weapons technology, we brought them to the United States and we set them up, and we put them in different corporations. And this model, this thinking about the role of pharmaceuticals, that has endured in the United States. And frankly, a kind of a fascist model of corporations lobbying the government, creating these tax exempt corporations, having their lobbyists in DC, having the revolving door, all of these things are indicia of this euphemistically this kind of corporatist model, which comes right out of Nazi Germany.

Jonathan Otto: Wow. And the title of the program that you're referring to is Operation Paperclip, correct?

Mary Holland: Yes. Correct. Correct.

Jonathan Otto: Yeah. And so, it's real. And it's interesting. I was just actually researching this a little bit more yesterday, I was looking at the fact that the 3 world's wealthiest men that were all opponents of the Federal Reserve bank were given tickets to board the Titanic, but we're not gonna go into deep into conspiracies here. But, if you look that up, you'll realize that they were on the boat. And, that's a huge shame to see that there was not enough life for us, for the men, so naturally all the men would die. There were boats that were close by, but because it had white flares instead of red flares, it meant that no one came to their rescue. There were so many events that went wrong in order for that to happen. And then now, here were the greatest opponents of the Federal Reserve at the end of 1912, they're dead. Then the end of the following year, Federal Reserve bank is set up and it's used as a funding source for World War II the following year in 1914.

So, these trends are just so sad and the reality of this untold suffering that comes to humanity as a result. But, I think coming to what we can do, you are one that teaches people to stand up for their rights, from a legal perspective, what can people do to take power back into their hands to speak truth, do so in loving, ethical ways? I mean look at you, you're not sitting here, frothing at the mouth, telling me what you plan to do to the people that are doing this to you. Instead, you're with a smile on your face, speaking at events, encouraging people to put their chin up, and then move forward, and to stand for freedom regardless of circumstance or consequence. What's your message to people right now?

Mary Holland: Well my message, Jonathan, is I don't judge anybody, I really don't. I've been in this world a long time. I've been in this over 20 years and I don't judge anybody. If somebody wants to take a vaccine, it's their choice to do that. I respect that choice. But, no one ever should be coerced into taking a medical intervention that can kill them. That's the reality. No one should be coerced and you have the choice to just not comply. And, some things are more important than your job, they're more important than your child's college, or some fancy degree, or some prestigious honor. You know, conscience matters and living in conscience is a reward, there's a real satisfaction in that. And, I just encourage people to do your homework, sign up for our publication, The Defender, get educated and then read Bobby Kennedy's book, The Real Anthony Fauci, it really goes over 50 years of public health in the United States.

Really get educated and then make your own decisions and own your own decisions. And, I can't tell you that there won't be adverse consequences to your decisions, there may be adverse consequences, but I really believe that the truth will win out, we are going to win this. Mandates are wrong, they should be illegal. I think they are illegal based on international and constitutional norms, and they're unethical and they're unscientific. So, we will win this, but I can't tell you that we're gonna win it tomorrow. It's gonna take work, it really is, and it may take to divine intervention. But we will win this and I think we are on the right side of history, and I would just ask for people to join us.



Jonathan Otto: Thank you so much. And, it actually does really touch me to think that you would be willing even to say something like divine intervention. I think that that is a very profound moment in history when we have people such as yourself that are willing to just say, "Listen, let's stand according to our conscience. We're being prompted potentially by something divine to even stand for conscience. So, is it not that the prompting that we have for that is our protection, is our defense, is our greatest advocate, and power, and help in time of need? And should we not trust and surrender to that versus to keep trying to put our hope in another man?" Sometimes when people get caught into political arena and very angry and venomous against people is because they're really hoping that new person would be their savior instead of trusting in something greater than that, and yet still working through channels when we need to. But the belief in divine protection, it...

Mary Holland: There's clearly something greater than us, and these ideas, they come from somewhere of freedom and I do believe that there is a creator. And, I don't know that there's any one creed that's correct, but I do believe that it is in the nature of the human spirit that there's something beyond, there's something greater. And I think, if we connect to that sense of freedom is something that is a part of the human spirit, then we understand how essential this is. And it's really- You know, Bobby Kennedy, the chair of Children's Health Defense says on occasion is, "You know there are things worth dying for." We were, in the United States, granted a remarkable degree of liberty. And we have, as adults, we have an obligation to pass this on to the younger generation. These are the blessings of liberty that we got and it is really our ethical obligation to pass that on. And I don't know how it ends, but I do know that I believe very deeply that that is my calling, is to pass on these blessings of liberty.

Jonathan Otto: Thank you so much. And then yeah, with the freezing of people's assets in Canada and this type of thing that you brought up, it certainly brings up the reality that we need to make our appeal known to help create a reality that these things are not happening and to stand as a society and say we don't stand for these things, and so we won't be electing people that stand for these types of things.

Mary Holland: Right. We can win, we outnumber this elite by the billion, so we can win. And, I do believe that our notions of freedom and conscience are they're human values and I do believe that most people will embrace them. Our job is to make people understand what's at stake and to get them to join in the movement.

Jonathan Otto: Thank you. And I know you've got to get going, so just this last thought that I was thinking of. It seems to have some of the ringings of even something that happened 500 years ago in the 1500s, the Protestant Reformation had lots of these sentiments. The tenets of what was being talked about were the liberty of conscience, that was really the tagline for that event that happened and that was- that led up to there and then continued, which was, "I cannot go against my conscience. Here I stand, I can do no other." And, that was the rooting deep in the ground saying, "We need to stand on our conscience because it's through our conscience that we have the freedom to do good things, and to be good and loving citizens, and parents, and friends, and a community that can make a difference." Would you agree with this interaction?

Mary Holland: I agree with you, and I think it was a stand against tyranny. And we're at that same point of we have to stand up against tyranny and we can win, but it will take a lot of us.

CONCLUSION



For the longest time, we've known war. Throughout history, people have died fighting for their country, and ultimately their government. Just like in the past, the government sacrifices its people for their selfish causes. What we're facing today is no different and many people have suffered as a result of the pandemic.

But, history books repeat themselves as we see the uprising of people who are fighting back. The government cannot get away with their gross injustice. Our experts, along with many others, have been advocating for medical freedom. They're sharing the tools we need to fight against their unfolding agenda.

The key to winning this fight is to be receptive of the truth, to stand against oppressive mandates and to advocate for our right to medical freedom. The more we stand together, the stronger we are.

ABOUT JONATHAN OTTO



Jonathan Otto is an investigative journalist, natural health researcher, documentary filmmaker, and humanitarian.

He has created several highly-acclaimed, groundbreaking docuseries — **Depression, Anxiety** & **Dementia Secrets, Autoimmune Secrets, Natural Medicine Secrets, Women's Health Secrets, Autoimmune Answers, and Vaccine Secrets: Covid Crisis** — covering innovative, effective natural remedies for autoimmune disease, neurodegenerative disease, mental health, cancer, and heart disease.

These docuseries — watched by millions around the world — represent Jonathan's unceasing quest to discover the root causes of debilitating diseases by interviewing over 100 world-renowned natural medicine doctors, scientists, natural health experts, and patients.

In response to this life-saving knowledge, Jonathan created *Well of Life*, a line of doctor-formulated, 100% natural supplements specially designed to detox and fortify the body.

Jonathan's greatest reward has been hearing the testimonials from people whose lives have literally been saved with the protocols he developed.

His work has been featured in international TV broadcasts, print media, national news, and radio broadcasts. He received the awards, *Young Citizen of the Year and International Volunteer of the Year*, by the Australian government for international humanitarian contributions, which he continues to support.

Jonathan and his wife, Lori, welcomed their first son, Asher, in January 2019 and their second son, Arthur, in May 2021.