

FULL TRANSCRIPT

Sovereignty Summit 3

**“THIRD SOVEREIGNTY SUMMIT” TO EXPOSE CHALLENGES TO OUR
SOVEREIGNTY AND FREEDOM**

Bid by Secretary-General for Emergency Powers Must be Rejected

September 16, 2024

<https://sovereigntysummit.org/the-sovereignty-summit-3/>

Media File: SovSummit 3.mp4

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

FRANK GAFFNEY: [00:00:05] Welcome to the third Sovereignty Summit sponsored by the Sovereignty Coalition. I'm Frank Gaffney. I'm very pleased to be one of the co-founders, with my colleague Reggie Littlejohn, of this coalition, an extraordinary group of men and women who have come together, bringing an extraordinary array of life experiences and skill sets and a shared conviction that national sovereignty is an essential building block of a world in which freedom can exist and prosper. We're going to talk about a threat to that world based on national sovereignty and to individual freedoms, as well as national [00:01:00] sovereignty that arises most immediately from an initiative that will be unveiled next week at the United Nations General Assembly. In the course of something called the summit of the future, we will have people who have deep knowledge of the UN of this particular program and the pact for the future that is specifically intended to be advanced and, in some form or fashion, set in motion, perhaps approved, perhaps blessed in principle with a process set in motion. We'll talk about all of the implications of the various options that the UN has to advance its agenda that, at the end of the day, is about instituting world government instead of government by nations that [00:02:00] come together where they see fit to do so. In the United Nations, in the World Health Organization or otherwise. To talk a bit more about the setting for this particular event and the pact for the future, I'm very pleased to introduce as our first presenter, my colleague Reggie Littlejohn, the co-founder of our Sovereignty Coalition. As I mentioned, the woman who has founded Women's Rights Without Frontiers and more recently the Antiglobalist International. And Reggie, we're delighted to have you with us. The floor is yours.

REGGIE LITTLEJOHN: [00:02:39] Thank you so very much. So in terms of setting sort of a scene for all of this, Nigel Farage was on with us in a previous summit. And what he said, I think is important to set the scene for all of this, which is that he said that the United Nations from the beginning, that it was set up after [00:03:00] the two brutal world wars in Europe. And they said that nationalism was the reason for these wars and, and that if we could just get rid of nationalism and have sort of more or less a one world government that we could stop war, we could stop poverty. Obviously, this has not been true. But what he said, I think is very thought provoking, which is that the initial impetus behind the United Nations is the end of the nation state, and we are seeing this play out before our eyes right now the summit for the future. We the whole movement, the freedom movement, has been concentrating on the World Health Organization and all of their shenanigans. And they passed on June 1st a set of amendments to the International Health Regulations, which already has given the world, the world, the globalists, all they need to establish a global totalitarian police state, namely surveillance, censorship and [00:04:00] mandatory IDs, which will be either paper or digital. But in developed countries they will be digital, and that will give the infrastructure that is needed to establish a Chinese style social credit system worldwide, but not to be left out of the action.

REGGIE LITTLEJOHN: [00:04:15] The United Nations now has proposed something that is equally dangerous. That is coming up this week, the pact for the future and in the pact for the future. First of all this I want to say this procedurally, it is being handled under something called the silence procedure. Now, the United Nations passed that they would be using the silence procedure during Covid because they would not be able to meet. The silence procedure just enables a committee to come to a consensus about something and then submit it to the silence procedure, where the United Nations will get it out to the 194 member states, and if nobody objects within 72 hours or whatever deadline they set, then it is adopted. Adopted. [00:05:00] There's no discussion in the United Nations. There's no discussion internationally. It's just adopted. So they have put the pact for the future under the science procedure and its two annexes. Some of these have had the silence broken. We are not sure exactly which ones. They are being completely opaque about. What the what the you know, what the status is of these documents in terms of being renegotiated and put under, again, the silence procedure. But what we do know is that one of the deliverables of the deliverables that they want to have at the end of the summit for the future is an agreement to this pact for the future.

REGGIE LITTLEJOHN: [00:05:31] Now, the word pact indicates it's a treaty. And so, God, thank God, we have something that just came out of Congress saying that any treaty that comes out of the World Health Organization can only pass be passed by with you know, the advice and consent of the Senate that's passed by the House and has not yet been passed to the Senate. There is no similar bill yet. We need a similar bill for the United Nations. And just to give you a little bit of detail, an overview about what's in the pack for [00:06:00] the future. Basically you know, there's a section, section five called Transforming Global Governance, which has action 57, which is to strengthen the international response to complex global shocks. It's very vague. It doesn't give any particulars. Where the particulars are is in another document, which is a policy brief. And in that policy brief, we learned that what the secretary general of the United Nations wants is and he says, I propose, meaning the secretary general of the United Nations proposes that the General Assembly provide the secretary general and the United Nations system with a standing authority to convene and operationalize automatically an emergency platform in the event of future complex global shocks of sufficient scale, severity and reach.

REGGIE LITTLEJOHN: [00:06:46] What does that mean to operationalize automatically? It means that once this is passed and if it's passed by the Senate by the House procedure, it is deemed adopted, that the Secretary general will be able to unilaterally declare complex global shocks. And this whole protocol [00:07:00] that they have not defined is going to roll into place automatically, with no debate among the nations and these complex global shocks. I will end with this is they define them in this policy brief as anything has to do with climate change, future pandemics, biological warfare agents disruption of the global flow of good people or finance. So financial disruption, internet disruption, grid going down, a major event in outer space. Alright. And then an unforeseen black swan event. So that basically covers everything that can happen on planet Earth and that this will operationalize automatically. And the only way that we can stop it is to get the word out. Number one, people don't know about it. Our leaders do not even know that this is happening. And the best thing that you can do is go onto the sovereignty coalition and go onto the Alline act and, and, and send an email and call your representatives to alert them to the fact that this [00:08:00] is happening this week and that we need to take a stand against it urgently. Thank you.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [00:08:05] Thank you, Reggie, very much. An excellent overview. We're going to turn next to one of the members of our sovereignty coalition, who has had an incredibly profound effect on the practice of medicine, for one thing, but also public policy with respect to, among other things, the response to the Covid 19 pandemic. His name is Doctor Robert Malone. He was one of the inventors of technology that gave rise to the mRNA vaccine capability. But he has been a very much front line doctor in recommending That alternatives to vaccinations using that technology are in order, and very much at the vanguard of warning against having entities like the World Health Organization or for that matter, the UN, [00:09:00] tell us what kind of medical treatments we need to adopt in response to pandemics or other crises, for that matter. Doctor Malone is the author of Lies My Government Told Me and the Better Future Ahead, and the forthcoming book very relevant to today's topic Cyberwar Enforcing the New World Order. Doctor Malone, we're delighted to have you with us. The floor is yours, sir.

ROBERT MALONE: [00:09:30] Thank you. Frank. Let's keep in mind that the secretary general, in describing the summit for the future, which is one of the things that Reggie glossed over summit for the future is explicitly a mechanism to facilitate and accelerate compliance with agenda 2030, which is, among other things, the document that ensures that the world all agrees that there shall be universal health care, universal education, universal access [00:10:00] to internet. It's a fundamental human right for individuals to live wherever they want. So immigration, what we call illegal immigration, is all fundamentally codified into agenda 2030, which is functionally a treaty signed by Obama and not verified in any way or confirmed by the Senate. But I'd like to talk about kind of comes out of our research and writing in the new book cyberwar, and focuses on what is the structure of what the One World order or new globalism is intended to be, as envisioned to be. And also, I just want to quickly get in. We have two examples of this process having been deployed just recently. That's all in recent memory. And remember that the United Nations has a partnership agreement with the World Economic Forum, that corporatist organization that is really a trade union of the [00:11:00] 1000 largest transnational companies in the world. These two examples that I wish to cite that are among the list of what the secretary general himself asserts are the best plans.

ROBERT MALONE: [00:11:14] Anybody that lived through Anthony Fauci's the science statements, probably the hair goes up on the back of their neck when they hear the

secretary general asserting that the UN has the best plans, even though we're not even aware of many of those plans, and we have not had an opportunity to verify or validate. Neither has the United Nations, these plans that essentially emerge out of Groupthink committees composed largely dominated by the membership of the United Nations. And remember that the secretary general actually is a socialist. He was a socialist in Portugal. He was a member of the Socialist Party. He became the socialist prime minister [00:12:00] after that failed period as Prime minister in Portugal. He became the head of Socialist International and then joined the United Nations and eventually was appointed the secretary general. He is a socialist. There's no ifs, ands or buts about that, and he is promoting a socialist corporatist agenda together with his World Economic Forum partners. So what are examples of these best plans that we've seen deployed? Well, one is diversity, equity and inclusion Dei, which now suddenly is becoming a sort of persona non grata. Even Larry Fink, who has actively promoted this from Blackrock and made statements that this has to be imposed on corporations that they shall comply with. Dei, is now distancing himself from Dei for the very fact that it's not consistent with profitability of companies.

ROBERT MALONE: [00:12:56] It adds nothing to corporate function, even though this is what's promoted [00:13:00] by Klaus Schwab. So there's example number one. Dei is failing across the world. It's causing major grief in corporations. It's causing systems failures like we saw with CrowdStrike. And it is I think within the next 12 months, we're going to see very little. It's really going to be downplayed because the largest corporatist of them all, Larry Fink, is now distancing himself from that. There's one example. The second example is the obvious one of the Covid crisis. If there has ever been a bungled public health response, that would be the Covid crisis and that management protocol was throughout the world basically implemented based on the United Nations. I'm sorry, the World Health Organization, a United Nations affiliate organization incorporating the China model for how to respond to the [00:14:00] Covid crisis jettisoning the global consensus about how one should manage an upper respiratory disease pandemic and imposing all these totalitarian policies that really have let so many of us up the lockdowns, social distancing, vaccine mandates, suspension of informed consent. I could go on and on. So what is the model that these folks, the United Nations, its affiliate organizations and its partner of the World Economic Forum, its corporate partner, wish wished to promote on all of us.

ROBERT MALONE: [00:14:37] It's essentially a larger version of the model that is implemented in Europe as the European Union, in which nation states basically sit at the bottom of the pyramid. They still have legislatures, they still have courts, they still enact laws. But those laws are all subject to comment and advice from the European Parliament. [00:15:00] But the true power exists in the European Council and its president, currently Ursula von Leyden, who is a trainee of Angela Merkel. And what exists there in Europe, which is the model for what the United Nations wish to wishes to impose in the world, is a situation in which you have an unelected body. The European Council is appointed by the leaders of the nations of Europe that are members of the European Union and then A president of the European Union. Or Director of European Union Ursula von der Leyen. Basically is then appointed on top of that through a consensus action. This is the structure that's proposed now for this globalist new world order. And so we would have basically nation states subsidiary to an overlay [00:16:00] of a globalist government that would represent largely the United Nations and the UN and the West. Talk about this openly, as if it's already predetermined that they will become the new one world government. So you'll have the West representing corporate interests, corporatist interests, the United Nations, with their diverse community of stakeholders and interests that are very biased towards nation states that are, let's say, underdeveloped.

ROBERT MALONE: [00:16:30] And then they will be the kind of the new bureaucracy. If you want to think of administrative state, the administrative state will now reside at the level of the UN World Economic Forum access. And then sitting above that will be global public private partnerships, which will be functioning akin to think tanks or advisory groups. We're all familiar with the various notorious ones that exist right now, like Atlantic Council Aspen Institute and many others. [00:17:00] So we'll have these globalist public, private partnerships sitting above this administrative bureaucracy and advising it and directing it as to what the policy should be and how they should act. And then sitting under that will be the formerly autonomous nation states that will basically akin to what happens in the European Union. They'll be subjected to potential Vito negation of any policies which they implement, which the socialist United Nations and corporatist World Economic Forum believe are counterproductive. So when Dede says or Reggie says that we have a threat to sovereignty, this is very present, clear and present danger. It is explicitly in the structure. So of course, then [00:18:00] all this the

propaganda and psychological warfare technology. So thanks, Frank. I hope that wasn't too long and I'll close with that.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [00:18:08] It was a little longer than we bargained for, but it was exceptionally important and set the stage brilliantly for what we will be talking about in the subsequent presentations. Thank you so much, Doctor Malone, for joining us. We're going to turn next as part of the purpose of these summits, to showcase not only the views and concerns of Americans, but also those elsewhere around the world who are recognizing, as many of us are in this country, that their national sovereignty and the freedoms that their country has afforded them are being imperiled by this inexorable march towards global governance. One such individual is an Italian senator by the name of Lucio Malan. [00:19:00] He has been a member of the Senate in Italy since 2001, and is a secretary to its presidency. He is also a member of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, and we are delighted to have him with us to make some comments about his perspective and that of his countrymen on what is afoot here at the summit of the future and beyond. Senator, thank you so much for taking the time to join us. The floor is yours.

LUCIO MALAN: [00:19:28] Thank you very much. I'm very honored to be. To be with you, to be with such a prestigious and important people. I have to update my biography. Currently, I'm the leader of the main party in the in the Italian Senate. Not anymore. In the Secretary of the president of the of the Senate. And a kind of a majority leader. We don't have that name for in Italy. And not so important anyway. I don't have to add much to what was said about what is awaiting us with [00:20:00] all these moves from the United Nations, WEF and W.H.O., I would like to add one thing that an instrumental, a very important tool to get the that done from the part of those we oppose is the judiciary system, the courts, both national and international, who are as well as the other organizations that you mentioned, are up to destroy the national sovereignty and the sovereignty of the people. In the article one of our Constitution, we have that we read that the sovereignty belongs to the people, and all the elected organisms are under attack with all kinds of excuses of the supposed perks and privileges and so on. While billionaires are trying to rule the [00:21:00] world, and they are there to attack members of Parliament or any kind of political leader on the very, very irrelevant grounds, I think at what is which is very important is what to do, how to respond to that, the fact that such important steps Are completely neglected by the media.

LUCIO MALAN: [00:21:26] This is something that is frightening. As well as the attempt to curb, to disrupt the freedom of expression, free speech. And anything that can bring this to a wider attention is welcome. Is this I think that this is the main thing because of course, there are many people, not all of them, because people are so conditioned by the propaganda that are okay. Very good. The word government, limitation [00:22:00] of freedom of speech, very good. But yet, thank God there are still many people who know what the human rights actually are. And so this is, I think, the main point to find the way to let these things to be to bring them to the public, to the public attention. To speak very concretely. Very, very. On the point that we should do that these governments, as many governments as possible, should oppose to this. But the problem is to find the first one. What? I find it strange that is both in the in the instance of W.H.O.

LUCIO MALAN: [00:22:45] pandemic compact and in this in this instance, in this move of the United Nations, is that we haven't heard as far as I know, we haven't heard yet of [00:23:00] nations moving. You know, for a nation like Italy, part of the European Union. And you just spoke about how the European Union works, or rather, how they would like to work. They are they have done a lot in this direction, in this wrong direction. They haven't completed the work yet. But for a country that belongs to the European Union, that has a huge public debt where just little moves on, the international finance can bring about big problems, it is not easy to be the first or even among the 2 or 3 first. I hope that countries who have less, who don't have these specific problems can make the first move. And then something can be can be done. So we, we, we need to have the collaboration of those countries who have [00:24:00] the possibility, the possibility to do it, because it is always very difficult to be the first in such a specific situation. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak and to hear.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [00:24:12] Senator, thank you very much. And I owe you an apology. I made the mistake of looking at your Wikipedia profile, and I can tell you from my own that those are not to be trusted. It certainly is in need of an update. Congratulations on your current role and the importance of your voice being heard at this moment is therefore all the greater. Let me say a regrettable update. We had anticipated hearing from one of the great leaders on these matters in the United States Congress, Congressman Ralph Norman. I just was informed that due to weather in the Washington, DC area, he's had to make rearrangements flying back to the Capitol for

the session [00:25:00] getting underway today, and he will be unable to be with us as a result of being on a plane instead. But we have him with us in spirit for sure, and we appreciate his valiant efforts to protect our sovereignty from the World Health Organization. And now the UN and others. We do have with us, though, by video, a man who has been incredibly insightful and impactful in terms of his warnings about this global governance business. His name is Doctor James Lindsay. He is a mathematician by training, but an extraordinary expert by avocation about Marxism and other tyrannies, including the ambitions of various totalitarians of the world, to use world government as a means of dominating and ultimately ruling the rest of us. We have [00:26:00] a short video from James. We're very pleased to present him to you now.

JAMES LINDSAY: [00:26:04] At the present time, there is probably the greatest threat to national sovereignty that has ever been pushed upon the world. The United States, of course, is being threatened to have its sovereignty eroded if not taken away by entities such as the United Nations and its subsidiary, the W.H.O., in a variety of different ways. And we have to take very seriously what that might imply. Just to kind of cover the basics, I'm sure people are somewhat familiar with these. We have this so-called pandemic treaties, the International Health Regulations, the IHR that have been pushed through back in the beginning of June in very suspicious circumstances at the W.H.O. And we now have this upcoming pact for the future. That is just another attempt to push the same kind of agenda. And the goal is actually for them to force nations [00:27:00] like the United States and the nations of Western Europe and across the world to sacrifice their sovereignty, whether it's in the name of a pandemic or controls for public health, or whether it's in it's in a vision for some greater future where they have not been able to convince our nations to sacrifice that sovereignty willingly through softer methods, some of which they called things like the Great Reset and so on. Agenda 2030 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals is another one of these projects that has not been coming together. If we sacrifice our sovereignty to these entities, what we have to understand is what we're actually signing up for. And this is the piece of expertise I think, that I bring to the table. What we're signing up for is the same model of communism that the CCP uses over the People's Republic of China.

JAMES LINDSAY: [00:27:49] That model was forged in the wake of Mao Zedong's death in the 1970s through the 1980s by Deng Xiaoping, working together with the United States State Department, most notably Henry [00:28:00] Kissinger and David

Rockefeller, and the goal is to create a one world government. They already use the language reflective of this. They try to teach our children to believe that they are global citizens. They try to get us to understand that global citizenship is in coordination with meeting the Sustainable Development Goals of United Nations Agenda 2030. Even the Pope, speaking from the Vatican, has said so recently. Of course, he's also tied up with a related agenda called the Council for Inclusive Capitalism. This is an attempt to have a complete values and ethics shift that will take away the ability for countries to build according to the way that they want to govern the people, the way that they need and to provide for their citizens, but most importantly, to protect their citizens individual rights. And those will be taken away and coordinated fashions, much like we saw attempted and executed in a mostly semi-voluntary way under the Covid 19 protocols that were put [00:29:00] forth in 2020, where virtually every nation, perhaps with the exception of Sweden, marched in lockstep to do exactly the same thing, which happened to be the thing that was most beneficial for the People's Republic of China. The system. The Deng Xiaoping Theory system is called one country, two systems. It is a communist program that is operating a fascist economic system within it, so that it can meet productive standards that can keep their society going.

JAMES LINDSAY: [00:29:28] It is it is a totalitarian autocracy that is controlled through social credit, which is complete social control of the population to do as they will, but also a mechanism for brainwashing the population into these new ethics by making them have to play ball. It's what Karl Marx called the inversion of praxis, socializing people to be ideal citizens. And what we see, whether it's from the sustainable development agenda, from the pact for the future, whether it's the EIR or whether it is the ESG environmental [00:30:00] social governance programs of Blackrock, the United Nations and the World Economic Forum, what we see is the attempt to install a Deng Xiaoping One country, two systems model for the West and perfect mirror image. And if we sacrifice our sovereignty here at this point by saying that the president can unilaterally agree to these treaties or whatever, then we will find ourselves in a situation like the Chinese system. So for me, it's incumbent upon Congress to speak up and say there will be no agreement to these sovereignty eroding treaties without Senate approval, full, proper Senate approval as indicated in the Constitution. And I would go further and call directly on President Trump, who, of course, is running for president again to make this an issue of his campaign. I would love to see him talk about

defending American sovereignty from these international globalist efforts, to try to steal it away and transform us to the system that we see in China.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [00:30:56] Thank you, Doctor Lindsay. I strongly second [00:31:00] the idea that this issue should feature prominently in the presidential context. The candidacies, the differences the parties may have on this subject. We need to expose those differences and have them inform the voters. It's of critical importance. It's part of why we're doing this program is to make sure that voters and citizens more generally are equipped to make informed decisions about our possible surrender of sovereignty to these global elites. We're going to turn next to a man who has done an outsized job in resisting that trajectory, and in particular, by enlisting the help of senior officials across this country, notably attorneys general and governors, through the work of his organization, State Shield, and his [00:32:00] very important participation in our sovereignty coalition. His name is Joe Gebbia. He is the founder of State Shield, and we're very pleased to welcome him to the floor. It's over to you.

JOE GEBBIA: [00:32:11] Thank you very much, Frank. It really is quite an honor for me to be participating with such a phenomenal group here, and the effort that you and Reggie put forth with Sovereignty Coalition. I want to thank you for this opportunity. So I was asked to speak on the macro effect of all this, of what's going on. So I've been asked to I'm going to take 100 years and put it down in three minutes about what we're contending with. If we look at what's going on here, basically 1913, when the Rockefellers tried to redefine the category of oil, is when this effort really began. And it just has been picking up. So what we're facing today is really the byproduct of over 100 year effort that has really refined itself in many, many ways. Covid 19 was a [00:33:00] practice run. And now what we see happening here are the members. The cast members of the Covid 19 are looking to take the same practice and legalize it. So I'm going to focus really on 2024, because 2024 is the epitome of what has culminated up to this point, and there is a rush to bring this across the finish line. In my opinion, it is because they want to get it done before a potential change in administration. So 2024 was the year of the trifecta, and we look at the NACs in January. We look at the Who with the amendment updates and the pandemic treaty in June. And now we're looking at the UN with the summit of the future and the pack of the future with an ax.

JOE GEBBIA: [00:33:44] Obviously, we were able to defeat in a Hail Mary pass there on the last day. We did an excellent sovereignty, sovereignty coalition and all of the affiliates that a wonderful job in cleaning out the legislation that was trying to be passed at the by the at the Who in Geneva [00:34:00] although they did pass a basic core, they had to pass something. If you all recall, on that Monday when Tedros got up and said, well, we don't have the votes for pass on either of these. The globalists got together and said, we are going to pass something. And they totally disregarded all of the procedures, the protocols of procedures, the United Nations. And they got something passed because they knew that if they got something passed, they'd have a core to work on, and they needed to get that passed in order to provide the foundation upon which they're moving now in September, to give similar type of autocratic powers to the secretary general. So let's just look also what's happened here in 2024. We've seen a large a move afoot by the Who to bring out all kinds of concerns about monkeypox, bird flu, triple E, etc. and they're using the same rule book that they [00:35:00] did during Covid. What's happening now is that fanning the flames of fear, trying to get people to act and no one act, no one move on their part is a move.

JOE GEBBIA: [00:35:12] Simply, it's all part of a grand plan. And if you just take the time to think about it, what really brought me to this point of thinking about it was I was taking a flight back from the Republican Governors Association, sitting with a very, very good friend of mine who's a big thinker, and we were talking about the efforts of states and what we're trying to do at the state level. And he looked at me and he said, Joe, he said, what's a win? And I tried to scramble and say, well, this is what we're doing at State Shield. And he stopped me and he said, what's a win? And he really made me think, you know, so what's the ultimate win here? And of course, that's not in my purview to provide the ultimate win. It's what we're all doing together. But it really made me think about what the big picture is here. So you look at the monkeypox and they're fanning the flames and they're [00:36:00] trying to get people to get ready. But it doesn't stand alone as a move. It's just a single move on the chessboard. And then you look at the move for illegal immigration and illegal voting. You know the Biden administration has been behind it. They've been supportive of it. It's pretty obvious they're behind and the supportive of the whole move. They're behind in supportive of the UN move and the summit of the future.

JOE GEBBIA: [00:36:24] So when they didn't pass S 444 in December in the United States Senate, which would have given permission or responsibility to the United States Senate to take on the advice and consent of treaties, basically, the Democratic Party surrendered their constitutional obligations and gave the president the right to be able to sign a presidential agreement. And then came 1425, in the House, which is where they wanted to get the Save act, which would have Acquired the American citizen to provide proof [00:37:00] of residence or proof of citizenship in order to vote. And that's to prevent what was going on with what was becoming fairly apparent that illegals were being given the right and being encouraged to register to vote. So finally, with the reissue of the 1425 last week during China Week by the United States Congress to be attached to the continuing resolution budget request that probably is the strongest chance that we have to fight that. But those are still small moves on the chess table, and they're all working in concert for what is the ultimate objective. Then you take, for example we've got the we've got the immigration, we've got the, the attempt to try and prevent voter identification via citizenship. And then we've got the move afoot in the Senate to prevent the Senate [00:38:00] from having the right to pass a treaty. So then you've got the who coming in the background, pushing hard for another pandemic type of move.

JOE GEBBIA: [00:38:10] Last week, the Tedros said once again he wants to do a pandemic health increase of international emergency of international concern review on the monkeypox. They're all working to create a sense of hype and to do this before the next election in fear of a of a Republican taking office. So what's really happening here in my, in my mind is that they recognize they're so close to getting what they want, and the only thing that could prevent them from moving forward is the is, is, is a Trump election to the presidency. He has the ability and the wherewithal to defund the Who. Defund the United Nations. Stand up and be a [00:39:00] president. Prophesizing American values America's worth in the marketplace that's not being done today. Provide the leadership that the world does not see and break the cabal. It's that serious to them. That's the big picture here. He everything they're doing is to prevent him and be prepared if he should become in to continue their feet. Once the United States takes that position, other countries of the world will follow. And that's exactly what we experienced when we went to Geneva in in the end of May, beginning of June, when the folks there were saying, thank God that the United States, that the United States

governors and the attorney generals stood up and made a voice, and I had to make sure that the governors and the attorney generals knew they were not aware.

JOE GEBBIA: [00:39:57] I think of the impact they had on an international [00:40:00] basis, and my communications to them were your voice was heard loud and clear. You're filling the void of American leadership that is not being presented by our current administration. And, you know, lo and behold, they were taking my recommendations on how to move forward. And we came out with the we will not comply. And it was it was an easy decision for them to do. And it happened fairly quickly, which was surprising to me, which is another statement that our government, especially at the state level, which has always been separated in handling their relationship with the federal government, are working in concert as a group now to maximize the influence they have, not as individual states, but as 27 Republican states. And its soon to be 30 because we're looking to pick up three more in the next election round. And the AG's who actually made their presence known well, with Margaret's very strong help during the first run, [00:41:00] were there to support it on the second round for the Who, and they are also realizing, I think, what conservative effort they have in consolidating and making of all, all 27 of their states be a powerhouse. So the big picture here is a battle of good and evil. And that's what that's what we're down to.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [00:41:22] Our next speaker is a man who is going to speak to us, I believe, about good and evil, about the spiritual warfare dimension of what the global elites are up to, those seeking to impose global governance on nations who have traditions very much at odds with the agenda of the globalists. His name is Pastor Jim Garlow. He is the author, most recently of many books, but most recently of well-versed biblical answers to today's tough issues. This is one [00:42:00] of the toughest issues. Pastor, I hope you'll be able to speak to the biblical and other answers that we need to this one.

JIM GARLOW: [00:42:06] Thank you. Thank you so much, Frank and I probably need to update also. I have a book that just came out called reversed from Culturally Woke to Biblically Awake, and it addresses the biblical foundations to 60 political topics, including World Health Organization. All of these topics we're talking about ESG. Di how is the what's the scriptural approach to these? I want to thank all of you for your leadership. We were there in Geneva with you. It was so encouraging to meet with like-

mindful people standing against this totalitarian authoritarianism coming on us. My wife and I went on from there to The Hague the International Court of Justice for the meetings there in which they ended up voting 11 to 4 against Israel. I'm not unfamiliar with the United Nations. I've had a ministry there for four years up until Covid and Covid. The place closed down for three years, but we had Bible studies going there, trying to make a difference spiritually in that [00:43:00] environment. I speak as a pastor as I've already been introduced, so I speak from a spiritual or theological standpoint. Totalitarianism and one world government, which we're facing is not new. Genesis 11, The Tower of Babel. Daniel warned us in his writings about the beast that will come. Revelation speaks of the Antichrist. And I know that may sound hyperbole to some ears, but that's exactly what we're dealing with. The spirit of globalism is always the spirit of Antichrist. During the 2016 campaign, I wrote a little article about the biggest thing Trump's going to face is that he is not a globalist. I didn't even understand it.

JIM GARLOW: [00:43:33] I said in the article, I don't fully understand it. I cannot believe how much more we've come to learn in the last eight years. God established nations. He did not establish a global government. There will be a time when Messiah will rule. But until that time, I'm not for a global government. I'm going to call us to the actions that are going to be submitted by the leadership of this. We need to act. It's from a Christian perspective. We have a moral obligation to act and act [00:44:00] soon on these issues. And I'm going to call us later to pray and even for some to fast. I want to give, if I can, a sort of a metaphor of some degree of hope. I want us to understand that God is still God in the midst of this totalitarianism. The God who allowed the United Nations to come into existence in 1945 so they could do a 1947 vote, 33 yes, 13 no, and ten abstentions to establish the State of Israel. That same God who allowed the United Nations to come into existence can take it out of existence. But I want to give you kind of a strange mix here. If you walk into the United Nations and you're going in the entrance and over to your left, to the East River, you will find a sword, actually a statue of a man pounding a sword into a plowshare. From Isaiah chapter two. If you go around the opposite side of the building, southwest corner across First Avenue, the Ralph Bunche Park, you'll see there what's called the Isaiah Wall, 20ft high or 30ft high or so.

JIM GARLOW: [00:44:54] And there's the Isaiah two passage. What these passages say they say there's a coming a time we'll study war [00:45:00] no more. But what's odd

is this same United Nations that disallows God can't understand that the very scriptures they have parameters in their building is an announcement that God himself will send a messiah. And that's the only peace we're going to know is, is at the time he rules. The irony is, is that that that statue of we're going to pound the sword into a plowshare and in other words, productive instead of killing each other. That was given, of all things, by the USSR and officially atheistic nation. And that passage goes on to say, the truth will flow forth from Zion, from the Torah, from the teachings from the Tanakh. In other words, God is going to speak and there's even a statue affirming that at the front entrance of the United Nations, I don't think most people there know what it actually means and its theological significance. The 30 Universal Declaration of the United Nations, that they were created for the purpose of creating freedom, and now they're being violated, their own principles, [00:46:00] their own declarations, not just their procedures that was spoken about, but their own universal declarations, the crushing of freedom. In the same way the European Union was founded by Robert Schumann and other people, three guys who founded it, they founded it on good, solid foundations. And then it was corrupted and turned a different way. Before March of 2020, we couldn't imagine exactly what a one world government would look like.

JIM GARLOW: [00:46:24] I mean, we knew we have understood that something was happening, but before March of 2020, it was hard to grasp how is this going to unfold from March 2020 on? We have seen it and now it's gone into full speed. And I what I want to appeal peel his is every one of these speakers have been on are people I so respect and I learned so much. I'm so grateful for each one of you. I want to take it to a wider dimension. It's not hyperbole. This is a demonic force we're dealing with. These are not individuals alone. These are people used demonically. And this is a this is an [00:47:00] entire globe, a demonic activity taking place to crush this human spirit, to crush what God has established in each one of us. So we must act and follow the advice of each one who are speaking now and giving us a battle plan. But I urge us to pray, I pray, I pray to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And for some you may be called to fast on behalf. I'm going to pray this and then we'll close. Father, we come to you right now. We are a nation in need. We are a world in need. From this crushing, suffocating spirit, the demonic presence of a one world government that would rob us of all that we value, would rob us of life and vitality itself. We ask for your help, your wisdom, your supernatural guidance that this force be driven back. We pray this in the name that is above all names. Amen. Thank you. Frank.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [00:47:51] Amen. Thank you, pastor, very much needed.

Ultimately, not only is this up to us to do our part, but we need God's [00:48:00] grace for sure. We're going to turn next to a man who has, speaking of God's grace, done Incalculably important work on behalf of religious freedom as well as democracy and human rights more generally, notably in the role of Assistant Secretary of State for democracy, Human Rights, and labor in the Trump administration. His name is Robert Destro. He is back teaching these days at Catholic University in their law school. And we very much appreciate his participation in this program. Mr. Secretary, the floor is yours.

ROBERT DESTRO: [00:48:40] Well, thank you, Frank, and it's really a pleasure to be here this this afternoon. Now almost, I guess, you know, as the law professor in the group, I thought I would talk a little bit about the law, because what we're talking about is the idea of a treaty. And so what I thought I would do is start with a couple of general principles [00:49:00] that I think inform everything that people have been saying. And I'll try and give a couple of examples before my time runs out. So let's start with the proposition. What do you mean by sovereignty? I mean, that would be, you know, what an international law 101 student would ask. And the answer is, it's the power to make and enforce the law and to adjudicate controversies that arise under the law within a defined physical space. Okay. And I need you to think spatially when we're talking about this in when I teach private international law, which is the law of multi state transactions to law students, you know they get they go crazy because what we do is we make charts with boxes and Texas is a box, California is a box, Romania is a box. And we and we look and see what happened there. Now why do we why do we make those distinctions? And the answer [00:50:00] is that sovereignty is viewed from the ground up okay. So basically it starts at the political center of a geographic space, whether that space is Virginia, Italy or whatever.

ROBERT DESTRO: [00:50:17] And writing in the mid-1500s, the premier theorist of private international law developed three basic principles. And those principles are that the laws of a state extend to its borders, but not beyond. The second principle is that the boundaries of a state that any person within the boundaries of the state is subject to the jurisdiction of that state, regardless of where he lives. And then in cross boundary cases. So that's the pandemic. It's also international [00:51:00] law. You know, states

operate under their own laws, but they seek to try and accommodate interests and rights that are acquired under the laws of other places that so a good example with that would be if somebody goes from does a destination wedding and, and goes to the Bahamas to get married, they're married when they come back. And, and the state of Virginia, where I live, I would say, yeah, we're going to govern. We're going to decide the validity of the marriage based on what the law of the Bahamas is. So that's that territorial principle. Now, sovereignty as a matter of law is the default legal rule, but it cannot work in inherently international settings, such as the law of the sea, outer space, and increasingly in cyberspace. The big the big attempt [00:52:00] to shut down telegram where the French arrested Pavel Durov, or the attempts to shut down X in Brazil, are good examples of the frustration that these international types are feeling.

ROBERT DESTRO: [00:52:17] Yeah, they can shut down X in Brazil, but they can't shut it down generally unless you get international cooperation. And so international law by and large is governed by customary by customs. So basically, we don't board your ships if you don't. Board our ships. And treaty law, which is what we're talking about today, is the functional equivalent of a statute. Now, hold that thought. That's the legal background. That's the legal 101 background. One of the things that President Putin often talks about is international law. And our side, the United States and the EU, always [00:53:00] respond by using a phrase called the, quote, rules based international order. You know, now, if you go look it up as lawyers are supposed to do, the we have no idea what that means. It basically means whatever rules that they make up. And so if you think about the human rights dimension now of this is that sovereignty is the basis for representative self-government. Whether we like to admit it or not, it's the basis for almost all human rights law, including freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from slavery. And I raised that question about slavery specifically. Why? Because if you think about the slave trade that exists to this day in places like Libya and parts of Africa, you [00:54:00] know, the slave trade over the American southern border, because that's precisely what it is. Slavery can only exist in ungoverned spaces.

ROBERT DESTRO: [00:54:13] I want you to think about that for a second. When the British Navy decided that it was going to shut down the international slave trade, things started to change. So let's talk about how things have changed. Well, back in the late 1800s the economic entity that we now know as the City of London, the collective idea of a collective place, kind of like Wall Street began to come up with the idea that we had

to eliminate war. And they came up with the idea of sanctions. And Woodrow Wilson jumped on that bandwagon, you know, with [00:55:00] his proposals for the League of Nations. And the idea was that only a supervening international entity like the League of Nations could enforce peace. And I want you to look at those two words in juxtaposition enforce peace. And so sanctions enforce are the idea by which an entity like the World Health Organization and the EU actually enforce their diktats. You know, one of the one of the points that most people don't think about is the European Parliament has no power at all. You know, the General Assembly really doesn't have any power at all. It's really the Security Council that has the power. And so if you cross the powers that be, then you're going to find yourself on the receiving end of sanctions. [00:56:00] And so I want you to think about what you know, as I close up here, I want you to think about a topic that I've been spending a lot of time thinking about lately.

ROBERT DESTRO: [00:56:09] Most people have a hard time grasping it, you know? But that's because it's a new idea. And that is the idea of digital slavery. If you think about the book that Shoshana Zuboff of Harvard wrote called The Age of Surveillance Capitalism, which you begin to realize is that that in the rules based international order, all of us, you know, are sources of information that can be mined and sold without our consent, without our knowledge, without any of this. And so when we look at this question of getting rid of sovereignty and giving, giving away our sovereignty to, to these international organizations, most of which are controlled by the United States, [00:57:00] China and the Europeans, you know, then what you're really talking about is creating a new form of slavery, because we don't have anything to say about it. So if you think about the what I said early on, that you have to conceptualize sovereignty in boxes, in geographic boxes that proceed from the ground up. My question would be where does any governmental leader get the authority from his own people, whether it's Xi or whether it's the people of Trinidad and Tobago or the people of the United States? Where do they get the authority to give that representative self-government away? I don't think they have it. And those of us who say we won't comply, you know I'm right with them. Thanks, Frank.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [00:57:49] Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Appreciate your being with us tremendously. And those insights are extraordinarily powerful and important for this conversation. We're going to turn next to another of our frontline [00:58:00] doctors, a woman who has distinguished herself, among other things, by suffering the punishment

of the medical authorities in her native state of Maine for standing up for personal freedom, medical freedom in the context of the Covid pandemic. She has become in the course of her public activities in that critical moment, one of, I think, the leading authorities in our country on what the global governance agenda is and how it is being inexorably advanced, notably through the World Health Organization, but also, as we are discussing now in the United Nations context. Her name is Doctor Meryl Nass. She is, among other things, the founder of Door to Freedom and very important resource on all of these issues and an incredibly important component member of component [00:59:00] in the organizational sense. Member in the personal sense of our sovereignty coalition. Doctor Nass, welcome. It's good to have you with us. Over to you.

MERYL NASS: [00:59:08] It's great to be here. I want to say, in response to Senator Millan, who asked for one country to go first and say no. I want to point out that Slovakia did that last spring for the W.H.O., and within a few days, the prime minister was nearly killed in an assassination attempt and that former President Trump tried to pull the United States out of the W.H.O. And he has now suffered two assassination attempts, the latest yesterday. So although the UN calls for a rules based order and the compliance with international law, we are in fact living in a lawless state where those who would take control of the entire [01:00:00] world are free. They think to do as they will. From my prepared remarks, I want to say that, perhaps unsurprisingly, UN pact for the future is very similar to the proposed IHR Amendments and Pandemic Treaty. Both the pact and the Who's draft treaties would give the head of each agency the sole authority to determine global emergencies, declare them gain unlimited powers to manage them, and decide when the emergency is over. Neither organization issued any standards or guidelines for making declarations, or limiting the powers in any way that would accrue to the heads of the organizations whenever an emergency declaration was made. In other words, both the W.H.O. and the UN proposals would place unlimited dictatorial powers in [01:01:00] the hands of each agency head. Both the UN and W.H.O. proposals call for censorship of misinformation, alongside calling for freedom of speech, despite knowing that the two are mutually exclusive. All these documents are deceptive. The proposed pandemic treaty stated there would be no surrender of national sovereignty.

MERYL NASS: [01:01:24] While in later paragraphs demanded such surrender, the UN pact for the future calls for the mobility of talent while simultaneously demanding no

brain drain. Each agency called for using technology and scientific advancements to help developing nations, but paradoxically called for enforcing intellectual property rights. The UN echoes the demands of the W.H.O. for nations to comply with the pandemic preparedness agenda, despite its expansion [01:02:00] of surveillance and impingement on privacy rights. Each agency demands efforts to restore the trust in science. Diplomats and national leaders are being asked to agree to unspecified transformations of global governance and the imposition of an entirely new global financial architecture. Compliance is to be obtained by using mandated intergovernmental processes, where they exist, by strengthening implementation of environmental agreements, and by engaging national lawmakers to embed UN policies in domestic legislation. While the Sustainable Development Goals are a recent invention, the UN tries to make us believe they are an original pillar of the UN. They aren't. The pact goes on to assert that the Sustainable [01:03:00] Development Goals are the central objective of multilateralism, and the center of the reform of the international financial Architecture. The citizens of the Earth did not vote for the Sustainable Development Goals. Nor did they vote for the UN Secretary General or the W.H.O. Director General. To be granted dictatorial powers over the planet. Nor did they ask for a new financial architecture. Or the pact for the future. This summit and these two agencies seek to impose illegitimate authorities on the people of this planet. As 26 US governors said recently about the W.H.O. We will not comply. Not with any of it. Not now [01:04:00] and not ever. Thank you.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:04:04] Thank you, Doctor Nass, for an extremely sobering commentary, but very much appreciated. We're going to turn next, I hope, to a man who has joined us from his native Switzerland, where he is a leading international attorney and one of the most stalwart champions of freedom, notably freedom from tyranny of the kind that global governance would inevitably entail. His name is Philipp Kruse. He has been very much a leading figure, in particular in connection with the global governance gambit at the World Health Organization. In fact, he sponsored a very important demonstration in opposition to it that Doctor Malone and Joe Gebbia and Reggie Littlejohn and I and others, I believe, attended [01:05:00] on the on the very eve of the W.H.O., doing what it did to get a new International Health Regulations treaty adopted. We're delighted to have him with us to speak about that if he cares to. As well as, of course, of the present topic of the summit of the future. Philipp, the floor is yours.

PHILIPP KRUSE: [01:05:20] Thank you so much, Frank Gaffney, for the invitation. It's a great privilege and honor for me to speak here with all the great leaders and experts, to preserve our nation's freedoms and sovereignty. Yes, so much has been said already. I would like to focus on two questions that have already been mentioned already, also by Doctor Merryl Nuss. Number one, what are the most significant similar threats from these international treaties? Number one, from the World Health Organization's amendments to the International Health Regulations and the new Pandemic Treaty. On the one side, [01:06:00] and number two of the new pact for the future that is now on the table of United Nations. And as much has been said already, I really would like to focus on the most essential elements that we see here that are so striking and very similar. Number one, to the first question, what are the similar threats here? What is the similar architecture that can be seen, the pattern behind these two new regimes now? Well, number one, it was mentioned rightfully by Doctor Marianus. Number one is clearly the sole authority of one single person, whether it is the general director of the World Health Organization or the director general of the United Nations to declare some, some kind of global emergency with immediate global [01:07:00] effect, whether it is under the United Nations and a global shock or on the World Health Organization.

PHILIPP KRUSE: [01:07:07] The public health emergency of international concerns. Number two, this triggering on the right to provide the only solution that this declaration then demands, whether it is total surveillance and an increased surveillance of citizens, an increased surveillance of pathogens, whether it is health certificates and most notably, experimental drugs, we see a much longer list of potential responses that will be given to the hands of director general, the secretary general of United Nations and number three then, and this is, in my view, as a lawyer, the most dangerous one. And this is [01:08:00] the absolute control and infallibility of the narrative, whether in the sense in the term of the who, it's the narrative with respect to the threat regarding our health, or in the terms of the United Nations, all other kinds of global shocks. Why is that so dangerous? This notion of information control is much going much further than just the notion of individual censorship and harming people's free choice and informed consent. We do see here clearly also a threat for sovereignty, because sovereignty is based on every member state's sovereign right to choose its decision making basis himself. So it is a matter of, [01:09:00] An efficacy of proficiency are to also consider second opinions, dissenting opinions, and integrate these opinions and new facts into the decision making process.

PHILIPP KRUSE: [01:09:15] Once this principle is excluded as a solution, and also as a matter of quality management and control, member states will lose their sovereign right of coming to their own judgment. And also, as mentioned already, there are no standards, no clear accepted standards with respect to these kinds of declarations, whether it is the declaration of an international threat or the declaration with respect to the potential solutions, and ultimately, what for? From the perspective of constitutional law is always important, is whether do we have [01:10:00] a mechanism of checks and balances which allows and process of reconsideration, of reassessment and ultimately of correction, of wrong decisions, wrong declarations in both spheres on the World health organizations to two pandemic treaties, as well as now under the United Nations Pact for the future. As we all know, there is nothing that could be called a mechanism of control and mechanism of checks and balances. What does this mean? So altogether, it has been said from different perspectives already multiple times we are seeing a transfer of power, of effective power from the governments to a supranational organization. And also see a shift of nature of this [01:11:00] international organization. It's nothing that was originally intended to be done in the terms of an international organization of equal nations coming to the same table. No. With such a regime, we see an own distinct supranational organization following its own agenda, which is not based on any kind of control and democratic based process. So with other words, it is the clear totalitarian power structure that we see here in all details laid out. And the question is, what can we learn from our attempts that we have done already, Mariners and others together, when we also Dr. Kat Lindley visited Members of Parliament in many different countries. And the answer is very clear. [01:12:00] We are seeing here a change of regime of our traditional national regimes with protection of human rights, with clear, established rules for the different three constitutional branches shifting up to the benefit of an international organization. So this is clearly, clearly in the competence of the lawmakers. It is in the competence of the people to be informed and to participate in this decision making process. So as the media do not do their work, as the governments do not their work to inform the people, we must do it so and here in Switzerland, just to give you a brief update, what we started is a campaign to inform the local politicians from bottom up.

PHILIPP KRUSE: [01:13:00] Community [01:13:00] politicians and politicians of cantonal parliaments, which is the equivalent to United States countries. State excuse

me, state parliaments. Because they are less corrupted, they are more open to listen to us, and they are more willing to bring in these initiatives into a public debate. One thing, in my view, is clear as soon as we manage to bring these fundamental projects that harm democracy, that will harm the heart of sovereignty of our countries and their capability to protect people's freedom. Because also, let's not forget also the judges will be bound by this principle of a global information agenda. So when our countries will lose all. Their [01:14:00] essential capacities that are defined in our constitutions, then this is something where every lawmaker and every citizen will clearly say no. So the answer here or the solution I. Can only repeat what has been said already multiple times. We must try to get heard and to bring out the message to the citizens and to our lawmakers at all the federal levels. Thank you very much for the invitation.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:14:32] And thank you for this important contribution. Again, your leadership on the continent and internationally with your fellow international attorneys, as well as the masses of the people that I saw gathered at your demonstration in Switzerland, is very inspiring and deeply appreciated here. We're going to turn next to another of our duty experts on these matters of the agenda of the United Nations, [01:15:00] the mechanisms by which it is seeking to effectually transform itself from a mechanism established in its charter in 1948 to allow collaboration between sovereign nations where they saw fit into a world government. His name is Alex Newman. He is a prize winning journalist and podcaster and author. He has, among other things, to his credit, a book entitled Indoctrinating Our Children to Death. We've asked him to join us. He could only do so by video. We'll go to his tape now.

ALEX NEWMAN: [01:15:42] Hey, guys. Thank you for having me. It's an honor to be here. Appreciate it. And the climate change narrative is actually one of the essential components of everything that the United Nations is doing. It is the pretext for deindustrializing the Western world shutting down our energy infrastructure, shipping, our manufacturing, our productive [01:16:00] capacity to China and to other nations. It is the pretext for bringing in a new system of ethics and values, which they themselves have said. I was at the COP27 on the Sinai Peninsula in Egypt. They had all these religious leaders walk to the top of Mount Sinai to come up with a new Ten Commandments, and they did a climate repentance ceremony. This was right after the UN revealed that we needed a new system of ethics and morality that would properly

take into account taking care of the planet. And it's also the climate narrative is underpinning the entire restructuring of government. Right. We're moving away from the free market economy, where government protects property rights, and toward a more technocratic form of government, where your carbon emissions, your carbon budget, are at the core of everything you do, your carbon footprint. This will be tracked by central bank digital currencies. One of the pretexts for bringing them in is that we need all of this data, so we can keep better track of who is doing what. So, folks, it's hard to overstate the importance [01:17:00] of this climate narrative from the totalitarian perspective. It also is one of the possible emergencies that cited in our Common Policy Agenda brief by the Secretary General of the United Nations as the pretext for bringing in these global dictatorial controls that are imagined under what's coming at the summit of the future.

ALEX NEWMAN: [01:17:19] So it's hard, again, to overstate the importance of the climate change narrative. And I would just say that after interviewing dozens, maybe hundreds of scientists, some of the best scientists in the world from Harvard, from Yale, from Princeton, from MIT, many of whom worked on the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. I can tell you, beyond any shadow of a doubt, the narrative that carbon dioxide is pollution, that the gas we exhale is pollution is utterly preposterous. And I can also tell you that the people pushing this narrative do not believe it themselves. If they believed it, the worst thing in the world that they could have done is what they did in Paris, at the Paris Agreement, I was there, I was at that UN summit, Barack Obama promised to [01:18:00] slash American emissions of CO₂ by over a third in the next 15 years. Communist China promised to keep increasing theirs. And of course, they have made good on that promise. They now emit more than 150% more CO₂ than the United States. They're building two coal fired power plants every week, so if CO₂ was bad, they would all have been horrified about this. Instead, they were slapping each other, high fives and congratulating each other for saving the world. Folks were being scammed. It's not about science. It's not about the science. If that were even a thing, it's about a pretext for taking over humanity, taking over the economy and fundamentally restructuring every element of life. And I'm out of time, so I'll hand it back to you. Thank you.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:18:42] Thank you very much, Alex, for your contribution here and what you are doing in these various fora of the UN, including the upcoming one at

the summit for the future. We'll look forward to your reporting from there. Next up, we're going to have another of our front line doctors, Doctor [01:19:00] Kat Lindley, a woman who has distinguished herself again, not only with her practice of medicine in her native state of Texas, but also her leadership in standing up against the tyranny that was inflicted upon, well, her state and people and the country during the Covid 19 pandemic. She's a very important member of our sovereignty coalition. We're delighted to have her speak to the present issue of global governance at the world, with the summit of the future, as they're calling it now. Kat Lindley, welcome back. It's time for you to be heard from.

KAT LINDLEY: [01:19:39] Thank you, Frank. So I'll start by saying that Secretary Gutierrez in Davos in January has said that he's very confident that we can build a new multipolar global order. His specific quote says that facing dramatic global challenges, we [01:20:00] need a global capacity to address them. That reaffirms the importance of multilateralism and the importance of rules based set of international relations based on the rule of law and in accordance with the United Nations. So why are we all here today? Well, this idea of global governance has actually been introduced before, and it's been introduced insidiously into our society. With the initial formation of the European Union in 1993. And I would say that now we are seeing the fruits of that insertion and what it's doing to the member states of the European Union. Now let's take what's happening in the United Nations this week with the pact for the future and summit of the future. This is a central initiative of the United Nations Summit of the future, and it aims to redefine the global governance and cooperation in response to [01:21:00] contemporary and future challenges, including but not limited to, climate change, pandemics, technological advancements and geopolitical tensions. As Doctor Malone said earlier on, it reaffirms the commitments the existing frameworks like the Sustainable Development Goals and the United Nations Charter. Now, what is really the problem with all this? Well, there is a very concerning policy that the policy brief that's called the emergency platform that would give Secretary Gutierrez authority to convene and operate an emergency platform in the event of complex global crisis, whether that be another pandemic, environmental crisis, disruption in global flow of goods, people or finance, or some other black swan event.

KAT LINDLEY: [01:21:50] Under this platform, Secretary Gutierrez would be given standing authority to convene and operationalize automatic and emergency platform

with [01:22:00] minimal consultation from governments, thus strengthening the sovereignty of Member States and in our case, United States of America. And this is exactly what Doctor Nasser was talking about and what Felipe Cruz was talking about. With the pandemic treaty and the amendments to the International Health regulations that the World Health Organization tried to do earlier this year. It is important for all our countries and the United States. We have several bills, and we have Senate and the House that's calling for our leadership to look into this and to make sure that the World Health Organization or the United Nations could not take sovereignty away from our country. Another important thing is our amendment ten right. The 10th amendment that does say that anything that doesn't go under federal jurisdiction goes back to the states. And this is where it's important for our states to fight back as well. And we have several states like Louisiana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and others that have tried, and some of [01:23:00] them have passed legislature to make sure that this doesn't happen. When it comes to World Health Organization, we need to do the same with the United Nations. The summit of the future and park for the future. That most likely will be signed later on this week. It's an existential threat to all our nations. Thank you, Frank.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:23:21] Thank you, Doctor Lindley. We're going to hear next from a man who has emerged as a leader of the conservative movement in the United States. His name is Bill Walton. He has had a number of positions in Washington, but most prominently, he has become of late the vice chairman of the Conservative Political Action Coalition, better known as CPAC. In a previous life, he is. Well, I call him a recovering master of the universe. A former Wall Street financial maven. His present [01:24:00] focus, however, has been very importantly on trying to preserve this country's sovereignty, both in his role as a member of our sovereignty coalition and through the good work of CPAC. And we're very pleased to have him with us to talk a little bit about his thoughts on the global governance gambit and the summit of the future must immediately. Over to you, Bill.

BILL WALTON: [01:24:26] It's hard to follow everybody that's come before me because you've all covered so many points, so, so many interesting ways. My take on this is maybe a little bit different. I don't think this is primarily being driven by the United Nations. Obviously, the United Nations is the latest version of the agenda that's being worked. But this this has been in the works for decades to and aimed and aimed primarily at American sovereignty. And this began in earnest during the Obama

administration. And we know most of the Obama administration carried over through the [01:25:00] Trump administration into Biden's group. And if you look at who's in there, it's most of the same people. And they've been working on undermining our sovereignty stealthily day after day and agency after agency in every way they can. And the, you know, some of the other people that are driving this, of course, are the people in Davos and Klaus Schwab and Bill gates, of course, is interested in America giving up its sovereignty. And China, of course, is driving this. They control, of course, the World Health Organization, through its executive director, probably have a somewhat similar relationship in the United Nations. And the irony is that China sees itself as a middle kingdom. They don't really, they don't, you know, they view that as they rule over, you know, all under heaven and they don't recognize any law except their own. And so that they're using these [01:26:00] legalisms of globalism and giving up national sovereignty to further their aims is at best ironic, but it's real and it is happening.

BILL WALTON: [01:26:12] And the attack on the United States sovereignty is coming from this direction. It's also coming from opening our borders wide open eliminating voter ID requirements so that illegal aliens can vote in the United States. And, you know, they've taken this group, has taken to calling themselves calling themselves the global majority, and they simply want to override what has made America so very, very special, which is it's a government. As John Adams said, it's a government of laws and not of men. Now, I don't want to be too myopic about America. CPAC has been running CPAC conferences all over the world. We've done seven or 8 or 9 in very interesting countries Mexico, Brazil, Japan, Israel, on and on. And [01:27:00] there is a there's a freedom movement against the globalist worldwide. And, and, you know, in some of these countries, particularly Japan, it's not so much a John Locke kind of natural rights argument. It's more they want to preserve their culture, their language, their way of life. And that's really what's at stake here. And that's why I think we can generate a lot of enthusiasm among people to, you know, fight back against this. And Kat mentioned a couple of things, but if you look at what they want to do, they want to. And as Alex mentioned, they want to conflate the climate agenda and make that part of what happened in 2020 with the, with CDC and the and the pandemic agenda. And they've lumped in all these, these crises together. That would be called a possible complex global shock.

BILL WALTON: [01:27:57] And I think part of the fight here, Frank, [01:28:00] is for us to make clear to everybody just exactly what they're talking about and how they want to take control, you know, environment, climate and environment, obviously, pandemics, biological agents, they want to be able to, to step in. The one of the interesting ones is disruptions to global flows of goods. And people are financed. Well, that encompasses everything. And my favorite in here is a major event in outer space that causes severe disruptions. And, you know, of course, China has already claimed the moon and Mars, so presumably that would be excluded from this, this category. But then just everything else, they have unforeseen events. Black Swan, when you put it out, if we if we talk in terms of legalism, I think we lose the argument. But if we talk in terms of what they want to do to claim control over us and compare it to the incompetence with which the CDC and the World Health Organization [01:29:00] handled the 2020 crisis, I think we've got a very good chance of not only pushing back on this, but making a big issue in the campaign. And I think this as a political matter, we need to make this a big issue in the in the campaign with the election. The technical date is November 5th, but we know it's already started and we know it will probably continue after the fifth, But I'm pleased to be part of this. And this is something we've got to stop dead in its tracks.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:29:31] Very important guidance on how we must proceed. And thank you for explaining some of the insights that have been garnered around the world by your organization, Bill, the Conservative Political Action Coalition. This is not a uniquely American problem. That's vital that we know that there are friends, albeit many, who would like our leadership on this matter, and we hope to provide it going forward. We're going to hear next from [01:30:00] a woman who has served in the State Department, as did one of our previous speakers, Bob Destro, in the role as the senior bureau official for international organizations, International Organization affairs, I should say, during the Trump administration, which included overseeing the various challenges in dealing with Organizations like the United Nations and the World Health Organization. Her name is Pam Pryor. I'm sorry to say she was not able to be with us in person, but she kindly gave us a video and we are going to go to that now.

PAM PRYOR: [01:30:35] Thank you to Frank Gaffney and Dede Laugesen for being so tireless in their support of American sovereignty and keeping tabs on the United Nations, especially the globalist proxies of the World Health Organization and other high sounding names like our Common Agenda Report or the pact for the future or the

summit for the future. When I was attending high level weeks during the first [01:31:00] Trump administration, whether in person or by zoom during Covid, it was a little more than a talkfest. If words were measured in gold, these events would be trillion dollar extravaganzas. Little action came out of these meetings, but I would posit that's a good thing. You see, the UN is the highest form of socialism and even communism with a little C. Everyone gets a say. Whether you are the United States paying most of the bills for everyone else, or third world country in deep arrears for past dues assessments. And while I have sympathy for third world countries and their multiplicity of problems, I kind of like the airlines oxygen mask policy. Put yours on first and then you can help others. We are a generous nation, whether the UN tells us to be or not, and we do help other countries without asking for anything in return. But we cannot allow this multilateral organization to usurp our authority with a new [01:32:00] emergency report just in case something happens, like a pandemic, a global power shortage, or something happens in outer space that affects us all, I guess like a mars invasion or something.

PAM PRYOR: [01:32:12] You see, they have no track record to prove that they are good at these things. They just continue to talk and fiddle while Rome burns as a grateful citizen of this glorious America. I want our sovereignty protected. I don't want a UN that steps on us and actually resents our power or way of life. And in 1945, when the UN was born, the world had suffered two world wars without great lasting peace emanating from either. And now, close to 80 years later, we may not have had another world war. But terrorism, pandemics, food shortages, lack of religious liberty, high rates of human trafficking, and countless bilateral military actions abound. And for the most part, the UN does little to [01:33:00] staunch the spread of terrorism. Pandemics curb food shortages. Nor is it successful in peacekeeping or helping long term solutions to refugee problems. To wit, UN workers with the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees were involved with the attack on Israel last October and in January when these. Allegations were brought to the UN by Israel. It took until August to get people fired. Just fired. It seems like criminal legal action would have been a better route to take with these folks than just firing them, but the fact that any of its employees were involved in a terror attack is a high crime to be taken seriously. According to the AP, Israel's allegations initially led top donor countries to suspend their funding for UNWRA.

PAM PRYOR: [01:33:52] That caused a cash crunch of about \$450 million. But since then, all donor countries except [01:34:00] for the US have decided to resume funding. Where is the deep dive investigation there? Or pack for the future or future of Israel or summit for the future of refugees? Look, if people from all over the world want to have a boondoggle in New York. The third week of September in meet and greet. Go for it helps the bottom line of New York City. But if you want to gather to figure out world domination in the name of a pandemic or outer space conflagration, the US should just say no thanks. The only thing going for us is agencies like the W.H.O. resemble the gang who couldn't shoot straight. They still deny Taiwan a seat at the table, despite the good protocols that they had during Covid, and they still have yet to even discover the real cause of Covid 19. But trust me, they will find time to talk about sustainable development goals, reproductive and sexual health and gender fluidity [01:35:00] all things that cannot help a starving person in Africa, a hostage in Gaza, nor a country without continual electric power. The best we can hope for if the UN overreach continues, is that a new administration in the US and the US Senate with backbone will channel their inner Nancy Reagan and just say no. Thank you so much for hosting this third Sovereignty Summit, and may God bless America.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:35:31] Amen. Thank you very much for your service to our country and including that you've just rendered. It's deeply appreciated. We're going to hear next from Doctor Andrea Nazarenko, a PhD who has founded and is the president of the Inspired Network, which sponsors the Inspired Global Leadership Summit as a, among other things, an event of the Geneva project that has facilitated [01:36:00] coming together of freedom minded leaders from around the world. We are deeply appreciative of her participation in these programs, as she brings a perspective on a sort of the psychological elements at work here, and not least the use of manipulative techniques to induce people to go along with these programs, including by inducing fear. We're very pleased to have her with us. Andrea, the floor is yours.

ANDREA NAZARENKO: [01:36:33] Thank you so much. I am so honored to be here. It's really quite an amazing lineup and, you know, refreshing to see such leadership pull together in one place. And I have to say that it is really reinforcing to hear such beautiful things come out of Geneva. Geneva was something that was spirit driven. It was it was the bringing together of some of the greatest minds and [01:37:00] the most fire in our soul to take back the sovereignty of our earth. And I was asked to come here today to

talk about what we could do next. And so we have a really exciting event planned here in America coming up in the next week in the next few weeks on the 29th of September in Washington, DC. And it's a really perfect time to talk about it, because so many of the experts on today's call discussed this idea of what could the people do? You know, we listened to this amazing summit and we feel ready. We're ready to take on our nation, to take back our nation and to fight with all of the fire in our soul. But what could we do and how could we do it? How can we wake policy makers up, and how can we get them on our side? There is so much complexity to the problems that we're faced, and there's so much expertise that is needed.

ANDREA NAZARENKO: [01:37:58] But at the bottom line [01:38:00] and at the core, there are American values that we could all stand behind, that we don't need huge amounts of knowledge to support that. We don't need to have PhDs and MDS and law degrees to know all of the details. We, the people of America, could stand up and support these values no matter what side of the aisle you're on. And so on September 29th, the people of the country will be coming together to rescue the Republic. We have an all-star lineup of folks, of keynote speakers, of comedians, of musicians. And we're all rallying behind these basic eight principles, because no matter where you lie on the political spectrum, these are things that underscore the fabric of our society. This is what our nation is based on, not global government, not the ideas that live within these treaties, not the ideas that are stealing and robbing [01:39:00] our sovereignty. But this is the stuff that our country was based on. And if we can stand behind these eight principles, then we will be in a much better place. So I share with you the lineup. We hope that you could come out to DC to stand with your fellow Americans. We have folks flying in from all over the world. This is a small step that you can take to help bring to action all of the items that our panelists talk about today.

ANDREA NAZARENKO: [01:39:32] It's always nice to be informed, but it's even better to be informed and ready for action. This is one step we could take as an action, and the sovereignty coalition always has high impact actions that we could take on a regular basis. I encourage anyone listening to join their email list, follow on social media because change happens one small action at a time. There are big rallies that happen, but small steps [01:40:00] like calling your legislators, supporting acts, and forwarding the very many impactful documents and resources put out by the sovereignty coalition are the ways in which we take a stand against all of the threats that they are pushing

out towards us. We the people, can do this together. We don't need to rely on external forces to save our sovereignty, to save us. We this election cycle is going to happen. There's going to be an outcome. Hopefully it's the one that's favorable towards us. But regardless of what happens, we the people are the ones who hold the power. And so I encourage everyone to remember that we are the 8 billion people of the world. They are the few. We are the many. We will always stay in control so long as we stay informed and ready for action. Thank you so much.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:40:52] Thank you. Doctor Nazarenko. Ariel Kellner has been active inside the councils of the Israeli government on [01:41:00] raising concerns about what has happened to Israel at the hands of global elites, a process that is very much in evidence at the moment with respect to the International Court of Justice and the W.H.O. and others who are denouncing Israel and otherwise seeking to bend it to their will. And we're grateful for his participation as well as his efforts within the Knesset, of which he is a leading member of the good party, as I recall, to elevate these issues and assert Israel's sovereignty in the face of these challenges. So let's go to the video with Member of Knesset Kellner.

ARIEL KELLNER: [01:41:52] From here in Jerusalem, I would like to congratulate the Sovereignty Coalition and personally, Frank Gaffney and [01:42:00] attorney Reggie Littlejohn. I would like to strengthen you. We need to protect our sovereignty. We need to protect our nations. This whole globalism trend is a danger to our sovereignty and to our freedom. And we need to stand together. I'm going to follow the discussions in the UN, and I'm going to protect the sovereignty of our nation. I encourage you to do the same for your nations, and together I'm sure we will succeed. Thank you very much. God bless you.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:42:42] Thank you, Member of the Knesset Kellner. Let's pick up, if I may, Meryl Nass with you. We have been very much alive to some of the abuses that these international organizations have engaged in.

MERYL NASS: [01:42:59] There is a question I'd [01:43:00] like to discuss particularly with Philippe or any other lawyers who are still present. And that is the legal implications of the pact for the future. The UN has made a tremendous effort to not to disguise whether this is a treaty. It doesn't look like a treaty. It's not written like a treaty, but they

are calling it an action oriented document. And, you know, I wonder if others could comment on how it might be enforceable or what it really means.

PHILIPP KRUSE: [01:43:35] Thank you. Meryl. So this is something I wanted to speak about and make the point in my previous brief speech, and that is that lawmakers need to come to the understanding that the content matters. The real effects of a treaty, no matter how it is called, no matter how it is introduced to the public, we have with the W.H.O., the regulations, the relations [01:44:00] to be understood as technical, mere administrative rules with limited effect. That's the official narrative. But once you analyze these rules, only then you understand the far reaching effect for people's lives. And here, with respect to the United Nations, the pact for the future, as it has been said repeatedly, every aspect of human life will be touched. And in addition to that, basic principles of constitutional architecture, of power and sovereignty. So that should respond to your question and also should make it clear to the lawmakers that we have to deal here with an international treaty with the effect of changing our constitutional order and imposing to people new obligations and depriving them [01:45:00] ultimately of their chance to be protected on the national level. And why is that? As I said, the most dangerous aspect, in my view, is this key they hold in their hand to control the narrative. Once you control the narrative, then you control the action of individuals and of governments. And there were many people to claim, well, this is not a loss of sovereignty. This is not a loss of sovereignty. Sovereignty is still there because governments go there as an example of sovereignty and they give their vote. Well, my response to that position is, can you imagine a captain on his ship claiming that as an act of sovereignty, he throws overboard his own compass because he receives the direction where is north and where the south from his king. That's exactly the same situation. Our [01:46:00] governments solemnly declare that this is an act of sovereignty. To throw out their genuine sovereignty to self. The analyze the situation to self, detect the problems, and to self-respond to the solution. So let's look at the effects and then we know what to do. And that we have to engage the lawmakers. They are in charge including the people. Because in my view we are looking at fundamental changes if not abolishment, of the entire constitution of member states.

REGGIE LITTLEJOHN: [01:46:39] I discussed that point with Doctor Boyle, Francis Boyle, and even though the pact for the future doesn't call itself a treaty, it is a treaty. So Pact is a legally binding agreement between two or more parties, especially nations or

governance as governed by international law. It can also be called treaties, conventions, protocols, [01:47:00] covenants or declarations. The name of the agreement is not important, but rather the content of what of the agreement. A treaty is any legally binding agreement between states, and it can be called a pact or an accord, etc. I discussed this with Doctor Francis Boyle and we both said it. You know, calling something a pact doesn't make it not a tree like the Warsaw Pact or whatever else. Sometimes trees are called pacts. And the intent it it's clear to us that the intention of the United Nations is that this would be legally binding under international law. Thank you.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:47:35] I wanted... Meryl, I was poised to ask you a question, if I could, about one of these treaties and the implications of it. It's still being negotiated by the World Health Organization, but it seems to me it's a prime example of why you don't want to entrust to global government any responsibilities at all. And that is the [01:48:00] idea that the world's nations need to share information about pathogens. And you've been very forceful in warning about the implications of this. Could you talk a little bit about it? And if it does, in fact illustrate the likelihood that left to their own devices, we will see actions taken that are very ill advised and possibly extraordinarily dangerous.

MERYL NASS: [01:48:28] There are a few different issues there. The first is that if nations manage their own business, their officials are accountable to the public. But if the UN or the W.H.O. manages our business, those leaders are accountable to nobody. And that's a big problem. And the way the all of these treaties and documents have been written for the W.H.O. and UN. There is no accountability, there is no review. There is no investigation by any other entities within the W.H.O., the UN, the [01:49:00] General Assembly, the Security Council, the nations. No way in these documents can they examine what the leaders of the W.H.O. and UN have done or are doing. As Philippe said, there are no checks and balances. This they have defined a dictatorship for us and told us that they want our leaders to go along with it, and they don't even want to hold a vote. They are holding something called. They've been holding a silence procedure and trying to make it appear that they have consensus when they don't. Last year, the UN attempted had a 13 page document that was supporting the W.H.O. pandemic treaties, the treaty and the IHR amendments, and 11 nations Wrote to the secretary general of the UN saying, we don't go along ahead of time. And what did the UN do about that? They pretended it didn't happen. They wrote [01:50:00] out a

statement as if they had achieved consensus. It was signed by the president of the General Assembly, and they pushed it out and never mentioned the 11 countries that had not gone along. These are international organizations that are power seeking. They are deceptive.

MERYL NASS: [01:50:14] They misrepresent. They lie to us. They conceal what they have said they want to do. The W.H.O. was very explicit. The UN has been vague, but they want to support and the infrastructure has been getting built in place for at least three years and possibly for the last two decades, which is the biosecurity agenda also known as pandemic preparedness and response. There are many names for it, but it is basically a giveaway to the virology, biosecurity and national security communities of many billions of dollars. [01:51:00] And the allegation is that other nations, our enemies, could attack us with biological weapons or lab creations, could escape. And therefore we need a central organization like the W.H.O. with a network of laboratories to which it is connected. And it already has one of these laboratories in Spitz, Switzerland, that will collect all the biological warfare agents, all the potential pandemic pathogens that any country will supply to them. They will put it into an essentially a library of pathogens and then share these pathogens with the rest of the world. Now. Does that make sense? On the one hand, they're worried about an enemy country using a biological weapon against another country. That's one hand. On the other hand, they want to share all the biological weapons with all the countries, so everybody has them. [01:52:00] Obviously, it makes no sense. And the more laboratories you have working with these potential pandemic pathogens, and there are, as designated by the US government, there are over 60 for animals, plants and humans. There are going to be more and more lab accidents. So the United States had received reports of 200 of these lab accidents with potential pandemic pathogens on a yearly basis for a week, right? Right.

MERYL NASS: [01:52:30] One almost every day. When and the UN and W.H.O. are encouraging developing nations to build their own laboratories and also work with these very dangerous, deadly Pathogens, which will encourage only more lab accidents because they don't have the experience to deal with them. This is insane. Now. The only conclusion I can reach is that they're actually seeking there to be more pandemics, that they're [01:53:00] hoping for, lab accidents they are hoping for use, and that will then give them authority to say what needs to be done to control these infectious diseases. The whole issue should raise the shackles of everyone who hears about it. It's

a terrible idea. It could, you know, it. It could have horrible ramifications. And it makes no sense. And so it's an obvious reason why we should reject all these treaties, all these organizations. And I would suggest the UN system is out of control. It is being controlled by people. We can't identify exactly who they are, but clearly, we know Bill Gates is donates billions of dollars to the W.H.O. and millions to the UN. There is no real good reason why the United States or most other [01:54:00] nations should even be a party to these organizations. And the best thing to do is and the safest thing to do for us is to leave them, because then they will wither away. They have been captured, they are no longer fit for purpose and they need to be gone. Thank you.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:54:17] Thank you, Doctor Nass. Joe Gebbia, I wanted to explore something that I think both you and Meryl addressed in passing, at least. And that is the fact that in no small measure, thanks to your good work and states shields, we now have an actual majority of the governors of the United States who have explicitly said they would not comply with what the World Health Organization is going to dictate. The question occurs do you believe that their attitude with respect to the infringement that these international organizations would inevitably [01:55:00] engage in on their responsibilities, their authorities, some of which are very explicitly left to the states like public health, would apply as well to what we're looking at emerging from this pact for the future, as it's called at the summit of the future.

JOE GEBBIA: [01:55:21] The premise for the answer to that question is the same premise that existed when we attacked the enacts and when we attacked the whose amendment updates. So basically, there have been lawsuits filed previously by attorney generals on behalf of the states, their states, and they have not been able to move forward because they did not have what's called standing, which meant that harm had to be imposed upon the state for the action taken. It's been a slow process in educating these governors for the last year and a half, and there's been an enormous increase in understanding of what's going on. So [01:56:00] where we're at, which is really historical, is that when we got to 26 governors, that was the first time that's ever happened. So that's more than half the country. And there was only one governor that didn't sign. And he basically operates in a very, very strong blue state. So that politics entered the and entered that decision. And then so we expect to be up to 30 states after November. We're really, we have very three states that are going to change governorships that we're fairly confident on. We attempted to reach out to Democratic

governors, but none of them ever want to participate, because then they're forced to have to defend the Biden position, and they don't want to suffer that embarrassment. So what we did and where we were moving forward to address the answer to your question is we had two states, as Reggie mentioned earlier, that passed their bills basically denying jurisdiction for the W.H.O. to operate in their states. Louisiana was the first state, and that was self-initiated by a state senator there. And then Oklahoma, [01:57:00] under Governor Stitt followed in concert. What we did is we then went back to the chair of the RGA, which is Bill Lee in Tennessee, who's the one who supported and got the other two governors to sign that, that we will not comply statement.

JOE GEBBIA: [01:57:14] And I proposed to him that we follow up with an executive order issuing, having the other 25 remaining states issue an executive order, which was predicated upon the bills passed in Louisiana and Oklahoma only. We updated it to include that if a dictate was to come from an outside entity like the W.H.O. or the UN or anybody pertaining to health related issues, and it came through the CDC that that was the same as if they were initiating the dictates upon the United States directly. It wasn't covered originally under the first two bills. It was a loophole there. So we covered that, and I'm pushing hard on that. [01:58:00] And we'll see what happens. We have to do the executive order before January, because January is when the session gets back in, and that's the only time you can pass bills. So that's the answer to your question is on a state by state basis, we have to have the grounds that would prove that damage is being done, that they would have standing. And I've also coordinated this activity with the chair of the Republican Governors Association, Republican Attorney General's Association. So they have that, of course, along with the four constraints that were in the amendment updates that created a mandate upon the United States. So we're prepared to take action. But until Biden signs the presidential agreement, no harm can be initiated. We're anticipating that. But again, to be prepared for it, I'm trying to get this executive order to pass that the remaining 25 states understood.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [01:58:57] Well, Godspeed. One of the people that we were very much hoping might [01:59:00] be able to join us has done so. I'm very pleased to say, actually, two of them. We're going to turn first to Lara Logan, who I'm pretty sure needs no introduction to this audience. She is one of our most distinguished journalists. Among other things, to her credit, a role on 60 minutes. But she has become an incredible voice for freedom and those who aspire to it, as well as those who are risking

It's lost, and she has become very much a catalyst for change in the right direction, and we couldn't be more appreciative of what she is doing in that regard, even as she works to try to improve the quality of our media, which is a sufficient task to say the least. But we are especially appreciative of her willingness to join us to talk a little bit about what the UN is up to, its [02:00:00] agenda for global governance and the inadvisability of it. Laura, thank you very much for being with us. The floor is yours.

LARA LOGAN: [02:00:09] Thank you so much, Frank. One of the things that I am working on right now is the other side of what this emergency power will actually mean, which is it may seem a little counterintuitive to some of you, but it's actually directly related, which is Afghanistan. And, you know, for many Americans, Afghanistan came and went. We knew it was an embarrassment and a disaster. It was a betrayal for many. But it sort of it seemed to recede into the background as an Afghan problem. Not the case. We have an absolutely catastrophic situation that is developing, and I relate it to the emergency powers, because the broad number of events that if there are successful in what they intend to do, which is to expand, you know, the definition of emergency global [02:01:00] emergencies and to put that centralized power in the United Nations secretary general and dictate the response. Well, that can apply to as we as you know, I know you've discussed to any number of things, but including a massive terrorist attack. And right now, I'm not quite sure that people really appreciate what has happened in Afghanistan. There are 24 Islamic terrorist groups that are currently based and training and have freedom. Freedom of movement in Afghanistan. Not only has the Taliban, I think that the Department of Education of the Taliban has, has put out that they have 4 million students who are enrolled in terrorist training at the madrassas. Okay. That's what the Department of Education for the Taliban has put out. Nobody is even asking, why are you training for a jihad if your jihad is ostensibly over? Because you now have a situation where you have the country.

LARA LOGAN: [02:01:59] Right. We [02:02:00] were told for years the Taliban doesn't have an existential agenda. They're not looking to take over the world. It's purely if America would just get out of their country. If you didn't have Americans on Afghan soil, the Taliban wouldn't have an issue with America. Well, we know that to not be true. So now what you what you have essentially created is you have a situation where these terrorist groups have complete freedom of movement in Afghanistan. What does that really mean? That means they have the ability now. Not just the motivation, not just the

ideology, not just the capacity, because they just graduated 70,000 students from these terror training camps. So motivation, ideology and capacity, which is now combined with two things logistical and financial networks. So they have the capability. So these networks have been expanded. They're all over the world, pretty much the US, the French, most European countries, [02:03:00] Western nations have been kicked out of Africa. Those countries no longer enjoy freedom of movement and significant access in Africa. Not completely kicked out, but they're definitely extremely limited. And at the same time, these terrorist networks have expanded their reach across Africa. Why does that matter? Well, because the funding is for ISIS. K is coming out of an office in Somalia and also out of another office in Nigeria. So we look at these groups, you know, from. Through a Western lens, and we don't pay much attention to them. We don't particularly care about them. And it's ironic to me because in the age of where we're supposed to be so woke, we look down on these organizations.

LARA LOGAN: [02:03:41] And I don't mean you or me. I mean, you know, as an administration, if you are the administration of you have correct the sort of sins of the past and acknowledge everybody and so on and so on. But yet at the same time, you're dismissive of these networks that have sprung up all across the world. And we have a [02:04:00] real problem here. The Europeans have now identified ISIS as the biggest existential threat to Europe. They've disrupted 15 plots that were either in planning stage or in operational phase over the last year, the Taylor Swift concert that was canceled. You know, they're not honest about these things publicly, but behind the scenes, that was in the operational phase of planning. They're working very hard to recruit people in Europe, and it's not very hard to do that to recruit disaffected Afghans across Europe and the United States, because, as we know I mean, you hear on the one side with Aurora, Colorado and Springfield, Ohio and so on, you know, about how much immigrants are getting and how this is at the expense of US citizens. But at the same time, you talk to the immigrant community and they're struggling. Well, why is that? Well, because to have a fully functioning life where you have a roof over your head, a house that you own, your own car, you know, food in the garage and [02:05:00] your children, you're able to take them on vacation once a year. I mean, these things are not simple to provide.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [02:05:09] Could I interrupt? I appreciate very much this excursion. Interestingly enough, one of the things that global governance types at the UN are

promoting is migration, by the way, which I think speaks to your point. Could I just ask you to suspend for a moment? Senator Ron Johnson has joined us. We thought he might not be able to get to us for a little bit longer, but he's with us, and I'm sure he can't stay very long. So if we could take him and then we'll come back to you momentarily. Senator Johnson, I've already introduced you, though you truly need no introduction to the Sovereignty Coalition team. We believe you are the single most important individual in the United States Congress when it comes to trying to protect the sovereignty of this nation. And your leadership in particular, with respect to having the Senate play its constitutional role [02:06:00] with respect to treaties that would infringe upon, if not actually crush our sovereignty, has been incalculably important. Would you please give us an update from your perspective on the state of that effort, as well as the challenge that you see emerging now from this summit of the future, which will be upon us next week. Welcome, sir.

Sen. RON JOHNSON: [02:06:23] Frank. Let me apologize profusely to Laura. I didn't intend to interrupt. I really apologize for that. But. But at the same time, I want to thank you and the Sovereignty Coalition for all your hard efforts, how doggedly you've continued to pursue and expose what these globalists are trying to do. Thank you. Obviously, with the who trees fortunately, we kind of we dodged a bullet momentarily. From that power grab by the globalists. But one thing you have to understand is the globalist. And by the way, they are the leftists [02:07:00] of the world. They're the radical leftists. Globally they are relentless. They will never stop. And the tools of their trade, the way they are able to gain more and more power is through fear. And again, to point out how relentless they are. I'm old enough to remember when they were pushing the fear of global cooling. And then when that wasn't panning out, they switched to global warming. And then when that didn't pan out, it was just climate change as a catch all. I mean, everything every major weather event is now attributed to climate change. Just about everything bad in this world is all attributed to climate change, so that they can scare the, you know what, out of the world population to give them more power. And I think what the pandemic did is it opened up a lot more people's eyes to their standard operating procedure. [02:08:00]

Sen. RON JOHNSON: [02:08:00] So climate change didn't quite do it for them. I mean, it's still pretty successful. They're still spending literally trillions of dollars not making a dent in trying to hold back the tides. But boy, once they had a pandemic and they were

able to, you know, that was set loose on the global society. They definitely did everything they could. And we saw our freedoms recede and we saw global governance enhanced and their power and their influence increased. And they use that fear. But now that that is somewhat subsided, they need a new pandemic. They're not even worried about having an actual pandemic. They're calling it disease X because something's going to happen. Something will they will be able to highlight, whether it's monkeypox or bird flu, they're going to be able to elevate something again to pandemic levels, create the kind of fear that will have the global [02:09:00] community go running to an outfit like the UN and grant them emergency powers to save them, apparently. Now, again, that's a false sense of security. Global governance Individual government governance can't solve these problems. So again, I'm so very thankful for the sovereignty coalition that is highlighting their power grab that is highlighting their abuse. You know, when it comes to what's happening in Congress, unfortunately, it's a Partizan issue.

Sen. RON JOHNSON: [02:09:35] You don't have Democrats that are demanding that any agreement that the Biden administration either does with the World Health Organization or the UN be deemed a treaty and come before the Senate for debate, for discussion, for exposure, and for eventual ratification, that they're happy to have all the stuff occur under the radar. So, you know, from my stand standpoint, the most important thing we can do is [02:10:00] make sure that we don't extend this administration into a Kamala Harris administration, that we make sure that President Trump wins in November. And that's certainly where I'm devoting an awful lot of my time and effort right now, but again, it all starts with exposing what they are trying to do. The relentless of the radical left of the world. You know, one order world governance cabal in terms of what they're doing and what that means for your individual liberty, your freedom, your health, autonomy. People have to be aware of that. And that's exactly what you and all your partners here in the Sovereignty Coalition are doing. So again, I apologize to Laura. I'll turn it back over to her. I look forward to seeing you again next time that we meet. But, Frank, thank you for everything you and the Sovereignty Coalition does well.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [02:10:50] And back at you, sir. Thank you for your leadership. And let me just say that there has been a signal development on that front. We have had four [02:11:00] Democratic members of the House of Representatives vote for the companion bill to the one you introduced, Senator s 444. That would require the

Senate's advice and hopefully dissent to the World Health Organization treaties. And I think that Congressman Massie actually got an amendment tacked on that says, you know, all of these treaties have got to be covered in that fashion. So we hope that's a full employment program for you in the United States Senate. But we so appreciate again your leadership and your participation on no notice at all in this program today. God bless you, sir.

Sen. RON JOHNSON: [02:11:41] Have a great day. Take care.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [02:11:42] Thank you. Laura Logan, back to you and time is somewhat limited, so if you can tie this together with our present preoccupation, it would be very helpful.

LARA LOGAN: [02:11:52] Okay, so basically what I'm describing is that while they're working at the UN to take over this power, they not [02:12:00] only, as you pointed out, Frank, and as I have pointed out repeatedly under the Global Compact, the United Nations Global Compact for migration, they already did what they followed up with the W.H.O. and what they're trying to do now with the secretary general. They already did this in 2018. Trump rejected it. And then of course, it's been embraced by Biden. So that's one part of it. But the part of it that people are really not aware of is that we they have set in place the machinery for an absolutely catastrophic, absolutely catastrophic campaign of terror by multiple terrorist organizations whose networks are now so entrenched globally. There are hundreds and hundreds of Chinese now based at Bagram Air Base in Afghanistan. This is not small. And so the only thing that that I'm really trying to impress upon people here is that as important as you all believe, this is because you're on this call. [02:13:00] We have no idea how urgent it is, because there are other things that have been set in place that go along with this, and this is at least one fight that we can bring out in the open. That strikes me as very simple. I mean, it's a very simple narrative for Americans to grasp. You want Constitution to matter, you want your vote to matter, and you don't want to be ruled by some unelected bureaucrat on the other side of the world. So then, you know, this is something that can unite Americans. I don't know, because I wasn't on the call, and I apologize for not being able to be here the entire time. I mean, to me, this is one of the most urgent issues before the campaigns and anything that can be done to get this before the campaigns really matters.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [02:13:40] Laura Logan, thank you. This is a very important contribution and broadens our horizon. And I would just add that in addition to the things that you've referred to that make this safe haven for the world's jihadists into a global threat, which almost certainly at some point will [02:14:00] be used as a pretext for, you know, global responses, global governance and the like we left, by some estimates, \$83 billion worth of very advanced weaponry for the Taliban to both use themselves and to disseminate around the world to others, which adds enormously to the dangers that you have described. So thank you again for joining us. Laura, again on very short notice, we're going to conclude with a watch this space kind of feature to this program. It's a little bit off the topic of the immediate summit for the future and its agenda. But trust me, for reasons that you will hear from our next presenter, Margaret Byfield of American Stewards of Liberty, the effort to gain control over our lands and therefore over [02:15:00] our population in the furtherance of This idea that climate change or other green initiatives have to take precedence as mandated by the World Health Organization and its sustainability goals and the like. This is a very, very important aspect of the larger agenda and one to which we must attend. So, Margaret Byfield, thank you for your leadership on this issue. It was alluded to earlier in the program, the natural asset companies and what is now being cooked up in their stead, I guess in the way of something called natural capital accounts. Welcome. The floor is yours, ma'am.

MARGARET BYFIELD: [02:15:48] Thank you. All of you. I know we've worked with all of you, many of you who are the panelists here. That definitely helped us stop the natural asset companies. So that was a heavy lift by everyone and [02:16:00] really appreciate everybody's contribution to that. Basically the next iteration is now really developing, and it's something that we've been watching for a while. In fact, Frank, you, Bill and I had a conversation maybe about a month ago about kind of the latest things the white House is doing to advance this idea that they can create a new asset to monetize, which is monetizing these natural processes, things that we learned about for the first time that it was really even an issue. Things like pollination, photosynthesis, and the health benefits of being in open air. It's been this move to create a whole new asset class that they attach to land and air, but then use it as a way to control that land through the sustainability agenda. And so with the natural asset companies, that was one of the key things that we were fighting. We did not want to see these things monetized. First off, they're not property. You can understand property simply as

something that you can contain and [02:17:00] exclude others from. So land and water fits that bill. But pollination, photosynthesis, health benefits from open space. You cannot exclude people from using that. We all must have that, which is the reason why these things have never been considered property before.

MARGARET BYFIELD: [02:17:17] But that's the real play that is taking place, is there is a move to for entities to own the environmental services, which is the monetization of these natural processes that come off of land. So we fought that with the natural asset companies when the private side was trying to gain ownership of these natural processes on federal and proper and private lands here in America, we're now fighting it again through a strategy that the white House finalized in January of 2023, and that is to create a new line item on the federal balance sheet called Natural capital [02:18:00] accounts. So now we're talking NCAs. So these natural capital accounts is where they would take the value of these environmental services presumably. And they say this in their executive summary that when they contribute to something that like, like through conservation programs where there's federal dollars used to carry out conservation programs and private lands, then that value that the environmental services that are generated through that need to be accounted for on the federal balance sheet. So it's kind of it's similar to NACs, but it's different because in this, this time, the purpose of it is to raise the wealth of the federal government, which we think could be for a number of purposes, one of which, most notably and obviously, is to increase the amount of net wealth of the US to increase our ability to acquire more [02:19:00] debt.

MARGARET BYFIELD: [02:19:00] So that's one reason there's a lot of different reasons for it. The documents actually say that it's to help track our progress towards meeting the sustainability goals. So that's another reason for it. But I think the main thing to understand is that they are at it again of trying to figure out how to create a new property, right. You know, you know the saying that has been shared many times, we don't have any more land, so there's no more land to buy or sell. It's all been appropriated. And this is, I think, their way of trying to come up with a new asset class to generate additional wealth. But the other thing to understand about this is that the value of these natural assets is not determined by consumers. So you think of our market is a consumer marketplace. It's what people will buy and sell that determines the price of the items that that then generate our whole economic system. In this case, consumers are not [02:20:00] going to determine the value of air pollination or photosynthesis. It's going

to be determined by using a UN accounting system to determine that the air you breathe is worth X, and the air I breathe is worth Y. And that value is going to change depending on who is sitting in the White House. So it's completely subjective. It's politically. It's politically motivated. And it could do incredible distortions to our marketplace if it is allowed to go forward.

MARGARET BYFIELD: [02:20:32] So this is something that we've been tracking, and we've had discussions with many of you on the call about to keep this audience in particular. Well, apprised of what they're doing. We've had now kind of another iteration of this and that is that in the end of 2022, there is a bill slipped into the appropriations bill, the omnibus appropriations bill called the Sustains Act. Now, the Sustains Act is a Republican [02:21:00] led bill, even though it went into a Democrat bill. It's actually a Republican promoted idea. And what it does is it allows private contributions to be made to these federal conservation programs that then are put on private lands. And the secretary is directed to determine who owns the environmental services. And the way that the statute is written is it requires that the private contributor prescribes how much of the environmental services they know they own. The Secretary approves that and then the landowner is noticed. So this is where you have the federal government, a private outside contributor, which could be the Nature Conservancy. It could be China sovereign wealth funds. I mean, we don't know where this money is coming from, and the law itself does not have any guardrails on it that protect the landowner, [02:22:00] but they will be making the determination of who owns the environmental services now on that private landowners property. So again, it goes back to the advice that we give landowners stay out of these federal conservation programs, if you can if you can avoid it, stay out of it.

MARGARET BYFIELD: [02:22:17] That's the safest position that you could be in so that these things aren't triggered on your property. So that's one of the things that's going on right now. The, the department, the US Department of Agriculture and NRCS is in the process of writing policies on how they're going to implement that. They are not going through a formal rulemaking process, which is what you would expect when you're doing something the size of this with the magnitude of this. But what they're doing is just simply have asked for a request for information that will not go through. And we could not challenge through an APA challenge. And this is what administrations do when they don't want to be challenged on a policy. So they've avoided [02:23:00] the rulemaking

process, and they are just going to do this via policy. The good news is, if we get a change of administration, the new Secretary of Agriculture could rescind whatever policy they come up with. Also, because this was a part of the Appropriations Act, it could be rescinded through a reconciliation budget reconciliation process. So there are two ways that we could actually get this. This stopped, which is important for everybody to know. And I think it's something to start educating your members of Congress on so that they're aware of this. And when those opportunities come up, they know exactly what they need to do.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [02:23:38] We're beyond our allotted time as it is, but I wanted to just feature this particular coming - not attraction - but potentially significant problem for, you know, one of the fundamental elements of our form of government. Namely, property rights and the efforts that you're making to [02:24:00] raise awareness about it and to. Expose in particular how this fits into, you know, sort of this globalist agenda that they will get. Access to our resources or prevent us from having access to our resources and the nature of. Sustainability and so on is an element of the global government, the world government. Both its purpose, its objectives, its policy initiatives. And we thank you for contributing to this part of the program, Margaret Byfield. We're going to wrap it up, having extended this by half an hour beyond what we asked you all to allocate. I want to thank every one of our participants, as well as, of course, those who have made all this possible - Dede Laugesen and Oleg Atbashian - our tremendously creative and energetic staff for the Sovereignty Coalition and its work. We are grateful to you in the audience as well, for taking all this [02:25:00] aboard, and we hope, beginning to become involved. The Sovereignty Coalition is one way you can do that. As was mentioned earlier, there is an Align Act campaign that is active right now in encouraging your elected representatives to oppose what's going on at the summit of the future and to, among other things, support efforts to ensure that the Senate advises and considers, shall we say, dissents, hopefully to pack for the future that would infringe upon our sovereignty.

FRANK GAFFNEY: [02:25:33] I might also add that there is an Align Act campaign on this issue that Margaret Byfield just has brought up as well. Today is the closing day of comments for the Department of Agriculture, if you care to learn more about that and engage with the Agriculture Department, as well as with your elected representatives, to alert them to what's going on in this next phase of the assault upon our sovereignty

[02:26:00] and freedoms. We encourage you to check out SovereigntyCoalition.org for that Align act campaign as well. In the meantime, I want to thank especially the Patriots that are yet to learn about all of these things, but who will hopefully do so when these important comments and presentations are made available with the posting of this video, which should be in the next day or so on the SovereigntyCoalition.org website. Thank you very much, everybody. Please pass on the links to this video when they become available. And as I'm fond of saying, go forth and multiply. God bless you all.