

TRANSCRIPT

SOVEREIGNTY SUMMIT 7:
Exposing the Hidden Traps in the WHO's Pandemic Treaty

*Frank Gaffney & Reggie Littlejohn, Esq., with Jonathan Alexandre, Esq.,
Alex Newman, Andrea Nazarenko, Ph. D.*

Tuesday, April 8, 2025

<https://sovereigntysummit.org/the-sovereignty-summit-7/>

Media file: SovSummit 7.mp4

BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

Dede Laugesen: [00:00:05] Hello everyone. Thanks for joining us today. I'm Didi Lawson for the Sovereignty Coalition. We appreciate your presence at the seventh Sovereignty Summit. We encourage you to visit SovereigntyCoalition.Org for information on new programs, access to videos of our past summits and webinars, and tons of other very valuable content. Please subscribe to our Substack at Sovereignty.Substack.com And follow us on X at @SovCoalition. Our moderator today is Frank Gaffney. Frank is co-founder of the Sovereignty Coalition, president of the Institute for the American Future, and host of Securing America with Frank Gaffney on Real America's Voice Network.

Frank Gaffney: [00:00:48] Good afternoon. This is a special Sovereignty Summit. I am in a mobile studio, in a manner of speaking, and I'm catching as catch can on a very [00:01:00] important topic. It is one that is, as we speak in the process of being further thrashed out by the World Health Organization and its member nations. It is involving a pandemic preparedness and response treaty that has been the subject of intense conversations and negotiations and disputes and various other histrionics now for several years. We're catching up with it in what is supposed to be the end game. As the World Health Assembly meeting looms at the end of May beginning of June, at which point this treaty is supposed to be done and then approved by the participating nations. It remains very much to be seen whether that will happen or if it does [00:02:00] happen, whether it will happen in advance of the meeting. It's supposed to be done, of course, four months in advance for the own the rules of the World Health Organization's international health regulations. That is not generally the practice, however, as we saw

with the recent escapade last year of amending the International Health Regulations done, literally at the last possible moment in the dark of night in Geneva, Switzerland with, I think it's fair to say scarcely anybody knew what was in the document that was agreed. That may prove to be the case here, too. But what we're going to try to do today is to assess what seems likely to be in it. And at least some of that whether it's based upon the last of the formal drafts that has been made available [00:03:00] for comment.

Frank Gaffney: [00:03:01] Or the informal drafts that has also been circulated. It appears that there are certain aspects of the pandemic treaty that are more or less set, and that will prove to be, we believe, the sovereignty coalition to be very problematic indeed. We're going to hear from a wonderful panel of people who have been following the negotiations and are deeply knowledgeable in the substance of what is being negotiated, and I think are very clear eyed about the problems that it might represent, not just, by the way, for member nations who sign up to be subject to this treaty, but also quite possibly for the rest of the world as well, Including the United States of America, which Donald Trump has decided will [00:04:00] finally withdraw from the World Health Organization, a move that we at the Sovereignty Coalition very strongly support and commend him for doing. We're going to hear first from our co-founder of the Sovereignty Coalition, a woman who has distinguished herself in a number of other ways as well. She is the founder of a relatively new organization. The deals with the globalist international. And it's a form to oppose it, needless to say. She is also the founder and president of the Women's Rights Without Frontiers. She is Reggie Littlejohn, Yale trained attorney specializing in litigation. In her day and now very much devoted to trying to help bring those same skills to bear on behalf of freedom and humankind. We're deeply [00:05:00] grateful for her participation in this program, as well as her leadership of the coalition. Reggie, hope to you.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:05:05] Thank you very much. So the INB, the international negotiating body of the World Health Organization, this very week, is meeting trying to hammer out agreements to several controversial provisions in the new pandemic treaty. They are, of course, continuing to refuse to call it a treaty. They call it a convention, agreement or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response. So the reason they don't want to call it a treaty is that they don't want it to have to go through the treaty process in the various countries. But it is a treaty. It's a negotiated agreement between nations, a treaty. And this they hope to vote on at the

end of May, the beginning of June at the upcoming World Health Assembly. And they have even voiced [00:06:00] the concern that if it is not voted on at this assembly, that there is going to be a lack of will, that the political will will dissipate and there will be no pandemic treaty. So I think that actually would be a great outcome. I'm going to concentrate on a couple of things. One is the way that this treaty, consistent with the International Health Regulations, supports the digital gulag that I've been speaking about. And then the other one about the pathogen access and benefit sharing system, the PABs system. Both of these are highly problematic, but I just want to. And what I'm going to do is I've got a copy here of the latest. Actually, it's kind of an informal draft.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:06:43] This is a it says it's an on screen text reflecting progress up to up to Friday, February 21st of 2025. So in this draft, it says here recognizing that the World Health Organization is the directing [00:07:00] and coordinating authority on international health work, including pandemic prevention, preparedness and response. So what this is seeks to do is to position the World Health Association as the one who's going to be directing and coordinating the implementation of, of international health response to pandemics or whatever else, international health crises. So to whoever is saying that this is really no different than what has gone before, it is, is because the way that the World Health Organization started was that it would just make suggestions. It was a resource for people to consult, and now they are recognizing themselves as the directing and coordinating authority. Now that's on page four. On page five It says here, recognizing the importance of building trust and ensuring the timely sharing of information to prevent [00:08:00] misinformation, disinformation and stigmatization. All right. So in the amended international health regulations, they say that they want to address misinformation and disinformation. That's pretty you know, that that's an ambiguous term. How do you address it? They don't say how they're going to address it. Well, I guess we can find out here in the in the draft pandemic treaty. They want to address it by preventing it. So this is not a situation where somebody says something that is misinformation or disinformation and then it's censored.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:08:35] This is a situation where they are seeking to prevent us from even saying misinformation and disinformation. No information is given out, out about how they're going to do this. But I find this prevention of misinformation and disinformation to be very, very troubling, especially given the way that they've defined misinformation and disinformation in the past. [00:09:00] Actually, they've never quite

defined it, but you can define it by their actions and by their actions. You can see that misinformation and disinformation as they see it is basically voicing an opinion, including if you're a scientist or a physician and you have and you're an expert in the field, but voicing an opinion that counters or is contrary to whatever the narrative is of the World Health Organization is pushing out. So that, for example, in the beginning of the pandemic they were the World Health Organization was parroting the Chinese Communist Party, saying, this is not a lab leak. It was, you know, a wet market bat infection. There's no human to human transmission there. You know, it's racist, basically to, move to restrict travel to and from China. Those are all Chinese narratives which the World Health Organization pushed out all over the world. The result of which is that the world was not on guard to human to human transmission, and then accepted [00:10:00] flights from China all over the world in enabling the virus to be spread all over the world. And if you had at that time said, you know what, there is human to human transmission and it was not spread by a bat.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:10:14] It was a lab leak. And we should restrict travel from China, which China was restricting travel internally. Those would have been called misinformation and disinformation, and you would have been censored and possibly lose your license if you're a medical doctor saying things that are contrary. So that's bad enough. But how are they going to prevent people from even saying the misinformation in the disinformation? That is something I find quite chilling to even speculate about. And so one of the ways that they're going to, you know, identify and prevent this spread of so-called misinformation and disinformation is by surveillance and, and censorship. So [00:11:00] not to go into a lot of detail because one of the other panelists will, but they have the one health approach is put forth in the pandemic agreement. And the one health approach seeks to balance human health, animal health, plant health and the environment. And this kind of thinking, this balancing of human health with plant health, animal health and the environment. Number one, in many ways, I think is anti-religious. I mean, we believe, you know, many traditions believe that human beings are created by God in his image. And this is not something that is shared by rats and cockroaches and, and other, you know, animals and plants. But on top of that, this is the kind of thinking that we saw in California with the wildfires where the governor there, Gavin Newsom, even though California had had a lot of rain in the previous years, did [00:12:00] not capture that rain in reservoirs to be used by humans, he let it flow out to the sea to save some little two inch fish called the smelt.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:12:08] And then when the fire broke out in Southern California, there wasn't enough water to put them out. And there was tremendous loss of human life and devastation. That's the kind of thing that we're talking about. We balance human health against, you know, a human being's health against the health of a two inch smelt. The human being doesn't necessarily win out. So this is a very dangerous way of thinking. And one of the other panelists is going to go into more detail about this. But what the one health, the relevance of the one health approach, is that what it does? Is it gives a pretext for the World Health Organization to be surveilling us in terms of human health, animal health, plant health and the environment, surveilling basically every aspect of life on Earth. And companion animals are specifically [00:13:00] mentioned in the pandemic. This draft pandemic agreement. So if you have a cat, you have a dog, you have a parrot, you have whatever you have. The World Health Organization is reserving the right to come to come into your home and surveil your pet in case, you know, there might be some kind of human animal to human transmission of something.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:13:25] So regarding the pathogen access and benefits sharing system. This starts on page 16 of the draft pandemic agreement. Let me just give you an overview. Pathogen access and benefit sharing. So what's pathogen access? What's a pathogen? The pathogen. They're concentrating on pathogens with pandemic potential. And so these are our deadly [00:14:00] germs that could or they don't have to necessarily be deadly. They are dangerous germs that can spread easily and make a lot of people very sick very quickly. Pathogen access. What this means is that when someone discovers a pathogen or perhaps even develops a pathogen in the lab, that they are to send it to the World Health Organization, who will then farm it out to labs all over the world to develop a vaccine. Well, what could possibly go wrong? So to the extent that we believe that the Wuhan virus was leaked out of a lab in Wuhan. If you're going to spread something like that to however many dozens of labs all over the world you are greatly increasing the chances of more lab leaks causing pandemics. So what's that going to do? Well, there's going to do a couple of things [00:15:00] anyway. If there's a chronic flow of pandemics from different lab leaks all over the world, number one, it's going to greatly benefit the vaccine manufacturers, right? They're going to make a lot of money from all of those pandemics. And number two, it's going to serve as a pretext to keep the world on lockdown and to take away our rights systematically and consistently.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:15:26] We're going to be in a current a consistent, chronic state of emergency. And that, you know who benefits? People who make money off of vaccines and people who want to exert totalitarian control. So this is a this is a terrible system. In my opinion. And it's something that's really terrible about it is also, if you look at provision number two, paragraph two it says here I'm not going to read it. It's all in very dense legalese. What it says is basically that they're not going to really try [00:16:00] to work out the details of this in this pandemic agreement. They're going to they're going to kick the can down the road by having the conference of the parties come up with something that will be an annex to this agreement. So this agreement is actually, you know, this provision, the provision is very controversial. It's one of the main sticking points that they're trying to hammer out right now, and they're actually not going to work out the details. They're going to give it over to the conference of the parties that's going to vote on it and attach it. So what that means is that, you know, the conference of the parties is another whole big problem that is in this pandemic agreement. But I don't know that there's any provision for an annex to an existing treaty to go through the treaty process.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:16:52] It's a way of trying to make it so that whatever agreement they come out with is not going to be voted on by the nations. [00:17:00] And this and these agreements are very controversial and they're very, very difficult. And they should it should be in the agreement itself so that it's voted on by all the nations. Okay. So. One of the things benefit sharing. So that's pathogen access. Benefit sharing is they want first class labs to be all over the world. The question is who's going to finance those? Who's going to finance the building of all of these, you know, state of the art labs all over the world? The United States has withdrawn from the World Health Organization. Otherwise, I have no doubt that we would have been saddled with a lot of the bill for that. But they also are requiring and I am going to read this. Okay. It says here and this is under benefit sharing. Each participating manufacturer. Okay. So that would be a pharmaceutical company. You know Moderna Pfizer AstraZeneca. Just name the pharmaceutical companies. Each participating manufacturers shall make available to the W.H.O. [00:18:00] pursuant to legally binding contracts signed with the W.H.O. So the W.H.O. is going to be the center of all of this contractual activity. People are not going to be made. Countries are not going to be making contracts with each other.

Pharmaceutical companies are not going to be making contracts with countries. It's all going through the W.H.O.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:18:17] So they are going to make available rapid access to 20% of their production of safe, quality and effective vaccines, therapeutics and diagnostics for the pathogen causing the pandemic emergency with flexibility, providing a threshold of at least 10% of their real time production is made available to the show as a donation, and the remaining percentage to fulfill the 20% commitment is at an affordable price or reserved for the show so well. So this is a situation where they are saying you know, the [00:19:00] to the vaccine manufacturers, whatever you create, that's a, you know, vaccine, you got to give 20% of it has to be saved for other countries. You can't just, you know, sell it to, to the United States or whatever, wherever you created it. 10% is a as a donation and another 10% as a reduced price. That's a big sticking point, no doubt with the vaccine manufacturers. And here are some other of the things that of the benefits that have to be shared by. And these are going to be set out by legally binding contracts signed with the W.H.O. So, I mean, whoever says that all of this stuff is voluntary. What's voluntary about a legally binding contract with the W.H.O.? So, so, so developed countries are going to have to help with capacity building and technical assistance, meaning, you know, donate a bunch of money to, to build state of the art labs in other countries. Research and development in [00:20:00] other countries.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:20:01] I mean, it goes on and on, other forms of relevant technology transfer. And that's a whole nother subject. But one of the big sticking points is, is either the forced transfer of technology or the voluntary transfer of technology. That's what they're what they're struggling with. But there will be technology transfer. So and also meanwhile there is no real they have not set forth any kind of. Parameters or a view of how safe these labs are to make sure there aren't any lab leaks, no oversight or anything like that. So between the surveillance and the control and, and really the damaging of our sovereignty through the suppression of so-called misinformation and disinformation. And the reason that that damages our sovereignty is that what is sovereignty? Sovereignty is your [00:21:00] ability to make informed decisions that you can implement. You can't make an informed decision if true things that are being labor are being labeled by the World Health Organization as misinformation and disinformation. You can't make a sovereign decision if you're an individual or a nation. So between that and the digital gulag, that this is going to put us in through the

surveillance and, and control and also this pathogen access and benefit sharing system, which could lead to a state of chronic pandemics which will benefit greatly vaccine manufacturers and be a pretext for causing us to be to lose our constitutional rights. This pandemic agreement is extremely dangerous and needs to be opposed. Thank you.

Frank Gaffney: [00:21:52] Reggie, thank you for this extremely comprehensive treatment of several of the most important of the problems with this treaty. Not hidden, [00:22:00] if you know what to look for, that's for sure. But thank you for laying out so elegantly the evidence that this is not the kind of agreement that we want to be party to or be subject to, even if we are to party. I did want to rectify a mistake in presenting one of your programs. The Anti-globalist international is the name of your group. We will then go to a video contribution by Jonathan Alexandre of Liberty counsel. And Liberty Counsel action. He is the senior counsel and vice president for governmental affairs and those important members of our coalition. We've asked him to speak about intellectual property rights and financial costs associated with belonging to the W.H.O. Let's go to the videotape with Jonathan.

Jonathan Alexandre: [00:22:47] Liberty Counsel wanting to address just that section of article 11 of the proposed treaty that seeks to make private industry technology mandatory, to be shared across [00:23:00] even national borders. And the word there that is stopping them, or many places that they are having to face a speed bump is in this word, voluntary. We should only have a voluntary approach for private companies to develop and fund the innovations. But of course, this red flag comes up as this dangerous, underhanded attempt, this quiet push to remove words like voluntary, ultimately making it mandatory even across national borders for private companies to share their technology. They're reacting to the word voluntary. Sort of like it's a contingent itself. It's contagious if you have voluntary, because some might think that countries actually have a choice in the globalist germ can't react to voluntary sovereignty spreads. And so globalism retracts if you have voluntary. And at the heart of this dispute is whether or not countries, and by extension, private innovators, [00:24:00] should be forced to give away their hard earned intellectual property under the guise of global solidarity. Nations like Germany. You already saw Germany enact emergency powers to compel certain production during Covid, and so they, even them, are sort of

further down the road. And what it may look like for a government to compel its private industries. And so private sector breakthroughs, as we know, were critical.

Jonathan Alexandre: [00:24:29] They were central to the Covid response, but they also want to be able to maintain their innovation, their proprietary of knowledge. And so forcing these innovators to share their technology under these vague compulsory conditions would cripple any future development. It would delay responses if there is something to react to. Of course, this common phrase is often used while its equity proponents of removing voluntary from the treaty say, well, this is [00:25:00] just going to be equitable. It'll allow wealthier nations to help lower income nations. But you by saying that you're ignoring the realities, the economic realities of what innovation is. Research itself is expensive. Research is time sensitive. Research is often funded by private risk capital. It's not government entities that promote innovation and research and are funding this. This is private risk capital that leads to such great innovation. And so using words like equity doesn't change the fact. This is once again, global bodies attempting to come in and strip the power of innovators and ultimately skirting patent systems. So there are patent laws and patent systems certainly in United States and in many other nations. This is ultimately a back door effort to undermine those patent systems. It's a precedent that could backfire. So don't [00:26:00] think for a second, it's only going to remain in the sector of vaccine development or other pharmaceuticals. If there is another sector where the so-called global crisis arises, then they'll use this same argument to say, well, you have to hand over your cybersecurity to this governing body or you have to hand over even your physical agriculture, which you produce.

Jonathan Alexandre: [00:26:24] You must do that to react to the global crises. So anytime you remove voluntary, it ultimately leads to a coercive redistribution of proprietary information. And it is a slippery slope that will lead to other sectors. I sort of want to do a point counterpoint. So one of the points that they make is that the term voluntary is redundant, that you already have mutually agreed terms, and that means transfer is voluntary. Well, the counterpoint to that is if you do leave out the word voluntary, the pressure comes in future interpretations that [00:27:00] technology must be handed over. If the word voluntary isn't there, it will remove any protections that companies and countries have from being compelled to give up their valuable technology and their trade secrets under global pressure. One of the claims they make is that manufacturers won't be forced to force to transfer technology because

international law does not bind private companies. Well, you can make an argument for that, but governments can certainly try to apply that pressure. And so it's not just individual governments like Germany applying that pressure, but you have the impetus from other company countries saying, well, you signed on to this.

Jonathan Alexandre: [00:27:37] You should facilitate, you should urge your country. And so you have outside powers influencing that individual government saying, hey, you signed on to this. You should urge that transfer, even if that isn't the intention. And I do think now we do realize that is the intention. Without the word voluntary being there, it is clear that there is a gray area that governments [00:28:00] can interpret themselves, and certainly outside global bodies will say, hey, you agreed to this thing, you should enforce it within your country. The word voluntary, there is not going to limit governments from engaging in their own tools to compel tech transfer is needed. That's an. Another argument that if you have voluntary there, it's going to limit government's powers to influence. Ip rights within their country. Once again, I think the same argument. Responding to that is true. Individual governments will have to face elections. They'll have to face their populace rising up against them if they're forcing certain things, particularly on private innovation. If you remove voluntary there, that government no longer is able to yield to a higher body and say, well, we're bound by this because of something we signed and the global pressure campaign will be severely diluted if voluntary is there. And private [00:29:00] companies, even if they're making the arguments within court and say, no, you are not required yourself to follow this.

Jonathan Alexandre: [00:29:06] Therefore, there is no nexus to you forcing us to do this. Another argument they made is that voluntary approaches is what failed the world during Covid. It's not voluntary purchase that failed during Covid. It was the inefficient bureaucracy. It was the poor coordination. It was the overreach of governments stifling individuals rights that failed during Covid. It was the stripping away of rights that made companies that could have otherwise been in the fight be apprehensive, or companies that would have otherwise had the capital being forced to shut down such that they couldn't produce or innovate locally. So it wasn't the same case across the world as it was in individual countries. Individual countries should have been able to make the decisions themselves, not just individual countries, individual states, individual [00:30:00] localities and municipalities being able to make the decisions themselves based on what was going on right around them geographically. And so it wasn't a

voluntary approach that failed during Covid. It was this top down, one size fits all. Inefficient bureaucracy that ultimately failed. What voluntary being added to this language will do, or included in this language will do, will ensure that individual localities have all the power that they need in the private industries. Within those individual localities will have all the power they need to react to the situation that is on the ground in front of them, without some obligation to a global power that doesn't have any interest in what's going on right there on the ground.

Jonathan Alexandre: [00:30:48] The last claim that they make that I'll refute is that while other UN agreements already define that, there can be this transfer of intellectual property, and they don't necessarily limit it by [00:31:00] having the word voluntary. So there's other UN agreements there. They don't put voluntary on it. We don't need voluntary within this agreement. Well that's not a good argument. You shouldn't make the same mistake again. Every agreement should be judged based on its own consequences. And if this is a consequence that deals with lifesaving, high risk technology during a so-called global crisis, then that clarity matters even more. Just because we've made the mistake in the past and have yielded authority through other UN agreements that weren't clear enough, we should take every opportunity we have to fix that now and not repeat the same vague wording that leads to a globalist grab of not just individual nations, but a globalist grab of the private innovation that is so critical for all of the technology that we have all across this country. And so for these reasons, we need to oppose anything that [00:32:00] does not reemphasize the voluntary nature of sharing a private or national intellectual property as a response to a future global crisis.

Frank Gaffney: [00:32:13] Jonathan, thank you again. An absolutely marvelous discussion of what we are being told on the one hand, and what is the truth on the other, as it relates particularly to the financial and intellectual property rights implications of this, this treaty that they're trying to foist upon the world. We're going to hear next about, as promised by Reggie, this one health business and the general thrust of this treaty, of course, which is as part of the World Health Organization's agenda, as part of the UN's agenda, which the World Health Organization is, of course, a part. Namely, global government. How does [00:33:00] this treaty advance? That agenda is a topic to which we have asked one of our great contributors to the Sovereignty Coalition, Alex Newman to speak. He has an internationally recognized and award winning journalist with Sentinel, Liberty Sentinel Media. He has contributed immensely to such

publications and outlets as Epoch Times, WorldNetDaily, The Freedom Project Media, The New America magazine, Law Enforcement Intelligence Brief. He's the author of Indoctrinating Our Children to Death. We've asked him, as I say, to speak to One Health and how that might advance this globalist world government agenda. We have him joining us by video as well. Let's go to him now.

Alex Newman: [00:33:51] Hey guys. Great to be with you. Thank you very much. I'm Alex Newman, journalist, and I've been following the W.H.O. threat for a very long time. It's a great honor to be with you again. And I want to start by saying [00:34:00] just because we're out of the W.H.O. right now does not mean that the danger has passed. As some of the other panelists have explained. Right. We've got the World Health Organization and many of its member governments continuing to push this pandemic treaty and all the rest of the global agenda. In fact, as they're meeting now, the director general, Dr. Tedros Ghebreyesus, the former Marxist revolutionary Marxist terrorist with the Tigray People's Liberation Front, he was chiding governments for being willing to spend money on the military, but not doing enough to prepare for the invisible enemy, the pandemic causing pathogen that might be more damaging than war. He also, in his talk, said all governments must find a balance in protecting people from both bombs and bugs because the next pandemic is an epidemiological certainty. So folks, this is really serious. In some of the statements that they've been making, they've talked about, oh, without mentioning us by name, but they've talked about a systematic misinformation campaign that's undermining public [00:35:00] support for the W.H.O. and this pandemic treaty. They blast right wing parties and organizations, including a significant portion of President Trump's Republican Party for pushing what they call anti W.H.O. conspiracies. They don't even know how to use the word properly.

Alex Newman: [00:35:17] They mean conspiracy theories, of course. But folks, they're also saying and this is in the articles that are coming out about these meetings that the US now poses a risk to the rest of the world because the Trump administration has dismantled parts of the health system, including cutting 2400 bureaucrats at the CDC. So, folks, they may not have us now, but the way these things are structured, they can always bring us back in later. They can wait us out. They can wait till the next Deep State Democrat puppet is in the white House to sign up for these things. And so we really need to focus on having Congress act and act in a way that is permanent, that makes it impossible for the next Democrat president to come in and just sign us

[00:36:00] up to these things. Even outside the W.H.O. front, the global governing agenda is moving full speed ahead right now. In fact, just today I published an article or yesterday I published an article about global shipping taxes. So the a UN agency called the International Maritime Organization is pushing for the first ever true global tax. Now, this doesn't directly deal with health. They're saying it's to stop global warming. But as we'll see, global warming, climate change is directly related to what the W.H.O. is doing. And they say so themselves. And so they're saying they're going to tax fuel used in international shipping and forget the implications of the tax itself, forget how much it's going to add to the cost of our food and our goods and our services.

Alex Newman: [00:36:43] Forget the fact that Americans are going to pay the bulk of this. The real problem here is this would give the UN an independent funding stream. So no longer would they have to ask the member States for money. All they have to do is impose taxes. And yeah, it's a relatively [00:37:00] small tax. They're saying it might raise \$100 billion a year, which maybe sounds insignificant when you're dealing with a trillion multi trillion dollar US government budget. But that's just the camel's nose under the tent, right? Meanwhile, the UN's World Court, the International Court of Justice, is, as we speak, preparing to issue its landmark ruling on the so-called legal obligations of governments with respect to climate change. The Biden administration urged them to take a strong stand on this. And so even with Trump in the white House, these global governing agendas are moving full speed ahead. Now, they mentioned three big items being discussed for the pandemic treaty that they really want to get in there, the information sharing and surveillance, the technology transfer. And also, I'm quoting here, pandemic preparedness responsibilities of member states, including one health measures. At the last sovereignty summit. I focused most of my time on that. I just want to reiterate some of my warnings about this one health thing, folks, because what it does is hugely significant. It's not just political health or economic [00:38:00] tyranny that they're plotting.

Alex Newman: [00:38:01] They're talking here about a drastic new understanding of our place as human beings in the world. A drastic new understanding of our rights as individuals. Because One health is really an effort to redefine health care in collectivist terms. No longer is health care something for an individual. It's a collective responsibility. And even beyond that, it goes into this pagan idea that humanity is not as God in the Bible says, you know, the pinnacle of his creation, in charge of this planet.

Humanity is just like a cockroach. It's just like a lizard. We're just one part of this one ecosystem, one world. And health care needs to be understood in that framework, right? We're just part of Mother Earth, and our health is inextricably intertwined, they say, with the health of the climate and the environment and the ecosystem and even the animals. Right. They've got far more veterinarians on their one health high level commission than they do people doctors. Right. And so what they're doing here, they're trying to redefine [00:39:00] health in a way that it becomes a pretext for any tyrannical policy you can imagine, right? They and climate change is a perfect example. They say climate change is bad for your health. I showed you the interview I did at the UN climate summit in Baku with the UN's director of climate change and public health, saying climate change is directly related to public health. Right. Again, the repay organization here, this totally alien worldview, this kind of new age Gaia centered worldview where man is just a meaningless cog in this global machine.

Alex Newman: [00:39:32] No real transcendent value, certainly no eternal value. And we're watching this folks happen on every single front. It's not just through the health agenda, it's through the climate agenda. It's through everything that the UN is doing. I was in Egypt in 2022 for the UN's climate summit, and they even unveiled the new and improved Ten Commandments. One of the commandments was compassion means feeling the pain of the earth. Okay. So, folks I'll end by saying we have to take this [00:40:00] threat seriously. And it's not enough to just cheer on Donald. Trump in the white House. We've got to get Congress to codify some of these things. Into federal law. Because best case scenario, we've got Trump in office for almost another four years. Maybe if we get lucky with the next election, work really hard, we'll have another Republican. But eventually they will rope us back into this thing. And so very grateful for what Trump has done as a good first step in the right direction. But we have got to put the brakes on this. And the only ones that can really do that in a permanent and institutional way are members of Congress. So we've got to get this done, folks. Thank you again for allowing me to share with you, and I hope we'll talk again soon. God bless you all.

Frank Gaffney: [00:40:39] Alex Newman, thank you for another wonderful contribution to this Summit Series. You've been a very faithful participant in them, and we're deeply grateful. And I want to say a special word of appreciation for a point that I don't think we've studied closely enough or addressed adequately for [00:41:00] sure, in terms of

world government. And that is this idea that a feature of government, of course, is the ability to impose taxes. This would be, I think, the first time that that would be institutionalized in a treaty that ceded the authority to impose taxes on Americans, for example, to a foreign body. Very bad precedent to set. Needless to say, but one to which these globalists aspire indisputably. Our final presenter is going to be another regular contributor to these summits. Doctor Andrea Nazarenko, a community and quantitative psychologist who specialized in the gap between research and practice and engaging in system level societal It'll change. She's a leading expert in implementation [00:42:00] science and a co-founder of the Inspired Network, which is a network for healthcare system improvement. We're always very grateful to her for her participation, especially in this role as a summarizer of what has come before. And someone particularly gifted at looking ahead to what may be in the offing. She will talk to us about the importance of rejecting this treaty and leaving the World Health Organization. Of course, I'm sure reinforcing the points that others have made already about the necessity of actually institutionalizing those arrangements in statute here in the United States and joining forces with the exit of the World Health Organization and Donald Trump's efforts by abolishing the World Health Organization. Thanks, Andrew. Welcome back. It's good to have you. Over to you.

Andrea Nazarenko: [00:42:58] Thank you so much. [00:43:00] I am honored to be here today. One of the things that I always find really incredible and empowering from both Frank and Reggie is their ability to put together these summits at the precise, critical times. We know that the globalists are sneaky, to say the least, in the way they do things and don't always have to follow by their own rules, like a four month waiting period to prep people before a vote. And so being on top of things and alerting the world to what's going on, I give the, the chairs of the Sovereignty Coalition all my accolades. And it truly is an honor to be here with all of the changes that have been going on, particularly in the United States, with the changing administration, the cabinet picks and all of the. Social and political influences that have taken over the media. [00:44:00] It's really easy to overlook the risks of globalization that have been happening. They have been the globalists have been working. The moves to centralize our world have been happening while we have been looking in other directions with more proximal risks or proximal winds that have been handed to us domestically. So it's easy to celebrate the wins that we have, right? It's easy to say, hey, Trump signed an executive order. We

could like exhale a little bit and let that one go. But when we do that, when we when we celebrate the win for the battle, we forget that we're actually looking to win the war.

Andrea Nazarenko: [00:44:43] And a stroke of a pen, a signing of an EO is certainly a celebration worth having. It started the process, but we need a mountain of strategy at a global level. To really finish this war? Yes. Trump signed an executive order to begin [00:45:00] the withdrawal from the Who. That's a massive victory. And I don't take anything away from that. And I am endlessly grateful for that. That move. But make no mistake, our fight does not end here. Because this is just not a procedural process. What we're looking at here is truly a shift in global powers. We are not just signing a piece of paper and saying, hey, get me out of study hall in high school. Get me out of this act that you're writing. Get me out of this. Get me out of that. What we're actively fighting here is the shift in the global power and the right for our nations, and by consequence, ourselves to be sovereign. The battle may have been won, but the war is not over until this power shift happens and global sovereignty is restored. Let us not forget that these globalists are [00:46:00] relentless and we are acting on their finances. They may govern unfairly, but there is one thing that they do well and that is strategy. They play the long game. They are not worried right now about what we, the people are going to do, but they should be because we have held the power all along.

Andrea Nazarenko: [00:46:21] We messed up their pandemic treaty the first time through our activism, through our voice, and through our relentless power. And we can do it again. There is a 12 month waiting period before we are officially out of the who. We are part of the Who. Technically, until January 22nd, 2026, we remain under their authority and the pandemic treaty passing adds a bit more threat to this waiting period situation. It gives them a full year to maneuver. It gives them a full year to strategize and do whatever it takes to get us back in. Domestically. Right now, our [00:47:00] biggest risk is reversal. We have already heard chatter that Trump may be renegotiating, that it may come down to a financial situation instead of a human rights issue. We cannot allow that to happen. Our message to Trump must be clear and consistent. We will not go back. We will not compromise. The only option is a withdrawal. But even if Trump stays the course, which I hope and pray that he will, we still run the risk of just like the stroke of the pen got us out with the EO, the stroke of a pen with the next administration could put us back in, and it could even put us back in at a higher rate. Right? If it is a

financial situation. And so what we need is to ensure that there is no back pedaling. As Alex just said, we need congressional action.

Andrea Nazarenko: [00:47:55] If we are serious about breaking free, we can't rely on executive orders. [00:48:00] We need law. We need to codify the executive order into law by congressional action. Trump stepped up to the plate with the EO, but now Congress must swing. We cannot run out the clock, and the clock is ticking. So there are currently two bills on the table that would lock in this victory. The first is H.R. 54, which ensures that no future president can unilaterally rejoin the Who without congressional approval. And the second is known as the Barrasso bill, which blocks the US from entering or complying with the Who's health emergencies pandemic agreements and all of their orders. So, to be clear and to emphasize my other colleagues on the line. The risks of this pandemic treaty and remaining involved with the Who are extraordinarily dangerous to our individual sovereignties and freedoms. It gives [00:49:00] the Who the power to declare pandemics, to override health policies, to force this global surveillance and data sharing in in just ways that go against our freedoms. And once signed and ratified, the who becomes the command center of the world. We must get out of this through congressional order. That's why passing these two bills are so important. And your voice matters more than ever before, because it is through our voice that we make the demand. So you could go right now, as I'm speaking. I won't even be offended if you switch screens. Go to Sovereignty Coalition org and sign the Align act.

Andrea Nazarenko: [00:49:44] It will send a message to your lawmakers letting them know that this is a no budge situation. We must get out of the Who. We must make it a law that that keeps us out. And we must make [00:50:00] this a permanent solution. We will not backpedal and we will not go back. But this, by the way, is only phase one. So stay the course, because this type of battle we're in right now, even if we do all of that stuff, even if we pass a law and we codify into law that the US is no longer involved, we are still at risk. This is a war that we have never fought before. This is a global power shift. And so we cannot fight this alone. It may be clichéd, but freedom is not an island and it is certainly true in this case. What we need is for other countries to join us. We simply cannot be complacent and live in our own bubble, because what's important here is that a US withdrawal is not enough to protect our ultimate sovereignty from a global [00:51:00] level. The Who is just one arm of a much bigger globalist machine. So even

without them, even by withdrawing the same agenda is continuing at a global level. And we are a global community. So the US leaving the Who I call phase one, but phase two is encouraging others to do the same. We are using the hashtag #Wexit because we need others to join us in exiting the WHO.

Andrea Nazarenko: [00:51:35] Even if we leave, we will see you at Who policies that shape global decisions, and those decisions will circle right back around to us in the form of trade restrictions, international travel mandates, business compliance laws, technological censorship agendas. The digital gulag that was talked about earlier, our families and friends [00:52:00] abroad will certainly suffer. Our supply chains will be bent. Our children's futures will be tied to these decisions of these bureaucrats in Geneva, and their ability to travel globally will be limited. We're already seeing the signs. We're seeing the UN pushing this pandemic preparedness treaties that are overriding national sovereignty. We're seeing issues at the world Bank tying financial aid to Who compliance. The World Economic Forum steering corporate policies towards global governance. This stuff is not going away. Even if we pull out, we are still in the war with a globalist agenda. We cannot get complacent. We cannot get quiet and we must continue to use our voices. It is working, friends. Our voice has swayed other countries, like Argentina to begin the process of rejecting who overreach. That's a start. We do this one country [00:53:00] at a time. We reach out our hand to our international friends and we offer them support in activism. We share the dialog and we get louder together. We could all learn something from each other. We could all exit the who together. And by doing that, we take a stand against the globalists.

Andrea Nazarenko: [00:53:23] This issue is why this summit matters, because we cannot think that this executive order is the end. It's simply the opening inning. And now we must score some goals. We must push Congress to pass H.R. 54 and the Barrasso bill. Again, you could do that by going to Sovereignty coalition.org and signing the Align act. It only takes 30s of your time, and your voice is powerful. We need to expose the Who's pandemic treaty for what it truly is, a coup against national sovereignty. [00:54:00] The conversation has quieted because all of this other stuff domestically has risen to the top. But there is no issue more important than the pandemic treaty right now. And everybody, whether you're talking about it in the Uber on the way to the store or you're announcing it over social media to a million person following. We need to be talking about it. The pandemic treaty needs to be stopped, and we need to support and

join with other nations in reclaiming their independence as they exit the Who. Please use hashtag #Wexit. We x l t to keep the conversation loud and prevalent as we exit the who. We must extend our hand, not turn our backs, because the war does not end when we walk off the battlefield. The war ends when we win and [00:55:00] we win when that global power shifts. So go to SovereigntyCoalition.org right now. Sign the Align act and join us in finishing what we started. Thank you.

Frank Gaffney: [00:55:10] Andrea, thank you. What a rousing call to action. And I so appreciate you specifically mentioning an easy action that people can take at Sovereignty coalition.org and the align act button there. Reggie, let me come to you for a first question. You've heard Andrea, of course. Talking about the need to reach out to and engage and support other nations who are contemplating taking the action that Donald Trump has taken. I know you were just in Israel presenting, among others, to the Knesset there. Talk a little bit about what you, you know, experienced in making this case to a very important [00:56:00] government, one that I would argue has seen firsthand as much as any in the world the dangers of global government having suffered endlessly from the various UN fora and human rights councils and courts of justice and the like. How did it go there? And what can you share in terms of insights as to how best to do this elsewhere as well?

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:56:26] Well, yes, I did. I just returned from Israel late Sunday night. I'm still pretty jet lagged, and I was very honored to be asked to speak you know, at, at the Knesset about the dangers of the international health regulations. So Israel is among several countries that are having a very heated debate about whether or not to leave the World Health Organization. And, you know, as you know, Israel is at war right now. There's a lot that is just drawing [00:57:00] people's attention there, away from the World Health Organization. And the activists that are really promoting this cause are so to be commended because they are really swimming upstream there. And I think that that they were very amenable to the kinds of arguments that, that we're making here. Of course, the entire debate was in Hebrew. So I was not able to really understand a lot of it. I think that one issue that people have is can Israel withdraw from the World Health Organization because the World Health Organization doesn't have a provision that you know, that says you can withdraw and, you know, there are many legal arguments about this. The former Soviet Union withdrew long ago early on, along with a bunch of satellite states. And there was, you know, was reinstated. So it's not it's not without

precedent. But [00:58:00] even if the World Health Organization were to say that, you know, you can't withdraw.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:58:04] To me, that's almost sort of like, you know, a situation where you have a married couple and the wife says, you know, so with the World Health Organization says, you know, you can't withdraw. We'll just mark you down as inactive. You know, what? If there's a married couple and the and the wife says, I'm filing for a divorce and the husband says, I don't recognize divorce, I'll mark you down as inactive, you know, I mean, you know, we it's if a country wants to withdraw and states that they are withdrawing and they're not attending the meetings. They're not paying their dues. They're not acknowledging any of the directives that are coming down from the W.H.O. Then I would argue that they are withdrawn and that this is something that can be done. I'm going to be coming up with a legal analysis regarding exactly how this can be done under international law. But I think that in the meantime, countries should take heart that I just don't think it's right. It just seems wrong that if once you join an [00:59:00] organization that you can never get out, you know and if that was the case, they should have put it in there. Once you join, you can never get out. So anyway, that that was my experience in Israel.

Frank Gaffney: [00:59:12] It sounds like the Hotel California, doesn't it?

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:59:14] Absolutely.

Frank Gaffney: [00:59:16] But you know why they wouldn't have put that in? Because we never would have gone in. In fact, if you go back to the debates about the entry into this World Health Organization, it was very clear that those endorsing it in the United States Senate were not interested in having this be simply a stepping stone towards world government or towards the diminution of our sovereignty. So this is a very important point. And, Reggie, I think it will be tremendously helpful to have your international legal analysis when it when it is ready. Andrea, I wanted to come back to I think we may have touched on [01:00:00] this in the last summit, but it's stayed with me. You and Reggie and a number of us were all there in Geneva last year when the World Health Assembly was doing its final efforts to get this treaty over the finish line. And in the end, failing that, tried to put as much of what they wanted in it into this other agreement, another treaty, we believe this amendments to the International Health

Regulations, as it's called. I wanted you to speak to a point that one of our sovereign coalition members has made in the chat here. Of and I think you alluded to it, but just to talk about it in the context of what we saw firsthand taking place in terms of the real skullduggery that these international bureaucrats [01:01:00] and the and the diplomats who are trying to do basically, I guess, their bidding and giving them still more unaccountable power. How they how they conducted themselves in that that last go round and, and what that might portend for the next one.

Andrea Nazarenko: [01:01:20] Absolutely. So what Frank is referring to is we went out to Geneva along with - Gosh - droves of citizens from all over the world, from Western and Eastern countries to stand our ground and to say that we the people, are going to create the future that we want to see in the world, and that these unelected bureaucrats truly did not hold the power. We were taking our power back. And we went there with this spirit of togetherness, of a global community. We didn't show up with anger. We showed up with power [01:02:00] and togetherness. And I don't know, to be honest with you, I was one of the co-organizers. I don't know if I ever thought we would have the level of impact that we truly did, but we got in their heads. And there's a video of Tedros noting that by the end of the week, one of us or one of us will win. Will it be us or the people of the world, us being, you know, them. And I think this was a really impactful moment. It was a turning point in the trajectory of the world, because what we learned was that we could get under their skin, and what they did was against all of their rules. And I would be likely misquoting if I tried to remember all of the details. But basically what happened was Reggie probably remembers them to the tee, but what I recall was that they just passed things.

Andrea Nazarenko: [01:02:58] They broke their own rules. They [01:03:00] they passed things without a vote. They moved things forward. They just tried to win the game via cheating. Right? Let's just win because this pressure is on. And this is really an important observation because we like to think, you know, we like to think that we have the power, right? We the people. But somewhere in the back of probably all of our minds is. But I'm just one voice. What does one voice matter? But the truth is, we saw. And by the way, we often think about that. What does one voice matter? I mean, that's the essence of the whole get out and vote campaign, right? It's a force we've been fighting for decades. And people think, what does one voice matter when it comes to local government, state government, federal government? And you go up to a globalist

regime and you begin to say, what does one voice matter? But what we showed that day is that one voice mattered a [01:04:00] whole heck of a lot. When that one voice was paired with another voice, which was paired with another and another and another, and it didn't even matter if those voices were speaking the same language. They were all speaking the same purpose.

Andrea Nazarenko: [01:04:16] And that purpose was to say no to the who. It was to say no to their globalist regime and all of the control tactics that they were taking over us, and we were able to force them to put their cards on the table to show us exactly the type of tyrannical decision making that they make. We saw it in full daylight. What they will do to win. And we also made them play their weakness. We showed them that they are intimidated by us just as much as some of us are intimidated by them. We entered onto that battlefield. Not maybe we entered on as the underdog, but [01:05:00] we won that battle because we forced them to put the skunk on the table and show us how unjust they are willing to rule. And so we just need to remember that as we proceed forward, they do not want us to speak out. They do not want us to know they are going to do things in the darkness. They are going to do all of the things to cheat in this game. And so long as we remain principled in our Constitution, in our global rights and the basic fundamental human rights that were given to us by God, we will win this war because we are no longer the underdogs. We are the 8 billion people of the world.

Frank Gaffney: [01:05:44] Well said. And I want to say a special word of thanks to you for your inspired network and the team building that you did on that occasion. It was a perfect example of what you're talking about, and the impact that it could have, was palpable. [01:06:00] Reggie, a question to you. That kind of builds on what has just been said. Doctor Kaplan, who was not able to be with us, unfortunately, is someone who grew up under communism in her native Croatia. And she was going to talk a bit about how this globalist enterprise really at the core of it, is communist. It is totalitarian, yes, but it's it has the hallmarks. And not surprisingly, the Chinese Communist Party is a very prime mover behind this whole world government agenda, is it not? And you might talk about that a little bit in the context as well of your own efforts to well, to do what we just were talking about with Andrea in terms of an Anti-globalist alliance. Yes where [01:07:00] possible, working with national authorities, but working with leaders and influencers and the people as well.

Reggie Littlejohn: [01:07:09] Well, Frank as you know, my work started as the head of women's rights without frontiers. We were we were fighting coercive population control, and we are fighting coercive population control in China. That organization is still going strong. And I'm an attorney, and in the mid-90s, I represented a couple of refugees from China in their cases for political asylum in the United States. They were victims of the one child policy, one of whom was forcibly sterilized. So it was a very gruesome, horrible situation. Left her permanently disabled. And so I left the practice of law and decided to dedicate myself to, you know, raising the visibility of this issue and trying to end coercive population control in China. Fast forward to 2019, 2020, when Covid hit, and I saw the tactics [01:08:00] that were being used by the Chinese Communist Party being exported worldwide. So one of them, one of the tactics was the atomization of society, the creation of situation where everybody feels like they're alone and that that is very important to totalitarianism. So in in China, for example, a woman who was illegally pregnant, meaning that she was pregnant without a birth permit could be ratted out by her family, her friends, her neighbors, her coworkers, people just, you know, were sitting in in the town square looking at women's abdomen, seeing if anybody looked pregnant.

Reggie Littlejohn: [01:08:39] And then if they didn't have a birth permit on them, they would just take them for a forced abortion immediately. So what it did is it ruptured all, systematically ruptured all the traditional I'm trying to say that the traditional relationships of trust in, in Chinese society on purpose, because if you can't trust anyone, you can't [01:09:00] organize for you can't organize for democracy. And then you look at what happened with Covid, with the lockdowns and, and then also the, the vaccines that were so controversial that it really tore families apart. Tore friends apart, Spouses apart. It was a situation again where? Where people were isolated. You know, I have a friend who had some kind of an event on Thanksgiving, I guess, maybe had more family over, and their neighbor ratted on them to the police. They had police cars at their door because they had more than the I don't know how many people they were allowed to have in there at that time, setting everybody against each other, each other and then isolating people. So, you know, during Covid, suicide went in. All kinds of mental health problems went skyrocketing up because people were isolated and just felt alone. And that, again, is it's a precursor to totalitarianism.

Reggie Littlejohn: [01:09:54] It's straight out of the Chinese communist playbook. And then there's the whole other thing which is [01:10:00] something I have talked about

frequently, which is the whole imposition of the digital gulag and China. There's the China Social Credit system, where they just monitor every single part of your existence, and they come up with a score of how compliant you are. And if you're a compliant person, you can lead what looks like a free life. And if you're not compliant, they will punish you. They will punish you by you can lose your job, not be able to borrow money. So you can't, you know, open a business or buy a home. You'll not be able to travel in China. You will not even be able to take the bus. You keep it up. They will sever you from your credit card and your bank account. And if you continue in China, they will just disappear. You. Which people have said? What does that mean? It means that you just one day you are not to be found anywhere anymore, and no one knows where you are, and you may never be seen again. And that and the infrastructure for that China social credit system. This is what turned my me, my attention towards this can be duplicated by the vaccine passports that they were [01:11:00] running in the beginning.

Reggie Littlejohn: [01:11:00] So the idea is to terrify everybody about this pathogen so that everybody will accept that we need to track and surveil you know, who's sick, who's not sick, who's been vaccinated, who's not been vaccinated. And that that would serve as a Chinese style social credit system going in the United States and worldwide. And the World Health Organization has been rolling these out since, I think it's mid-2023. International interoperable digital IDs. And if you go on to the World Economic Forum website, you can see what you will need to be to have a digital ID for. And what you need to be in good standing for. You'll need a digital ID to access healthcare, to open a bank account, to travel, to have to access government benefits like Medicare or Medicaid, to own a communications device, like a cell phone or a computer to vote, [01:12:00] to collect government benefits. So this is the China Social Credit system. And there's and they're setting it up through these digital IDs. And the pretext for them is, is health. And it's all coming down through the World Health Organization. So that's how I see the China model being exported all over the world through the World Health Organization.

Frank Gaffney: [01:12:21] This is so critically important that we understand some of the wellsprings of this agenda, as well as who's helping advance it so strongly. Doctor Nazarenko, you have specialized in systemic change. I feel sure that there are some people listening to this program who will hear all of this and say, you know, these people are off on a toot. We have a constitutional republic. We have freedoms,

inalienable rights [01:13:00] guaranteed by that constitution, but given to us by God, not by the UN or the World Health Organization or even our own government. What would you say to them in terms of what we've already seen? I'm thinking specifically of what would happen during the Covid pandemic, that our evidence of systemic change of mutation, if you will, and of perhaps the steady erosion of those things that we believe are, well, our inalienable rights, our God-given liberties. And if you can help, you know, give us a sense of why this is not hyperbole, why this is not, you know, projecting, you know, some horrific dystopian outcome many, many years from now, but [01:14:00] something that is real and imminently possible. Reggie's just talked very eloquently about the Chinese Communist Party's social credit system, which is very real and very palpable, but that it could possibly through this backdoor, even if we are not actually a party to the treaty, even if we are not actually in the World Health Organization in effecting this kind of well, to use Barack Obama's expression, the fundamental transformation of our country from a sovereign nation imbued with liberty and God's grace to something very dark and very different. And how important it is, I guess, in short, to reiterate what you've said already so well that we not let that happen. Not to us, not to our children, not to our children's children.

Andrea Nazarenko: [01:14:58] It's a really phenomenal question [01:15:00] you're asking, Frank. So the important thing to recognize when you think about system level change, people think about system level change. And first of all, they immediately go to political system. It's not the only system. There's a lot of systems. We're embedded within systems. Right. Political system. You could take the individual where each an individual. And we're surrounded by these various layers of ecological systems, the outermost layer being political influence and macro level factors like the globalist regime, globalist regime is even further. But in inside of all of those are our educational systems, our workplace systems, our family systems, our peer groups, our neighborhoods, and all of those things. These system level change is all encompassing. The important thing to realize when we talk about system level change is a system is merely a collection of individuals. You change a system by changing one human [01:16:00] behavior at a time. A system is a is a collection of individuals who are organized into a hierarchy of power. And when that hierarchy of power dictates something different depending on how powerful the source is, they can make each individual within the system believe something different. We saw this with Covid, right? This is point-blank. What happened with Covid? If they started out by saying you are

going to be locked down for a year, you're going to wear masks, your children are going to be set back academically, and we're going to force a vaccination on you that has been untested but makes us trillions of dollars in profits. None of us would have complied.

Andrea Nazarenko: [01:16:52] So what did they do? They used straight out of the textbook propaganda techniques to change the hearts [01:17:00] and minds of individuals, to orient the system towards their hierarchy of power. They invested billions in the messaging. They invested billions in implementation. They did not just pound us over the head with scientific data. They focused on our perceptions and our attitudes and our expectations of the outcome. We believed we would save grandma. So we lifted our sleeve and said, put this untested genetic therapy in my arm. We didn't do it because we wanted to. In 2018, no one would have done that. But they used their hierarchy of power to persuade us. Once that becomes uncovered, once we recognize what they did, then we could begin to say is that what I really believe, or is that what my culture wanted me to believe? Is that [01:18:00] the cultural belief that they drove here. And so to go back to your original question, Frank, could this happen? Could this be a reality? Well, you know, those foundational documents that we rely on so heavily today? There was a point in time, I'm sure, in England where they did not believe that America would ever get independence, because at that time, their hierarchy with power was directly under the crown. We were their territory. We were not an independent, sovereign nation. That came about because the culture in the New World changed, because some strong minded, powerful voices stood up and said, I don't care what that hierarchy of power looks like over there. I don't care what the Crown says about taxation, I don't care.

Andrea Nazarenko: [01:18:59] We [01:19:00] the people deserve to be free. And so one by one, they changed the perceptions, attitudes and outcome expectations, their beliefs that they could do it. And now we are a sovereign nation with wonderful, God given rights and documents that could that protect us. But they only protect us to the degree that we the people, maintain the perceptions, attitudes and expectations that those documents hold true. And the second we give up our voice, the second we allow known propaganda to take hold of our minds and believe that some virus found in Africa is suddenly a threat to my dog at home. That is where we lose that. It is in the minds of every individual, the perceptions of our power that keep us free. I often [01:20:00] say,

And I'm not going to sing for you, and you could all thank me for that. But my favorite line of the national anthem. Whenever I do this, I always forget the line. My favorite line is the rocket's red glare, the bombs bursting in air gave proof through the night that our flag was still there. It was not the end of the war where they declared freedom. It was the fight being alive that meant freedom existed. So our doctrines are just a piece of paper. What keeps America sovereign and free are the voices, perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs of every American citizen. And when we let that go, we hand it over to the globalist regime. They are not taking it from us so long as we remain as steadfast as our forefathers.

Frank Gaffney: [01:20:50] I don't know what to say other than Amen and Hallelujah. Thank you to all of you. Those of you who are still with us and [01:21:00] who have been throughout those of you who joined us by video just an amazing program. Reggie Littlejohn, Jonathan Alexander, Alex Newman and Andrea Nazarenko. Thank you. From the bottom of my heart, I wish. And I know we all do. Doctor Kat Lindley restored health as soon as possible. She is one of our great medical doctors and freedom fighters in this sovereignty coalition. We need everyone on deck at the moment. Needless to say, folks, we will probably host another of these, the eighth in our series of sovereignty summits. In the next few weeks, as we get closer to the convening of this World Health Assembly. We hope to have a better fix on what exactly they're cooking up. But you've been given, I think, an incredibly important set of insights [01:22:00] into what the agenda is, the extent to which it is already embodied in this very problematic treaty, and the likelihood that it may yet become even more of a problem for the sorts of things that we've just heard Reggie and Andrea speak so powerfully to our freedoms, our liberties, our children's futures, not just our own. And indeed the incredible nation that was bequeathed to us by those founders and that it is our duty to God and to our countrymen and women to pass on to our progeny in turn. With that, let me just say thank you to all of you for tuning in. I hope you will share this widely. And Dede Laugesen, to whom I will return the microphone, will give you a little bit more [01:23:00] information about how to do that. In the meantime, thank you. God bless you. God bless America.

Dede Laugesen: [01:23:05] Thanks, Frank. Thanks to all of you for being here. A video of this webinar will be posted to both SovereigntySummit.org and SovereigntyCoalition.org, within a day of the conclusion of our program. Please share

this and our other programs with your elected representatives, colleagues and other networks. And don't forget to take action on our current Align Act to legislate removal from the WHO. For updates, subscribe to Substack at Sovereignty.Substack.com and follow us on X at [@SovCoalition](https://twitter.com/SovCoalition) for updates. And thanks for joining us today. Goodbye. We'll see you again in a few weeks.