

TRANSCRIPT

Soft Coup, Hard Tyranny: *Spawning Global Governance on September 20*

A joint Stop Vax Passports Task Force (SVPTF) and Sovereignty Coalition webinar, Frank Gaffney and Reggie Littlejohn with Honorable Michele Bachmann, Francis Boyle, Dr. David Bell, Dr. Meryl Nass, Dr. Karladine Graves, Alex Newman, and Ron Armstrong

4:30-6 pm ET, Wednesday, September 20, 2023

<https://stopvaxpassports.org/webinar-soft-coup-hard-tyranny-spawning-global-governance-on-september-20/>

Dede Laugesen: [00:00:12] Thanks for joining us today. I'm Dede Laugesen, coordinator and producer for the Stop Vax Passports Task Force and producer for the Sovereignty Coalition. Today's webinar is part of our ongoing webinar series focused on topics of concern regarding Communist Chinese pandemic response policies, including mandates for vaccine and centralized compliance tracking digital technologies, which are, we believe, a gateway to tyrannical social credit score surveillance and mass population control. A video of this webinar will post to stop VAX passports.org and sovereignty coalition.org. Within a day of the conclusion of our program, calls to action and past webinars can be found on both sites. Please share these with your elected officials, friends, colleagues and other networks. Our co-host and moderator today is Frank Gaffney. Frank is chairman of the Center for Security Policy, vice Chair for the Committee on the Present Danger China, co-author of the indictment Prosecuting the Chinese Communist Party and Friends for Crimes Against America, China and the World, and co-sponsor of Stop VAX Passports Task Force and the Sovereignty Coalition.

Frank Gaffney: [00:01:34] Thank you, Dede, and welcome everyone to our Stop Vax Passports Coalition Task Force effort to help raise awareness about and engender opposition to an agenda that is now moving forward inexorably to strip the United States, and for that matter, other nations around the world of their sovereignty in favor of a kind of well, they call it global governance that is being promoted by the Chinese Communist Party. The World Economic Forum. The European Union. Bill Gates, Big Pharma and others who would have us believe that the world will be better run by them and their ilk than by those that we choose here in the United States pursuant to our constitutional arrangements. This happens to be an exceptionally well-timed program as earlier today at the United Nations General Assembly, a policy declaration was adopted or at least was promulgated by the attending heads of state and other international bureaucrats and worthies that aims at. Facilitating, encouraging, greasing the skids. Pick your verb for a very ominous new empowerment of, at a minimum, the World Health Organization and perhaps the United Nations as well, at the expense of their member nations. We'll be talking about all of this with an extraordinarily formidable group of subject matter experts, policy practitioners and people deeply knowledgeable about, in particular, public health matters, including two, three, perhaps, I guess, now very formidable physicians. The topic of this program is soft coup, hard tyranny spawning global governance. On the 20th of

September, we're going to begin with comments from my co-host and the co leader of our Stop VAX Passports task Force. No stranger to these programs. In fact, one of the most important contributors to them and architects of them. Her name is Reggie Littlejohn. She is a lawyer by training a graduate of Yale University, a litigator in her previous incarnations. These days, she is the president, as well as the founder of a terrific organization, Women's Rights Without Frontiers. She's also a member of our committee on the present Danger China and, of course, a very formidable force for good in all of these matters. We're delighted to have her with us to help kick off this program. Reggie, welcome back.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:04:55] Thank you very much, Frank. So, we are facing an unprecedented threat to our national sovereignty and personal medical freedom at the hands of unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats at the W.H.O. and the United Nations. What's happening, basically is that the World Health Organization, through its international health regulations and its proposed pandemic treaty, want to grab global governance on any issue related to health. And then the United Nations wants to grab global governance to any religion that is any issue that is not related to health or including health. They would go through the W.H.O. with respect to health. So, whether it's a health issue or it's another issue between the two of them, between the World Health Organization and the United Nations, they are trying to a power grab on global governance about any aspect of life on Earth or even outer space, as I will discuss later. Meanwhile, the G20 and the Bank of International Settlements want to impose central bank digital currencies, so we need to resist before it's too late. And why would it be too late? It would be too late because once these protocols are put in place. So, in other words, I'm talking about mandatory universal digital IDs combined with surveillance and censorship, which is in all the documents that I just mentioned of these organizations that I just mentioned, and combine those with central bank digital currencies, we will be paralyzed. So, if you dissent, if you take a position that is counter narrative, like the position that I'm taking right now, you can be tracked and they can do things to lower your social credit score.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:06:39] And I think that those are coming worldwide as well, which will mean that you will not be able to borrow money, you will not be able to travel, your kid won't be able to go to a good school. There's all kinds of things that can happen with a social credit score. And if they combine that with a central bank digital currency, they can basically shut off your credit cards and your bank accounts, like what happened to the Canadian truckers, basically paralyzing you and even putting you at risk for homelessness or starvation if it gets bad enough. So once those protocols, once the once they are in place, there will be no more dissent, because as soon as you dissent, you'll be paralyzed and alienated. Like in China, anyone who tries to help somebody who has a low social credit score, their social credit score goes down. So, you will become like a pariah to everyone around you. And we and we need to dissent. We need to make sure that this does not happen before it's too late. And by the way, this is the China model, which the CCP seeks to impose on the whole world. So, China has an outsized influence on the United Nations and the World Health Organization. And in March of 2023, Chinese dictator Xi Jinping stated that he was calling upon China, quote, to lead the reform of the global governance system.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:07:58] So this is the result. He's leading the reform and imposing the China system worldwide. Meanwhile, in June of 2023, the United Nations Secretary General proposed a global digital compact to push global censorship laws against online misinformation and disinformation, which that would be information that's put out by vaccine skeptics or climate change skeptics would be considered to be misinformation or disinformation banning this disinformation as defined by the UN and possibly even during election, possibly interfering with the First Amendment protected political debate in US elections. So once fully implemented, these policies would amount to a soft coup. So, what is a soft coup? It's where a government is illegally overthrown, but not with the use of force. And we got to look at that may be very well what is happening right now to us and to the whole world. Why are we holding this webinar today? It's because today, September 20th, 2023, the UN General Assembly held a high-level meeting on health with high level officials at the World Health Organization. Their goal was to pass something called a political declaration. The goal of the political declaration was to mobilize political will at the national, regional and international level for basically the international health regulations and the pandemic treaty. So, they were hoping that through this this sneaky procedure called the silence procedure, wherein a nation is deemed to agree to something if they don't actively oppose it. So just slip this through so that they could put out the message that, you know, by a unanimous consent, the world, you know, agrees to move forward with W.H.O. documents.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:09:51] Well, actually, that didn't happen. 11 countries stood up and said we object. But nevertheless, undeterred, the W.H.O. announced that they had they spun this as a propaganda victory and they sent out an article saying W.H.O. welcomes historic commitment by world leaders for greater collaboration, government governance and investment to prevent, prepare for and respond to future pandemics. And if you look at the small print, actually, it was just the president of the United Nations General Assembly that signed this thing. They were not able to get it passed through the silence procedure. So, what would happen if and when these proposed documents would become international law? If the proposed amendments to the international health regulations were to pass a couple of things or many, many problems with this. But one of them is that the word non-binding would be stricken. So, it would make it would turn the World Health Organization from an advisory organization into something that could issue binding law that we have to follow whatever the recommendation is, and also that they would be able to intervene in the way that any nation would handle a health issue when there is a public health risk. That is only potential. So, it doesn't have to be a real risk. It can be just a potential risk. Then the proposed pandemic treaty would establish global surveillance.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:11:16] It would commit governments to censor dissenting views. There's something called a one health approach which would enable it to have sway over health, not just of people, but also of animals and plants as well, and the environment. So, if passed this, the W.H.O. would have control over every aspect of existence on Earth. Now, the next draft of the pandemic treaty is due on October 16th. This is not a situation where you have to throw out all the analysis of all the of the current bureau draft or even of the zero draft, because something that has been consistent throughout is this commitment to global surveillance, censorship and one health. And I don't think that that's going to change in the next iteration of

this treaty. So, these two W.H.O. instruments will come to a vote at the World Health Assembly in May 2024. And so, what I'm saying is that all of these things, all of these potential health risks of humans, plants and animals, the environment can be used as a pretext for the World Health Organization to move in and determine how we handle them, in other words, violating our national sovereignty and our personal medical freedom, because they will be able to tell doctors what they can prescribe and what they can't prescribe. And they want the power to actually force mandates, mask mandates, vaccine mandates and even lockdowns. So, the United Nations, similarly, they want to have an emergency platform that will operationalize automatically in case of other things such as climatic events, cyberspace, connectivity disruptions, a major event in our space, or even an unforeseen black swan event, I mean, that covers it.

Reggie Littlejohn: [00:12:59] There's nothing in the United States or in the solar system in the world that they can't cover and try to establish their global governance over all of us. Meanwhile, CBDCs also are being rolled out all over the world. So, in conclusion, if we do not resist now, we will inevitably be trapped in a in a digital gulag. If our message sounds dire, it's because it is the fate of our national sovereignty, our personal medical freedom and life as we know it. Indeed, Western civilization rests in our hands. We are in a race between ever accelerating, well organizing, well-funded globalist forces of unprecedented power. If we wake up and resist quickly enough, if we are able to wake up our leaders to resist, we may escape the trap that the globalists have set for us. And if not, the trap will snap shut and it will be too late to resist. So, I would just say, what is the best way to wake up? Our leaders take action by going to the Sovereignty Coalition website and taking action on that website, you will be able to send emails directly to your congressional representatives and wake them up. They have the power to defund the WTO and the UN and that would be a great start. Thank you.

Frank Gaffney: [00:14:14] Thank you, Reggie. Brilliantly done as always, and particularly set the stage for a more in-depth conversation about various aspects of where we find ourselves and where we're headed. So, thank you for all of that.

Frank Gaffney: [00:14:27] It's a distinct privilege to be able to welcome next great friend of the Sovereignty Coalition, one of our leaders, really a woman who has devoted considerable time and effort to raising the alarm about this global governance gambit, as I call it. Her name is Michele Bachmann. She is a former Congresswoman. She has served with distinction in the House of Representatives from 2007 to 2015. She also ran for president in 2012. These days, she is the dean of the Robertson School of Government at Regent University, indefatigable freedom fighter here and elsewhere around the world. And especially as she is very clear eyed about the dangers that we're facing to freedom at the hands of these assorted globalists, notably through their governance schemes. We've asked the Congresswoman to talk about the need for our leaders to stand against the tyranny that we're discussing today. And we welcome Michele Bachmann back for that purpose. Over to you, ma'am.

Hon. Michele Bachmann: [00:15:42] Thank you, Frank. Appreciate it. And thank you for everyone tuning in to the Sovereignty Coalition today. Today is a very important day. It's

actually, in my opinion, a very good day. We don't usually get a lot of good news when we're fighting global tyranny, but I think that we are we'll hear more about that through the course of the day. But just realize, four months ago in Geneva, Switzerland, at the World Health Assembly, not One Nation disagreed with a proposed 307 amendments to the international health rules. Not One Nation disagreed with a proposal for the pandemic treaty. It was all there. On paper, it was readable. All of the delegates were there wandering around Geneva, talking to each other in the coffee shop, going in and out of the meetings, but not one disagreed. Now, it may have been a completely orchestrated move where only certain nations were allowed to speak on the topic when the International Health Rule amendments came up and when the global pandemic treaty came up. But there wasn't one registered item of disagreement. No one stood anywhere. No one offered an alternative position. So, this really is big news in my mind today. The fact that there were 11 nations and I'm sure that Dr. Francis Boyle will talk about this more, but the fact that there were 11 nations who disagreed with the proposed resolution today. So, what's a resolution at the at the United Nations during the General Assembly? Not much.

Hon. Michele Bachmann: [00:17:18] But what they wanted to do is show this unanimous face and it's a fake. It's a fakery that there's a unanimous agreement that yielding up national sovereignty to the United Nations for the purpose of letting them call the shots in our various nations is a good thing. Well, that was that was shot through with holes today with the fact that this there were 11 nations that that didn't agree. And so, I think this is absolutely excellent news. And I'm grateful because remember, in 2022, there were several nations that actually stopped the proposed Biden amendments from going through to the international health rules. The Biden administration, as many people know, didn't even put their proposed. Rolls up according to their own timeline. It was just about a month to six weeks out before the meeting in Geneva when they put these amendments out. But enough people were alerted that they actually were stopped by just a couple of small nations. These nations may be small, but they're huge in stature in terms of fighting for freedom. So, in our mind, we would love to see the United States of America oppose this. They aren't. In fact, the Biden administration is leading the charge. But miraculously, we're seeing a few small nations actually stand up and in disagreement and say we're not going along with this.

Hon. Michele Bachmann: [00:18:49] So this is a stunning turn of events that I'm extremely grateful for. These events are happening very fast, very quickly. And as we have seen, that there wasn't disagreement in May in Geneva, Switzerland, we saw that by the time we returned home from our flights from Geneva, there was a huge bombshell and there was a bombshell in the form of a press release. And the United or the European Union announced that the World Health Organization would now run Europe's digital vaccine passport. So, Europe was running their own passport just fine by themselves during the pandemic. Now all of a sudden, they gave it over to the World Health Organization, which, by the way, is exactly what was being proposed in the amendments to the international health rules and the global pandemic treaty. So, what is happening in Europe right now is that they are, in effect, operationalizing global government. So global government is being operationalized as of June of 2023. The press release said that we are going to put this into effect, that the W.H.O. is running the European

Union's digital passport. It's effective, it's already running. So, we have global government operationalized. We're focusing on trying to stop the legalization of the digital passport and of global governance. And that is right. And we are calling on leaders across the world to stand up and join with the people of this world who don't want to come under global governance.

Hon. Michele Bachmann: [00:20:33] This is a complete undermining of democracy, of representative, of representative form of government. And there aren't too many leaders out there who care. As a matter of fact, when we talk to US senators and US congressmen, no one really cares. They've gotten a different memo. Their memo says, Oh, we don't have to worry about this. Once this pandemic treaty passes, it'll come back to the US Senate and we'll vote it down. Not even Democrats would vote for this. And if by some chance it gets through Congress, well, then the United States Supreme Court will knock it down. When you look at the perspective of the of our adversaries who are trying to put global governance into place, they think it's nice to get the legalization for global governance. But what they really care about is operationalizing they know that the facts on the ground are far more important than getting all of the niceties passed, even at these international bodies level, at these body levels. So that hence that's why this press release came out. We know also that South Africa is also on board with this system. Ethiopia, it seems to be on board with this system, but this is moving at lightning speed. And we saw not this past weekend, but the weekend before at the G20 meeting, there was an announcement made by Ursula van der Linden, who is the head of the European Union Parliament, and she had stated that three things came as a result of the recent G20 meeting.

Hon. Michele Bachmann: [00:22:06] One was pushing this digital vaccine passport. The other one is the collection of biometric data from people presumably around the earth, and then the other one was advancing digital currency. Well, this last week there were already advertisements that came out in the United States that in October, in just a couple of months here in the United States, we're going to be seeing digital currency offered through various banks. So, this is moving very fast. When the announcement was made at the G20, they weren't asking permission. And this is what we need to understand. The people who live in various so-called democracies and representative republics are never asked what their opinion is. To my knowledge, there isn't one nation that has held a referendum to ask the people, Do you want to have a digital passport that is going to be run by the W.H.O., the World Health Organization? To my knowledge, that hasn't happened. And yet the steamrolling. That is coming through every nation is undeniable, and it's pushing forward without the consent of the governed. That's a complete opposite of what the American form of government at least stands on and most other nations form of government as well.

Hon. Michele Bachmann: [00:23:24] So again, what we're seeing is a push to operationalize global government, operationalize the collection of biometric data. It happened to me this summer when I was in Europe speaking. There was a mandatory collection of biometric data for me to be able to move from one place to another. We also know that now in the United States, American citizens will now have to apply for a visa to go to Europe. Today, I could call Delta Airlines. I could buy a ticket to go to Paris tomorrow. No problem. As of January 1st, that will no

longer be the case. Now government will decide if I'm allowed to go to France or if I'm allowed to go to another nation. The same will be true for Brazil. They're also putting a requirement in place. And of course, what is this tied to the global digital passport? Because the effort is to limit travel. We will have to have approval for us to be able to travel, for us to be able to spend our money. And we have to demonstrate to the World Health Organization or whoever the enforcer will be. And global government is your phone that that will be global government, that your digital passport. So, this is where we're at right now. We're very far down the road and that's why we need our leaders to step up.

Hon. Michele Bachmann: [00:24:43] But again, I want to encourage people we take. I'm the dean at a faith-based university. We're a biblical based university. And so, 35 days ago, we started 40 days of prayer and fasting. We began with 25 people. We now have over 3100 people. We had people go on site near the UN today to pray. We had over 600 people praying this morning against this effort that happened this morning to get all the countries to sign. What I'm saying is this. I think that prayer changes history and chair prayer changes events on the ground. I realize this isn't a faith-based call. I understand that there may be people here who are offended by what I'm saying. But what I will say is I'm extremely grateful that today we saw victory at the UN. As far as I'm concerned, 11 nations said no. We're told Hungary will say no. So, we're going to keep praying here at Regent University. We're going to keep joining with all of the wonderful professionals on this call, and we're going to keep advancing because we need to be the leaders until our leaders decide they're going to lead. We oppose global tyranny with all of our being. And so, we're going to continue to push forward. And I am hopeful for victory. And thank you for allowing me to be on this call today.

Frank Gaffney: [00:26:03] We are privileged to have you with us and thank you for your continuing leadership and all of these matters, especially calling to our attention that not only the digital passport feature, but also the central bank digital currency train that is rocketing down the tracks towards us with incredibly ominous implications for our fundamental freedoms. And I for one strongly second, your point about the importance of prayer at a moment such as this. So, thank you for that, Congresswoman.

Frank Gaffney: [00:26:38] We're going to turn next to another frequent contributor to these programs. I'm proud to say. His name is Dr. Francis Boyle. He has an extraordinary pedigree. He is, among other things, a professor of international law at the University of Illinois, his Harvard law degree and a PhD, also from Harvard, speak to his academic credentials. He has been on numerous boards, including that of Amnesty International and has been responsible for drafting, implementing legislation, among other things, for the Biological Weapons Convention. So, he knows a good bit about some of the challenges that we are facing at the moment. I did want to say that Dr. Boyle has made a very important contribution to our understanding of the challenges that we are facing from these globalists by identifying some of the arrangements in our own law that make it look as though they may already have prior authorization to do to us what they will. And we've asked him to talk a bit about how we can go about stopping the globalist at the UN and the World Health Organization as they seek to establish a truly

totalitarian medical and scientific police state. Dr. Boyle, thank you for being with us. Over to you, sir.

Dr. Francis Boyle, Ph.D.: [00:28:11] Well, Frank, thank you very much for that kind and generous introduction. I'm very happy to be here today at this critical moment in human history. I kid you not. The numerous extreme totalitarian edicts, shut downs and mandates imposed upon the American people by our elitist, globalist government officials, scientists, medical doctors and mainstream news media produced massive civil resistance all over the United States by ordinary citizens exercising their common sense and principled opposition in order to circumvent and then repress and quash this massive American civil resistance movement. The Biden administration decided to go to the World Health Organization in Geneva and procure from them a treaty and an international agreement that it could then use here in the United States to defeat the 10th Amendment to the United States Constitution that gives control over public health to state and local, democratically elected officials, [excuse me], and to the American people themselves. If successful, the net result of this W.H.O. treaty and or international agreement will be the establishment of an elitist, globalist, worldwide totalitarian medical and scientific police state under the guise of the W.H.O. That has no precedent in the modern history of international organizations going back for the past 125 years to the First Hague Peace conference of 1898.

Dr. Francis Boyle, Ph.D.: [00:30:07] This worldwide totalitarian police state will function as a front organization for an order of the elitist globalists behind the W.H.O., the Biden administration, and its apparatchiks, and its Wall Street financiers. The US State Department bureaucrats. CDC scientists and doctors. Bill Gates. The Chinese Communist Government. Big Pharma. The US Biowarfare industry. Klaus Schwab and his World Economic Forum. And their Davos crowd. And the European bureaucrats in Brussels. This worldwide totalitarian medical and scientific police state will pursue the elitist globalist agenda of drastic worldwide population reduction. We now see 26 million dead as a result of Covid 19, an offensive biological warfare weapon, that leaked out of the Wuhan BSL four, and establish a totalitarian dictatorship. No matter what the cost to the future of the human race and to democratically elected systems of government around the world, that will all be rendered nugatory in name and will survive in name alone, including and especially here in the United States. Make no mistake about it, the very future of humanity and of democracy in the United States of America are at stake. We must defeat, defund, disable, discombobulate, and leave the W.H.O. The sooner, the better. A pox upon the W.H.O. Thank you.

Frank Gaffney: [00:32:07] Thank you, Dr. Boyle. I'm particularly keen on discombobulating the W.H.O., but all of the other responses to this, I think are well taken and urgently needed. So, I appreciate your forthright assessment and recommendation, sir.

Frank Gaffney: [00:32:23] We're going to talk next. A bit more about the nature of the deal that is afoot here with a man who has been in the belly of the beast. He was a former medical officer on the staff of the W.H.O., the World Health Organization. His name is Dr. David Bell. He is these days a senior scholar at the Brownstone Institute, a public health physician by training

and a biotech consultant on global health matters. We have benefited greatly from his insights into the nature of the W.H.O., its shortcomings, which are myriad as well as the dangers of the agenda upon which it is embarked. And we're delighted to have him speaking about, among other things, why it is that the W.H.O. and the UN should not have any role in our health care and are, in fact, undermining our democracy. Dr. Bell, it's a pleasure to have you with us once again, sir. Over to you.

Dr. David Bell, M.D.: [00:33:31] Thank you, Frank. What is behind this declaration that we've been discussing and the appropriateness, as Frank said, of the World Health Organization, in exerting power over health emergencies, particularly in democratic states, which we hope that we live within. So, the declaration that the intent of it is was discussed is to lend support to the International Health Regulation amendments and the Who treaty, which will be voted on next May. And there, as Reggie explained, to give unprecedented power to the director General of the Who to control health care and control movement of populations in emergencies. So that is mentioned but briefly within the Declaration, although it's the main intent, most of the declaration, it runs over 12 pages, is essentially rhetoric and it discusses upholding women's rights, emphasizes the importance of education in getting people, children and adults out of poverty. Frequently uses terms such as equality, equity, inclusion, diversity, which are things that we would all agree with as rational human beings. I think in the true sense of those terms, inclusion, diversity, for instance, of course includes inclusion of contrary opinions to our own and recognizing free speech. So, we have to understand what the institutions that wrote this or behind it, the UN and the W.H.O. have just done, and the staff who, you know, essentially have written this. So, they've just overseen for the last three years an unprecedented concentration of wealth from low-income individuals to a very few high-income individuals and corporations who have been very strong sponsors, particularly of the W.H.O. And also, of the U.N.

Dr. David Bell, M.D.: [00:35:25] Um, they've overseen school closures for up to two years in some countries that have devastated children's hopes for their future and really locked in poverty for a generation or two over a lot of the world's population. They've reduced health access with results of increasing malaria and decreasing tuberculosis in low-income countries. Increasing cancer rates in many Western countries through stopping screening. Et cetera. A global increase in poverty and malnutrition up to 100 million people additional in severe poverty. They've overseen. Additionally, millions of girls go into child marriage, increasing child labor. So, destroying the future of all these children and through closing educational institutions, increasing poverty. And they knew that they would do this back in 2020 when they started this process of lockdowns. So, these are not institutions that you would rationally think have our best interests at heart. So, we have to read the declaration and the rhetoric in it in the context of what has just happened. So, this is really the results of two, two decades or more of increasing influence of very rich, private individuals and corporations, both in the UN and the Who and the groups like the World Economic Forum that represent these people and these corporations. So. The show itself, the World Health Organization. Is it a in any way a rational choice for looking after our health care or, as was pointed out by Michelle, the. Looking after vaccine passports or instituting such rules.

Dr. David Bell, M.D.: [00:37:13] So as an organization, it's very heavily privately influenced. The second largest funder is private. This funding is specified from private individuals and corporations, which means the WHO is a tool. It doesn't decide how to use these funds. It is given funds for a specific purpose. So, it's a tool very much of private individuals and the corporations are funded. 50% of the member states don't even claim to be open democracies. So, it's you it's irrational to give such an organization control over people in democratic states. It's not a pool of high expertise, as much higher expertise in infectious disease in many, many countries of the world. So, you wouldn't hand control to people with less expertise and the poor track record of who has been shown, as we just discussed, you know, increasing malnutrition, tuberculosis, um, the other results of the policies that they push very hard over the last three years. And lastly, you don't you do not hand control to an organization that denigrates and vilifies and tries to silence those who disagree with it and with its policies. That's the opposite of a scientific approach, is the opposite of a democratic approach. But this is what the WHO is increasingly indulging in the censorship area. So thirdly, just the idea that pandemics are becoming an existential threat needs to be thought through. So, the last large pandemic was the natural one, was the Spanish flu in 1918, 19. That was before we had antibiotics.

Dr. David Bell, M.D.: [00:38:54] We have improving nutrition globally. We have improved sanitation. We have antibiotics now for secondary bacterial infections. We have antiviral drugs. We have all the benefits of modern medical care. So, to suggest that we're going into an era of pandemics and the pandemics are an increasing threat is frankly ludicrous unless it is envisaged that poorly conducted scientific research is going to increase release of altered pathogens, which could be dangerous. And it seems clear now that the last three years were due to gain-of-function research and probably an accidental lab release. So, unless that happens again, naturally, we would not expect pandemics to have a big impact. The health burdens that we face all the diseases which putting billions of dollars in the pandemic agenda will defund such as diabetes heart disease, cancer in other countries. Malaria. Tuberculosis. Malnutrition. So, I think we can be really glad that there's been pushback on this declaration. But we need to look very hard at the agenda that's behind this and think about the you know, what happens in May of next year, for instance, when the amendments and the treaty are voted on. And essentially, you know, we need to understand that this is this whole emergency health agenda is built on a series of fallacies and untruths. And a lot of it is stupid. And, you know, both at an individual and a national level, we really need to stop complying with stupidity. Thanks, Frank.

Frank Gaffney: [00:40:39] David Bell Thank you. This is an extraordinarily important insight. It seems to me that we are not only talking about surrendering our sovereignty over personal as well as national public health decisions to unelected, unaccountable. The bureaucrats at best, as Reggie spoke of. We're actually turning them over to people who do not have the competence that our own medical professionals have. And we've unfortunately had some concerns about those in the course of this pandemic experience as well. But at the very least, we have some sense of their training, their expertise, their competence as well. Thank you again, Dr. Bell.

Dr. Meryl Nass, M.D.: [00:41:26] We're going to speak to another very accomplished medical practitioner, Dr. Meryl Nass. She is not only a family medicine board certified internist of some renown in her native state of Maine. She's been one of the most courageous frontline doctors in opposing much of what has been done to us. Well, let's be clear. Under the advice of the World Health Organization, she's also an expert in biological warfare activities and the research and development that can spawn new grave threats in that area. And we've asked her to talk a bit about how these arrangements that the World Health Organization will now claim have received the imprimatur of the world's leadership pursuant to this political declaration, to do a lot more of that sort of spawning and hyping of fear through, among other things, this pandemic treaty. And I should just simply say the treaty is a term that is used when people slip up. If it's a treaty, it's supposed to be taken up and ratified formally by the United States Senate. So, most times they talk about it as an agreement or a framework or something else, but a treaty, it is. And it should, in fact, receive the Senate's advice and dissent. And Meryl Nass will give us some reasons why. Dr. Nass, thank you so much for joining us. The floor is yours.

Dr. Meryl Nass, M.D.: [00:43:10] What David Bell said is absolutely correct. The whole concept that we are, which was said today at the UN, we are in an age of pandemics is false. What we need to realize is that the Covid pandemic, the actual virus, was created in a laboratory using gain of function research, which is another term for biological warfare research. So, we have been subjected to a biological warfare event. That was the pandemic we've lived through during the last three and a half years. And we were also subject to another sort of biological or toxin agent, which was the vaccines that have been developed supposedly to help us manage this infection. But in fact, the vaccines were designed using a as the basic initial structure, a toxic protein, the spike protein known to be toxic, and then various even more dangerous and toxic portions were added to it to cause it to do many different things that were harmful to humans. And this had to have been deliberate because this particular virus was designed to preferentially infect humans. It wasn't interested in bats. It was made for humans and many aspects of the. Vaccine protein also appear to have been designed to harm humans. Okay. What happened today at the UN. As others have said, was an effort to shore up the AU's efforts to take over. Global control of pandemics and health emergencies under the guise of helping us, but actually taking over authorities that should normally be those managed by governments and sub subnational organizations.

Dr. Meryl Nass, M.D.: [00:45:21] So in the US, public health and management of medical care is actually a state authority, not a federal authority. So, the Who wants to take over the management of health whenever it declares a pandemic using the international health regulations or any time based on the treaty draft that has that is being negotiated currently, which will be operative all the time. Not only are the pandemics that we may be subject to potentially coming out of labs that our governments and our tax dollars are supporting, but this global health architecture that everybody who works for a government or a multinational agency wants to build, that too, is based on a house of cards, lies and false claims. So, there is no global health architecture. Health is between you and your medical practitioner. The W.H.O. has nothing to add in terms of instructing your doctor how you as an individual should be treated. They may have a role in identifying viruses, but they certainly have no role in telling

you how you should be treated or protected. What one of the ways this is being foisted on us is to tell us that we are defenseless without their solutions, and that is completely false.

Dr. Meryl Nass, M.D.: [00:46:56] The solutions are reckless in the extreme in the chat. Maybe you can, maybe you can't see it. But in the chat, I gave a link to the proposed treaty. This is the Bureau text, the current text that we have available, and it incentivizes gain of function research, which is biological warfare research. It tells nations to do it, it tells them to build labs. It sort of in other documents, promises to give nations money to build out these labs in which they can design new, very virulent pathogenic microorganisms. It also demands that once they have designed them or found them and all the nations are required to go out looking for potential pandemic pathogens, they must share them globally. This is in the language of the proposed treaty. This means we're talking about the most crazy thing possible. Open source, biological weapons, making the code. You know, the genetic code available for biological weapons. Why would you want to do that? Why would you want to go out and find them and create them? And why would you want to share them? In fact, all of these actions go against the Biological Weapons Convention, which is another treaty that everyone's ignoring preparedness by performing. This sort of searching for agents and working on them is extremely risky. And the United States has 200 reports per year to the CDC of leaks.

Dr. Meryl Nass, M.D.: [00:48:45] Or thefts or losses of potential pandemic pathogens. So, if the 200 alone accidents that could turn into pandemics in the US that we know about, how many are there everywhere else, and isn't this just a disaster waiting to happen? So let me just mention that under the guise of trying to help us with our health and making us frightened to death of future pandemics, we are promised governance at the highest political levels. This is in the UN document that David Bell discussed, where countries are told there will be sharing of benefits. I'm quoting sharing of benefits arising from the use of pathogens and sequences with pandemic potential. Countries are required to counter misinformation, so they must perform surveillance of their citizens, social media and make sure that only the single W.H.O. UN health narrative is allowed to be used. And they definitely want more immunizations. So, you can anticipate that vaccines this was discussed at the UN today, vaccines being developed in 100 days instead of the 10 to 20 years it normally takes will be rolled out with no liability for their manufacturers or the governments that can potentially mandate them. And this is going to happen again. And this is something we need to stop. Um, I probably used up my time, so thank you very much.

Frank Gaffney: [00:50:26] Thank you. Dr. Nass, as always, I appreciate so much the leadership, people like you who have been in the medical space and who have witnessed firsthand what we were subjected to when the World Health Organization had only advisory authority in pandemic 1.0. And it makes all the more ominous, as you say, what might be in prospect.

Frank Gaffney: [00:50:49] Now, another such medical practitioner is our next presenter. Her name is Dr. Karladine Graves. She is another frontline doctor who has been very active in trying to treat patients with the most efficacious means possible in the face of prohibitions on doing so. That again emanated from the World Health Organization, the China model, and those

diktats that were then passed along by US government entities. We've asked Dr. Graves to address the question of how might what the World Health Organization and its proponents have in mind for us impinge even more upon the patient doctor relationship and the quality of medical care that we may each experience if our personal as well as national sovereignty is crushed in the manner we've been discussing. Dr. Graves, welcome back. It's good to have you. The floor is yours, ma'am.

Dr. Karladine Graves, M.D.: [00:52:00] Thank you. I appreciate this opportunity. I want everyone here who is here and who will listen to this afterwards to realize. That we are at a war. Not with bullets. Not with bombs. But we at a war of ideas. And the sooner we understand this, the better. And we better look at it as such, because we are not only fighting for our sovereignty. We are. We are fighting for our freedom. When the so-called pandemic started. We begin researching on what we might be able to do to help those individuals who were really coming down quite ill. And in our research, we did find medications that could be used to certainly offset the severity and, in many cases, actually clear the infectious process from individuals. However, we soon learned that our prescriptions were being denied by pharmacist and they were being reported to medical health boards across the United States. These came not as mandates. Now, really, think about this. They weren't mandated at this point. They were suggested treatments from the World Health Organization, which, of course, we know is the arm of the United Nations. And under the only recommendations, we had lockdowns. You don't lock up individuals who are healthy. We need to be out and about. We should not be isolated. They mandated across the United States masking for children two years in age and up when very seldom are children ever even affected from this.

Dr. Karladine Graves, M.D.: [00:54:15] These types of illnesses. Yet they were made in schools to wear these masks where carbon dioxide levels were increased. When you have a mask on, you have to realize that you are only you are not actually eradicating a virus from coming in. You've got the holes on the side. You've got the holes underneath. I don't care how many masks you put on. The virus is 0.125 microns. The mask filter nothing less than 0.3 microns. Ladies and gentlemen, this is a farce. It is a sign of actually conceding to their world tyranny. We have to also realize that as physicians, our hands were tied. Can you imagine when it would be mandated that we no longer could use alternative medications other than what the World Health Organization has actually deemed as their protocol? And we would have to follow it, because if we didn't follow it, we would be illegally practicing medicine and that would come with possible fines and, yes, possibly even imprisonment. So can you imagine let's put this on a personal level. Let's say that you are very ill and that you don't. And you go to the hospital and you don't want to take remdesivir, which I had many patients who went to the hospital and they would even sign papers that they did not want to have the remdesivir yet against their will.

Dr. Karladine Graves, M.D.: [00:55:53] They were given that medication because it was, quote, protocol, but it was only a suggested protocol. But when it's mandated, ladies and gentlemen, can you imagine what will happen to your personal care? Also, physicians will be mandated to follow these protocols and cannot break away from them. Did you realize that when you go to

your physician now that they now have Z codes and those Z codes now will record whether you have been vaccinated or not vaccinated or if you've been partially vaccinated or not. And all of that data is now going into our government for surveillance and to actually track those who have gotten the so-called Covid shot and those who have not, and to what degree it will only become worse, ladies and gentlemen. And it will only be with you and I standing in the gap between freedom and tyranny. Ladies and gentlemen, many times we know throughout the whole United States that our system has been. Based on community a trust. A faith in one another. A faith in our God. And yet look what has been happening, ladies and gentlemen, rather than faith. In one another. Our community, our ability to come together and actually treat all of these medical conditions. Instead, they are inciting fear. And ladies and gentlemen, with fear, you are not going to get the facts because you are going to be so fearful that you won't be able to actually take in the facts.

Dr. Karladine Graves, M.D.: [00:57:53] Stand with us. What can you do? Well, some of you could take some of this. A video of this webinar and you could host some people in your home and show it. You could support a bill by Andy Biggs with HB 79 to defund the Who. You can go to the Sovereignty coalition.org and see what is available to you and to those around you also. And do not stop contacting your congressmen and your senators, ladies and gentlemen. They are they have crickets. They do not hear this plea. Our leadership and our legislators are turning a deaf ear to this. They are not listening. They are listening to the global elitist and to the World Health Organization. So, continue to hammer on their door. Do not stop. There are two things that legislators count on. That's money and votes. And we know that each and every one of us have that vote. So please stand and take your authority. Bring us back to America, where we are a community of faith in our God and one another. Our medical communities. And do not allow them to steal this freedom with fear. Thank you so much. I appreciate your time.

Frank Gaffney: [00:59:33] Doctor Graves, I appreciate your doctor's orders. With respect to the need for standing up for our freedom and how to do it, some very practical and well taken advice.

Frank Gaffney: [00:59:44] We're going to hear next from a really remarkable expert on so many of these topics. His name is Alex Newman. He is an internationally recognized journalist and an author, a podcaster, as well as a contributor to Epoch Times and other outlets. The co-author of a book entitled Crimes of the Educators How Utopians Are Using Government Schools to Destroy America's Children. Proper light motif for what Utopians are doing in so many other areas, including the ones we're discussing today. We've asked Alex Newman to speak about. What might life be like for us in an environment following a globalist soft coup? Alex, thank you for joining us. The floor is yours.

Alex Newman: [01:00:38] Good to be here. Thank you so much, Frank. And thank you to all the panelists. I couldn't agree more with what everybody is saying. This is an enormous crisis and we have no option but to win. So, in terms of what it will look like if these totalitarians, these globalists get their way, I'd like to borrow, first of all, from George Orwell, Eric Blair. He said, if you want a vision of the future, imagine a boot stamping on a human face forever. Right? That's

what they have planned for us and we cannot allow that. And so, to get into specifics and to put it in concrete terms, first of all, I think what needs to be understood is that communist China is the global role model for what they want the planet to look like. And that's not my opinion. They've been telling us this very openly for decades. And so, we can start. In 1973, David Rockefeller had gone over to China. This was before regular Americans could go over to communist China. And he wrote in the New York Times in 1973, it's still in their archives today. He said the social experiment in China under the leadership of Chairman Mao is one of the most important and successful in human history. Now, I don't know what kind of psychopath could possibly imagine that 50 million innocent individuals slaughtered is a successful social experiment. But those are his words. And anybody can go to The New York Times right now and verify it.

Alex Newman: [01:01:52] The headline for his op ed was From a China Traveler. That's barbarism writ large. The general idea has not changed since then. About 12 years ago, George Soros did an interview with the Financial Times, and I've got the video of it. I play it regularly. He says Communist China needs to own the new world order in the same way that the United States owns the current order. And of course, that is what we are watching happen right now. Just a few months ago, Klaus Schwab, the head of the World Economic Forum, went on communist Chinese propaganda television and said, and I'll do my best, Klaus Schwab impersonation. China is a role model for many countries. And frankly, I don't know what universe has communist China as a role model. For many countries, they are ruthless persecutors of dissidents. They are ruthless persecutors of Christians and Muslims and Falun Gong practitioners and Tibetans, and basically anybody who has a different idea for their own lives and their own communities than the Communist Party has. They have used ruthless population control methods, as Reggie has exposed to the world. This is completely unacceptable. And yet it was the norm for generations in China. This is a regime that has completely demolished a culture that was there for thousands of years, a civilization that achieved incredible things. It's hard to imagine a worse role model for anyone.

Alex Newman: [01:03:13] And yet some of the most powerful people on the planet are telling us that they see this as a role model. So, what does that mean in more tangible terms? Well, let's start with the social credit system in China. Everybody gets a score based on a number of factors. Not all of them are evil per se. Right. One of the things that they look at is, do you keep your phone charged? Do you pay your mortgage on time? Do you cross the street illegally? And these things may not seem like controversial areas to look at what becomes controversial is that they're including them in a score that's then going to determine what sort of privileges you're allowed to have. But then you have the other things to mix. Like have you asked questions that the government doesn't like on social media? Do you have friends or relatives who maybe have subversive opinions that they've expressed publicly? Have your children said anything out of line in school? So, all these things get factored in and then you get privileges or lack of privileges based on your social credit score. So, if you have a very high score, you can get a good job, you get well paid, your kids can go to a good school, you can hang out with the elites. Et cetera. You can even get a passport. You can go overseas because they know you're a loyal slave.

Alex Newman: [01:04:16] If you don't get a good score, things get progressively worse for you. You can't have a good job. Your kids can't go to a good school. Eventually it gets to the point where you can't travel, and if you go too far below what's allowed, you'll end up in a reeducation camp. And if that still doesn't work, you may find yourself on an operating table having your organs removed from your body. For members of the Communist Party or some wealthy oil sheik who's going to pay them money. So that's the kind of mindset that we're dealing with now. A lot of people call it communism fascism. Frankly, the Communist Party of China has quite a bit in common with national socialism, the Nazi ideology that reigned in Germany. But I think if you want to label it, I think technocracy is a very important word that we shouldn't lose sight of. And a lot of the most powerful people in the United States for generations have actually made an argument that this is the kind of economic system we want to move toward. The idea first popped up at Columbia University about a century ago, and Zbigniew Brzezinski picked up on it in his book, America's Role in the Technotronic Age. It's called Between Two Ages. David Rockefeller loved this book so much. He set up the Trilateral Commission based on that. And so, what it is, it's kind of fuses fascism and communism, and it becomes rather than a free market economy, you are allocated certain resources by your overlords in accordance with how useful you are to them and how loyal you are.

Alex Newman: [01:05:35] And so we see this now even being an advocate. It in the Western world through universal basic income, right? Well, you're all going to lose your jobs because technology is advancing so quickly. But don't worry, the government's going to give you a universal basic income. So, you'll have a carbon footprint budget right after you exceed that, you'll be in big trouble. They'll implement and enforce all of this using central bank digital currencies. And of course, all of this fits right in with the health care control that we're talking about right now through the World Health Organization. It is one of the critical levers that they can use to enforce compliance. Now, what you see in China is, yes, they've got millions of people in concentration camps. Yes, they will arrest you, they will beat you. They will torture you. But in many cases, they don't even have to do this anymore. They've set up the incentive structure such that with the social credit score system, with the technocratic control of the economy, people just behave themselves naturally. They don't even have to break out the terror apparatus and take off the glove from the fist very often anymore. So that's what we're dealing with. You factor in then the advancements in technology that we're seeing, the mRNA injections, the fourth industrial revolution, the advances in genetic engineering, the what Klaus Schwab again describes as the fourth industrial revolution.

Alex Newman: [01:06:46] He describes it as the fusion of our biological and digital identities. These technologies are advancing very rapidly. Now, I'm not anti-technology. I don't believe technologies are inherently bad when they're used by psychopaths, megalomaniacs and totalitarians. They become incredibly dangerous. And so, when you're looking at technologies like just to pick one out of many that we could talk about neuralink that Elon Musk is developing right now, that's going to hook your brain directly up to technology. And in fact, Elon Musk has talked about how they can use this technology even to write on your brain. You put these kinds of technologies in the hands of monsters. It's a recipe for disaster. Now, the UN wants to lead all of this. They're making this very clear as we speak. They just wrapped up the

SDG 2023 summit. That, of course, is paving the way for the summit of the future. In line with that, in preparation for that, the secretary general of the UN, who of course is a well-known socialist, has already dropped a bunch of policy briefs that are intended to guide this process. One of the key takeaways is that during any declared emergency, the UN wants to be the absolute decision maker on everything. And they say this very clearly in the document on the emergency protocols, any global emergency that doesn't have to be global and doesn't have to be an emergency could result in the invocation of these protocols where then, according to the text itself, private sector, national governments, everybody would then have to respect the decision-making authority of the UN.

Alex Newman: [01:08:09] We're talking about massive levels of wealth redistribution, the impoverishment of the third world. I mentioned the SDG summit that they just held. SDG stands for the Sustainable Development Goals. The head of the UN General Assembly when these were passed in 2015, referred to it as the Master plan for Humanity. And I would imagine God thought that was probably pretty funny, but that's their vision anyways. And they outlined very clearly what their plan is for the world. Goal number ten. They make clear that National Socialism, domestic wealth redistribution is not enough. We now need global wealth redistribution. They make clear in goal number four that your children will be indoctrinated to the point where they won't just submit to these things. In fact, what the UN uses in Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals is they will actively promote the UN's ideology on human rights, sustainable development, gender equality, which in un speak means radical feminism, abortion, smashing the nuclear family. Et cetera. And finally, I'll leave it at this, because I know I'm just about out of time. They're bringing in an entirely new ethical and moral code, along with their fake vision of human rights that are essentially the opposite of what Americans have always understood as our God given rights.

Alex Newman: [01:09:15] And I saw this process up close and personal. I was in Egypt last year for the UN Cop 27, the climate summit. Right before that happened, they released a document through the UN Development program saying that the system of ethics and morals that evolved with mankind over a period of thousands of years was no longer adequate to taking care of the planet. And right after that, a whole bunch of religious leaders of the world, in partnership with the UN, marched up to the top of what they call Mount Sinai. Whether it's the real Mount Sinai or not is a subject for another day. They unveiled the New Ten Commandments. The New Ten Commandments do not include any of the traditional things that we understand as Ten Commandments. They include you to be compassionate. You have to hear the cries of Mother Earth. You have to repent of your climate sins. They did this big climate repentance ceremony. So, folks, they have incredible plans for us. They deal with every area of our lives, the future of our families, our liberties, our churches, our communities and our country are all on the line. And I want to just echo everything that everybody else has said. We cannot lose. We must resist this. Everything is on the line and we have to defeat these people. Thank you.

Frank Gaffney: [01:10:18] Alex Newman, Thank you. Very powerful exposition on so many of the topics that have been discussed already and amplifying the most important of them.

Frank Gaffney: [01:10:28] We're going to conclude with the presentation by another of our favorite freedom fighters, a man by the name of Ron Armstrong. He is the president of Stanford. Up Michigan, but also the leader of an informal team of activist. Leaders across the country who have very clear-eyed understandings of the challenges that we are facing. Well, from enemies, foreign and domestic. And we've asked Ron to describe, given everything that has been said to this point, what must now be done by Americans both to understand more fully the various efforts that are underway. The United Nations at the World Health Organization, amidst those Davos and Beijing and elsewhere who seek to affect a soft coup and the hard tyranny they have in mind for all of us. As we have heard from each of our presenters to this point. Ron Armstrong, thank you very much for your leadership in the Defense of Liberty. And we're anxious to get your thoughts on what we must do now in the face of what we've just been told.

Ron Armstrong: [01:11:43] Well, I think what you've heard today is all of the facts that are necessary for you to understand what's happening. And I think most of you knew or recognized something was wrong. Certainly, since the pandemic hit and our reaction to it, this was a test and we failed the test. The majority of us conformed and consented to whatever was asked of us. We masked our two-year-olds. We forced vaccinations. We closed our schools, and the churches closed as well. And when we talk about being in a war in America, I would say that majority of us are considered, again, a Christian or a faith-based nation. And that means that we have got to understand that we are in a spiritual war. And Alex explained it perfectly. What we are dealing with, I believe, is evil. We are looking at a clear attack and it is on America. They have to bring America down. And just to understand that this is a strategic and a systematic plan that they are seeking, and the one thing they have to circumvent is the US Constitution. It is, again, the founding document. It is the basis and the foundation in which we're built on. And what the rest of the world doesn't understand is that the foundation was not built on those men who swore their honor. To what was listed and written in that constitution.

Ron Armstrong: [01:13:04] But it was about those unalienable rights that government could never have over the people because man and government were never allowed to give them or oppress the people with anything that was meant or given to us by our Creator. That's where the hope lies. And what I'm here to talk to you about is the solution. The solution is actually simple in my mind. It means we have to separate ourselves from these global organizations. We need to defund and we need to exit the World Health Organization as soon as possible. We've discussed the China and one health approach. You have to understand that this group of people consider. Individuals in humans, animals, plants and the environment all on exactly the same level. They aren't created to make sure we have a better way of life. They are exactly the same. And if we have to reduce the human population to protect the planet, that is where these people live. It is, I believe, a demonic influence that we are looking at right now. If you're a faith-based person, there's nothing else you could look at but the scales that are over the eyes of our leaders. The people that are our representatives that have stood by during all of the circumventing of our constitutional and individual rights. And those of you as a business owner, as a parent. And what we have seen happen over the last few years and it is obviously speeding towards a conclusion.

Ron Armstrong: [01:14:38] Some of these things are going to be implemented and are going to be enshrined in our lives before we ever reach the next presidential election or in 2025 with whoever prevails there. You know how this has been done with our own tax dollars, our own printed and borrowed money that we have given to these organizations. There are people within this administration. It's the reason that we discuss things like foreign and domestic terrorism that is active, that is looking to destroy our own country. Many within this own this administration, many that are ahead of the departments that are that are leading the charge on a global basis, and certainly many billionaires that exist within our country and around the world have always sought to control the ultimate control over the people and the United States government. But they can't do it in a regular process because the Constitution is in the way. What have we witnessed over the last three years? We have witnessed anything that is considered an emergency declaration sets aside our constitutional rights and liberties in their mind. Now, we would say that that's impossible and not meant to be, and you are correct. But the courts have not saved us. Did they save it when we were shut down? I can tell you in Michigan they did not.

Ron Armstrong: [01:15:54] They didn't let us visit our own families. They did not let us go into a boat or go into a golf cart with another family member. They didn't let us buy seeds in the same store as we could do this. This happened in America while our churches were closed and our children were home with masks on inside. This is what America has come to. It is an apathetic place and it is time for us to wake up. It is time for us. I believe there is a reawakening that is happening. And what you heard from the people today are the facts as they are on the ground. And it is our job not to pretend that the people that are elected are out against us. Some of them are, but the majority are not. They are simply uninformed, uneducated, and they do not know the way forward. They do not believe that what is happening is actually happening and by the time they figure it out, it will be too late. What did we hear on national media? Because the media, the social media are all bought into this plan. And part of this World Health Organization plan for us is to do what it is to censor us self, censor us, and to force the countries and member countries to censor themselves with any dissenting opinions.

Ron Armstrong: [01:17:00] It's against all free speech. It's against everything we stand for. What we need you to do is go to the [Sovereignty coalition.org](https://sovereigntycoalition.org) website. It'll be in the chat, it'll be everywhere. It'll be attached obviously in the video. When you watch this and share this with every single person, you know, every elected official, I believe that the solution is starts at a local basis. We're not going to change every state government, but we can change local communities. We can seek out governors that are in red states to proclaim that we are not following any mandates by the World Health Organization, the United Nations, the World Economic Forum or anyone else. We can ban digital currencies and make sure that we have alternatives. If you haven't done it, you need to read the book called *Pirate Money* by Kevin Freeman. It explains alternatives that exist because we are going to need them. On the [Sovereignty coalition.org](https://sovereigntycoalition.org) website. You will see everything you need from resources, from stories and videos like this one that will be posted there by tomorrow. There also is a social media toolkit with over 20 memes and one of them at the top. I just want to read from unless you're okay with surveillance and censorship, restricted travel, forced medical examination and

testing, forced vaccinations, quarantine and loss of national and individual sovereignty. We have got to exit the World Health Organization.

Ron Armstrong: [01:18:18] It's that simple. But these are there for you to share. And we have got to take action now because May of 2024, these amendments will take hold. And our administration has already basically signed over that. We will agree to follow these. They're calling them an agreement. They're calling them an accord, anything except a treaty. And it doesn't matter because this Senate has decided they're not going to treat it as a treaty. By the time we get this through a court process, we will already have succumbed to many of the things and the and the dictates that are happening from an international basis. We have time. We have the solution. We have the spirit of freedom within us as Americans. And most importantly, we have our God. We have our unalienable rights that exist within our Constitution. We need to learn about them. We need to uphold them. We need to defend them, and we need to live by them and live free. And if we on a local basis begin to make sure we're not following these and create alternatives in the medical industry and every other way. We can come out stronger than ever before. Recognizing the strength of our country is not in the men, but it is in the founding principles and the godly individual rights and liberties that exist for us as a nation. Thank you.

Frank Gaffney: [01:19:39] Thank you, Ron. We have had an extraordinary conversation to this point. I would like to just do a quick round if we can. We're asked in the chat by an individual who watched the proceedings today that everybody who spoke apparently was completely on board with this program. So how is it that we can contend here that progress that's being made towards this end state is other than what's being described by its proponents as universally agreed?

Dr. Meryl Nass, M.D.: [01:20:13] So there were there was a letter written several pages long and signed by the officials, foreign ministers or health department people or someone from those countries. And I read it and it was strong and it didn't agree. I also then happened to hear that Nicaragua was one of those countries and they tended to be countries we used to think of as enemies. But now I think we have to realize they are more likely to be our allies than our own country. When the Nicaraguan official spoke, he spoke about primary health care and how much they had done about that. He didn't actually criticize the UN proposal, but he talked about what his country was doing instead. And so, people who didn't understand that nuance might have thought he agreed, but in fact he did not. And I imagine that was true of the other 11 signatories to the letter.

Frank Gaffney: [01:21:10] Let me just reframe the question and maybe, David Bell, I could ask you, as you had a lot of experience with the World Health Organization and these international bodies, we are being told that with the exception of these 11 nations, all of whom, by the way, happen to be pretty unsavory sorts, very authoritarian in character, that those who spoke were basically in favor of what is being proposed here. To the extent that that is so, is that in some way, shape or form an indicator that their publics have been canvassed and are supportive of this, including our own and.

Dr. David Bell, M.D.: [01:21:47] Yeah. Thanks, Frank. No, the I mean, no country has had a vote on this. It is hard to see how a vote to give away your individual rights and rights, to see your family rights over your own health care decisions, to give them away to essentially a foreign entity, how any country would ever vote for that. So, we have to be careful here in distinguishing what is a country at the United Nations, a country at the United Nations is a group of bureaucrats and some high-level politicians who, you know, as Klaus Schwab from the World Economic Forum that Alex mentioned, has said, you know, the World Economic Forum has penetrated the cabinets of and he lists a whole range of countries. So, these are not people who and I think we see this in a lot of Western governments now. Western governments now have social behavioral psychology units attached to their governments whose role is to twist public opinion in a way that the government wants rather than the way that people would naturally go. So, we have a subversion of democracy on a fairly deep scale in democratic countries and the representatives of the United Nations and the Who are not, you know, necessarily indicative of the will of the people.

Dr. David Bell, M.D.: [01:23:06] They're indicative of a sort of class of very high-level bureaucrat who, you know, with revolving doors into the corporate world, etcetera, who live this international sort of globalist world or club rather than primarily being, you know, attached to nations and national borders. So, I think and, you know, there's nothing wrong with nationalism. Nationalism is an expression of individual sovereignty, and you need boundaries within which an individual can express their sovereignty. So, it, you know, it allows human rights to be imposed. Whereas taking away borders allows someone against human rights to have complete control and individuals have no pushback. So, I think, you know, we're seeing this dichotomy between countries and between a sort of globalist agenda that does not respect boundaries, but does not respect basic human rights, individual sovereignty. And that's the sort of tension here. And the UN over the last decade or two has come out very strongly on the side of the sort of globalist agenda rather than the basic individual sovereignty human rights side.

Frank Gaffney: [01:24:20] Thank you. Dr. Boyle. Your expertise with biological weapons prompts me to wonder if you agree with Dr. Nasser, who I think is describing kind of this fixation on redistributing and otherwise sharing things. The prospect of what we would do with sharing novel viruses is greatly proliferated, ultimately biological weapons worldwide. Would you agree and is that consistent with the biological weapons convention on which you worked?

Dr. Francis Boyle, Ph.D.: [01:24:51] Well, of course that is correct. But let me make another point here, based on my professional experience. I single handedly defeated the United Nations Organization and the European Union for my clients at that time, the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. I will not go through all that here. I have a book Stopping Serb Genocide against the Bosnians and whatever. From my perspective, having defeated the United Nations Organization and the European Union all by myself. The real threat here is the W.H.O. It is the treaty and the amendments to the regulations. This is what we really must focus on. Obviously, this other going on at the UN will be a danger at some point in time in the future. But the imminent danger, the existential danger to the human race and the and democratic systems of government all over the world is the W.H.O. treaty and amendments to the regulations. We

must defeat them. We must defund the W.H.O. We must discombobulate it. We must leave the W.H.O. as soon as possible. This is the real threat.

Frank Gaffney: [01:26:29] Thank you, sir. Dr. Graves, you have spoken very powerfully about your personal experience with the trickle-down effects, if you will, of the World Health Organization and its admonitions, injunctions, advice, what have you, in the last go round hearing what Dr. Boyle, among others, has said with respect to the power that would be granted, the World Health Organization that is very considerably greater than what they had with the first pandemic. Does the need for disengaging really, frankly, both from the World Health Organization and I would argue from the UN as well, now seem to be to you the only remedy for what would otherwise be our fate?

Dr. Karladine Graves, M.D.: [01:27:20] Absolutely. Otherwise, they're going to hold us hostage. Us meaning every individual across this nation, as well as the medical profession. We have to realize that the medical profession years ago became consolidated, where they were bought up into groups and they are owned by hospitals, insurance companies. And of course, those large corporations, for the most part, depend upon government funding. And that's where a lot of the government supplements came in to subsidize these institutions and therefore, they had to follow the mandates. Also, physicians and hospitals were given immunity that they would not be held responsible for certain deaths if they followed the protocols that were suggested by the World Health Organization. Now, when they are mandated, there will be no alternatives. We have to realize that in medicine on a daily basis, most physicians who prescribe any medications, about 25% of all prescriptions that are written every single day are what we call off label use. In other words, they were not they did not come to the and go through the FDA to be approved as what necessarily they are being used to be treated for, such as we would use some of the diabetic medications as a perfect example that yes, they're used for diabetes, but an off-label use would be for polycystic ovarian condition. And they work. They're safe. That is what we suggested and what we found out to be true early in this pandemic. But can you imagine that you are a physician and, you know, if you can give that medication to that patient, that you can offset their illness or let's say that it was your child and your child is sick and yet you are mandated to go home and wait until and this is what people were told all the time through this debacle of health care, that they called health care through the World Health Organization.

Dr. Karladine Graves, M.D.: [01:29:47] And can you imagine saying, well, wait until your child can't breathe and then bring them back? Then you can come back and you can get treatment after you can't breathe or you can't hardly exist. Well, of course, the body has almost exhausted itself to the point that there's nothing that's going to help. And so therefore, we saw millions of people die unnecessarily because they were not treated as medicine has always been a proponent of and that's early treat early. And the earlier you treat, the less viral load or bacterial load that you have. And so, with these protocols being mandated, I can't even imagine myself facing this again through these regulations that they have placed and watching people suffer and die and be separated from their loved ones where they say goodbye in an ICU unit over Zoom and can't touch that individual. We have gotten away from humanity and we are

treating protocols. And unfortunately, these protocols are being in place by the elitist who have in fact, I don't know how many people know this, but the director of the World Health Organization, they call him doctor, but he is not a medical doctor. He has no medical background. And most of these people who are doing this have no background as far as medical care, but they certainly. And they do want to have gain of function. And ladies and gentlemen, either we stand now arm to arm against this tyranny or we bow for the rest of this time out to their whims and what they are calling for, which is going to actually be a world disaster.

Frank Gaffney: [01:31:54] Thank you. All of them. This brings me to Alex Newman. You made an observation that struck me as requiring clarification that on the one hand, this is going to entail massive wealth transfer. And on the other hand, it is going to result in the impoverishment of developing nations. If the wealth is being transferred, I thought it would be transferred to the impoverished nations of the Third World at the moment. Is that not the case?

Alex Newman: [01:32:21] When the UN talks about wealth redistribution from the rich to the poor, what they're really talking about is looting the middle class, especially in the Western world, and then redistributing that money to the kleptocrats who have either impoverished the Third World or kept the third world in poverty. As somebody who grew up in the Third World, I lived this. I mean, I've been in the third world most of my life. I lived across Latin America and Africa. And what happens? All these it's not just the UN. I want to be clear. The US government does the same thing. A lot of the Western European governments, they transfer all this money down to the governments in these third world countries, and then the governments either hide it in secret bank accounts or they use it to add additions to their mansions. They hire more cronies; they redistribute it to their buddies who have businesses and tenders with the government. So, when they talk about wealth redistribution, the idea that they want people to have, is that they're going to go after the billionaires and take their excessive profits, as they like to say, and then redistribute it to people who are really hungry. The reality is totally different when they're talking about wealth redistribution. They're talking about coming after people like I mean, the billionaires hide all their money in tax exempt foundations anyway. George Soros and Warren Buffett and the Rockefellers, they're not going to pay any more taxes to do this.

Alex Newman: [01:33:34] That's going to be on us. And when they redistribute it, it doesn't go to the people. In fact, it does the opposite of benefiting the people. It further entrenches the powers, the forces that have impoverished and undermined the freedom of these people in the first place by giving them more credibility, giving them more money to entrench themselves in power. It really is the most grotesque form of wealth redistribution one could imagine. It's very similar to what they do here in the United States when they claim to be doing wealth redistribution. Yeah, they give a little bit to the peons, but really, they're giving the big. And we saw this so clearly with the Covid bailout, \$1,200 per American and a lot of people cheered, especially poor people. Oh, \$1,200 that I didn't have before. Well, they're taking that money from us. And if the \$1,200 was just a cheese in the mousetrap for every \$1,200 they gave to an American adult, they gave they took \$70,000 from the average American household and redistributed it to the mega banks, the big corporations and the crony contractors in bed with

the government. So, this is not wealth redistribution in the sense that they want poor people to think this is wealth redistribution from the poor and the middle class to the elites who are doing the bidding of the UN.

Frank Gaffney: [01:34:46] Thank you so much, Reggie, Leslie, to you. We are talking about two things that are, I think, of importance here. One is some believe that the United States Senate may spare us the various horrors that we've described here, specifically with respect to what has been described repeatedly as a treaty, the pandemic treaty, they call it. But also, these amendments that would fundamentally alter the international health regulations and thereby empower in very, very dangerous ways. The World Health Organization, 0.1 and 0.2, to name some of the names of those in Congress who have taken a stand against all of this, the actions that are needed now and can we rely on the Senate, all other things being equal, to step up, do you think.

Reggie Littlejohn: [01:35:38] In terms of the Senate stepping in to save us? The Senate is not going to save us. Okay. Senator Johnson ran an amendment I don't know how many months ago at this point, maybe eight months ago, just saying any treaty that goes through the World Health Organization has got to be ratified by the Senate. And the Senate itself voted it down. So, I don't think we can count on that. And what the senators care about is hearing from constituents. And the same thing with the House. Okay. They want to hear from the constituents. And so, we need to have a groundswell of concern coming from everybody. And so, again, I would point people towards the Align Act on the Sovereignty Coalition. It will go to your senator; it'll go to your congressional representative. So that's the pandemic treaty, which those who don't want it to go through the Senate are refusing to call treaty. It is a treaty. But in terms of the international health regulations, those are amendments to existing regulations. And so, it's very easy to try to get out of calling them a treaty or saying that they don't have to be passed through the Senate. And those are very dangerous.

Reggie Littlejohn: [01:36:52] The minister to the International Health Regulations are where it says that the World Health Organization is. They strike the word non-binding. And also, there's a lot in there about destroying the patient physician relationship. And then beyond that, something that Dr. Boyle was the one that that originally alerted us to was that in the NDAA at the end of 2022, there was language that was passed in there as the Pandemic Preparedness Act of 2022 that said that that it committed the US government to comply with and adhere to a number of known treaties on health, but also any other relevant framework having to do with health, which would include. Amendments to the International Health Regulations or pandemic treaty so that the people who want to bypass the Senate can say, look, the Senate already passed this in the NDAA of 2022. And that's something else that I think that we need to take aim at is getting that overturned, that particular provision. So, Senator Johnson, in the Senate, I think Andy Biggs in the House are two people who have been leaders in this space. And Frank, you're closer to Congress than I am. I'm sure you can list others as well.

Frank Gaffney: [01:38:09] Well, I would just mention a couple of names that have been important in this to this point. They need help, obviously. One is Ralph Norman. He has been an

instigator of an important press conference in which I think some 19 or so, including himself of his colleagues in the House, spoke out very forcefully against the World Health Organization and called for its defunding. The chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, Mario Diaz-Balart, and John Moolenaar, have both expressed very strong opposition to funding of the World Health Organization and in fact, zeroed it out in their markup of the House Appropriations Committee's bill that would fund the World Health Organization. Otherwise, the problem is, of course, what happens to these appropriations measures in light of what's going on at the moment in terms of a continuing resolution or an omnibus bill. It's not entirely clear, but there is, it seems, strong sentiment in the House, at least among the Appropriations Committee specifically, that we should, in fact, be disengaging. And that was before this political declaration and all the rest of it. So, I'm hoping that with help from people who are watching this program and who are otherwise getting up to speed on the problems that we've been discussing, that they will be encouraged to hold the line. Two other members that I think have been important in offering some legislative initiatives to defund and to withdraw from the World Health Organization are Congressman Chip Roy of Texas and Congressman Andy Biggs of Arizona.

Frank Gaffney: [01:39:56] All of these folks need to be hearing a lot more about the popular sentiment, about the kinds of ideas that are now being inexorably advanced, as we've talked about in this program, to the detriment of our personal freedoms and our national sovereignty. I think we will see more responding if we do. Insist upon the sentiments of the American people being taken into account. With that, I think we better wrap it up. And I want to say thank you to this. Extraordinary panel, as well as to the large number of those of you who've been watching and asking questions about our proceedings. I'm going to turn it back to Dede to answer, among other things, a question of will we provide in addition to the video, which the answer is yes, of course, and fairly shortly this webinar, but also the chat that has gone on in the Q&A part of the program or the chat room, I guess, and its resources or both. So, I'm going to throw that back to you and just say my thanks to all of those who have made this program possible. And hopefully we'll go forth and multiply with the information that we've been providing.

Dede Laugesen: [01:41:12] Thank you. Thank you, Frank. And thank you to all of our incredible panelists today. Most especially, thank you to our audience for being here. Please share this video with your networks. A video of this webinar will post to stopvaxpassports.org and also to sovereigntycoalition.org by some time tomorrow, probably in the morning. Please share this program with your colleagues and other networks and check back at both sites for more information on this and other upcoming programs. And also join with us at Sovereigntycoalition.org to demand America exit the W.H.O. Thanks again for being here today and goodbye.