

## TRANSCRIPT

# Emergency Briefing: Globalist Ambitions at the U.N. Summit of the Future

Sovereignty Coalition | <https://sovereigntycoalition.org/briefing-globalist-ambitions-at-the-u-n-s-summit-of-the-future/>

Media: 8.27.2024\_01.mp4

(Begin Transcript)

**Dede Laugesen:** [00:00:05] Hello, everyone. Welcome to the Sovereignty Coalition's emergency briefing on globalist ambitions and the UN Summit of the Future coming up in September. We're glad to have you here.

**Dede Laugesen:** [00:00:19] Our moderator today is Frank Gaffney. He is a co-founder of the Sovereignty Coalition and executive vice chairman of the Center for Security Policy.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:00:30] Welcome, everyone, to a very special, well, emergency briefing that we are putting on under the auspices of the Sovereignty Coalition, which I'm proud to be the co-founder with Reggie Littlejohn. This particular program is an emergency because it addresses the idea of imbuing international bureaucrats unaccountable, unelected and typically Marxist international bureaucrats with emergency powers. This has been put in motion and far advanced. In fact, with the empowering of the Director General of the World Health Organization, Tedros Ghebreyesus, with the authority not only to declare a public health emergency of international concern but also to begin to, well, yes, dictate what nations must do in response to them. Some of these powers have been formalized in a treaty. Yes, it is a treaty that was agreed on the 1st of June in the dark of night, literally at the last possible moment in Geneva, Switzerland, a meeting of the so-called World Health Assembly. Some of them are powers that the World Health Assembly hopes to impart to the director general in another treaty that is still under negotiation. In my estimation, plenty of damage was done by the first one, not least because it has helped create a model for what is coming next in this trajectory towards what its sponsors call "global governance" and what I think is properly described as one world government. That would mean, of

course, that other governments, other forms of government, and other nations operating under sovereign governments, would be subordinated to the one world government under the leadership of people like Tedros Ghebreyesus and Antonio Guterres, the secretary general of the United Nations, to accomplish the empowering of the latter, the secretary general, with these emergency authorities.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:03:00] A program has been convened or planned now and will be convened shortly, I should say, in September, September 22nd and 23rd, specifically in New York, on the margins of the General Assembly meetings of the United Nations. And we will be hearing in the course of today's briefing about what the United Nations has in store for us if its secretary general has his way, as the director general of the World Health Organization recently did. I couldn't be more pleased to have speaking about these topics, two of the men that I have come to admire, not only for their intellect and their scholarship on the matters at hand, and much more, of course, but for their clarity and their courage in speaking the truth to power, including what's left of that in our own government. And, of course, that is now in question as to whether it will be exercised by these international supra-national organizations. The first is Doctor James Lindsay. He is a mathematician by training, but as I say, a man of letters more generally who has deeply thought about and written about and help the rest of us understand more about what is the agenda of assorted totalitarians. And he will, I hope, walk us through some of the dramatis personae in that category and what they have in mind for us. We will hear secondly from Alex Newman, and I will introduce him following Doctor Lindsay's remarks. It is terrific to have you with us, James. I know we've caught you on an interlude very brief in your extensive travels. Thank you for making yourself available. And the floor is yours.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:05:01] Thank you so much, Frank. Thanks for convening this and putting this on. I think it's extremely important, and I'm, of course, honored to be involved since I don't have much time, and there's so much that could be said. I want to just kind of dive into the business. And so, I kind of want to hit upon three points to address a briefing for this Summit of the Future from the United Nations. And the first of these is to understand the context in which we're operating, which is the evolution of communism, in my opinion, or the advent of 21st century communism, which doesn't look like 20th century communism, but is communism nevertheless. The second is going to be to talk about the United Nations Millennium Agenda from about 25 years

ago, just briefly, and then to just remark upon, to finally remark upon how the Summit of the Future is designed to implement and accelerate the implementation of these agendas. But the bulk of my commentary will probably be about the evolution of communism, so that we can properly set the table for the model. And what's very important to understand is that we are now dealing with and I'm going to use the word communism very just bluntly here. I'm not going to dance around it and say, is it fascist? Is it this? Is it that what are the weird elements? But what you'll find is that a lot of people do not believe that it's communism, because it's not what some Marxists in the 1960s and 70s called communism or Marxism of strict obedience.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:06:19] It, in fact, evolved. And this is the primary message I'm trying to spread in the world right now is that communism changed shape to fit the 21st century. And so, this happened in two places at once, what we might call the Eastern model and the Western model. Clearly, in the 1990s, the Soviet Union collapsed, and so it did not become the basis for the evolution of communism to a 21<sup>st</sup>-century model. The Eastern model actually took place in China, and the impetus for this transformation was the absolute failure of Mao Zedong's Great Leap Forward. What we're experiencing and have been experiencing in the West with the identity politics in particular with the implementation of vaccinated versus unvaccinated in these other deep divisions in society for the last 5 to 6 years in the United States, maybe ten years or even longer is Maoist style division. But the goal is not to establish a Maoist style regime. The question I always get when I bring this up and show the parallels to Maoism is, well, who's Mao? And how are we going to have a Maoist regime? That's not the point. The point of using Maoism here in the West is to break America enough and Western nations enough to allow the implementation of what they've tested in China since the, I guess, late 1970s, but particularly since the late 1980s, which is the new CCP model, which is based off of not Mao Zedong's thought, but rather his successor.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:07:44] Deng Xiaoping's theory, which incorporates Deng Xiaoping's model, was named one country, two systems. So, it incorporates literally a fascist or openly, in their own description, National Socialist economic model inside of a communist social and political model. So, the goal is still to move the basic spirit of communism to allow the CCP to be the governance, using the same communist democratic centralist model that their government operates on that Lenin and Stalin used before Mao also used it. It's to bring glory and advancement and spread to

socialism. But they realized that after the Great Leap Forward, which we call the Great Reset today, after the Great Leap Forward and it's absolute catastrophe and calamity, they realize that the productive forces are simply not present in 20<sup>th</sup>-century communist models like we saw in the Soviet Union, in the PRC and under Mao, and in Cuba and other countries that decided to take that path. We can look at North Korea today, which is invisible from satellites at night because it has no lights, because it has no development, and no production. So, they realized that wouldn't work. And so Deng Xiaoping introduced the slogan open up. And the idea was to open up a Potemkin market system within. So, what's allowed in that system? This is the beta test for 21<sup>st</sup>-century communism, that individuals are allowed to become fabulously wealthy by doing various business interests and pursuing various business interests, but it all has to be within the purview of what the CCP allows.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:09:20] It all has to be in line with the communist theory of productive forces outlined by Lenin and then implemented by Deng. And it has to further not just adhere to communism but has to advance the basic spirit of communism. The state owns all of the raw materials, land, and basic resources, but quasi-capitalists within China are allowed to use those to produce so that you can produce this kind of Oxymoronic object called productive socialism. Now, in the West, we saw the failures of what they called actually existing socialism in the Soviet Union and PRC under Mao. Again, the kind of great leap Forward being the biggest failure. And you had theorists, the neo-Marxist theorists, Herbert Marcuse, perhaps most influentially through the 1950s and 60s and into the 1970s talking about this issue. So the Soviet model was not going to work as it was organized, is what they kind of laid out. And so what we ended up with is a Western model for 21<sup>st</sup>-century communism coming into being. And that recognized reading Marcuse in his essay on Liberation and also in One-dimensional mankind is some of his most influential writings from the 60s. He's very clear that the problem with socialism is that not only is it bureaucratic and totalitarian, but it's also unproductive. So this productive socialism needs to come into the world somewhere.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:10:44] And like I said, China became the beta test under the PRC. And on the other hand, capitalism needs to have a bridle put on it because, in particular, it's not sustainable or inclusive. So, we end up with a sustainable and inclusive capitalist model developing in the West, coordinated through the United Nations significantly, especially in the 21st century, but also forwarded very early on by

the World Economic Forum, trying to create the public-private partnership, which is, again, that quasi-fascist business environment in which the communist agenda would be embedded. And so, like I said, the goal is to put a bridle on capitalism while socialism becomes productive in the way that they've achieved this. The model that they came up with, beginning in the early 2000s at the United Nations, was called the ESG, or Environmental Social Governance Standards. And just to break those words down very quickly, E is environmental, and S is social. So, the S is the social justice, and the E is the climate action. Those are your excuses to be able to implement this. This is where you shuttle the ideology into the corporations. But the G is actually very important in the most powerful of the letters. And, in fact, the G is the only of the letters that is being implemented in China, which already has done its system. And so G stands for governance. And what I want to impress upon everybody is that the stakeholder capitalist model, forwarded by Klaus Schwab at the World Economic Forum, that is behind virtually everything you see in big business.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:12:13] The Harvard Business Review publishes about it constantly. It's in every corporate document to shift away from shareholder primacy to stakeholder primacy. I want to impress upon you that this is a rebirth, nothing more than a rebirth of the old Soviet model of the USSR or the democratic centralist model of China, just allowing for this one-country, two-systems approach that Deng Xiaoping pioneered. As a matter of fact, the G of ESG is Sovietism. It's no longer that the Soviets are workers' councils, where hand-picked party members representing the workers would dictate what was good for the workers and thus be allowed to control how the environment worked. Soviet, by the way, means council – referring to councils that govern. And they are these controlled workers' councils. We now have stakeholder councils instead, or a stakeholder Soviet, where managerial experts are going to tell us how business has to be done. But it's the exact same model. It's no longer a workers' council, just a managerial council. And, the purpose of ESG is actually to facilitate the implementation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, which are part and parcel of its Agenda 2030. Those 17 sustainable goals are meant to, in their own words, just like all Marxists would say, transform our nations and our business environment and in fact, our personal environment. And we'll start with a de facto social credit system for corporations that will eventually become a social credit system for individuals, just like you see in China.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:13:40] If you read China's explanation that they wrote in 2014 for why they wanted to implement a social credit system, it's very clear because they say it dozens of times that it's necessary to implement for a modern socialism. This is what is going on in the Eastern and Western models to create a 21<sup>st</sup>-century communism that sets the table. So why in the world is this going on? I take us back to characters like Robert Mueller at the United Nations, but his hearkening actually back to the beginning with Julian Huxley's writings. If you read what was going on at the United Nations, both from its beginning, but especially with Robert Mueller leading into the Millennium Assembly approaching the year 2000, it was very clear that their agenda was to create global governance in order to control the global evolution of the planet and everything on it. They are explicit about this. They will think of the planet and all of its inhabitants, plants, animals and humans as a single meta-organism that needs a central nervous system that it will be able to control. So, the United Nations sets itself up as the global nervous system, the central nervous system for everything on the planet, including people. The administration of nature, the organization of society, and the practice of business. And that's exactly what we see affected through their ESG tool, which, I remind you, was invented by an intern at the United Nations in 2003 to do exactly what it's doing now.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:15:07] The model that they pushed at the time at the UN Millennium Assembly said that Robert Mueller specifically said that both capitalism and socialism or communism have failed in some new model called frugalism would have to replace this. Today, the name for frugalism is degrowth or degrowth communism, in which they will shrink our GDP and measure some other bogus statistic called well-being, where we have much less prosperity, we have much lower standards of living, but we have more nature and more free time without having to work. So, we actually somehow have greater abundance. And the goal is to shrink our economies down to a manageable size that they can control with central governance. And ESG is meant to force corporations in the West to participate in this. They already do it by default in China because the ESG is still the Soviet democratic centralist model, with official representatives of the party hand-chosen to do it. So, what is the Summit of the Future? This is the summit that they're holding. Soon, very soon. This year, in order to renew this agenda, renew commitment to this agenda across member states and to accelerate its implementation, which is to say, to accelerate the growth of China and the

destruction of the West so that we can move to a global single system that is 21st century communism. Thank you.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:16:25] Wow. Thank you. James Lindsay. What a superb overview and with such efficiency. You really introduced both, as I hoped, the forces at work here and their track record of advancing inexorably an agenda that they hope to steal a march on us yet again in just a few weeks at the Summit of the Future to both amplify some of the points that James has made, I'm sure, and especially to synthesize a bit more how all of this is translating into the specific agenda of the Summit of the Future.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:17:07] I'm very pleased to have our second presenter be Alex Newman. Both of these men are on the go all the time. We're catching up with Alex, I believe, at an airport. He is not joining us by video. As a result, we're going to throw up a slide with his handsome visage on it and a little bit of his background, so I will forego introducing him other than to say that, like James, he has an extraordinary grasp Of the dire threats that not only our national sovereignty and American's individual liberties are now facing at the hands of this process, and this is a term we'll come back to, I'm sure, inexorably moving forward towards one world government. And I'm delighted that he has a few minutes before he boards his plane to read us in on the specifics of what's at hand next month in the UN. Alex, over to you, sir. Welcome.

**Alex Newman:** [00:18:04] Thank you Frank. Thanks, everybody, for being here. I'm sorry I couldn't join you with the video, but as Frank mentioned, I am at the airport. I want to start by echoing everything that James just explained. He's exactly correct, as far as I can tell in his assessment of what is going on here. Now, I've been following the UN around the world for the last 15 years in my career as a journalist, so I've seen a lot of this happening face to face. I've been in these meetings. I've been talking to the policymakers and the leaders about a lot of this on camera. So, I've been following this very closely. And I think what's coming in September is the culmination of a lot of efforts. And so I want to give a little bit of an overview of the Summit of the Future. But before that, I want to point out also that the UN is not just working on its own on this. It's got powerful allies, obviously, the CCP in Beijing. I'll talk a little bit more about them. It's working very closely with the World Economic Forum, which is actually the strategic partner of the United Nations in the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals. I'll get to those the 2030 Agenda, but it's also working with an organization

calling itself religions for peace. This is an organization that's led by a former high ranking UN bureaucrat. It describes itself as the UN of religions, and it claims that every religion in the world is a member, and their goals are pretty open at this point.

**Alex Newman:** [00:19:24] They want to transform the world, and they're also working to centralize political, economic, health and even ecclesiastical power at the international level. There's a variety of different pretexts, and I think they all need to be understood as pretexts, even though everybody working toward these objectives may not understand that the climate change narrative, the idea that CO2 is pollution, the gas we exhale, the pandemics, the idea that tyranny is somehow the only way to deal with a health problem, the economic problems that, of course, are the result in many cases of too much socialism and bad economic policy. These are just some of the pretexts being used. And so when we talk about the Summit of the Future that's coming up soon, I intend to be there. The UN is giving me a harder time than usual to get press credentials. So working with them right now, hoping to have those approved very soon. But I think what this comes down to is this is an effort to institutionalize the largest international power grab in recent memory, potentially the largest international power grab in my lifetime. Um, I have been comparing it to kind of a constitutional convention. Whether they'll actually go ahead and revise the UN charter remains to be seen, but what they're trying to do is usurp a huge array of new powers over all different areas of life, all different areas of law and governance and the economy.

**Alex Newman:** [00:20:39] And they're trying to do this under the guise of dealing with those pretexts that I mentioned earlier. The one that first caught my attention was the one dealing with emergencies. So the secretary general, Antonio Guterres, has released a series of what they're calling policy briefs through what he calls our common agenda, which is meant to be the humanity's agenda. And one of the first and in my opinion, most important ones that he released was called Strengthening the International Response to Complex Shocks and Emergency Platform. And I would encourage everybody on the Hill to go ahead and read this document. It's not that long. It's not that difficult to comprehend what he does. The secretary general is he lays out a vision for empowering the globe, this global organization, to supposedly deal with global crises, but in fact to become Basically an all-powerful international organization with authority over everything. I mean, they're essentially asking the governments of the world to write a blank check to the UN in terms of power and money in the event of any

emergency. And so in the in the document, the policy brief, he says, the challenges that we face can only be addressed through stronger international cooperation. In other words, a stronger United Nations. He calls for strengthening global governance. And if you look at these protocols, they make clear in this document that they would apply to all sorts of different institutions, not just the UN and its agencies.

**Alex Newman:** [00:22:01] These institutions that would come under this include national governments, of course, international institutions, even outside of the UN system and even the private sector. And as the document itself explains, all of these institutions would have to recognize, and I'm quoting here, the primary role of intergovernmental organs such as UN agencies in decision making. So we're talking here about a very real and very Transparent effort to undermine national sovereignty. It says these global emergency protocols would be triggered automatically in case of a global crisis, regardless of the type or nature of crisis involved. They do give some examples. It could be an environmental crisis, an economic crisis, a war. It could be a cyber-attack. It could be a something from outer space, which they don't elaborate on. It could even be a black swan. So we don't even know what it might be. But any of these things could trigger these emergency protocols in which all power and authority would be centralized, not just in the hands of the UN, but in the hands of one individual, Antonio Guterres, who for those who aren't familiar with his background, prior to leading the UN, he led the Socialist International. It's the world's largest alliance of socialist and communist political parties, and it traces its roots directly back to Karl Marx himself. Now, when I learned of this, I reached out to some people on Capitol Hill, including House Foreign Affairs Chairman Mike McCaul, and I did get a statement from him, which in my opinion, was not very strong.

**Alex Newman:** [00:23:25] He said we must be sure that any global protocol or platform operated by the UN respects US national sovereignty and US taxpayer dollars. Well, it's very clear from reading this, this particular, um, element of our common agenda and all the others that these are global protocols that do not respect U.S. sovereignty and they do not respect U.S. taxpayer dollars. In fact, there's essentially no limit to what could be demanded from us under these protocols if they were to be implemented. Um, I also reached out to a former U.S. assistant secretary of state for international organizations, Kevin Moley. Um, he served for two years in that position in the U.S. State Department under the previous administration. And he said that allowing the UN to do this would be

the equivalent of putting the CCP in charge of global emergencies. And I think his assessment is exactly correct. Um, and when you look at the role of the CCP within the UN, this has happened very quietly, but it is not hard to discern if you know where to look. To give an example, out of the 15 specialized UN agencies that would take all power and authority in the event of a global emergency. Five of these are led by a card carrying member of the CCP, the Chinese Communist Party. And unlike Americans who go work in international organizations who are expected to leave their loyalty to country and party behind, CCP members are not just expected, they are required to remain loyal to the CCP and even to implement its decisions and to prove its point.

**Alex Newman:** [00:24:51] There is a CCP card carrying member of the CCP who is running Interpol, which is not a UN agency, but likes to style itself the global law enforcement agency. The leader of this, Meng Hongwei, was actually arrested by the Chinese Communist Party when he went back to China, despite his diplomatic immunity. And the official reason was he wasn't faithfully implementing the decisions of the CCP in his sphere at the international organization. So this is very, very clear from their own statements. They expect all CCP members to deal with the international organizations from the perspective of helping to advance the CCP's interests. Now, all of these emergency power grabs, which go with the other power grabs, including the ability to censor or regulate information under the guise of tackling misinformation, malinformation and disinformation. These are especially dangerous in the context of what the World Economic Forum and others are warning about right now, which is the emergence of what they call a poly crisis. This poly crisis, um, is supposed to include possible economic crisis, social crisis, environmental crisis, monetary crisis, pandemic or health crisis, and a cyber-attack all merging into one giant poly crisis that would supposedly necessitate huge changes in the way government runs and the way that the architecture of global governance performs. Now, one of the deliverables that they're hoping to get out of this summit for the future, it's already posted on the UN's website.

**Alex Newman:** [00:26:15] I encourage people to read it. It's called the Pact for the Future, and it doesn't take long to read this. By the time you get to page four, it's very clear what they're doing. In their words, they want to expand global governance. They want to strengthen the UN. They want to reform the international financial and monetary systems. They want to vigorously implement the 2030 Agenda, which we'll pause here for a moment and discuss the 2030 Agenda. When this was first approved in 2015 by

Barack Obama and basically every other national government in the world, as soon as this was adopted by the UN General Assembly, the CCP used all of its propaganda organs, including its newspapers and television stations, to brag that the CCP had played, in their words, a crucial role in developing this. What the president of the UN General Assembly called the master plan for humanity. So, that right there is a significant red flag, no pun intended. If you read these 17 Sustainable Development Goals. You don't even have to read between the lines. It is self-evident what they're doing. I encourage you, for reference, to go to goal number ten as one example. They're saying now that national wealth redistribution is no longer enough, that we need international wealth redistribution within and among countries, as they put it in the goal.

**Alex Newman:** [00:27:26] And they say this requires sharing the wealth and addressing income inequality. So, when James talks about this being kind of a reemergence or a repackaged form of communism, he's exactly correct. And even the economic component is still there, although certainly, the pure Marxist model seems to have been abandoned for the stakeholder model that Klaus Schwab and his friends have been talking about. And by the way, Klaus Schwab and his friends boast that over the last 40 years, they have helped transform China. And I think China, the CCP actually practices the closest version of the stakeholder model where companies, businesses, governments, and the social sector all collaborate under one umbrella as opposed to, you know, the traditional checks and balances like we have in what's left of our free market system in this country. So, as you read The Pact for the Future, again, this is the outcome document that they want to ratify at the Summit of the Future. They talk about reforming the Security Council. They talk about transforming, by the way, that could jeopardize the US veto on the Security Council. It talks about strengthening the United Nations system. It talks about strengthening the UN's human rights pillar, which unfortunately is not human rights in the sense that Americans understand it, but rather a totally upside-down understanding of human rights. They're talking about transforming the international financial architecture. It talks about reforming the economy to meet climate change goals. It talks about actually coming up with a new framework to measure progress beyond gross domestic product, which is actually a critical component of the economic transformation that they are trying to bring about.

**Alex Newman:** [00:29:05] It talks about strengthening enforcement and compliance when it comes to multilateral environmental agreements, which, of course, would

include the Paris Agreement. And this is just the tip of the iceberg. So, I'm just about at the end of my time now. But I do want to encourage everybody to read these documents for themselves. They're not being broadly reported in the media, but they are all posted on the United Nations website. At this point, the UN has made this very clear. And one more thing that I should mention before I give the microphone back. I did reach out to the Biden administration when I was reporting on these things. They made it clear to me that the Biden administration is 100% on board with all of this agenda, so we can expect that they will approve these things as soon as they come up for a vote or for a consensus agreement. So, our country is in grave danger. Our sovereignty is in danger. Our economy is in danger. I would argue that even our Constitution is in danger. And I do believe this is a far more significant crisis than any of the alleged crises that are being used as the pretext to bring this about. And with that, I'll hand back my time. And thank you very much.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:30:07] Alex. Thank you. We will proceed to questions from our audience.

**Danielle Walker:** [00:30:12] Thank you. This is Danielle Walker from the State of Freedom podcast. Thank you all for having us today and for this really important discussion. Two quick questions. One is a question that is kind of a request not to overlook the role of multinational corporations that are very active at the UN. I used to work for Pfizer, so I'm very familiar with this and their foundations; their 501(c)3s – quote unquote – fund the UN and related organizations to the UN as international lobbyists. And they end up lobbying for the UN's agenda. So, I just wanted to flag that for this team. You may be very well aware of that, but I didn't want the opportunity to go by without saying it. The second question, given the CCP's clear interest in infiltration and non-kinetic takeover of the West, is, what level of alert or concern do you have about the security of our November elections? It seems that their desired outcome would be a coup of the entire West, and some of us believe that we are already living through that now.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:31:13] An observation, and I think particularly for those of us who have been tracking the World Health Organization, the role of multinational corporations, not just as well lobbyists in the UN or for the UN, but as arbiters of what these agencies do, is a is a very real problem. Big Pharma is essentially providing, as I

understand it, something on the order of 75% of the funding for the World Health Organization. I actually correction that number reflects the amount of money that's being provided by Big Pharma to the FDA. It's a smaller amount, but also significant by the Gates and pharma operations and the World Health Organization case. But we'll talk a little bit about that with you guys. But also, the question was a little bit off-topic, honestly. So, if you care to comment on it, I'd ask you to be brief. So, we have more time on the Summit of the Future, folks. But the other question was, "Is China so determined to achieve its goal of world hegemony through non-kinetic means possible that they would interfere with our elections through, among other means, advance that goal?" Alex, start with any answers from you.

**Alex Newman:** [00:32:26] Well, thank you, Frank, and thank you for the questions. Yes, I think the role of multinational companies is really important to highlight here. And if you actually look at what the United Nations and the World Economic Forum did in 2019, they both put out press releases on that. They brought the World Economic Forum on as a strategic partner for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. And if you look at this strategic partnership and the memorandum of understanding, the heart of that was to bring international businesses, especially the fortune 500 and the big industries of the world, on board with the UN Sustainable Development Goals. So that is happening in full public view. By the way, despite the fact that the media is not reporting on it. And as James was saying earlier, the ESG was one of the mechanisms they used to kind of hijack international business. I would argue, even against the best interests of shareholders, because what people like Larry Fink, the head of Blackrock, who's also on the board of the World Economic Forum, have done, is they have convinced major companies that if they want investment, if they want capital, then they're going to have to play ball. All of this includes sustainable development goals and the broader global agenda. And so, yes, I think that's a critical part of it. You know, Peter Drucker talked about the three-legged stool to bring about major international changes. And the first leg of the stool was the public sector, which all the governments of the world essentially are marching in lockstep on this.

**Alex Newman:** [00:33:49] The second leg of the stool was private business, the private sector. And of course, we see them on board now openly. And then the third leg of the stool was what he called the social sector or even the religions. And so that is how you make the stool stand is through the three legs. And we're watching all of these

organizations in the religious area and the private sector and within government, all working on this. The next question was about the role of the CCP in the elections. And I will tell you, I am extremely concerned about this. I do believe that they are funding all sorts of subversive campaigns to interfere in our elections. And I have spoken with experts in election security who have repeatedly sounded the alarm about the Chinese Progressive Association here in the United States when it comes to phony voter registrations, especially in swing states. And, of course, this was an organization that was even involved with some of what we saw in the summer of 2020, in terms of the unrest in our cities. So we would be, I think, very naive and very foolish not to recognize that the CCP is extremely active in our country stirring division, stirring hatred, stirring confusion. And, I believe, definitely an attempt to interfere in the election. And so I'll leave it at that. Thank you for the questions.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:35:04] So, I won't say much about the election. I'll just add one point to what Alex said, which is that I share his concern. Of course, the CCP would try to interfere to the degree that it can. I just would like to draw attention to this unfolding or developing awareness of what's known as the Act Blue organizations kind of scandal, where it appears that they're somehow laundering large amounts of money through very small people who don't know that lots of money is being donated to progressive candidates and campaigns in their name, sometimes hundreds of thousands of dollars. And it has been suggested to me, though I think it's merely rumor. So I can't confirm that much of or some of that money may actually be coming from foreign sources, including the CCP. So, this Act Blue apparent may be a money laundering scandal that seems to be developing and unfolding in some reporting is probably something to pay attention to in that regard as well. But as to the role of multinational corporations, I have not much to add because Alex covered it, and we don't need to say it twice, but I do want to point out that the environment that the ESG model produces and that operates, you know, in China as well, is something like the book or film "Hunger Games" for corporations. And the idea is that these multinational corporations have very little necessary loyalty to any given country. And here's this global agenda that's put before them. And so, whoever shows the most fealty will find the regulatory environment most conducive to them continuing to do business, including through ESG access to capital, through the various passive investment controls that entities like Blackrock, Vanguard and State Street have combined.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:36:40] They manage assets totaling something like 40% or more of the S&P 500. So, certainly, multinational corporations are a huge vehicle for this. In fact, it's necessary to put the bridle, as I phrased it, on American and Western capitalism to have some kind of mechanism like this. And so, corporations are induced by these mechanisms, like ESG, to participate in a game of ideological loyalty and agenda loyalty in order to be kind of the king of the pile, the monopoly on the far side of the economic transformation. I think that's the promise that they're given. If you play ball, you'll survive. And if you don't play ball, you probably aren't going to make it through the transition. I've certainly heard both first and second-hand from corporate leaders that they've been given such instructions as the offer. There's a change coming. There's nothing you can do about it. If you go along with it, it'll be good for you. If you don't help us, it will be bad for you being kind of the threat. So, I encourage people on the call that have the power to do something with this, to recognize that the ESG environment operates as a cartel. This is a fundamental international criminal organization to control American businesses, not just to gain control of them, but also to regrow the West, which would be a traitorous endeavor to make our economic capacity and our production capacity all diminished and basically outsourced to China. So that's, I think, one of the most important points to make regarding how the international business or multinational business environment works and the role that ESG plays in it.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:38:13] It's such an incredibly important point, James, and I just would add to it, if I may, that the average American probably would be surprised to discover that corporations that we think of as major American enterprises don't think of themselves that way at all. They now think of themselves as multinational and have the attributes you've just described.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:38:35] There's an organization out there that I think needs to be looked into, which is called the Council for Inclusive Capitalism, which I think is a major player in regard to this. You can find that they're very open about their agendas. It sounds like it's all kinds of the bad woke things, given that it's so-called inclusive capitalism. I would say that this is another manifestation of the exact same program. This idea where Marcuse laid out this identity politics that's supposed to end up putting a bridle on Western capitalism. And if you look at who the partners are, they're partnered directly with the Vatican's Lynn Forester. De Rothschild is photographed with the Pope and with Desmond Tutu and kind of one of their big press

releases. But they're also partnered with nearly 700 of the CEOs of the largest corporations in the world. And they're trying to drive this same agenda. So, to Alex's point that there are these three legs of the stool, which are, in essence, the public sector and private sector and the faith sector, you see this implementation of the faith sector, at least through the Catholic and their further ecumenical programs that they're running, kind of manifested in the Council for Inclusive Capitalism. And so, that's just another term to put on the map for people to look into and understand as part of this maneuver.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:39:50] Interfaith dialogue is, I think, another of the hardy perennials of this operation. And let me just say mention was made of Blackrock. I think its role in enforcing this ESG agenda is not to be overstated. It is incredibly powerful and diabolical.

**Bill Walton:** [00:40:06] It's more of an observation. I mean, we talk about multinationals. I think, certainly, the multinationals headquartered here in the United States. If they were giving clues or cues or directions from their political leadership, they would behave differently. But they are not. I mean, it's our government has been really complicit in letting them be globalist and not really worry about their role as an international, in this case, bad guys. And getting to that point. We don't seem to have politicians, James and Alex that understand what you do. I think what you've done is you've identified what you need to understand. If you're going to win any kind of war is you need to understand the nature of your enemy. And I don't think our political class understands what we're really up against here. And, you know, the more practical question I have, is there anybody on Team Trump, whether it's Trump himself, which I doubt, or somebody like Bob Lighthizer or maybe somebody in the in his in his foreign policy team that understands, uh, just how, uh, how invisible this enemy is. And they don't know the true nature of this evil. Therefore, they're not going to do anything about it.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:41:25] The question basically reduced to its essence, it was, is President Trump or his team schooled up on what is the reason for this emergency briefing, which is most Americans, including their political elites, have no idea of what we've just been discussing. If I may just add to the question, President Trump did speak shortly before the World Health Assembly approved the so-called International Health Regulations agreement. We think of it as a treaty and, therefore, that it requires the Senate's advice and consent. But he did speak about ripping up these things if

President Biden went forward with them. The two treaties in the W.H.O. So, James Lindsay, maybe we'll start with you and go to Alex second.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:42:11] I don't know much about what the Trump camp knows or is fully briefed on or understands, which is an even deeper level. I know that I try to sound the alarm a lot, and maybe it's like a form of a secular digital prayer. I hope that the message lands where it might need to in order to effect change. I do know, like Frank just mentioned, that Trump himself has remarked upon things vaguely in this direction, and he seems much more aware of the problem than he did in his previous term. He's openly using words like Marxist and communist and fascist, and he seems to be quite aware of the way that ESG is hampering American business. But I don't know if it goes further than that or how deep and insidious it is. So, unfortunately, the best answer I can give you is that I don't know, but that puts a responsibility on those of us who do understand these things, to continue to try to get that message as far out as we can so that it reaches those ears.

**Alex Newman:** [00:43:07] I have had several conversations with several people close to him, including General Flynn, Peter Navarro, Roger Stone, and a number of others who are expected to play a role in the administration. And I can tell you that from the ones I have talked to, there is an understanding of these dangers. Some of my conversations on this have been on the records that we've publicized that. And I would say especially General Flynn and Peter Navarro have a very, very good understanding of all of these issues that we're facing with the multinationals, the international subversion of sovereignty and the CCP. But we need to do a whole lot more in reaching more and more people who are going to be in the administration and get the word out to the grassroots, because he does really respond to pressure from the grassroots. And so, that will be my last comment for today. And thank you guys all. God bless you, and hopefully, our paths will cross again soon.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:43:50] God bless you Alex and safe travels. This is a key point, it does seem to me, and hopefully, something that will come from this emergency briefing is to build upon the work that we've been doing with the Sovereignty Coalition and with so many others to raise awareness on the part of the public and make this, frankly, a defining issue in this election season. We need a mandate for a course correction on globalism. It seems to me, and this is an opportunity to enunciate the reasons why I do

want to jump the line, to ask our co-founder of the Sovereignty Coalition. Speaking of which, Reggie Littlejohn, to say a word here, Reggie, a question or comment.

**Reggie Littlejohn, Esq.:** [00:44:30] Regarding the emergency platform. Do you have a sense of what the actual protocols would be should the UN declare a complex global shock, which they could do in the case of climate change, pandemic risks, supply chain disruptions, disruption in cyberspace, and disruption in internet connectivity and unforeseen black swan events. What would the actual protocols be, and what do they mean when they say a whole-of-society and a whole-of-government approach?

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:44:59] It's hard to guess for sure what the specific protocols would be, but I think that they gave us a preview with Covid 19, where in essence, these entities declare what they want to see done and they expect, although with this kind of power that they're taking now, it wouldn't be so much as an expectation as it would be a demand that countries comply. The protocols would probably look very much like that. There would be some central offices that decide precisely what the correct solution to the problem is, which is always going to end up, somehow or another to increase the amount of power of these same committees. If I had to make a guess and to hamper the ability for people to protest or speak up about the demands that are being put on them. And so the best I can give you for what the protocols would look like is that there's going to be a mirror image but with teeth of what they tried to do with Covid 19 in 2020, expecting every nation and every state and every individual to jump according to whatever their dictates are now. The whole-of-society and whole-of-government are directly within my wheelhouse, which I spend most of my time learning how to understand and decode this kind of cryptic, esoteric Marxist language that they use. And this, I mean, goes back. I don't want to belabor this with obscure seeming philosophy, but this goes back well beyond Marx to Hegel before him and well beyond Hegel to the esoteric faiths that he drew upon in order to create his model of systematic philosophy.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:46:25] And the idea is that you have to understand the tension between the whole and the parts, and, in fact, that the parts aren't comprehensible without seeing them as parts of the whole, and so that the whole then receives primacy. Hegel famously, and I bring him up for this reason. Hegel famously said that the way that the whole is manifested practically on earth is through the state.

In fact, his statement on that and, you know, depending on the translation from German, was that the state is the divine idea as it exists on Earth. And so everybody is meant to give complete fealty to the state. So that may give us some hints about protocol, is that the state will be the arbiter of how each how citizens in different countries are supposed to react, that they will go along with the program in lockstep as, as a demand of these, I guess, treaties or whatever they're wanting to call these agreements and the whole of society, whole of government idea is, therefore, that the whole society and the whole governance environment, not just within a country, but between countries as well, internationally or nationally, will be operating in lockstep. That's what it means. We're going to mobilize and marshal all forces of government across the entire world to push the exact same program, the exact same agenda, with the closest thing that you could have to the worldly equivalent of divine force.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:47:44] If we understand the philosophies from where these ideas come. And, this is why you will frequently see in their literature them talking about taking a holistic approach to, say, solving literacy problems or taking a holistic approach to solving one of these crises. So, what that would also demand then is not just that the whole of government explains that there's going to be lockstep. Whole of society means that every possible facet of how society works will have to be included in the change. So that would include supply chains. That would include mobilizing through supply and the distribution of goods and services. That would include mobilizing, you know, whether it's police forces or security forces to make people stay in line or stay in lockdown. Everything in society, in essence, is going to have to be reorganized around solving the crisis. And, like I said, that will result in them repeatedly grabbing more and more power and taking more and more rights away from people in an incremental fashion and the biggest chunks they can take. But the whole of society and whole of government mean it's going to be lock step, and we're all going to have to do it. And including rearranging all of our systems.

**Reggie Littlejohn, Esq.:** [00:48:49] I would argue that it would include, for example, harnessing the power of the education system, entertainment media, and possibly even the military to enforce their will on our society and on the world. I mean, would you agree with that?

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:49:05] Yeah, absolutely. Expect a lot more dancing nurses for the first or the dancing IT people or whatever to create a propaganda wave in line with the so-called it's an artistic style called socialist realism; you would definitely expect the entertainment sector, the education sector is already fully captured and has been is not already fully retooled but has been retooling. Education for global citizenship is already mostly implemented across Western nations, even African nations. As I've talked to some educators from Kenya who are suffering, their education has the exact same perversities that the American education system has in it. Certainly, the education system and media would be designed in the military, and yes, everything you said, Reggie, every aspect of society and government will be implemented. But I just want to draw attention to what Klaus Schwab said in his most recent book, "The Great Narrative for a Better Future." And he said, specifically talking about ESG, that the goal would be for the public-private partnerships facilitated by entities like the World Economic Forum to force companies to participate in ESG. And he specifically says to force them to participate in ESG. And then he says, but not every company will want to do this. And so, the second wave of forcing is through creating, he says, a youth movement that demands these changes. Young people who won't work for or buy from companies that aren't in line with the agenda, and that requires this kind of mobilization and brainwashing of the youth. And that's where the education and entertainment sectors come in, primarily to mobilize people to demand that we go along with the agenda, of course, the Maoist style politics that we shut down the world until people comply.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:50:45] So the people who don't comply are the problem, who have to be smashed is also going to be part of how they do that, which will affect young people most. The third wave, by the way, he says, is to rewrite the social contract itself, just what's expected to be a person in society, in a relationship with the government, which means your access to your privileges, no longer rights in society, will go along with participation, which means you will also probably expect social credit to be implemented as quickly as possible, where you get points for complying and you get demerits for failing to comply to whatever the demands are. I think that we would see tyrannical measures pushed again where 2020 with COVID was a test run, at the very least, far exceeding the tyranny of that. If they are able to implement what they truly wish to implement. With this and the brainwashing of our children in schools, and through entertainment and brainwashing whoever it is that watches any entertainment all the time. Late night television, for example, we saw Stephen Colbert dancing with the

fake syringes. You can definitely expect all of those shows to go all in to try to brainwash the public, in addition to everything else like the military and the edicts of law.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:51:57] Instruments like TikTok, of course. Let me just say, if this sounds as though it can't possibly come about as a result of this kind of process, I mean, many of us have for many years had low regard for the United Nations and, as a result, found ourselves susceptible to underestimating the International Health Regulation treaty, of which I spoke earlier, has in it a requirement that a focal point be created to assure that member nations laws and regulations conform to the dictates of the Director General of the World Health Organization. It also provides for a requirement for member nations to have digital or paper; presumably, the latter is something that will go away fairly quickly. Digital or paper IDs for everyone in their countries. The basic building block, as Reggie has pointed out frequently for what we call the digital gulag, the social credit system. Third, it provides a requirement that every member nation has to come up with some sort of censorship mechanism to assure that mis and disinformation, namely narratives or alternative positions to those taken by the director general, are not, in fact, going to be circulated. And not least, there's a requirement for kind of open-ended funding for all of this, a commitment that is a blank check, as I think you said earlier, James. So all of these are things that are not just possible, not just hypothetical. They're being done. And, to this moment, nobody has formally said the United States Senate will advise and consent to this treaty, which is something they very strenuously urged to be done. Sorin Shapiro is with us from our Israeli partners in our international sovereignty efforts. So, we take a question from him.

**Dr. Sorin Schapira, MD, MBA:** [00:54:05] It seems that capitalism and communism colluded together to create the new neo-feudalism today. And all those structures, both financial and political structures, are merely tools for faceless people. Some of them are visible, like Gates, Rothschilds, Rockefeller, and the Central Committee of the CCP. But I heard something about a 300 Council. Who are those? The remaining faces. It couldn't be that. Only a bunch of people are running all this show. There must be more than that. Some rumors said something about the British royal family and so on. Somebody knows that the names of all these people.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:54:54] Let me just encourage us to stick with what we can actually establish as fact because inevitably, many of us who are expressing the kinds of

concerns that we are here are going to be pilloried for being conspiracy theorists. James, do you have any thoughts on who's actually running the show? That's based on fact?

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:55:14] Based on fact is the publicly visible people. It's not in question that the United Nations, that the World Economic Forum as a strategic partner, and the CCP are deeply engaged in this. It's not in question that it's being facilitated through the corporations by entities like Blackrock, Vanguard, and State Street as the three largest proxy investment firms, but also through entities like the Council for Inclusive Capitalism, which immediately implicates the Vatican. These are, again, those public faces, so far as it goes, to implicate somebody such as the British royal family, whether it has connections to the so-called Committee of 300 or not. Whether that's real or not is outside of what I could establish, in fact. But, for the British royal family, it is worth mentioning that the first person who publicly announced the beginning of the Great Reset was not, in fact, Klaus Schwab. It was, in fact, at the time, Prince Charles. So, it is undoubted that Charles at least is on board with this agenda. And his actions, of course, both as Prince and as king have borne that out. We can say that there is certainly some link there between Charles, because he was the one who proudly announced this agenda, standing beneath a digital image of a crown made of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations as he announced it. You can look that up and see the image for yourself. But as far as what's rooted deeply, in fact, that I'm aware of that, it's hard to say much more than that. There's a great deal of speculation. I would strongly suspect that the players that we see in public are not the whole story, but since the others are kept secret, I don't know who they are. I don't think I could name a single one of them, actually, even if kind of pressed to do so. But I strongly suspect that there is more coordination behind the scenes than we're seeing publicly.

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:57:07] Lara Logan is in the house. I understand she has a question as well.

**Lara Logan:** [00:57:10] Yes, I'll be very brief because Frank has given me strict instructions not to talk too much. James, question for you. Can you speak specifically to the role of technology? I know Frank briefly mentioned the digital IDs and it's, you know, beyond the obvious, right? You referred to the "cellular religion" that I understand was

actually the foundation of the UN when they first formed the Temple of Understanding based on this cellular religion, this idea that every cell is equal, which obviously is counter to Genesis and teachings of Christianity, where, you know, God gives humans dominion over the earth and the animals and so on. The links to the Vatican make sense in that context, but I wonder if you can just expand on that a little bit, and then have you witnessed any form of resistance to this in any way?

**Frank Gaffney:** [00:57:56] Two questions. And Lara, I do want James to clarify this. I heard him say secular religion rather than cellular, but which it is.

**Lara Logan:** [00:58:04] It's the same thing, right? It's kind of like paganism, that it's a religion without God.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:58:08] I did say secular, and I kind of say that with my tongue in cheek because it's certainly not secular. It's esoteric. I very much liked hearing the phrase "cellular religion" because that is actually sort of how it works, beyond the idea that maybe every cell is considered equal. More importantly, I think, is the way that the United Nations is, it's quite explicit about this when it describes humanity as a single meta-organism that is bound together through its communications technology, specifically the internet and the algorithms that govern how we think. Because of our connection through the internet, it actually sees individual human beings, like the cells of this larger organism, which are all dedicated toward whatever the larger organism's purpose is. And that seems to be, well, that seems to be that's explicitly what at least Robert Mueller and all the way back to the founding of the United Nations and UNESCO, Julian Huxley are very clear about. That's how they think about what's going on with the role of the United Nations performing central nervous system for this meta organism of humanity, the kind of keyword that comes from the French Jesuit heretic, basically Teilhard or Teilhard de Chardin in the 20s through the 1950s, not published until after he died, because it would have been heresy to publish it as a Catholic priest. The concept is this noosphere the sphere of mind. And he envisioned an interlinkage of all humanity connected through what we now have is the internet.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [00:59:41] So for Lara's question about the role of technology, I think that this hasn't been fundamentally possible before this, pamphlets, leaflets and newspapers and even mass broadcast did a certain amount to be able to

bring people into a single mode of thought as a single metaorganism controlled by some central nervous system or central authority. But it was extremely limited. And they see this connection and this possibility much more realistically in the technologies that exist today, which would not just include our connectivity through the internet. And by the way, I know it sounds weird that I've invoked the noosphere and Teilhard de Chardin, which sounds very obscure, but I'll point out that again, Julian Huxley, Robert Mueller, other players at the United Nations, and Steven Rockefeller are all very open supporters of these ideas. So these aren't some fringe set of ideas. The Rockefeller family, of course, being the underwriters for the beginning of the United Nations, these are central to the program. Again, his goal was to direct the future of the evolution of mankind to operate as a single meta-organism with, in effect, a single global mind that works in a particular direction. And this is the religion that they are actually practicing. In other words, humanity is going to become its own god. The technology that Lara specifically wanted to know about, the internet, is just a beginning.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:00:59] I've heard phrases like "algaocrathy", or government by algorithm, thrown around the idea. Actually, there's a there's a wonderful paper that was written by a critical theorist. So, a leftist of all things, criticizing the program in education called social-emotional learning specifically. But what he was talking about is that social-emotional learning is organized not just to brainwash students through social and emotional manipulation that's personally tailored to them, but it's also designed to gather the necessary data from the students in order to do that. And the objectives are to this – Ben Williamson is the author's name – are extraordinarily clear. I think the title of that paper is something like "Psych-ocracy" or something like that, or Psychodata or something like this, if you end up finding it. I think it's called Psychodata. But he says that there's going to be a psychological ruling of the world, a psych-ocracy. And the goal would be that they will gather data so that the algorithm that delivers to you the information that you receive through, say, your cell phone device or whatever other device is perfectly tailored to meet your intellectual and emotional processes, to drive you in the directions that you need to go. In Williamson's words, to be a perfectly predictable political player in a perfectly controllable economic participant, the advertisements will be tailored so that they can stimulate the economy or suppress the economy to keep it at its circular, steady state, exactly as necessary by getting inside everybody's head and using algorithms to feed them only what they want or need you to know.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:02:31] Kind of a perfect disinformation environment.

That's still science fiction, frankly, but it is certainly conceivable to a degree, especially if we were to go to augmented reality technologies like these glasses that have you connected to the internet constantly, or even more something like Neuralink, where you actually have chips or neural lace embedded in your body or your brain that could contour your entire information environment, connect you to the internet so that you can only have the corrupted form of Wikipedia information all the time. For example, we also, though, have to integrate surveillance technology. Surveillance technology is extraordinarily important to these goals because the social credit system requires real-time, constant surveillance of all citizens in order to know not just their purchasing habits but also their behaviors. If they want to be a perfect marketing environment, they have to know perfectly what kinds of things you are interested in, what kinds of things you've bought in the past, and according to what patterns correlate that even with biometric data from the little watch that you wear that tells you whether you got enough sleep in all of this? So, the technology now creates at least a glimpse of a possibility for them to create this kind of global meta-organism, which has been the vision of the United Nations from the beginning.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:03:41] I don't think that's been the vision of the CCP from the beginning, and I don't think it ever was. But, the CCP's vision was always communist, and the communist vision is explicitly a religion where everybody is to become transformed, as Karl Marx phrased it. It is. Communism is the positive transcendence of private property as human self-estrangement and a return to our true human or social nature, which means that the goal of communism has always been to transform man, to believe that he's a communist. And so that's, again, the same idea of one mind operating for one society. It's just expressed in a different form. But again, I think that what we see in China playing out is that technology can be very powerful. I don't think it's as powerful as they believe it will be, but we have reasons to believe at least dipping our toes into science fiction that's well grounded in written literature, not just fantastic thinking that this could all become at least real enough. Maybe not perfectly real, but real enough to be able to cause real damage to our individual sovereignty and our freedoms. Williamson documents, for example, with social-emotional learning at the present level of technology, is that the way that it's designed, with the surveying and the evaluation and the observation of various data points, such

as psychometric data, biometric data, filling out surveys to assess mood and so on, that they are actually able to create far, very, very granular, he said.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:05:06] Psychometric profiles of every individual student that go far beyond the usual five, the big five, the ocean model, personality inventories that are extraordinarily granular. We saw, you know, rumors, at least in 2016, that entities like Cambridge Analytica experimented with that. That led to the Trump victory to use social media to contour people's understanding we saw in 2020. We now see Mark Zuckerberg apologizing for his role in doing the same thing, and saying he was pressured by the federal government to do so, to interfere in what we understood about whether it's the 2020 election, whether it's Covid 19 or other misinformation, disinformation, things since. So, technology plays an incredible role in opening up the horizon for them to do what they always believed, whether communist or this kind of new thought religion, what they've always thought that they had to do to elevate humanity to its next spiritual level, which is to transform us kind of at the fundamental level of our thoughts. What Herbert Marcuse called the level of our vital needs have to be recontoured to socialism. And he called that a biological foundation for socialism. And the second question was, do you see pushback and a yes in the grassroots. And B, you're on the call with one of the most effective pushback mechanisms so far. We do not have natural asset companies and assets, largely due to the activities of this organization.

**Frank Gaffney:** [01:06:29] It was a team effort, and you were in the leadership of it. Let me just add, though, that I mentioned TikTok. I think, again, talk about algorithmic governance arrangements. Look no further than what the Chinese have done to make that platform as addictive as they possibly can. And you get a taste of how this could be operationalized more generally. And also, going back to the health business, the World Health Organization, one health is, you know, just another example of this cellular religion, if you will. And very much of the character that we buy into is almost unimaginable because you've already had it, I think in part thanks to the Biden team, but possibly some before them. Billions and billions and billions of dollars allocated to one health infrastructure and practice. By which is meant, I think, that all cells are equal. Plant cells, animal cells and human cells are equal. Plant rights, animal rights, human rights, and the environment, more generally, are all equal. It gets you into a very

dangerous environment, especially if you believe, as I think we do, that God has entrusted the plants and the animals and nature to our management.

**Frank Gaffney:** [01:07:52] And sometimes that stewardship has not been great. But, you know, it is a very different thing, if we will, under this new world order, actually be submitted below. Plants and animals and those standing for their rights. Let me just read something from Robert Malone, who was unable to present it Presented himself. He wanted to ask. And James, I don't know if you know the answer to this. What is the timeline for any formal signatures on this pact, for the future? Or for that matter? There's a statement about future generations. There's also a so-called global digital compact. Are we likely to see the same practice applied as we did with the World Health Organization's International Health Regulations treaty? Namely, there's just kind of a vote or a consensus? I think they actually called it not even a vote. And there has, as far as I know, certainly, at least not yet in the United States, been an actual signing of this thing. Do you know how the mechanics of this are supposed to work?

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:09:00] No, unfortunately, I do not have the slightest idea how the mechanics are supposed to work. I do think that we can look to the pandemic accords to get a taste of kind of how it'll roll out. I think that if they could get a formal agreement, that would be kind of a top priority. And barring that, they probably have a cascade down to, well, everybody in the room who we didn't silence agreed with us. And so, we have consensus and we're moving forward. This sort of cascade of agreements, of agreement standards to where the highest standard would be that they actually get a formal vote and people agree to it. And the lowest standard would be some goofy consensus thing, but I don't know how they intend to get people to agree to it. And I frankly don't know that they care if people agree to it. I think that that puts us in a position to where we expose their illegitimacy by forcing them to have the worst possible terms upon which they declare a mandate, and thus discredit the program with larger and larger numbers of people who become, as the saying goes, ungovernable.

**Frank Gaffney:** [01:10:00] Going back to what you said about totalitarianism, the ideologies of totalitarianism, one that I don't think you alluded to but deserves Teasing out in this context is, well, what I call Sharia supremacism. Not just Islam, Islam, but the operating code of Islam, if you will, that has at its core Sharia law, policy directives, jihadist guidance and the like, and has the largest voting bloc, as you know, in the

United Nations, is the so-called Organization of Islamic Cooperation, or OIC. How do they play into this? Do you see it? And more generally, this is presumably this contest that will ultimately have to be sorted out between the communists on the one hand and the Schwabian globalists and the totalitarian Islamists.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:10:52] First of all, they don't get along. At least they will not get along in the long term. And I strongly suspect that each entity in this unholy triad believes that it will cheat the other two and seize victory for itself, which is not going to be a particularly pleasant experience for the rest of the world. I have a feeling what we have to understand in terms of how they're operating is sometimes called the Red-Green Alliance, which refers to communism and Islam. It's a little complicated now because you have the environmentalist as a second green. Still, we have this red-green alliance where the radical Muslims and the communist entities become frenemies, as it were. They work together to undermine the West, both thinking that they're going to be able to collect the primary spoils and both willing to play extremely long games against the other. You know, if they can destroy the US in a decade or two or the West in a decade or two, and then fight amongst each other for a couple of centuries over who gets what's left. I don't think that that's a big problem for their thinking in either of those centers. What we can look at in the world is we can look at a couple of examples where this alliance has come to fruition; in other words, that they are able to succeed in getting a revolution. Iran is one such place, and you don't see very many communists in Iran.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:12:05] They were told, convert or die. And so, you don't see very many communists there. On the other hand, we can look at how many Muslims there are in China, and in particular to the Uyghur population, and see that if the communists have the upper hand, the Muslims are not going to fare very well either. They'll be going to be absolutely repressed, absolutely squashed. And so I have a feeling that that will end up being on a global scale, quite the conflict. And that increases the imperative for us not to let any of those factions win, to reassert our sovereignty, and to reassert our position that we've held for a long time what they call the Pax Americana of global stewardship. Certainly, I wouldn't imagine that the CCP would hesitate if the United States and the Western alliance were out of the way. I don't think they would hesitate to use nuclear weapons to glass the Middle East if they thought it would be to their strategic advantage to do so. They don't put a very high premium on human life. There are immense resources there that would be available to them, and

what the consequences of that would be without a United States and Western alliance. Minimal, as far as I can imagine. I don't know who would try to stop them. I strongly suspect that the advantage would be toward China, but I don't know for sure how that would play out, except that it would be a global catastrophe, I think, unlike any we've seen before, lasting probably hundreds of years.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:13:26] Unless there were some quick, decisive moves like the one I just described. But at present, you have to understand that they are a red-green alliance. They are working together to undermine our interests even though they don't get along. I saw an interview recently with an imam saying about why they push abortion rights so hard through even characters like Ilhan Omar, and they said, because abortion is for you, you kill your own people. And if you think that a Muslim woman would kill a Muslim baby in her stomach, you're out of your mind. So, it's not that they believe that they're going. They push it because they know they won't do it, and it'll give them the opportunity for greater dominance. And I bring that up because that's the kind of strategic mindset that both of these entities are using to undermine the West and their handshaking in order to do it. I don't know which tyranny would be worse to live under, but I know that I want to live under neither, and I know that renewed American strength at home and abroad is absolutely necessary to start preventing that problem from one or the other, from taking over the world in the long term.

**Reggie Littlejohn, Esq.:** [01:14:27] What is the endgame in all of this with all these algorithms, surveillance, censorship, social credit system. And then you mentioned Neuralink and the Internet of Things, the Internet of Bodies. What's the end game here? What are they aiming at? And are they trying to create a new kind of have and have not the people who are running the algorithms, the people who have access to Neuralink being the haves and the people who are being trapped by the algorithms, who are being controlled, probably in some way through all of these algorithms being the have nots and establishing a neo-feudal society.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:15:07] It's actually worth mentioning. Just people understand what's going on, especially since Lara brought up the question about the cellular religion and really emphasize how important that is to be thinking. The goal in the short term, of course, is tyranny, and the goal of tyranny is to remake man. It's actually a kind of a spiritual eugenics program, not a classical eugenics program, but

rather that the people who have the right views, in other words, some kind of a communal view, are going to elevate humanity to its next. I mean, this is explicit in their documentation, whether they're communist or United Nations. So, it's going to elevate humanity to its next phase, which is a social phase sometimes described. And I'm not kidding. I know it sounds stupid as the Aquarian Age, where we're all supposed to basically think and act as one collective organism, that it's extraordinarily, apparently effective and good, I would say in more blatant terms, because you ask if this is another form of have versus have not? Yes, it is. The goal is to resurrect in its rawest but also most complete form, the Platonic Republic, where you have the philosopher kings sitting at the top, and they have their Praetorian Guard beneath them that enables them to do what they do. And you have the people who do all the work down below. The only difference would be that you would have. So those are the gold to silver and the base metal people. And those people are going to be the society. So, the top, the gold people, will have everything and run everything, and they'll control the algorithm. They are the stakeholders. Then you have their kind of functionaries who make sure everything happens in our world. Those are your Justin Trudeau, your Kamala Harris, your Keir Starmer, and your Emmanuel Macron.

**Dr. James Lindsay, PhD:** [01:16:44] That's the silver tier. And then below them are the base metal tier who do all the work. Now, the Platonic Republic has a fourth tier, which are the hoi polloi. And to be completely grim and end on such a positive note, their goal is to eliminate the hoi polloi. There will be no hoi polloi. There will only be the people that are needed to run the society. Hence many of the insinuations about depopulation. And to that point, since it's so grim. Again, Herbert Marcuse, the most influential leftist of the American 20th century, wrote in his most influential book, which was called One-dimensional Man. You can look for yourself in chapter nine. He says that to achieve a liberated world would of course, of course, he says, require a reduction in the future population of the world. And that was when it was about 3.5 billion people, far fewer than half of what we have today. I think that that's kind of the long-term vision is to set up the Platonic Republic, where the philosopher kings get to be the philosopher kings, and they're the oligarchs over the world, and they have their functionaries who enable that world to serve them. And they have the algorithmically controlled base metal people who go around and do all the work that the machines and the algorithms and the AI cannot do, which is mostly probably going to be a hard labor and be humiliating service that feeds their egos. So, I don't see a pretty picture in the end of this road long term.

Every attempt to implement communism has been an experiment in this, and we see the shape of every such attempt. And I see zero reason to believe that it will be different just because they have high-tech equipment now.

**Frank Gaffney:** [01:18:18] James Lindsay, thank you for a really remarkable program along with Alex Newman. Of course, we are deeply in your debt. Let me just conclude, if I may, I think what we have been treated to makes the explanation of why we're having this conversation self-evident. This is an emergency, folks, whether we understand it as such. Whether we treat it as such. There is headed our way an evil of quite possibly unprecedented proportions in this world. I personally am given to the idea that this is a spiritual battle. There is good. And I think we're on that side. Those of us who are resisting Jesus, Reggie's word or laws, the evil. And if you take nothing else away from this conversation, I pray. And I mean that literally. I pray that it will be the need to invoke God's blessing and grace on this country, and that the leaders that we have will find it in themselves to step up on behalf of all of us, the people they are supposed to represent, and stave this off in whatever way is needed to prevent the kind of tyranny of whichever form or coloration or technological character that is now in the offing from coming to pass. And I pray that, furthermore, each and every one of you, as I'm fond of saying, will go forth and multiply that You will take this video, which we will post shortly at [Sovereignty.coalition.org](http://Sovereignty.coalition.org), and make it as widely available as you can.

**Frank Gaffney:** [01:20:04] Share it with friends, share it with neighbors, share it with family members, share it with business colleagues and associates. Most especially, share it with those who are, in fact, supposed to represent you. We have a great national election coming. Concern has been expressed. I share fully that it will be very much a contest between those who are trying to ensure a free and fair election and those, whether they're Chinese, communists, or others, who are determined to prevent that. But win, lose, or draw in terms of the election itself; it is a crucible in which to have a conversation about globalism and the kind of world government that is in prospect for us if we do not stand up for hours for the constitution of this republic and the freedoms that it guarantees. So, I encourage you to join me in prayer on this subject, as well as to do everything you can to ensure that our people are awakened to this emergency and join forces with us at the Sovereignty Coalition and with our partners and friends elsewhere across this country to preserve the nation we love. God bless you all. Back to you, Dede.

**Dede Laugesen:** [01:21:21] Thank you, Frank, and thank you to all of our audience members for being here today, for expressing your interest and showing up. A video of this brief will be made available within a day or so after the conclusion of our program at [SovereigntyCoalition.org](http://SovereigntyCoalition.org). I will also send a link to the video to everyone who registered. We're grateful for you and goodbye.

(END)