



Liberty Counsel Action
LCAction.org

The Globalist Threat to National Sovereignty

Contents

Executive Action Requiring Congressional Support.....	3
Background: Supranational Entities & Individuals Seeking to Control the Movement of People, Finances, Resources, and Ideas	3
Policy Recommendations.....	6
I. Reform the Means by Which the U.S. Enters and Exits International Treaties	6
II. Defund and Disengage Entirely from the United Nations and Form a New “Coalition of Nations”	7
III. (Pending the Achievement of Recommendation II): Withdraw from Various Non-Binding and Binding Councils and Agreements	9
IV. Prohibit Funding for the World Economic Forum & Other Concerning Global Entities	17
V. Codify President Trump’s Executive Order Preventing a Central Digital Bank Currency	17
VI. Protect Against Cybercrime and Ensure Proper Regulation of Artificial Intelligence, Biometric Technologies, & “Smart Cities”	18
VII. Prevent Censorship and Global Digital Governance	21
VIII. Establish a (Domestic) Moratorium on Dangerous Geoengineering and Related Experiments, Take Precautionary Measures, and Solidify a Solar-Geoengineering International Non-use Agreement	22
IX. End Global Abortion Funding—Particularly Where It Is Illegal.....	23
Reversing Status Quo’s Advancement of Destructive Agendas.....	26

“The new biofascism in the west, very much driven by big tech leaders, and soon to be exploited by our enemies geopolitically, is a war against free human beings and against the qualities that make us human. But this time we do not just face a war on freedom. This time we face a war on human beings, and on all that makes us human.”

-The End of America, Naomi Wolf, PhD

Executive Action Requiring Congressional Support

President Donald J. Trump promised to “drive out the globalists”¹ from the deep state, and already his executive actions—directing the U.S. to exit the World Health Organization (WHO) and prohibiting the development of a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC), among others—demonstrate his opposition to certain elements of the globalist agenda. Said executive actions should serve as a launching pad that Congress can build on to ensure these morally irrefutable positions become legislatively unassailable. The following provides a summary of the growing influence of supranational organizations and technocrats advancing this harmful globalist agenda and policy recommendations on the same.

For more information on any aspect of the below, see Liberty Counsel Action’s White Paper: “The Globalist Agenda: A Clear and Present Threat to National Sovereignty and Individual Liberty.”

Background: Supranational Entities & Individuals Seeking to Control the Movement of People, Finances, Resources, and Ideas

A group of international organizations comprised of several United Nations (UN) entities and other international bodies (e.g. the World Economic Forum (WEF)), alongside Fortune 500 companies and several wealthy and influential individuals and political actors (government leaders and “technocrats”), are actively advancing strategies and policies, such as the “One Health Agenda” and the notion of “Digital Governance”, that are laying the foundation for a one-world government. While they appear noble in their intent, collectively these policies espouse Marxist socialized medicine, dangerous trends of censorship and surveillance, a globally mandated response to climate change, and other concerning elements contrary to American ideals. They are being pushed through various international agreements, such as the proposed Pandemic Treaty, International Health Regulations, Pact of the Future, Global Digital Compact, and Declaration of Future Generations; as well as through “big business” and “big tech”—for example, consider Facebook’s suppression of certain content related to COVID-19 and the Hunter Biden laptop story.²

Consider as well the outcome of the 2023 G20 Summit in India, where leaders of the top 20 global economies announced their intent to create the digital public infrastructure needed for both digital IDs and a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC).³ Such a move sets the foundation for a global surveillance state, or “digital gulag,” which would provide said global actors with the ability to force a dictator-level style of governance on the world.⁴ Though the proposed infrastructure is voluntary at this stage, one “black swan” event—that is, unforeseen risks that could lead to a global crisis⁵—distilling fear into society could easily lead Government leaders to submit to a totalitarian form of global governance.

Indeed, if implemented or adhered to, these “agreements” (and similar documents effectively operating as treaties that should receive the Constitutionally required two-thirds approval of the U.S. Senate) lay the foundation for global and state control (via surveillance and other means) of the following:

- **Movement of people.** Mechanisms are already in place or readily available that would allow governments (whether at a global or national level) to control the movement of people. Such mechanisms include “Smart Cities,” Vaccine Passports and Digital IDs, among others.
- **Movement of finances.** Similarly, there are already methods of controlling individuals’ access to personal finances through CBDCs. Several nations are advancing the idea of a state-run digital currency, similar to what’s being advanced via the People’s Bank of China.⁶ The threat to liberty rests in the fact that such a system may require identity verification for various types of transactions, allowing the system to be used for government “surveillance and control.”⁷
- **Movement of resources.** National governments have at various times sought to control and limit access to resources (e.g. rationing during world wars), but global governing entities are poised and ready to do the same. Predicated on the risk of global shocks, including “black swan” events, elements of various international “agreements,”⁸ “pacts,”⁹ and other documents¹⁰ detail how global governance structures could take control of food supply chains, medical resources, and more. For example, the Pact of the Future outlines how UN Member states “*will uphold the Secretary-General’s role to, inter alia, convene Member States, promote the coordination of the whole multilateral system and engage with relevant stakeholders in response to crises. We request the Secretary-General to: (a) Consider approaches to strengthen the United Nations system response to complex global shocks, within existing authorities and in consultation with Member States . . . and with full respect for the mandated coordination role of the United Nations in response to humanitarian emergencies.*”¹¹
- **Dissemination of ideas.** This is becoming an increasing concern given the surge in the use of technology to censor and suppress ideas and content (both from the private and public sectors). Specifically, numerous global actors have pushed the need to combat—that is, censor—what they determine to be “mis-” and “disinformation,”¹² including the former Biden administration.¹³

Whether or not one believes there is a coordinated effort to establish a greater level of global governance, many of the more concerning aspects of this agenda are already occurring either with explicit or tacit approval from world governments. Indeed, **compliance by way of accepting and implementing binding and non-binding global “guidelines,” “agreements,” “pacts” and other similar directives issued by the UN**

is commonplace—often seemingly driven by fear of future pandemics or “black swan” events.

Even without strong compliance mechanisms, such acceptance tends to establish standard operating norms and procedures that quickly become entrenched. For example, consider how global governments (the U.S. included) accepted the World Health Organization’s (WHO) recommendations on vaccinations and lockdowns during COVID-19. Seemingly utilizing information being disseminated by the WHO, Australia took this to an extreme level by enforcing a “zero-Covid” strategy¹⁴ that forced even healthy people into quarantine camps. The draconian nature of this policy is perhaps best illustrated by the arrest of three healthy individuals (they tested negative for COVID-19) who escaped the Howard Springs centre COVID quarantine compound—one of multiple such compounds in Australia in 2021.¹⁵

Furthermore, whether nation states agree or not, elements of these policies and the global structures required to carry them out are being subtly (and at times not so subtly) implemented, often via leaders of “big business” and “big tech.”¹⁶ To cite one example, in 2020 the founder and chairman of the WEF, Klaus Schwab, wrote that COVID-19 presented an “opportunity” and openly advanced the notion of a “Great Reset,” stating: ***“The world must act jointly and swiftly to revamp all aspects of our societies and economies . . . Every country, from the United States to China, must participate, and every industry, from oil and gas to tech, must be transformed. In short, we need a ‘Great Reset’ of capitalism.”***¹⁷

And it is beginning. According to one pundit: “. . . as Schwab and the WEF predicted, the COVID crisis has accelerated the Great Reset. Monopolistic corporations have consolidated their grip on the economy from above, while socialism continues to advance for the rest of us below. In partnership with Big Digital, Big Pharma, the mainstream media, national and international health agencies, and compliant populations, hitherto democratic Western states—think especially of Australia, New Zealand, and Austria—are being transformed into totalitarian regimes modeled after China.”¹⁸ Ending on a note of hope, he goes on to say, “Because the goals of the Great Reset depend on the obliteration not only of free markets, but of individual liberty and free will, it is, perhaps ironically, unsustainable. . . . That doesn’t mean, however, that it won’t . . . leave a lot of destruction in its wake—which is all the more reason to oppose it now and with all our might.”¹⁹

Indeed, without direct intervention, these policies will continue to advance, and the authority of the U.S. Government will be ceded to globalist entities that seek to control nearly every aspect of life, ranging from national responses to pandemics to financial transactions, and more. To complement President Trump’s actions in this arena and ensure our republic is protected from present and future threats of a one-world government, congressional action is required.

Policy Recommendations

Note: Most of the following recommendations complement one another, though, at times, they are duplicative. They are all included in case any single recommendation fails to gain traction. Similarly, in the immediate term, Liberty Counsel Action respectfully suggests that where relevant, the following recommendations be proposed to the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) for their consideration.

I. Reform the Means by Which the U.S. Enters and Exits International Treaties

President Trump recently issued an executive order that (among other things) directed the Secretary of State and the UN Ambassador to “conduct a review of all international intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member and provides any type of funding or other support, and all conventions and treaties to which the United States is a party, to determine which. . . are contrary to the interests of the United States.”²⁰ The review must note whether reform of said organizations, conventions or treaties is possible, or conversely, whether the U.S. should withdraw from the same.²¹ While unclear whether “treaties” includes all international agreements that effectively operate as treaties (though they do not have the Constitutionally required advice and consent of the Senate), this is a welcome and needed first step. However, more reform is needed in this area, especially given the consistent “flip-flopping” of U.S. foreign policy on the global stage. Created both by administration changes and the increasing use of executive orders to enter and exit international agreements, such drastic changes in foreign policy (e.g., exiting the WHO, entering the WHO, and exiting again in less than five years) are a recipe for disaster.

Furthermore the U.S. enters into over 200 international agreements **annually**²² (this does not include those currently in force), and while some are more than likely proving effective, there are also likely numerous agreements that are ineffective, harmful,²³ or controversial (e.g. the Paris Agreement).²⁴ There is also a risk of duplication or redundancies. Reform is sorely needed to both bring stability and credibility to U.S. diplomacy as well as ensure the U.S. is only party to beneficial international agreements.

Liberty Counsel Action therefore recommends that Congress:

A. Introduce Legislation Outlining an Explicit Requirement that the President Receive the Advice and Consent (two-thirds) of the U.S. Senate for Entering, Exiting, and Amending All Legally Binding International Agreements. Given the immense risks related to an advancing globalist agenda, the vast financial burdens created by many current international agreements, as well as the lack of effectiveness of many international agreements, it is imperative that Congress hold all presidents accountable for entering, exiting, and amending legally binding

international agreements. As it pertains to entering agreements, this can be achieved by simply requiring adherence to the process outlined in Article II, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution.²⁵

B. Establish a Congressional Select Subcommittee to Take Action on President Trump’s Executive Order Requiring a Review of U.S Engagement with International Intergovernmental Organizations, Conventions, and Treaties. In part to fortify any recommendations made as a result of the aforementioned executive order, Congress should establish a Select Subcommittee to conduct a similar review that explicitly includes all international agreements that may not technically be classified as treaties or conventions. While it can lean heavily on the review conducted by the Secretary of State and the UN Ambassador, said review should also specifically determine which organizations, conventions, treaties and similar agreements merit not just withdrawal, but legislation prohibiting re-entry.

II. Defund and Disengage Entirely from the United Nations and Form a New “Coalition of Nations”

The UN yields a vast amount of influence on foreign policy, influence which is often used to infringe on religious liberty (via the LGBTQ agenda), promote antisemitism, impose censorship, and oppose life (via promotion of abortion)—to name a few. The executive order referred to above requiring a review of U.S. support to all international intergovernmental organizations is a helpful and long overdue first step in addressing this issue, specifically, it’s a directive that the U.S. “reevaluate” its commitment to UN agencies and bodies, in part to determine whether they can be reformed.²⁶ While reform would be ideal, efforts from the previous Trump administration on this front proved to be futile (see Recommendation III (B) below on the UNHRC), and evidence suggests most if not all UN agencies are in fact working contrary to U.S. interests. Therefore, Liberty Counsel Action proposes the following:

A. Advance the Disengaging Entirely from the United Nations Debacle (DEFUND) Act²⁷ (or similar legislation). Despite the corruption and ineptitude of the UN, ranging from “tacitly supporting ICC-led efforts to prosecute Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu”²⁸ and protecting Hamas (via the UNRWA), to its incessant promotion of abortion and LGBT ideology, to permitting China’s election to the Human Rights Council,²⁹ in 2022 the U.S. contributed over \$18 billion to various UN entities,³⁰ decreasing to just under \$13 billion in 2023.³¹ The DEFUND Act would ensure U.S. tax dollars cease being used for such efforts by repealing the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, ceasing U.S. funding to the UN, formalizing withdrawal from UN conventions and agreements, and setting “stringent conditions for any future engagement with the UN, requiring Senate approval.”³² In short, it ensures the U.S.

completely withdraws from the UN.³³ Like the fallout after the United Kingdom voted in favor of “Brexit,” the entire process will likely be long and complicated, and the U.S. should prepare itself for bumps along the way.³⁴ A presidential advisory team could be appointed to assist in the process.

B. Form a New Coalition of Nations, starting with the Geneva Consensus Declaration Signatories.³⁵ In his executive order exiting the WHO, President Trump directed the Secretary of State and Director of the Office of Management and Budget to identify possible international partners for the U.S., to do any “necessary activities previously undertaken by the WHO.”³⁶ Should the U.S. exit the UN, Liberty Counsel Action simply recommends that Congress direct the President to expand said international partners to include those that can do any of the necessary activities previously undertaken by the UN and desire to advance a more limited set of goals related to global security based on principles of national sovereignty and individual liberty. We further propose that Congress capitalize on the momentum generated by U.S. re-entry into the Geneva Consensus Declaration by requesting that the nations signatory to it to be the first to join said new coalition. Indeed, the Declaration “backs a strategic international coalition” now totaling 40 nations,³⁷ and most notably—like the goal Trump outlined in his 2023 statement to exit the WHO and form a new coalition—its stated goal is “**to protect the sovereign right of nations to support their own core values through national policy and legislation.**”³⁸ Furthermore, a core unifying principle of this declaration is its affirmation that abortion is not an international right.

(Specifically, we recommend convening a Summit of the current signers and any other nation that desires to return to the core values and principles upon which the UN was founded. The work of President Trump’s UN Ambassador could be re-focused in this regard. We likewise propose the Speaker and Senate Majority leader, along with other Members of Congress, write a joint letter(s) to their counterparts in other nations to this effect, as well as publish op-eds or other related statements to educate the public on the corruption of the UN and vital need to forge a new coalition.)

C. Alternatively: Advance Reform at the UN via Conditioning Funding and Requiring Accountability and Transparency. If the above fails to gain traction and evidence is presented that suggests reform of various UN entities is tenable,³⁹ strict requirements for and scrutiny of continued U.S. participation in the same will be vital; namely, selective funding of the UN and other international institutions predicated upon certain congressionally outlined conditions. At a minimum, these should include requirements to:

- Increase transparency and accountability to ensure waste, fraud, and abuse cease.
- Cease anti-Israeli bias.

- End all promotion—direct or indirect—of abortion and gender ideology.
- Prohibit detrimental Chinese influence.
- Ensuring humanitarian aid is not politicized.

Legislation modelled after the WHO is Accountable Act (simply replacing the WHO with the UN) would accomplish most of these aims.⁴⁰ If this route is selected, to ensure its conditions are met, Liberty Counsel Action recommends that all global recipients of U.S. funding, UN and otherwise, undergo regular audits. See also Recommendation III (L) below on Congress exercising the power of the purse.

D. Establish a Congressional Subcommittee Tasked with Reviewing Current U.S Engagement at the UN and Providing Recommendations on the Same. Whether Congress pursues Recommendations A and B, or the alternative outlined in C, there will be numerous subsequent actions required by various agencies and officials. Pending the extent of the review completed by the Secretary of State and UN Ambassador, we recommend the same select subcommittee referred to in Recommendation I (B) also review U.S. engagement in the UN and determine its extent, effectiveness, or lack thereof, as well as (as needed) consider means by which the U.S. can effect change. Said review may simply require analyzing the work of the Secretary and UN Ambassador on the same, but should include the following at a minimum:

- Outlining current domestic policies referencing or influenced by UN policies (such as the Biden Administration’s Commitments to the Generation Equality Forum convened by the UN⁴¹).
- Whether and how the UN is or can be made accountable to the U.S. for proper use and management of its funds.
- The extent to which the UN promotes controversial policies counter to U.S. values, and how the U.S. can change the narrative on the same. Indeed, the culture of “progressive” values needs transformation, and it will not happen without U.S. leadership.

Based on its findings, the committee should then issue specific policy recommendations for legislation.

III. (Pending the Achievement of Recommendation II): Withdraw from Various Non-Binding and Binding Councils and Agreements

Should the above for any reason fail to advance, there are several other means by which Congress and the President, separately and together, can ensure the U.S. ceases to fund an inept, bloated, and often corrupt organization (the UN).

A. Recommended Actions to Follow in the Wake of Exiting the WHO/UN. Liberty Counsel Action has consistently recommended prompt withdrawal from the WHO,

which is currently underway: On his first day in office, President Trump issued an executive order withdrawing the U.S. from the WHO and pausing “*the future transfer of any United States Government funds, support, or resources to the WHO,*” among other things.⁴² While in process, some details of how the executive order will be executed are unclear. Given this, we respectfully propose the following actions:

- 1. Ensure the U.S. does not unilaterally re-enter the WHO (HR 54).** Congress should have a role in any potential re-entry process. The WHO Withdrawal Act would ensure Congressional action is needed for such a move.⁴³ To strengthen it (pending achievement of Recommendation I), Liberty Counsel Action recommends language be added establishing that to re-enter the WHO, or any UN body, requires two-thirds of the U.S. Senate to concur.
- 2. Pass legislation to codify pause of financial contributions (HR 401).** The U.S. has historically been one of the largest funders of the WHO—U.S. contributions have ranged between \$163 million and \$816 million annually over the last decade,⁴⁴ with contributions reaching \$1.284 billion during the 2022–2023 biennium, approximately 16% of the WHO’s overall revenue.⁴⁵ To ensure U.S. taxpayers cease funding the WHO, Congress should pass the No Taxpayer Funding for the World Health Organization Act (HR 401), which prohibits both voluntary and assessed contributions to the WHO.⁴⁶ Notably, The WHO is Accountable Act would also prohibit funding to the WHO, unless they meet certain conditions.⁴⁷ Pending any debate on the matter, an amendment could be added to the above act to explicitly eliminate any remaining U.S. payment obligations.⁴⁸
- 3. Ensure the U.S. exits the 2005 International Health Regulations (IHRs).** As it pertains to the IHRs, this legally binding agreement has exacerbated the issues with the WHO, with the recent 2024 amendments serving as the latest offense. It is unclear if President Trump’s executive order, while a positive first step, would ensure the IHR amendments passed in June 2024 do not take effect. Given this, Congress should pass legislation directing the President to exit the IHRs and ensure a future president cannot unilaterally re-enter them by requiring any re-entry to obtain two-thirds approval from the U.S. Senate.
- 4. Ensure the U.S. does not sign onto the Pandemic (or similar) Treaty (S 92).** Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress take action to codify President Trump’s directive ceasing all negotiations on the Pandemic Treaty by passing the *Defending American Sovereignty in Global Pandemics*.⁴⁹ We further recommend Congress urge their counterparts in other nations to do the same.

- 5. Call upon nations who signed the Geneva Consensus Declaration to form a new coalition.** In the 2023 statement in which President Trump pledged to withdraw from the WHO, he stated, “[the WHO] deserves to be completely abolished and replaced.”⁵⁰ President Trump’s executive order directing officials to “identify credible and transparent United States and international partners to assume necessary activities previously undertaken by the WHO”⁵¹ takes the first steps in forming a replacement. Related, as noted above, in his first week in office President Trump re-entered the Geneva Consensus Declaration. Given these nations have already publicly declared their commitment to sovereignty, Liberty Counsel Action proposes requesting these nations be the first to participate in a new coalition of nations that can “assume necessary activities previously undertaken by the WHO.”⁵² *See also Recommendation II (B).*
- 6. Reform or defund the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO).** The PAHO, located in Washington D.C., is one of the WHO’s 6 worldwide regional offices, serving a dual function as “the specialized health agency of the Inter-American System,” while simultaneously serving as the “Regional Office for the Americas of the World Health Organization” (more or less a front for the WHO).⁵³ Among the 35 member nations, the U.S. currently has the highest assessed contributions, with over \$78 million owed for 2024 and 2025.⁵⁴ Liberty Counsel Action recommends either:
- A complete overhaul of the Pan American Health Organization such that it ceases all work with the WHO (unlikely), or
 - Permanently ceasing all funding to the PAHO, including to the “Revolving Fund” for access to vaccines.⁵⁵
- 7. Review and address the current operations of the federal government’s work with the WHO, including via the “National Focal Point,” the 68 WHO “Collaboration Centers,” and as part of the “One-Health” approach.** Liberty Counsel Action recommends that a previous requirement made by President Trump’s Administration upon exiting the WHO, that any officials or diplomats currently working with the WHO “justify any engagement with the WHO as being necessary for national security and public health safety,” be reinstated.⁵⁶ Pending said justifications, we also recommend Congress and the administration ensure the formal work of the U.S. National Focal Point (NFP, meant to be “accessible at all times [7/24/365] for communications with WHO”), which includes the HHS Secretary’s Operations Center, International Health Regulations (IHR) NFP Program (located in the Office of Global Affairs), and the Message Authorizing Official, ceases immediately.

Similarly, Liberty Counsel Action recommends a select sub-committee conduct a thorough review of all the WHO Collaboration Centres Operating in the U.S.⁵⁷ and make recommendations based on the same. As part of the above review, given its ties to the WHO, we further suggest that the One Health Agenda being embedded in Federal Agencies⁵⁸ be thoroughly amended as needed. Indeed, while One Health as an approach is not in and of itself problematic, it becomes problematic if officials use it to justify an unwarranted policy. For example, One Health notes that the environment can affect health, but climate alarmists could use this to justify policies that lead to tariffs on cow flatulence.

B. Defund and Disengage with the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC).

As he did in his first term, President Trump issued an executive order withdrawing the U.S. from participation in the UNHRC. Said withdrawal is more than justified: The UNHRC is extremely inept and arguably counterproductive, demonstrating the highest degree of hypocrisy by permitting nations with some of the most egregious human rights records (e.g. China, Cuba, Venezuela) to sit on the council itself.⁵⁹ Similarly, as summarized by Congressman Hoyer, they maintain a strong bias against Israel; since being established in 2006, the UNHRC *“has adopted 103 resolutions against Israel, more than all those leveled against North Korea, Iran, and Syria combined. This unfair treatment continues in the wake of the October 7 attack.”*⁶⁰ As of January 2025, the number of resolutions condemning Israel increased to 108.⁶¹ Yet, under Biden, the U.S. provided massive amounts of financing: the UNHCR received a total of \$4.7 billion in 2023,⁶² with over a third—\$1.9 billion—coming from *voluntary* U.S. contributions.⁶³ Given that the last time the U.S. exited the UNHRC was in the wake of former Ambassador to the UN Nikki Haley spending “more than a year trying to reform the Human Rights Council,” to no avail,⁶⁴ Liberty Counsel Action recommends that Congress take action to codify President Trump’s executive order by passing HR 400, the No taxpayer funding for United Nations Human Rights Council Act.⁶⁵ Furthermore, Congress should introduce an amendment to HR 400 that permanently ends U.S. status as an observer nation⁶⁶ and prohibits future membership in or engagement with the Council.

C. Defund and Disengage with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

Under the Biden administration, the U.S. contributed over \$1.1 billion to the UNRWA between 2021-2023—including hundreds of millions in voluntary contributions—before said funding was temporarily halted in 2024.⁶⁷ On February 4, 2025, President Trump again cut off this funding.⁶⁸ Given the UNRWA’s long history of abuses, ranging from working with terrorists⁶⁹ to allowing Hamas to infiltrate UNRWA schools,⁷⁰ among others (for example, recently released Israeli hostages described being detained in tent camps and other locations administrated by the UNRWA⁷¹) Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress re-

introduce and pass the Stop Support for UNRWA Act of 2024,⁷² or similar legislation, to prevent a future administration from simply undoing President Trump’s executive order.

D. Defund and Disengage with the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). In 2023, U.S. contributions to UNESCO exceeded \$28 million.⁷³ However, as highlighted in a resolution introduced by Congressman Steube in the 118th Congress, UNESCO is guilty of (among other things):

- Anti-Israel bias, having “passed 6 resolutions condemning Israel in 2013.”
- Embracing human rights violators.
- Honoring “Che Guevara, the chief executioner of Cuban dictator Fidel Castro, both of whom committed crimes against humanity, by including “The Life and Works of Ernesto Che Guevara” to its “Memory of the World Register.”⁷⁴

Notably, UNESCO is slated to receive a high level of scrutiny.⁷⁵ Such scrutiny is warranted: In addition to the aforementioned issues, their “Guidelines for the Governance of Digital Platforms,” while seeking to combat hate speech, dis- and misinformation essentially leave room for mass censorship. Liberty Counsel Action recommends Trump again withdraw from this organization and that Congress pass legislation to both prohibit funding for the same and establish that to re-enter it requires two-thirds of the U.S. Senate to concur.

E. Defund and Disengage with the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). In 2017, the Trump administration ceased contributions to the UNFPA. A letter from the U.S. Department of State details the justification for ending UNFPA funding, stating, “While there is no evidence that UNFPA directly engages in coercive abortions or involuntary sterilizations in China, **the agency continues to partner with the [Chinese health and family planning office], and thus can be found to support, or participate in the management of China’s coercive policies . . .**”⁷⁶

Though these problems still exist, in 2023, the U.S. provided the UNFPA with \$198.7 million in funding.⁷⁷ To address this we recommend passing legislation similar to that introduced by Congressmen Chip Roy to defund the UNFPA.⁷⁸

F. Defund and Disengage with the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNOHCHR). The OHCHR serves as the secretariat for the UN Human Rights and treaty bodies, both of which have continued to overstep their mandates, “promoting ideological claims on abortion and gender outside of international consensus.”⁷⁹ For example, the office “claims that abortion is a human right and ought to be enforced in every UN member state.”⁸⁰ Indeed, they have in fact pressured “other pro-life countries into repealing their laws,”⁸¹ seemingly in spite of the Siljander amendment (which prohibits entities that receive foreign aid funds from

lobbying for or against abortion). Similarly (and most ironically, given that they are violating U.S. own law in doing so) they called on the Biden Administration to mitigate the effects of the Dobbs decision after denouncing it as “shocking and dangerous.”⁸² As a further indictment against them, the entity has previously supported prostitution.⁸³ Even so, the U.S. was its largest financial donor in 2024, with over \$36 million in voluntary contributions.⁸⁴ We therefore recommend Congress pass legislation to permanently defund the OHCHR and require two-thirds of the U.S. Senate to concur to any decisions related to re-engaging with the entity.

G. Defund and Disengage with UN Women. UN Women promotes controversial policies under the guise of “sexual and reproductive rights,” which in many cases violate the laws of member nations. Said policies include “the acceptance and decriminalization of abortion” and “the notion of prostitution as ‘sex-work.’”⁸⁵ They also define gender loosely, having, for example, promoted Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) programs which “include teaching very young children about masturbation, non-heterosexual behaviors, and non-conformative ‘gender identities.’”⁸⁶ Perhaps sealing its fate as an utterly useless and harmful entity, in 2023, though ample photos, videos, and other documented evidence demonstrated Hamas was undoubtedly guilty of inflicting unspeakable harm on Israeli women, UN Women failed to swiftly and unequivocally condemn them for such atrocities,⁸⁷ essentially providing political cover for Hamas.⁸⁸ Despite this, under the Biden Administration, the U.S. was one of the largest funders of UN Women,⁸⁹ with U.S. contributions amounting to over \$46 million in 2022.⁹⁰ Total contributions in 2023 reduced, though again, the U.S. was still among the top contributors.⁹¹ Based on the above information, Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress pass legislation to permanently defund UN Women, and require two-thirds of the U.S. Senate to concur to any decisions related to re-engaging with the entity.

H. Defund and Disengage with the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS). Like UN Women, UNAIDS promotes the notion of “sex work” and has campaigned for its decriminalization.⁹² Furthermore, its *HIV and Transgender and Other Gender-Diverse People: Human Rights Fact Sheet Series (2021)* promotes “Gender-affirming care, including hormone therapy or affirmation surgery,” which they claim “can help transgender and gender-diverse persons express themselves and be recognized as their self-identified gender.”⁹³ The same document further asserts, “States have an obligation under international human rights law to provide for the legal recognition of a person’s self-identified gender, including for non-binary persons.”⁹⁴ Despite advancing such a controversial agenda, in 2023 U.S. contributions to UNAIDS totaled over \$99 million.⁹⁵ Given this, Congress should pass legislation to immediately and permanently defund UNAIDS, require two-thirds of the

U.S. Senate to approve of any decision to re-engage with the entity, and, as needed, re-direct said funding elsewhere.

I. Defund and Disengage with the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) (or at minimum replace its executive director). While very noble in stated intent,⁹⁶ like other UN entities, UNICEF has strayed away from these core purposes, promoting harmful controversial abortion and gender ideology policies. Predicting the situation UNICEF is now in, a report from over a decade ago by a world-renowned expert on the status of reproductive rights in International law outlined UNICEF’s reputation was “increasingly at risk . . . because powerful forces both within the organization and within the larger international community have demanded that UNICEF change, that it alter its traditional child survival programs and that it add new and ever-more controversial programs.”⁹⁷ Tragically, UNICEF has continued to drift toward these controversial areas by:

- Endorsing the idea that children can choose their gender.⁹⁸
- Intervening in domestic debates on abortion.⁹⁹
- Advocating for children to have the right to “confidential sexual health services without parental knowledge.”¹⁰⁰
- Claiming not all pornography is harmful to children¹⁰¹ (the report in which this was outlined was replaced with a version that removed controversial language— though its overarching positions remained the same¹⁰²).

A final point on UNICEF: Currently, it is led by a former advisor to President Biden and abortion advocate Catherine Russell. She is credited with creating a global strategy for adolescent girls issued under Obama in which the phrase “sexual and reproductive health and rights” (SRHR) was first used in a U.S. policy document.¹⁰³ The phrase is widely known for being a euphemism for “promoting abortion, gender ideology and the LGBT agenda.”

In total for 2023, the U.S. government contributed \$1.4 billion to UNICEF, making it UNICEF’s top donor.¹⁰⁴ This included \$48.3 million for a UNICEF initiative that “promotes access to abortion and contraception to young people.”¹⁰⁵ We recommend Congress pass legislation to immediately defund UNICEF, or at a minimum replace its abortion-promoting Executive Director and place conditions on U.S. funds to ensure they do not support any policies that promote abortion or the LGBTQ agenda. If the former, funding that is removed from UNICEF should be re-directed to NGOs and other entities that actually focus on the core needs of children and certify that they do not promote harmful and controversial policies.

J. Review of UN Officials and Special Rapporteurs. Various officials working for or employed by the UN raise serious concerns. For example, UN Special Rapporteur Francesca Albanese was recently investigated by UN Watch, with allegations against

her outlining she “illegally accepted funding from pro-Hamas groups to fund an estimated \$20,000 trip to Australia and New Zealand, in which she lobbied a major pension fund to divest from Israel.”¹⁰⁶ Another UN Special rapporteur, Dr. Tlaleng Mofokeng, issued a report in 2021 that outlines that states, under the “right to sexual and reproductive health,” have three obligations, which could require states to reform “laws criminalizing abortion.”¹⁰⁷ In short, Liberty Counsel Action recommends that Congress conduct a thorough investigation of all current UN officials and special rapporteurs. For those who promote ideologies conflicting with U.S. policy, Congress should pass legislation to require the UN to replace these individuals or face a loss of funding.

K. Codify President’s Trump Exit of the Paris Agreement and Ensure the U.S. Exits the Global Methane Pledge. On the first day of his second term in office, President Trump signed an executive order directing the U.S. Ambassador to the UN to withdraw from the Paris Agreement - and any similar “agreement, pact, accord, or similar commitment made under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.”¹⁰⁸ Indeed, accelerating actions to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement would more than likely lead to detrimental impacts on the U.S. Economy (when signing the order mentioned above, President Trump stated it would save the U.S. over \$1 trillion¹⁰⁹).

The Global Methane Pledge, which the U.S. joined under President Biden, creates similar concerns, committing its signatories to working “to continuously improve . . . national greenhouse gas inventory reporting under the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement.”¹¹⁰ One of its signatories, Denmark, “*became the first country to announce plans to introduce a tax on . . . farting cows. From 2030, farmers will have to pay a levy of 300 kroner (roughly £34) per ton of methane emitted by livestock.*”¹¹¹ Similarly, in December 2023 the Biden Administration released its own methane reduction plan, which (among other things) outlines that \$19.5 billion would be used to promote “*climate-smart conservation practices,*”¹¹² with “**a focus on reducing enteric methane** [a ‘by-product’ from ‘the natural digestive process’ in cows and other ruminant animals¹¹³] **through feed management.**”¹¹⁴ Furthermore, in 2024 the Food and Drug Administration approved the food additive Bovaer, “as the ‘first-in-class methane reducing feed ingredient’ that meets safety and efficacy requirements for lactating dairy cattle.”¹¹⁵ In other words, the U.S. is supplementing the alteration of cow’s natural digestive processes to address climate change and has approved said alteration as safe— seemingly utilizing millions of taxpayer dollars to do so.

Though the Global Methane Pledge is voluntary, it is closely tied to the same entity—the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change—that has issued agreements on climate change that President Trump ordered the U.S. to withdraw

from.¹¹⁶ We recommend President Trump promptly exit the Global Methane Pledge and that Congress introduce and pass legislation to codify exit from this and the Paris Agreement that specifically requires two-thirds of the U.S. Senate to concur with any decision to re-enter these or similar agreements.

- L. Congress Should Exercise the Power of the Purse.** Should any of the above recommendations fail to gain traction, or be undone by a future administration, Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress issue a joint statement or resolution outlining that they are not obligated to fund U.S. commitments to various UN agreements and ensure no funds are allocated to the same. If simply defunding lacks the needed support in Congress, at a minimum Congress should ensure said funding is conditioned (a longstanding U.S. practice) upon reforms tailored to that organization, per Recommendation II (C); as well as requiring an outside audit of all UN agencies and related departments, with the intended goal of closing those that are duplicative or wasteful.

IV. Prohibit Funding for the World Economic Forum & Other Concerning Global Entities

- A. Prohibit Funding to the World Economic Forum.** According to one source, since 2013, USAID allocated over \$68 million to the WEF.¹¹⁷ This sort of funding is not only wasteful but counterproductive on a global scale as U.S. financial support for the WEF indicates a tacit if not explicit approval of its harmful agendas, including the notion of a “**Great Reset**’ of capitalism.”¹¹⁸ In short, Congress should immediately pass the Defund Davos Act (introduced in the 118th Congress), or similar legislation, to ensure the U.S. ceases to provide any funding to the World Economic Forum.¹¹⁹
- B. Review U.S. Funding for CEPI, Gavi & Related Entities.** Various global entities engaged in questionable practices during the COVID crisis, including Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, and the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI).¹²⁰ Congress should order a thorough review of said questionable practices and issue recommendations on the same.

V. Codify President Trump’s Executive Order Preventing a Central Digital Bank Currency

President Trump recently issued an executive order prohibiting agencies “from undertaking any action to establish, issue, or promote CBDCs within the jurisdiction of the United States or abroad.”¹²¹ In order to fully guard against the threat of a government-controlled currency (permitting unparalleled surveillance and control of Americans’

finances), both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury should be prohibited from developing retail, intermediated, and wholesale CBDCs (given the latter paves the way for the former). The Power of the Mint Act, a bipartisan bill introduced in the 118th Congress, accomplish all these aspects. A bill introduced by Senator Mike Lee in the 119th Congress would achieve similar ends.¹²² To ensure President Trump's action endures post his presidency,¹²³ Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress promptly pass this or similar legislation as swiftly as possible.

VI. Protect Against Cybercrime and Ensure Proper Regulation of Artificial Intelligence, Biometric Technologies, & “Smart Cities”

The rapid pace of development ushered in by the “4th Industrial Revolution” leaves myriad legislative gaps as governments struggle to keep pace with all the changes. At the same time, international actors are pushing for global digital governance via the Global Digital Compact and the Cybercrime Treaty, among other things. While Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress oppose these and similar international agreements, for reasons outlined elsewhere, this does not preclude the U.S. from seeking to prevent cybercrime or regulating AI.

A. Protecting the U.S. from Foreign and Domestic Cyber-Security Threats. Foreign and domestic cyber threats are increasing. Unfortunately, the UN Cybercrime treaty is a poor attempt to prevent the same.¹²⁴ Given the lack of effective international cooperation on this matter to date, Liberty Counsel Action recommends the following:

- 1. Ensure the U.S. does not ratify the UN Treaty on Cybercrime and (instead) forge a coalition of nations intent upon actual cybercrime prevention.** The UN Cybercrime treaty would leave open the door for allowing “authoritarian states to criminalize free expression and peaceful assembly under the guise of preventing cybercrime,”¹²⁵ among other risks. Therefore, we recommend Congress pass legislation prohibiting the U.S. from supporting it and urge other nations to do the same. To address the gap in the international arena on this matter, we also recommend that Congress pass legislation to direct the President to form a coalition of nations seeking to prevent cybercrime without empowering authoritarian states to criminalize free speech, among other things. This coalition could be (pending the achievement of the above) based on or part of any new coalitions formed under the Trump administration.
- 2. Pass legislation similar to that which was introduced by the Homeland Security Committee in October 2024.**¹²⁶ In addition to the above, we propose that Congress pass legislation similar (but not limited) to the following:

- **The Cyber PIVOTT Act**, which seeks to “amend the Homeland Security Act . . . to provide for education and training programs and resources of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) of the Department of Homeland Security.”¹²⁷
- **The Strengthening Cyber Resilience Against State-Sponsored Threats Act**, which “creates a joint interagency task force” to respond to state-sponsored cyber actors, especially those from China (among other things).¹²⁸
- As it is closely related, we further recommend legislation to combat online hacking in the private sphere, including measures to increase protections against individuals entering or electronically seizing and/or controlling a computer or digital device without the express written consent of the owner of said computer or device.

B. Maintain Global Leadership in, and Implement a Balanced Regulatory Structure for, Artificial Intelligence (AI). President Trump recently issued an executive order calling for “enhancing America’s global AI dominance,” stating such dominance is vital for national security - as well as economic competitiveness. In the Fact Sheet on this Executive Order, the White House states, “with the right government policies, the United States can solidify its position as the leader in AI and secure a brighter future for all Americans.”¹²⁹ Yet, without further clarification of what the “right government policies” are, AI development could in fact lead to great harm. As outlined by Elon Musk in 2023, AI is “one of the biggest threats to humanity.”¹³⁰ Indeed, a recent study by researchers from China found AI can replicate itself without human assistance, which is “an early signal for rogue AIs,”—that is, AI systems which develop some level of “self-awareness or autonomy and then work counter to human interests.”¹³¹ Similarly concerning, AI can now impersonate someone with an accuracy rate of 85%, according to a recent study by researchers from Stanford University and Google.¹³²

Also of note, President Trump recently announced OpenAI, Oracle, MGX and SoftBank, will join efforts to launch an AI-driven project called Stargate.¹³³ While believed to be a job-generator, it also carries controversy, including concerns related to its “potential . . . [to] be used to detect cancers and customize mRNA vaccines to treat them within 48 hours.”¹³⁴ Given the risks presented by mRNA vaccines,¹³⁵ such technology needs thorough vetting. Given the above, Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress take the following actions:

- 1. Establish a Congressional Subcommittee to review AI legislation and research and make recommendations.** According to one researcher, in 2023 lobbying related to AI “surged by a staggering 185%, largely driven by the self-serving interests of a handful of tech giants seeking to advance anticompetitive, licensing-based approaches.”¹³⁶ Several AI related bills have also already been

introduced in the 119th Congress. Of note among the bills is one that would “prohibit United States persons from advancing artificial intelligence capabilities within the People’s Republic of China,”¹³⁷ the bipartisan Secure Artificial Intelligence Act,¹³⁸ and the bipartisan Future of AI Innovation Act, introduced in the 118th Congress. The latter one, for example, “creates testbeds with national labs to accelerate groundbreaking AI innovation that will spur future economic growth and protect national security.”¹³⁹ Yet, overall, balance is needed. Congress must both encourage innovation and protect against imminent threats posed by AI. To do so, Liberty Counsel Action recommends a congressional subcommittee be formed and tasked with developing legislative recommendations for a proper regulatory structure for AI. At minimum, said committee should review current research, recently proposed and current legislation on AI, any policies developed as a result of President Trump’s Executive Order on AI, and seek testimony from experts in the field.

2. **Pass legislation similar to the DEFIANCE Act of 2024.** Related specifically to the use of deepfakes in pornography, the DEFIANCE Act (which stands for “Disrupt Explicit Forged Images and Non-Consensual Edits¹⁴⁰) “would allow victims of nonconsensual sexually explicit deepfakes to sue people who create, share and receive them.”¹⁴¹ Of note, it passed unanimously out of the Senate.¹⁴² Liberty Counsel Action recommends this or similar legislation, be introduced and passed in the 119th Congress.
3. **Pass legislation similar to the No AI FRAUD Act of 2024.**¹⁴³ Notably, this act “establishes a federal framework to protect Americans’ individual right to their likeness and voice against AI-generated fakes and forgeries.”¹⁴⁴ Like much AI legislation, it is bi-partisan. Liberty Counsel Action recommends this or similar legislation be introduced and passed in the 119th Congress.

C. Ensure Proper Oversight and Regulation of Biometric Technologies and Smart Cities. Like the use of AI, biometric technology is becoming increasingly prevalent. Notably, three states have enacted privacy laws specific to biometric data; Illinois, Texas and Washington (for example, in 2008 Illinois passed the Biometric Information Privacy Act (BIPA) in 2008; a year later Texas passed the Capture or Use of Biometric Identifiers Act (CUBI) to prohibit “the sale, lease, or disclosure of biometrics to a third party”¹⁴⁵). Given the risks related to biometric technology and “Smart City” development as outlined above (state surveillance and control), we recommend Congress review the above current state laws on regulating biometric data as well as proposed federal legislation—namely, “The Facial Recognition and Biometric Technology Moratorium Act,” which prohibits the use of federal use of biometric surveillance systems without specific authorization from Congress (among other

things)¹⁴⁶—and advance legislation based on the best practices and principles of each.

Similarly, we recommend Congress oppose any legislation similar to the Smart Cities and Communities Act of 2021¹⁴⁷ or the SUPER BUGS Act of 2023 (S 4581¹⁴⁸ and HR 1305¹⁴⁹). Finally, Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress pass legislation to codify and complement actions outlined in President Trump’s Executive Order on “Unleashing American Energy”¹⁵⁰ in order to stop, and ideally reverse where possible, the damage caused by the Infrastructure Act, which included several provisions that have “a direct connection to smart city requirements.”¹⁵¹

VII. Prevent Censorship and Global Digital Governance

On his first day in office, President Trump issued an executive order prohibiting federal employees or taxpayer resources from being used to censor Americans by unconstitutionally abridging the right to free speech, among other things.¹⁵² To undergird this action and further address concerns related to censorship emanating from within the U.S. and beyond its borders, Liberty Counsel Action recommends Congress advance legislation similar to the following acts introduced in the 118th or 119th Congress:

- A. The Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act.** This act expands the Hatch Act¹⁵³ by prohibiting federal employees from engaging in censorship “while acting in an official capacity” and providing penalties for doing so.¹⁵⁴ Essentially this, or similar legislation, would codify the first part of the President’s executive order.
- B. The Censorship Accountability Act.** This act allows individuals harmed by censorship or similar actions to bring a suit against the federal employee responsible.¹⁵⁵
- C. The Accountability for Government Censorship Act.** Not to be confused with the above, this act (largely in response to the Biden Administration’s actions that bullied “social media companies to censor certain views and news on their platforms”) requires any actions made by officers or employees of federal agencies to suppress speech on social media platforms or any privately own platforms in the last five years to be reported.¹⁵⁶ Like Recommendation I, this act codifies part of the President’s executive order.
- D. The End U.N. Censorship Act (applies beyond the UN).** This act prohibits funding for the iVerify fact-checking tool developed by the United Nations, as well as other international efforts that endeavor to “label speech or expression as mal-, mis-, or dis-information.”¹⁵⁷

E. The No Funding or Enforcement of Censorship Abroad Act. This would ensure “No assistance may be furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 . . . if the Secretary of State has credible information that such foreign entity has engaged in, facilitated, or promoted, or will imminently engage in, facilitate, or promote censorship of lawful speech online” (among other things).¹⁵⁸

Similarly, Liberty Counsel Action recommends that Congress pass legislation directing the President to U.S. withdraw its support for the Global Digital Compact¹⁵⁹ and any similar agreements, as well as (as noted above) prohibit the U.S. from joining the United Nations Convention against Cybercrime. To underscore the importance of this issue, Congress should likewise pass a resolution to urge other countries follow suit.

VIII. Establish a (Domestic) Moratorium on Dangerous Geoengineering and Related Experiments, Take Precautionary Measures, and Solidify a Solar-Geoengineering International Non-use Agreement

Largely led and funded by private individuals independent of nation states, “geo-engineering” and related experiments seeking to alter the earth’s plants and animals present myriad unknown and possibly catastrophic risks. Indeed, releasing particles into the air to block the sun’s rays from hitting the earth (solar geoengineering) carries with it the potential of drastically altering climate patterns and agricultural cycles, affecting food supplies, ecosystems, and more—which could drastically reduce animal and human populations by the millions, or even billions.

Domestic and international law currently lack comprehensive, effective regulations related to geoengineering and other related technologies and numerous public officials are calling for international action.¹⁶⁰ Not only should the U.S. be among them, but the U.S. should also lead the way for international cooperation on a non-use agreement as it pertains to these nascent technologies. Specifically, Liberty Counsel Action recommends the following:

A. Congressional Hearings and a Moratorium on All Geoengineering and Related Experiments. The health and environmental risks posed by geoengineering and related eco-system altering efforts—modifying cows to reduce their methane emissions and creating “vaccinator” mosquitoes, as well as the continued use of genetically modified food, including growing meat in laboratories—are numerous. And there is no “reset” button. Indeed, rather than use “One Health” as a justification to advance policies akin to totalitarianism, this approach should be used to shine a light on how all the aforementioned modifications—*currently happening*—have the potential to cause great and lasting harm. These efforts could, in fact, create the “black swan” event the UN and others have used to justify their global governance overreach. Given this, Congress should convene public hearings on the current,

known risks associated with each of the above technologies. In addition, until all risks are fully understood—including but not limited to risks related to a global climate crisis, damage to the Food Supply, vaccine mutation, vaccine shedding, self-replicating vaccines, and the effects of eating meat grown in a laboratory—Congress should pass legislation to place a moratorium on these dangerous geoengineering and related experiments, to be effective immediately.¹⁶¹

B. Taking Precautionary Measures for National Security. Until agreement on Recommendation III is reached, for the sake of national security the U.S. should maintain vigilance by monitoring what other nations are doing and ensure it has the capacity to respond as needed should other nations take harmful action.¹⁶² The U.S. may similarly benefit from consideration of counter-geoengineering research, though this needs thorough review by Congress.¹⁶³

C. Convening a Summit to Establish a Solar-geoengineering International Non-use Agreement. In 2023, concerns from within the U.S. intelligence community led them “to plot how to avert a war triggered by [solar geo-engineering].”¹⁶⁴ Those familiar with this sort of role-playing underscored that such “practice” signifies how “they see it as a credible threat in need of a strategy.”¹⁶⁵ Corroborating such a scenario as a credible threat, a 2021 National Intelligence Council Report¹⁶⁶ highlights how researchers in numerous countries, including those in Australia, China, India, Russia, the United Kingdom, and some EU members, “are exploring geoengineering techniques.”¹⁶⁷ Furthermore, concerns emanating from multiple nations, largely in the global south “reveal the growing global political support for a non-use agreement.”¹⁶⁸ The U.S. should capitalize on this momentum and convene a summit calling for an international non-use agreement as it relates to geoengineering experiments—which would include those within its own borders. While treaties are over-used, as noted above, they do serve practical and vital needs—of which this most certainly is. *Note: While the Harvard Project on Climate Agreements (rightly) warns such treaty may have little effect, given “countries likely to use geoengineering would choose not to participate in the treaty,”¹⁶⁹ akin to efforts seeking to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, the U.S. can make clear it will not tolerate any nation-states that conduct and sanction solar-geoengineering experiments. Indeed, President Trump is well-positioned to do so, given its prior use of President Ronald Reagan’s strategy, “peace through strength.”¹⁷⁰*

IX. End Global Abortion Funding—Particularly Where It Is Illegal

As outlined by Maureen Condic, Ph.D., associate professor of neurobiology at the University of Utah School of Medicine: “The conclusion that human life begins at sperm-egg fusion is uncontested, objective, based on the universally accepted scientific

method of distinguishing different cell types from each other and on ample scientific evidence . . . Moreover, it is entirely independent of any specific ethical, moral, political, or religious view of human life or human embryos.”¹⁷¹ Even if one disagrees with this reality, the U.S. should not be funding controversial agendas like abortion at home, let alone abroad—particularly when said global agenda equates denial of abortion to torture¹⁷² and promotes illegal activity.¹⁷³ Yet the U.S. currently provides direct financial support to various multilateral entities, including the UN and its affiliated bodies, that not only promote abortion but seek to entrench it as a “human right”.¹⁷⁴ As the below outlines, this promotion is not limited to a few UN entities—rather, it seems the UN system itself now seeks to promote abortion worldwide.

As it pertains to arguments that the U.S. merely seeks to advance “reproductive health” efforts that claim to reduce the need for abortions, the current means of doing so are at best flawed and at worst failing, given the number of abortions globally continues to increase. Continuing to fund these efforts would therefore be fiscally irresponsible. President Trump’s actions thus far have made great strides in overcoming this fiscal irresponsibility; however, to prevent future administrations from once again providing funding to entities that promote and perform abortions, we recommend the following:

A. Codify President Trump's Executive Memorandum Reinstating the Protecting Life in Global Assistance Policy. The American Values Act and the Protecting Life in Foreign Assistance Act would accomplish this purpose. The former would make permanent and strengthen existing prohibitions on the use of federal funds to pay for or promote abortions abroad by ensuring said prohibition covers all aid under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961,¹⁷⁵ and make permanent the Siljander and Kemp-Kasten amendments (which prohibit foreign aid from being used to lobby for or against abortion or from being allocated to organizations that support, or participate in managing, a coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization program, respectively).¹⁷⁶ The latter codifies and strengthens the PLGHA policy by prohibiting federal funds from being allocated (for purposes abroad) to any foreign or domestic organization that performs or promotes abortion, or provides any items “intended to procure abortions,” or provides financial support to any “entity that conducts abortion-related activities.”¹⁷⁷ This closes an existing loophole that historically exempted some entities from the PLGHA Policy, including various multilateral entities such as Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance (among others).¹⁷⁸ Given this, it has the potential to cease all U.S. funding to the UNFPA, and if fully adhered to, most of the UN system, based on their relentless promotion of abortion.

B. Defund the HHS Reproductive Healthcare Access Task Force (and Related Task Forces) and Establish a Pro-Life Task Force. As part of the Presidential Memorandum reinstating the PLGHA policy, the president directed the Secretary of State to coordinate “with the Secretary of Health and Human Services . . . to

implement a plan to extend the requirements of the reinstated Memorandum to global health assistance furnished by all departments or agencies.”¹⁷⁹ To expedite the process, we recommend Congress pass the No Pro-Abortion Task Force Act, which would ensure the HHS Intra-agency Task Force on Reproductive Healthcare Access is defunded.¹⁸⁰ Said task should then be replaced with a pro-life task force responsible for coordinating and enforcing the PLGHA policy and reviewing all agency policies related to “family planning” and “reproductive health” abroad, and the use of all related aid, requiring complete transparency on how U.S. taxpayer dollars are being utilized for the same.¹⁸¹

C. Establish a Select Sub-Committee to Review Foreign Family Planning Aid and Related Policies and Make Recommendations.

To undergird both the PLGHA policy and the recent Presidential action requiring review of foreign aid, we recommend Congress establish a sub-committee to review the work of each department and agency directed to analyze foreign development assistance funds “for programmatic efficiency and consistency with United States foreign policy.”¹⁸² Upon completion of the review, the subcommittee should issue legislative recommendations. At a minimum, Congress should pass legislation ensuring:

- The use of all foreign aid adheres to principles of transparency and efficiency. That is, if funds are allocated for “family planning,” “sexual and reproductive health,” or similar terms, it should be clear that said funds may not in any way promote abortion, and recipients of said federal funding should be required to prove adherence to this condition.
- Any relevant new policies, such as those proposed by the task force outlined in Recommendation II, are made permanent.
- Any rules, “resource materials,” or other documents developed by departments or agencies in relation to abortion abroad receive congressional approval.

D. Codify U.S. Re-entry to Geneva Consensus Declaration and Exit the Generation Equality Forum.

As noted, President Trump re-entered the Geneva Consensus Declaration during the first week of his second term. As outlined in other recommendations, said Declaration is beneficial in terms of promoting the well-being of women and children.¹⁸³ To ensure the U.S. maintains membership in the Consensus, Congress should build on recent resolutions expressing support for the Geneva Consensus Declaration¹⁸⁴ and pass legislation requiring congressional approval to exit it.

Conversely, the U.S. should immediately end all commitments related to abortion (even if tangential) made as part of the Generation Equality Forum, including ceasing any efforts to mobilize the \$12 billion promised by the Biden Administration “to invest in businesses that advance gender equity in emerging markets” (which is in part

coded language for ensuring women have “equal” control of their bodies - and can access abortion on demand).¹⁸⁵

E. Ensure the U.S. does not Ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of the Child.¹⁸⁶

Not only is abortion not a human right, but calling it one demeans all other rights, which, based on a proper reading of international treaty law and natural law, include and are founded on *the right to life*. Yet UN Treaty bodies argue that the former contains language demonstrating abortion is a human right,¹⁸⁷ and that states should “decriminalize abortion.”¹⁸⁸ The Committee on the Rights of the Child further recommends states “ensure access to safe abortion and post-abortion care services, irrespective of whether abortion itself is legal.”¹⁸⁹ Given this, the U.S. should maintain its refusal to ratify both treaties.

Reversing Status Quo’s Advancement of Destructive Agendas.

If the U.S. Government fails to actively address these matters, the “status quo,” which is being advanced through multiple avenues, will eventually cripple America. Consider for example the United Kingdom, where it is illegal to stand quietly outside an abortion clinic - if one admits they are praying in their head. Based on the previous actions of various global actors and their known agendas, similar measures on a global level—censoring minds, tracking citizens, preventing purchases or travel, requiring vaccinations to participate in the public sector, or other such recommendations predicated on claims of risks to global health—are not far-fetched. The U.S. needs to do all it can to prevent such actions from ever occurring. The above recommendations provide basic “first steps” to do so.

Endnotes

¹ Calvin Woodward, “Trump offered a bountiful batch of campaign promises that come due on Day 1,” *AP News*, January 16, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/trump-day-1-promises-9c842ada3c54e2219445f1598db2c8d6>.

² House Judiciary GOP, Twitter, August 26, 2024, <https://x.com/JudiciaryGOP/status/1828201780544504064>; see also James Lynch, “Zuckerberg Admits Facebook Wrong to Suppress Hunter Laptop Story, Scolds White House for Covid Censorship,” *National Review*, August 27, 2024, <https://www.nationalreview.com/news/zuckerberg-admits-facebook-wrong-to-suppress-hunter-laptop-story-scolds-white-house-for-COVID-censorship/>.

³ Bryan Jung, “G20 Announces Plan to Impose Digital Currencies and IDs Worldwide,” *The Epoch Times*, September 12, 2023, <https://www.theepochtimes.com/business/g20-announces-plan-to-impose-digital-currencies-and-ids-worldwide-5489947>.

⁴ The document summarizing the outcome of the G-20 meeting outlined the Indian Presidency’s initiative, which described digital public infrastructure “as a set of shared digital systems . . . that can be used modularly by governments, businesses, academia, and civil society to enable society-wide development.” While the document notes a desire “to foster a digital economy that promotes respect for human rights, privacy, and protection of personal data for all,” it is not clear how this will be accomplished. Given China’s known surveillance of and ability to control its citizens, any global digital public infrastructure carries great risk. See: “G20 Digital Economy Ministers Meeting Outcome Document and Chair Summary,” G7G20 Documents Database, August 19, 2023, <https://g7g20-documents.org/database/document/2023-g20-india-sherpa-track-digital-economy-ministers-ministers-language->

[g20-digital-economy-ministers-meeting-outcome-document-and-chair-summary](#) and Nicole Kobie, “The complicated truth about China's social credit system,” *Wired*, June 7, 2019, <https://www.wired.com/story/china-social-credit-system-explained/>.

⁵ United Nations office of the Secretary General, “Strengthening the International Response to Complex Global Shocks – An Emergency Platform: Our Common Agenda Policy Brief 2,” UN Library, March 10, 2023, <https://www.un-ilibrary.org/content/papers/10.18356/27082245-25>.

⁶ “Central Digital Bank Currency Tracker,” *Atlantic Council*, September 2024, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/cbdctracker/>.

⁷ Mike Orcutt, “What’s Next for China’s Digital Currency?” *MIT Technology Review*, August 3, 2023, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/08/03/1077181/whats-next-for-chinas-digital-currency/>.

⁸ “Strengthening preparedness for and response to public health emergencies through targeted amendments to the International Health Regulations (2005),” World Health Organization, June 1, 2024, https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA77/A77_R17-en.pdf.

⁹ “Pact for the Future, Global Digital Compact and Declaration on Future Generations,” United Nations, September 2024, https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/sof-pact_for_the_future_adopted.pdf.

¹⁰ For example, the UN has published “Policy Briefs” detailing how they could deliver on the sustainable development goals. See: “Secretary-General Launches ‘Our Common Agenda’ Policy Briefs on Delivering 2030 Agenda Promises, Strengthening Response to Global Shocks,” United Nations, March 9, 2023, <https://press.un.org/en/2023/sgsm21718.doc.htm>.

¹¹ “Pact for the Future, Global Digital Compact and Declaration on Future Generations,” United Nations.

¹² See: “Factsheet 4: Types of Misinformation and Disinformation,” UNHCR, accessed February 14, 2025, <https://www.unhcr.org/innovation/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Factsheet-4.pdf>.

¹³ “U.S. Strategy on Global Development,” The White House, September 2024, https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/FINAL-U.S.-Strategy-on-Global-Development_091824.pdf. For examples of global actors seeking to regulate speech, see: “Guidelines for the Governance of Digital Platforms,” UNESCO, <https://www.unesco.org/en/internet-trust/guidelines/>; “Global Principles for Information Integrity address risks posed by advances in AI,” United Nations, June 24, 2024, <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2024/06/global-principles-information-integrity-launch/>; “Dealing with propaganda, misinformation and fake news,” Council of Europe, accessed February 25, 2025, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/campaign-free-to-speak-safe-to-learn/dealing-with-propaganda-misinformation-and-fake-news>.

¹⁴ Louise Perry, “Australia’s draconian streak means that it is struggling to find the Covid exit lane,” *The New Statesman*, December 7, 2021, <https://www.newstatesman.com/international-politics/coronavirus-international-politics/2021/12/trashed-2>.

¹⁵ “Howard Springs: Australia police arrest quarantine escapees,” *BBC*, November 21, 2021, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-australia-59486285>.

¹⁶ For example, to “drive toward” achievement of the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals, over 150 companies are using “stakeholder metrics” in their reporting, which includes “non-financial disclosures centred around four pillars: people, planet, prosperity and principles of governance and include measurements around greenhouse gas emissions, pay equality and board diversity, among others.” See “Stakeholder Metrics Initiative: over 150 companies implement sustainability reporting metrics,” World Economic Forum, January 11, 2024, <https://www.weforum.org/impact/stakeholder-capitalism-reporting-metrics-davos2024/>.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Michael Rectenwald, “What Is the Great Reset?” *Imprimis*, December 2021, <https://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/what-is-the-great-reset/>.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ “Withdrawing the United States from and Ending Funding to Certain United Nations Organizations and Reviewing United States Support to All International Organizations,” The White House, February 4, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/02/withdrawing-the-united-states-from-and-ending-funding-to-certain-united-nations-organizations-and-reviewing-united-states-support-to-all-international-organizations/>.

²¹ Ibid.

²² “Treaties and International Agreements,” U.S. Department of State, accessed December 16, 2024, <https://www.state.gov/policy-issues/treaties-and-international-agreements/>.

²³ As outlined by York University Professor Mathieu J.P. Poirier, “some treaties may have even led to unintended harmful impacts;” for example, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child was associated with harmful effects such as “worsened human rights practices, no improvements in health outcomes and, paradoxically, increases in child labour.” See: “Landmark study finds most international treaties ineffective,” *YorkU*, August 3, 2022, <https://www.yorku.ca/yfile/2022/08/03/landmark-study-finds-most-international-treaties-ineffective/>.

²⁴ Oona A. Hathaway, “Reengaging on Treaties and Other International Agreements (Part I): President Donald Trump’s Rejection of International Law,” *Just Security*, October 2, 2020, <https://www.justsecurity.org/72656/reengaging-on-treaties-and-other-international-agreements-part-i-president-donald-trumps-rejection-of-international-law/>. Also of note, according to the U.S. Department of State, the U.S. enters into over 200 international agreements annually. See: “Treaties and International Agreements,” U.S. Department of State, accessed December 16, 2024, <https://www.state.gov/policy-issues/treaties-and-international-agreements/>.

²⁵ While the Constitution is clear that the President can make treaties “with the Advice and Consent of the Senate . . . provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur,” it is silent about how treaties might be terminated (withdrawn). The issue was brought before the Supreme Court in the 1978 case *Goldwater v. Carter*. Referencing a lack of clear Constitutional guidance, the Court concluded it “a nonjusticiable political question.” Hence president have and continue to unilaterally exit treaties. See “ArtII.S2.C2.1.10 Breach and Termination of Treaties,” Constitution Annotated | Analysis and Interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, accessed December 23, 2024, https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/essay/artII-S2-C2-1-10/ALDE_00012961/#ALDF_00016413.

²⁶ “Withdrawing the United States from and Ending Funding to Certain United Nations Organizations and Reviewing United States Support to All International Organizations,” The White House, February 4, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/02/withdrawing-the-united-states-from-and-ending-funding-to-certain-united-nations-organizations-and-reviewing-united-states-support-to-all-international-organizations/>.

²⁷ It should be noted that some oppose this recommendation given that, in their view, the U.S. leaving would empower China. It should likewise be mentioned that while the UN Charter does not outline a procedure for voluntarily withdrawing membership, under international law, “the right is probably implicit,” as outlined in an article on terminating treaties in Oxford Public International Law. However, the U.S. has tried before and failed to change things within the UN, hence, a new approach is needed.

²⁸ “Disengaging Entirely From the United Nations Debacle (DEFUND) Act,” Mike Lee | U.S. Senator for Utah, February 2025, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/services/files/596172FB-FA97-4CDD-B1B2-23B38BBDB428>.

²⁹ “Rep. Roy, Rep. Rogers, and Sen. Lee lead fight to defund the United Nations,” *Press Release*, Chip Roy, U.S. Congress, December 7, 2023, <https://roy.house.gov/media/press-releases/rep-roy-rep-rogers-and-sen-lee-lead-fight-defund-united-nations>.

³⁰ “Who funds the UN?” Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and the United Nations Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office, accessed February 4, 2025, <https://financingun.report/un-financing/un-funding/funding-entity>.

³¹ Revenue By Government Donor,” United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, accessed December 24, 2024, <https://unsceb.org/fs-revenue-government-donor>.

³² “Disengaging Entirely From the United Nations Debacle (DEFUND) Act,” Mike Lee | U.S. Senator for Utah, February 2025, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/services/files/596172FB-FA97-4CDD-B1B2-23B38BBDB428>; “Lee introduces DEFUND Act to Pull USA from UN,” *Press Releases*, Mike Lee | U.S. Senator for Utah, February 20, 2025, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/2025/2/lee-introduces-defund-act-to-pull-usa-from-un>.

³³ Legislation introduced by Senator Mike Lee, 119th Congress, accessed February 25, 2025, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/services/files/51F8EECC-11FC-4FC8-8D84-07DFA0DF710B>.

³⁴ “Brexit: What you need to know about the UK leaving the EU,” *BBC*, December 30, 2020, <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887>.

³⁵ This approach mirrors President Trump’s stated intentions to, upon exiting the WHO, form a coalition of nations who are “strongly committed to protecting health, while also upholding sovereignty and freedom.” RealDonaldTrump, *Instagram*, October 17, 2023, https://www.instagram.com/reel/CygeiuHun0i/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link.

³⁶ “Withdrawing the United States from the World Health Organization,” The White House, January 20, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/withdrawing-the-united-states-from-the-worldhealth-organization/>.

³⁷ “About the GCD (Geneva Consensus Declaration),” *The Institute for Women’s Health*, accessed December 23, 2024, <https://www.theiwh.org/about-gcd/>.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Reform at this stage seems improbable, based on all the evidence outlined in the above policy analysis and detailed in the recommendations.

⁴⁰ “H.R.600 - WHO is Accountable Act,” Congress.gov, January 22, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/600>.

⁴¹ “Fact Sheet: United States to Announce Commitments to the Generation Equality Forum,” The White House, June 30, 2021, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/06/30/fact-sheet-united-states-to-announce-commitments-to-the-generation-equality-forum/>.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Legislation introduced by Representative Andy Biggs, 119th Congress, accessed February 25, 2025, <https://biggs.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/biggs.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/biggs-who-withdrawal-act->

119.pdf. The act also prohibits funding for participation in the WHO and includes a section that is arguably no longer necessary, directing the President to withdraw from the WHO.

⁴⁴ “The U.S. Government and the World Health Organization,” *KFF*, June 13, 2024, <https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/fact-sheet/the-u-s-government-and-the-world-health-organization/>.

⁴⁵ “United State of America Partner in Global Health,” World Health Organization, December 23, 2024, <https://www.who.int/about/funding/cof-for-contributors/usa>. See also “The U.S. Government and the World Health Organization,” *KFF*, January 21, 2025, <https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/fact-sheet/the-u-s-government-and-the-world-health-organization/>.

⁴⁶ “H.R.401 - No Taxpayer Funding for the World Health Organization Act,” Congress.gov, January 14, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/401>.

⁴⁷ “H.R.600 - WHO is Accountable Act,” Congress.gov, January 22, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/600>.

⁴⁸ A Congressional Research Service report outlines Congress could facilitate U.S. withdrawal in the WHO by amending the relevant law “to eliminate the payment obligation.” See: “Withdrawal from the World Health Organization: Legal Basis and Implications,” *Congressional Research Service*, June 5, 2020, <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/LSB/LSB10489>. Also of note, according to the WHO Constitution, failing to pay financial obligations may result in a loss of voting privileges; see Article 7, “Constitution of the World Health Organization,” World Health Organization, 1946, <https://apps.who.int/gb/bd/PDF/bd47/EN/constitution-en.pdf?ua=1>.

⁴⁹ “S.92 - Defending American Sovereignty in Global Pandemics Act,” Congress.gov, January 1, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/senate-bill/92>. This act outlines that the U.S. can only “become a party to a convention, agreement, or other international instrument under the Constitution of the World Health Organization to strengthen pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response” if done so as “a treaty made under Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

⁵⁰ “RealDonaldTrump, *Instagram*, October 17, 2023, https://www.instagram.com/reel/CygeiuHun0i/?utm_source=ig_web_copy_link.

⁵¹ “Withdrawing the United States from the World Health Organization,” The White House, January 20, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/withdrawing-the-united-states-from-the-worldhealth-organization/>.

⁵² *Ibid*.

⁵³ “Who We Are,” Pan American Health Organization | World Health Organization, accessed December 6, 2024, <https://www.paho.org/en/who-we-are>.

⁵⁴ “Statement of Assessed Contributions due from Member States,” Pan American Health Organization, November 27, 2024, <https://www.paho.org/en/node/69017>.

⁵⁵ Cornejo S, Chevez A, Ozturk M, Vargas O, Behrens F, Solano L, Rodriguez D, “The Pan American Health Organization’s Revolving Fund for access to vaccines: 43 years responding to the regional immunization program,” *NIH*, April 2023, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37114167/>.

⁵⁶ Sebastian Rotella, James Bandler and Patricia Callahan “Inside the Trump Administration’s Decision to Leave the World Health Organization,” *ProPublica*, June 20, 2020, <https://www.propublica.org/article/inside-the-trump-administrations-decision-to-leave-the-world-health-organization>.

⁵⁷ There are 68 WHO Collaboration Centres in the U.S., several of which include divisions of the CDC, FDA, and NIH, as well as hospitals and universities. See: “WHO Collaborating Centres, Global database,” World Health Organization, accessed December 6, 2024, <https://apps.who.int/whocc/List.aspx?USZdN9B/p/yKUq4QHE2keA==>.

⁵⁸ Current use of the One Health Approach in the U.S. includes the One Health Federal Interagency Network (OH-FIN), One Health Federal Interagency Coordination Committee (OH-FICC), created and coordinated by the CDC; The National One Health Framework, and U.S. One Health Coordination Unit (U.S. OHCU). See: “Federal One Health Coordination,” U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, accessed December 24, 2024, <https://www.cdc.gov/one-health/php/about/federal-one-health-coordination-1.html> and “About the Commission,” One Health Commission, accessed December 24, 2024, https://www.onehealthcommission.org/en/why_one_health/about_the_commission/.

⁵⁹ “Remarks on the UN Human Rights Council,” U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Geneva, June 21, 2028, <https://geneva.usmission.gov/2018/06/21/remarks-on-the-un-human-rights-council/>.

⁶⁰ Steny H. Hoyer, and Richard P. Schifter, “Hoyer: The United Nations’ historic anti-Israel bias emboldened Hamas,” *Semafor*, February 16, 2024, <https://www.semafor.com/article/02/15/2024/hoyer-the-united-nations-historic-anti-israel-bias-emboldened-hamas>.

⁶¹ “Rep. Roy reintroduces bill to prevent taxpayer dollars from going to the United Nations’ Human Rights Council,” Chip Roy, U.S. Congress - 21st District of Texas, January 14, 2025, <https://roy.house.gov/media/press-releases/rep-roy-reintroduces-bill-prevent-taxpayer-dollars-going-united-nations-human>.

⁶² “Revenue By Entity,” United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, accessed December 24, 2024, <https://unsceb.org/fs-revenue-agency>.

⁶³ “Revenue By Government Donor,” United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, accessed December 24, 2024, <https://unsceb.org/fs-revenue-government-donor>.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ “To prohibit contributions to the United Nations Human Rights Council, and for other purposes,” 119th Congress, accessed February 25, 2025, https://roy.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/roy.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/No_Taxpayer_Funding_for_the_UN_Human_Rights_Council_bill_text_119.pdf. “H.R.400 - To prohibit contributions to the United Nations Human Rights Council, and for other purposes,” Congress.gov, January 14, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/400/text>.

⁶⁶ “U.S. Delegation to the Human Rights Council,” *U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Geneva*, accessed January 23, 2025, <https://geneva.usmission.gov/human-rights/>.

⁶⁷ CFR.org Editors, “Funding the United Nations: How Much Does the U.S. Pay?” Council on Foreign Relations, February 29, 2024, <https://www.cfr.org/article/funding-united-nations-what-impact-do-us-contributions-have-un-agencies-and-programs>; “Revenue By Government Donor,” United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, accessed February 11, 2025, <https://unsceb.org/fs-revenue-government-donor>. Specific amounts: \$338 million in 2021, \$344 million in 2022, and \$422 million in 2023.

⁶⁸ “Withdrawing the United States from and Ending Funding to Certain United Nations Organizations and Reviewing United States Support to All International Organizations,” The White House, February 4, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/02/withdrawing-the-united-states-from-and-ending-funding-to-certain-united-nations-organizations-and-reviewing-united-states-support-to-all-international-organizations/>.

⁶⁹ Beth W. Bailey, “New reports claim UNRWA works with terrorists, teaches hate as agency hits back at critics,” *Fox News*, December 8, 2024, <https://www.foxnews.com/world/new-reports-claim-unrwa-works-terrorists-teaches-hate-agency-hits-back-critics>.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Joshua Klein, “Shocking: Freed Israeli Hostages Say Hamas Used U.N. Facilities to Hide Them,” *Breitbart*, January 22, 2025, <https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2025/01/22/freed-israeli-hostages-hamas-used-u-n-facilities/>.

⁷² “H.R.7122 - Stop Support for UNRWA Act of 2024,” January 29, 2024, Congress.gov, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/7122/text>.

⁷³ “White House marks the U.S. return to UNESCO,” UNESCO, 19 October 2023, <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/white-house-marks-us-return-unesco>; see also: “Revenue By Government Donor,” United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, accessed December 24, 2024, <https://unsceb.org/fs-revenue-government-donor>.

⁷⁴ H.Res.581 - Condemning the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and refraining the United States from rejoining, Congress.gov, July 11, 2023, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-resolution/581/text>.

⁷⁵ The same executive order that defunded the UNRWA and UNHRC directed the Secretary of State to review international organizations, conventions, and treaties that “‘promote radical or anti-American sentiment,’ with a particular focus on UNESCO.” Megan Messerly, “US to again withdraw from the UN Human Rights Council, stop UNRWA funding,” *Politico*, February 3, 2025, <https://www.politico.com/news/2025/02/03/us-withdraw-un-human-rights-council-trump-00202100>.

⁷⁶ Jina Moore, “The Trump Administration Just Cut All Funding For The UN's Family Planning Agency,” *Bizz Feed*, April 3, 2017, <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/jinamoore/the-us-wont-give-any-more-money-to-the-un-population-fund#.wpxWPxm4wo>

⁷⁷ “Revenue By Government Donor,” United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, accessed December 24, 2024, <https://unsceb.org/fs-revenue-government-donor>.

⁷⁸ “H.R.699 - To prohibit United States contributions to the United Nations Population Fund,” Congress.gov, January 23, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/699/text>.

⁷⁹ C-Fam Staff, “C-Fam Submission for Consideration for U.S. House FY 2025 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill,” *C-Fam*, March 11, 2024, https://c-fam.org/un_statement/c-fam-submission-for-consideration-for-u-s-house-fy-2025-state-and-foreign-operations-appropriations-bill/.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² “Joint web statement by UN Human rights experts on Supreme Court decision to strike down Roe v. Wade,” United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, June 24, 2022, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/statements/2022/06/joint-web-statement-un-human-rights-experts-supreme-court-decision-strike-down>.

⁸³ Stefano Gennarini, “UN Bureaucrats Pick Fight with EU Parliament on Prostitution,” *Friday Fax*, C-Fam, September 28, 2023, https://c-fam.org/friday_fax/un-bureaucrats-pick-fight-with-eu-parliament-on-prostitution/. See also: “Guidance document of the Working Group on discrimination against women and girls: Eliminating discrimination against sex workers and securing their human rights,” *United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human*

Rights, December 7, 2023, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/tools-and-resources/guidance-document-working-group-discrimination-against-women-and>.

⁸⁴ “Voluntary Contributions to the OHCHR in 2024,” United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, accessed February 13, 2025,

<https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/aboutus/fundingbudget/voluntarycontributions2024.pdf>.

⁸⁵ C-Fam Staff, “Five Reasons Why the U.S. Should Defund UN Women,” Center for Family and Human Rights, January 9, 2025, https://c-fam.org/briefing_paper/five-reasons-u-s-defund-un-women/; see also “Report of the Expert Group Meeting on the CSW 61 Priority Theme: Women’s Economic Empowerment in the Changing World of Work,” UN Women, September 28, 2016,

<https://www.nswp.org/sites/nswp.org/files/EGM%20Report%2C%20UN%20Women%20-%202016.pdf>.

⁸⁶ “Five Reasons Why the U.S. Should Defund UN Women...”

⁸⁷ Haley Strack, “UN Women Demands Proof of Hamas’s Gender-Based Violence,” *National Review*, November 29, 2023, <https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/un-women-demands-proof-of-hamass-gender-based-violence/>.

⁸⁸ “About UN Women,” UN Women, accessed February 25, 2025, <https://www.unwomen.org/en/about-us/about-un-women>.

⁸⁹ “Annex I: Financial Results: Revenue and expenditures,” UN Women, accessed February 25, 2025,

https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2024-05/annex_i_financial_results.pdf.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ “UN Women Financial brochure,” UN Women, accessed February 25, 2025,

<https://unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2024-09/UN-Women-financial-brochure-2023-en.pdf>.

⁹² Rebecca Oas, Ph.D., “Human Rights Expert Advocates Abolishing Prostitution/Abortion Groups Upset,” Center for Family and Human Rights, June 27, 2024, https://c-fam.org/friday_fax/human-rights-expert-advocates-abolishing-prostitution-abortion-groups-upset/.

⁹³ “HIV and Transgender and Other Gender-Diverse People: Human Rights Fact Sheet Series,” UNAIDS, 2021,

https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/04-hiv-human-rights-factsheet-transgender-gender-diverse_en.pdf.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ “Revenue By Government Donor,” United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination, accessed December 24, 2024, <https://unsceb.org/fs-revenue-government-donor>.

⁹⁶ Which includes providing and advocating for “education, health and nutrition services” and protecting “children from violence and abuse.” Ibid. Note: they are also “the world’s largest provider of vaccines.” See: “Who we are,” UNICEF, accessed February 4, 2025, <https://www.unicef.org/who-we-are>.

⁹⁷ Douglas A. Sylva, “The United Nations Children Fund | Women or Children First?” International Organizations Research Group, 2010, <https://c-fam.org/wp-content/uploads/UNICEF.pdf>.

⁹⁸ “Gender Transformative Education: Reimagining education for a more just and inclusive world,” UNICEF, December 2021, <https://www.unicef.org/media/113166/file/Gender%20Transformative%20Education.pdf>.

⁹⁹ Piero A. Tozzi, “UNICEF Calls for Legal Abortion in Dominican Republic,” Sex Ed for Social Change, accessed February 25, 2025, <https://siecus.org/unicef-calls-for-legal-abortion-in-dominican-republic-2/>; “C-Fam Submission for Consideration for U.S. House FY 2025 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill”... See also Susan Yoshihara, Ph.D., “UNICEF Claims Children Have Right to Confidential Sex Services,” Center for Family and Human Rights, July 5, 2013, https://c-fam.org/friday_fax/unicef-claims-children-have-right-to-confidential-sex-services/.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Alexis I. Fragosa, Esq., “UNICEF Takes Down Controversial Report,” Center for Family and Human Rights, May 20, 2021, https://c-fam.org/friday_fax/unicef-takes-down-controversial-report/; “Digital Age Assurance Tools and Children’s Rights Online Across The Globe,” UNICEF, 2021, <https://www.scribd.com/document/511152514/Digital-Age-Assurance-Tools-and-Childrens-Rights-Online-Across-the-Globe>. See also “DPA Information Note: UNICEF Discussion Paper Taken Down: Digital Age Assurance Tools and Children’s Rights Online across the Globe,” Digital Policy Alliance,” October 6, 2021, <https://www.dpalliance.org.uk/dpa-information-note-unicef-discussion-paper-taken-down-digital-age-assurance-tools-and-childrens-rights-online-across-the-globe/>.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Lisa Correnti, “Longtime Abortion Advocate Appointed to Lead UNICEF,” Center for Family and Human Rights, December 23, 2021, https://c-fam.org/friday_fax/longtime-abortion-advocate-appointed-to-lead-unicef/.

¹⁰⁴ “Funding to UNICEF,” UNICEF, accessed February 4, 2025, <https://www.unicef.org/partnerships/funding>.

¹⁰⁵ “C-Fam Submission for Consideration for U.S. House FY 2025 State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill,” Center for Family and Human Rights...

¹⁰⁶ Francesca Albanese, “UN opens investigation into allegations its Palestine monitor took funds from pro-Hamas lobby groups,” *UN Watch*, July 2, 2024, <https://unwatch.org/un-opens-investigation-into-official-accused-of-antisemitism-by-france-germany-us/>. See also, “Jewish Leaders Demand Removal of UN Special Rapporteur Albanese,” Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, October 15, 2024,

<https://conferenceofpresidents.org/press/jewish-leaders-demand-removal-of-un-special-rapporteur-albanese/>.

-
- ¹⁰⁷ Secretary-General, “Right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health,” United Nations General Assembly, July 16, 2021, <https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n21/195/83/pdf/n2119583.pdf?OpenElement>.
- ¹⁰⁸ “Putting America First in International Environmental Agreements,” The White House, January 20, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/putting-america-first-in-international-environmental-agreements/>.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ben Johnson, “All the Executive Orders Trump Signed on Day One,” *The Washington Stand*, January 21, 2025, <https://washingtonstand.com/news/all-the-executive-orders-trump-signed-on-day-one>.
- ¹¹⁰ “About the Global Methane Pledge,” The Global Methane Pledge, Climate and Clean Air Coalition Secretariat, accessed December 16, 2024, <https://www.globalmethanepledge.org/>. See also: “The Global Methane Pledge,” accessed December 16, 2024, <https://www.globalmethanepledge.org/sites/default/files/documents/2023-11/Global%20Methane%20Pledge.pdf>.
- ¹¹¹ Ben Wright, “Why Bill Gates is under fire over cow flatulence,” *The Telegraph*, November 28, 2024, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/environment/0/cow-fart-vaccine-bill-gates>.
- ¹¹² “Accelerating Progress: Delivering on the U.S. Methane Emissions Reduction Plan,” The White House, December 2023, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Methane-Action-Plan-2023-Topper.pdf>.
- ¹¹³ “Livestock and enteric methane,” Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, accessed December 19, 2024, <https://www.fao.org/in-action/enteric-methane/background/en>.
- ¹¹⁴ “Accelerating Progress: Delivering on the U.S. Methane Emissions Reduction Plan,” The White House, December 2023, <https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Methane-Action-Plan-2023-Topper.pdf>.
- ¹¹⁵ Chris Clayton, “FDA approves dairy feed additive to reduce methane, create carbon credits,” *Farm Week Now*, May 30, 2024, https://www.farmweeknow.com/livestock/fda-approves-dairy-feed-additive-to-reduce-methane-create-carbon-credits/article_301a0eee-1dd7-11ef-bc61-0746475ecfb9.html.
- ¹¹⁶ “Global Methane Pledge,” Climate and Clean Air Coalition, accessed January 30, 2025, <https://www.ccacoalition.org/content/global-methane-pledge>. See also “Conference of the Parties,” United Nations Climate Change, accessed January 30, 2025, <https://unfccc.int/process/bodies/supreme-bodies/conference-of-the-parties-cop>.
- ¹¹⁷ Florence Muchai, “Why did USAID give \$68+ million to the World Economic Forum?” *MSN*, accessed February 25, 2025, <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/world/why-did-usaid-give-68-million-to-the-world-economic-forum/ar-AA1ywgLy>. See also: Adam Andrzejewski, “It’s Time That U.S. Taxpayers Defund The Davos Sponsor – World Economic Forum,” *Open the Books*, May 19, 2022, <https://openthebooks.substack.com/p/its-time-that-us-taxpayers-defund?s=w>.
- ¹¹⁸ Klaus Schwab, “Now is the time for a ‘great reset,’” June 3, 2020, <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2020/06/now-is-the-time-for-a-great-reset/>.
- ¹¹⁹ “H.R. 7047 – Defund Davos Act,” *Congress.gov*, January 18, 2024, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/7047/text>.
- ¹²⁰ After seven months of in-depth research, Politico journalists found that four organizations tied to Bill Gates spent \$8.3 million lobbying the U.S. and EU (European Union) governments for COVID funding, receiving unprecedented access to heads of state “to push U.S. and European officials to commit billions of dollars to Covid programs the organizations helped envision and lead.” And it worked — earning them massive returns (\$23 billion). CEPI and Gavi were among them. See: Erin Banco, Ashleigh Furlong, and Lennart Pfahler, “How Bill Gates and Partners Used Their Clout to Control the Global Covid Response — with Little Oversight,” *POLITICO*, September 14, 2022, <https://www.POLITICO.com/news/2022/09/14/global-covid-pandemic-response-bill-gates-partners-00053969>.
- ¹²¹ “Strengthening American Leadership in Digital Financial Technology,” The White House, January 23, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/strengthening-american-leadership-in-digital-financial-technology/>.
- ¹²² “S.464 - A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to limit the ability of Federal Reserve banks to issue central bank digital currency.” *Congress.gov*, February 6, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/senate-bill/464/text>. See also, “Lee Introduces Bill Making Trump Ban on Central Bank Digital Currency Permanent,” *Press Releases, Mike Lee | U.S. Senator for Utah*, February 6, 2025, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/2025/2/lee-introduces-bill-making-trump-ban-on-central-bank-digital-currency-permanent>.
- ¹²³ “H.R.3402 - Power of the Mint Act,” *Congress.gov*, May 17, 2023, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/3402/text>.
- ¹²⁴ “Countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes,” United Nations, November 27, 2024, <https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n24/372/04/pdf/n2437204.pdf>.
- ¹²⁵ Fiona Alexander, “US Approves UN Cybercrime Convention That Legitimizes Censorship,” *Center for European Policy Analysis*, November 14, 2024, <https://cepa.org/article/us-approving-un-cybercrime-treaty-would-legitimize-authoritarian-censorship/>.
- ¹²⁶ For a list of all seven bills, see the following press release: “Cybersecurity Awareness Month begins on a high note for congressional action,” *Homeland Security Republicans*, October 2, 2024,

<https://homeland.house.gov/2024/10/02/what-they-are-saying-cybersecurity-takes-center-stage-in-committee-on-homeland-security-legislation/>.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ “Strengthening Cyber Resilience Against State-Sponsored Threats Act,” Congress.gov., September 24, 2024, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/9769>.

¹²⁹ “Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Takes Action to Enhance America’s AI Leadership,” January 23, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/01/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-takes-action-to-enhance-americas-ai-leadership/>.

¹³⁰ Dan Milmo and Kiran Stacey, “It’s not clear we can control it’: what they said at the Bletchley Park AI summit,” *The Guardian*, November 1, 2023, <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/nov/01/elon-musk-calls-ai-one-of-the-biggest-threats-to-humanity-at-summit>.

¹³¹ Owen Hughes, “AI can now replicate itself — a milestone that has experts terrified,” *Live Science*, January 24, 2025, <https://www.livescience.com/technology/artificial-intelligence/ai-can-now-replicate-itself-a-milestone-that-has-experts-terrified>.

¹³² Owen Hughes, “Just 2 hours is all it takes for AI agents to replicate your personality with 85% accuracy,” *Live Science*, January 4, 2025, <https://www.livescience.com/technology/artificial-intelligence/just-2-hours-is-all-it-takes-for-ai-agents-to-replicate-your-personality-with-85-percent-accuracy>. In short, we are entering an era in which it is not outside the realm of possibility for governing officials to pass legislation seeking to prevent crime based on the probability an individual will commit a crime — akin to the plot of the 2002 film *Minority Report*.

¹³³ Ewan Palmer, “Donald Trump Backing mRNA Vaccine Project Gets Backlash,” *Newsweek*, January 22, 2025, <https://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-mrna-vaccine-cure-cancer-ai-2018701>, and April Rubin, “Musk bashes Trump-backed Stargate deal: ‘They don’t actually have the money,’” *Axios*, January 22, 2025, <https://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-mrna-vaccine-cure-cancer-ai-2018701>.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Nicolas Hulscher “Oracle Chairman Pushes AI-Generated Cancer mRNA Injections Developed in 48 Hours,” *Courageous Discourse*, January 22, 2025, <https://petermcculloughmd.substack.com/p/oracle-chairman-pushes-ai-generated>.

¹³⁶ Jake Denton, “The U.S. Shouldn’t Go the Way of Europe on AI,” The Heritage Foundation, May 8, 2024, <https://www.heritage.org/big-tech/commentary/the-us-shouldnt-go-the-way-europe-ai>.

¹³⁷ “A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit United States persons from advancing artificial intelligence capabilities within the People’s Republic of China, and for other purposes,” Congress.gov, January 29 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/senate-bill/321>.

¹³⁸ “Warner, Tillis Introduce Legislation to Advance Security of Artificial Intelligence Ecosystem,” Mark R. Warner, May 1, 2024, <https://www.warner.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/pressreleases?id=86DDB0A3-F402-4594-AD76-AF38B38CA068>.

¹³⁹ “Commerce Committee Passes Bipartisan Bill to Ensure U.S. Leads Global AI Innovation,” U.S. Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, July 31, 2024, <https://www.commerce.senate.gov/2024/7/commerce-committee-passes-bipartisan-bill-to-ensure-u-s-leads-global-ai-innovation>.

¹⁴⁰ Kate Tenbarge, “The Defiance Act passes in the Senate, potentially allowing deepfake victims to sue over nonconsensual images,” *NBC News*, July 24, 2024, <https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/defiance-act-passes-senate-allow-deepfake-victims-sue-rcna163464>.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ “H.R.6943 - No AI FRAUD Act,” Congress.gov, January 10, 2024, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/6943/text>.

¹⁴⁴ “Salazar Introduces the No AI Fraud Act,” Congresswoman María Elvira Salazar, January 10, 2024, <https://salazar.house.gov/media/press-releases/salazar-introduces-no-ai-fraud-act>.

¹⁴⁵ Stevie Carpenter, “4 Legal Insights into Biometric Privacy Laws and Regulations,” IEEE Computer Society, February 28, 2024, <https://www.computer.org/publications/tech-news/trends/biometric-privacy-laws-and-regulations-insights>.

¹⁴⁶ “S.681 - Facial Recognition and Biometric Technology Moratorium Act of 2023,” Congress.gov, March 7, 2023, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/senate-bill/681>.

¹⁴⁷ “H.R.9892 - Smart Cities and Communities Act of 2024,” Congress.gov, October 1, 2024, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/9892/text>. This act would “promote smart technologies and systems” to achieve outcomes similar to that of Smart Cities.

¹⁴⁸ “S.4581 - SUPER BUGS Act of 2024,” Congress.gov, June 18, 2024, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/senate-bill/4581/text>. This legislation “requires the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to seek to enter into arrangements with foreign countries, multilateral organizations, and other appropriate entities to

facilitate the development and commercialization of qualified pandemic or epidemic products, which include drugs, biological products, and medical devices.”

¹⁴⁹ “H.R.1305 - SUPER BUGS Act of 2023,” Congress.gov, March 1, 2023, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/1305>.

¹⁵⁰ “Unleashing American Energy,” The White House, January 20, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/unleashing-american-energy/>.

¹⁵¹ Mike Hernon, “Building smart cities and counties with the Infrastructure Act,” American City and County, January 27, 2022, <https://www.americancityandcounty.com/smart-cities/building-smart-cities-and-counties-with-the-infrastructure-act>.

¹⁵² “Restoring Freedom of Speech and Ending Federal Censorship,” The White House, January 20, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/restoring-freedom-of-speech-and-ending-federal-censorship/>.

¹⁵³ “Comer Announces Markup of Bills to Protect Speech from Government Censorship,” Committee on Oversight and Accountability, February 23, 2023, <https://oversight.house.gov/release/comer-announces-markup-of-bills-to-protect-speech-from-government-censorship>.

¹⁵⁴ “What They’re Saying: Support for Bill to Protect Speech from Government Censorship,” Committee on Oversight and Accountability, March 8, 2023, <https://oversight.house.gov/release/what-theyre-saying-support-for-bill-to-protect-speech-from-government-censorship/>. See also:

“H.R.140 - Protecting Speech from Government Interference Act,” Congress.gov, January 9, 2023, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/140/text/>.

¹⁵⁵ “H.R.4848 - Censorship Accountability Act,” Congress.gov, July 25, 2023, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/4848/text>.

¹⁵⁶ “Comer Announces Markup of Bills to Protect Speech from Government Censorship,” Committee on Oversight and Accountability, February 23, 2023, <https://oversight.house.gov/release/comer-announces-markup-of-bills-to-protect-speech-from-government-censorship>; see also: “H.R.1162 - Accountability for Government Censorship Act,” Congress.gov, February 24, 2023, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/1162>.

¹⁵⁷ “H.R.417 - End U.N. Censorship Act,” Congress.gov, January 15, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/417/text>. See also: “H.R.5531 - End U.N. Censorship Act,” Congress.gov, September 18, 2023, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/5531/text>.

¹⁵⁸ “H.R.9850 - No Funding or Enforcement of Censorship Abroad Act,” Congress.gov, September 25, 2024, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/9850/text/>.

¹⁵⁹ “Pact for the Future, Global Digital Compact and Declaration on Future Generations Key Deliverables and U.S. Explanation of Position,” United States Mission to the United Nations, October 15, 2024, <https://usun.usmission.gov/pact-for-the-future-global-digital-compact-and-declaration-on-future-generations-key-deliverables-and-u-s-explanation-of-position/>.

¹⁶⁰ Frank Biermann, “Mexico Bans Solar Geoengineering Experiments,” Solar Geoengineering Non-Use Agreement, February 5, 2023, <https://www.solargeoeng.org/mexico-bans-solar-geoengineering-experiments/>; “Political Momentum for Solar Geoengineering Non-Use Growing,” Center for International and Environmental Law, September 26, 2024, <https://www.ciel.org/news/growing-momentum-for-solar-geoengineering-non-use/>; Heleen Bruggink and Carol Bardi, “UN-Science Summit: Countries Call for the Non-Use of Solar Geoengineering,” Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, October 29, 2024, <https://www.boell.de/en/2024/10/29/un-science-summit-countries-call-non-use-solar-geoengineering>.

¹⁶¹ Note, separate hearings could be held on each specific topic; however, they are included in the same recommendation as Liberty Counsel Action believes it is vital to consider their combined effects as a whole.

¹⁶² Joseph Versen, Zaruhi Mnatsakanyan, and Johannes Urpelainen, “Preparing the United States for security and governance in a geoengineering future,” *Brookings*, December 14, 2021, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/preparing-the-united-states-for-security-and-governance-in-a-geoengineering-future/>.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ Michael Birnbaum, “A ‘climate solution’ that spies worry could trigger war,” *The Washington Post*, February 27, 2023, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2023/02/27/geoengineering-security-war/>.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ “ODNI Releases National Intelligence Estimate on Climate Change,” Office of the Director of National Intelligence, October 21, 2021, <https://www.dni.gov/index.php/newsroom/press-releases/press-releases-2021/3574-odni-releases-national-intelligence-estimate-on-climate-change>.

¹⁶⁷ “National Intelligence Estimate: Climate Change and International Responses Increasing Challenges to US National Security Through 2040,” National Intelligence Council, 2021, https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/assessments/NIE_Climate_Change_and_National_Security.pdf. Note: By their assessment, “the lack of any country level dialogue or governance body to set regulations and enforce transparency over research increases the possibility that state or nonstate actors will independently develop or

deploy the technology— possibly covertly—in a manner that risks conflict if other nations blame them for a weather disaster they believe was caused by geoengineering.”

¹⁶⁸ Heleen Bruggink and Carol Bardi, “UN-Science Summit: Countries Call for the Non-Use of Solar Geoengineering,” Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, October 29, 2024, <https://www.boell.de/en/2024/10/29/un-science-summit-countries-call-non-use-solar-geoengineering>.

¹⁶⁹ Charles Pekow, “Will we be ready? Geoengineering policy lags far behind pace of climate change,” *Mongabay*, August 26, 2024, <https://news.mongabay.com/2024/08/will-we-be-ready-geoengineering-policy-lags-far-behind-pace-of-climate-change/>.

¹⁷⁰ “Remarks by President Trump on Iran,” The White House, January 8, 2020, <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-iran/>.

¹⁷¹ Maureen Condic, “A Scientific View of When Life Begins,” *Charlotte Lozier Institute*, June 11, 2014, <https://lozierinstitute.org/a-scientific-view-of-when-life-begins/>.

¹⁷² “Brief of United Nations Mandate Holders as Amici Curiae in Support of Respondents,” U.S. Supreme Court, September 20, 2021, https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/19/19-1392/193045/20210920163400578_19-1392%20bsac%20United%20Nations%20Mandate%20Holders.pdf. UN Mandate Holders appointed by the UNHRC submitted an amicus brief to the Supreme Court on the *Dobbs* case, which argued, “safe and legal abortion access constitutes a critical part of human rights . . . including . . . the right to freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment.”

¹⁷³ For examples, see: “Evidence of Systemic and Unlawful Promotion of Abortion by UN Secretariat, Agencies, and Other UN Entities,” *C-FAM*, September 24, 2024, <https://c-fam.org/wp-content/uploads/Abortion-Factsheet-September-2024-V2.pdf>.

¹⁷⁴ For example, see: “Abortion,” United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, 2020, https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/INFO_Abortion_WEB.pdf.

¹⁷⁵ “Risch, Colleagues Introduce Bill to Expand Prohibitions on Use of Foreign Assistance Funding for Abortions,” Foreign Relations Committee, January 30, 2025, <https://www.foreign.senate.gov/press/rep/release/risch-colleagues-introduce-bill-to-expand-prohibitions-on-use-of-foreign-assistance-funding-for-abortions>.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.* (See on pager on the act.)

¹⁷⁷ “Protecting Life in Foreign Assistance Act,” Mike Lee | U.S. Senator for Utah, January 2025, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/services/files/80851716-9528-4735-8F23-BD9F957BF5B8>.

¹⁷⁸ Kellie Moss and Jennifer Kates, “The Mexico City Policy: An Explainer,” *KFF*, October 25, 2024, <https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/issue-brief/the-mexico-city-policy-an-explainer/#footnote-643131-12>.

¹⁷⁹ “Memorandum for the Secretary of State the Secretary of Defense the Secretary of Health and Human Services the Administrator of the United States for International Development,” The White House, January 24, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/memorandum-for-the-secretary-of-state-the-secretary-of-defense-the-secretary-of-health-and-human-services-the-administrator-of-the-united-states-for-international-development/>.

¹⁸⁰ “H.R.49 - No Pro-Abortion Task Force Act,” *Congress.gov*, January 3, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/49/text>. Specifically the bill outlines that “No Federal funds may be used for—(1) the HHS Reproductive Healthcare Access Task Force, announced by the Secretary of Health and Human Services on January 21, 2022; or (2) any successor or substantially similar task force.”

¹⁸¹ This would, for example, include review of the USAID Policy Guidelines on Voluntary Sterilization and the USAID Policy Paper on Population Assistance. Indeed, as the latter opens the door to the justification of abortion on demand to control population growth, said policy should (most likely) be rescinded.

¹⁸² “Reevaluating and Realigning United States Foreign Aid,” The White House, January 20, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/reevaluating-and-realigning-united-states-foreign-aid/>. Said review should ensure all foreign aid is compliant with all relevant legislation, akin to a 2020 request made by 60 Members of Congress that the Trump administration enforce the Siljander Amendment by having “U.S. diplomats . . . insist that international agreements and multilateral assistance not include abortion ‘under the guise of sexual and reproductive health.’” See: “Abortion Funding Restrictions in Foreign Assistance Legislation,” April 12, 2024, Congressional Research Service, <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF12235>.

¹⁸³ “The Geneva Consensus Declaration,” The Institute for Women’s Health, accessed February 25, 2025, <https://www.theiwh.org/the-gcd/>.

¹⁸⁴ “S.Con.Res.4 - A concurrent resolution expressing support for the Geneva Consensus Declaration on Promoting Women’s Health and Strengthening the Family and urging that the United States rejoin this historic declaration,” *Congress.gov*, January 13, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bil/119th-congress/senate-concurrent-resolution/4/text> and H.Con.Res.3 - Expressing support for the Geneva Consensus Declaration on Promoting Women’s Health and Strengthening the Family and urging that the United States rejoin this historic declaration, *Congress.gov*, January 13, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/bil/119th-congress/house-concurrent-resolution/>.

¹⁸⁵ “Fact Sheet: United States to Announce Commitments to the Generation Equality Forum,” The American Presidency Project, June 30, 2021, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/06/30/fact-sheet-united-states-to-announce-commitments-to-the-generation-equality-forum/>.

¹⁸⁶ “Frequently asked questions on the Convention on the Rights of the Child,” UNICEF, accessed February 25, 2025, <https://www.unicef.org/child-rights-convention/frequently-asked-questions>.

¹⁸⁷ Grace Melton, “No, Abortion Is Not a Human Right,” *The Heritage Foundation*, November 16, 2023, <https://www.heritage.org/life/report/no-abortion-not-human-right>.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.* See also “General comment No. 20 (2016) on the implementation of the rights of the child during adolescence,” United Nations, December 6, 2016, <https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/g16/404/44/pdf/g1640444.pdf>.

¹⁸⁹ “General comment No. 15 (2013) on the right of the child to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health (art. 24),” United Nations, April 17, 2013, <https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/g13/428/14/pdf/g1342814.pdf>.