



The Solari Report

November 14, 2019

Sneaky Treaties: Globalists and the Corruption of International Law with Amy Benjamin



Catherine Austin Fitts



Amy Benjamin



Guest: Amy Benjamin

Summary: This week, Amy Benjamin returns to The Solari Report to educate us about the use of international treaties to circumvent domestic political process and law.

Bio: Amy is a legal scholar and lecturer in Public International Law at Auckland University of Technology Law School. Her research centers on the evolution of the concept of state sovereignty from the 'Thirty Years' War to the present and on the asymmetric aspects of the laws of war. She has published about government secrecy, international treaties, and 9/11. In this interview, Amy does her usual masterful job of unpacking this highly complex, important topic.

Discussion Topics:

- A. Sneaky Treaties
- B. Harold Koh-Obama Administration's Ratification of the Paris Climate Accords
- C. Should instead of Shall
- D. Violate International Law
- E. Create Legal Treaties Without Going Through Any Kind of a Treaty Process
- F. Engineer Globalism
- G. Do Not Believe in the Constitution
- H. Different Kinds of Treaties
- I. Engineer Dictatorship
- J. Notice-and-Comment Rulemaking Procedure
- K. Going to War Without Congressional Approval
- L. FASAB 56
 - Unilateral International Agreement-Making Power
- M. Paris Agreement
- N. Law and Money
- O. Power Grab

- P. Brexit
- Q. Judiciary is Involved
- R. Deferring to Academics as Though They Are Experts
- S. Useful and Other Idiots
- T. Greater Transparency
- U. Global Migration Compact
- V. Arms Trade Treaty
- W. Treaties Are the Big Enemy of Globalists
- X. NGOs-Non-Governmental Organizations
- Y. Narco Dollars for Beginners
- Z. Human Rights as a Weapon
- AA. Technocracy
- BB. Sneaky Treaties are an Integral Part For Central Control
- CC. A-Political
- DD. Intelligence Community
- EE. The Transpacific Partnership
- FF. Intellectual Feats
- GG. Get Smart and Bring This Issue to the People Who Represent Us

C. Austin Fitts: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to The Solari Report. I am with Amy Benjamin who joins us from New Zealand. She has been on The Solari Report twice before. One of the most popular reports we have ever done is her discussion on secrecy based on a wonderful piece that she published on the issue of governmental secrecy. It's a must-listen-to interview, and I am pleased to have her back.

She has a new article coming out in January, and we will post it with this report when it comes out. It's on the topic of, what I call, **'Sneaky Treaties'**.

Amy being a legal scholar and lecturer at a law school has a much more accurate description of it, but I will let her tell you all about it.

Amy, thank you for joining us on The Solari Report.

Amy Benjamin: Thank you for having me again, Catherine. It's a pleasure.

Fitts: Tell us about the article – how it came about and your interest in this topic. You are an expert on international law, but this is a particular slice. Lead us into the history of how this became of interest to you and how you wrote the article.

Benjamin: It actually came out of my research. My interest was piqued because in doing my article on secrecy, I came across the work of a very prominent scholar in the United States, former Yale law school dean and current **Yale law professor, Harold Koh**. He wrote an article about trying to justify the **Obama Administration's ratification of the Paris Climate Accords** without Congress's involvement, and he tried to justify that.

Of course, in doing that, he said that the agreement didn't require any Congressional approval because it represented just a political commitment on the part of the Obama Administration, and that could be seen by the very careful use of language in the Accord itself. The use of certain modal verb forms made it clear that the parties to the agreement would only be required to 'try their best' to reduce emissions; they would not be held to account for any outcomes.

From a transparency perspective – since my article was on secrecy – I was interested in that. He was basically saying that we are going to represent the United States' commitment and that of all the other parties as just an aspirational commitment, and we are going to use certain modal verb forms such as **'should' instead of 'shall'** to obfuscate the level of commitment. This was to obfuscate it for the public and obfuscate it for people who think that Congress should be involved in ratifying it. So, from a transparency perspective, my interest was really piqued by that.

It seemed to represent a sort of underhanded or 'sneaky' way of cutting Congress out of the loop. So when I was finished, I included it from the transparency perspective in my article on secrecy.

After my article was published, I thought, "This is very interesting what Koh and others have been up to with this treaty." It was 'kicking around' in the back of my mind this issue of engineering a course of global order through devices like manipulation of language and treaties. So, that was somewhat 'kicking around' in the back of my mind.

In early 2017 two things came across my desk in the news. One was a UN bureaucrat writing the Trump Administration a letter stating that the Administration's plan to repeal Obamacare would **violate international law**.

Fitts: What?

Benjamin: I read that letter very carefully and it is in the article. I started with that because he said that repealing Obamacare would violate international law. That was quite an argument. I looked at the details of the argument, and I saw that he was reading international doctrine related to sources of international legal obligation in a very idiosyncratic way – to put it euphemistically. So I thought, “That’s interesting.” It somewhat reminded me of Koh and his modal verb forms.

Then soon thereafter, another UN bureaucrat by the name of Philip Alston, who is also a major international law scholar, descended upon the United States and did a poverty tour. He issued a report saying that the Trump Administration's plan for tax reform and tax reduction might run afoul of international law. Again, he made what seemed to be dubious arguments based on sources of international legal obligation.

By this time, my interest was really piqued because it seemed that I had three examples of scholars making very aggressive and dubious arguments based on sources law, which is what international scholars refer to when talking about sources of international legal obligations. So, that ‘set me off’ and running and a year later, I have a 70-page article about it.

Fitts: It's very shocking. Clearly, you are writing for a very serious audience, so you are trying not to be shocking. But basically, what you have is a group of people conspiring to **create legal treaties without going through any kind of a treaty process** and manipulating domestic laws top-down without any kind of legal process and completely in violation of the Constitution.

Benjamin: That is an understatement. It is difficult to read much of the scholarly literature and not get very, very angry. I have to do a little meditation before I delve into it, and certainly before I sit down to write.

The academics have been on the globalist bandwagon since the early 1990's, and they have consistently provided arguments in favor of whatever changes in legal doctrine have been needed to **engineer globalism**.

They provide the academic cover, and that is what the article is about. It is an analysis of the scholarly discourse that has been dished up to engineer globalism. It has been sneaky, and some scholars don't feel like they want to hide that anymore.

As you can see from my discussion of Harold Koh and his reaction to the Trump Administration, and some of his proposals to stop the Trump Administration from enacting its policy agenda, the veil has come down. Some of the proposals are extreme, and they don't even try to hide it anymore.

Fitts: These are lawyers who **do not believe in the Constitution.**

Benjamin: They certainly don't seem to believe in the virtues of representative democracy anymore. I will certainly say that. Yes, I am sure that many of them would be against some of the fundamental protections in the Bill of Rights such as the Second Amendment and the First Amendment and the Fourth Amendment.

There is democracy, and then there are rights. The Constitution has both, and establishment scholars who tend to be globalists – because that is where the money is and has been for the last 30 years – don't think much of the Constitution.

Fitts: Let's go back to US law 101. If the Federal government wants to enter into a treaty, it needs to be ratified by Congress. Is that correct?

Benjamin: Usually, but here are **different kinds of treaties.** Some treaties are for the Senate by super majority vote. These require two-thirds of the Senate, and the House of Representatives doesn't have a say at all. These are Senate-ratified treaties. Then there have been innovations off that which are provided for in the Constitution but are widely accepted, and I don't have a problem with them. They are called Congressional-Executive agreements where you have the President on a board, and then both Houses of Congress by simple majority vote, approve it as they would a simple garden variety statute.

But in both cases, some or all of Congress is involved. What the Obama Administration did is innovate a different kind of international agreement that only the President needed to be involved in, and they did it in a variety of ways.

They basically tried to cut Congress out of it, and Harold Koh provided a number of legal justifications for those kinds of euphemistically ‘innovative’ types of agreements where only the President need approve it. That is quite a big deal.

Fitts: So, we are looking at the international law equivalent of dictatorship – of figuring out how to **engineer dictatorship** – so that the President can enter into a treaty, and somehow it can be binding on US law and citizens even though it hasn’t been ratified by anyone in Congress.

Benjamin: Yes, although the arguments obviously won’t be nearly as honest as that.

What did the Obama Administration do? It did a couple of things. In the case of the Paris Climate Accords, they changed the modal verb forms to ‘should’ instead of ‘shall’. They could say that the United States’ commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions was an aspirational one, therefore a political one, and that the United States wouldn’t be in any kind of legal breach if it failed to reach a certain level of emissions cuts. Since it was just an aspirational commitment, Congress did not need to be involved.

The problem with that and the way we can debunk that rather easily is because, pursuant to that ostensibly ‘political commitment’, Obama directed his administrative agencies to enact very legally binding administrative regulations that are very legal. So, this political commitment is anchored at the domestic level with real legal teeth.

Fitts: Can’t those regulations be stopped by Congress?

Benjamin: The regulations can be repealed by the administrative agency, but that is quite a legal process in and of itself. Usually you need a **‘Notice- and- Comment Rulemaking’ procedure**. It’s not so easy to do, and the Congress – the Democrats in the House – aren’t going to want to be repealing any Paris regulations. They aren’t going to be leaning on the EPA and other agencies to do that.

The agencies might find themselves scrutinized by this Democratic Congress – at least the House – if they were to try to do it. So, the point is that these ostensibly political commitments if they are anchored domestically by regulations, have real inertia. They are very difficult to dislodge.

In that sense, it is close to a dictatorship, and it is done under very false pretenses because Obama unilaterally signed the United States up to a political pledge that his successor is finding difficult to dislodge.

Fitts: Let me bring up one other thing. During the same period, we see the countries regularly **going to war without Congressional approval**. I don't know much about the Iran deal, but what I've been told is that it was never even signed by the Iranians. So, it was a question of what it is, but as I remember, it certainly wasn't approved by Congress. Isn't that the case?

Benjamin: Yes, it was not approved by Congress. I cannot vouch for a lack of signatures, but Congress was cut out of that as well.

In a sense, I think there are other problems with the Iran deal. What payments were made? How much? Didn't we see pallets of cash in the millions of dollars going over there? I imagine some of that money was kicked back to European leaders and to the US as well. The whole thing just 'stinks to high heaven'.

The fact that Congress was cut out of the loop on that one bothers me, but not quite so much as the Paris Accords because with Paris, you have real domestic legal ramifications. You have regulations in place anchoring that political commitment that constrained the activities of domestic actors, corporations, individuals, and everybody.

When you are cutting out the national legislature regarding laws and regulations that will be impacting domestic actors, that is a real coup. That may be the most extreme form of a power grab.

Fitts: Let me bring up **FASAB 56**, because if you add FASAB 56, you are saying that the executive branch can spend whatever they want whenever they want. They can issue as many bonds as they want. They can keep it all secret in addition to running around the world and making secret treaties and deals without Congressional approval. So it is appropriations, it is borrowing, it is treaties, and it is wars. What is left for Congress to do?

Benjamin: I'll be quite disappointed in the Trump Administration if it seeks to exercise the '**unilateral international agreement-making power**' of the Obama Administration because that is a real matter of principle, and they shouldn't do it. They should abjure it. They should recant. They should say, "We are not going to be doing this. We will include Congress."

Yes, FASAB 56 is on the books, and it was placed on the books during the Trump Administration, but I haven't seen Trump and his state department and his DOJ claim that he can be entering into formal international agreements without Congress' consent. If and when I see that, I will be very disappointed because that power is just way too unconstrained.

Fitts: Let's go back to the **Paris Agreement**. We have in essence, a treaty created without going through a real treaty process. The new President cancelled our participation in the Paris Agreement. Then recently, he moved forward with the formal process necessary to give a year's notice. So he gave the notice, and how he is moving forward with the formal ending. We see that whole community screaming as if he was abrogating a treaty when he is not.

Benjamin: He is abrogating a treaty. A treaty is only an agreement between two countries. It is a treaty, but the most consequential provision of that concerned the emissions reductions commitments of the states signing the treaty, and that was the one that was put in aspirational language. In those crucial provisions, instead of saying – as a hypothetical – that each state party agrees they 'shall achieve a certain emissions reductions outcome' it says (and I'm paraphrasing here) that 'they will make their best effort, all things considered, regarding their economy and the situation'.

'Making the best effort' means that if they fail to achieve the outcome they are aspiring to, it doesn't create a right of redress on the part of any other country. They are not in legal breach.

So it is a treaty, but it contains that the operative provision is just an aspirational one. So, he is withdrawing from the treaty, but the criticism is completely misplaced.

Fitts: If the Senate hasn't approved that, how can it be a legally binding treaty on the United States?

Benjamin: I argue in my article that it can't be; it isn't. If it were purely a political commitment with no legal ramifications, that would be one thing, and I would say that that is okay. But as I said with the administrative regulations in place that are anchoring it, that makes it have legal repercussions. Suddenly, it's not just a political commitment.

The Paris Agreement was concluded against the backdrop of a framework treaty, which I think was in 1992. This was the framework treaty- I can't remember the name-that was the UN treaty on climate. The senate ratified that big framework treaty in the 1990's saying they did anticipate that other agreements to address the climate issue would be entered into pursuant to this framework treaty. But the senate made clear when it ratified, that if any future agreement had legal ramifications or created legal commitments that the senate expected, such agreements would be presented to the senate.

In other words, critics of President Trump claim that, in a sense, Paris was 'blessed' by Congress because it was made pursuant to a prior treaty that the senate had ratified, but it wasn't. The senate that ratified the framework treaty clearly anticipated that any future agreement with legal ramifications would be presented to the senate and Congress, and Paris was not.

I argue that Paris was not a valid exercise of unilateral Presidential agreement-making power and it violated the Constitution. That is my take in terms of Congressional and Presidential power.

Fitts: You are discussing **law**, but let me talk '**money**' for a bit.

When Trump was considering taking the US out of the Paris Agreement, I read it and I hadn't read it before. What was astonishing to me was they were talking about something that if truly implemented, it could have unbelievably dramatic impact on the lives and economy of the United States. You are talking about major changes in how people live and where they live. You are talking about 'gut-wrenching' changes and essentially, 'gut-wrenching' taxes paid to central authorities.

Benjamin: And that is why Congress needed to be involved.

Fitts: You are talking about something that has unbelievably dramatic impacts on the citizens of the United States. This is not a little thing.

I don't mean to exaggerate, but if somebody said, "We are going to go to Paris and agree with everybody, and we are going to take away all of your homes," the hubris of it is so astonishing that it is hard to describe. It is also hard to face the backlash that Trump took for doing what any thinking person would have done. It is exactly what I would have done; I would have just torn the thing up.

It is shocking that they had the hubris to do it, and it is shocking, if you look at the discussion going on right now, because there is no doubt that you are talking about taking a massive amount of financial resources and turning them over to a small handful of non-accountable people who would have enormous central control of the global economy.

Benjamin: Yes, and the globalists have reached a point where the **power grab** is just so obvious, and we can call it out. It was developing slowly beginning in the 1990's as they did a little forward here and a little forward there with baby steps. Now the power grab is covered by scholars. They launder the ideas for the globalists along with the foundations, and the steps have become bolder and bolder. The reaction to any resistance has really become bolder and bolder.

Just look at what is happening in Britain with the Remainers who have opposed **Brexit**. Some of these globalists are 'flat-out' calling for the cancellation of Brexit like the liberal democrats. They are really being flushed out into the open. They are now saying exactly what they want, which is completely counter to democratic governance and any restraints on centralization of power. It's all very much out in the open now.

Fitts: You are talking about a series of constituencies who make large amounts of money on centralizing control. So, let's go back to Koh and the group because this is really amazing. This is a group of legal scholars who get together and figure out how to create all sorts of binding intellectual international treaties without any Congressional approval whatsoever. It is quite astonishing.

Benjamin: And the **judiciary is involved** also. There are globalist judges who are complicit as well. I think that the globalists were hoping to get judges in place that would agree and implement some of these scholarly arguments. Some have been quite open to them. That is one thing that we should really watch for in any future Supreme Court nominations. The candidates or nominees going forward should really be queried about that. There are a number of questions to ask on that front.

The question of the role of international law domestically and in interpreting key provisions of the US Constitution is one that every nominee should be grilled on.

Fitts: Let's talk about **Koh**. Who is this person, and where did he come from?

Benjamin: He is a long-standing professor at Yale Law School. When I was at Yale, I didn't take his class, but I obviously knew who he was. Then he went on to be the Dean of Yale Law School and served a stint as dean. He has been in and out of government and the state department. He was a senior government official in charge of human rights. I think he had a human rights portfolio at the state department for a while. He was in the state department during the Obama Administration, and then he went back to Yale. He has been in the so-called 'Trump resistance' since 2017. I think he worked with the student clinic at Yale law to file lawsuits opposing Trump's immigration policies. Obviously, he opposes Trump's withdrawal from Paris, and has written a couple of articles that discuss that.

For all I know, he might be filing a lawsuit today, tomorrow, or next week seeking to enjoin the Trump Administration's giving of notice on Paris. He might say that Trump doesn't have the power to take the United States out of Paris and needs Congress' support, which is a ridiculous argument because Congress wasn't involved in the making of Paris.

I site these statements in my article where he says, "Congress now needs to be involved."

The inconsistency is just mind-boggling because there you had Koh during Obama's Administration saying, "Congress doesn't need to be involved in the making of the Paris Agreement because it's just a political commitment; it is just an aspirational commitment."

Now that Hillary didn't win and Trump is in, and Trump wants to get out of it, now Koh – to preserve Paris – wants to say that Congress has to sign off on the withdrawal. This is the quality of academic discourse; this is the result-oriented nature just completely bare-knuckled now. It is so obvious.

I am so sick of people **deferring to academics as though they are experts**. Some of these people spout the most idiotic arguments, and they are accepted because these are respectable people.

Fitts: When I was Assistant Secretary of Housing and then worked as financial advisor for HUD, my experience with some of the most powerful pots of money in the country are the endowments at the different universities and foundations. The Yale endowment and Harvard endowment are two of the most powerful.

Over time, I came to realize the conflicts of interest between what they were promoting academics, and how the endowments were making money was a coordinated game.

Benjamin: That should be investigated.

Fitts: Whenever I see an academic from one of the universities that has big endowments, I immediately dismiss them as somebody who is stalking for the endowment. They might not even know it; they are the ones doing what the endowment needs and the ones who get funded and promoted.

Benjamin: There are the **‘useful idiots’**, and then there are the **‘other idiots’**. I don’t think that Koh is a ‘useful idiot’; he is a co-conspirator.

There is a great deal of corruption between money interests and the universities that need to have the spotlight shone on it just as there is a great deal of corruption between these ostensibly nonprofit foundations and the world of the think tanks and the Military-Industrial Complex.

Going forward, we are going to need much **greater transparency** between the intellectual class, the intelligentsia, their work product, and the money interests. We have to be enabled to see the connection.

Fitts: I was in a meeting, but I won’t tell the whole story here because I spoke about it in the *Deep State* series. I was in a meeting where the secretary was negotiating with some wonderful people from the private sector about the new legislation that he was trying to get through for housing. He had these two assistants who had just come over from the Heritage Foundation, which, at the time, was doing a lot of work on housing.

Basically, they were proposing radical centralization of control of the money into Washington. One of the private sector people said, “I thought you were Republican, and you are for decentralization.”

The person from the Heritage Foundation said, “Yeah, but we are here now.”

That is what these people reminded me of: If it makes us money and it’s good for us, it’s good.

Benjamin: The universities have lost their way, and they have to find it again.

Fitts: Let's turn to the **Global Migration Compact** because that was another example you suggested that we look at in terms of 'sneaky treaties'. What is the Global Migration Compact?

Benjamin: It is a treaty. The treaty is legally binding, but its most important provisions are a set of innocent, aspirational, or political commitments on the part of the state's parties to do their best to regularize global migration. They want to regularize it and thereby, promote it and encourage it and enable it.

They commit to adjusting their national systems to make immigration into their countries easier, to make the requirements more transparent, and thereby, hope to get more immigrants and more migratory flows up and running. It is more user-friendly, if you will, because every country until now, has had its own idiosyncratic immigration requirements and standards and criteria. There is a certain amount of harmonization required by the compact.

The overall goal is to get global populations more up and moving. These are political commitments, so no state party can be held to account if they don't achieve a certain amount of change in their domestic regulatory framework within a certain amount of time. They won't be in breach of anything, and there will be no right of redress on the part of any of their state's party. So, these are a set of political commitments.

The thing is that these aspirational commitments in the hands of scholars – after a little time passes – might get a number of them saying that these immigration policies have morphed into something called customary international law, which is a very indirect form of law creation that is based on state conduct. Scholars have a large role in saying whether a norm of customary international law is formed or not. Once it is formed, it binds all states regardless of whether they signed up for the initial treaty or not.

Fitts: So, the United States was one of the parties who voted against it, and didn't sign it. So, you are saying that somehow we can still be held accountable to comply?

Benjamin: Possibly, because there might be a movement. Some time will have to pass. I think a good number of states have refused to become state parties to the Global Migration Compact, but in any event, the tactic that has been used in the past is to let a little time pass and then say that the provisions of a treaty have passed in the corpus of this customary international law.

The reason that is important is because the custom, if it is declared to be such and accepted to be such by the international community, will bind any state regardless of whether they signed a treaty that gave rise to the custom unless the state is, what we say, ‘has persistently objected’ to the customary norm as it was in the process of formation. This is all very esoteric, but it is a very useful tactic for globalization because it tends to throw the burden onto the objecting states who strenuously object just to keep out of the evolving customary norm.

It is not enough just to reject the initial treaty. The state has to then strenuously object to any customary norm that evolves out of it, and that is very difficult to do because of the doctrine related to persistent objection.

It is a very clever tactic, which I discuss at length in the article. For instance, it is states that have rejected a treaty or reserve to a treaty. It is very, very clever, and globalist scholars have done it as a matter of course since the 1990’s.

Fitts: Let me ask you about the **Arms Trade Treaty**. That is another example that you mentioned.

Benjamin: This is a treaty with some binding legal commitments to require state’s parties to put domestic controls in to ensure that they are not exporting arms to countries where the arms may be used to commit certain egregious crimes – crimes against humanity or genocide or crimes against women and children, etc. Basically, it’s a treaty where state parties commit to making sure that they don’t export arms that are used badly by the importing population.

These are really good commitments, and a number of countries have not signed. Russia and the United States have not signed, and I don’t know about China. But you already have NGO activists out there saying that it is just a matter of time before a customary norm develops off this treaty which will ensnare non-state parties in a non-signatory treaty and force them, unless they persistently object, into compliance with the relevant treaty provisions as a matter of international custom, if not as a matter of the treaty because they refused the treaty.

Customary international law – which was an old-fashioned way of law formation prior to the era of treaties – has been weaponized against treaties, and it has been weaponized in a way that is meant to get all the treaty rejecters and treaty preservers into the corral via subsequently arising custom. I call it the ‘sheepdog function’.

It is very sneaky, and the tactic is played out at the domestic level, too, but in a slightly different scenario whereby, custom is used to get around the fact that sometimes Congress or the senate ratifies a treaty. That is not implemented domestically, so custom is used to get around that failure to implement.

In a way, I wouldn't want to delve into it because it's a bit of a long story, but the custom has been weaponized at both levels – domestic and international – to get around the voluntarist problem that treaties pose. Treaties are lovely for sovereigntists like me because there are so many ways that the state can register its choices and desires relative to treaties.

Treaties are the big enemy, if you will, **of globalists**, and they are trying to either get around treaties and the volunteerist nature of treaties, or they are trying to redefine treaties.

Fitts: Let's talk a little about the **NGOs (Non-Governmental Organization)**. In my experience, the NGOs are up to their 'eyeballs' in all of this. Part of it is when you talk about weaponizing the process, the more complicated it becomes, the more overwhelming it becomes for many, many people. When you have a large number of people – whether it's academics or NGOs – funded to figure this out and make it go, you are talking about a tsunami of complexity that can be very overwhelming to the political process.

Benjamin: Yes.

Fitts: Tell us about NGOs.

Benjamin: The bottom line is that I absolutely 'hate' them. I hate them almost as much as I hate the nonprofit foundations. Give me a break! They claim to be the global do-gooders doing the public's business, but they are accountable to no one. Their donors are often opaque, and if you scratch the surface of some, I imagine that with many of these NGOs you will find Soros or a Soros-like person behind them.

These are not organizations that can inject a democratic element into the international political and legal space, and they have been touted as such an element. I fully reject that. They serve their own interests and those of their donors.

I think they are behind some policies that I personally disagree with. They tend to be ‘progressive’ in their outlook, which means fascist. I think they rose to prominence in the 1990’s, and then they were demanding seats at the international law-making table at all these conferences and conventions and international law-making events. They have been let in by the states when they have been useful, and they have been kept at bay at other times.

They are very loud, and they are the international law. They man the international law and politics shriek-o-meter, and they are extremely noxious. I would like to see much more transparency regarding their funding – just like the foundations and the academics. Whenever they say something, they should have a sign saying who funded that report and who paid for that campaign.

Fitts: In the United States, any not-for-profit is required to disclose the last three years of their tax returns if asked. In fact, I once asked the University of Pennsylvania for their last three years of tax returns, and they didn’t respond. So, I had my attorney write a letter asking again, and I got a call from one of my relatives screaming at me that my brother (who at the time was the Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School) had called and said that he had been called into the Provost’s office. If I didn’t back down on the tax returns, my brother would be fired. This was all during the litigations.

My brother exaggerates, so I’m sure that isn’t exactly what happened, but I was told, basically that my own family would attack and destroy me if I didn’t back down on requesting the last three years of tax returns of the University of Pennsylvania. And I should mention that I have a BA and an MBA from the University of Pennsylvania.

Benjamin: Oh my goodness! Dare I ask what happened?

Fitts: I decided to back down because, in fact, if you look at why I was asking, I can’t say that it was of major importance to me. I wasn’t planning on writing about the University of Pennsylvania, but they kept asking me to donate money. I would raise a great deal of money for them, and they kept asking me to donate. I was being very critical of the Harvard endowment at the time, and I said, “It’s hypocritical of me to criticize Harvard and not at least look at the place I’m giving money to.”

So, I felt that it was a matter of integrity that I look, but it set off such a storm. I don't know if you remember the story of Harvard Watch, but it was Harvard tax returns that outed Harvard's role with Enron, which was quite a horrible story of what they were up to.

The tax returns can tell you plenty, and any not-for-profit under the laws of the United States has to give you those tax returns. It's hard work to get all the documents and go through them and publish them. Unfortunately, now that we don't have a body of investigative reporters working that beat, it doesn't happen. But you can get it.

You are right. You will find that there is a remarkably small amount of funding for these people.

I will tell you one story. I wrote an article once called *Narco Dollars for Beginners*. It 'rocketed' around the world because it was explaining the intersection between narcotics trafficking and related money laundering in Wall Street and Washington, but it was written to be funny. It was quite 'dead-on' as to how the system worked.

It was published by *Narco News*, which was funded by Soros. All the leaders of the war on drugs got very angry at me and organized and had a meeting with the person from *Narco News* complaining about this. They had emails going back and forth about how they were going to deal with me.

What came out in the email – and the people at *Narco News* were nice enough to send it to me – was they all were funded by Soros; all of them. It was shocking because there were ten different groups.

They were all funded by Soros, and my big 'bugaboo' with that group was to say, "Look, let's take out a blank sheet of paper, and let's look at how the money works and figure out the sources and uses of all the dollars. That is how we will bring transparency and make progress here," which they wouldn't touch. They wouldn't touch the money with a 'ten-foot pole'. Given that they were funded by Soros, now I know why.

What came out was that all ten groups were funded by Soros, and their number one concern was that I was going to take their funding away from them.

Benjamin: Oh, the corrupt showing the corruption!

Fitts: I had to write an email to them and say, “Look, I have a brand. My brand would be destroyed if I ever took any money from Soros. I have no interest in Soros’ money, so you have nothing to fear from me.”

But it was quite astonishing. On the NGO front, I’ve had numerous occasions of personally bumping into these groups at various times. It is so centralized that if I tried to describe how centralized their funding is, no one would believe me.

Benjamin: That does not surprise me at all. They proliferate as branches off a central trunk. No one sees the trunk; they just see this sea of NGOs all claiming to be do-gooders.

In fact, you probably can trace the funding back to one or two or just a small coterie of sources. It’s ridiculous, and it’s the same with the mainstream media.

Fitts: I feel that many of the people in the NGOs started off with a really good heart and a good intention, and they don’t realize that they are getting bought up and directed. They really don’t. They don’t see the game of how they get weaponized.

Naomi Klein had a great book on disaster capitalism called *The Shock Doctrine*, and she described how the Ford Foundation financed all these different activists and managed them in Latin America. So as the US interests are going through and raping the place, they keep the activists limited and focused on a limited number of areas so they don’t interrupt the play. You somewhat see how it works.

Benjamin: They compartmentalize many people. I don’t know what the percentage breakdown would be. Maybe 80% of the people involved in the NGOs are sincere, but then 20% are manipulative and corrupt. Maybe it’s 90% and 10% or 70% and 30%. I’m sure that more than half are fine, but most of management will be in on it and they are highly paid.

The thing that I most resent is that they are such virtue-signalers, and they are always very quick to condescend, and they are quick to tell us that we are barbaric. That is what really ‘rankles’ me.

Fitts: You are very eloquent. We have to get you back to talk about **human rights as a weapon** because you are very eloquent, and you have seen plenty of this.

Benjamin: I ‘hate’ human rights! I hate human rights – maybe as much as NGOs. I have colleagues who are human rights scholars, and I tell them on a daily basis, “I hate your work.”

Fitts: I want to turn now to **technocracy** because I perceive that there is a real effort underway globally to centralize control. Patrick Wood has done a series and he defined it as technocracy, but it is replacing markets and democracy with rule-making and software and AI. All these systems make it possible to micromanage everything and run very tight control. The big play on climate change and the Paris agreement is, now that we have had a financial coup d’état and created these corporate and investment monopolies, those monopolies are going to turn around and say, “You and the cows have been destroying the climate. None of these other things that we are doing – nuclear testing, depleting uranium, global spraying, and weather manipulation – are not a problem. You are the problem, and now we are going to get together and have much tighter control of you. We are going to reduce your resources so that we can be even bigger and more powerful monopolies.”

That is my vision of technocracy. Around the world you see people pushing back against it, whether it’s in Chile or Hong Kong or with the farmers in Europe. When I was in Europe they were going ‘nuts’ against all this nonsense.

I believe the **sneaky treaties are an integral part of this effort for central control**, and you have to see it in that context. This piece is a very, very important piece, and it is very rare.

You are the only legal scholar I know who has made it accessible to us.

Benjamin: Thank you for the compliment. The article, in a sense, wrote itself because it was such an interesting story to tell. Of course, it had been completely ignored by establishment scholars. It practically wrote itself because it’s just a wonderful story of this project to manipulate the doctrine of international law sources to engineer globalism. It’s an easy story to tell, and anyone listening to it – whether they are legally trained or not – should be able to understand it.

When I came into academia in 2016, there were so many stories that were being ignored – stories in plain sight that were very important. Talk about ‘low-hanging fruit’!

I could write about Libya because no one had written about it in the way that it needed to be done, and it was such an easy story. Syria was the same thing, as was secrecy and 9/11 and now Soros. So many compelling stories are just being ignored by scholars that it's rather easy to do. Because the stories have such internal logic, they are rather easy to tell.

I did want to say something about technocracy. The 'claim to fame' of the technocrats and how they justify their power – and I talk about this in the secrecy article, and I take aim at this claim – is that technocratic decision-making, so they say, is A-political.

“It's A-political. It's just interested in the best possible solution, whatever the context. It's not political in any way.”

Fitts: “Whatever makes the most money for our friends.”

Benjamin: Yes, and they are **A-political**, right? So, these technocrats are not left or right. They are not for the rich or for the poor; they are just interested on some sort of utilitarian calculus for the best possible solution, given the context.

We see this claim to A-political expertise pop up in the context of central banking and the Federal Reserve. “We are just pulling the technocratic levers of monetary policy; we are not trying to engineer outcomes or favor any financial or economic demographic. We are just interested in engineering an optimal monetary policy,” as if they had no political agenda at all.

That is how they justify being independent – independent of politically countable actors. They say, “We are not political, so we don't need to be monitored by politically accountable actors. In fact, being accountable to politically accountable actors like the President would compromise our work. It would make us focus on politics rather than on the facts or on the truth of any given issue”.

We actually see this in real time playing out with the **intelligence community**. I wanted to mention this to you because it's playing out in real time. What do I mean by that? John Brennan (a former CIA Director) was sitting next to another former CIA Director, John McLaughlin. An interview came out recently talking about how the intelligence community has admitted to the deep state intelligence community-driven coup against Trump. They are basically admitting it because more and more evidence is coming up about it. So, they are going to have to admit to it.

What was intriguing about their statements was that they were justifying it on a technocratic basis. They were saying that the intelligence community is not political; it's just about the facts and it is just about seeking the truth. They don't care whose 'ox they gore'; they just want to seek the truth. It was incredible.

They were defending themselves and this technocratic garb of A-politicization, and they were justifying their attempts to impede and take down the Trump Administration based on that. So, I think that we are at the high-water mark of technocracy. I think that it is going to go down, but they are not going to go down without a fight. We have to combat them at their strongest claim. We must contest this claim that they are A-political. We have to unmask that.

Fitts: It's not just that they are 'A-political', but that they are extremely 'intelligent and fact-based'.

In other words, "We are experts and we have access to all the scientific and economic data that you need to know what is best. So, we know what is best."

It is interesting that not long ago; we had a wonderful episode of our Future Science Series called *The Mathematics of Genetic Code*. When you study **physics** and you study **reality** at the deepest level, you learn that we are intelligent, the universe is intelligent, and the whole idea of markets or democracy is to capture that intelligence. It's to get the benefit of that shared intelligence.

I'll never forget when I was Assistant Secretary. When I got there, we were losing \$11 million a day in the single-family fund, which is required by law to be self-sustaining. So, we did this huge actuarial study and came up with a series of proposals of how to fix it.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary was very intelligent. He came in with Price Waterhouse and all these people. They said, "This is what we are going to do, and we are going to keep it secret until we plop it out there because it's important to keep it all secret, and we have all figured it out. We are the technocrats, and we have figured it out. We know what we are doing, and this is it."

I said, "Well, I am into the democratic process. I want to call in the top guys from all over the field office." So, I called in the top 20 people. They went into the room, and basically 'ripped it to shreds'.

If we had gone out with it publicly, we would have gotten ‘ripped to shreds’. It’s because once you apply something in a human and financial ecosystem, life is complicated. You need that intelligence figuring it out and emerging solutions on a much more emergent basis. That is what we have seen with these treaty processes.

The Transpacific Partnership was different, but they wanted to keep it secret. If it had been allowed in the public for people to say, “Okay, what is this going to do in a real world ecosystem,” you would realize that the technocrats are in way over their heads. They just don’t have access to the shared intelligence, which makes them phenomenally dangerous and stupid – not to mention all the fake science and fake economics.

Benjamin: They don’t necessarily produce good outcomes, and usually they hope for wars to occur at just the right time to give them cover for the collapse that resulted from their stupid decision-making. But they are not getting their war this time, and that is the problem. They were hoping that Trump would give them a war, and so far he has not.

They are completely without cover if we are talking about the central banks at the moment. They are exposed.

Fitts: The article is coming out in January. You are going to make it accessible. As soon as it is available, will you let me know so that we can add it to this discussion?

In closing I want to thank you again. I think that the sneaky treaties are a very important component of how central control is being engineered, and it is one that for someone like me, is almost impossible to understand. You have made it understandable.

You say you can do that and it is relatively easy, but I know that it is quite an intellectual feat. I have to say that your article on secrecy, your article on 9/11, and your article on secret treaties are all enormous **intellectual feats**. I encourage the subscribers to plug into them.

I think the weapon of choice to stop all the centralization is transparency, and you say that, and yet the complexity of it makes it very difficult to make it transparent. I think you have done an amazing thing here and I cannot thank you enough.

Benjamin: You are very welcome. It's very gratifying work, but I don't know how many big stories I have left to tell. I do feel that with this latest one, maybe I am done with the big stories.

Fitts: No, I disagree.

Benjamin: I have done the jus ad bellum; I've done the regime change wars; I've done Syria and Libya; and I have unmasked those wars for the ridiculous creatures they were.

Fitts: You still have to disagree with it-because it is not right.

Benjamin: Part of the effect of Libya and Syria interventions, which were done in the name of 'human rights', was to unmask that agenda as being ridiculously corrupt. I don't know how many big stories are still out there, but we will see. Thank you very much for the compliment.

Fitts: Before we close, is there anything else that you want to add about sneaky treaties and your article, *Globalists and the Corruption of Sources*?

Benjamin: I would only say that going forward, if ordinary citizens could become more aware of this project of instituting a more coercive order, and to become aware that there are things that we can do at the domestic level to frustrate it – such as making sure that we put pressure on our representatives in Congress to vet judicial nominees to see what their attitudes are regarding international law and the role it plays.

The globalists have tried to corrupt the judges. They have wined and dined them, but judges should be vetted not only for their views on abortion rights or Second Amendment rights, but their views of the rule of international law in the domestic American order. I think that we should pressure our senators to be on that topic and to be prepared to vet judicial nominees on that topic.

The other thing is to put pressure on our representatives and Congress not to feed congressional power to the executive branch. I don't know that President Trump will try to make international agreements behind Congress's back. I don't think that Trump is interested in making international agreements – these big multilateral deals that interested Obama so much. He likes bilateral issues, but that is not such a big threat.

Congress should not feed its Constitutional role of approving international agreements. That is not part of the general conversation that constituents have with their Congress people, “What is your stand on international agreements?”

That is simply not talked about domestically between citizens and their representatives, but it should be because it is very, very important. “What is your position on international agreements and Congress’ role in approving them?”

What I would leave your listeners and readers with is this: It’s time that we as a citizenry **get smart and bring this issue to the people who represent us.**

Fitts: I couldn’t agree more.

Amy Benjamin, thank you for joining us on The Solari Report. You have a wonderful day.

Benjamin: Thank you, Catherine. We will talk soon.

MODIFICATION

Transcripts are not always verbatim. Modifications are sometimes made to improve clarity, usefulness and readability, while staying true to the original intent.

DISCLAIMER

Nothing on The Solari Report should be taken as individual investment advice. Anyone seeking investment advice for his or her personal financial situation is advised to seek out a qualified advisor or advisors and provide as much information as possible to the advisor in order that such advisor can take into account all relevant circumstances, objectives, and risks before rendering an opinion as to the appropriate investment strategy.