

The Professor's Record: Garrett Ziegler

Thursday, 7/15/2021
19:00 MST

David Clements: Welcome to another episode of *The Professor's Record*. I'm David Clements, and tonight I'm joined by the one and only, Garrett Ziegler. Many of you might know who Garrett is if you've seen him on Telegram. Perhaps you've seen some of his posts related to Italy, Hunter Biden, among many other topics. I really didn't know who Garrett was for the longest time. But he reached out to me through Lin—through Lin Wood—and we've corresponded through back channels for quite some time, and I'm an admirer of his intellect, his work up to date. And so he just happened to be traveling through New Mexico—and you can believe that if you want to. But he's here!

Garrett Ziegler: LA to Dallas.

David Clements: And we're going to talk about a whole host of things that I think will be of great interest to you. So with that, Garrett, welcome.

Garrett Ziegler: Thank you very much for doing this. And good studio.

Garrett Ziegler: If there's been one good thing that's come out of the coup it's been meeting people across the country who obviously knew the 3rd was a scam. And so it's like meeting somebody in a foreign country, where you're both from America, there's a certain camaraderie, and there's a certain number of topics you don't have to talk about to know you're going to connect. And so that's why I was comfortable introducing myself to you because I like what you're doing. And I think that you're one of the few people with credentials, especially in academia, to even talk about these issues. Pretty much every powerful institution in the nation—from the big law firms, big accounting firms, even the big seminaries—are co-opted. And so I love what you're doing. And I appreciate the opportunity to talk and, partly, because there's been a dearth of interviews about the Trump administration. There's has been a lot of books. There's been a lot of money made on book deals, you know, from Pence himself! But there's been very few, I think, in-depth recollections of what's happened. I just did an interview with a French academic who's writing a book on populism—about the Le Pen movement in France and the Trump movement in America. And I think that's going to be good, as well.

David Clements: I could tell right away that I was dealing with someone with a lot of horses at work. The stuff that you're tackling is not easy. And it's not even easy for someone who's got credentials. One of the things that I want to ask you—before we get into ItalyGate, the Hunter Biden laptop, what happened with the Presidential election—how is it that one, Garrett Ziegler, got a job at the White House? That's a rare feat, so take us through that.

Garrett Ziegler: Well, I consider the White House to be a little bit like Brazil in that there's no middle class. So there's actually, in each Presidential administration, like if you go to the administrator Biden's staff list right now, you're going to see a lot of very highly paid individuals, like our “Circle Back Girl”, who is the Press Secretary. She's going to be raking in [\$\$]180[k]. And, there's going to be a lot of young people. And so it's not unprecedented that a very young person got a job at the White House, but I was very deliberate in who I wanted to work for—Peter Navarro—who's actually turning 72 today, so shout out to Peter. It's his 72nd birthday. He looks very good for 72. I hope to look as good as that at 72 and have the mental dexterity that he does. But, basically, I am a heretic. I don't believe in free trade. And, in that way, I'm like all of the American Founders. It just so happens that the Republican Party, today, is dominated by people who don't believe what the American Founders believe and believe in the fallacy of free trade. And I think that Peter—and I—believe in a version of free trade, where if you have the same currency, and you have the same social mores, you can have a little bit of free trade. But basically, what we have today is the worst of all worlds. America is getting economically raped and pillaged by pretty much every country in the world, and Peter was one of the few to recognize that and pretty much the only person with credentials to back that up. And, the President believes this at a visceral level—that we're getting ripped off economically, and everybody's stealing our IP, and it's just a gangbuster time. But, he had very few people in his corner that had the patina of the Harvard PhD, and I certainly don't have that. And Peter provided that for the President.

David Clements: Now, so how did you come to meet Peter?

Garrett Ziegler: Well, I met somebody—I'd known the person for years. His name's Richard. He's from Illinois, and he worked since day one. He got a job on day one in the White House. And so I connected with him and tried to get an internship in the White House my senior year of college with his help. And knowing Richard helped me. And so I got in as an intern, but I think they take like 50 interns per class and have three classes a year. And so there's about 150 interns that get cycled through. And, so the rate of interns that then translates to staff is pretty low. And so when I became an intern, I was surrounded by globalists. I was actually just talking to somebody about this the other day. It was actually under the Gary Cohn version of NEC. And I told Peter this eventually, and, obviously, I loathe Gary Cohn and everything he stands for because he truly doesn't care about the United States. He cares about the economy, which can be global. And I told Peter about this later, and we both got a chuckle. Because, you know, Peter was vociferously competing with Gary Cohn for both the President's ear and pretty much everything to do with human life.

David Clements: Let me stop you real quick. Because when red-blooded Americans hear the word “free trade” they think of freedom, they think of trade and commerce. Can you give us a little bit more precision on how you are pushing back against [it]? Obviously, free trade means something to you.

Garrett Ziegler: Yes.

David Clements: But I don't want our viewers to be confused by — “What does he mean he's against free trade? I thought even Donald Trump was for Free trade in some ways!” — so if you could flesh that out just a little bit — when you say free trade, what do you mean?

Garrett Ziegler: So when I when I think of free trade I'm taking it straight from the Ricardo-Keynesian model of no barriers between nations engaging in commerce. That is a very synthetic view of the world. So when people today—everybody at the Cato Institute, at all these libertarian, what I call conservatard institutions, they're defending that which doesn't exist in real life. And they're defending an economic model of no barriers between nations that is *artificial*. It doesn't exist. It's fairy dust. And so what I think the President did—and what Peter did, and I, as a humble young person, tried to do in their footsteps—was to explain to the world, the economy, *as it really is*. So if you're actually engaging in business with China—and you can talk to people who tried to outsource to China in the 90s, and even the oughts—and when you talk to those people, the people who were actually on the ground, the Chinese don't believe in that at all. They don't believe in barrier-less commerce. And so what the President was trying to do was bring our economic policy back to reality, back to this side of heaven where there *is* original sin, nations *do* have national interests, and they pursue them.

So, for example, going back to Italy, we think that this hacker who is alleged to have been involved, we don't know for sure—what we do know is true is that he has been stealing IP from Western firms for almost a decade. And he's a prodigy. He was somebody who is under the tutelage of high-up military industrial complex people in Italy. And so, how this relates back to free trade is that all of those entities that we interact with, that our corporate titans interact with day-to-day, they don't believe in it. And so we are trying to play basketball with one hand tied behind our back. And so, in a very concrete way, if Europe charges 25% for our Chevys to go over to Nuremberg, but we charge 10% for a Mercedes to go into South Carolina, that, by definition is not free trade. So what we're trying to do is cajole—the best case scenario is to strong arm, through diplomatic and other means, the Europeans to lower their tariffs, so our exporters can have a fair shot. But, in reality, what it's going to mean is that everybody is going to have to stop sucking off the teat of the United States.

David Clements: So, from a standpoint of trying to grasp at structures that some economists are familiar with, or at least students that take university classes, you've got like the Chicago Milton Friedman school and you've got the Mises crowd with the Hazlitts of the world, you've got the Keynesian model. If you had to overlay the America First, Peter Navarro-Trump model, where would you line that up along the schools of economics?

Garrett Ziegler: Well, this is where it's really important to talk about two people: Henry Clay, an American, a longtime senator from the south, during the 1850s. And then, a German man, named Friedrich List, who I really appreciate, and I try to talk about him as much as I can.

What we have to do is just simply go back to the American model. What the American model taught, and which was, in my opinion, and I can try to prove this if you gave me three hours and an internet connection, is that that's what made us strong. It's favoring domestic industry first. Taxes should only be collected to internally improve the state. So, for example, taxes for canals make a ton of sense because canals are public goods that can be used by all. But what we have now is, I think, the worst of all worlds where our taxes fund administrators at state, land-grant institutions teaching that all white people are inherently racist. And then you have decrepit roads. So the taxes aren't even going to internal improvements.

David Clements: So, I think the one thing, if I had to pick a school, I'm becoming more hip to the Trump way of looking...

Garrett Ziegler: ...at the American system.

David Clements: ...American system, or we'll call it the America First model, in the sense that it's definitely not textbook. It's like real life, "Let me tell you about a deal we just made with this country, and it was terrible." I mean, that's the way that Trump would talk. And he was really good at that. In fact, he was unassailable because he was giving concrete examples—not looking at the Laffer curve, or anything else where you're like, "Okay, what does that mean?"

I found more comfort in the Austrian School. Not to say that I'm a staunch defender of it, but when you have the Keynesian model, you kind of have...

Garrett Ziegler: ...it's definitely preferable.

David Clements: It's preferable. And I think whether it's *Americans for Prosperity*, or some of the other groups that are libertarian-leaning, the biggest critique that I'd hear them offer against Trump was just on the issue of tariffs.

Garrett Ziegler: Yes. And this is where precisely I love him the most. It's what separated him from every other single Republican candidate. And the reason why I have, sort of, the zeal of a 16th century Jesuit priest is because I don't have to invent anything. All the Founders have already written on this. I would urge all of your viewers to find—and I don't doubt they exist, [but] it's just very hard to find—one quote from a Founder that basically says that favoring our domestic industry is bad. They all—across the board—realize that domestic industry comes first, whether it's semiconductors—we don't even make rail cars in this country anymore—we can't even make railcars. And so, I think, the reason why I don't focus on my bio that much is because it's not really important. It is about the ideas. These ideas are so important to me that, if we don't fix this, we are going to see—the country is going to deracinate. Our original sins of bias—or whatever we were talking about earlier at dinner—they're going to be exacerbated if we don't get this issue right.

David Clements: I'm actually open to that. I probably got swept in with, "Okay, well, I respect these people and they're talking about tariffs, and they must be right because they're really smart. And I agree with them on everything else."

It wasn't until I started having to deal with the issue of national security, intellectual property, and looking at that theft as an act of war where you're saying, "Okay, there are legitimate places for tariffs," and especially when you're trying to establish a protection apparatus for your country. And so I guess I'm not a purist like a lot of folks are and so I'm open to having my mind changed on that.

Garrett Ziegler: Think about where we are right now: Las Cruces, right? I was reading the encyclopedia when we were on the Interstate down here. I was reading about it. *This area was founded, in part, between a partnership between the government and the best of private industry.*

Missiles. There's no such thing as a private missile company at first. You have to have the best of both worlds. I'm not saying that everything needs to be a public-private partnership. I think there's a lot of problems with that; however, Silicon Valley, all these things, if you actually go look into the history of Silicon Valley, the State played a *big* role in it. And that's a conservatard fallacy to say that Silicon Valley was created in a petri dish

These things are very murky. And every single time we're in war we realize how important the domestic industry is—like with the masks. I think the masks are overblown; they don't work. However, let's say we actually did have a real pandemic, and it was Ebola, and it did kill 30% of the people it infected, then we would have been really up [shit] creek without a paddle because we can't make masks at the quantity that we need.

David Clements: You can go back to the Ford Motor Company and the factory lines and where we went from manufacturing cars to bombers.

Garrett Ziegler: Yes!

David Clements: And so there is historical precedent for that. Perhaps we're all victims of our prosperity where we've lost sight of all the sacrifices that went into preserving and protecting this country in World War I, World War II. And we can be cute and clever in our economics books without understanding where these resources come from.

Garrett Ziegler: And one more comment I have on why I wanted to work for Peter and why I wanted to work at the White House—it wasn't just a fancy name. And remember—I don't have a next job to go to so I can piss off anybody that I want to—the core idea, more than tariffs or anything, is bilateralism. With the President, I think, and through some private interactions, and through everything publicly, is multilateralism *will* end in failure. What we'll end up with is a world run by [George] Soros and Pierre Omidyar and all these global elites who *hate* normal people because they're uncontrollable. They don't mind the servant class because they're docile and they'll do what they want. But the global elite will end up running the multilateral world and that's going to be a horrible thing. And I think that Donald Trump's insistence on dealing with nations bilaterally is historical. It'll be one of the most important things in our century—much more important than anything I do.

David Clements: Well, okay, so, internship turned to a staff job at the White House.

Garrett Ziegler: Peter's office was very young. You know, Peter was a professor at UC Irvine for 30 years, and he wasn't discriminatory on young people. He actually liked being around them. Peter has a tremendous amount of energy—more energy than my parents. God bless them. And he turned 72 today. So, you know, Peter[s] staff was always under 30. And there were six of us.

David Clements: So, I just want to say, during dinner I joked with Garrett that we were both going to wear black shirts, and...

Garrett Ziegler: ...gesticulate. His gesticulations are *as distinct* as Donald Trump's.

David Clements: On the *War Room* I see it, and I'm like—'cause I actually followed him up, I think, during the Regent University thing—he's so dynamic.

Garrett Ziegler: He is.

David Clements: He's standing. He's got the presence.

Garrett Ziegler: He is intimidating. I don't get intimidated by many people, but Peter is a very domineering personality. And, I respect him for that. And he has to be. Everybody treated him horribly because we were like lepers. We hold views that are the President's. And the President was a leper to the Republican establishment, to Paul Ryan, and to Mike Pence. And so how lepers are treated is very bad. And so he had to—he formed those sharp elbows through necessity.

David Clements: No, I can see it on the *War Room* where he he's got to cut and get to the core of the problem. He cuts right through it.

Garrett Ziegler: He told me I bury the lede a lot. And he's right about that. And I have the humility to admit that. He doesn't bury the lede at all. He's very direct. And I need to learn more about how to do that.

David Clements: Okay. Well, so staff position—Navarro—then you're in the White House. What year is this?

Garrett Ziegler: 2019. So I spent 23 months with Peter. I was his second longest staff member. The other guy, Chris Abbott, is a native New Mexican. Is that what they call it?

David Clements: Yeah.

Garrett Ziegler: His parents both worked at Sandia [National Laboratories]. So Chris was there three months longer than me. Chris Abbott and I were with Peter for over two years and I love him to death. I was going through some personal issues last summer and Peter gave me some time off. Great boss. Nothing but respect for him.

David Clements: Okay, so that happens. You kind of have a sense of who Garrett is by this time by being a rare bird who followed another rare bird who just happened to see eye-to-eye with President Trump.

Garrett Ziegler: Yeah, we were both heretics in a time where heresy was accepted.

David Clements: Yeah.

Garrett Ziegler: And I'm a Lutheran, so I'm a triple heretic.

David Clements: There's so much we could we could cover. I'm an economics nerd. I mean, I actually studied Federal Reserve audits in law school.

Garrett Ziegler: That was your thesis.

David Clements: That was my thesis. And so part of me wants to really just talk about that. But I think our audience would say that's a waste of their time.

Garrett Ziegler: It's as important! China and the election, which are connected, we know, through Staple Street, and UBS Securities, LLC.

David Clements: Let's talk though, really quick, about what I do know our audience will care about, which is November 3, 2020. Could you give us your best sense of what it was like working in the White House in the weeks leading up to the election? And, just as importantly, what was it like up until January 20th. [It was] historical for all the wrong reasons because of the coup.

So, question number one: Did you, within the White House, anticipate and say, "Okay, brace yourself, we know that they're going to attempt to steal the election." Was that part of your radar?

Garrett Ziegler: Absolutely.

David Clements: Okay...

Garrett Ziegler: ...but, you know, the President, if you go back and read his tweets, even starting in March, he talked about the mail-in ballots, but what really got my attention, apart from just the President's tweets, was this project that Bill[y] Kristol, who's an eternal enemy of mine—literally—eternal enemy. Bill Kristol used to run *The Weekly Standard*. Very portly man. Very condescending and very evil. He was involved with this thing called the *Transition Integrity Project*, which basically wargamed this scenario where the mail-in ballots weren't counted by 9pm on election night, and we had a disputed election. So, they had wargamed this out months in advance. They knew that if the President was leading they were going to backfill with the mail-in [ballots].

And the problem is—and this is going to make some people mad, which I consider a great honor because it means that I'm talking about things that nobody wants to talk about—the State Legislatures didn't have what I call "testicular fortitude."

And they let these Karens, literally Karen [Kathy] Boockvar, the Secretary of State in Pennsylvania, just change the rules. I would have held her in contempt immediately. If we had Republican control of the State Legislatures, and they had read Donald Trump's tweets in 2020, they would have realized that he called this. And so, no, I didn't know exactly how they were going to do the remote adjudication of the ballots, which we know they did—we just don't know how yet. We do know that they were wargaming how to utilize the scam of the mail-in votes to delay the counting. I mean ...

David Clements: ...and by virtue of Trump's tweets, it's fair to say...

Garrett Ziegler: ...he knew it...

David Clements: ...he was anticipating...

Garrett Ziegler: ...he did...

David Clements: ...that something like this was going to happen.

Garrett Ziegler: Yes. And I think that comes from negotiating rebar subcontracts with former mobsters from the outer boroughs. I mean, if you spent any time in a DMV in America, you know that mailing ballots to every single person on the voter list—regardless of whether they requested it—is a joke. It is Zimbabwean. And I have no problem saying that and he would[n't either]. And he did! He said it's the greatest crime of the century, and it really *is*. And so, specifically, what we were doing two weeks before the election? We were churning out these state reports that haven't gotten basically any press, but I'll put them on my Telegram channel later this week. We were going [through] the six key important states. We were going through the Trump economic record in things like mining. My friend Greg, who I'm helping move, drove through last night this huge mine, just about an hour away from here—Safford Mine, I believe, if you recall—and those industries, goods producing industries—not just fairy dust finance, right—but goods producing industries measurably improved under Trump and those reports talk about that. So my nose was to the grindstone. And Peter, in his gesticulator motions, was doing videos on those reports. In fact, you can even look at the Trump Archived White House YouTube channel for this hour-long report by Peter Navarro about the six key states and how the Trump economy benefited them. Miraculously...

David Clements: ... so what are those six key states? Are these all the Rust Belt?

Garrett Ziegler: No, no, no. And I hate that term as much as you do. But Nevada, Arizona—well, we did the reports on nine. But the six that were contentious that night—we did it on those, as well. So the six states that we know they jiggered with the count and the six key counties are: Nevada, Arizona, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Michigan. But we also did reports on North Carolina and a couple of others. Florida—we did a report on Florida. The space industry benefited tremendously under Trump. Nobody talks about it. Not even just NASA but the commercial side.

David Clements: So, well, this is, I think I read this somewhere, that you did, you assist with Peter Navarro in *The Navarro Report*, where he did that fantastic breakdown?

Garrett Ziegler: Absolutely. You asked [about] two weeks before the election. We were doing those reports hoping that we would pepper the swing states with those. And Peter is—and our office—is the subject of a *Hatch Act* investigation, which I consider a great honor because the *Hatch Act* is one of the stupidest statutes in the history of the country.

But anyways, during the coup, starting from probably November 15th to January 12th is when we published last one, we did three volumes. And that was our team—it was me, Joanna, Chris, and Hannah, and Riley to a lesser extent. We helped Peter with those reports. So, we prepared. Peter gave direction. He's a fantastic, logical thinker, which is very hard. Easier said than done. He laid it out—what his vision was—and our job was to get the first draft. And sometimes he did the first draft. And he would get very mad at me because I would miss mistakes of his or other people. He's like “You know, you proofread this. How is this semicolon...?”

David Clements: ...it's an amazing report.

Garrett Ziegler: It's not BS. The report is footnoted, right? This is one of the things that got lost—it's the only nationwide report still out there. Nobody's done a nationwide report. They've done stuff on the CTCL and ZuckerBucks, and the money flowing in from the Chan initiative. But nobody's done a nationwide report. And if you look at the preliminary results of the Arizona audit, you'll notice that our chart about Arizona is not that far off. So I consider it great honor. Obviously, Peter got lambasted for it.

But Peter was the star of the show. And, some people on Telegram were mad that I made like [\$]58[k] grand. They're like, “Garrett, you were just a young guy. How'd you make so little money?” I'm like, “The star of the show is Peter. My job was to serve Peter and the President.” I've never conflated my title or position or salary. I was in the room for a lot of amazing stuff, and I think I've seen more than any other 25-year-old in the country.

David Clements: That's awesome.

Garrett Ziegler: But I'm not anything more than Peter. It was really—I was there to support Peter. And that's why I didn't talk to the press before January 20th.

David Clements: Oh, well, whether you talked to them or not, I mean, I was the recipient of the report as it was being put out there. I was monitoring many cases. And my journey through the lawsuits was just through, you know, really, *The Epoch Times* would do...

Garrett Ziegler: ...they did a phenomenal job.

David Clements: ... its monthly, or this nightly, breakdown, and they would provide in their links in the description. I'd find the case, and then I could fill in the dots from there and created kind of my own organic matrix for the cases. And then Peter had the most brilliant minds in America do what he did. And so that was another resource.

Garrett Ziegler: And we weren't trying to affect the Supreme Court. Some people, some of my friends even, were like, “Garrett, why are you spending six hours a day on this thing? You know, it's not going to affect—it's not gonna make SCOTUS take the case.” But what Peter, I think, in his foresight did is realize that this is going to be historical record. When they stole it from Nixon in '60—when Kennedy stole it through the Chicago machine and [the] Daley machine—there's no report about that election.

The Navarro Report, regardless of what the lying press says and what the *Reuters* fact checkers—paid by Zuckerberg—do, the report is going to stand the test of time.

David Clements: Well, we're going to come back to that, too, with *Reuters*, because one of the things that you've been focusing on is ItalyGate. And I don't want to quite go there just yet. But I remember when the infamous ItalyGate affidavit came out...

Garrett Ziegler: ...the audio, too...

David Clements: ...when that came out *Reuters* was really quick to try to do a fact check on that. And then, there was a fact check of *Reuters* that really called them into question. And so people have to understand that. And because *Reuters*, for whatever reason, stayed above the fray. And people think, "Well it's *Reuters*, obviously, you can trust them..."

Garrett Ziegler: "...150 years, London, you know..."

David Clements: ...it's terrible. It's terrible. But before we switch gears to that, I heard that in November when there was that fateful meeting where Sidney Powell comes over to the White House that a certain person opened the door for them. Who would that be?

Garrett Ziegler: Well, technically, it was two of us. And I'm going to talk about him today because he has been out of the—he's not gotten enough credit—because Patrick didn't mention us in his book, *The Deep Rig*. But there's another Patrick—Patrick Weaver—who helped me out with that. And, basically, I had the visitor access. And he [Patrick Weaver] went down and got General Flynn and Sidney Powell.

I was talking with Lin Wood, and he was like, "Well, you know, General Flynn could get in the White House regardless." And it's actually not that way. You can't. Certainly, General Flynn could know the Secret Service, but you still have to put in your Social Security Number, date of birth, all that stuff. So I just happen to have the visitor access privileges, which then got revoked by Meadows's team once he realized that. You know, they didn't realize that meeting on the 18th—that was totally impromptu, that was not scheduled, nothing—so when Meadows and Cipollone got called into that meeting and they realized that Sidney Powell and General Flynn were there they had no idea how they got in the building. And then, post-facto, at like 1:00am they went and checked the system and realized it was me. And so I got my visitor privileges taken away. And that was just—that comes from my Christian faith. I don't even think I told Peter about that. But I did it because it was right thing to do. And regardless of what *Reuters* and [the] *New York Times* said about that meeting, there was no martial law discussed. It was basically, "Are we going to do an actual count of the votes, or are we going to do a "Eric Coomer, Risk-Limit[ing] Audit" special, where we get to pick which batches we're going to check?" It's a total shell game, casino hoax.

David Clements: Okay. So, the question that comes to mind with me, though, is why would Mark Meadows be upset with you to the extent that he revoked your privileges on who to bring into the building? What was it about Sidney Powell, General Flynn coming to the White House, speaking with

the President, that he would find irksome? Because I've seen some of your posts on the people that surrounded the President. I think a good, legitimate criticism of President Trump is: 1) His endorsements had been pretty spotty on a lot of people.

Garrett Ziegler: I agree with that.

David Clements: And there's...

Garrett Ziegler: ...and he says that, right? We're not saying anything he doesn't say. He said, "I shouldn't have endorsed Mitch McConnell. He turned out to be Benedict Arnold too." Right? So it's the [Office of] Political Affairs shop in the White House [and] at the RNC.

David Clements: So he's got that. But then you also have the—man, why is he surrounding himself with this person? Whether, it's General Mattis, so like a lot of people, that military when Mattis was appointed, he's been around forever, they were saying, "Great selection..."

Garrett Ziegler: "...Mad Dog..."

David Clements: "Mad Dog." And for someone like me, who's more of a noninterventionist, which...

Garrett Ziegler: ...yeah, me too, like the Founders...

David Clements: A lot of people that bothers. Oh, gosh, it bothers so many people...

Garrett Ziegler: ...that you're like the American Founders? That's a great thing to be accused of.

David Clements: Well, because you brought up Bill Kristol...

Garrett Ziegler: He's a horrible human being.

David Clements: He is. He's one of the those folks that has never seen any place he didn't want to bomb.

Garrett Ziegler: Exactly. Right. Permanent war—*a/ways*. War all the time.

David Clements: But, it begs the question—because they come in, and then Trump says, "Well you're not what I need you to be..."

Garrett Ziegler: "...You're not doing what I ran on..."

David Clements: "...so you're gone." But it begs the question: Mark Meadows, this isn't the first time that I've heard about either interference after the fact. When I interviewed Joe Oltmann...

Garrett Ziegler: ...an amazing guy who needs to be famous—more famous than he already is. Joe Oltmann is the reason why we know about Eric Coomer.

David Clements: Yeah, he is. And so Joe Oltmann was like, “I've got all this information. Let me get to the President [and] let them know.” Because this is in January—at this time, I think it might have been the day of the “Insurrection”—and he ran into the buzzsaw that is Mark Meadows, as well. So what's your sense of the environment around President Trump?

Garrett Ziegler: Yeah, so I'll be very, very blunt. Basically, Mark Meadows is not the type of guy we need. The President needed consiglieres. He needed people to get stuff done. He needed carnivores—somebody who could stare down the CIA and make them do the President's will. He didn't have it. And he's never gonna have it. He's just doesn't have it. He's a Freedom Caucus guy. And what this means is—I call them “Permanent Hearing Holders.” So Benghazi, Killary, Strzok, Paige—the FBI lovers. Nobody ever gets indicted with these jokers. Mark Meadows comes from that ilk. That is the truth.

David Clements: So, “Let's set up another hearing.”

Garrett Ziegler: “...let's set up another hearing.” We already have had hearings. We want indictments. They've committed federal felonies.

So, how does this relate to the President's Chief of Staff? He just wasn't effective. He would get steamrolled by people. He would trust people. A certain cabinet Secretary would tell them that he was doing something, and he'd never follow up. The President would tell him something [and] he wouldn't follow up and do it. And I can't explain why he still has the President's ear. People keep asking me that. All I know...

David Clements: ...that was going to be my next question...

Garrett Ziegler: is what I experienced. So, for example, the drama between the RNC and the legal teams. If you had a real Chief of Staff during the coup, he would have sat down those two entities. Sat Ronna Romney down—drag her from C Street to the White House every day—and say, “We are going to have a 90-minute session on strategy, funding, etc.” That wasn't done. He just didn't know what he was doing. And I don't know why more people aren't telling the truth. Maybe they don't want to piss him off. Maybe their buddies at the Republican Capitol Hill Club. I'm not. And so I have no incentive to lie about this man. I want to see the good in people.

David Clements: And when say this man, we're talking about Meadows?

Garrett Ziegler: I mean, he's just—he's a leaf eater. I'm sorry. I have an uncle that's a tractor salesman. It'd be like a tractor salesman trying to run the White House. I mean, these are serious institutions. The CIA is a domestic threat—like it is *rotten* to the core. We had a dossier prepared by a former MI6, tipped off by Alexander Downer, an Australian, through a Maltese academic. The reason why I'm going into that is because these are very sophisticated people with histories and agendas.

And it's a leftist freight train. And if we elect people like Mark Meadows—good, jolly, you know, your brother next door—we're going to end up in Zimbabwe. And so if I can do one thing is stop electing nice guys. We need Christian zealots, frankly.

David Clements: So tell our viewers what was Peter Navarro's expertise on what he was focused with? Because I think it's economic related, right?

Garrett Ziegler: It is. It's industrial base.

David Clements: Okay. It's industrial-based economics.

Garrett Ziegler: So how does that translate to the election?

David Clements: I know how it does from just following his work and to seeing him on the War Room on all these different segments. But, obviously, you all were able to take something that, at first blush, does not seem like it has anything to do with elections [and] fold it over into one of the best reports out there, if not the best report on *this is what happened*. Let's break it down. Let's look at our bellwether counters. Let's look at all these things...

Garrett Ziegler: ...379 footnotes, I think. Yeah, something like that. It was a slog.

David Clements: So you go that route. At the same time, you're in the White House, you're letting in General Flynn, Sidney Powell...

Garrett Ziegler: ...oh, and other people are doing job interviews. Literally. Other presidential staff we're having job interviews in the Eisenhower Executive Office Building.

David Clements: For the new Administration?

Garrett Ziegler: No, not for the Biden regime. But for outside firms. Think about all of the limp-wristed Pride Month[s]—like Accenture, McKinsey, Bain, all of these globalist institutions. They were having interviews in the White House while the President was still fighting for the country during the coup. And so he had a half of a staff that were careerists. They weren't willing—let's put it this way, and this is the last thing I'll say about Meadows—he wasn't willing to do *whatever* is necessary. Beyond sinning—we don't want to sin. we don't want to commit mortal sins—but, beyond that, I will do *whatever is necessary* to win politically. And he just doesn't do that. So he gets *destroyed*. He gets spit up and chewed out.

David Clements: But we still don't know quite why he's in the day-to-day...

Garrett Ziegler: ...I think that he does interviews. It's an amazing title—former White House Chief of Staff. There's books written about the position. It's a position that—I would never want to be President. I would love to be the White House Chief of Staff. You get a fantastic purview. I'm obviously not experienced enough to do something like that yet. But he didn't read up on it. He didn't realize

that our biggest threat is the intelligence community. Every single problem the President had went back to the intelligence community.

David Clements: Now Bannon, as a strategic advisor, was off the scene by the time...

Garrett Ziegler: ...he was, very. He left in August of 2017. I've only talked to the man a couple times.

David Clements: Okay. So there's a big question—but I would love to interview Steve Bannon. But ask him the questions I want to ask him.

Garrett Ziegler: Yes. Not scripted—just like this interview. Nothing is scripted.

David Clements: Because he's, you know, you have like one of the chief architects of MAGA. And talk about scorched earth when mainstream media starts to attack the President. You've got, literally, Steve Bannon personified as death on *Saturday Night Live*. And that's powerful optics because, again, it's the young millennial crowd. It's like, “Oh, wow, he must be evil—if for no other reason—he's dressed up as death. And so you have that and I've gotten to see just how over the target he is. And he's been basically the great platform creator for so many people, myself included, just to shine a light and say, “Hey, look what they're doing.”

Garrett Ziegler: I respect Bannon for one thing in particular—he's giving people like you, *the doers*, a chance to talk about your work. That's what I started this interview out with is saying that this coup brought us together. I would not be sitting here had they not tried this and Eric Coomer had not existed. Because I think he is a front man, but he knows a lot. I keep going back to Coomer.

But I love that, and Bannon has done a great job of talking about Garland Favorito in Georgia. There's a new community. There has to be a new statusphere. The current structure of the Right *has* to change. Heritage Foundation is a useless institution. And I hope I'm always held to that quote. And I hope I get proven wrong because then they will be *not* useless. They're useless. Don't donate to them. They don't win. They don't do anything. So, there's a lot of talk about patriots...

David Clements: ...by the way, I'm not offended by this at all because one of the things that's cool about this podcast, or whatever you want to call it...

Garrett Ziegler: ...this conversation...

David Clements: ...this conversation. I don't have any affiliations with anyone—with Heritage. I really don't even have a professional affiliation with *War Room*. And so what's really cool is they get the unvarnished truth as you see it.

Garrett Ziegler: And if the facts change and Heritage becomes useful, I will change my opinion. But right now I see them—so there's a lot of talk about “paypatriots.” P.A.Y.T.R... There are some of them. However, the Heritage Foundation, and Cato, they're the biggest “paypatriots” in the world. And what we

need to be doing is channeling the funds that *were* going to them into *other* people creating real content and doing really hard research.

David Clements: Well, the only contribution that I've been trying to do is—I look at this as a murder of our vote...

Garrett Ziegler: ...yes...

David Clements: ...and, so for me, foundationally, you get certain witnesses that know what they're talking about that most people probably wouldn't want to talk to. But I do. Because I know that I can't get to the sexy, star witness until I've laid the foundation. So the first *Professor's Record* I did was with a gentleman by the name of Dennis Haugh. If anybody's...

Garrett Ziegler: I do know him.

David Clements: So Dennis is a guy that is an expert in input-output systems...

Garrett Ziegler: ...Colorado, right?...

David Clements: ...Colorado.

Garrett Ziegler: ...I was on a call with him once. Great dude...

David Clements: Yeah, and he's a patriot. And he'll talk about tightness. So [he] doesn't know Trump. Doesn't know Peter Navarro. Doesn't know a lot of these folks. But, from a foundational standpoint, before we can talk about Dominion and vulnerabilities, I need to talk to someone who understands the machines and we talked about—so we'd have someone like him.

We'd have Edward Solomon just looking at geometric proof math. It was a math fest for like two hours.

Garrett Ziegler: I think it's great.

David Clements: So yeah, we've got those folks and they can talk to that. And then it's weird to come full circle to this interview because now we've got someone who was right there in the inner sanctum of the White House. How many times would you say you were in the same room with President Trump?

Garrett Ziegler: I don't know—probably half a dozen. For public events? Dozens, right. For private events where it's a staff thing probably half a dozen, but for like press conferences—you know those 90-minute fiascos with a foreign leader where there would be some nincompoop from *NBC* screaming at him and he'd be like, "Sit down, sit down, you're interrupting stuff"—I was in the background of a lot of those.

So [I've] been in the room with him, you know, dozens of times, but the memory that sticks out to me the most was on the 18th. And that's the most that I had spoken to him one-on-one and he directly listened to me. Peter was actually ill at the time, so he was on the phone. They conference him in. And, you know, Cipollone was there, Kushner was there, Meadows was there. And I was basically saying...

David Clements: ...18th of what?...

Garrett Ziegler: ...January. So this was after the Federal Bureau of Insurrection did their thing. And so I was basically, you know, Mark [Meadows] had said that they'd already done a couple audits in Georgia. And he says—he has absolutely no clue what he's talking about. The audits that he's talking about are Eric Coomer-designed, Dominion “Risk-Limited Audits” that simply don't look at the actual ballots. They just count the tally not realizing that, if it's perfectly filled in, it's probably by a machine.

So that's what I always keep coming back to you. And I think that it was tragic that—not tragic, but a travesty—that it ended the way it did. But I'm glad I had that opportunity on the 18th as a final like, “This is what I believe and most of your staff are incompetent.”

And he believed that, especially about his lawyers. He would—I'm not betraying any trust by saying—privately bitch about his lawyers. They're all “no men.” What we need are people who when they get a task figure out how to do it.

David Clements: It's interesting because while that was going on—you'll be the first person I've shared this with—Steve Bannon reached out to me and asked me if I wanted to come on to the *War Room*. You know, it's weird—because everyone that watched me on *Tucker Carlson*—what they remember was, “Oh, he's standing up against an employer, loosely, that is targeting conservatives.” And that was it. Bannon's ear must have picked up on something completely different, which was [that] I looked at all the lawsuits. And, by the way, there's tons of evidence. Like, out of all that—it was a 30-minute video—that's what he picked up. And that's really what he wanted to talk about.

But what you're talking about right now is very relevant because there are times where he's like, “You know, you want to come up and do the defense of President Trump?” Or, you know, I don't know how to take that serious. You know, I started going through the evolution of how would you present that case? And I want to say that some of the attorneys did a really good job, but it really wasn't punching back.

Garrett Ziegler: And especially the White House Counsel staff. I didn't have enough experience with Rudy in-person to get a good view, in my opinion, on his ultimate character. I think he's a little bit of a Brett Favre figure in that he can't ever really retire. And that I mean that with respect. And I've always said that with respect. Brett Favre couldn't retire and, therefore, he pissed a lot of people off because he wouldn't retire.

But the White House Counsel staff was a totally different beast, and they actively worked with Department of Justice to slow walk what I call the most “based actions” of the Trump administration.

The Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel is staffed by careers. We never got a hold of it. And Cipollone's White House Counsel would, basically, just let them run the show.

David Clements: Well, my biggest critique of the impeachment defense was there was a missed opportunity where, when Senator Ted Cruz was talking about having a 10-day hearing to actually put on evidence, that which would have completely justified, like, a righteous anger for why patriots were there in the first place. That wasn't there. And so it would have been really cool to just parade out witness after witness after witness.

Garrett Ziegler: I know...

David Clements: ...and they were somewhat hamstrung, perhaps through agreements on not having live witnesses. I don't quite understand that. But, as a prosecutor, I was like, "That was a missed opportunity." They could have tied that out and really made a case to the American people for a month. They could have done it for two months. "You want to do this? You want to make a spectacle—you want to create the story that we've got radicalized conservatives? Well, we're going to beat you at your game." And that was something that I shared with Steve [Bannon] behind the scenes.

Garrett Ziegler: One more thing, if I may?

David Clements: Sure.

Garrett Ziegler: I want everybody to know, though—and this is very important because what I provide, in one sense, is names, right?—there's people who are responsible for this. Both for the coup and for, I think, the lack of coordination in rectifying the coup. Pat Cipollone, and Eric Herschmann, who were the Chief White House Counsel and the Deputy White House Counsel, they truly don't believe the election was stolen. He [President Trump] asked him that—straight up.

So the 75 million people who know that this was a joke—the mail-in ballots, the stopping the count, everything—the President's own lawyers [don't].

If I were President, my Chief White House Counsel would be my best mate. You know, he'd be there with me 25 hours a day because it's the most toughest [sic] job on planet Earth. And so, if your own counsel doesn't support you then it's going to be hard to fight any—it's going to be hard to run Bulgaria, let alone the United States.

David Clements: What's your take on Jenna Ellis, then? Because I profoundly disagree with her on whether or not reinstatement is an option. She seems to suggest that you have to go through the impeachment route.

Garrett Ziegler: Yeah, through what precedent? I would tell—I would say to Jenna, who's been very kind and, I think, has been—well, I think she's been very clear on her Christian beliefs. And I respect that. However, what she's talking about there is literally no precedent for. So how would she know that we can't do that? And the bigger question is whether or not you will follow the Constitution into your

own demise. This is where me and Jenna wholeheartedly disagree is that she wants—as long as we, you know, we can destroy the country as long as we do it *legally*. If we have 75 million immigrants and everybody has low wage jobs, that's fine, because it's legal.

They stole the election. We are going to have to use *creative* legal thinking to rectify this situation. If there are six audits in the six swing states, and they realize that they were fraudulently certified, why can't we rescind that slate of electors? Then, both candidates get below 270 [electors] and we know what happens with that. If they don't get to 270, it goes to the House. But these are the creative legal strategies that very few people are talking about. That needs to be the conversation. It doesn't need to be the conversation of just basically swatting down the righteous indignation of 75 million people. You're the attorney—figure it out. If the President United States tells you to do something, try to figure out a solution before saying—out of hand—“It's not possible.”

David Clements: I think it's a balance. You've got—you certainly want to give good legal advice. And the way that you give good legal advice is saying, “There is a precedent, and if you apply the law, you can expect a certain outcome.”

The biggest problem that I'm seeing is that the black-letter law just wasn't followed. And so precedents weren't followed. The *Bush v. Gore* [case] wasn't followed.

Garrett Ziegler: Yes. The state legislators didn't dictate the time, manner, or place of elections.

David Clements: So there were so many failures there. But people forget that a lawyer is also supposed to be an *advocate*. And this kind of speaks to what you're talking about with the Counsel that the White House had. I was looking—“Where are the guys that are they're basically shooting for the moon?” Like “Yeah, hell yeah, we can get reinstated. In fact, we don't need to worry about electoral votes if we win in Arizona...”

Garrett Ziegler: ...get the six states...

David Clements: ...get him in the White House right now. And you position yourself and you argue that. Maybe you don't win.

Garrett Ziegler: Maybe she's talking semantics. Maybe she's uncomfortable—and this is what I would say if she were sitting right here—“Are you uncomfortable with the word *reinstatement*? How about *decertification*? Are you okay with that word? What if they decertify their slate of electors that they selected in 2020?” Maybe that would suit her fancy and *then* we could get to the conversation of, “What do you do if somebody who is in the White House did not actually—legally—win the election? But think about it this way. They're not historical people, meaning that we need generational-level talent. Lincoln didn't have—“Let me see; the South is seceding. So let me go see what the Constitution says for this.” You have to use *everything*—precedent some, and this is where, like I said with Meadows, he just doesn't have it. They can't think outside of the box. They're not generational-level winners.

David Clements: Lincoln's actually a perfect example. Because for many Constitutionalists, and this is where you get into trouble with some of the John Birch Society folks, or even the people that I've admired like Ron Paul in the past, where you're like: "You raise the argument of suspension of the Writ of Habeas Corpus, for instance, [is] terrible because that's the Constitution we're talking about!" Yet, you also live in a world where people were literally in chains. And so, you got this document that's God-inspired, that its north star is liberty.

Garrett Ziegler: I agree. *Ordered* liberty. I'm sorry.

David Clements: Ordered liberty. But when we talk about the Constitution being the supreme law of the land over state laws, state statutes, what have you—we focus on that because the Constitution is this natural law-infused document, and it gives it this weight. So, to me, it's not illogical, then, to also assert that there are some things that were wrong with our society, namely slavery, where in keeping with that spirit of the Declaration of Independence a man in bondage.

Garrett Ziegler: ...yeah, and the beauty of our Constitution is that we amended it. There's a process for amending it, which has just insanely...

David Clements: ...but that's a perfect example of Lincoln saying, "I'm actually in greater keeping with the spirit of liberty, the Constitution, the Declaration, to fix kind of the eyesore of, really, what's given credence to the Critical Race theorists out there right now. Is there a valid argument to suspend the Writ of Habeas Corpus?"

Garrett Ziegler: Very interesting arguments. I need a J.D. to argue that more persuasively. I will say, though, that—if I have any criticism of Jenna, it's like, "The tea leaves, like what would, what does the Constitution say?"

We have to have *actors* in the political arena. The left does not care; they will steamroll you. And here's the final thing I'll say about lawyers, and I'm not one. Here's a perfect example. Right now, our research group that we've started—we talked about what I'm what I'm doing now—we're trying to write a report on the Hunter Biden laptop. This is what I think of a lawyer as—we want to release personal identifiable information about certain figures because they were engaged in felonies: sex trafficking, drugs, everything. We asked an attorney, "Tell me—get me to 'Yes.' Tell me what I can release about this person without being sued. That's what a lawyer is for. Get me to 'Yes'." We want to hand count the ballots in Michigan. I don't need your opinion. Get me to 'Yes.'" They didn't do that. In that sense, they were a failure. They need to be shunned—Amish style—and repent of their sins. And they haven't yet, so it's sad.

David Clements: I think there's a couple things that work. A lot of people have asked me about the idea of, "Can we create like a Legal Zoom template for lay persons to file lawsuits?"

Garrett Ziegler: I think that's a great idea.

David Clements: Well, it is, but that presents problems, too, for the lawyer because when I asked, “Well, what’s the strategy?” They say, “Well, Marc Elias and Perkins Coie, they’ve got hundreds of lawyers, unlimited resources. We need to engage them on a resource level. So why not have a thousand patriots where you’ve got to fund to get filing fees, and just start filing them in every county that you can think of, and we’ll bankroll it. You can use the Legal Zoom template. Maybe get some attorneys.” How to market that’s tough, though, because if you’re saying “Really, this is about resource warfare. It’s really not about whether you’ve got a snowball’s chance in hell of winning in a corrupt court.” There are certain things that you have to be aware of. And so when I was wargaming this with some folks out there, it’s like, “You don’t want attorneys taking this? You want Pro Se litigants? You want regular people that have no attorneys—because attorneys have to worry about Rule 11 sanctions—we have...”

Garrett Ziegler: ...Pro Se is very tricky...

David Clements: Well, if it’s about resources there’s nothing more frustrating for an attorney than a Pro Se litigant because they don’t know the rules, they’re not expected to know the rules, and they just kind of have to fumble through. But if you’re talking about a resource warfare strategy, there’s no better messenger than like, Joe, just filing lawsuit, “Like I’m really not sure, but election was stolen. I found this on the Internet...”

Garrett Ziegler: “...they gave me a sharpie...”

David Clements: “...yeah, and here I am...”

Garrett Ziegler: “...Eric Coomer is a crackhead. We know he invented adjudication. Adjudication. Focus on adjudication, Joe.”

David Clements: And set the hearing, but set the hearing times—like 300,000 patriots that [are] doing that. So I think there’s a way to do that, but lawyers are very wary of ethics complaints. And these aren’t people that I would say are cowards, either. Now the vast majority are; I’ve gone on record to say they are. But you can see what happens to someone like Matt DePerno. You can see what happens to someone like Lin Wood [and] Sidney Powell where you’ve got, Sidney Powell, for instance, she’s only licensed in Texas. And you’ve got a Michigan judge that’s trying to issue sanctions against her for a frivolous filing in that case. In the case that was filed in Michigan. And it just shows you how evil these people are in targeting and trying to remove vital pieces of patriot advocacy from the chessboard.

Garrett Ziegler: Yes.

David Clements: So, let’s talk a little bit about Italy.

Garrett Ziegler: Yes.

David Clements: Like many, I saw affidavits that were slapped in support of the various election lawsuits. The one that was the most *exciting* was one that came out of Italy. If it's true, if it's real—I had access to it, looked at it—and I followed it. But, very quickly, I realized there's almost no one talking about it. *Except* for you, and I've been wanting to have this interview more...

Garrett Ziegler: ...about this, mainly? Me too...

David Clements: ...about this issue, mainly. So, when we talk about ItalyGate, educate our viewers on what exactly are we talking about. I know that you've come at cross-purposes with the *Gateway Pundit* not really doing their due diligence in reporting your involvement. So if you could just give us the backdrop on what this Italian affidavit represents, the players, and what your work has been to date.

Garrett Ziegler: Thank you very much for allowing me to talk about this because this has been a rock that hasn't been examined and turned over to the degree that I would like it to be. So fact number—I'll just start with a couple of key facts.

Fact number one is that Eric Coomer invented this thing called adjudication, which allows election officials to decipher the “intent of the voter.” So, if there's two holes that are filled in for one [position], the adjudicator can decide which candidate that voter really selected. Well, that can be prone to abuse, as we know. And what is also not necessary is for that election official to be at the precinct where that vote was cast. So, there is this thing called remote adjudication, meaning that if you're connected to the same EMS network, you can adjudicate those ballots from afar. What we think occurred is that somebody did this with either a supercomputer or some type of entity that would produce so many ballots that it couldn't just be a couple of people. Either it's a whole ton of people who are doing it manually, remotely, away from the precinct, like in Michigan, or it could be done by some other machine that is doing it automatically, that is refilling in the hole and making a new ballot image. So those are facts. That adjudication process is true. It's been patented. What piqued my interest in late December about the Italy case is that there is a certain computer programmer who...

David Clements: ...what's the name?..

Garrett Ziegler: ...so, central to this case are two women who inexplicably became the messengers of this information and who have butchered so many things that I don't know where to start. And I don't take any pleasure in saying that, meaning I don't want to denigrate them any more than they should be.

But the guy's name is Arturo D'ELIA. Not D'ELIO. It's Arturo D'ELIA. And he's a computer programming prodigy. He hacked into NATO, an Air Force Base in Oklahoma, through the NATO cyber security system, when he was 24—when he was like my age—and he was still living with his parents at the time. And when he went to become—there's report out of Salerno that when they went to arrest him for that cyber-attack they thought that they were going to arrest the dad. Like they didn't realize the dude—because they just had the IP address—they didn't realize the dude was a young kid.

So that guy is alleged to have been communicating with an Italian intelligence—with a former Italian official—named Luciano CAMPOLI, who runs this private security firm called G7 Srl—G7 International Srl. You can look this up. This is what I wanted the *Gateway Pundit* to do to verify these people are leading us on a merry chase. The more research I did the more bad actors became involved. For instance, the company that D’ELIA was a consultant for at the time that the remote adjudication apparently took place [partnered with] CrowdStrike, which is the same entity that declared that Russia had hacked the DNC server. And the FBI just trusted CrowdStrike’s word for it. So, Shawn Henry, the founder of CrowdStrike, tells James Comey, “Yeah, it was the Russians. We saw this line of code that was in Russian.” And they [the FBI] didn’t even take control of the servers. So...

David Clements: ...this isn't the first time I've heard of Crowdstrike...

Garrett Ziegler: Yes, CrowdStrike features prominently in a report that my research firm, which is called *Marco Polo*, just put out. And the reason why we put out that research report was because it has nothing to do with Maria Zack. We didn't consult with Maria Zack at all. It has everything to do with the cyber-attack [associated with] Arturo D’ELIA, who is the same figure that is alleged to have been participating in the remote adjudication. He was arrested on December 5th for a previous cyber-attack that occurred, allegedly, from 2015 to 2017 at Leonardo when he was a consultant there. And so we have these Italians—Arturo D’ELIA, Luciano CAMPOLI, the attorney that wrote the supposed affidavit, which isn't official because it wasn't notarized, which is another thing that we've been lovingly calling “Boomer mistakes” by Maria and Michele—

David Clements: ...but, this is something I got asked in the past. Normally, the affiant would be the hacker himself that would sign off. So Italy must have a different system where it's—because I don't know Italian law, but I know that here stateside—“I, the affiant, am attesting. I'm over the age of 18. I'm of sound mind, XYZ. And that was the first thing that I looked at like “Well, this is the attorney basically filling out the affidavit on behalf of.” Is that something that's unique to Italy? Do you know?

Garrett Ziegler: I do not know, but what I know that is equally as relevant is that if you look at Alfio D’URSO, who is a lawyer in Catania. We know where this guy lives. We've done so much research on all these officials. We know their wives’ names. We know what political party they're in. We know way too much. And he's not able to be found, by the way. Nobody's able to call. We've called him 20 times. We called his law firm. We've called his wife's firm in Catania and nobody will answer the phone.

What we know is that Alfio D’URSO’s affidavit doesn't say that he spoke to D’ELIA. It says he spoke to “a high level army security services official.” So it's a hearsay affidavit. But the people and the entities involved are corrupt. We know this from prior crimes. They're criminals. What we have been trying to do with ItalyGate is to forget about the messenger! Forget about Maria, who lovingly mispronounces things and gets details wrong. She wasn't—this is not really her job. She's not suited for this. So, we have been trying to focus on the allegations which is what I've been trying to get *Gateway Pundit*, and everybody else to do. Go find Luciano CAMPOLI. Go find these people. And ask them, “Who told you this? Who introduced you?” We know the girlfriend to Arturo D’ELIA. The

Mossad guy—literally—that the *Gateway Pundit* got to do the hit piece on us—his name is Yaacov APELBAUM, who did great work on the Hunter Biden laptop—didn't get D'ELIA's girlfriend right. So the girlfriend's name—and the reason why I'm saying these names is for your listeners go look it up—his girlfriend's name is Concetta GIGLIO. And apparently, Arturo tells Concetta—and I laid this out [with] my research firm. It's called “A Limited Hangout?” I follow the chain of allegations from Arturo to Maria Zack's mouth in her interviews in the back of an SUV...

David Clements: ...I've seen those...

Garrett Ziegler: ...yes, they're painful. But the actual entities *exist*. So, unlike a server raid in Frankfurt that didn't happen, these people are real. And so if we were led on a goose chase, I want to go tar and feather Maria and Michele. If they're telling the truth, and they just so happened to do so clumsily, then I will buy them dinner and say, “I'm sorry that we couldn't deliver for you, but we needed more proof.”

I do want to say one last thing, though, about Maria in that she said that Phil Waldron, who worked for Rudy Giuliani, who has done a lot of good work on the cyber front, somehow mis-stepped in that he called Luciano CAMPOLI to verify the allegations that Maria and Michele were giving him. And Maria said he blew the operation—that Leonardo was listening into his calls. And I don't doubt that Leonardo bugs everything coming out of Italy. They've done it for years. But why would we believe that Michele and Maria's communications with the Italians are not compromised? You know, if Phil calls them, why are his comms monitored, but Maria and Michele's aren't?

One last thing: I have asked to see the supposed evidence. I went straight to Maria and Michele. I approached them like adults, and I wanted to talk with them. I met with them in West Palm Beach, and they wanted me to sign an NDA. I told them that's ridiculous. If anybody is not an MI6 infiltrator [it's me]; I worked for the President of the United States and I have a TS/SCI clearance. And they were telling me that this stuff was classified.

Mr. Clements, that's ridiculous. They do not have a security clearance. They're private citizens. I mean, it's just rich irony—somebody telling me something is classified but I'm the one with the security clearance and have actually been vetted and reviewed by the CIA. So it's just pitiful. But at the end of this the most important thing is not Maria and Michele! It's that we figure out whether we were led on a goose chase, so we can hold—if we never figure this out, those same entities—if it's a hoax, which I've never denied that it could be—are going to do the same thing again. And I don't want to be led on a goose chase.

David Clements: Yeah, so my initial impression was, if this is real, it's huge. It's like the affidavit of all affidavits because you can basically account for...

Garrett Ziegler: ...who, what, when, where, why, how...

David Clements: yeah, all of those questions. And then it also gives an easy explanation of those major spikes...

Garrett Ziegler: ...at 3:43[am]!

David Clements: because you've got the national algorithm of Dr. Frank's work, and, you know, finding one set number and once you find out what that number is you've got the key and you can you can basically plot how someone's election is stolen.

But I want to say in four different states you had major swings where it looked like there was a reboot that had to take place. That's where the Italian affidavit is really, really appealing. And when I saw that, I'm like, "Okay, just from a foundational standpoint, I'm familiar with how affidavits work. Problem number one—unless you've got a different system—is you don't have the personal affiant. Two, the notarization isn't too problematic [and] depends on your rules because even in the American system we have rules that will basically say that, 'By virtue of this lawsuit, and this rule, this is a verified sworn statement, and you don't have to have a notary.'" Effectively, when you submit your lawsuit into a court of law you're certifying to the court that this is true. So, like a complaint that I would sign off as an attorney, it comes with it a rule that says, "If you're lying to me, you're in trouble." It's Rule 11. I don't have to get a notary to do that. So they might have something like that, so I've tried to give robust defenses...

Garrett Ziegler: ...yes, me too...

David Clements: ...in the event that this is legitimate, but, not being a scholar of Italian law it's hard...

Garrett Ziegler: ...well, it's sketchy. It's sketchy because Carlo GORIA, who also wrote a letter to the President, who was the Italian partner [of Michele], the nephew of a former Italian Prime Minister, also wrote a letter to the President alleging very similar things. There were basically two affidavits—one was a letter; one was an affidavit. There are two more things that I want to touch on that are very relevant.

Number one: Maria says that they had constant communication through intermediaries—not Maria—[such as] Michele. Maria doesn't know pretty much anybody in Italy. Everything she is getting is through this figure named Michele Roosevelt Edwards, okay? And she says that throughout the coup—from like November 17th to when he was arrested—they were in communication with Arturo D'ELIA, at the cybersecurity facility that we know they have a supercomputer at in Chieti, which is by Pescara, which is where it allegedly took place. Why, during those intervening days, did you not get something on the record from D'ELIA himself? How could you not do that? It's almost a month! I know that if what they're saying is true, and I'm granting that, that it was a security thing, and he was scared, you can literally pull out an iPhone and record something for 90 seconds.

Point number two: They were wanting the President's legal team, and I know this for a fact because I've seen all the documents, they wanted \$750,000 to do an exfiltration of D'ELIA and his family and his girlfriend to protect them because, if this is true, there will be Italian mobsters, which is literally what Italy is known for, along with gelato and a couple of other things, is mobsters who cut off your

index fingers. So they were wanting money for an exfiltration. Why, if Michele Roosevelt Edwards is this billionaire that she alleges to be and is written about and has all these horse farms and all this stuff, why wouldn't she pony the money? They were asking the federal government—or some private entity—to give them three quarters of a million dollars and then they—the people who gave the money—weren't allowed to verify the facts. If you had a billion dollars and somebody asks you for 750 grand to exfiltrate a subject out of Italy, you might do it. But would want to speak to the guy. You'd want to speak to his wife. They wouldn't allow that. So I have no allegiances other than I am going to figure out what is going on over there. And I've talked to D'ELIA's first attorney, who is currently running for mayor of Eboli, which is D'ELIA's hometown. He's known the guy since he was like 12. And I said that if you pull this off for me, Damiano, I guarantee you, and this is all true, Donald Trump will endorse you for mayor of Eboli, Italy. And I was being a little cute with him.

Fascinating story, though. Has all the tales of a CIA op. If anybody who has ever read anything about the CIA's operations in Nicaragua, Central America, they know they're capable of this. I'm sure Serafini did ops for the CIA. Stefano Serafini—you can look him up. He was a 20-year State Department official. I can't get his sister on the phone. Nobody will talk to me. I called his attorney in Dallas, who he Venmo'd for a hotel room in April. Nobody will talk to me.

David Clements: So what are the next steps that you think needs to happen with ItalyGate? 60 seconds. And then—because I want to touch on Hunter Biden after that.

Garrett Ziegler: Sixty seconds with ItalyGate. D'ELIA allegedly entered into a plea deal yesterday in the court of Naples. The prosecutor's name is Giovanni MELILLO, who happens to be married to the UK Ambassador to Italy. Someone needs to get to Arturo D'ELIA, and they need to ask him if he knows Luciano CAMPOLI and if these two American women named Maria Zack and Michele Edwards are telling the truth. If he says yes, but he wants protections, they need to get him on a boat with his family and get him somewhere. If he says it's a hoax, and they're all lying, and this is a joke, then I am going to personally shame every single person who led us on this without proper verification.

David Clements: Well, I was—I got caught up in it, too. I mean—I basically put it out there. People ask me questions about it [and] saw the *Reuters* fact check.

Garrett Ziegler: Oh, can I say one more thing?

David Clements: Yeah.

Garrett Ziegler: One of the fact checkers—by the way, none of the fact checkers for Francesca Landini, who is the Italian-American journalist for *Reuters* who did it (she didn't do any work—the three fact checkers for that article weren't even in Italy. They were in Mexico, New York City, and another American city. And it was Katie Couric's *daughter*. The fact checker for *Reuters* ItalyGate was Katie Couric's daughter, and they didn't even follow up with Leonardo. So, there you have it. It's one big incestuous left-wing family.

David Clements: Alright, so I'm going to try to give us 10 minutes to close out this interview and because you've looked at ItalyGate, but you're also are one of these people that are doing a deep dive into Hunter Biden's laptop. Most people that have heard about laptop—it was briefly mentioned, I think, in the *New York Post* twice and that was the extent of it. They were under tremendous pressure. And then Jack Maxey has gone on I want to say...

Garrett Ziegler: ...he's a patriot doing [the] *Metaxas* [show]...

David Clements: ... *Metaxas*, but not many other places.

Garrett Ziegler: He did a great thing on a Christian outlet [*LifeSite*]. It was with an Indian man. I'll put it so you can put it in your Telegram. I really love what Jack Maxey is doing, and thank God for *The Daily Mail*. Josh Boswell out of LA—the LA correspondent for *The Daily Mail*—is doing God's work because he's the only person with any reach to do what I call Chinese water torture drip pieces. The hookers, the cocaine, everything. All of the felonies.

David Clements: That's the thing. It's almost like this, you know, reading the tea leaves. You've got something that no one's really disputing. Everyone knows this laptop exists. And when you got Hunter Biden sitting down saying “Is this your laptop?” and saying just, “I don't know, could be,” that's like—that's not the greatest defense.

Garrett Ziegler: Coke has fried his mind.

David Clements: So Maxey gets on there and you're almost holding your breath—not for him, so much, but for the host because they're like, “Oh my God, if this is true.” I mean, what else is going to be—because the information on the laptop is so salacious. So damning. It's so evil...

Garrett Ziegler: ...money laundering, back taxes, hookers.

David Clements: And here you are. You've got this golden goose that can literally unravel nations. But no one's touching it, which...

Garrett Ziegler: ...the corporate people don't want to be sued because they care about their bottom line. My two biggest focuses in my life right now are the election coup and Hunter Biden because I think those two things are worthy of everybody's time and my time. And they hold the key to so much corruption within the United States. And I think Hunter Biden can actually lead us to clues about the election coup.

So that's what *Marco Polo* is focused on—in that order—the election coup and Hunter Biden. And my goal is to write the first academic report on the Hunter Biden laptop. There have been tremendous articles done, even in *The Daily Mail*, tremendous ones. And *Western Journal* has talked about it a little bit. But we're not going to get it from the corporate entities. AEI is not going to talk about money laundering with Ukrainian oligarchs with Hunter Biden. It's going to take a rag-tag research LLC with no allegiances—other than to the truth and Jesus Christ—to talk about this. What we want is a

foundational document that blurs out nothing. We're going to have a redacted and an unredacted version. There's going to be people named and felonies talked about, and it's going to run the gamut. So it's going to be laid out by legal code—sections of legal code.

So, by law, a Delaware social worker is required to report allegations of sexual abuse of a minor. Ashley Biden didn't do that. That is a felony; Ashley Biden needs to be held account[able] for that. We will talk about that. Our vision is akin to Ron Johnson's *Report* about Burisma back in 2020, which I'll link your people to on Telegram, as well. What we want is a foundational document that other people can cite, that Senators can cite, that Congressmen can cite, that is *true*. We are going to go to each and every single one of the intelligence officers that signed the October 22nd letter that said that the Hunter Biden laptop was akin to a Russian disinformation operation, which they totally ran cover for him. And we are going to put those people on the spot and make them account for their sins because what they did was sinful, and it needs to be called out. And this is going to be a long endeavor. We're hoping for a couple hundred page report that has over 500 footnotes, that's indisputable, that goes on the source documents. And we're hoping for the involvement, although unconfirmed as of yet, which I'll be honest about, of the laptop shop owner. We want it to be like an authorized—you know how authorized biographies have the subject involved. We want to tell that story as well because the FBI involvement will point to cover-ups. The fact that they had it from December of [20]19 with explanatory evidence—that Trump didn't back channel with Ukrainians and pressure them—that it was actually Biden. It's really satanic. It's really Alinsky stuff. What they've done—what the Biden's have done and the left wing media—has accused us of exactly what they're guilty of.

And so this report is monumental. The *Marco Polo* dads, as we call ourselves—I'm the only one with a public facing account right now—they're anonymous as of yet. If they want to do joint interviews with me, I'll be glad to. I love them all to death. But right now we want the attacks to be on—because once they see the report, the report will be very hard to attack. So I'm okay with the attacks. I truly don't care what people think about me. But I want the attacks to be personal because that means we're over the target. So the report will go into all the felonies. We have wire transfers from Chinese entities to all the Finger Lakes LLCs that he set up. And we hope it'll be something that will be on par with the *Moynehan Report* in 1965 that talked about the condition of Black families. And we think that this is not just going past old crimes; this is going to lead us to current crimes. The laptop that he [had] was, I think, a drug-induced abandonment to a Wilmington, Delaware Mac shop will be political dynamite. And it will implicate the Big Guy, which we know was siphoning off money. Peter Schweizer, who I respect, is doing a deep dive on Hunter Biden, as well. I think the more the merrier. I hope that he does a report on it, but I want ours to have the involvement of the laptop shop owner, as well.

So that is what I'm focused on. We're hoping to get some election integrity non-profits off the ground. We've been having trouble forming the right team. If I learned anything in my time at the White House, it's who you have at the table matters more than anything. You can get over technology hurdles—anything—if you have the right team. So I'm very excited about this research firm I've started. I think that it's going to be a unique on the Right. We basically have nothing like this. We're not doing political oppo research—what we're doing is corruption research. We feel that all the think tanks in the country, Mr. Clements, are basically money laundering schemes because we're dealing with blackmailed individuals—not all the time, of course. But a lot of our—some people think it's

always sexual blackmail or something salacious, like Hunter Biden. It can be economic blackmail. It can be certain Congressmen getting campaign donations from this one energy company and they're dictating their decisions. What we want to try to do is expose blackmailed entities, whether they be people or organizations, so as to inspire one of two things: Either the blackmailed entity can get off the stage and some non-compromised entity can replace them, or the blackmailed entity that we are revealing is no longer controlled by the blackmailer, thus freeing them of the shackles that is dictating all their decisions.

David Clements: What it sounds like is, historically, what you would have expected a free press to do, which is to investigate, shine a light, and apply tremendous public pressure and public support. But we've lost that. We've lost it. I see a kind of an element of Project Veritas, because we're not just going to do a report. We're going to activate action with the report.

Garrett Ziegler: ...yeah, we're hopefully going to partner with attorneys who can bring suits. We want to do lawfare.

David Clements: That's what I love about what you're doing, Garrett. Garrett will get into the mix with supporting Peter Navarro's mission with *The Navarro Report*. I also know that Garrett was instrumental in helping John Droz, Jr., who's done amazing reports on the lawsuits. But then he did the *Elections Recommendations Report*, which you helped with. And now you've got another report that you're working on for the Hunter Biden laptop. And you mentioned something earlier about there being more than just one laptop but three...

Garrett Ziegler: there's actually multiple laptops, but through the handling off to Robert Costello, who was Rudy Giuliani's attorney, then to Rudy, to the *New York Post*, stuff got lost in translation. And so that's why I did that chain of allegations thing on ItalyGate. You know that game when you're in a cafeteria, somebody tells somebody, who tells somebody, and the story is different at both ends? That's what the laptop is like. It got handed off to so many entities that I want to try to go back to the source—go back to laptop shop owner and then tell that story. So it can be the definitive history of it. And that's what we're doing. Your programming now is going to be in the historical record. We live in the greatest carnival ever, which is America. And we can't have [the] Heritage [Foundation] writing the history anymore. They have to go into the dust bin of history. The history has to be rewritten by other people like us who aren't bought.

David Clements: Well, Garrett, we've covered a lot. And it's all stuff that I've wanted to talk with you about. And so what I'd like to do is treat this interview much like I treat many of the other ones. I hope it's a continuing conversation with updates. I talked about some very uncomfortable things with the pandemic with Dr. Richard Fleming, who has been a major target of the Fauci operations. I think we've got a total of five interviews and probably six or seven hours' worth of content on just all things COVID. It would be really cool to document all things ItalyGate, all things Hunter Biden. And just keep getting the information out there. But, with that, thank you very much.

Garrett Ziegler: Thank you very much. Thanks for giving me the opportunity. God bless you.