

# TRANSCRIPT

## **Sovereignty Summit 4:**

**An Update on the Globalists' World Government Agenda;  
Why and How it Must be Resisted**

**Thursday, October 17, 2024**

<https://sovereigntysummit.org/the-sovereignty-summit-4/>

Media file: SovSummit\_4.mp4

### BEGIN TRANSCRIPT:

**Dede Laugesen:** [00:00:05] Good morning, everyone. Welcome and thank you for being here today for the Sovereignty Coalition's fourth Sovereignty Summit. Our moderator today is Frank Gaffney. He is a co-founder of the Sovereignty Coalition and vice chair for the Committee on the Present Danger, China.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:00:24] Welcome, everyone, to this fourth Sovereignty Summit, brought to you by the Sovereignty Coalition, which I'm very proud to be a co-founder with my colleague Reggie Littlejohn, from whom you'll be hearing momentarily. We founded the coalition about two years ago or so, in the interest of raising awareness about and opposing actively efforts to crush the sovereignty of the United States, and, for that matter, other nations around the world in the furtherance [00:01:00] of something that globalists call. Well, global governance or more precisely, world government. This has been brought to us in a number of different forms in the intervening period, notably a treaty. And yes, I use that term advisedly, amending the International Health Regulations of the World Health Organization and a new pact just completed and adopted by the United Nations General Assembly meeting in the form of the summit of the future, they call it the pact of the future or pact for the future. I think it is. And it is another of these products of a multilateral negotiating process that is deeply problematic, especially in terms of the rights of individuals and countries like ours [00:02:00] and the sovereignty of their government. We are deeply concerned about it, for reasons that will be made very clear in the course of this extraordinary program. We are deeply grateful to all of you for tuning in and for those who will be in the days and

months to come, we hope, as well as to the extraordinary lineup of speakers, presenters and the people who make up our Sovereignty coalition and its allies. Their efforts have been, I think, remarkably successful in raising the alarm, if to this point not as successful as we would like in terms of stopping what the globalists have afoot.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:02:49] But we are going to be hearing a lot in the course of this program about the safety mechanism that the founders of our republic, the [00:03:00] framers of our Constitution, built in in the form of a check and balance by the United States Senate, a quality control mechanism, if you will, on the products of executive branch negotiations, one of which has been in this area of world government promotion. We're going to be hearing from, among others, legislators who are involved in trying to make sure that the Senate does its constitutional duty with respect to both this International Health Regulation treaty, another one in the offing, by the way, from the World Health Organization, a so-called pandemic prevention, preparedness and response accord. Sometimes they call it a treaty, actually, and it is, of course, as well as this new pact for the future. And I'm delighted that they're going to be joining us to shed their insights [00:04:00] into the stakes and the likelihood that the Senate will do its job. Before we get to all of that, I'm welcoming first to the program. My friend, my colleague, our fellow co-founder of the Sovereignty Coalition, Reggie Littlejohn. She is the president of Women's Rights Without Frontiers, as well as the new Anti-globalist international. And her leadership on all of these efforts is vital importance, and we're always privileged to have her with us. Reggie, the floor is yours.

**Reggie Littlejohn:** [00:04:35] My topic is basically the digital gulag that is being set in place by instruments from both the World Health Organization and the United Nations. I'd like to start out by saying that both of these instruments, one of which is called amendments to the International Health Regulations, the other one of which is called pact for the future. They are both treaties which [00:05:00] makes them subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. And why do I say that? Well, under the Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties of 1969, here's the definition of a treaty. It's very simply a treaty means an international agreement concluded between states in written form and governed by international law, whether embodied in a single instrument or in two or more related instruments, and whatever its particular designation. In other words, the fact that they call this a pact or they call it amendments to International Health Regulations, it doesn't matter what designation, if it is an international instrument that is

written and it's between nations, it's a treaty and it needs to. It has to be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. And this is so important. And Doctor Francis Boyle will go into much more chapter and verse about this. But it is so important because the Senate is our protection against all the things I'm going to be telling you about that are in these pernicious documents. So just as [00:06:00] as a beginner, both of these documents were passed in ways that are unacceptable to democracies in terms of the international Health Regulation amendments, they were supposed to circulate them for months in advance.

**Reggie Littlejohn:** [00:06:12] I don't know if they even circulated them for hours in advance. So what this did is it circumvented national debate within the nations to be able to see what they were voting on and to actually comment on it. And the same thing with the pack for the future. They it was passed by something called the silence procedure, which means that it was never debated on the floor of the United Nations, and it was never debated in our Senate or anywhere else. It was basically, you know, passed in the dark. Both of these were passed in the dark. So what's in these dark documents? Well, with respect to the International Health Regulations of the World Health Organization. One of the things that's in there is the article four requires every country in the world to appoint responsible authorities, [00:07:00] and they should be called the National International Health Regulations Authority or the national IHR Focal Point. The point is that they shall, quote, coordinate the implementation of these regulations and the jurisdiction within the jurisdiction of the state party, adjusting their domestic legislation and administrative amendments. So these are basically you know, these are people who are going to be answering to the World Health Organization, not to our own government to implement what the World Health Organization says, including adjusting legislation.

**Reggie Littlejohn:** [00:07:40] In other words, they're going to be trying to get our domestic legislation, whether it's, you know, local, state or federal to conform with the W.H.O. That's their job. This is a huge conflict of interest. The W.H.O. amended health regulations also require nation [00:08:00] states to surveil their citizens and also to censor, to, to develop, strengthen and maintain capacities in relation to addressing misinformation and disinformation. So how are they going to define those? They're not defined in the documents. But I would submit to you that they're going to be defined basically the way they defined it under Covid, which is anything that disagrees with the

World Health Organization or the CDC. They also in these amendment amended International Health Regulations. They, they require health documents. So and this is going to lead to the digital ID and that's a whole nother subject, which is very important. They're already, you know, rolling these out. The W.H.O. and the European Union have been rolling out digital IDs internationally since June, I think, of last year. They're well along the way of this and these digital IDs. If you go on to the World Economic Forum website, they [00:09:00] are going to be required in order for people to open a bank account, access government benefits, vote carry on online tax transactions, own a communications device like a cell phone or a you know, or a laptop. They're going to be required for every aspect of our lives.

**Reggie Littlejohn:** [00:09:22] And what that means is if they're required to access these things, then then they're going to be able to gather information about us and make a decision about us similar to the China Social Credit system, and deny us access if we act up like by, for example, refusing to be vaccinated, we might not be able to access restaurants, etc. or by actually criticizing them online with respect to the United Nations pact for the future. They talk about transforming global governance and the central role of responding to complex global shocks of [00:10:00] the United Nations. So we got on one hand the World Health Organization establishing a digital gulag with respect to health. And then we've got the United Nations establishing a digital gulag with respect to climate change. The banking, the banking system going down the grid, going down the internet, going down, supply chain disruptions even immigration disruptions. So between the two of them, they've got us trapped, coming and going. So what I'd like to say is that these things are well along the way. It's not like they were waiting for them to be passed in order to implement them. They are well along the implementation stage, and it's going to take a massive effort to turn this around, the first of which is informing people. Most people don't even know that this is happening. So that's number one. And that includes even members of Congress.

**Reggie Littlejohn:** [00:10:59] So [00:11:00] I would urge people to go on to the sovereignty coalition, take action there. And that will send. It will send an email to your congressional representatives or call them and alert them to this and tell them that it's an important that's important to you. Bring it up in, you know, when people or candidates are debating in the election. And please share this video. So that being said, I would like to introduce now it's my privilege to introduce Doctor Francis Boyle, who is a

renowned international Actual attorney and who has, you know, great credibility to comment on his topic, which is the courts advancing world government or treaties and must be subject to approval by the US Senate. And I should also mention that Senator Ron Johnson is here and has done more than anybody else to try to make that a reality. But Doctor Boyle is professor [00:12:00] of international law at the University of Illinois College of Law. He's got a J.D. degree, magna cum laude, from Harvard, a PhD in political science from Harvard University. He's a former board member of Amnesty International, and he is the author of the US Domestic Implementing Legislation for the Biological Weapons Convention, known as the Biological Weapons Anti-Terrorism act of 1989, and which was approved unanimously by both houses of the US Congress and signed into law by President George H.W. Bush. So Doctor Boyle, the floor is now yours.

**Dr. Francis Boyle:** [00:12:35] Thank you very much, Reggie. And thank you, Frank, for asking me to speak here today at this very important conference. Yes. As Reggie said, this clearly qualifies as a treaty within the meaning of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. And in particular, the portion we're dealing with here is accepted as customary [00:13:00] international law by the United States government. That is the definition of a treaty which Reggie just read to you. I will not repeat that here, except it says, quote, whatever its particular designation, unquote. So it does not have to say it is a treaty. But the giveaway here is that instead of calling this a treaty, they've called it a pact. Well, a pact is another word for a treaty. Consider the Hitler-Stalin pact. That was a treaty. And it's called the Hitler-Stalin pact. That is what we are dealing with here. And it fulfills the other requirements by states written form governed by international law. Now, if you look at the text of the document itself, [00:14:00] the United Nations is lying here that it was adopted by consensus. That is not true. There were seven votes against this before it was rammed through the General Assembly. Calling it a consensus resolution is an attempt to bootstrap it into a customary international law. Now, if you doubt what I am saying, the document itself proves it.

**Dr. Francis Boyle:** [00:14:31] If you go to the Declaration on Future Generations, page 52. Okay. And the next pages. The next page 53. With respect to the declaration on future generations, it says guiding principles. Guiding principles. All right. So the people who drafted this document [00:15:00] knew how to make commitments under that. Not binding a guiding principles means it's hortatory. It is not binding. But other than that,

the rest of this document is binding as an international convention. Let me read for you the first paragraph. It says that the pact for the future. It says, quote, we the heads of state and government. All right. Heads of state and government. It was specifically convened for that purpose. Heads of state and government have extraordinary and plenipotentiary powers to bind their states by their mere fiat alone, either orally or in writing, or by means of a vote. And that's why this was convened [00:16:00] this way, to get the heads of state and governments to sign on to this document. And then it says, through the actions in this pact for the future actions for in this pact for the future. So there they are already ordering actions to be undertaken that are being undertaken now as we speak. And then the second paragraph. We are at a time of profound global transformation.

**Dr. Francis Boyle:** [00:16:35] Right. They give it all away there, right at the beginning by saying it's global. These are the globalist people here are doing to this the Klaus Schwab people, the Chinese Communist government, World Economic Forum, Bill gates and all the rest of them. Finally and again, I apologize for being so technical [00:17:00] here, but that is my job. If you take a look at Vienna Convention article 18 paragraph B, and again, the United States government accepts this as binding customary international law. A state is obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object of the purpose of a treaty when it has expressed its consent to be bound by the treaty. That's exactly what happened. Heads of state and government have the authority to express the consent of their states to a treaty, as defined by the Vienna Convention and international law. So as we speak here today, the United States government is under an obligation to act in a manner so as not to defeat the object and purpose of the pact for the future. In other words, they are provisionally [00:18:00] bringing this pact of the future into force now and are acting on it. Quote actions without any advice and consent by the Senate, as required by the US Constitution. Technically, then, this is, as we speak today, an international executive agreement that they can proceed to act on which they could be doing.

**Dr. Francis Boyle:** [00:18:26] Right now, we just don't know. They could issue an executive order and bring this whole thing into effect right away, if that is what they want to do. So this leads to the conclusion, of course, we have to resist. We I commend those courageous politicians here in the United States who have gone on record to resist what's going on here. We need every politician in the country our governors,

attorney generals, members of Congress, of [00:19:00] the state legislators, county boards, city councils going on record and saying we will disobey any order coming out of any organization, a specialized agency, affiliated organization of the United Nations organization period, and especially the W.H.O. itself. We've discussed this before. That W.H.O. will set up a worldwide totalitarian medical police state. So we have to resist. Let me conclude on a personal point. I have been up against the entire United Nations organization for my client at the time, the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and all 4.5 million of its citizens as their attorney of record at the World Court and their ambassador there at the Owen-Stoltenberg negotiations [00:20:00] in the summer of 1993. They were conducted under the auspices of the entire United Nations organization, including the secretary general his representative Stoltenberg, and their lawyer, the UN lawyer Paul Zoss.

**Dr. Francis Boyle:** [00:20:16] The purpose of the Owen-Stoltenberg negotiations Was to destroy the entire Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a state. Carved up into three little bitty pieces. Robbed Bosnia of its UN membership and subject 1.5 to 2 million more Bosnians to ethnic cleansing, when we already had 2 million victims of ethnic cleansing and 200,000 dead Bosnians and 40 to 50,000 raped Bosnian women. All this was going on at UN headquarters in Geneva, the Palais des Nations, under the supervision of the UN secretary [00:21:00] general Thorvald Stoltenberg, and the UN lawyer. And when I tried to stop this, I was threatened at UN headquarters in Geneva by the UN lawyer Paul Zass, despite the fact that I had diplomatic privileges and immunities under the United Nations Charter. All this took place at UN headquarters in Geneva. Now, I stopped this. It never happened. Bosnia is still there. It still has its UN membership. But I can tell you from my personal experience, the UN secretary general, the UN Secretariat and all of its bureaucrats are pure evil. We cannot trust them with the future of the Republic of the United States of America, the Constitution of the United States of America, and the people of the United States of America. Thank you for your time.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:21:57] Professor Boyle. Thank you for yours. And as [00:22:00] you say, getting into the technical details is your job. And you've done it magnificently, both here and elsewhere. And we are deeply grateful to you for your participation. We have the privilege of having with us one of the legislators that both Reggie and I have spoken of. A man who has really distinguished himself with his commitment to the

sovereignty of the United States, to the Constitution of the United States. In fact, he is arguably one of relatively few members of the United States Senate who remember, it seems, the oath of office to which each of them formally swore to preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. His name is Senator Ron Johnson. He represents the people of Wisconsin with great distinction in the Senate. He is the lead sponsor of S 444, legislation [00:23:00] that would require these treaties to be brought to the Senate for its advice, and we would hope, dissent. Senator, thank you so much for joining us. You have been such an important contributor to these summits in the past. We really are privileged to have you with us. Floor is yours, sir.

**Sen. Ron Johnson:** [00:23:18] Well, thank you, Frank. Thank you. Reggie. Please ignore my voice. I sound a lot worse than I actually feel. First of all, I think what Reggie said is the most important. The number one action. And this is why I so appreciate the sovereignty coalition is to expose this to the public. I think the good news is that the American public, by and large, is very leery of global governance. They're very leery of the UN. But I want to spend my time just talking about the political reality of what we've tried to do in terms of deeming these executive agreements, treaties and, you know, force them to be debated and ratified in the Senate. We've had very little luck. And I'll start with the Iran agreement, which I believe, if you look at the Foreign Affairs manual, clearly [00:24:00] would be deemed a treaty. And yet the amendment I offered was actually voted against by Republicans as well as Democrats, because they had a bill that they thought would, you know, Require reporting on the Iran agreement. It did, of course, did nothing. Iran is closer to breakout now than they've ever been. But again, that was clearly a treaty. I had Republicans actually vote against that, that amendment to deem the treaty to bring forth the United States Senate for ratification was soundly defeated. So let's fast forward to this because of your efforts. You know, we did get the attention of Republicans in the Senate. So prior to the and, of course, I know they never they never voted on the amendments.

**Sen. Ron Johnson:** [00:24:41] But that whole process going up to the General Assembly where you were trying to defeat those amendments. We made enough Republicans in the Senate aware of the fact that I actually got every Republican senator signing a letter to President Biden to basically deem the treaty and not enter into anything until [00:25:00] the Senate has had its advice and consent role. We could not



get one Democrat to sign that bill. So again, it's a completely political Process, I can pretty well show you. You look back at, you know, the loss of freedom. You know, the totalitarian measures taken by governments, including the United States government, based on laws and phrases and laws that have been laid down literally decades before, pretty much guarantee you the members of Congress, when they are voting for those piece of legislation, had no idea that they were voting for basically an accumulation of law and international law that would allow these tyrants, these totalitarians, to assume that kind of power. So again, my main point is this is this is a political process. You know, we are dealing with lawless administrations. I mean, Obama completely ignored the Supreme Court when it came to DACA. You know, that total misuse of prosecutorial discretion. The Biden administration has [00:26:00] a ruling against the eviction moratoriums just extended the moratorium anyway. Supreme Court rulings and other court rulings ruling that you cannot forgive student loans, they continue to forgive them. So again these are lawless administrations. It's going to take, you know, at some point in time, the legal reality of whether these things are or aren't treaties, maybe, you know, have its day in court, but that would be way down the road.

**Sen. Ron Johnson:** [00:26:24] And the best way to defeat this is politically short term. The best way to defeat it is to make sure that President Trump gets elected. You'll notice the Iranian agreement was canceled by President Trump because it was just an executive agreement. It's not it's not worth the paper. It's signed on. I mean that that is the advantage of not going through the Senate, not having it be deemed a treaty. Again, we're all assuming that if this thing would come before the Senate, it would be defeated. I think it would be. But, you know, we've got that ace in the hole as well. We've got elect the right presidents. People who are actually [00:27:00] will follow the law that are opposed to the UN domination and global governance, and we won't be dealing with these issues. But again, my main point is it's a political process. It's about getting public support to put pressure on members of Congress. But again, I just I just do not see having the support in the United States Senate to even pass a bill that would deem something that's a treaty to force the debate in the advice and consent. It's just not going to happen. We need to elect President Trump as president. So sorry to be Partizan, but that's the best solution right now. Short term.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:27:34] You're calling them as you see them, Senator. And I think none of us would disagree with you, though I would hope if the composition of the

Senate changes, irrespective of who's in the presidency. Some of the politics of this might be different as well. But your leadership in trying to make sure that the law is followed, the Constitution, most especially is followed, is, as I said, deeply, deeply appreciated. Sir, thank you for joining, explaining where we stand. All [00:28:00] of which makes the case the more for what we're trying to do here, folks, which is to raise the public's awareness of, well, the power grab that is very, very far advanced by both the United Nations and the World Health Organization. Congressman Ralph Norman, he has been one of the great leaders in the House of Representatives and Who's Rules Committee. He serves with distinction, among other positions. He is also the chairman of the House Conservative Opportunity Society, which has been in the very vanguard of the effort to protect our sovereignty. Congressman, I know you're in the midst of a series of appointments. We are very appreciative of you finding a few minutes for us. Floor is now yours. Speak up sir.

**Rep. Ralph Norman:** [00:28:42] My honor, Frank and I just want to thank you and the Sovereignty Coalition for ringing the bells on this. As Senator Johnson said, you know, according to our Constitution, we it's got to be voted on by two thirds margin in the Senate. And, you know, the overview of what the UN [00:29:00] is trying to do to strip the sovereignty of America, what the Biden administration is unlawfully doing. We've got to make this first and foremost a loud voice coming from the United States Congress, which I think we can do, particularly after President Trump gets elected and stop this absurd treaty that they would impose on the United States. We can't afford it. Why would we give up everything that we're asked to give up in a vague document? The good news, though, Frank, they couldn't come to an agreement, and I think they may have. May 24th of this year is postponed to May 25th of 25. Hopefully we're going to have new bodies and new majorities in the House and Senate and of course, the presidency. But it's insanity at its height. And as Senator Johnson said, the American people are with the sovereignty coalition, I think, and they're with those of us who oppose everything the W.H.O. is doing [00:30:00] and has done for as long as I can remember, particularly with the Covid debacle that they controlled and put the United States at really a financial risk and an international risk.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:30:12] Thank you. Congressman, this is music to our ears. Of course, that you're on the case and leading, as you must, in the effort to ensure that the Senate does its job. The House is, as you mentioned, taken action recently on the

companion to Senator Johnson's bill, SB 1425. And we very much hope that these legislative efforts will effectively create the conditions under which we finally do see the Senate stepping up and doing its job. We're going to turn next to a gentleman who has been studying very closely and for quite some time, the issues of what the states can do to try to nullify Constitutional agreements [00:31:00] that might otherwise impact and in fact, imperil states rights. His name is Joe Wolverton, the second. He's an attorney by training, a constitutional law scholar and a contributor to The New American. And we've asked him to talk about what is state nullification and why states should embrace it. Now, the floor is yours, Joe. Welcome.

**Joe Wolverton:** [00:31:26] Thank you, Frank, Reggie and Dede, thank you all for inviting me. And I'll be quick so I can stand by my oath to not use more time than necessary. Nullification is no more, no less than the application of the law of principle and agency to the government. The states acting as principals entered into a contract, the US Constitution whereby they created an agent, the federal government. And within the four corners of that contract they enumerated the full scope of their agent's authority, as with any contract creating a principal agent relationship, [00:32:00] the principal retains the right to refuse to hold, to be held accountable for any act of the agent that exceeds the agent's contractual authority. This has been the law in England and America for almost a millennium. The status of states as principals and the federal government as their agent is clearly explicated throughout the Federalist Papers, particularly 33, 39, 45, 46, and 78, as well as throughout the debates on the ratification of the Constitution held in the States. With that relationship clearly established, it's easy enough for anyone to understand that the states retain the right, as Madison expressed it in Federalist 46, to refuse to cooperate with the officers of the Union when the acts of the federal government exceed its enumerated authority. The black letter of the 10th Amendment clearly compels anyone to admit such authority on the part of the states, and to admit such restrictions on the [00:33:00] authority of the federal government.

**Joe Wolverton:** [00:33:01] Opponents of nullification often warn of the chaos that would ensue should states be at liberty to nullify unconstitutional acts of the federal government. Well, I don't have to imagine the chaos that would occur under an uncontrollable federal government because I'm living it in real life. Finally, to those who would aver that a state's refusal to enforce an unconstitutional act of the federal government is seditious, I would point to the declaration made by Thomas Jefferson in

the Kentucky Resolutions, whereby he declares that nullification is the rightful remedy against federal usurpation. How can it be rebellion or sedition against a government to uphold and enforce the document that created that government? It seems to me that such an act would not be an act of rebellion, but rather an exercise of sovereignty aimed at preserving the Constitution and protecting the liberties of the people from a centralized, overreaching government. Nullification is the scalpel with which we may [00:34:00] remove tumors of tyranny. Without damaging the healthy tissue surrounding it. It is the safest remedy and still the rightful one. And we know that state refusal to enforce unconstitutional federal acts or orders is safe, because as far as I know, states like Idaho, Colorado and Arizona remain peacefully part of the union despite openly refusing to enforce federal regulations banning the sale of marijuana and raw milk.

**Joe Wolverton:** [00:34:30] Such power is not granted to the federal government. Thus, states, again per the plain language of the 10th Amendment and the principles of law of agency, may safely refuse to enforce those unconstitutional attempts at regulation. That is to say, we know for certain that nullification works without dissolving the Union, because it is doing so right now. While the word nullification does not appear in the Constitution, the principle is inherent in the very structure of the Union. The 10th Amendment [00:35:00] explicitly reserves to the states or to the people all powers not granted or delegated to the federal government. Since the Constitution grants only specific enumerated powers to the federal government. Any action taken beyond those powers is null and void. Additionally, in article six, the Supremacy Clause states that only laws made in pursuance thereof in pursuance of the Constitution are the supreme law of the land. Any federal law that violates the Constitution is, by definition, not made in pursuance thereof, and thus has no binding force. This is the foundation of nullification in the States, as parties to the compact have not only the right, but the obligation to resist unconstitutional federal laws.

**Joe Wolverton:** [00:35:39] The Latin legal maxim *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* was well known to the founding generation, and it simply means that if a class is defined by a list and a particular item is left off that list, then that item was purposely left off the list by those drafting the document. In this case, Supreme Court opinions [00:36:00] are not listed as forming part of the class designated as the supreme law of the land. Therefore, the drafters purposefully left that item off the list and is therefore not included in the supreme law of the land. Furthermore, article seven of the Constitution named states as

the bodies that would ratify the Constitution and sets the threshold number of ratifying states at nine. Therefore, should not only nine states have chosen to ratify the Constitution and create a union, then each of the other four states would have remained. As Madison explained in Federalist 39, each of those states would have remained a sovereign body independent of all others, and only bound by its own voluntary act. Finally, does a treaty override the constitution? No, a treaty does not override the Constitution. Article six establishes that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land. Treaties. Although part of the supreme law, when made in pursuance of the Constitution, cannot alter or supersede the Constitution's provisions.

**Joe Wolverton:** [00:36:58] The US Supreme Court affirmed [00:37:00] this in Reid versus covert 1957 ruling. Thus, it would be manifestly contrary to the objectives of those who created the Constitution, as well as those who were responsible for the Bill of rights, let alone alien to our entire constitutional history and tradition. To construe article six as permitting the United States to exercise power under an international agreement without observing constitutional prohibitions. In effect, such construction would permit amendment of the Constitution in a manner not sanctioned by article five. The prohibitions of the Constitution were designed to apply to all branches of the national government, and they cannot be nullified by the executive or by the executive and the Senate combined. In the Reed case, the court held that treaties do not permit federal government to violate constitutional rights of U.S. citizens. Finally, state legislators and governors are required by article six of the Constitution to be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution. I can think of no better way [00:38:00] to faithfully execute that oath than to refuse to recognize or enforce within a state sovereign borders, any international treaty that violates the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, or that is not made in pursuance of the powers granted to the federal government by the states in the contract known as the US Constitution.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:38:22] Thank you. Thank you, Joe Wolverton, a very compelling presentation. We appreciate you doing it, sir. We'll look forward to collaborating with you further on many of these issues. A pleasure, sir. I believe that we have, at least by audio, perhaps altogether Representative Bud Hulse of Tennessee, a man who has actually been on point in the adoption by that state legislature of the nullification legislation, known as HB 2795, is the representative with us in point of fact.

[00:39:00] And if so, can you speak now, sir? I bet your experiences and the leadership you're providing.

**Rep. Bud Hulseley:** [00:39:05] Thank you for the opportunity to be here. And it's a lift up my heart to listen to other folks talk about these issues. The bill that I have is based on what Joe said. I just can't say it as eloquently as he did, but it's based on the constitutional principle that the states created the federal government and that article one, section eight of the United States Constitution only gives the federal government about 18 things that they can mess around in. And the way I explain it is the framers gave them a very small garden to hoe in. Absolutely everything else on the landscape belongs to the States, and we have this huge garden. And over the last 100 plus years, of course, they've been encroached and started plowing in our garden. [00:40:00] And it's the same thing with the treaties that you're talking about. And what Joe mentioned that that treaties have to be pursuant to the Constitution and the things that you are talking about, of course, violate the Constitution. And so this bill doesn't force the legislature to do anything. It doesn't force them to nullify anything. What it does do is say, if you're going to nullify an unconstitutional edict, there's five ways to do it. And that's what the bill does. And I'm hoping we can be successful here this year.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:40:39] But just a point of clarification, I misunderstood. I thought the bill had been adopted. It has not yet. And you anticipate it being taken up in the next session of the legislature in Tennessee?

**Rep. Bud Hulseley:** [00:40:49] Yes, sir. I will run it again in January and last session, the Senate summer study. And we just had that summer study, October [00:41:00] the 3rd. And as a matter of fact, Joe testified in that and did an excellent job. And I'm hoping that that will set the stage for its passage in January.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:41:11] Splendid. Well, we look forward to working with you on raising awareness about the importance of this constitutional process, and wish you the best of luck. And thank you for your leadership at the state level. And I'm sure it will serve as a model for other states as well, at least if our sovereignty coalition has anything to do with it. Thank you, Frank.

**Rep. Bud Hulseley:** [00:41:31] And I appreciate your allowing me to be with your group this morning.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:41:35] No, it's great that you could do so. And I'm appreciative you found a technological workaround for it. We're going to turn next to a very distinguished new member of our sovereignty coalition. I'm very proud to say her name is Doctor Sherri Tenpenny. She is a board certified medical doctor specializing in osteopathic medicine. She has an integrative medicine certification [00:42:00] proficiency. But for our purposes most importantly, she is the founder and the leader of Tenpenny Investigative Medical Center in Cleveland, Ohio, and an internationally recognized expert on vaccines. Doctor Tenpenny. We are both appreciative of you enlisting in our efforts with the Sovereignty Coalition, and you're taking a few minutes to present on the question of the pitfalls associated with the pact for the future.

**Dr. Sherri Tenpenny:** [00:42:29] Well, good morning, Frank. Thank you so much for having me. And thank you so much for inviting me to the group. I've. I've followed you and your work and the things that you've done for quite a while. And it's really, really an honor and a pleasure to be part of the group and to be able to talk just a couple of minutes. You know, I didn't wasn't able to listen to what previous speakers have had to say. So I may have some level of duplication here. But my, my main concern about this pact when you read it [00:43:00] when you read it is the first paragraph. I mean, the first paragraph starts with we, the heads of state and government representing the peoples of the world. To me that when I read that, I just didn't need to read anything else because they have gathered to protect the needs and interests of future, present, future, future, present or present. Present and future generations. And it's like you don't represent me. I don't know who you are. And you're a you're an appointed person by a government that is an ambassador that. I don't know who you are. I don't know what you represent. I don't you don't represent me. I mean, do you even represent the Constitution? You know, the permanent members are of the UN National Security Council or the US, UK, France, Russia and China.

**Dr. Sherri Tenpenny:** [00:43:50] And each one of them points an ambassador to go there. And they are they have a commitment to who? And who are they representing? [00:44:00] Are they representing the US or are they representing our countries or each one of these other countries, or are they representing the United Nations? And what the

and what the United Nations is wanting to move forward? And they and another thing that was so disturbing to me about this document is that it said we affirm our unwavering commitment in, in act to act in accordance with the international law. And so that's sort of like saying to me, instead of saying, I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and for the and for the Republic for which it stands. It's more like saying I pledge allegiance to the United Nation, which I don't think anybody here in the United States even knows about or even wants to do so. And they keep saying over and over again, and we hear this in a lot of the speeches that people give when they want to invigorate global action for the future we want. Who are we? Did anybody else get to vote? Did they get a say? Did they get a chance to write this document? And [00:45:00] you know, the sustainability things of the 17 sustainability goals.

**Dr. Sherri Tenpenny:** [00:45:05] They all sound so lofty until you read between the lines and pull and pull back the information and see what's actually there. And so my main concern is that people need to know about this, and they need to know about how the UN is going to use the real ID in our world to implement all of these different things. The biometrics that you won't be able to travel, you won't be able to get on an airplane, you won't be able to maybe get groceries, you won't be able to do a lot of different things without having the real ID, and they've moved that down the road several times. I think I've had my driver's license renewed twice without signing up for the real idea. You know, I just opted out. But they're going everywhere that you go in the airport. It talks about that by May 7th of 2025, unless your driver's license says real ID on it, you won't be able to get on a plane. So they are squeezing in [00:46:00] with what they want us to do in the world. The future we want, meaning them. And I just love what I love how Bobby Kennedy defines the World Economic Forum as the billionaire boys club.

**Dr. Sherri Tenpenny:** [00:46:14] I just think that is just a great sort of collective title of the future we want. And I'm always kind of wondering what is the end game in it for them. You know, the depopulation agenda is alive and well. It really did happen during Covid, and it's still ongoing with the unbelievable number of deaths that we've recorded around the world. Are they going to replace all of us with robotics? So there are many things in this document to be concerned about the unwavering commitment to act. I think that is really, you know, the, the, the general people, the general population needs to know what they are planning so we can plan to revolt. I will say from the World Economic Forum, they released Covid on the world. I, [00:47:00] you know, when you



read initially went to that original website that was very complicated and you push buttons and different lights would light up. Whoever designed that, that took a lot of time and it was really quite complicated. But there was no plan B in there. When you really analyze what was part of that website, it was like, this is what's going to happen and this is what we're doing. It's not like, well, if this doesn't work, we're going to try this.

**Dr. Sherri Tenpenny:** [00:47:23] They've been doing that for 50 years and I. But the good news is two things that are really good news. One is that I don't think that those people or any people on the globalist level they, I think that they were so out of tune with the hearts and minds of the of the people of the world that they like freedom and sovereignty and justice. I don't think they were prepared for the level of blowback that they got. The second piece of good news is that on a just this was something that just came out and probably a few weeks ago that said that only [00:48:00] at this point in time that there, you know, for the, the, the agendas of the 17 sustainability goals should be completely done in enacted by 2030. But around the world, less than 17% of the goals have been accomplished. So I think that that's a really good thing, that people either are not paying attention or they say, in my individual country, we've got more important things to deal with and work with for our people than what the UN globalists are wanting us to do. So I think that the more people know about what they're planning, the more we can plan to do otherwise.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:48:35] Doctor Tenpenny, thank you. That really is exactly the point of this sovereignty coalition and these periodic updates on what is going on to inform and inspire and facilitate resistance to this agenda. We're so delighted again to have you participating in all of this work. We're going to turn next to a repeat contributor [00:49:00] to these summits. Her name is Doctor Andrea Nazarenko, PhD. She has a background in community and quantitative psychology, but I think she's probably best known at the moment for her leadership in something called the Inspired Network, which is a coordinated action network for healthcare Your system improvement. I have the privilege of being present for an important meeting of that group in Geneva, on the margins of the World Health Organization travesty, and we're delighted to have her back to sort of update us on the implications of world government for freedom of speech and culture. Andrea, welcome back. Over to you.

**Dr. Andrea Nazarenko:** [00:49:44] Thank you. Thank you so much. I am here today to talk about freedom of speech, honing in specifically on that piece of the pact of the future, because oftentimes, colloquially, when we talk about freedom of speech, we think about what we're allowed to [00:50:00] say on social media, how we're being shadow banned, how we're being censored, censored, and, you know, the implications for our First Amendment rights. But really, when we're talking about freedom of speech, we're talking about something much broader than that and much more dangerous than that. And it's ironic that we're talking about it this week with Columbus Day or Indigenous Persons Day. I guess depending on your generation, you call the day a different thing. But I was struck by Kamala's, you know, viral videos with all of her virtue signaling about Indigenous Person's Day. And what she failed to mention in the entire video was that the mechanism of action that they convinced that the white man convinced themselves of to be true, which justified the genocide of the natives, was that their beliefs, attitudes, and information was wrong, that because they did not adhere to the mainstream white values, they must [00:51:00] have been savages, and it justified their mode of action, their mode of action being taking over their society. Speech itself is civilization, and if we want to maintain our information and our cultural heritage, our cultural knowledge and most importantly, our intergenerational wisdom. We need to maintain our information. And there is no shortage across history of the powers that be taking action to destroy information.

**Dr. Andrea Nazarenko:** [00:51:37] Because when they take away our knowledge, they take away our culture. And when they take away our culture, we are left vulnerable to their infiltration. And so when I look at this iconic image of the UN with all of their diverse flags, it actually creates a visceral reaction to me because there is [00:52:00] no diversity with a common agenda against disinformation, because our culture, our cultural knowledge and our intergenerational wisdom is dependent on the diversity that does not is not contained in a common agenda that outlaws dis or misinformation. So there's this book that came out pre Covid. I think it was like 2004, but there's this really beautiful quote in it. It's a great essay, in fact, by a man named Jack Balkin out of Yale. And he says in free speech theory, we need to move from protecting just the democratic process, but actually moving towards what he calls a democratic culture. And what does that mean? It means that individuals do not just exist to place their vote or to engage in the democratic process, but to actually engage in meaning making that constitutes what it means to be an individual [00:53:00] of the country that they reside in. What does it

mean to be American? What does it mean to have sovereignty? What does it mean to have my cultural background and who I am and every individual out there has a voice in this process.

**Dr. Andrea Nazarenko:** [00:53:18] And so we need to have the ability through information sharing, through not being outlawed by disinformation to participate and participate in the production and distribution of our own culture. Now, there are some cultures out there. I started having this conversation just last week with a really dear friend of mine and colleague in India, and she's very active in the freedom movement in India. And she said, well, what I'm doing right now is I'm relying, I'm taking a step back. All of this UN stuff, all of this PAC to the future is too much. So I'm taking a step back, and a lot of people around me are doing the same, where they're going back to our ancient wisdom. [00:54:00] And there are certain cultures out there like India, like Japan, like Bhutan, and even like non-free countries like China and Afghanistan that have such a strong culture that they have the ability to draw upon ancient wisdom to guide them. Their ancient wisdom is alive and well. Unfortunately, in America, we don't really have ancient wisdom. We're a new country, and our culture is intertwined with politics, especially today and economics. And it's really hard to just pull out and rely on our cultural ties that keep us bound together, largely because our cultural ties are based on disunity and coming together and diversity and all of the things that they're trying to squash. And so there's two approaches we could take to protect our American culture.

**Dr. Andrea Nazarenko:** [00:54:50] The first are top down approaches. This is all of the genius stuff that everyone on this call has talked about today. These are the legal rules. These are the education systems, [00:55:00] the media, the recognition that we have constitutional rights that we should be abiding by. And of course, technological development and giving people voices. But there's also bottom up approaches, and that's not how I want to end my talk today, because every single person out there can take steps on a daily basis to protect the culture and keep information alive. So very simple strategies using written word. If you're every contact you have on your phone is stored on a Google or Apple platform, when they shut that down, or decide by based on your social credit score that you can't have access, you have just lost your voice. Write down on a good old pen and paper every key contact that you should have, because they can't take that away. Buying books instead of Kindles. So you have a hard copy, writing down recipes, writing down traditions, writing down family beliefs and actually

passing it to children and grandchildren. [00:56:00] Maintaining control of information. The corollary to burning down libraries and burning books is hitting a delete button on a social platform. They could take away all of our information. If all of it is stored in Google Docs and on Chrome. Finding mentors is really critical.

**Dr. Andrea Nazarenko:** [00:56:19] Mentorship in this country is often based in academia or vocational settings. We should have mentors. When I stepped into the health freedom movement, as Frank said, my major interest in here is in bringing the movement together, systematizing, getting people to work together in a coordinated fashion. I immediately clicked in to Maureen McDonnell, who has who had years before me doing this type of work. I found my mentors. I found the people who could give me wisdom in this movement. Covid just opened up so many people's eyes, but people. And I'm so honored that Sherri Tenpenny is here today because she's been fighting this fight for decades. [00:57:00] We should be drawing upon the wisdom of the people who fought before us so that we can continue to grow. We stand on the shoulders of giants, but not if everyone tries to be the hero. Going local, that's really important. Oh, and mentorship matters in real life too. Not just if you're in the movement. Like if you are a grandmother. Go mentor a new mom, teach her how to breastfeed, teach her how to grow some foods, teacher how to garden. New moms don't know how to do these things all the time because young moms grow up in a digital era. So how do you garden? How do you breastfeed? How do you teach your children how to read phonetically? Because the education system certainly isn't teaching that anymore. Going global...

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:57:43] We really are out of time.

**Dr. Andrea Nazarenko:** [00:57:44] Okay. I'm good. You could read them on the screen.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [00:57:49] Terrific. Thank you so much. What a, you know, as always, power-packed presentation. And I think as you've indicated the threat to [00:58:00] everything we hold dear that is present in the effort to constrict information and access to it, and characterizing it as mis or dis or mal information is a mortal threat. And thank you for your attention to it and for contributing to this part of the program. Let me go to Alex Newman. Alex has been a tremendous leader in this fight for years, in point of fact. He is the founder of Liberty Sentinel Media. He is a podcaster. He is an author. He is an investigative journalist. He has logged incalculable hours hanging

around with the people who are cooking up these globalist schemes. And I don't know that anybody does a better job of penetrating and explicating what they're up to and the threats that they represent. We're delighted to have him with us. I know he has to shoot and scoot, but we'll have him shoot now. Alex, welcome.

**Alex Newman:** [00:58:59] Well, thank you so much, [00:59:00] Frank. It's an honor to be here with you guys. I appreciate all that you're doing. And I did go to the summit of the future. I went there as an accredited journalist, and I asked the spokesman for the secretary general during a press conference about concerns that this was an attack on sovereignty, this pact for the future that they came out with. And anybody who reads it will see that very quickly. Right. Ostensibly originally set up, it was supposed to be just a forum for stopping war. Now, as you read this pact, you see they want to take over education, the environment, the economy, every area of life. They want to give these emergency powers to the United Nations to basically become a global dictatorship. And so when you when I asked the secretary general's spokesman about the concerns around this, he launches into a diatribe about how there's no threat to and we put the video out. Anybody can see it. There's no threat to sovereignty here. This is just independent nations coming together and working together. And then right after he finishes that, he launches into another diatribe about how global problems require global solutions. And so it's essential [01:00:00] that we have the UN leading the charge on issues like those discussed in pact for the future. So they're really talking out of both sides of their mouth. On the one hand, they're claiming this is no threat to our sovereignty.

**Alex Newman:** [01:00:11] It's no threat to self-government. On the other, they're saying it's essential that we undermine sovereignty and have global governance, because otherwise we can't deal with these global problems like pandemics, like terrorism, like misinformation and several others that he mentioned. So we need to understand here that this is an attack on sovereignty. It's been going on for a very long time. And one of the things that the secretary general's spokesman recommended was that everybody go read the documents for themselves. And for once, I agree with a senior UN official. I encourage everybody to go read these documents for themselves and come to your own conclusion. How is it that we have dozens of references to education in a pact for the future? When did we decide that the UN needed to be in charge of education? When did we decide that the UN would determine what is a safe, equitable and

inclusive education, which is what is clearly called for [01:01:00] in this document, and I encourage people to look past the superficial, nice sounding items like this idea of safe and high quality education. Because you need to ask yourself the very obvious question, who is going to determine what is a quality education? And thankfully, we don't have to speculate on that issue. It's one of many that I have addressed. And when you go to obviously, the UN Universal Declaration on Human Rights is kind of their bedrock document for the issue of human rights.

**Alex Newman:** [01:01:30] They have a whole section in there on education. They say education shall be compulsory. And then they say education shall further the activities of the United Nations. They're claiming, based on their own international agreements, that every child has a human right to an education based on what the UN wants to do. And so what happens then, if you have an education that doesn't further the activities of the United Nations? Well, in that case, you're depriving your child of his or her human rights. So people need [01:02:00] to just read through the lines, read about what these people are doing outside of their summits, what the what the implication is of these terms. And you'll understand very clearly, they are setting up a one world system. They're doing it very rapidly. They've brought the business community on board through the World Economic Forum. They're bringing the religions of the world on board through an organization they call religions for peace, which the leader now describes as the UN of religions. And, you know, America is the last man standing when it comes to putting a stop to this. If we fall, if we surrender. No other nation, no other people will be able to resist this. So it's critical that we get informed, and it's critical that we use all of our influence to stop this. And I think I've gotten my four minutes, so I will put a stop to it there. Thank you once again, everybody.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:02:46] Wonderful. Thank you. Alex, as always, you have an incredibly succinct manner invade the most important of the ideas here that a global government is antithetical to [01:03:00] freedom and most especially overreaching world government. That is a threat to everything, as I said, that we hold dear. We're going to hear from a medical doctor who has been with the sovereignty coalition from the get go. She's been a frontline doctor fighting the well prescriptions. If you wish to call them that of Doctor Tedros Ghebreyesus, the director general of the World Health Organization. Going back to the Covid pandemic and by some estimates, roughly a million Americans needlessly lost their lives because of our government and the centers for Disease

Control, about which we're going to be hearing more in a moment. Implementing Tedros Ghebreyesus advisory directions are mandatory, and we're deeply grateful to Doctor Kate Lindley for [01:04:00] her leadership in all of these fronts and to have the chance to visit with her briefly. I know you're in the midst of treating patients, so thank you for taking a few minutes to join us. Kat, as always, welcome.

**Dr. Kat Lindley:** [01:04:11] So I just kind of wanted to talk about this whole idea of globalism when Covid happened early on. I was very much surprised at the narrative that was coming from the world leaders. Right? Everyone was saying, build back better. We all have to do exactly the same things. And then we started with mandates around the world, and I always had the issue with the mandates. I always felt that the mandate was actually an attack on our republic. And in my opinion, the Republic fell when we allowed the mandates to stand. So then, because I'm a medical doctor I started watching what the World Health Organization was doing, and they came early on to talk about this idea that we need to have better pandemic response, [01:05:00] and we have to do it together. We have to do it under their direction. And they started negotiating the pandemic treaty and the amendments to international health regulation. We went through many, many revisions of these documents, but something that stood out glaringly was the fact that they wanted control. They wanted control over the world when it came to health. They wanted the ability to lock down the countries again, to issue mandates on vaccines, to implement the digital, the vaccine passport, which essentially would bring them closer to this digital ID, and then you had to watch what the central bank was doing and central bank was doing this CBDC. Right. The idea is if you combine this vaccine passport, digital ID with CBDC, see there is more control.

**Dr. Kat Lindley:** [01:05:52] So we went through these different variations of the documents, the pandemic treaty. They were not able to come to the agreement completely, because [01:06:00] the world essentially woke up with the sovereignty coalition and many leaders from around the world. And we said, this is really an attack on sovereignty of our nations, and we don't want to participate. But they were able to pass the amendments to international health regulation in Geneva, the watered down version, and they will continue. But then, while this is happening in the World Health Organization, who is actually a child, in my opinion, of United Nations, you had to see what the United Nations was doing. They were doing the same thing on a different level. They were talking about this idea of global governance. We need global governance so

that we can respond to black swan events so we can respond to future pandemics or some kind of climate change threat because the countries can do it on their own. We need this global governance. And who's going to do it for us is going to be United Nations. So we have pact for the future. [01:07:00] And as everyone I had before me has talked about this idea, this pact might seem benign because they're calling it a pact, but there is legal implications behind that pact. So since I'm a doctor, I look at the problem, I diagnosed the problem, and I have to come with a solution, right? Because I have to help people.

**Dr. Kat Lindley:** [01:07:22] What is the solution? I think Sovereignty Coalition has taken a great lead on this, and we had wonderful legislators who joined us and tried to do their work, and they have done it when it came to the World Health Organization and even United Nations. To a certain extent. We have a lot of states who are trying and have passed different bills that are based on the 10th Amendment, that these things have to come back to the states, and the states will not comply. But we have a problem on the federal level, right? We have several bills in the House and the Senate that we need to make sure [01:08:00] that are passed, and we need to do our jobs. We need to call our legislators. So call your own. Don't call someone else because they don't care. So call your own and keep on kind of shouting this from high up. It's an issue because these organizations truly want global governance and truly are attacking our sovereignty. They keep on saying, no, no, no, we're not doing that. We're still going to let you make your decisions. No they're not. So we need to make sure that we do our part as Americans, and we have our opportunity to do that November 5th and to continue doing it. And that's my call to action. Do your part. Thank you, Frank.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:08:39] Wonderful. Thank you. As always, you are focused on the action piece of this. And it's one of the things that our sovereignty coalition has benefited greatly from. We're going to turn next to an attorney who recently had a very important conversation with one of our favorite, one of our other, I should [01:09:00] say, favorite medical practitioners, Doctor Peter McCullough. Her name is Lisa Miron. She is a Canadian attorney with some 24 years of practice there. She said the distinction of suing her government in connection with the first SARS pandemic. She's the author of a forthcoming book entitled unprofessional. We're asking her to talk about unconstitutional, something that many of our presenters have touched on at various points. But how what's being institutionalized in actually the original International Health



Regulations of the World Health Organization, but in an amped up form. Under the amendments that were adopted in at the beginning of June in the nature of the so-called national international health regulation, [01:10:00] focal points or authorities, the role they're playing, and what it would mean were we to allow them to become as envisioned, essentially a mechanism for informing our government, our policies, our laws to the dictates of the W.H.O.? Lisa, it's very good to have you with us. Thank you for taking a few minutes to join us. The floor is yours, Matt.

**Lisa Miron:** [01:10:29] It's a tremendous opportunity to speak to people in your country and to be amongst so many distinguished panelists. So thank you for inviting me. The first stop I would like to make, is that not every contract is enforceable. You cannot enforce a contract for murder. So let's say that a treaty is a contract between nations. And one limit of the treaties that we've not discussed in this panel is that not every treaty is [01:11:00] enforceable, even in respect of whether or not you follow procedural guidelines. So you cannot invert your society into something that it is not. Now I'm going to take you to two places, and I went to some very dark places, I'm afraid. The first is a bill called Bill C-293, which is the domestication of this W.H.O. International Health Regulation amendments and the treaty in Canada. And because of that, I've been able to source provisions that are a warning for you. And the second is the NFP system, which is the national focal points of the W.H.O. And those, my friends, are the satellite offices of the W.H.O., which have been implemented in our countries for 19 years now. Bill C-293 takes the two power points of [01:12:00] the NFP of Canada, the Satellite offices of Canada, and gives the governance of Canada over in one bill to the W.H.O. My warning to you Americans is to look for all legislation across every state, community, and federal level that mentions one health. The first point on one health is that it is totalitarianism, and that is what is being implemented by the UN and the W.H.O.

**Lisa Miron:** [01:12:37] in any of their instruments. One. Health is multisectoral. Any sector. Multidisciplinary. Any discipline. And it is to focus on human animal health. I mean plant and ecosystem health. So everything on God's green earth, the grant of power [01:13:00] is that then it is also to concern the welfare interface. So your relationship with AI, your relationship with NGO, your relationship with this global governance scheme. That, my friends, is totalitarianism. That is an inversion of the grant that you have under your Constitution, and it is an inversion of your Bill of rights, and it is a version of everything that is good and holy about the United States and about

any country in the world that preserves any semblance of democracy. So that's the first thing Totalitarianism should not be something they can implement. Therefore it is void in my opinion. Ab initio bill C-293 and the documents that we're talking about focus on global equity. Equity is the same result. So if someone's starving in the Sahel region of Africa, you must starve. In the United States, you must starve [01:14:00] in Canada. Global health equity is a universal communism. And as a universal communism, again, it is an inversion of what your country is here. So it is a contract that is being entered into that, in my humble opinion, is void ab initio. Bill C-293. Talks about handing over our communications infrastructure. It talks about handing over full-scale ability to close down animal husbandry, to replace it with artificial proteins to, you know, replace how it is that even land laws are appropriated. So we are talking about removing your legal rights to own land. Most people put these documents [01:15:00] in the context of our last rodeo. My examination of Bill C-293 tells me that it is a new rodeo. It is a command infrastructure. It is an embedded into all our governments. It is training our governments to be what they are not. So I do not believe every treaty is enforceable. I believe like contracts law, they cannot be. And that's irrespective of whatever your Constitution may say. Now, I researched what are known as national focal points, and I was looking to prove that our public health agencies were not ours. What I found was that in the 2005 International Health Regulations of the W.H.O., there was a requirement to put a satellite office in every country of the world. But no one knew that, no freedom. Medical doctors [01:16:00] knew that. No lawyers who are fighting this knew that. So they were hiding it. It's been embedded in Canada. I found that our national focal point, even when I found the concept of it, I could not locate it.

**Lisa Miron:** [01:16:15] I could not locate your national focal point. So they were hiding it. I finally found it on a farm site. And what I found was all 190 some focal points of the world. It's breathtaking. Public Health Canada Agency of Canada satellite office of the Who. So when they hand over Bill C-293 in governance, they're handing it over to the satellite office of the Who Health Canada. Our patented prices review board. Hey, you're going to buy those vaccines. How much are they going to cost? Right? And you're in addition to that, it was our food inspection agency. So what [01:17:00] does that mean? You know. Does that bird have the flu? Does that bird and all its flock have to be culled? So it was a very dark place and nobody knew that. So it colors where we were, but it colors where we're going to. And our national focal point address is in Washington, D.C., at an organization called the Pan American Health Organization

slash W.H.O. So think of how circular that is. Our NFP is run out of the United States at a sub governmental or sub NGO organization of the W.H.O. Then I found the US satellite office of the Who. There's four.

**Lisa Miron:** [01:17:49] I'm going to mention two. The CDC. Every pronouncement that the CDC makes is now colored [01:18:00] by the W.H.O. And I want to say in respect of that, this is also fascism, because the funding of the W.H.O., 89% of it is funded privately by organizations like the like the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Gavi and Cepi et al. So when you take corporate interests and you put global governance together. That's fascism. Also not permissible to get into a contract for fascism. Right. This treaty for fascism. So it's not merely that you have to refuse all these treaties and pacts and whatnot. You have to root out your NPS and take them out. The other NFP in this in the US is foreign assistance. So why is your money that you are spending as citizens dealt [01:19:00] with through a satellite office of the W.H.O.? I'm going to finish by saying there are amendments to the International Health Regulations 4.1 that put the dictator at the top of these NPS into your countries to be your new presidents. If you want more information, I will require more time. But that's it for today. I'm humbled to be a panelist here, and I will leave it at that. Thank you.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:19:27] Lisa Miron, thank you very much. This is an extraordinarily important presentation. We have a further addition to the presentation that you've made that we will be talking about, I suspect, in our next summit, as it is vitally important that we understand that the IHR amendments have intensified this kind of enforcement mechanism to assure compliance with the edicts, the rules, what have you of the World Health Organization and your insights in particular for this audience, [01:20:00] mostly American, as to principal institutions of our government that are now formally part of this globalist enterprise, including the CDC, which brought us so much harm during the Covid pandemic, is of extraordinary importance. So thank you again for that contribution, Senator Bob Bollinger is a man of considerable accomplishment in a state legislature. I have not formally met him, so I'm going to ask him to say which one. He is. Now working as a former legislator with the extraordinary organization led by Jason Rapert, former state senator from Arkansas, called the National Association of Christian Legislators. He's a late addition to the program. We're very appreciative that he was able to find some time to join us to talk a little bit about the implications of this move towards world government for [01:21:00] the states, for their authorities, for their

powers. We'd hope to have Joe Gebbia of State Shield with us to talk about some of the work that he's been doing with governors and state attorneys general and others. But we're delighted to have Senator Bollinger. Over to you, sir. Welcome.

**Sen. Bob Ballinger:** [01:21:17] Thank you so much, Frank. I appreciate that, and I do apologize for getting on. I'd love to take apart with this panel and there's little miscommunication on our end. I actually thought it was later on in the afternoon that we were doing. But anyway, we're hooked up and we're going now, so. Yes. So, NACL - obviously, National Association of Christian Lawmakers is... This is an issue that's extremely important to us. So I served in the legislature for ten years in Arkansas. Served six in the House and four in the Senate. And my one of the reasons why I went in from the very beginning is to protect individual liberty and individual sovereignty. Right. So that's the that was my, my goal going into the legislature and [01:22:00] the, the from a state's perspective, I think that that is fundamentally probably in fact, we know governments are instituted among men to protect life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. Right. So it's a there are natural laws that are out there that are God given laws and governments. Only legitimate existence is to try to protect those natural laws or natural rights. And the more that we give away as a, as a nation to any other entity or body, the less you have the ability to protect those rights. In particular, if you're handing those the ability that sovereignty away on a national level, then you're giving it mostly to people who don't believe the way we believe and don't feel the way we do, and honestly don't recognize the same rights that that we recognize as a nation, or at least in the beginning we did.

**Sen. Bob Ballinger:** [01:22:51] And fundamentally, the foundations of our nation existed on. So, you know, as a group, we are really concerned about this issue. And, [01:23:00] you know, I think that from the very beginning, the League of Nations was created with the intent to be a world governing body, and United Nations was created even if it wasn't in the charter. It is part of what their goal is, is to be a world governing body. And so because of that, you know, we obviously recognize and are skeptical towards it as an entity and realize that as a nation, we need to be this needs to be a hot issue to us so that we don't hand over control. And I think you're pointing to what happened during Covid. It's clear that you had governmental and non-governmental bodies, world bodies that was dictating what, you know, a person in, in, you know, small town Arkansas could do, whether they could attend church and how they could attend

church and whether they could open their barber shop or, or open their grocery store or open their restaurant. And, and that that just shows you how, how pervasive the problem could be. And so we need to make sure that we're aware of it [01:24:00] and pushing back against it.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:24:02] Thank you. And as I said, we're anxious to work with your team. You have, as I understand it, members at every level of government. And that's what's needed here is a whole of government approach. I guess one might be calling it a whole of our government. Not to be confused with the whole of this world government apparatus. That is, unfortunately, as we've been documenting in the course of this program, moving inexorably forward. It's not just these treaties, it's some of what's gone before. As Lisa Miron was saying, it's some of what is still in the offing, notably with this pandemic treaty. Joe Gebbia is the founder and driving force behind a tremendously important organization, working, as its name suggests, primarily at the state level state Shield, it's called. He has been arguably the single most impactful member of our [01:25:00] sovereignty coalition as a result of his important work with governors and state attorneys general, as I mentioned earlier. We wanted to get from him both sort of an assessment, I guess, of the impact that that working partnership has had to date and where things stand at the moment with respect to getting these various state officials equipped to understand that yet another problem is upon them, namely, the pact for the future of the United Nations. Welcome, Joe. Thank you so much for taking some time to join us.

**Joe Gebbia:** [01:25:37] Well, thank you, Frank. It's good to see you again. You too. Dede said under Bollinger. Thank you for your comments. I enjoyed listening to them. By the way, we're coming to Arkansas next. So State Shield? Yeah. The recap on it overall is the RGA. The Republican Governors Association has made a significant advancement in how they've unified their power. [01:26:00] And a lot of it began with the NAC back in January, when they cooperated with State Shield and issued their first ever unified statement in opposition and for the year 2024. Now we've had four statements coming out from them.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:26:18] You might mention what the NAC stands for, Joe.

**Joe Gebbia:** [01:26:20] Oh yeah, the National Asset Corporation, which was, in my opinion, the collusion, the effort between the SEC and the New York Stock Exchange started last October in 2023 and came to a conclusion January 18th here, 2024. And it was an effort to monetize nature. And it included the one health, which was appropriately brought up, that One Health is obviously the Trojan horse and everything that's going on here, including the pandemic treaty. And we're not done seeing it, but they have really learned the value of being able to consolidate their voice, especially in this era of the Biden administration, where we're not getting leadership [01:27:00] from the executive office. And I've shared with them the impact that they've had around the world. Because I was out in Geneva with a good many of you and the conversation out there about what our governors and our AGS are doing to make statements. They had no awareness of that, and I really wasn't as fully aware as I am now having been abroad. And it's been very, very impactful. So that's a very, very good sign. The last round of on my request. So could I.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:27:26] Could I just mention because I don't think anybody's actually given the numbers here, could you speak to the actual buy in that the governors have made, as you've said, in connection with these global governance threats?

**Joe Gebbia:** [01:27:40] Of course. So there are 27 Republican states, state governors, and I have brought my programs to Democratic states, but they do not want to participate. And so it's really, really sad because this is not a Partizan issue. So historically, it's been 22 governors on the first [01:28:00] round, 24 governors on the second statement was which was a protest Prior approval of the IHR updates in Geneva, and then the third one was post approval of the June 1st passage in Geneva of the IHR amendments, at least the modified version, and at that time we had 26 governors out of 27. And now we can boast over half the country from governors are in opposition of. And that it was a loud statement to have the governors at 22, but to say 26 was remarkable. So they're, they're, they're really coming together as a, as a, as a group. I'm very, very proud of them. And the good news is November, if things go the way they plan to go, RGA potentially has an opportunity to pick up three more states. So we would be at 30 states. Very, very loud statement. And it's a very, very good move for America. In tangent to that [01:29:00] are the AGS. And usually if you can get 22 AGS out of 28, which includes outside territories of the United States. That's a very, very, very good rating. So historically, it's always been 22 on the AGS. They remained

fairly solid in it. So what's going on right now? Let's just get to that. The last statement that came out from the RGA was issued on August 29th, and it was a request that I had put to governor Bill Lee in Tennessee, who's chair to put out a to take the laws that were passed in Louisiana and the state of Oklahoma, which basically denied jurisdiction to the W.H.O.

**Joe Gebbia:** [01:29:43] in their states and issue an executive order for the other 25 states and have it come out through the chair. And the whole purpose of that was to create an official state policy that if and when President Biden should sign the amendment updates or [01:30:00] if he just lets it roll into place, which looks like that's going to be the option that's possibly going to take place. There would be an official policy, whereas harm can then be initiated upon the state, and it would give the AG's standing. And the reason why Ken Paxton out of Texas was unable to follow through on his lawsuit against the HHS last year because the courts dismissed it, because he didn't have standing, which meant there was no harm that was pending. So an official policy would establish that. And I've coordinated with the AG's the whole thought concept of having to get involved in lawfare should this happen, because that's, that's the only default for us right now. And to, to mitigate having these actions take, take effect. And we don't need all 22 AGS to do that. There are nine circuits. We only need two or 3 or 4 at most, and even one to really set it off. So we're working in concert to pick the best AGS, the ones [01:31:00] that are most active, and it's pretty well known who they are. And it's moving. So their statement that came out they didn't follow through on my request to initiate the executive order.

**Joe Gebbia:** [01:31:13] But they did come out with a statement and it said we will not comply. If you remember that statement that came out from the from the from the governors. So I was really pleased to see that. So I just came from a meeting about two weeks ago. That's the Republican Attorney General's Association meeting in Orlando. And I had a conversation with seven different of the AGS, and we personally presented my team and I were there. We personally presented this whole concept, and we listed the four reasons why they need to do it. The most recent one, pending, would have been the passage of an executive order, which I think would be a very, very loud statement. So we're still continuing to pursue that. I've got some personal meetings coming up with two of the AGS in particular, and hopefully I'll be able to follow up with you all on the success of that coming down the road. [01:32:00] But the other thing I

brought up with them in just 15 seconds, Frank, is this whole concept of making sure that you have a contingency plan for your National Guard. Because I got to tell you, this is the calm before the storm. I think right now. And with all the reports coming out from the FBI about what's going to be happening, and, I mean, it's unbelievable what we could be facing here in the not too distant future, especially post-election. But I know you were short on time, and I thank you for allowing me to have a couple of words here and update you all, and I'll continue to do that and keep posting on State Shield.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:32:40] Wonderful. And thank you for the leadership that you're exhibiting there, Joe. And across the country it's been spectacularly impressive. And I was with you when some of the folks in Geneva conveyed their deep appreciation for the Leadership, not from the executive branch of our country. Yes, but [01:33:00] from these states, it was very much not only needed, but applauded. And we hope that you will keep up this good work and keep us apprised of its progress. Of course. Brian O'Shea, please give us a quick update on what is going on in that space and the degree to which, as I think was just described, this is a Trojan Horse for the whole rest of the global governance agenda.

**Brian O'Shea:** [01:33:29] One Health is, in my opinion, beyond the global medical governance and the global medical takeover. One health is communism, okay? And one health is one of the many vectors for which communism is trying to overtake literally every country in the world. This is not hyperbole, and the reason I say that is because Gramsci in Antonio Gramsci and from Italy when he wrote his prison diaries. [01:34:00] He about communism, he, he figured out the best way to spread communism was to really focus on children media, religion and the law. I would add to that that include medicine in that and families. So where does why does this line up? Because all of those sections, all of those sectors, with the exception of media, are also things that are covered under Health and Human Services. So let me bring this in to a more consumable format. What we're seeing is this constant barrage against all of those sectors, from everything from medical, but also from the media. And as Reggie correctly said, one health covers everything equitable outcomes for man, beast, plant and the planet. That literally is everything under the sun. Now who is the father of one health? [01:35:00] Well, one health is actually conceived of in the mid-19th century by Rudolf Virchow, who happens to be the guy who also came up with a way to look at people's physical features to determine if there were certain race or not. His famous quote was



medicine is social science, and politics is nothing but medicine on a grand scale. That is the father of not only one health, but also the guy who coined the term zoonosis. So flash forward to the present time. If you go to Google right now and you type in quotes one health space site colon star.gov, your jaw is going to hit the ground because almost every county in the country and almost every province office in the world of the 194 countries in the W.H.O., WTO. Take your pick.

**Brian O'Shea:** [01:35:50] They all have One health offices. So who has joined the one health party here in America recently? Well, FEMA, of course, [01:36:00] because when those hurricanes that could lead to landslides, which could lead to the spread of disease and the next pandemic. And so they're now in the mix. And some of them will be attending in Medellin, Colombia November early November. My notes also went down with my computer. And they're talking this is the digital information sharing conference for the world of more than just the World Health Organization, it's pretty much everything. These same people were complaining at the last conference, which happened to be in China, that they couldn't really get to these the data from private businesses and private individuals and some of these annoying countries where the government doesn't help them out, but they were very tickled with the fact that some of the more totalitarian governments were more than happy to share private data. So what's the latest with One Health? The latest one health is [01:37:00] always the same. It's growing from the ground up. So a speaker earlier said, you know, we're blocking things at the federal level. Legally, the fed can't lean on states, local governments to the nth degree of power. One health knows this. So what they've been systematically doing is starting just like communism with education. And right now, there are dozens of one health degrees across the world, especially at UC Davis, that teach one health and start indoctrinating people not just medical people, but people in political science, people in social science into the one health Concept of equitable outcomes for man plant beast. So what does this mean? Okay, why? Why am I bringing up the local level that allows them to circumvent the law? How do they circumvent the law? Well, [01:38:00] when you are worried about the health of humans.

**Brian O'Shea:** [01:38:05] The doctor will look at them and then they report to the state. Then it's up to the state to report that up to the federal level. This was a big problem that these wannabe oppressors had during this pandemic, because not every state was reporting all the data they wanted. So who doesn't have to report to the state

veterinarians? So if you ever wondered why in the pandemic there were so many veterinarians, that is the reason why. Because veterinarians, if you're concerned about livestock, you're concerned about pets, pet health, everything like that. The veterinarian can actually report that right up to the basically the one health quadripartite in this country. And so where what that means is they can come on if these things go through, they're coming onto your property and to check on the holistic [01:39:00] health of your pets. Or they can look at your environment, your house, what's what, what could possibly affect that animal or that livestock. They even have snitch networks in Vietnam that they've been testing where you can stitch out your neighbor if they're not raising their cows the right way. So the latest with one health. I would definitely keep an eye on what is going on with FEMA. I was very shocked, but not surprised to see that they quickly moved into that space. And I will say on November 1st in Kentucky and I'll get these links up. There is a conference for One health, a big one, and it's all veterinarians. And all of their titles include the word Surveillance and, you know, that sort of thing. So that is the latest on One Health. It's the march that's not stopping. I brought up the communism thing because I recently saw one of our speakers, Alex Newman, in a wonderful documentary called Beneath Sheep's Clothing by Julie Balan. [01:40:00] And it just struck me watching that, which is a fine line of communism and how it spreads and how it's spreading and how it looks in the modern times.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:40:13] Brian, thank you. Your presentation was, as always, superb. Reggie, let's wrap up and I'll go to you for your closing comments.

**Reggie Littlejohn:** [01:40:22] This has been a very wide ranging and extremely important webinar. I just want to lift out a couple of points. We've been talking a lot about freedom of speech, and I want to draw the connection between freedom of speech and sovereignty, whether it is personal sovereignty or national sovereignty. If we have no freedom of speech, if we are being censored and surveilled by the World Health Organization, by the United Nations through AI or otherwise, then that is a direct violation of our sovereignty, because sovereignty means that we have the ability to make decisions for ourselves, either as individuals or as a nation. And we cannot [01:41:00] make decisions for ourselves if we don't have accurate information because it has been censored. So there's a direct relationship between censorship and sovereignty. I also, you know, Frank, I'm also an expert on one health. And I can make a couple of points. Please. So one health is a construct by the World Health

Organization that says that human health is related to plant health, is related to animal health, is related to the environment. And the way that they manipulate that is as a pretext for being able to surveil every aspect of life on earth, every aspect of considering humans, animals, plants and the environment and also to control it so that through one health you can end up getting you know, W.H.O. directives concerning climate change or even gun violence or even racism or even depression, anything that relates to health they can, they [01:42:00] claim, is under their authority, under the one health.

**Reggie Littlejohn:** [01:42:02] And there was an article in The Lancet, which is a prestigious medical journal about one health saying that one health means that all life is equal and of equal concern, meaning that your life and my life and the lives of our loved ones are equal and of equal concern to a croc, a cockroach, or a blade of grass, which is in itself a defiance of Judeo-Christian tradition, saying that human beings are created by God in his image. And that's not something that we share with cockroaches and blades of grass. But in any case, the overarching picture here is one also of China. We've hardly mentioned China in this, but all of this global governance is the is the enforcement of the China model. And China was directing things during the World Health Organization. And President XI has said, and I quote, that China [01:43:00] is to lead the reform of the global governance system. China is to lead the reform of the global governance system. And if we want to see where we're headed in terms of a digital gulag, all we have to do is look at China and the social credit system. When all this is in place, we are going to be trapped in a digital gulag unless we immediately resist. So I will leave you with that. I would say go to the Sovereignty Coalition for more information and for actions that you can take. Thank you.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:43:31] Let me make just a closing comment of my own, if I may. It's been an extraordinary program, and I want to thank everyone who has come together. Most of them on very short notice, to lend their expertise and their insights into what's going on here and the dangers associated with it. I want to underscore something that Reggie said a moment ago. It is, unfortunately, the case that [01:44:00] what we're dealing with is a, well, an agenda that is animated by totalitarianism. Communism is clearly the most apparent brand. Chinese communism especially so and indeed, I just to add to a point about the Chinese taking credit for what's going on here. I believe it was Alex Newman who had a front page piece in the Epoch Times. I think a week or so ago, reporting on what had happened at the summit of the future, his time as

a journalist there. And he noted that the Chinese Communists were very explicitly taking credit for having achieved this pact for the future. And that's partly thanks to the [01:45:00] people that they've put in place in these various international organizations. I'm sure this is true of Gutierrez, the six year president. I think it was of the Socialist International, no mistaking their involvement with the selection of Tedros Ghebreyesus, an obscure communist from Ethiopia, to be the head of the World Health Organization, now recently re-upped in that role. These are individuals Jewels and legions of others in organizations like the UN. Like its subordinate enterprises that are populated by Chinese nationals, if not actually leading the organization. Certainly running most of these agencies day to day. So it's hard to overstate the significance of this. It's world government with Chinese characteristics, as Xi Jinping [01:46:00] would say, that we're up against. And that makes it all the more insidious, all the more unacceptable. And I would just finally say that we are having this conversation, of course. And one of the reasons for having this sovereignty summit, the fourth in our series at this moment in time, because as we've been talking about from my opening remarks about the imperative need to inform the American people about what's going on here and people elsewhere around the world as well. But we happen to have a national election underway, reaching its denouement in some 20 days. It is essential that the candidates and their positions on world government be made absolutely clear to the voters. I think Donald Trump has done that fairly forthrightly in his comments on the World [01:47:00] Health Organization. Going back to when he was in office, his efforts to withdraw us from it. His more recent remarks that he would rip up these treaties if they were in fact you know, formalized by Joe Biden. Less clear, less explicit, at least, is Kamala Harris's position. She has certainly said publicly that she wouldn't change any of Joe Biden's policies. And one of those policies, to be absolutely, brutally frank, is driving this agenda of world government. I am not personally persuaded that we're the US government in opposition to this, that we'd be anywhere near the place we are at the moment. If there had been anything but championing the amendments [01:48:00] to the World Health Organization's International Health Regulations, or championing the pandemic treaty that is still being negotiated or championing the pack for the future. These would almost certainly not be, as they are now, either very much in the offing or effectively, as Francis Boyle said. Executive agreements in force today. So we're not here to tell you how to vote. We're here to make information available that will enable everyone listening. And I'm prayerful that it will be a vastly larger number than we have with us today. Over time. But it is vital that people be informed voters. And I want to thank all of the contributors to

this program for helping provide that kind of information [01:49:00] while we still can. Harkening back to the points Reggie just made about censorship and the absolutely devastating effect that it has, as we've heard from a number of our panelists on freedom and certainly on a constitutional republic like ours.

**FRANK GAFFNEY:** [01:49:23] So we want to again express our appreciation to everyone who's participated in this. I want to say a special word of thanks to Dede Laugesen and Oleg Atbashian, who make all of these things work and so often absolutely seamlessly against long odds. And I want to thank most especially those of you who've joined us today. God bless you all. Go forth and multiply. Dede.

**Dede Laugesen:** [01:49:46] Thanks, everyone for being here today and for taking action by sharing this video with your elected officials and other networks. This program's video will be posted generally within a day or two [01:50:00] to [SovereigntyCoalition.org](http://SovereigntyCoalition.org) and [SovereigntySummit.org](http://SovereigntySummit.org). Please share with your networks. Please share with your colleagues and definitely share with your elected representatives. Thanks everyone for being here today and goodbye.