

The WHO Worldwide Totalitarian Medical Police State (May 3, 2023)

Interviewer: Okay. Sorry, there was a little bit of a delay when a call first started. So, thank you for taking the time to speak with me. You said that there's a combination of four documents, which together will serve to strip the U.S. of sovereignty once either these amendments to the WHO International Health Regulations or this WHO pandemic treaty are signed by the U.S. representative. So, I was hoping we could talk about that, and whatever insights you could share about this issue and about these documents would be really helpful.

Francis Boyle: Well, start first, there was a Joint Resolution by both Houses of the United States Congress authorizing the United States to join the WHO. And a Joint Resolution of Congress is just like a statute, an Act. The WHO Constitution was then signed by President Truman and sent into the depositary. That means that the WHO Constitution constitutionally is just like a treaty that has received the advice and consent of two-thirds of the U.S. Senate and is the supreme law of the land under Article Six of the United States Constitution. Other laws, statutes, and treaties stand on the same constitutional footing. So, it didn't really matter that the Senate did not give its advice and consent by two-thirds vote to the WHO Constitution.

Now then, if you go to the WHO Constitution, Article 19 gives the WHO Health Assembly, the authority to adopt conventions or agreements by two-thirds vote. That deals with the pandemic treaty. I'll get to the amendment to the regulations in a second. But that deals with the treaty itself. So effectively Congress has authorized the WHA to adopt treaties by a two-thirds vote. But who knows how many states would be there to give their approval to the treaty. We just don't know. The WHA only requires a majority of states to constitute a quorum and do business. No-shows don't count in the final vote, and abstentions don't count either. So, it could be a very small number of states that actually show up and vote. But then the chair of that assembly could just have it adopted by consensus, which means no one dissents. The chair could get up and say, well, I move it to be adopted by consensus and if no one dissents, that's that. So, there you go.

Now, as we've already seen in a previous interview, I gave you the pandemic treaty in the concluding clauses it provides that it can provisionally go into force provisionally, after approval by the World Health Assembly. And I pointed out that violates the U.S. treaty constitutional law and practice. Indeed, Article 19 of the WHO Constitution says a two-thirds vote of the Health Assembly shall be required for the adoption of such conventions or agreements and shall come into force for each member state when accepted by it in accordance with its constitutional processes. Now, that was put in there to make sure for the United States constitutional processes for a treaty would require the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate. And yet, if you read the treaty at the end, it can provisionally come into force after approval by the World Health Assembly which clearly violates Article 19 and also the United States Constitution, as well as the normal practice under the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties that does not provide for treaties to provisionally come into force after they are signed or approved.

Now when you add all that together, then you have the National Defense Authorization Act of 2023. And I think I've cited this to you before and it says that the terms Global Health Security agenda, mean... "to facilitate national capacity to comply with and adhere to other relevant frameworks that contribute to global health security." So, the Biden administration can take the position that because of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2023, it can simply go right ahead and provisionally adhere to the terms of the Pandemic Treaty without the advice and consent of the Senate. That's the danger here. We have no idea how many states might be voting at that World Health Assembly. We have no idea. It could be a consensus vote; it could be anything. But the moment it gets reported out of that Assembly, Biden can already say, well, I'm now invoking the National Defense Authorization Act, that gives me the authority to "facilitate national capacity" Notice, it says, "to comply with and adhere to." There's nothing ambiguous about that. And then "to comply with and adhere to other relevant frameworks that contribute to global health security." That is, the Pandemic Treaty. So, they could go right ahead and do this.

And then under a very well-known Supreme Court case, *Missouri v. Holland*, a Treaty of the United States of America preempts the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that the police powers reside in the hands of the State of the Union, not in the U.S. federal government. And police powers means and includes public health.

So, the Biden administration could take the position that immediately upon approving the pandemic treaty by the World Health Assembly, and they could provisionally bring that whole treaty into force. And that usurps and circumvents the 10th Amendment, that is the control of states of the Union and democratically elected officials at the state level when it comes to public health. And that's that. State and local officials would be obligated to obey whatever decisions were coming out of this new WHO body set up by the pandemic treaty. And that could go all the way down to issuing orders for your primary care physician that they would be obliged to obey. So, I think it's extremely dangerous.

Now, the WHO has said, well, we're not going to get to the treaty until May of 2024. Well, we don't know if that's true or not. The last version of the Treaty I looked at it could be ready to go at the end of the month. We just don't know. We can't take their word for it. We have no idea what what's going happen here at the end of the month.

Now, as for the amendments to the regulations and here, they say the regulations definitely will be ready by the end of this month. Going back to the same authority, the WHO Constitution Article 21 gives the World Health Assembly authority to adopt regulations, certainly with respect to pandemics. And Article 22 says they will come into force for all members after due notice has been given unless a State opts out of it. Well, okay. So again, the problem would be at the Health Authority Assembly at the end of the month there could be a completely bogus disingenuous approval process. We don't know how many states are going to show up or how many are going to abstain or anything else. And again, it could be adopted by a consensus procedure where the chair of the session just gets up and says, well, I move it be adopted by consensus. And that's that, the gavel comes down. And article 22 has already said it will come into force, and that will be the authority coming from that Joint Resolution of Congress approving the WHO Constitution. And Article 22 says, the amendments to the regulations will come into force.

Now, you also then have to add into that, once again, the same provision of the National Defense Authorization Act to facilitate national capacity to comply with and adhere to, to comply with and adhere to, the amendments to the Health Regulations. So, there's nothing recommendatory here. The previous regulations were recommendatory. These amendments will be bound to comply with and adhere to other relevant frameworks that contribute to global health security. So,

again, the Biden administration could take the position that once these amendments are approved by the World Health Assembly at the end of the month it has authorization under the National Defense Act there to immediately comply with, make sure everyone complies with and adheres to those amendments to the regulations. Again, under Article Six of the supremacy clause of the U.S Constitution and to the disadvantage of state officials, constitutions, local governments, et cetera, et cetera.

Moreover, then previously in the 2005 regulations that were only recommended, the United States government took the position, the State Department took the position, that this was a binding international agreement that they listed in a publication called *U.S. Treaties in Force*. They're still there today. I recently looked at them which means that even though they have not received the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, nevertheless they had been approved by the executive branch of government in accordance with the WHO Constitution, which in turn had been approved by this Joint Resolution of Congress. And now, this time, they will also have the National Defense Authorization Act. So, again, they could take the position, I'm sure they will, that once these amendments to the regulations are approved by the Assembly that they are the constitutional equivalent of a treaty and therefore override the 10th Amendment to the United States Constitution with respect to state and local governments and state and local democratically elected officials and constitutions.

And there are two Supreme Court cases right on point here, the *Belmont* case and the *Pink* case where the Supreme Court upheld executive agreements as the constitutional equivalent of treaties when it comes to overriding the 10th Amendment to the United States Constitution. So, as I see it, that's the danger here. And this could happen at the end of the month here certainly with the amendment to the regulations. The treaty, I don't know, they might hold off the treaty. I don't think we can take their word that they won't get to until 2024, but certainly the amendment to the regulations, all this could happen very quickly. By a Consensus Vote at the World Health Assembly.

Interviewer: Wow. Wow. Well, thank you for all of that, Dr. Boyle. That really clears things up. One follow-up question that I have is, assuming all of this comes into force, let's say some future U.S. government doesn't abide by some edict that comes down from the WHO, but the U.S. remains at that time, a

member of the WHO, what sort of enforcement mechanisms would then exist against the U.S. let's say, if it didn't abide by whatever the, the WHO was dictating?

Francis Boyle: Well, I mean, the bottom line is the Biden administration is behind all of this, and they are the ones who definitely intend to carry it out. If you put all this together, the National Defense Authorization Act, the treaty, and the amendments to the regulations, they are part of a package to steamroll at least the amendments to the regulations right on through. So, I don't think the Bidenites contemplate disobeying what's happening here. The keynote was that Trump correctly pulled us out of the WHO, but there was required one year's notice. Biden got elected, rescinded the pullout, and then put us back into the WHO, and then appointed Fauci as the U.S. representative on the executive committee of the WHO. That gives it all away.

So, it's clear that Fauci and the State Department, the United States government are behind all this. It's all being coordinated and they're going to do it. You know, so whatever some government might do, suppose you get Trump back in there two years from now. I'm not saying I support Trump. He decides to pull us out. Well, we're still going to have two years of this worldwide totalitarian medical police state in operation between now and then, and it's going to be very difficult to deal with it let alone get out of it.

The other point to keep in mind is that all these government officials and scientists, the news media are saying, well, another pandemic is coming. That's right. They know another pandemic is coming. It's coming out of their BSL-3s and BSL-4 laboratories. And so, they are paving the way already for the next pandemic.

Indeed, this whole process going to the WHO was produced by the fact that there was a lot of domestic opposition here in the United States on a state and local basis to all the orders coming out of Washington, D.C., of what we had to do, including the shutdowns and the vaccine mandates and everything else. So, seeing how much opposition there was to these totalitarian measures under the Covid Pandemic the Bidenites decided to do an end run around all that state and local opposition and the 10th Amendment and state and local governments by going to the WHO and turning all this into an international treaty or an international agreement. Tedros has been quite clear, this is an international agreement, and when they have an international agreement like that, they can

then come back here and compel state and local governments and democratically elected officials to comply with that international agreement. So that's what's really going on here.

Interviewer: Okay. So, following from that, essentially what you're saying is that the only way out of this, either now or if this does go through, with some future administration in the U.S., the only way out would be exiting the WHO.

Francis Boyle: Well, starting all the documents and the history here that is my conclusion that Congressman Biggs has introduced legislation into Congress. There's a lot of legislation in Congress, which I've read, but what we really need is the Biggs legislation. The first article pulls the United States out of the WHO. The second article terminates all funding for the WHO and the third article revokes that Joint Resolution of Congress whereby we joined the WHO in the first place. I think if we got that legislation, that would be it. We'd be protected.

The other thing, as you know the Childrens Health Defense right now is launching a campaign. It will be launched on Friday on state and local opposition to this right now. And I've just worked down there in Florida, Collier County adopted an ordinance and a resolution. There's another county down there that adopted a ban the jab resolution. And state and local governments taking the position now that we will not comply no matter what the WHO does.

Interviewer: Okay. So, yes, definitely there's this issue of local and state level opposition to this as well. And they'll be mentioned in the article that I will prepare. Let's see. Did I have anything else? Oh, yes. About, you mentioned Congressman Biggs. Do you think, you know, why would you say is the reason why the bill that Biggs has introduced and other similar bills that have also been introduced haven't gotten many co-sponsors so far?

Francis Boyle: I believe they have co-sponsors; you'd have to check that out now, how many co-sponsors there are. But I think it has several. And last night Childrens Health Defense are calling on this tomorrow, the Arizona Chapter of Childrens Health Defense will be having a conversation with Congressman Biggs on this. Biggs is a leader of the Republican House Freedom Caucus. So it might be that certain members of Congress do not wish to associate with him for that reason. The Democrats, I can't say. But he does have more co-sponsors than himself the last time I looked.

Interviewer: Yes. I think he does have about 35. So far, what I, what I've, from what I've been told, that indicates it's not enough for this bill to have a chance of passing, but I don't know if that's just speculation.

Francis Boyle: It's important because right now, the Republicans control the House, which means they control the budget and appropriations, and they can use that control to put pressure on the WHO on this matter. Right. They can. This happened before in the Rwanda genocide where the United Nations Organization played a role in facilitating that genocide. And there was demand that the Secretary General set up an independent commission to investigate the U.N. role in Rwanda genocide. And Kofi Annan wasn't going to do it until a member of the U.S. House made it clear he was going to sit on the U.N. budget allocation until that commission was set up. So, the commission was set up, and then Kofi Annan was not going to release the report. And again, a member of Congress made it clear that he was going to sit on the U.N. budget allocation until that report was issued, and then it was issued. So, my opinion is that the Republicans in the House because they control the budget and appropriations for the WHO and indeed for the entire United Nations Organization, they can follow this precedent somehow in their House rules, and put pressure on the WHO to cease and desist in moving forward with this WHO amendments to the regulations and the treaty, which is clearly a project by the Biden administration. Remember, Trump rejected, pulled us out of the WHO.

Interviewer: Okay. So, Dr. Boyle, thank you so much. All of that was really, really helpful.

Francis Boyle: Okay, great. Thanks a lot. Bye-Bye.

Interviewer: Thank you. Bye-Bye. Take care.