

Actionable intelligence to live a Free & Inspired Life



The Solari Report

April 25, 2023

**Solution Series:
The Power of Constitutional
Education
with
KrisAnne Hall**

Brought to you by Solari and Corey's Digs



James White: Hello, this is James White once again for the *Solution Series*, brought to you by *Solari.com* and *CoreysDigs.com*. I'm glad to be joined, as always, by my cohost, Corey Lynn. Corey, always good to be with you.

Corey Lynn: It's great to be here. I'm looking forward to this one. I've been wanting to get KrisAnne on for a long time.

White: I've been following her work for a long time, and I'm as excited as you are.

Before we get KrisAnne on, let's give her a brief introduction.

KrisAnne Hall received her Bachelor's Degree in biochemistry from Blackburn College and her Juris Doctor from the University of Florida, College of Law. She served in the US Army as a military intelligence cryptologic linguist and was a prosecutor for the State of Florida for nearly a decade.

KrisAnne also worked with a prominent 1st Amendment law firm where she travelled the country defending Americans whose rights were violated by unlawful arrests and prosecutions.

KrisAnne is the most sought-after national speaker on the Constitution, averaging over 250 events in nearly 22 states every year for seven years. She has written six books on American history and the US Constitution, and has produced two documentaries about the power of the states and the duty of the sheriff.

KrisAnne is also a professor at River University School of Government, and Chief Council for Liberty First Legal, a national nonprofit law firm defending the civil rights of the people.

KrisAnne is a regular consultant on the Constitution for numerous radio, podcast, and television programs. She's been seen on Victory News, Court TV, I24 News, Law & Crime, NewsMax, Fox News, and she's been interviewed by C-Span InDepth, and her books and classes have been featured on CSPAN Book-TV.

KrisAnne had a nationally popular radio show for over 8 years that was carried on both terrestrial and internet stations. KrisAnne lives in Tampa, Florida with her husband, JC Hall, and their adopted son Colton. She can be found at KrisAnneHall.com. We are so delighted to have KrisAnne Hall with us today on the *Solution Series*. Thank you so much for being here with us.

KrisAnne Hall: It is my pleasure. Thank you so much.

White: You are quite welcome. As you can see by the background (*Solari* website), we will be talking about the Constitution. We couldn't have anybody better on to talk about it than yourself.

Hall: You can see by my background that I'm in Tampa, Florida.

White: We love Tampa! Tampa is great; it's nice and warm down there.

Hall: It's rainy today.

White: We would like to start with the macro and then move into the micro. Overall, the first question I have – and Corey, you probably have more questions than I – is that I've recently seen plenty about the Constitution being brought up in the news. More people are talking about it. Why do you think that is? Why do you think the Constitution seems to be more popular than ever? At least that is the way that I see things.

Then we can go on to the solutions.

Hall: I think that because this is the macro – the 30,000-foot view – there are many answers to that question, not just one. I think that because now, for at least 22 years, and I'm reflecting on the Patriot Act as sort of a catalyst when it's been longer than that because the John Birch Society has been teaching the Constitution and Constitutional government for a long time. The Patriot Act of 2001 made some people wake up and realize that there are things about the operation of government that they don't know and that they don't understand. Probably much of what they do understand is wrong.

People most recently, since the COVID lockdown, and as parents, have come

face-to-face with what the government education system is teaching their children. COVID was one of the best things that has ever happened to any movement of education reform in America. We have a situation now where parents are coming face-to-face with what their children were being taught, realizing that they were not taught how government is supposed to work and what the Constitution means.

Then there are people such as the 10th Amendment Center, the John Birch Society, Tom Woods, and the Center for Self-Governance and the teachings that we've been doing for over 13 years.

We have been teaching for 13 years, and for seven of those years, I averaged 260 classes in 22 states every single year. So, I was only home four days a month, and every other day in some other city teaching – sometimes three times a day – in different cities every single day. So, the magnitude and the amount of people that we have taught and the vast geographic coverage we've taught in all 49 states; I've taught the legislators of 11 states in session. Several of those states have had me back for repeat trainings for freshman legislators.

I think that because there is an initial awareness or at least an initial question that comes to people's minds is, "What the heck? This doesn't feel right. Why are we doing it this way? This must be wrong," which leads people to the ultimate search and discovery of truth.

When we are talking about the big picture and the 30,000-foot view, we really are seeing a cultural change. I can tell you that 13 years ago when I started, we were already seeing many young people coming to our Constitution classes.

I'm not talking just because their parents are making them, but because they want to learn. Now 13 years later, I am teaching the children of the children I once taught. Especially in some areas of the country, which we would consider the most 'liberty-suppressed' or 'liberty-oppressed' are in the Northwest. Ten years ago, I would teach and have groups of 300 or 400 or 500 people come to my Constitution classes. Two-thirds of those would be 25 years or younger.

It's quite amazing. We are seeing the whole proverbial 'stuff the pipe' and eventually something is going to fall on the other side. What began as a

moderate counter-culture to the dictated government/socialist-led narrative is a full-on scale revolution of the mind where a large group of the population is actively seeking. The reason you hear about it more is that people remain a silent majority because they lack confidence in what they know.

They think they know, and they believe they know. They have a strong feeling about what they know, but they don't have a confidence in what they know. Lack of confidence will keep us quiet because we are afraid that we may go up against somebody who might know more than we do, and then we look like an idiot.

The bottom line is that the cultural shift to the seeking of knowledge, the acquisition and the availability of that knowledge that didn't exist before, or at least the 'easability', has led to a greater confidence in that knowledge. People are standing up and speaking more.

When people feel the most uncomfortable is when they speak out. What is happening is the 'good side of the bad coin' is that the more people become uncomfortable in their economic station, their political station, and their spiritual station or social station, the more uncomfortable they feel, and the more willing they are to speak up.

Lynn: Excellently stated. In 2020, you produced *Noncompliant*, the movie. People can see it at www.NoncompliantMovie.com. I highly recommend that everyone watch that. I love the way you simplify things and break things down so that everyone of all ages can understand.

One of the big questions that I would love for you to talk about, in a nutshell, is where the power lies in the state constitution versus the Federal government and the Federal Constitution. I think there is plenty of confusion there. As you point out, over the years, big gov tries to distract and keep your eyes off the states so you are so focused on the Presidency and the Federal government doing so many things that are unconstitutional, so you are not focused on the local and state level.

If there is a way to 'nutshell' that so people understand the true power we really have and where it resides in the states, please talk about that.

Hall: It's very interesting. Obviously in this short period of time that we will be together, there is a greater depth of answers and greater proofs of answers that I am not able to give. I want to start by saying that there are two ways that you can learn from us. Technically there are three ways, but the two easiest ways to learn from us are: First, through www.LibertyFirstSociety.com, which is our online training. It has a small monthly membership. It's cheaper than any online education that is worth something. You can get free instructions all the time, but that instruction is so superficial; it will either give you just enough information to hurt you, or they may not be teaching you the truth.

We guarantee that everything that we teach at Liberty First Society is not based on opinion or political perspective, but based on actual historical documentable truth. So, everything we teach about American history and everything we teach about the Constitution and the proper role of government and the lessons learned from the good and the bad things that we have done in the past are all based on what we call 'original source text'.

So, I don't teach what other history books write; I teach what the people who lived the history wrote. That is what 'original source' means.

The second way that you can learn from me is to come to River University in Tampa, Florida. We have a three-year program called the River School of Government where you can get a bachelor's degree in our government studies. It is a Christian school, so it will be Christian government studies, but we teach everything, regardless of what it is, from a Constitutional and accurate historical perspective. So that is River University if you want to come to a brick-and-mortar school.

The intake for our River School of Government is only in August; it's one time a year. So, if that is something that you are interested in, you need to go to www.RiverSchoolofGovernment.com and find out how to do that.

We are also able to offer a \$1,600 scholarship so that by the end of the year, your bachelor's degree will only cost you about \$2,500 if you come to River University. All of that is something that we can help you with.

The third way is to have us come and teach, which is what I'm about to do as

soon as I get off this interview. I'm going to be rushing out the door to the airport because I'll be in Cape Girardeau, Missouri teaching.

To answer that question in a 'nutshell', everything that creates confusion about the proper division of power is taught from error. It is an error that we began teaching in 1830. I know that year; that is the year we started teaching it because in 1833, we threw aside the textbooks on the proper operation of our Constitutional republic that were written by the founders themselves. We threw them out, and we picked up a textbook written by the former Supreme Court Justice, Joseph Story.

Joseph Story's treatises on the Constitution in 1833 changed everything that the people learned about how the government was supposed to work. So, if you get into this question understanding that 99.99% of American people – which will be even a greater percentage of those who went to law school and who work in government – were taught the wrong thing about the division of power in our Constitutional republic, then you will have an easier time in accepting and realizing the truth.

The division of power can be easily summed in a very general statement that probably leaves more questions than it answers, but it's just as simple as this: The states were created July 2, 1776. The states, as immediately as possible, created the Articles of Confederation that were our first union and the first semblance of central government.

When the Articles of Confederation were on the verge of failing and the Union was about to split, the delegates from the states got together. This is very important; the delegates from the states got together and debated, voted, and ratified over long-term the Constitution of the United States that we have right now.

So, the first thing we must understand is that the states created the Constitution; the Constitution is a contract. To any legitimate Constitutional historian, that is a factual reality. There are historians and academic idiots who try to put the question mark behind the fact that the Constitution is a contract in order to undermine its authority and efficacy.

The states are the creators of the Constitution, which is a contract. The

Constitution creates the Federal government. Without the Constitution's ratification, there would be no Federal government; there would only be independent sovereign states that are the political equivalent – each of them – of countries. So, they are individual sovereign countries without the Constitution. With the Constitution, we have a union of independent sovereign countries that created a central government for a singular purpose: To represent the states in foreign affairs.

So, the states created the Constitution, and the Constitution created the Federal government. This means that the states are the creators of the Federal government.

The 10th Amendment explains that relationship in this way: The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people. The power that the Federal government holds is a delegated power via the Constitution. The states created the Constitution, the Constitution created the Federal government, the Constitution delegated certain limited powers to the Federal government, so we know that the states are the delegators of power to the Federal government.

The definition of the word 'delegate' is very important here; the word 'delegate' means a temporary transfer of responsibility or authority from a higher power to a lower power. So, knowing that the states are the delegators of power to the Federal government, we know the power that the Federal government operates is done so with the permission of the states. The states, in this relationship, by the definition of the word delegate, are the higher power and the Federal government is the lower power.

If you want some more in-depth explanation about this power, specifically what power is delegated and what power is reserved, it is at www.LibertyFirstSociety.com. where I have a class on state sovereignty. I also have a book that I've written called, *Sovereign Duty*, which is all about that. The book is on Kindle as well, so this is something that you can pick up or read online that might help you. The documentary, *Noncompliant*, is all about that separation of power and the delegation of power to the Federal government and the retention of power by the states.

James Maddison wrote about this relationship in *Federalist No. 45*. He said explicitly that the powers delegated to the Federal government are few and defined, meaning that they are specifically enumerated. The power that remains in the states is innumerable and indefinite. He said the powers that are delegated to the Federal government will be reserved to foreign affairs or peace negotiation and foreign commerce. The powers that are reserved to the states will include everything else, including the ordinary course of affairs, which he calls ‘the lives, the liberties, the property of the people, the internal order, and prosperity of the state’.

When we understand all of that, we know the Federal government’s only realm of authority exists because the states have delegated a portion of their power to the Federal government to the purpose of representation in foreign affairs; the Federal government’s realm is foreign. Each state is left with its domestic governance without Federal intervention.

White: You are talking about an outrageous overstepping of their power. It may sound simplistic, but we know they only have the power that they have due to the consent of the governed.

You can certainly correct me if I’m wrong, but in law, if you don’t object, isn’t that considered silent consent? Is it just a matter that the reason they continue to do what they are doing is that we don’t object? I know it’s probably not that simple, but if we don’t give them our consent, then constitutionally, they don’t have power. Am I off-base on that?

Hall: Our documentary, *Noncompliant*, really helps with that understanding. It is just that simple; the establishment of our Constitutional Republic is unique in the fact that we created the central government from the states. So, the states are the creator, and in our Constitutional Republic paradigm, the states retain oversight over the Federal government.

The answer is really that simple. As a matter of fact, Alexander Hamilton wrote, “No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the Constitution, can be valid.” James Wilson wrote that anything created by the Federal government contrary to the Constitution will not have the force of law. Article VI, Clause 2 of the Constitution says that anything the Federal government does that is outside or

‘not in pursuance of’ the Constitution is not binding on the states.

So, the power that they are operating with outside their delegated authority really rests in the hands of the states. That is why our second documentary is all about the sheriff. The state and local governments are your most powerful and most practical defense of Federal government overreach.

Over the years, that has somewhat been whittled away a little at the Federal level, but it doesn’t eliminate the reality that the states retain the authority to refuse, not only to enforce Federal acts outside the Constitution contrary to the Constitution, but also to refuse to allow the Federal government to enforce them in their state. So, it is just that simple; it’s noncompliance-it’s peaceful noncompliance. It’s simply the recognition that, ‘You have no power over me because I never delegated to you any power over me.’

The distinction becomes the consented power, as you mentioned. Let me give you this analogy: I go away on vacation and you know that I’ve gone away on vacation, and you know that I’m going to be gone for three weeks. If on the day I leave, you steal my car, and are driving around in my car, you don’t have my permission. So, your taking of my car is an illegal act, your driving of my car is an illegal act, but I don’t know that you’ve done it. Because I don’t know you’ve done it, I haven’t objected.

Three weeks later, I go home, and notice that my car is gone, and you have it. I cannot legally assert that you’ve been driving my car for three weeks without any objection as claim of ownership of my car. I now have the authority – because I am the owner of that car – to object, even though I haven’t for three weeks. Even if I was gone for three weeks, I still have the authority to object.

That is ,to some extent, what has happened in America. The American people have been taught the wrong things for so long that they don’t realize that the Federal government has stolen power from the states. Our continued consent doesn’t establish legal authority to the Federal government because it is still stolen.

It is our objection, however, that is necessary to stop the continuation of that theft. I don’t have to sue you to get my car back; I simply must provide the title

deed to the car, and it must be returned to me as its rightful owner. States do not have to sue the Federal government to get their power back. When states sue the Federal government for power that is rightfully theirs, they are committing a dangerous act because they are saying that the Federal government – through the Federal courts – is the ultimate authority of Federal power.

In your county, your sheriff is the highest executive authority who is even superior to your governor if your governor is ordering unconstitutional things. It is the authority of these entities – your county commission, your city council, and anybody in state government who takes an oath that says, “I do solemnly swear I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of our state”, and it is their duty to refuse to comply and to refuse to allow that power to be exercised. That is the recognition and the demand. The title deed to that authority is the Constitution.

Thomas Jefferson talked about it, and I talk about it in the book, *Sovereign Duty*, and in my classes. The reality is that when the Federal government is using power that has not been delegated, it is creating criminal theft of the power that belongs to the states.

White: Is that ‘color of law’ theft?

Hall: No, it is actual theft.

What do you call the Constitution of the United States?: It’s the ‘law of the land’. Article VI, Clause 2 calls the Constitution the ‘supreme law of the land’. If you violate the law, what is that?

White: It’s a crime.

Hall: Right, it’s a crime. So, when they exercise power contrary to the delegation in the Constitution, which does not simply delegates power to the Federal government, but it reserves everything that is not delegated to the states.

Lynn: From a local and state standpoint, and from a personal standpoint, we have seen many examples of all this throughout the last few years during COVID. We’ve seen some states step up and say, “Masks are not mandatory

here,” or, “Jabs are not mandatory here.” We’ve seen that across the board.

Of course, unfortunately, we seem to see the divide with red states and blue states on which approach they are taking. But then on a personal level, you have business owners who say, “We are not going to lock down,” or, “We are not going to wear masks.”

Of course, if you go into a retailer who says, “You can’t come in unless you wear a mask,” I don’t know that you have much standing there because it’s a personal company; it’s not like it’s big gov telling you this. However, when you start to see police officers going in and enforcing this, now we have a problem. We did see many people stand up to that, but I think we saw many more people lock their doors.

As you have pointed out, there will be times where we have to get very uncomfortable, and some of this is going to get tough, but it’s the only way to fight back until everyone is educated enough to flip this system back the way it should be.

There are two main topics going on right now: One is, of course, the whole IHR, and they are saying they want the WHO in charge. I believe we already have a couple of states speaking up about that. Didn’t DeSantis speak to that?

I don’t know how that works because when you look at all the different areas that they weave through and how they connect in with big corp, they tell big corp, “You follow along.”

It becomes so complex for individuals to navigate. I’m wondering what would be some good tools, aside from educating themselves and noncompliance, to move forward through all this tyranny that we are seeing here. What are some good tools and some good ways for people to go about this on a personal level, a local level, and a state level? What do you recommend?

Hall: Samuel Adams said, “No people will tamely surrender their liberties nor be easily subdued when knowledge is diffused and virtue is preserved.” He said, “On the contrary, when the people become universally ignorant and debauched in their manners, they will sink underneath their own weight without the aid of

foreign invaders.”

So, we must understand that Samuel Adams has identified the problem and the solution right there. I don't mean this to slight what you've said, but plenty of times people ask, “What can I do besides get educated?”

First, you must get educated, and you have to recognize the education that you think you have is likely not accurate. There has to be an ability to accept and to receive truth when you think you already know it.

I travel the country, and I ask people to name the five liberties of the 1st Amendment. These are not just random people; these are not your Mark Dice ‘Man on the Street’ thing; these are people who consider themselves conservatives, who consider themselves Constitutionally-focused, and they have come because they have an interest in the Constitution. For thirteen years, I've been asking people to name all five liberties of the 1st Amendment. I can tell you without hesitation that less than 2% of any given crowd that I teach can name all five liberties of the 1st Amendment.

So, education is not simply something that we can do; it is the key. Without it, nothing can work. Without it, we become a people who drive for the wrong thing with the right reasons.

We are the Christians who tell George Bush to pass the Defense of Marriage Act. Without the Defense of Marriage Act, there would be no LGBTQ movement at all. So, the ‘road to hell’ is paved with good intentions of people who think they know, but they don't know what they don't know.

Education has to be the essential first step, and it must be an education that is accurate. Once that education happens, then you being educated doesn't help anything because only you in the world is not effective, with specific exceptions in mind. So, you must educate other people. We must have unity in this truth.

Thomas Paine said, “It's not in numbers that we gather our strength, but in unity. We must be unified in the right truths.”

The reality is this: Any agreement that Biden or any other President signs with the WHO is an invalid treaty. According to Article II and according to Article

VI of the Constitution, those treaties are invalid and therefore are not binding on anyone, as I said before.

So, the President of the United States' authority of the executive branch is delegated in Article II. Article II outlines the terms of a treaty. The only treaties that are valid under Article II are treaties that are negotiated by the President and then ratified by two-thirds of the Senate. There is zero authority for the President of the United States to make unilateral deals with foreign entities. They can make them all day long, but they are not binding, and that is the key.

Somebody might say, "Congress passed the act that gave the President this authority." Well, let me tell you, Article VI, Clause 2 says that any act of the government not made in pursuance to the Constitution is not binding. Congress does not have the authority to expand, diminish, or change executive authority different from the Constitution through simple legislation.

The only way to lawfully, legally change Presidential authority is to amend the Constitution, and Article V dictates the very arduous way that happens.

Even if a President negotiates a constitutional treaty and it is ratified by two-thirds of the Senate, Article VI, Clause 2 tells us that that treaty may still not be valid because treaties – in order to be valid – must be made under the authority of the Federal government. That means that treaties can only be lawfully constitutionally made when they involve delegated authority to the Federal government.

There has been no authority delegated to the Federal government to regulate, govern, or dictate our health. Any treaty with the World Health Organization, even if ratified by the Senate, is a null and void treaty because it's outside the authority of the United States.

I just told you in a 'nutshell' (in five minutes or less) a knowledge that, if the people possessed, this would be a 'nothing burger' or a non-issue. We would be electing people to office at the state and local level who knew this as well. You wouldn't need legislation, and you wouldn't need big pomp & circumstance; you would have governors and sheriffs who would say, "What the heck do they think they're doing? Like that's going to have any power here! I don't think so!"

It would be an absurdity. As a matter of fact, our founders referred to it and even the possibility of it as an absurdity. So, we have to get, not just a simple knowledge, but we must have a convicting, controlling, physical heart knowledge of how this is supposed to work and the power we retain when it is ignored.

Lynn: I have to interject on a slight side topic here, but along the same lines: That answered my question with the immunity series I've been working on, which I mentioned to you, where we now have 76 organizations, 22 of which make up the UN. We are started in 1945 when Congress designated to the President by executive order that they could assign privileges and immunities to these international organizations. So now we have banks, the Bank of International Settlements separately from other banks, and 76 organizations, and now these treaties.

This went all the way through Obama handing out these. So all of that, which I already knew, was broken down by you in a way that I understand.

Hall: What is interesting about that is first, you must recognize that the Constitution doesn't delegate that authority to the President, and secondly, Congress does not have the authority to delegate power to the President that is not already delegated via the Constitution; it must be done by an Amendment to the Constitution. Thirdly, and probably more relevantly so, Alexander Hamilton wrote in *Federalist No. 69* all about the delegated power to the President, and he did so with an analytical comparison between the power that a king possesses and the limited power that a President will possess.

The entire argument in ratifying the Constitution was that you had a group of people who were instrumental in writing the Constitution. They were there for the debates, they knew everything that went into it, and they knew how it was supposed to work. But then you have a second group of people who have not been involved in the very detailed, intricate debates that took place who are now reading the Constitution and have specific concerns.

One of their concerns was that by having a single executive head rather than a tribunal or a committee in the executive branch that you are really establishing, over a period, the predisposition in human nature to transform that President,

even though beginning with a limited and defined power, into a king.

In *Federalist 69*, Alexander Hamilton lays out this beautiful comparative analysis, “If you follow the Constitution, this will be the power of the President, and we made the power of the President specifically the way it is so that he wouldn’t be in any way remotely be a king.” One of those things that Hamilton really pointed out as a distinction is exactly what you are talking about.

Hamilton said, “We do not give the President the kingly authority to create denizens and to grant marks and privileges,” because that would be a power of a king.

So, when you have Congress doing exactly (unconstitutionally, because it’s not by an Amendment) and specifically what those who created the office of the President said we deliberately should not do for this particular reason, you have the ultimate evidence that society has fallen into universal ignorance, and they no longer have the courage or the knowledge to stand against that.

If you were to say that we are so far down the road now that individuals who reference the *Federalist Papers* are considered ‘radicals’ and ‘lunatics’. When I started around 2011, I got into a very heated discussion in Tallahassee-our state capitol-with the Senate president, who was a Republican. He considered himself a Constitutionalist historian. When I mentioned to him what Maddison said about the separation of power between the state and the Federal government, he accused me of having séances to know what Maddison said.

I said to him, “No, sir. I don’t have to have a séance. Maddison wrote what he said in the *Federalist Papers*.” You have a Republican who has risen to the level of being the senate president in the State of Florida, who considers himself a Constitutionalist, a historian of the American Constitution in history, telling me that it’s ludicrous that we can know what the founders meant when they wrote the Constitution. So that is how deep this goes.

That is why I said that it is great that we have this information. I think that it is wonderful that we have this information, but it is why I have travelled for 13 years, four days a month at home, because possessing this level of knowledge doesn’t help the country. We have to have a minimum of 3% of the people who

can unify in that knowledge to make a difference.

Lynn: I think that is fantastic.

White: You can't 'boil it down' to any particular item, but some of the things I've done and with people I've interviewed, I noticed that what comes up often is the term 'jurisdiction'. They don't have the jurisdiction in some cases for the authority that they exercise over us or attempt to. They don't have the jurisdiction to exercise that authority, yet they do so anyway.

Would looking up 'jurisdiction' and getting to know it and getting to embrace it be a good starting point for people? Would it be a good starting point for them to define that and get to know what that means? A lack of jurisdiction seems to be at the center of many of these things that are occurring. Would you care to comment on that?

Hall: Jurisdiction is a very general term. I don't think the definition of 'jurisdiction' is actually helpful. You need to know what jurisdiction is. The Constitution of the United States lines out the jurisdiction of the Federal government, as I told you. Article I shows you the jurisdiction of the legislative branch, Article II shows you the jurisdiction of the executive branch, and Article III shows you the jurisdiction of the judicial branch.

This is the same way that your state constitution works; your state constitution lays out the jurisdiction of your legislative, executive, and judicial branches. So, it is equally important to know the Constitution of the United States as it is to know your state constitution. If we are honest, the lockdowns all came through a state and local level, and every single one of the lockdowns in every single state violated at least five provisions of each state constitution.

I've travelled and taught the state constitutions specifically for the last three years, and I can't count how many times I've taught a state constitution within the state and I've had people tell me that they didn't even know they had a state constitution. So, we have to get people educated that the state governments are limited in their power by the constitution of the state. The US Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and the state constitution is the supreme law of the state. They don't contradict each other. When they are working properly, they

work in tandem.

What is important is that we understand initially, not only what the delegation of power is – because that is what jurisdiction means, which is the delegation of power – but what the boundaries are of that authority. Who has the authority to enforce jurisdiction? That is a very, very important matter. That is why our documentary about the sheriff and our documentary, *Noncompliant* were created.

Our first documentary is called *Noncompliant*, and our second documentary is called *Noncompliant 2: The Sheriff*. All of this is about that term, ‘jurisdiction’, and what the limit of Federal jurisdiction is, and who determines that. How is that determined?

The limit to Federal jurisdiction is determined by the Constitution. The enforcement of that jurisdiction is done by your state and local government, most powerfully and completely by your sheriff. Most people don’t really understand the duty of the sheriff and the fact that history, beginning in the year 849, has worked to develop the authority of the sheriff, not as an enforcer of the law, but as a defender of the rights of the people.

White: You said the year 849?

Hall: Yes. If you watch *Noncompliant 2: The Sheriff*, I give you a very brief overview of that history in that movie. This documentary is inspired by a three-hour continuing education course that I teach to sheriffs and deputies across the country, and I’ve been doing that for about seven years now.

I had so many people telling me, “Nobody knows this. We need to know this. How do we know this?”

I say, “I wrote a book called, *Sovereign Duty*, and it’s in the chapters there.” But in reality, I understand that we have a multi-media society, and people like movies and those types of things. So that is why we turned it into a documentary.

In 54 minutes, *Noncompliant 2: The Sheriff* will teach you unequivocally and

powerfully how the jurisdiction of the state and Federal government are both limited and enforced.

White: Thank you.

Lynn: Just so we are clear, it is *Noncompliant 2: The Sheriff?*

Hall: Yes, *Noncompliant 2: The Sheriff* is a history that builds the duty and the obligation of the sheriff. We should not be calling our sheriff a law enforcement officer, which is not the duty of the sheriff; he doesn't take an oath to enforce the law. The duty of the sheriff is a defender of the rights of the people. In defense of the people, he enforces laws that are consistent with the Constitution. That is how it works.

Noncompliant 1 is how the states are the essential check and balance on Federal authority. Both documentaries can be found at www.NoncompliantMovie.com.

Lynn: Excellent! If people go into www.LibertyFirstSociety.com, they can browse all of your courses. You have an enormous number of courses on there. You have video lessons, films, an activism boot camp, and textbooks.

Hall: We even have a homeschool directive there.

Lynn: Tell us just a little about that with the homeschooling. I know that you said it covers all different ages with that as well.

Hall: The beauty of what we offer exists in the fact that what we should know about history and what we should know about the Constitution is not complicated. It is a device – an academic ‘bullying’ – to keep people ignorant of the Constitution. We have taught people for decades that you have to be a scholar to understand the Constitution. I just got into a very frustrating discussion with someone who is in leadership of a statewide Constitutional organization. They said, “We can't all be scholars and understand the Constitution.”

I disagree; you don't have to be a scholar to understand the Constitution. It is very simply written. We don't need an interpretation of the Constitution. It's not

written in Mandarin Chinese; words mean what they mean.

Any time you don't understand a provision or there is a vague concept in the Constitution, which doesn't happen but I know that people like to see those kinds of things, then you go to the writings of the founders, and they tell you exactly what they meant.

In 13 years, I have been challenged in what I've taught by some very, very high-placed, and very, very educated people. Every time I have been asked a question about the Constitution with somebody who wanted to stump me, without fail, the answer is found in the writings of those who wrote the Constitution because they asked and answered all the questions. That seems somewhat supernatural that they could do something like that, but they really dove in and discussed it because it is about human nature, and it's about government. Human nature is very predictable.

So, our homeschool curriculum is just the beginning. It is a 'kernel' of core classes that we offer. This is for homeschool parents, but I believe every parent is a homeschool parent. I don't care where you send your child to school because, ultimately and eternally, what your child knows begins and ends in the home, not in the school. So, we will be held responsible for what our children learn regardless of where we send them to learn it.

We must be the ultimate check and balance, no matter where they go to school. So, we have many people who supplement their education with our curriculum. I say 'curriculum' very loosely because it is our classes.

The homeschool core is a way to help parents understand how the courses all go together. We start with a beginning set of courses that they can then launch into all the remaining courses. We have dozens and dozens of courses, but it is important to start at that core foundation because laying a foundation of education is essential to getting the higher-level concepts.

It's like the knowledge that we know: If we want to learn calculus, we better start with addition and subtraction. So, the homeschool core is teaching our children the addition and subtraction principles of governance and government so they can take the rest of our courses as electives in whichever order they

want to, and be able to retain and understand and apply the concepts.

Lynn: That is ‘so awesome’. I am so glad you did that.

Hall: In reality, we have students from 6th grade through law school. We have groups on law school campuses that take all the courses at www.LibertyFirstSociety.com because they realize they’re not learning what they should be learning about the Constitution in law school.

White: That is fantastic.

Hall: So, the courses are designed to be in such a way that they are delivered with a simplicity that a middle schooler can get it, understand it, and benefit from it, while a true seeker of scholarly knowledge – someone who thinks of themselves to be a scholar – will still get enormous benefit from them.

Lynn: I love it!

This will probably be too loaded of a topic, but since it is so prominent right now and since we are in the ‘thick’ of this, I wonder what your thoughts are on the banking situation. I know the Federal Reserve is another conversation, but with them talking about going into the digital currency – and now you have some states standing up and saying, “We’re not going to make it so that we are cashless here,” – I am thinking, “Talk about a web!”

How are we going to manage our way through this? I would love to know what your thoughts are on this banking situation.

Hall: This is probably a good place for us to wrap up because this is a direct solution issue. The real solution is a Constitutional solution; it’s a solution that has already happened, so we know that it works. The solution to the Federal government dictating digital money is that each state must start a state bank. A state bank will leave to the people of that state the ability and the authority to conduct banking on Constitutional terms.

Digital currency would not be a Constitutional currency in reality. Paper money is not a Constitutional currency either; it’s not based on weight and measure; it’s

a fiat.

Also, as a note for those who like to research things and might be judicial ‘nerds’ like me, there is case precedent that says the Federal government cannot eliminate the use of gold, silver, and currency, and they cannot prohibit people from using paper money either.

By establishing a digital currency, the case law and the precedent says that they can do it in addition, but they cannot do it in exclusion. So, banking would return to the state because banking is not a Federal authority. We never delegated the authority to the Federal government to engage in banking and to regulate banking. We only gave them the authority to dictate the weights and measure of coin money, establish the gold value and the silver value, and make the derivative denominations based on the weight of silver and gold.

The states can lawfully – even by legal precedent – return to weights and measures of gold and silver, and they can still use the Federal fiat if they want, but they can only enforce that and have an authority with that if they create a state bank.

North Dakota created a state bank a long time ago. They have had a state bank for a long time, and it is something that I have really investigated; it is something that I’ve investigated as a hobby kind of passion. I believe that North Dakota was headed in the right direction. They didn’t go as far as they should have, but what should happen is that each state should create a state bank which is the equivalent of a credit union; it’s separate from the FDIC.

We should not be allowing the FDIC. There is no Federal authority for the Federal government to insure money. By doing so and by issuing insurance, the Federal government has the authority - like they did with the Silicon Valley Bank. This was a bank that had over \$2 billion in assets, and suddenly, the Federal Reserve says, “You don’t have enough money. You don’t have enough assets.”

That shouldn’t be the Federal government’s determination; the capital market should be the determination of that.

A state bank would be outside the FDIC, it would not be controlled by

quantitative easing of the Federal Reserve, and it would have an authority to refuse Federal governance and Federal seizures of banking money without due process. Garnishments and asset forfeitures would be refused by the states without proper due process.

All of that can happen when the state has a state bank that goes further than North Dakota and has state bank branches so that actual banking can occur; it's not just a clearinghouse.

White: You are bringing back memories of an interview that I did with Bernard von NotHaus several years ago. He came up with the Liberty Dollar, and they threw that person in jail and confiscated all of his things.

KrisAnne Hall, it is great to have you here with us today. Before we wrap up the podcast, would you mind giving us your website and where people can find out more about your information? I know you mentioned your website a couple of times, but you can also give your Twitter information and other places where people can find out more about your specialty.

Hall: The main hub website is my name, www.KrisAnneHall.com. We also have our online Constitution training at www.LibertyFirstSociety.com. Then we have our two documentaries at www.Noncompliantmovie.com.

I am on Twitter, which is @RealKAHall. I am on Instagram as KrisAnne Hall, I am on Facebook as KrisAnne Hall, and I am on LinkedIn as KrisAnne Hall.

So basically, if you search my name, you will find me. Be aware that there are fake accounts out there, but it should be easy enough to determine which ones are fake and which ones are real.

White: 'Great stuff!' Corey, do you have anything that you want to say before we close things out?

Lynn: No. I just want to thank you so much for being on. I've wanted to have you on and talk with you for a long time. I really appreciate your knowledge and your motivation. You are a 'firecracker'! I could listen to you talk all day long.

Hall: Thank you very much. Just as a reminder to everybody, I will be in

Missouri this week, and I will be in Fitchburg, Massachusetts next weekend. For anybody in those areas, we would love to see you.

Lynn: Great!

White: Good times. We are out of time on the podcast. We want to thank our guest, KrisAnne Hall, for being here with us. If you want to know more about what we have happening, you can go to *Solari.com* or *CoreysDigs.com* and check out the previous episodes that we've had.

We want to thank again our guest, KrisAnne Hall, for being here today. Until next time, this is James White for the *Solution Series* saying goodbye for now.

MODIFICATION

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

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