

# Pandemic Treaty Will Usher in Unelected One World Government

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

March 08, 2023

## STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › February 6, 2023, the World Health Organization released a report by the director-general on the WHO's review of amendments to the international health regulations (IHR). The IHR is what empowers the WHO to declare a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC)
- › The proposed IHR amendments establish a global biosecurity architecture involving health surveillance, reporting and management – and we the public have no say in the matter
- › The amendments will be ready for adoption at the World Health Assembly in May 2024. A simple majority is required for the amendments to be adopted, after which they'll come into force in 12 months
- › The second attempt to seize global control is through an international pandemic treaty with the WHO. The treaty would grant the WHO the sole power to make decisions relating to global biosecurity, including but not limited to the implementation of a global vaccine passport/digital identity, mandatory vaccinations, travel restrictions and standardized medical care
- › The treaty will supersede the laws of member states, including the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. Republican senators have introduced a bill that would require a Senate supermajority to approve the WHO treaty, but even this may not be enough. We need Congress to withdraw the U.S. from the WHO altogether and stop funding of the WHO

In the Children's Health Defense video above, aired February 11, 2023, host Dr. Meryl Nass interviews investigative journalist James Corbett about the global biosecurity agenda, the World Health Organization's mishandling of global pandemics, and the two parallel processes currently underway that will effectively create a One World Government of unelected bureaucrats under the guise of global biosecurity. In a nutshell, the WHO is being installed as a de facto governing body for the global Deep State.

## **Attack No. 1 — International Health Regulation Amendments**

As reported by Nass, February 6, 2023, the WHO released a report by the director-general on the WHO's review of amendments to the international health regulations (IHR). The IHR, adopted in 2005, is what empowers the WHO to declare a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC).<sup>1</sup>

This is a special legal category that allows the WHO to initiate certain contracts and procedures, including drug and vaccine contracts. While the IHR already grants the WHO exceptional power over global health policy, under the current rules, member states must voluntarily consent to the WHO's recommendations.

Under the new amendments, however, the WHO would be able to declare a PHEIC in a member state over the objection of that state, and failure to adhere to the WHO's dictates in such a situation could have severe economic consequences.

As a whole, the proposed IHR amendments establish a global biosecurity architecture involving health surveillance, reporting and management — and we the public have no say in the matter.

We have no official avenue for providing feedback to the World Health Assembly, even though the amendments will give the WHO unprecedented power to restrict our rights and freedoms in the name of biosecurity. There's not even a publicly available list of who the delegates are or who will vote on the amendments.

All we currently know is that the amendments will be ready for adoption at the World Health Assembly in May 2024.<sup>2</sup> A simple majority is required for the amendments to be adopted, after which they'll come into force in 12 months. Member nations that disagree with the amendments have only 10 months to file a rejection or reservation.

## Important IHR Amendments

While more than 300 amendments to the IHR have been proposed,<sup>3</sup> and there's no telling which will stay and which will be tossed out, certain ones that are currently up for review are more crucial than others. Here are a few of the most egregious:

- **Permissiveness of conflicts of interest and bias are baked in** — Under Article 9, the WHO can declare a public health emergency based on information from undisclosed sources.

Those sources could include Big Pharma, WHO funders such as the Gates Foundation and the Gates-founded-and-funded GAVI Alliance, or any number of other players with conflicts of interest. The WHO's risk assessments will also be based on the same type of flawed modeling and prognostication that so grossly exaggerated the risk of COVID-19.<sup>4</sup>

- **Elimination of national sovereignty** — Under Article 12, the director-general has unilateral power to declare a public health emergency and is not required to consult with the WHO Emergency Committee and/or the member state before doing so. So, the director-general replaces any and all national sovereign authority. The director-general can also impose sanctions on nations that refuse to follow its dictates.<sup>5</sup>
- **Expansion of situations that constitute a PHEIC** — A PHEIC is currently defined as an "extraordinary event" in one country that constitutes "a public health risk to other states through the international spread of disease and to potentially require a coordinated international response."

Amendments seek to expand and broaden this definition to include things like clusters of infection with potential but unverified human-to-human transmission.

The actual risks of such clusters need not even be evaluated. What's more, the proposed definition of a PHEIC does not specify that it must involve "severe" or "life-threatening" disease, so it could be invoked for just about anything.

One of the amendments also suggests giving the director-general the ability to declare an "intermediate public health alert" when the situation doesn't fully meet the PHEIC criteria. In such an event, the director-general and/or a regional WHO director would be able to declare a public health emergency of regional concern (PHERC).<sup>6</sup>

- **Expansion of the WHO's executive emergency powers to include:**<sup>7</sup>
  - Permanent biosurveillance capacities
  - The authority to allocate health products worldwide
  - The authority to develop regulatory guidelines for the fast-tracking of health products
  - The capacity to "counter the dissemination of false and unreliable information" about public health events, preventive strategies and pandemic countermeasures
  - The authority to develop "an interoperability mechanism for secure global digital exchange of health information," i.e., a global health database to enable the implementation of vaccine passports

Once the amendments are adopted by the World Health Assembly, nations will have only a limited time — six months — to reject them. Any nation which hasn't officially rejected the amendments will then be legally bound by them, and any attempt to reject them after the six-month grace period will be null and void.

## **Attack No. 2 — The WHO Pandemic Treaty**

The IHR amendments are just one part of the globalist cabal's two-pronged attempt to create the foundation for a One World Government of unelected globalists. The second attempt to seize global control is through an international pandemic treaty with the WHO.

Right now, it looks like the [WHO Pandemic Treaty](#) may also be ratified at the World Health Assembly in May 2024, if it gets the two-thirds majority it needs to pass.<sup>8,9</sup> The WHO is seeking permanent and unilateral power to make pandemic decisions for the world, and the proposed treaty is the vehicle that would allow this.

It will grant the WHO the sole power to make decisions relating to global biosecurity, including but not limited to the implementation of a global vaccine passport/digital identity, mandatory vaccinations, travel restrictions and standardized medical care. Importantly, the treaty will supersede the laws of member states, including the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights.

## **The WHO Is Corrupt and Inept**

Even if centralizing biosecurity were a good idea, which it's not, the WHO would not be at the top of the list of organizations to be charged with this task, seeing how its "curriculum vitae" is a long list of failures and scandalous conflicts of interest.

For example, the WHO didn't publicly admit SARS-CoV-2 was airborne until the end of December 2021, yet scientists knew the virus was airborne within weeks of the pandemic being declared. The WHO also ignored early advice about airborne transmission.

The fact that the WHO has installed Dr. Jeremy Farrar, former head of the Wellcome Trust, as its chief scientist is yet another sign that the WHO's health recommendations will be far from trustworthy. As previously reported, [Farrar was one of the key figures in the coordinated cover-up of the origin of SARS-CoV-2](#),<sup>10</sup> along with Dr. Anthony Fauci.

Overall, the WHO is woefully unqualified to make health decisions for the whole world. But with this treaty in place, member nations will be subject to the WHO's dictates even

if citizens have rejected such plans using local democratic processes. In short, every country that signs onto the WHO's pandemic treaty will voluntarily give up its sovereignty and the bodily autonomy of all its citizens to one of the most corrupt organizations on the planet.

As noted by Francis Boyle, a bioweapons expert and professor of international law at the University of Illinois College of Law:<sup>11</sup>

*"Both [the IHR amendments and the treaty] are fatally dangerous. Either one or both would set up a worldwide medical police state under the control of the WHO, and in particular WHO Director-General Tedros.*

*If either one or both of these go through, Tedros or his successor will be able to issue orders that will go all the way down the pipe to your primary care physicians."*

## **The Pandemic Treaty Is Based on a Flawed Premise**

Aside from the fact that this **treaty will eradicate the national sovereignty of member states**, a core problem is that it simply cannot work. The whole premise behind this pandemic treaty is that "shared threat requires shared response," but a given threat is almost never equally shared across regions.

Take COVID-19 for example. Not only is the risk of COVID not the same for people in New York City and the outback of Australia, it's not even the same for all the people in those areas, as COVID is highly dependent on age and underlying health conditions.

**“ The WHO intends to eliminate individualized medicine and provide blanket rulings for how a given threat is to be addressed, and this can only result in needless suffering and loss of individual freedom.”**

The WHO insists that the remedy is the same for everyone everywhere, yet the risks vary widely from nation to nation, region to region, person to person. They intend to eliminate individualized medicine and provide blanket rulings for how a given threat is to be addressed, and this can only result in needless suffering – not to mention the loss of individual freedom.

## **The Long-Term Plan: One-Size-Fits-All Health Care**

Eventually, the WHO will probably implement a universal or "socialist-like" health care system worldwide, as part of The Great Reset. While a WHO-based universal health care system is not currently being discussed, there's every reason to suspect that this is part of the plan.

WHO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus has previously stated that his "central priority" as director-general is to push the world toward universal health coverage.<sup>12</sup>

And, considering the WHO changed its definition of "pandemic" to "a worldwide epidemic of a disease,"<sup>13</sup> without the original specificity of severe illness that causes high morbidity,<sup>14,15</sup> just about anything could be made to fit the pandemic criterion. As mentioned above, some of the IHR amendments also further broaden the scope of the situations in which a public health emergency might be applied.

## **Sustainable Goals Will Fall Under the WHO's Purview**

The WHO's "One Health surveillance" initiative, which is part of the pandemic treaty, also signals where this is really headed. As explained by The Epoch Times:<sup>16</sup>

*"One Health is a concept that has been embraced by the United Nations, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the World Bank, and other global organizations.*

*'The term originally meant a way of seeing human and animal health as linked – they sometimes are – so that you could improve human health by acting more broadly,' [public health physician and former WHO epidemic policy staffer David] Bell said.*

*'It has become hijacked and now is used to claim that all human activities, and all issues within the biosphere, affect health, and are therefore within Public Health's remit.*

*So public health can be deemed to include climate, or racism, or fisheries management, and this is being used to claim that addressing carbon emissions is a health issue and therefore a health 'emergency.'"*

## **Redefining Human Rights**

The pandemic treaty is also redefining human rights into a set of collective rights that are centered on public health. The Epoch Times continues:<sup>17</sup>

*"The accord presents human rights as 'health equity, through resolute action on social, environmental, cultural, political and economic determinants of health.'*

*In line with that concept, countries such as Austria went so far as to criminalize the refusal to take the COVID vaccine. Within the United States, places that included New York City mandated vaccine passports for access to public spaces, dividing its residents into a privileged vaccinated class and a second-tier unvaccinated class.*

*However, others see human rights not in terms of collective health but rather as individual rights, including such things as personal sovereignty, the ability of individuals to make their own choices, the right of people to have a voice in medical decisions that affect them, free speech, and freedom of movement and assembly.*



*Following World War II and the state-control ideologies of fascism, national socialism, and communism, 'it was realized that there has to be a fundamental understanding that individuals are sovereign,' Bell said.*

*Human rights declarations after the war emphasized that, even during times of crisis, 'we are born with rights, we're all equal, and those rights are inviolable. That is being very much watered down or wiped away in order to do this [treaty].'"*

## **The Gateway to Global Totalitarianism**

It's important to realize that the WHO's pandemic treaty will radically alter the global power structure and strip you of some of your most basic rights and freedoms. It's a direct attack on the sovereignty of its member states, as well as a direct attack on your bodily autonomy.

The treaty is basically the gateway to a global, top-down totalitarian regime where human rights as we understand them will no longer exist. Biosecurity will be the justification for an [international vaccine passport, which the G20 just signed on to](#), and that passport will also be your digital identification.

That digital ID, in turn, will be tied to your social credit score, personal carbon footprint tracker, medical records, educational records, work records, social media presence, purchase records, your bank accounts and a programmable central bank digital currency (CBDC).

Once all these pieces are fully connected, you'll be in a digital prison, and the ruling cabal — whether officially a one world government by then or not — will have total control over your life from cradle to grave.

The WHO's pandemic treaty is what sets off this chain of events, as it will have the power to implement vaccine passports globally once the treaty is signed. The WHO will also have the power to mandate vaccines, standardize medical care and issue travel restrictions.

# Can US Constitution Be Circumvented?

As reported by The Epoch Times,<sup>18</sup> there's great confusion about whether or not the U.S. government can bind the country to treaties and agreements without the consent of the Senate (as required under the Constitution), and whether international accords can circumvent or supersede the Constitution.

As currently written, there's no doubt both the IHR amendments and the pandemic treaty are intended to nullify the U.S. Constitution, as the U.S. would have to comply with the WHO's recommendations, even if such recommendations violate Constitutional rights. The Epoch Times reports:<sup>19</sup>

*"The zero draft concedes that, per international law, treaties between countries must be ratified by national legislatures, thus respecting the right of their citizens to consent.*

*However, the draft also includes a clause that the accord will go into effect on a 'provisional' basis as soon as it's signed by delegates to the WHO and would, therefore, be legally binding on members without being ratified by legislatures.*

*'Whoever drafted this clause knew as much about U.S. constitutional law and international law as I did, and deliberately drafted it to circumvent the power of the Senate to give its advice and consent to treaties, to provisionally bring it into force immediately upon signature,' Boyle said.*

*In addition, 'the Biden administration will take the position that this is an international executive agreement that the president can conclude of his own accord without approval by Congress and is binding on the United States of America, including all state and local democratically elected officials, governors, attorney generals, and health officials' ...*

*Increasingly, the Biden administration is looking toward international agreements to do what it can't achieve through Congress.*

*Most recently, having failed to increase corporate taxes in Congress, the Biden administration entered into an international agreement with the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)<sup>20</sup> to set minimum tax levels on all corporations within signatory countries.*

*While Republican lawmakers said the agreement has 'no path forward' toward approval as a treaty, provisions written into the agreement allow foreign countries to tax U.S.-based corporate profits as a punitive measure if senators don't approve it."*

## **Senators Introduce Bill to Require Senate Approval**

Fortunately, the U.S. Senate is not entirely clueless about the ramifications of this treaty, and 17 Republican senators, led by Sen. Ron Johnson, R-Wis., have introduced a bill to thwart the WHO's power grab.<sup>21</sup>

The "No WHO Pandemic Preparedness Treaty Without Senate Approval Act,"<sup>22</sup> introduced February 15, 2023, would require a Senate supermajority (two-thirds or 67 senators) to pass the pandemic treaty.

Additional sponsors of the bill include Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa; Bill Hagerty, R-Tenn.; John Barrasso, R-Wyo.; Mike Lee, R-Utah; Marsha Blackburn, R-Tenn.; Rick Scott, R-Fla.; John Hoeven, R-N.D.; Marco Rubio, R-Fla.; Ted Cruz, R-Texas; Steve Daines, R-Mont.; Thom Tillis, R-N.C.; Tom Cotton, R-Ark.; Mike Braun, R-Ind.; Tommy Tuberville, R-Ala.; Roger Marshall, R-Kan.; and Katie Britt, R-Ala.

## **Congress Must Withdraw US From the WHO**

However, according to Boyle,<sup>23</sup> an expert on international laws and treaties, even this bill might not be enough to protect us were President Biden to sign the treaty. The reason for this, Boyle explains, is because the treaty is written "specifically to circumvent the Senate-approval process."

A far more effective strategy, he says, would be for Congress to withhold its annual contributions to the WHO — and then withdraw the U.S. from the WHO altogether. I believe it may be worth supporting all of these strategies. So, please, contact your representatives and urge them to support the No WHO Pandemic Preparedness Treaty Without Senate Approval Act," to withhold funding for the WHO and, ultimately, support U.S. withdrawal from the WHO.

[Login](#) or [Join](#) to comment on this article