

WHO Releases Guide to 'Combating Misinformation'

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

November 23, 2022

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › The World Health Organization announced that it's working with Big Tech to combat misinformation online
- › As a result of WHO's "policy updates," 850,000 YouTube videos related to "harmful or misleading COVID-19 misinformation" were removed from the platform from February 2020 to January 2021
- › Lest you see all sides of an issue and form an educated opinion of your own, WHO intends to carefully control the internet so you only see what it deems as the "truth"
- › To accomplish this, WHO is working closely with master manipulators in their own right, including YouTube, Google, Facebook and NewsGuard
- › WHO has dedicated a webpage to reporting misinformation online, with direct links to social media platforms, making it easy to snitch on those who go against the status quo
- › Significant portions of regulatory agencies' budgets around the globe come from the pharmaceutical industry that these agencies are supposed to regulate

You can sleep easy tonight. The World Health Organization announced that it's working with Big Tech to combat misinformation online. It didn't define what "misinformation" it's targeting, or even what "misinformation" is, but if you see anything that looks suspicious, WHO wants you to report it right away so social media platforms can flag it or take it down.¹

Sound disturbing? More like a nightmare, but it's one that is, unfortunately, not a dream. As John Campbell, a retired nurse and teacher based in England, said in the video above, "It's almost as if they want to have an influence over all parts of social media."² Yes, indeed, and they're quite open about it too. WHO states that it's "changing social media policy and guidelines," and:³

"WHO works with social media policy departments to ensure company policy and guidelines for content providers are fit for purpose. For example, WHO worked with YouTube to enhance their COVID-19 Misinformation Policy and provide guidelines for content providers to ensure no medical misinformation related to the virus proliferates on their platform."

Nearly 1 Million YouTube Videos Taken Down

As a result of WHO's "policy updates," 850,000 YouTube videos related to "harmful or misleading COVID-19 misinformation" were removed from the platform from February 2020 to January 2021.⁴ As justification for its rampant censorship, WHO explains:⁵

"WHO and partners recognize that misinformation online has the potential to travel further, faster and sometimes deeper than the truth – on some social media platforms, falsehoods are 70% more likely to get shared than accurate news. To counter this, WHO has taken a number of actions with tech companies to remain one step ahead."

Lest you see all sides of an issue and form an educated opinion of your own, WHO intends to carefully control the internet so you only see what it deems as the "truth." And it's working closely, "on a weekly basis," in fact, with master manipulators in their own right, including YouTube, Google, Facebook and "several other partners such as NewsGuard ..."⁶

Ah yes, NewsGuard, another self-appointed internet watchdog that sells a browser plugin to rate websites on nine criteria of credibility and transparency. NewsGuard received much of its startup funds from Publicis Groupe, a giant global communications

group with divisions that brand imaging, design of digital business platforms, media relations and health care.

Publicis Groupe's health subsidiary, Publicis Health, names Lilly, Abbot, Roche, Amgen, Genentech, Celgene, Gilead, Biogen, Astra Zeneca, Sanofi, Bayer and other Big Pharma giants as clients. In fact, the PR firm that created and ran Purdue Pharma's deceptive marketing campaigns for the opioid Oxycontin is none other than Publicis.

At the beginning of May 2021, the Massachusetts attorney general filed a lawsuit⁷ against Publicis Health, accusing the Publicis subsidiary of helping Purdue create the deceptive marketing materials used to mislead doctors into prescribing OxyContin. We're going down a rabbit hole, but you know you can tell a lot about an organization by who its friends are.

'Protect Yourself and Others' – Report 'Misinformation'

WHO is also enlisting the help of basically anyone who will listen and fall for their blatant propaganda to report "misinformation" about COVID-19 and COVID-19 shots that goes against its policies. According to WHO:⁸

"Social media platforms have ... granted WHO access to fast track reporting systems, which allows us to flag misinformation on their platforms, speeding up the reporting and removal of content that breaks policy. WHO also works with Member States such as the Government of the United Kingdom to raise awareness of misinformation around COVID-19 and vaccines, and encourage individuals to report false or misleading content online."

Conveniently, WHO has taken the guesswork out of how to report said misinformation. They've dedicated a webpage to reporting misinformation online, with direct links to the following social media platforms, making it easy to snitch on those who go against the status quo:⁹

Facebook

YouTube

Twitter	Instagram
WhatsApp	TikTok
LinkedIn	Viber
VK	Kwai

WHO's Move to Create a Global Superpower

WHO won't stop at controlling the internet. It's also aiming to "save the world" from infectious diseases, food system failures and more by creating a globalist organization with synchronized plans — and the potential for ultimate control and power.

This was revealed in October 2022, when WHO announced a new initiative called One Health Joint Plan of Action. The plan was launched by the Quadripartite which, in addition to WHO, consists of the:¹⁰

- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
- World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH, founded as OIE)

WHO already has too much power. This new initiative will only give it more. It's important to understand that Bill Gates is WHO's No. 1 funder, contributing more to WHO's \$4.84 billion biennial budget¹¹ — via multiple avenues including the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation as well as GAVI, which was founded by the Gates Foundation in partnership with WHO, the World Bank and various vaccine manufacturers — than any member-state government. In short, Bill Gates is essentially the owner of WHO.

Regulatory Agencies Captured by Industry

In 1992, the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA) was created, which allows the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to collect fees from the drug industry. “With the act, the FDA moved from a fully taxpayer-funded entity to one supplemented by industry money,” a BMJ article written by investigative journalist Maryanne Demasi explains.¹²

Now, significant portions of regulatory agencies’ budgets come from the pharmaceutical industry that these agencies are supposed to regulate. In 1993, after PDUFA was passed, the FDA collected about \$29 million in net PDUFA fees. This increased 30-fold — to \$884 million — by 2016.¹³

It’s also revealing, as noted by Campbell, that at the FDA, 9 out of 10 of its former commissioners between 2006 and 2019 went on to work for pharmaceutical companies.¹⁴ But it’s not only U.S. regulators who are captured by industry; a similar trend occurred in Europe. In 1995, industry fees funded 20% of the European Medicines Agency (EMA). This rose to 75% by 2010 and now, in 2022, it’s 89%. According to Demasi:¹⁵

“In 2005 in the UK, the House of Commons’ health committee evaluated the influence of the drug industry on health policy, including the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency (MHRA).

The committee was concerned that industry funding could lead the agency to ‘lose sight of the need to protect and promote public health above all else as it seeks to win fee income from the companies.’ But nearly two decades on, little has changed, and industry funding of drug regulators has become the international norm.”

How do regulators from different countries compare? “Industry money permeates the globe’s leading regulators,” Demasi wrote, demonstrated as follows:¹⁶

Australia’s Therapeutic Goods
Administration — 96% of budget derived
from industry

Europe’s EMA — 89%

U.K.'s MHRA — 86%	Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency — 85%
U.S. FDA — 65%	Health Canada — 50.5%

“Are these the official bodies that we want to adjudicate over what health information we are given, over which drugs are good for us and which drugs are bad for us?” Campbell said. “Is this really who we want to make these decisions, given the amount of funding they’re receiving from, what some people might consider to be, vested interests?”¹⁷

“We’re talking about large amounts of money, which have no influence on decision-making,” he says sarcastically. “And yet these official agencies are going to decide what health information you and I are going to receive.”¹⁸

Are We Living Out an Orwellian Reality?

Access to information as it once was has been fundamentally changed. WHO and other world leaders are now working together to silence information that doesn’t correspond with its common agenda. Even information that was once fact, such as definitions in dictionaries and on official government websites, have been altered in real time.

Examples of definitions that have been changed include those for pandemic, herd immunity, vaccines and anti-vaxxer. Investigative journalist Sharyl Attkisson is among those who have explained that virtually everything you see and hear online has been coopted, or taken over to serve a greater agenda. Attkisson reiterates:¹⁹

“Virtually every form of information and sourcing that can be coopted has been. That includes the dictionary definitions, that includes everything because these are important ways to influence thought. Language is very powerful. People don’t want to be affiliated with certain names and labels.

It reminds me of 1984, the George Orwell story about the futuristic society, under which history was being rewritten in real time to jive with the version that

the government wanted or the party wanted it to be. Definitions now are being rewritten and changed in real time to fit with the vision that the establishment wants people to think."

Campbell also quotes "1984," which stated, "It was expected that Newspeak would have finally superseded Oldspeak (or Standard English, as we should call it) by about the year 2050."²⁰ "Let's hope it doesn't get there before that," Campbell said. "I kind of like Oldspeak. It's the one I was brought up with."

Orwell wrote, "The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc [the ruling party], but to make all other modes of thought impossible."²¹

"The C vocabulary [a component of Newspeak] was supplementary to the others and consisted entirely of scientific and technical terms. These resembled the scientific terms in use today, and were constructed from the same roots, but the usual care was taken to define them rigidly and strip them of undesirable meanings."²²

And then there are the three slogans, "War is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength," which are contradictory yet widely accepted by the people. It's food for thought, as WHO and other regulatory agencies become increasingly blatant in their censorship and suppression of freedom. "Make of that what you will," Campbell says.

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