

U.S. to Give WHO Complete Control Over Nation's Pandemic Response, Republicans Fight Back



Member states of the World Health Organization (WHO) are meeting next week in Switzerland to negotiate the final terms of what they're calling a "[convention, agreement, or other international instrument](#)" that will grant the WHO authority over U.S. pandemic policies under its "Constitution" and the United Nation's Charter. This is something that has been in the works since Dec. 2021.

If adopted, this accord would be legally binding on all 194 member states and allows the WHO to [declare pandemics](#), impose lockdowns, dictate and restrict treatments and therapeutics, control the medical supply chains, impose surveillance methods, and be the arbitrator of "disinformation and false news."

Seventeen Republican senators signed on to a bill introduced

on Feb. 15 by Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wis.), asserting the WHO's pandemic accord is actually a treaty and must be treated as such. [Article II, section 2](#) of the U.S. Constitution gives the President the power to enter into treaties, but only with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate. It is highly unlikely 67 senators would sign on to this accord if they read it and understood its implications.

Treaties are [binding agreements](#) between nations that become international law. Treaties to which the U.S. is a party have the force of federal legislation and become part of "the supreme Law of the Land."

In several instances, the U.S. Supreme Court has supported the idea that these agreements constitute federal law and supersede state laws and regulations. In [State of Missouri v. Holland](#), the Court ruled that [treaties supersede state laws](#), and in [United States v. Belmont](#), the Court said executive agreements without Senate consent legally bind Americans.

If the WHO's accord is legally binding, U.S. citizens would be unable to look to states or elected officials to protect them from invasive pandemic measures like vaccine mandates, forced masks, or lockdowns.

Only three things stood in the way of implementing what some have called the "New World Order" during the COVID-19 pandemic: Republicans (governors, senators, attorneys general, republican elected judges, etc.), the court system, and free speech.

The WHO's accord addresses all of these potential roadblocks by bypassing Congress, taking jurisdiction away from our courts, and appointing itself the proverbial king over our first amendment rights.

If the current [draft](#) of the accord is adopted, member states such as the U.S. must submit to "the central role of the WHO as the directing and coordinating authority on international

health work.”

But what if a country gets buyer’s remorse after signing on to the accord or a new U.S. President who disagrees with the WHO’s power grab is democratically elected? Not so fast.

The WHO has come up with the Cadillac of [withdrawal policies](#) that protect it in the off-chance Biden isn’t re-elected and a rogue President comes in who wants to pull out of the accord:

Article 27. Withdrawal

1. At any time after two years from the date on which the WHO CA+ has entered into force for a Party that Party may withdraw from the WHO CA+ by giving written notification to the Depositary.
2. Any such withdrawal shall take effect upon expiry of one year from the date of receipt by the Depositary of the notification of withdrawal, or on such later date as may be specified in the notification of withdrawal.
3. Any Party that withdraws from the WHO CA+ shall not be considered as having also withdrawn from any protocol to which it is a Party, or from any related instrument, unless such a Party formally withdraws from such other instruments, and does so in accordance with the relevant terms, if any, thereof.

A country can file a written notification to withdraw two years from the date the accord is entered into force for a party, but it won’t take effect for an additional year.

So the WHO, at a minimum, has **THREE YEARS** to implement the global governing system they’re attempting to create, complete with vaccine passports, endless vaccines for humans and livestock, and surveillance systems.

What if there’s a dispute by a member state? They’ve thought of this too.

If an American citizen wanted to challenge a pandemic measure during COVID-19, they could use the court system. That’s how several of the Biden administration’s federal vaccine mandates were struck down, how we preserved the vaccine religious exemption for United States Air Force members, how people

gained access to restricted treatments, how mask mandates were challenged in schools, and how the Health Freedom Defense Fund successfully challenged the federal mask mandate imposed on airlines.

Suppose an American citizen wants to challenge the WHO . . . good luck. Suppose two member states can't work out their issues. In that case, the International Court of Justice gets involved, or there is arbitration "in accordance with procedures to be adopted by consensus by the Governing Body."

This "International Court of Justice" is not code for the U.S. Supreme Court, and the "Governing Body" is not referring to our U.S. Congress. The United Nations controls the International Court of Justice.

You may be wondering who holds the WHO accountable under this accord. According to the draft, nobody. Yet, the WHO will "consider and approve cooperative procedures and institutional mechanisms to promote compliance with the provisions of the WHO CA+ and also address cases of non-compliance" of member states, who have an obligation to implement whatever the WHO imposes under this accord.

The WHO is an organization that is not elected by the people and has its own "constitution." The entire goal of this accord is to usurp the governance of member states and, by extension, the governed. The WHO, under this accord, can deem anything it wants a "pandemic," including COVID-19, monkeypox, animal viruses, and climate change. They can then demand member states carry out initiatives that may infringe upon our civil liberties.

They can demand children and animals be vaccinated with an endless amount of vaccines, impose lockdowns, determine which "therapeutics" we have access to, censor us online and through social media companies, force us to get rid of our gas stoves in the name of a climate change pandemic, shut down our

schools—and preclude us from doing anything about it.

According to a 2020 Pew Research survey, 51% of Americans felt the WHO had done a poor or fair job managing the COVID-19 pandemic. The WHO [sat on crucial information](#) regarding COVID-19 and delayed telling member states of its existence. In addition, it did not accurately convey information on COVID-19 or China's involvement, which is why President Trump notified the WHO of our intent to withdraw before he left office. When President Biden was elected, he stopped it.

Currently, the U.S. is the [largest donor](#) of the WHO. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is the [second largest donor](#). China is [third](#). Let this sink in.

The WHO has a \$6.72 billion [budget](#) largely provided by Bill Gates and China, and \$1.25 billion is dedicated to “health emergencies.” Bill Gates believes we should all give up meat and get our vaccines. China implemented a harsh “zero-COVID” policy, arguably causing the largest COVID-19 outbreak in the world and millions of deaths.

This is not a conspiracy. You can read the draft of this agreement created by the WHO's “Intergovernmental Negotiating Body” you didn't vote to rule over you [here](#).