

Should Australia reconsider its involvement with the WHO?

“It is hard to imagine a more stupid or more dangerous way of making decisions than by putting those decisions in the hands of people who pay no price for being wrong.”

Thomas Sowell

In the aftermath of World War II and its associated atrocities, several key developments occurred. These promised to uphold the rights and freedoms of the individual and ensure doctors safeguarded these patient rights. Among these developments were The Declaration of Geneva 1948¹, The Nuremberg Code² 1948 and the World Health Organization 1948. The WHO was born espousing noble aims to improve healthcare for all individuals across the world. It promised to connect nations, partners and people to promote health, keep the world safe and serve the vulnerable - so everyone, everywhere can attain the highest level of health. This was all to be done while maintaining respect, dignity and the fundamental human rights of every individual. In the WHO's own words “Freedoms include the right to control one's health and body and to be free from interference (for example, free from torture and non-consensual medical treatment and experimentation).

Unfortunately the WHO appears to have been progressively captured by corporate ideologues through the trojan horse of public/private partnerships. This trojan horse seems to be focused on instituting a global policy directive that maximises private profit and centralises control at the expense of public health. This is the same organisation that is advancing age inappropriate sexual behaviours in minors as part of a global sex education push^{3 4}.

The WHO is a supranational body, the health arm of the United Nations. This body has no oversight in the democratic sense: the WHO is run by unelected bureaucrats and funded by a combination of taxpayer funded contributions from the 194 Member States and, increasingly it seems, by private corporate donations in partnership with the WHO⁵. Employees pay no tax and have diplomatic immunity from the consequences of their global health policy directives.^{6 7 8 9} They are funded mostly by voluntary contributions from Sovereign nations, NGO's and individuals (e.g The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and numerous Pharmaceutical companies).^{10 11 12} Pharmaceutical companies and various other organisations that help fund the WHO also made huge profits from the WHO Covid-19 pandemic policy recommendations.

¹<https://www.who.int/about/funding>

²<https://www.who.int/about/funding/contributors>

³<https://www.spectator.com.au/2023/05/children-targeted-by-who-standards-for-sexuality-education-in-europe/>

⁴ https://www.bzga-whocc.de/fileadmin/user_upload/BZgA_Standards_English.pdf

⁵<https://www.who.int/westernpacific/about/partnerships/donors>

⁶<https://www.who.int/about/funding/assessed-contributions>

⁷<https://www.un.org/en/ethics/assets/pdfs/Convention%20of%20Privileges-Immunities%20of%20the%20UN.pdf>

⁸<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/514a0127e4b04d7440e8045d/t/5bd8a25f575d1fa44bd3a544/1540923999315/Letter+to+Ms.+Paula+Donovan+and+Mr.+Stephen+Lewis+-+7+July+2017.pdf>

⁹ <https://dailyclout.io/who-funds-the-who-where-does-the-money-go/>

¹⁰<https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/26-01-2023-new-who-report-lays-out-concrete-actions-for-governments-to-optimize-public-private-partnerships-for-health>

¹¹<https://www.masterspublichealth.net/faq/how-can-i-get-a-job-with-the-world-health-organization/>

¹² <https://www.who.int/careers/staff-appointments>

Voluntary contributions make up 75% of WHO's funding. Voluntary contributors include both member states and corporate interests, like any sponsorship deals, they come with ties and a preference for programs. The funding is inextricably linked to programs that benefit the contributors own profit margins.¹³
¹⁴ ¹⁵ ¹⁶ This kind of involvement in global health policy is an obvious conflict of interest and raises serious questions about who is really benefiting from the WHO's interventions¹⁷ in the name of health.

The salutary warning of the last three years should be that the WHO's non-binding health advice, followed by many governments across the world, was disastrous. When combined with their exaggerated fear campaign it has ended up resulting in catastrophic physical, mental, economic and social harm.¹⁸ ¹⁹ The highly damaging recommendations, which included, lockdowns, social distancing, masking, blocking safe effective repurposed medicines²⁰ and the pushing of a novel gene based vaccine²¹ has resulted in an enormous transfer of wealth from lower and middle income earners to the uber rich,²² ²³ the destruction of small business, and the rewinding of progress on poverty in the developing world. The WHO's public health policy recommendations have resulted in the greatest iatrogenic medical disaster in human history and has been an assault to democracy.

Rather than stop to review, reflect upon and assess what did and did not work during the last three years, the WHO is feverishly working behind closed doors to increase its influence and control through two main pathways: significant amendments to the International Health Regulations (IHR) 2005 ed, and the preparation of an entirely new pandemic treaty, called WHO CA+.

To bolster the WHO's position the United Nations have produced a document labelled the Pandemic Prevention Preparedness and Response (PPPR) Manifesto. This outlines the US\$30 Billion per year baseline funding that would be required to fund this biosurveillance system, along with the requirement of the WHO to prepare the IHRs and WHO Pandemic Treaty. The annual cost of funding the WHO is currently sitting at US\$ 5.5 billion.

The PPPR Manifesto describes the worldwide response to Covid as a catastrophic failure. However instead of investigating these purported failures the UN uses its name to support the creation of a system with much greater central command powers and a venture capital prospectus for the biopharmaceutical complex.²⁴ This will result in the potential to make very large profits from new pathogenic threats.

Dr David Bell an Australian public health physician who has previously worked at the WHO has warned in a number of powerful articles on the WHO "Without pausing to examine the costs, the public health industry is developing international instruments and processes that will entrench these destructive practices in international law. Public health, presented as a series of health emergencies, is being used once again to facilitate a fascist approach to societal management."²⁵

¹³<https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/26-01-2023-new-who-report-lays-out-concrete-actions-for-governments-to-optimize-public-private-partnerships-for-health>

¹⁴<https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/268107/PMC2560730.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

¹⁵ The People's Guide to the Proposed Amendments to the International Health Regulations by James Roguski 2023

¹⁶<https://jamesroguski.substack.com/p/what-is-the-pandemic-treaty-really>

¹⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2007/feb/16/health.healthandwellbeing1>

¹⁸<https://sites.krieger.jhu.edu/iae/files/2022/06/A-Systematic-Review-and-Meta-Analysis-of-the-Effects-of-Lockdowns-of-COVID-19-Mortality-II.pdf>

¹⁹ <https://clinmedjournals.org/articles/jide/journal-of-infectious-diseases-and-epidemiology-jide-6-130.php?jid=jide>

²⁰ <https://c19ivm.org/>

²¹ <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance-publications>

²² <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/27/who-health-china-coronavirus-tedros/>

²³ <https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/ten-richest-men-double-their-fortunes-pandemic-while-incomes-99-percent-humanity>

²⁴ <https://www.un.org/pga/77/wp-content/uploads/sites/105/2023/06/Zero-draft-PPPR-Political-Declaration-5-June.pdf>

²⁵ <https://brownstone.org/articles/pandemic-preparedness-and-road-to-international-fascism>

IHR Amendments

The IHR (International Health Regulations^{26 27 28 29 30}) is an instrument of international law that is legally-binding on the 194 Member States. The IHRs were first created in 1969 for the purpose of helping coordinate Member States in the event of life-threatening infectious disease epidemics that could cross international borders. Initially they only encompassed three diseases, cholera, the plague and yellow fever. In 2005 the IHR's were substantially amended, and expanded the range of infectious diseases and public health emergencies that crossed international borders following the SARS pandemic. The IHRs confer rights and obligations on Member States, which includes the requirement to report public health events. The WHO's recommendations are non-binding but Member States invariably comply.

Since the Covid pandemic, there have been one set of IHR amendments adopted by the World Health Assembly that significantly shorten the time frame for a Member State to consider and reject further proposed IHRs (from 18 to 10 months) and then implement them (from 24 to 12 months). These IHRs were adopted by the WHA in May 2022 meaning we have to actively and expressly reject these amendments by the end of November 2023 otherwise, silence is acceptance. Australia's Joint Standing Committee on Treaties (JSCT) received the adopted IHRs that significantly reduce time frames from the Department of Health on 13 June 2023, and on 3 August 2023³¹ concluded "*as a minor treaty action and that binding treaty action be taken*" that "*the amendments are expected to have negligible legal, financial, or practical impact on Australia*".

While these changes appear minor in number, their effect on any future amendments to the IHRs are not. The issue with JSCT's determination is that it has been done in a silo, without any consideration for the 307 substantial amendments to the IHR's or the WHO CA+ documents.

Separately, a WHO Working Group of unelected bureaucrats, have been drafting substantial changes to the IHRs. This will completely change the nature of how the WHO interacts with Member States, abolishing the sovereignty, in regards to health, that Member States have to make their own health decisions. At present these substantial changes tally 307 proposed amendments, and they effectively transfer the governance of potential health emergencies from Australia, and all other Member States, into the hands of unelected officials at the WHO.

These amendments, as currently drafted empower the Director General of the WHO to declare, control and direct the global response to an actual or perceived international public health emergency.³² If a simple majority of the nations who make up the World Health Assembly agree to the amendments, they will become international law.³³

The specific amendments³⁴ that are cause for major concern and should immediately raise alarm bells are:

1. Australia will **lose its sovereignty** in respect to health emergencies. This is proposed in the deletion of the words "non-binding" when describing advice given by the WHO. This changes any advice from the WHO from recommendations or advice to binding requirements (Article 1) . This when combined with the amendment at Article 42 "recommendations shall be implemented without delay" ensures Member States must comply with WHO directives and the WHO Emergency Committee will be given final decision. Article 1 (page2/197), Article 42 (page 99/197) and viewed in light of the

²⁶The final report of the International Health regulations Review Committee proposed Amendments to the International Health Regulations by James Roguski 2023

²⁷The International Health Regulations (1969)

²⁸The International Health Regulations (1981)

²⁹The International Health Regulations (2005) Original Editions(pages 27-81)

³⁰The International Health Regulations (2005) 2nd edition

³¹https://www.apf.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Treaties/SOFATimor-Leste/Report_210/Chapter_4_-_Minor_treaty_actions

³² 307 proposed IHRs, Article 2.

³³ <https://www.swp-berlin.org/10.18449/2023C04/>

³⁴ The International Health Regulations (2005) 3rd edition

already long list of recommendations the WHO can make in Article 18 (page 17/197), which have also been expanded.

2. **Article 2 The power to declare a potential health emergency:** Increases the scope of the WHO's power to declare an actual health emergency of international significance to one with the potential to be an emergency. (page 57/197) And removes the right of sovereign nations to oppose the declaration of a health emergency within their own jurisdiction by the WHO Article 12 (page 189/197).
3. **Article 3 Individual rights, gone:** Removes of the line "with full respect for the dignity, rights and fundamental freedoms of persons" to be replaced by a vague statement on equity, inclusivity and coherence. (page 58/197)
4. **Article 4:** "State parties shall / may enact or adapt legislation to provide IHR focal points with the authority and resources to perform their functions" this statement is providing the means by which the sovereign nations enact legislation to restrict their peoples' own rights and freedoms (page 165/197). If not directly opposed by sovereign nations they will be obliged to rubber stamp the IHR amendments.
5. **Vaccine passports -** Requires a Global digital health certificate to move across national borders Articles 18 (page 16/197), 35, 36(Page 30/197) and Annexure 6 (Page 42/97).
6. **Article 13 WHO will be able to declare what Member States do with their health products:** A & Annexe 1 "Upon request of WHO, State parties shall ensure the manufacturer's within their territory supply the requested quantity of health products to the WHO or other State parties as directed by the WHO". Sovereign nations will be forced to fund infrastructure in developing nations (poorly defined) to manage poorly defined problems which has immense financial implications for that sovereign state. (page 13/197) (page 15/197)

The above amendments³⁵ are profoundly concerning and need to be urgently addressed by our elected representatives. It is incumbent upon our parliamentary servants that they know about, read and understand what is being proposed for the citizens of Australia. These documents are being worked on at present, it is anticipated they will be adopted at the Seventy-seventh World Health Assembly in May 2027. These proposed changes, and their implications need to be understood and addressed now.

WHO CA +(Pandemic treaty)

Separately a WHO Intergovernmental Negotiating Body is preparing a brand new document commonly known as the Pandemic treaty, The Bureau's text or the WHO CA+³⁶. This document is being drafted for consideration and adoption by the World Health Assembly in May 2024.

The WHO CA+ is not a treaty, it is more akin to a framework convention or a trade agreement. The WHO CA+ establishes broad commitments for the Member States and gives the WHO's 'partners supporting the pandemic' such as those companies making 'pandemic related products' a place at the table.

Much of what is contained in the WHO CA + document is about creating targets and a legally binding framework which supports an expansive bureaucratic apparatus. The finer details of the agreement will be decided by un-elected, unaccountable bureaucrats behind closed doors and without further consultation, at a future date. If Australia as a sovereign nation is unhappy with any, to be revealed, working details, it will take three years to un-encumber itself from this expensive agreement.

It would seem that the draft document's goal is to set up a very expensive bureaucratic infrastructure. This will allow the WHO to institute a world wide bio-surveillance system, with the aim of detecting

³⁵ <https://www.wma.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Decl-of-Geneva-v2006.pdf>

³⁶ <https://jamesroguski.substack.com/p/top-10-reasons-to-exitthewho>

infectious diseases which they perceive could become a threat to the population. In addition it will actively censor information it feels will be critical of its programs or policies. The WHO's director general will have the power to declare that the pathogen discovered constitutes a Public Health Emergency of International Concern. Once this occurs then the bio-pharmaceutical industrial complex begins to develop, manufacture and mass produce inadequately tested, rapidly deployed mRNA vaccines to counter these potential threats. This will go hand in hand with restrictive public health measures, severe censorship and fear mongering propaganda campaigns. Directives could potentially be combined with coercive measures designed to enforce submission and compliance. These documents have nothing to do with improving the population's health, but are about legalising a medical tyranny.^{37 38}

Conclusion

Whilst these IHR amendments and the WHO CA+ may appear on occasion to make contradictory statements, make no mistake, they are extremely dangerous international legislative documents, which have the potential to arrest our freedoms and bodily autonomy, and place it in the hands of unelected unaccountable bureaucrats. The WHO has been captured by corporate influence. These major conflicts of interest have corrupted policy recommendations so much so that it seems clear the WHO is driven by profit and power rather than improving the health and well-being of humanity. We do not want the people controlling the WHO to be in control of our health choices or our personal freedoms. Every nation and person on this earth needs to seriously consider its relationship with the WHO before it is too late.

What could the above mean for you, your family and friends. If these documents are passed as they currently stand, humanity will face a never ending cycle of pandemics. The response to and evaluation of these events is taken out of the hands of individual nations and placed firmly into the hands of the WHO's unelected, unaccountable and unknown bureaucrats. However all is not lost, we can overcome this massive threat to our individual and national sovereignty, but we all must act now. Remember silence is consent, so it's very important everybody spreads the word about the WHO and voices opposition to their plans.

What you can do

1. Contact your politician, make them aware, speak to your friends, family, anybody who will listen regarding what this deeply troubling body is attempting to do.
2. Useful information packs about what questions to ask them can be found on <https://australiaexitstheWHO.com>
3. To learn more about what you can do or get more information:
<https://jamesroguski.substack.com/>
<https://jamesroguski.substack.com/p/top-10-reasons-to-exittheWHO>
<https://brownstone.org/author/david-bell/>
<https://worldcouncilforhealth.org/?s=who>
<https://worldcouncilforhealth.org/?s=WHO+>

³⁷ <https://jamesroguski.substack.com/p/stop-the-cop>

³⁸ <https://jamesroguski.substack.com/p/new-unedited-draft-bureaus-text-of>