

The WHO Pandemic Treaty and Amendments to the International Health Regulations: Enabling a Global Health Dictatorship

By [Paul Anthony Taylor](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

Global Research, November 26, 2023

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Intended to form part of international law, preparations for the creation of a World Health Organization (WHO) pandemic treaty began in 2021. Far from strengthening the prevention of, preparedness for, and response to future pandemics as the [latest draft](#) of the text claims, its implementation could severely undermine democracy by limiting the ability of national parliaments to make crucial healthcare decisions in the best interests of their citizens. Aided by [proposed amendments to the International Health Regulations of 2005](#), the treaty threatens to transform the WHO into a global health dictatorship.

The sweeping influence exerted by the WHO during the COVID-19 pandemic was the result of revised International Health Regulations passed at a [meeting of the World Health Assembly](#) (WHA) in 2005. The decision-making body of the WHO, the WHA's meetings are held annually in Geneva, Switzerland, and attended by delegations from the WHO's [194 Member States](#).

Prior to 2005, the WHO had principally acted as a coordinator, assistant, or collaborator to the public health services and drug regulatory authorities of its Member States. But with the passing of the revised International Health Regulations, the WHO took on vast new powers that were unprecedented in the field of global health. These essentially enable it to decide when a public health emergency of international concern exists and to take key decisions regarding what measures should be implemented in response. Under the regulations, the WHO's recommended actions can include vaccination, quarantine, isolation, drug treatment, and contact tracing, among others.

Now, however, in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, the road is being prepared for the WHO's already considerable powers to be expanded still further. Particularly worryingly, the [latest draft](#) of the proposed amendments to the regulations shows that clauses that

previously made their provisions non-binding are being reworded - effectively making them mandatory and giving the WHO real decision-making powers over its Member States. As such, claims that the planned pandemic treaty will not undermine national sovereignty are at best disingenuous, as its text has to be viewed in light of the increased authority that, if approved, will be given to the WHO under the amended International Health Regulations.

The WHO Thinks You Have “Too Much Information”

The growing concern over the WHO pandemic treaty isn't simply that it could undermine democracy by preventing national parliaments from being able to make crucial healthcare decisions in the best interests of their citizens. Through introducing the term “[infodemic](#),” the treaty seems to be attempting to prevent the spread of truthful information about science-based natural health approaches and dangerous experimental vaccines. Without citing any evidence, the text claims that having “too much information” available during a disease outbreak causes “confusion and risk-taking behaviors that can harm health.” Suggesting who this wording is primarily intended to benefit - namely, the WHO itself - the text states that having too much information apparently “leads to mistrust in health authorities.” To counter this, “infodemic management, at local, national, regional and international levels,” is proposed.

The pandemic treaty also dramatically expands the WHO's areas of interest. Through what it terms a “One Health approach,” the global body now intends to be able to take decisions in health matters related to animals, ecosystems, and the environment. The treaty specifically refers to “taking action on climate change,” for example. Several observers have suggested that with these extended powers, the WHO could potentially declare an environmental or climate emergency and enforce lockdowns.

Given the global body's close [links to Bill Gates and the pharma industry](#), and the hundreds of millions of dollars in annual funding it receives from them, there is a growing worldwide recognition that this looming power grab represents a fundamental threat to democracy. At the very least, the increasing transfer of powers to the WHO raises important questions regarding national sovereignty and personal liberty.

Ultimately, if its handling of the COVID-19 pandemic has taught us anything, it is that the WHO has sold its soul to corporate interests and cannot be trusted to take important decisions on global health. It is surely in all of our interests to demand that our national lawmakers do not sign away the sovereignty that the WHO is seeking.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on [Dr. Rath Health Foundation](#).

[Executive Director of the Dr. Rath Health Foundation and one of the coauthors of our explosive book, “The Nazi Roots of the ‘Brussels EU’”, Paul is also our expert on the Codex Alimentarius Commission and has had eye-witness experience, as an official observer delegate, at its meetings. You can find Paul on Twitter at \[@paulanthtaylor\]\(#\)](#)

He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from DRHF

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Paul Anthony Taylor](#), Global Research, 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Paul Anthony Taylor](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca