

# How the WHO was captured

Private capital wields far too much influence

BY [Thomas Fazi](#)



**Thomas Fazi** is an *UnHerd* columnist and translator. His latest book is [The Covid Consensus](#), co-authored with Toby Green.  
March 6, 2023

Listen to this article

Speed + | -



00:00 / 15:55

To hear more, download [Noa app](#) for iPhone or Android.

The World Health Organization had a terrible pandemic. Continually lambasted for its role in the public health disaster, only last week another embarrassment landed: the lab leak hypothesis, which it relentlessly tried to knock down, [was accepted](#) as the most likely explanation for the coronavirus.

The body tasked with the protection of public health, however, is undaunted by the criticism. We now learn it is engaged in a silent coup that, if successful, would grant it even more sweeping powers of intervention in the affairs of nation-states.



[battleforeurope](#)

March 6, 2023

Filed under:

[Technology](#) [Bill Gates](#) [Gates Foundation](#) [Pandemic](#) [Vandana Shiva](#) [WHO](#)

Share:



Like what you're reading? Get the [free UnHerd](#) daily email

[Sign up, for free](#)

Already registered? [Sign in](#)

When it was created, after World War II, as an agency of the United Nations, it had the aim of [promoting](#) “the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health” across the globe – whereby health was understood, crucially, as “a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity”. It was, in other words, predicated on an understanding of the fact that economic and social development are fundamental determinants of health – a concept that would be reaffirmed in the [Declaration of Alma-Ata](#) of 1978.

As a reaction to the brutality of 20th-century totalitarian and colonial regimes – both of which had involved horrendous cases of medical abuse – the WHO also emphasised the importance of democratising medicine by putting communities and individuals in charge of their health through the promotion of proximity and primary healthcare. Under this democratic and rights-based framework, the WHO achieved several notable achievements, most notably the eradication of smallpox.

However, from the Eighties onwards, things started to change. Until then, the organisation had relied on the contributions of its member states for its regular budget. In 1982, however, the World Health Assembly, the WHO’s decision-making body, voted to freeze its budget – under pressure from the Reagan administration, which [saw](#) the WHO as a socialist-leaning, unaccountable organisation working against American interests. This was followed by the 1985 decision by the United States to withhold its contribution, in part as a protest against its “Essential Drug Program”, which encouraged developing countries to develop their own capacities to produce essential medicines, rather than rely on Western drug companies – small wonder leading US-based pharmaceutical companies were averse.

As a result, the organisation was forced to rely increasingly on extrabudgetary funds provided by “stakeholders”: not only governments and bilateral and multilateral agencies (such as the World Bank), but private and corporate donors as well, [including](#) pharmaceutical giants such as GlaxoSmithKline and Novartis. Over the years, among the private extrabudgetary donors, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation rose above the rest: by the 2010s, it had become the WHO’s second-largest donor, accounting for around [10% of all funds](#).

Since voluntary contributions are earmarked, the donors largely get to call the shots on the use of the funds they contribute, as Margaret Chan, the WHO’s former Director-General, [complained](#) a few years back. This has led to the proliferation of public-private programmes more or less independent of the rest of the WHO’s programmes and decision-making structure, such as the [Children’s Vaccine Initiative](#).



“The priorities of WHO have evolved accordingly, moving away from community-centred care to a more vertical, commodity-based approach”, [writes](#) David Bell, a public health physician and former WHO staffer specialising in epidemic policy. “This inevitably follows the interests and self-interests of these funders.” In place of the preventative and “holistic” approach to health initially championed by the WHO, which viewed health as the outcome of a wide range of economic, social and political factors, a new paradigm has slowly emerged: a commercialised approach to health, single-mindedly focused on high-tech, largely vaccine-based solutions, with a particular interest for genetically engineered biotechnologies – an emerging industry [potentially worth](#) billions of dollars.

A crucial role in this shift was played by Bill Gates. As the WHO’s second-largest funder, Gates exercises a [massive influence](#) over the organisation, as even admirers of the foundation [admit](#). And he has used that influence to promote vaccine-driven responses to matters of global health – through the WHO as well as through related public-private partnerships such as GAVI (Vaccine Alliance) and CEPI, also funded by Gates. In 2011, Gates [spoke](#) at the WHO, and declared: “All 193 member states [must] make vaccines a central focus of their health systems”. The following year, the World Health Assembly adopted a “Global Vaccine Plan” that the Gates Foundation [co-authored](#), and over half of the WHO’s total budget now goes to vaccines.

His obsession with vaccines really shouldn’t come as a surprise. The Gates Foundation is strongly connected to the pharmaceutical industry, and ever since its creation, it has [owned stakes](#) in several drug companies. The foundation’s [website](#) even candidly declares a mission to pursue “mutually beneficial opportunities” with vaccine manufacturers. This is the essence of what has been called [philanthrocapitalism](#) – “a capitalist, market-based, for-profit approach to solving the world’s biggest and most pressing issues”. This kind of corporate-driven approach exemplifies the conflicts of interest inherent in the WHO’s dependence on unaccountable private donors such as the Gates Foundation.

Some activists in the Global South have especially negative views of the consequences for public health. A leading human rights activist in India, Vandana Shiva, [said](#): “Gates has hijacked the WHO and transformed it into an instrument of personal power that he wields for the cynical purpose of increasing pharmaceutical profits. He has single-handedly destroyed the infrastructure of public health globally.”

Meanwhile, Linsey McGoey, a professor of sociology at the University of Essex, explains in [her book](#) *No Such Thing as a Free Gift: The Gates Foundation and the Price of Philanthropy* how Gates has used his influence over the WHO to defend the intellectual property rights of drugs manufacturers.

Crucially, just as the WHO was falling increasingly under the dominion of private capital (and Gates in particular) the organisation also started expanding its power. A key step was the third revision of its [International Health Regulations](#) (IHR) in 2005, on the heels of the 2002-2004 SARS outbreak, which for the first time made the agreements, encompassing a wide range of rules for the management of epidemics and pandemics, binding for all member states (even though the latter remained formally in charge of health policies).

This coincided with a wider push towards the supranationalisation of health policies, with the transition from “international” to “global” public health. While the two terms may appear synonymous, they in fact indicate two very different systems: while the former is grounded in nation-states as the ultimate repositories of authority, the latter implies that governments are just one (and not even the most crucial) component of a global health system involving a wide range of “stakeholders” – for example the media, private institutions and multinational corporations – with the WHO at its core as the ultimate voice of authority. This gradually inverted the relationship between the WHO and member states: as the latter’s influence over the organisation was increasingly eclipsed by private interests, the WHO’s influence over member states was growing.

This has led, over the past two decades, to the burgeoning of a massive global health industry encompassing the world’s largest pharma and biotech companies, global and national public health organisations (first and foremost the WHO itself), private philanthropies such as the Gates Foundation, vaccine-focused public-private partnerships such as GAVI and CEPI, and trans-Atlantic planning groups-*cum*-think tanks such as the [World Economic Forum](#) as important intermediaries between the various actors. These actors clearly have interests independent of each other, but over the years such interests have come to coalesce over the need to prepare for, and the profit opportunities offered by, future pandemics – deemed to be all but inevitable.

[More from this author](#)

[How the Davos elite took back control](#)

By Thomas Fazi

Indeed, the pandemic shone a light on the power accrued by the global health industry in the years leading up to 2020 – and its influence over the WHO. As Covid took hold, the organisation jettisoned its years-long established [position](#) on pandemic management, along with any form of evidence-based science, in favour of a completely novel pro-lockdown and vaccine-centric narrative – the same approach championed, among others, by its main private donor, Bill Gates, who, *Politico* [suggested](#), used his clout to “control the global Covid response”. As one civil society group [stated](#), the WHO effectively “outsourced” the management of the global Covid vaccine rollout to Gates.

The WHO, for example, played a crucial role in the cover-up of the lab leak hypothesis. It also jettisoned its 2019 pandemic plan (which didn’t mention “lockdown” once) to embrace and [promote](#) Chinese-style lockdowns. Such was its praise and defence of China, it was criticised for appeasement. It [stoked panic](#) by claiming Covid was much deadlier than it was already known to be. It ignored known age-stratified [risk](#). It [promoted](#) test-and-tracing, even though it had [previously claimed](#) that “under no circumstances”, however severe the outbreak, should contact tracing be adopted, due to its limited effectiveness, but also due to “ethical concerns”.

[Further reading](#)

## [The WHO's Covid shame](#)

By Ian Birrell

It promoted universal masking, even though it had [acknowledged](#) early on that there was no evidence of its benefits. It negated the [benefits of natural immunity](#) in order to promote the claim that herd immunity could only be achieved [through vaccination](#). It refused to acknowledge (until April 2021) that SARS-CoV-2 is airborne, despite [ample evidence](#) of the contrary. And it promoted the [censorship](#) of factually true claims relating to all of the above under the guise of fighting disinformation – and actually promoted misinformation and disinformation itself.

All this points to a colossal failing on the WHO’s behalf. On the one hand, it highlights the risks inherent in a top-down, highly centralised and bureaucratised approach to public health – the opposite of the democratic, community-based, bottom-up approach initially championed by the WHO. On the other, however, it is also a stark reminder of what happens when an institution becomes captured by private interests. So why are plans underway to hand the WHO even more power?

This is the aim of two agreements currently under discussion. The first consists of a set of [amendments](#) to the existing International Health Regulations, an instrument with force under international law. The second is a new [“pandemic treaty”](#) that goes in the same direction as the IHR amendments.

The IHR amendments are at a much more advanced stage, and have a much greater chance of being approved – the modifications will effectively carry the same weight as a new treaty, but are much less contentious than the proposed “treaty” and only require the approval of 50% of countries to come into force. The consequences would be far-reaching. These amendments, as Bell writes, “are intended to fundamentally change the relationship between individuals, their countries’ governments, and WHO”.

[Further reading](#)

## [Did scientists stifle the lab-leak theory?](#)

By Ian Birrell

In terms of individual rights, the WHO propose to abandon, even formally, the WHO’s anchoring to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, by suggesting that the phrase stating that the regulations will be implemented “with full respect for the dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons” be deleted from the text and replaced with the vague terms “equity, coherence, inclusivity”. In terms of the relationship between member states and the WHO, the amendments aim to give the WHO authority over states, by proposing to change the definition of “recommendations” from “non-binding” to (by deletion) “binding”, and specifying that states will undertake to “follow” (rather than “consider”) the recommendations of WHO. The latter may include: vaccine mandates, measures requiring proof of vaccination (vaccine passports), quarantining of individuals (lockdown), travel restrictions and all manner of health interventions.

Moreover, an entire new article is proposed where states “recognize WHO as the guidance and coordinating authority of international public health response during public health Emergency of International Concern”. This is of particular concern if considered in tandem with another amendment which widens the definition of what constitutes a public health emergency to include “all risks with a potential to impact public health”, and assigns to the Director-General – today, Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus – the sole authority to declare an emergency. It’s hard to see how anyone could consider putting so much power into the hands of a single person a good idea, especially in view of Ghebreyesus’s flawed response to the pandemic.

We should be very concerned about the power grab being attempted by the WHO — especially since it's happening without any public debate whatsoever. It would be concerning even if the organisation had maintained its original funding model, institutional structure and underlying philosophy. But it's particularly concerning if we consider that the WHO has fallen largely under the control of private capital and other vested interests. It would mark the definitive transformation of global health into an authoritarian, corporate-driven, techno-centric affair — and risk making the Covid response a blueprint for the future rather than a disaster which should never be repeated.

### Like what you're reading?

Here are some more UnHerd articles we think you might enjoy



#### Why I broke up with Dua Lipa

She seemed like a goddess — and then I read her newsletter



#### Ten terrible years of Pope Francis

The church has lost all its moral authority



#### The problem with 'trans women are women'

Is it any wonder people are confused?



#### How the Tories lost their way

On housing, conservatism is stuck in an intellectual death-spiral



## Join the discussion



To join the discussion in the comments, become a paid subscriber.

Join like minded readers that support our journalism, read unlimited articles and enjoy other subscriber-only benefits.

[Subscribe](#)

98 COMMENTS

  Most Voted ▾



**Jim Veenbaas** 7 days ago

Who the hell is the WHO? It has zero power over sovereign nations, unless we cede it to them. The bigger problem in the west is electing leaders who actually pay attention to these corrupt, dysfunctional international organizations.

170 REPLY



**Chris Wheatley** 7 days ago

Reply to [Jim Veenbaas](#)

It is a cousin of The United Nations, child of The League of Nations. Full of well-paid old men, making long boring speeches. It is nothing.

20 REPLY



**John Riordan** 7 days ago

Reply to [Chris Wheatley](#)

"It is nothing."

Except a supranational power structure to which nation-State democracies are legally bound to follow its orders and without any accountability. So not nothing at all.

87 REPLY



**Chris Wheatley** 7 days ago

Reply to [John Riordan](#)

So China and Russia follow? I don't think legality comes into. Those who follow want to cuddle up to the Americans for some reason.

This reminds of something many years ago when I worked for a manufacturing company. We followed all of the EU laws but the Italian competitors just ignored them. I was told that Italy was always the first to sign up to EU laws; then Italy ignored them completely but the UK followed them to the letter. The idea of an international law is just plain ridiculous.

32 REPLY



**mike otter** 7 days ago

Reply to [Chris Wheatley](#)

Yes been there, got the T Shirt – lost the bids to Italian (or German and French) co's who had no intention of meeting EU (or ISO) standards but strictly complied with the clients brown envelope requirements.

15 REPLY



**Stephanie Surface** 7 days ago

Reply to [Chris Wheatley](#)

..."cuddle up to the Americans"? As the article said Reagan was very sceptical of WHO and withdrew some of the US' money, so did Trump. Biden on the other hand is another story

22 REPLY



**Terry M** 7 days ago

Reply to [Stephanie Surface](#)

Precisely.

*the WHO's decision-making body, voted to freeze its budget — under pressure from the Reagan administration, which saw the WHO as a socialist-leaning, unaccountable organisation working against American interests. This was followed by the 1985 decision by the United States to withhold its contribution, in part as a protest against its "Essential Drug Program"; which encouraged developing countries to develop their own capacities to produce essential medicines, rather than rely on Western drug companies — small wonder leading US-based pharmaceutical companies were averse.*

Imagine that. Companies averse to providing development funding to their incipient competitors!

Socialists like this idiot need to be called out at every juncture.

4 REPLY



**John Riordan** 6 days ago

Reply to [Chris Wheatley](#)

If you were explaining why the EU is such a hopeless mess then you would have a good point, but in this context we're talking about a situation where these supranational bodies are enthusiastically adopted and their rules adhered to by politicians who would much rather blame someone else for policies that are not popular and cannot gain democratic legitimacy directly. Given that such policies now include health services actually killing people legally, I don't think you can really make this about how Italy circumvents the rules-based order when it suits it: the point is that following such rules DOES suit politicians in many countries.

10 REPLY



**Nic Regan** 7 days ago

Reply to [John Riordan](#)

Where does it state that any nation is legally bound to follow its orders? Genuine question ....

11 REPLY



**Chris H** 7 days ago

Reply to [Nic Regan](#)

The WHO CA+ treaty specifically states that "the instrument should be legally binding".

11 REPLY



**laurence scaduto** 6 days ago

Reply to [Chris H](#)

Sure. But what's the enforcement mechanism?

4 REPLY



**Giselle Durnford** 6 days ago

Reply to [laurence scaduto](#)

Having other member states freeze you out economically.

2 REPLY



**Ruth Ross** 6 days ago

Reply to [Nic Regan](#)

It isn't ratified, YET. The WHO is dangerously close to getting control over 194 Nation 'states' (note how they refer to Nations as states) Public Health response during 'the next' pandemic which Bill Gates continually states is inevitable. They are working on a binding International Agreement which they will not call a Treaty because many countries have laws requiring that Treaties must be approved by, for example in the USA, 65% of the Senate. The WHO, UN, and WEF are all working on this – the WEF has many world leaders as members of their organization ie: Canada, USA, Australia, Europe, NZ, UK etc. so voters are not even being made aware that this is going down. Which is why I am glad that UNHERD published this article. WHO intends to ratify this 'agreement' in 2024. Meaning Teadros, an un-elected fool who takes his orders from the CCP and Gates would be calling the shots on OUR Public Health response to a pLANdemic. His last effort was a fiasco. The truth of it is starting to come out. The source of the virus, (lab) the ineffectiveness and the harms caused by mRNA, mandates, lockdowns, testing, masking – the entire useless response invented by the Chinese.

25 REPLY



**Caroline Minnear** 6 days ago

Reply to [Nic Regan](#)

I believe there were "opt in" documents signed by willing countries. They were rolled out in peak Covid panic when our governments were all freaking out looking for someone to tell them what to do.

If you read look up a fella called James Roguski he's all over the ins and outs of this stuff. Both the "Pandemic Treaty" and the IHR

2 REPLY



**John Riordan** 6 days ago

Reply to [Nic Regan](#)

The article itself explains this, surely?

👍 0 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

 **Miriam Cotton** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Chris Wheatley](#)

Yeah, well the governments of sovereign nations are happily ceding this power with no mandate for it.

👍 12 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

 **John Hicks** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Jim Veenbaas](#)

“Ceding power to them” seems to be a real possibility and concern particularly given current European legal trends promoting principles of “sincere cooperation” and “confidence creep” exposing member states to binding accomodation of “dysfunctional international organisations” like WHO.

👍 35 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

 **Richard Pearse** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Jim Veenbaas](#)

Rather (or, in addition) the question should be: “Who the Hell is Bill Gates (et al)?”

Private interests indirectly making “public” decisions (to the extent WHO impacts government policies) for their personal gain – or even for their personal opinions about policy preferences.

There is almost a whiff of treason in the air, to the extent these investments and decisions are intentionally contrary to and independent of the opinions of voters. Gates et al seem to be the root cause of buffalo-ing people with “fear, surprise and torture”.

👍 32 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

 **Ian L** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Richard Pearse](#)

A computer scientist, yet treated as a doctor

👍 18 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

 **Jane H** 1 day ago

🗨️ Reply to [Richard Pearse](#)

Bill Gates is son of William H. Gates who was deep state to the core. Bill Gates is buying up land in the US and is now the biggest private landowner in the US.

👍 0 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

 **Stephanie Surface** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Jim Veenbaas](#)

The WHO is a sibling to the IPCC. Any dissenting voice gets killed off and private interest groups and activists are deciding, what will happen to our future energy. Unless we elect politicians who will stand up to these supra national organisations, we are all doomed.

📄 Last edited 7 days ago by [Stephanie Surface](#)

👍 24 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

 **Peter Caswell** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Jim Veenbaas](#)

WHO will soon have power over sovereign nations who sign up to its global response objective on future pandemics, WHO will decide to who and what vaccines are administered, when lockdowns are to take place and for how long etc etc, I believe USA have signed up and UK are on the verge.

There is a global campaign by WHO to get every country to sign up, no doubt there will be some carrots dangled for poorer nations, which no doubt will be funded by the wealthier ones.

👍 12 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

 **Hennie Booysen** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Peter Caswell](#)

Not necessarily a carrot but most likely a stick. If the poorer countries don't sign up they will lose travel freedoms, trade concessions, become persona non grata and so on. The Covid pressures have shown WHO the blueprint, and it is now simply a matter of refining it.

Be afraid, be very afraid.

👍 14 🗨️ REPLY



**Peter Johnson** ⌚ 6 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Jim Veenbaas](#)

I genuinely don't understand why progressive politicians are so keen to cede power to these unelected organizations. I am guessing that they are encouraged to by the corporations that heavily influence them.

👍 4 🗨️ REPLY



**Terry M** ⌚ 6 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Peter Johnson](#)

The Progs think that they can control them – and that's true at present – but the worm turns. We are in for decades of hell, however.

👍 5 🗨️ REPLY



**G A Braine** ⌚ 5 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Jim Veenbaas](#)

Unfortunately it is about cede power on a level which will enter full dystopia. The writer of this article elegantly points out the major issues, and the power wielded will remove any democracy, body autonomy and will inflict untold harms. This goes against everything the Nuremberg and Geneva code stood for. This is the war of all wars, and our governments are working for these corporations now.

👍 3 🗨️ REPLY



**Andrew Horsman** ⌚ 7 days ago

This is a good analysis. We live in perilous times. It's important to rise above the noise and try and understand the facts and this article helps us to do that, so thank you Thomas Fazi. Please excuse the length of this post but I have twelve important factual points to add, all of which bar the first are gleaned from a detailed reading of the WHO's own website.

1. Tedros was appointed in 2017 with the backing of the Chinese Communist Party against the UK's eminently more qualified Sir David Nabarro. He is the first WHO Gen Sec does not to be a professionally qualified medical doctor. He is an Ethiopian communist, and (former?) member of the Tigray People's Liberation Front, an organisation that the US government deemed to be "terrorist". During his time in the Ethiopian government, including seven years as Health Minister, political opponents accuse him of human rights abuses and covering up three cholera outbreaks. Shortly after his appointment as WHO DG he attempted to appoint Robert Mugabe as a "goodwill ambassador".
2. He described the "pandemic treaty", in early 2022, as a "generational" change, a "game changer", and a "great historical stride forward". In his successful pitch for (unopposed) reappointment for another five year term in early 2022 he said urged national leaders to "act with ambition so that negotiations [on the pandemic treaty] are swift and we are ready to respond to the inevitable next Disease X".
3. Tedros has, so far successfully, led the charge for a "One Health" approach. Advocates of it describe it as "an integrated, unifying approach that aims to sustainably balance and optimize the health of people, animals and ecosystems". The WHO acknowledged in January 2022 that such an approach "would reach beyond pandemic preparedness and response and ... the mandate of WHO... However the application of a One Health approach also would yield significant benefits for the international community ... This could include new and/or strengthening of existing platforms, surveillance, furthering multisectoral partnerships (human, animal and environmental health sectors) and promoting specific countermeasures in line with the One Health approach." The UK's representative at the WHO appeared to agree, opining that "One Health should be the default approach".
4. This is reflected in the WHO's expressed belief that there should be "a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach" to disease control and pandemic management.
5. The treaty, if Tedros and Gates etc get their way, will not only empower Tedros to declare an emergency but will do so on the basis of the "precautionary principle". The proposed amendments to the IHR would allow Tedros to declare an emergency without the consent of the government of the country or countries in which an alleged outbreak is occurring.
6. The US has already pushed through an amendment to the IHR which reduces the amount of time that member states have to withdraw their consent to future IHR amendments once agreed, from 18 to 10 months. So no possibility of reopening a debate at the subsequent World Health Assembly in light, for example, of domestic opposition.
7. In his opening address to the May 2022 World Health Assembly, Tedros said  
"Only 57 countries have vaccinated 70% of their population – almost all of them high-income countries. We must continue to support all countries to reach 70% vaccination coverage as soon as possible, including 100% of those aged over 60; 100% of health workers; and 100% of those with underlying conditions." He did not acknowledge that not everyone might consent to being vaccinated so it is reasonable to interpret this comment as a call for mandatory vaccination of certain people. He goes on:

"In some [countries] we see gaps in operational or financial capacity; and in all, we see vaccine hesitancy driven by misinformation and disinformation."

"WHO's primary focus now is to support countries to turn vaccines into vaccinations as fast as possible ... The pandemic will not magically disappear. But we can end it. We have the knowledge. We have the tools. Science has given us the upper hand."

8. The WHO has said that "Non-State Actors" [see point 10 below], should "leverage their role as key actors in health emergency prevention, preparedness and response and as active promoters of pandemic and health emergency literacy, particularly in engaging local communities" and "contributing to transparency and timeliness of information with a view to preventing the spread of misinformation".

9. Thomas Fazi is correct that WHO's dependence on private funding has increased but they are also looking to extract more resources from national governments & the people they are supposed to represent, to "transform" the WHO. Tedros's May 2022 address, again:

"I welcome the recommendation of the Working Group on Sustainable Financing to increase assessed contributions to 50% of the core budget over the next decade ... I also welcome the recommendation to consider a replenishment model, to broaden our financing base, and to provide more flexible funding for the programme budget. These recommendations could completely transform this Organization."

10. The second part of the first meeting of the International Negotiating Body (INB) on the treaty agreed in March 2022 on "modalities of engagement for relevant stakeholders". This provided for a long list (I counted 291 in total at the time but they keep adding to this list) of entities who would be invited to attend and to speak at open session meetings of the INB, and its sub-groups, and to provide comments in writing including on draft materials prepared by those working groups. This includes:

- 19 UN and other intergovernmental organizations in effective relations with WHO, such as the League of Arab States and the International Committee of Military Medicine.
- 8 official "observers", including Gavi, the Vaccine alliance as one of eight official "observers" along with the Order of Malta, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.
- 220(!) "non-State actors in official relations with WHO (as of February 2022), including the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers and Associations (IFPMA), Oxfam, the Clinton Health Access Initiative, the Bloomberg Family Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Wellcome Trust and many other charitable, philanthropic, and trade organisations.
- A further list of 44 other "stakeholders", including the COVID-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP), the UN Population Fund, and the World Bank.

11. This follows agreement in January 2022 at the WHO's Executive Board that there should be an "informal pre-meeting for interested non-State actors in official relations, Member States and the Secretariat will be organized annually during the four to six weeks before the World Health Assembly". No records, minutes, or even attendee lists of any such a meeting were published as far as I can see (happy to stand corrected though if this is not true) but presumably it went ahead. Presumably the second one will be taking place some time this month.

12. In April 2022 the WHO held a series of public hearings and opened up a portal for comments by the "global public." They received a total of 36,294 written responses. This is from the WHO's own summary:

"The majority of written contributions proposed that no international instrument should be established." ... "A number of submissions referred to respect for national autonomy and sovereignty, noting that subnational and cultural bodies, and local health entities were better placed to make health decisions at the national level. Such a focus on sovereignty was justified by the differences in national health systems.

The majority of submissions requested that human rights be respected in the process of drafting and negotiating a convention, agreement or other international instrument, including but not limited to the right to bodily autonomy informed by consent, the freedom of information, the freedom from discrimination, and the freedom to choose medical interventions. Several submissions referred to international instruments such as the Nuremberg Code, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration of Helsinki, the Belmont Report, and the Oviedo Convention and its Protocols."

👍 112    🗨️    ➡️ REPLY



**Richard Pearse** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Andrew Horsman](#)

Many thanks! An extremely useful supplement to the article.

👍 28    🗨️    ➡️ REPLY



**Vesselina Zaitzeva** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Andrew Horsman](#)

Thank you, Mr Horsman.

An excellent addition to an excellent article.

👍 20    🗨️    ➡️ REPLY



**CHARLES STANHOPE** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to [Andrew Horsman](#)

Splendid.

👍 12 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**Ruth Ross** ⌚ 6 days ago

↩️ Reply to [Andrew Horsman](#)

THANK YOU! People need to wake up to this and your additions to the article are eye-opening – and terrifying. This has to be stopped.

👍 10 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**Andrew Horsman** ⌚ 6 days ago

↩️ Reply to [Andrew Horsman](#)

Thank you for the appreciative comments. Please feel very free to share the points with friends, family, colleagues, and legislators. The substantive, serious issue of this treaty & IHR amendments needs far more attention than it is currently getting relative to, for example, UK politicians' silly text messages.

👍 9 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**Peter D** ⌚ 5 days ago

↩️ Reply to [Andrew Horsman](#)

While this might be nit picking, it is a crucial nit that really does need to be picked because it punches above its weight for distorting the truth.

Colonialism improved public health around the world. It is a far cry from the abuses of the totalitarian states. The sooner we get away from the colonialism was an evil racist act done by an evil racist people (aka white people) the sooner we can move forward.

It is a stupid and thoughtless comment that divides and gets people offside. White people need to grow a spine and speak up from the get go. Colonialism was not perfect and abuses did happen but what is brought up ad-nauseam is totally out of context because the build up is ignored and the punishment handed down to the abuser is also ignored.

As long as this continues, we will be divided.

👍 0 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**polidori redux** ⌚ 7 days ago

It would not occur to me to rely on anything said by the WHO or Bill Gates. Or Tony Blair, whilst we are on the subject of human wretchedness.

👍 71 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**Diane Tasker** ⌚ 7 days ago

A great article! It's about time the general public are made aware that 'The Emperor has no Clothes'. I worked across the world for a large international development company – whose health programmes were efficiently planned, resourced, effective and timely. Without exception, compatriots I talked to, who represented other international organisations delivering health programmes or responding to disasters, viewed the WHO as largely ineffective, cumbersome and spendthrift. It's in the mould of the EU – large budgets, large salaries, plush offices, 'see the world' at the taxpayers' expense, a job for life – however ineffective the programme.

✎ Last edited 2 days ago by [Diane Tasker](#)

👍 60 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**Elliott Bjorn** ⌚ 7 days ago

WHO are a crime syndicate, one Ian Flemming would have invented for his books if it did not already exist. 1948 it was created as part of the UN... and so that was that, its turn to evil assured. Claus and Tedros and Gates – they basically could play themselves and the whole (**Special Executive for Counter-intelligence, Terrorism, Revenge and Extortion.**) SPECTRE would be believable (because it would be).

As a young man I read a biography of one of the first 'Surgeon Generals of the group which later became WHO, **International Sanitary Conference**, and Pan American Sanitary Bureau.

These men were scientists/Saints. The Surgeon Generals then were Medical doctors of the highest quality, who served in the Military and became expert on satiation by that, coupled with the international scope. The admiration I feel for these men is absolute. (the US Surgeon General now! WOW, not quite the same)

One of the most stirring books of my lifetime was the creation of the leper Colonies under them, and the astounding young Mid West Americans who would do Seminary, a crash course of doctor and dentist – and ship off to work the Leper Colonies – Never to Marry or Ever to return home as leprosy was contagious, and volunteering to be medical staff was a death sentence. And they did – and went, knowing one day they would

cross from the staff side of the colony to the inmate side.... and off off they would go to the very worst possible fate out of love for the lowest and most abandoned of all... They did it for their conviction to Love of mankind, and for God.

This was when it was about Health and serving Mankind.

Now we know it is about enslaving mankind, growing powerful and obscenely wealthy, and likely the WEF and Gates Foundation stated depopulation goals.

A saintly and scientific organization morphed into a satan and twisting science organization under Ted\*\*s and Bill and Melinda, and WEF, and the wicked Welcome Trust, and the whole Bio-Pharma evil – And now they are in grasping reach of taking over the world's governments in any Plandemic they chose to release next!

Is there anything good to come from modern political things like the NGOs and the UN? I doubt it, they are owned, they are captured by Evil men.

I did not read the article as the WHO make me ill to read on – so I do not address specific details.... I hope Fazi really let them have it.

*(edited to say – those young American Missionaries would go all over the world to work the Leper colonies – people who they did not understand, language they did not speak, for life with no parole. I was stirred because I have met this saintly type in odd parts of the world....)*

<https://wikisummaries.org/founding-of-the-international-sanitary-bureau/>

 Last edited 7 days ago by Elliott Bjorn

 34   REPLY 



**AJ Mac**  7 days ago 

 Reply to [Elliott Bjorn](#)

Your doomspeak rants are really tiresome, and mostly insane. It's pretty amazing that you're too delicate (or lazy) to read the article, lest you get a tummyache, but have no compunction subjecting others to thousands of words of often sickening dystopian hodgepodge—admittedly, I scroll past it now for the most part (but read your post above as a minimal courtesy)—and somehow don't seem to make yourself sicker by them, except perhaps in the head.

Do you like anything that still exists in the world, or are you solely against all the evil you see everywhere you look—everywhere, it seems, but the mirror? And heroes of a bygone, largely-imaginary age which I'm quite sure you'd find a way to condemn if they came back and became present-day real people. Good luck with whatever remains sane and benevolent within you. I know you have a sense of humor and I liked your recent "brown acid" joke.

 Last edited 7 days ago by AJ Mac

 -17   REPLY 



**Billy Bob**  7 days ago 

 Reply to [AJ Mac](#)

He's proper fallen down the rabbit hole. His previous incarnations were interesting and his opinions were well written and articulate, now it's just a load of buzz words copy and pasted from conspiracy theory websites

 -11   REPLY 



**B Emery**  7 days ago 

 Reply to [Billy Bob](#)

Difference between a conspiracy theory and a fact – 6 months. Joke.

Remember when the lab leak was a conspiracy?

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-9980015/26-Lancet-scientists-trashed-theory-Covid-leaked-Chinese-lab-links-Wuhan.html>

 Last edited 7 days ago by B Emery

 33   REPLY 



**AJ Mac**  7 days ago 

 Reply to [B Emery](#)

Good jokes tend to have an element of truth. I like: "Yes I'm paranoid, but that doesn't mean the world isn't out to get me!"

Surely the number of true conspiracies falls between zero and all that are logistically possible. Pretty shameful silencing and conspiratorial spin-doctoring on the Wuhan front—checked your link—as well as many aspects of the covid-flu world disaster, from groups of zealots on both sides, one whom I'll call Plandemicists, the other Follow-the-(changing) science-dogmatists.

 -2   REPLY 



**B Emery** 7 days ago

Reply to [AJ Mac](#)

Lmao. I like that line too its in a nirvana song called territorial p\*ssings.

Sorry. Not a nice name:

<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=bm6lz-l50mQ>

On the more serious side of the 'conspiracy' cult, it's about thinking independently. It's not about looking for a conspiracy as such but assessing all the information and drawing your own conclusions. If you draw conclusions that are outside the accepted narrative you are then normally called a conspiracy theorist, or peddler of misinformation.

There are some hilarious conspiracy theories granted. That are not based in any reality.

4 REPLY



**AJ Mac** 7 days ago

Reply to [B Emery](#)

Just gave it my first ever listen, thanks. A decent Nirvana "deep track". (I'm a fan but I never had any CDs of theirs).

Fair enough about "conspiracy hound!" and "misinformation-monger!" being thrown around as a reflex or smokescreen.

I mean, I believe that those who voted for the wrong candidates are reptilian pedophiles, but some of the theories are just silly. 😊

Last edited 7 days ago by AJ Mac

0 REPLY



**B Emery** 6 days ago

Reply to [AJ Mac](#)

I think it was a B side tbh, one of the lesser known and probably not one of their greatest tracks. I have his journals from being into all that years ago, that track and some others are written in them.

But are they reptiles from space or from the sea? You do realise even that crazy crew can't agree on the origin of their lizard overlords.....

2 REPLY



**AJ Mac** 7 days ago

Reply to [Billy Bob](#)

But his act has a fierce and distressingly large following, fellow downvoted "crusader". I'm gonna take a hopeful stance and chalk it up largely to the Yeats (know it, didn't show it) lines: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst / Are full of passionate intensity".

Other lines that seem relevant to the grim mood of many articles and comment boards here:

"The woods of Arcady are dead / And over is their antique joy / Of old the world on dreaming fed / Grey Truth is now her painted toy"

I've loved those lines since I saw them in my late teens, but noting that they are from 1895 does put hyper-nostalgic views into perspective, or at least on a longer timeline. O tempora! O mores!

Last edited 6 days ago by AJ Mac

-5 REPLY



**michael harris** 6 days ago

Reply to [AJ Mac](#)

Not Keats. Yeats.

2 REPLY



**AJ Mac** 6 days ago

Reply to [michael harris](#)

Indeed. A typo or mental transposition I've pointed out when made by others. You got me.

0 REPLY



**Chris Wheatley** 7 days ago

Reply to [Elliott Bjorn](#)

The WHO is about old people, people who might have done something in their lives and so get rewarded (put out to grass) in a paying job which makes them feel important. It is American, like The United Nations – also full of similar old people, who are too slow to keep up.

1 Like Dislike Reply



**Allison Barrows** 7 days ago

Reply to [Chris Wheatley](#)

Show us on the doll where the old people hurt you.

12 Likes Dislike Reply



**Chris Wheatley** 7 days ago

Reply to [Allison Barrows](#)

Old people hurt you by not being fast enough to react to change. Old people hurt you by knowing that they are right (experience), even when they are wrong.

A large survey of thousands of doctors in the USA showed that the old doctors just couldn't keep up with modern medicine BUT they thought that they were right because of their holistic approach. They were more likely to be wrong than any young doctor.

-10 Likes Dislike Reply



**Allison Barrows** 7 days ago

Reply to [Chris Wheatley](#)

Do your parents and grandparents know what you think of them? I wonder how you'll feel about yourself when you grow up.

7 Likes Dislike Reply



**Chris Wheatley** 7 days ago

Reply to [Allison Barrows](#)

I didn't ever meet my grandparents, who all died before I was born. My father died when I was 19 and my mother when I was 40. My very first record (45rpm) was Wimoweh by Karl Denver, bought from Woolworths.

I have grown up. I just don't know old people who have anything to offer – except for family support of course and that can often mean money. Maybe church or the WI but that is just old people supporting old people.

-8 Likes Dislike Reply



**Jeff Butcher** 7 days ago

Reply to [Chris Wheatley](#)

What a strange attitude. You're over 40, and yet still consider yourself young? I'm 51 and my teen kids already view me as a kind of decrepit, incipient dementia case.

Besides is life really all about what you 'have to offer'? Is it all merely a grey transactional analysis? I hope not!

Last edited 7 days ago by [Jeff Butcher](#)

9 Likes Dislike Reply



**Chris Wheatley** 7 days ago

Reply to [Jeff Butcher](#)

You at least get the point. It is all too easy to do something important (ish) in your life and then consider that your views are still meaningful as you get older and older.

I spent a lot of time working in Italy and every morning the old, retired men would be kicked out by their wives. They used to meet for hours in the morning in cafés, shouting at the tops of their voices, putting all of the problems of the world to rights. Nobody cared but it was fun.

0 Likes Dislike Reply



**AJ Mac** 7 days ago

Reply to [Allison Barrows](#)

Haha!

"Don't worry, the Tech Bros are young and energetic, and they'll make all your troubles go bye-bye..."

👍 6 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**Alex Carnegie** 7 days ago

I do not know about the situation at WHO but – if this article is broadly correct – then surely it is just an example of a wider trend. The state – at both the national and international levels – has got so large and complicated that a few elected ministers are unable to control the various bureaucracies. Instead assorted ideological and corporate interests try to capture the agencies and dictate the agenda. Arrangements which worked well in the nineteenth century are insufficient today.

👍 29 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**Andrew Richardson** 7 days ago

What concerns me is the complete conviction I have that there is no politician or official institution in this country that will in any way stand against WHO.

👍 29 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**Allison Barrows** 7 days ago

Fazi's loathing of "capitalism" doesn't excuse the fact that these U.N. Organizations, like the U.N. itself, are unelected, expensive, largely useless, and mostly dangerous. It's long past time the U.S. ended its relationship with that body and its affiliates. The building on the East River would, with some updates, make a nice and badly-needed homeless shelter for American vets.

👍 27 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**AJ Mac** 7 days ago

🗨️ [Reply to Allison Barrows](#)

We could have more unhinged returning vets if America decides to go at it even more on our own against Russia, China and their underlings. Or perhaps we'll build a wall around the perimeter of the contiguous states and finally confront our homeland nightmares, such as homelessness, drug overdoses, and runaway greed.

👍 -1 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**Jonathan Nash** 7 days ago

"Equity" is not a vague term: it identifies a programme for the complete dismantling of Western capitalism on the grounds that the structures it has produced are rooted in racism and colonialism. If that is the way the WHO is going, the UK should withdraw ASAP.

👍 24 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**Steve Murray** 7 days ago

🗨️ [Reply to Jonathan Nash](#)

This seems to me to be the nub of the matter, and your description couldn't be more succinct.

👍 9 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**John Riordan** 7 days ago

I wonder what Matt Ridley is doing about this – if anything. He was of course one of the first high-profile people to blow the whistle on the lab-leak hypothesis along with Alina Chan, so he's well placed to oppose this massive expansion of anti-democratic supranational power.

👍 21 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**Jane H** 7 days ago

A great article which i read with huge relief that folk are waking up to the plans underway. Another major funder of the WHO is..... China! That's why the so called investigation into the lab leak theory, in Wuhan, by the WHO was a complete whitewash and has been discredited ever since. China is cosying up to Russia too much in recent weeks leading to the FBI declaring the lab leak theory the most likely cause.

👍 15 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**Fran Martinez** 7 days ago

How do we stop it?

👍 14 🗨️ ↪️ REPLY



**CHARLES STANHOPE** 7 days ago

🗨️ [Reply to Fran Martinez](#)

How indeed?

Here in the UK we couldn't even prevent 'Sinbad' & 45,0000 of his chums paddling across the Channel last year, so what chance have we with the dreaded WHO?

 Last edited 6 days ago by stanhopecharles344

 9   REPLY



**Peta Seel**  6 days ago

This is a very good article but I am surprised it doesn't mention the way China hi-jacked control of the WHO in May 2017. At that time there was a vote for a new Director-General and Dr David Nabarro of Imperial College was the front runner. China corralled their client state votes, mostly in Africa, to install Tedros instead. He was the first Director-General of the WHO with no medical background whatsoever. He was re-installed, unopposed, in May 2022.

The Covid virus came from China. So did the lockdown policy and so did most of the PPE including billions upon billions of useless, disposable masks, most of which are currently polluting the environment (another aspect that needs investigation), with huge profits for Chinese companies. Why did the WHO change its mask policy in April 2020?

This aspect of what the WHO is currently trying to do needs a lot of further investigation.

 13   REPLY



**Nicky Samengo-Turner**  7 days ago

A far greater concern that " post industrial capitalism" has brought, via hoodwinking especially Conservative politicians, is the " privatisation" of sectors that are immune to competition/ competitive pricing. Utilities including railways are a prime example, where the consumer has no choice and is a fish in a barrel victim, yet the self same politicians allow post Lehman banks to be bailed out by " the taxpayer", and stop North Sea oil and gas so as to pander to eco sandaloid votes so as to keep their own jobs, as well as waste billions on " private PPE" during Covid?

 10   REPLY



**Elizabeth Hart**  7 days ago

Bill Gates is running the show, literally.

COVID is his baby, with the UK a most willing participant in this scam.

Consider [his speech at the virtual Global Vaccine Summit, hosted by the UK in June 2020](#)

Hello. It's great to be with you all today – albeit virtually. I want to thank the United Kingdom for hosting this summit – and for their generosity. They have been one of the world's leading contributors to global health and development – including immunization programs – and have supported Gavi from the beginning.

I think it's safe to say: This is not the kind of replenishment event we envisioned a few months ago. It's more remote. But it's also more important.

We are meeting at a unique time in history. Never have more people been more aware of the importance of vaccines.

As we race to develop a COVID-19 vaccine, we must also renew our commitment to delivering every lifesaving vaccine there is to every child on earth.

That is the work that Gavi and alliance partners have been doing for 20 years. And when we come together as a global community to support Gavi replenishment, we are making sure that it can continue doing this work until no child dies from a vaccine-preventable disease.

Since its inception, Gavi has helped vaccinate more than three quarters of a billion children. It has incentivized researchers to develop vaccines for neglected diseases. It has made new vaccines widely available years before they would have been available without Gavi.

And now, it has stepped up and said it is willing to deliver a COVID-19 vaccine as soon as one is available, to end this pandemic as soon as possible.

If we didn't already have Gavi, we would have to create it to solve this crisis.

Gavi will have to stay focused on its core work while learning how to address COVID-19. It can't let one task slip while it concentrates on the other, because lives, and children's futures, are at stake in both cases.

Our foundation is proud to have been a member of the Gavi alliance from the beginning. It's the largest investment we make – and easily one of the best. We need Gavi now more than ever.

Today, we are pledging \$1.6 billion dollars to help Gavi continue its work over the next five years.

In addition, the foundation is proud to support the new COVID-19 Vaccine Advance Market Commitment with a \$100 million contribution to help make sure that when a COVID-19 vaccine is discovered, everyone who needs it can have access to it, starting with health care workers and other high-risk populations. I hope others will consider similar commitments in the coming weeks, including at the upcoming Global Goal: Unite for our Future event on June 27.

To all those who have pledged: Thank you for your generosity. Thank you for making sure Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance has what it needs— and that billions of people can get the good health and opportunity they need.

👍 10 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**Elizabeth Hart** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to Elizabeth Hart

Question is...why was there a 'vaccine solution' for Covid-19?

It was known from the beginning that Covid wasn't a serious threat for most people, so how did we end up with Gates' insane plan to 'vaccinate' the entire global population...over and over again?

This is what must be tracked back now, how was the Covid vaccine plan evaluated and approved, where are the minutes of the meetings?

👍 18 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**Terry M** 6 days ago

🗨️ Reply to Elizabeth Hart

In June 2020 it was not clear (yet) just how bad things might get. The fear-mongering by the press had everyone shaking in their boots, hiding in their cellars. Vaccines were touted as the solution, and that was not a ridiculous idea. If they stopped the spread. But they didn't. Vaccinated people were less likely to get severe symptoms or die, but still got infected even more than once. And the death rate and co-morbidity situation was just starting to be understood.

And, of course, Gates has a messiah complex.

👍 1 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY



**Robbie K** 7 days ago

🗨️ Reply to Elizabeth Hart

Gates' baby? Covid scam? What a sick and twisted suggestion. I'm uncertain why people believe this conspiratorial garbage that drifts through the internet like a stinking open sewer. You are utterly deranged.

👍 -11 🗨️ ↩️ REPLY

**AD** **Chris Wheatley** 7 days ago

Reply to [Robbie K](#)

Just for once, we agree.

-3 REPLY

**HE** **Jane H** 7 days ago

Reply to [Robbie K](#)

So you agree with a Global Pandemic Treaty where the Gates funded WHO dictates global responses? And Global Vaccination Passports? I'm astonished by your naivety and your willingness to hand over your freedom of choice to a notoriously corrupt unelected World Health Organisation. Presumably you'll also be happy to have an underskin identity microchip.

6 REPLY

**RO** **Robbie K** 6 days ago

Reply to [Jane H](#)

Your words, not mine. I have little to no confidence in the WHO. That doesn't equate to believing that covid was a scam however or that Gates is some kind of evil bond villain, he's merely a rich geek with noble intentions but a disconnect with reality.

-3 REPLY

**HE** **Jane H** 6 days ago

Reply to [Robbie K](#)

Disregarding the covid scam issue, If you have little to no confidence in the WHO then you surely must have misgivings about a Global Pandemic Treaty authorising the unelected WHO to dictate mandatory global responses?

Last edited 6 days ago by [Jane H](#)

2 REPLY

**RO** **Robbie K** 6 days ago

Reply to [Jane H](#)

Definitely. That is one for the UN General Assembly.

-1 REPLY

**CA** **michael harris** 6 days ago

Reply to [Robbie K](#)

Her suggestion is to find out how mass vaccination became the weapon to use against a virus with a particular vulnerable target (the over 70s) while well argued points of view that opposed this line were silenced and at times demonised.

Your small diatribe against her seems to be a prepared and general attack against...well anyone who disagrees with you.

Last edited 6 days ago by [michael harris](#)

4 REPLY

**RO** **Robbie K** 6 days ago

Reply to [michael harris](#)

Now that could well be an interesting discussion. What ruined it however was to start the comment with referring to covid as Gates' baby and a UK scam, which just makes one appear to be on the lunatic fringe.

-2 REPLY

**MC** **John Solomon** 7 days ago

I would be more comfortable with the role of the WHO if it concentrated on fundamentals – e.g. “Don't cr\*p in the drinking water supply” “Boil water before you drink it.” and “Instead of sending most of the foreign aid money to Swiss banks, use some of it to build a sewer system and toilets.”

9 REPLY

**A** **Allan murray-jones** 7 days ago

Gates and co seem to have put in more money than China but have a fraction of the influence. Quite right in most respects; China has a vast population. But some of the most outrageous things complained about here were done in the interests of China, not science or rational debate.

I look forward to a non ideological, non journalistic, book on what happened with Covid 19.

6 REPLY



**CHARLES STANHOPE** 7 days ago

Reply to [Allan murray-jones](#)

'Sino delenda est'.

2 REPLY



**Andrew Wise** 7 days ago

So Reagan was right to defund it!

Great article, thanks

6 REPLY



**Martin Bollis** 7 days ago

"This is the aim of two agreements currently under discussion. The first consists of a set of amendments to the existing International Health Regulations, an instrument with force under international law. The second is a new "pandemic treaty" that goes in the same direction as the IHR amendments."

Who is discussing these issues, where, in what forums? Articles like this fall down for me in creating a very big bogeyman but leaving him ill defined and hidden in shadow.

Democratic government is not completely dead. Name the government departments responsible for these negotiations, the people involved, the timelines. Is this really a well advanced coup, as implied, or an early stage consideration. Clearly there is world wide pushback on the WHO's pandemic handling, how powerful is that movement,, who's leading it etc.

Some of these pieces are becoming as strident as those on the left stoking fear of the ever imminent right wing violent insurgency.

Last edited 7 days ago by Martin Bollis

5 REPLY



**Laura Creighton** 7 days ago

Reply to [Martin Bollis](#)

see <https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/614335>

11 REPLY



**Martin Bollis** 7 days ago

Reply to [Laura Creighton](#)

Many thanks. I wish I'd known about it, I would have signed it.

9 REPLY



**John Sullivan** 7 days ago

Reply to [Martin Bollis](#)

"Democratic government is not completely dead".

Delusional. Where have you been for the last 3 years?

28 REPLY



**Martin Bollis** 7 days ago

Reply to [John Sullivan](#)

Clearly not in the same echo chamber as you.

-9 REPLY



**mike otter** 7 days ago

Reply to [John Sullivan](#)

I think it's fair to say its wounded but not completely dead. These things are typically cyclical. Once the monsters overreach there'll be push back, the Nuremburg trials perhaps the best recent example. Sadly the monsters have to do their evil before this happens. If you look very long term the human condition has improved overall despite backward steps along the way – WHO being potentially a big one!

6 REPLY



**Samuel Ross** 7 days ago

Doctor Who is a strange bird. I prefer a doctor whose name I know. Incognito just doesn't do it for me!

4 REPLY



**Antoinette Kunda** 7 days ago

For those who might want to try to do something in the US please read this article. We have to stop them.

<https://jamesroguski.substack.com/p/a-world-wide-call-to-take-immediate>

4 REPLY



**Jane H** 6 days ago

There is a petition on Change.org at the moment demanding Parliament does not sign up to The Global Pandemic Treaty:

<https://chng.it/6tmM75Vd4b>

Last edited 6 days ago by Jane H

4 REPLY



**James Kirk** 7 days ago

A sensible WHO would take account of the growing population and incentivise the First World to breed more and the already poor Third World less. To increase life expectancy into the heart attack / cancer prone years without a health service who can cope is unkind.

Last edited 7 days ago by Zorro Tomorrow

3 REPLY



**Nic Cowper** 6 days ago

Lots of people here asking how the WHO can enforce its 'directives'. Err, were you asleep the last two years? Or because you were vaccinated (with what? Do you know?) so you weren't so badly affected? Point is personal freedoms were removed, many lost their jobs, economies collapsed, and societies turned against each other. But pharma companies got stinking rich, powerful individuals gained excessive influence and governments learned they could "remove" dissent using digital IDs (covid passports). Wake up people the consequences of this are serious – ask any Social Credit bound Chinese citizen.

3 REPLY



**Lee Wood** 6 days ago

He's wearing a 500 dollar suit but has failed to hide the shirt button with his tie ... shocking 😬

2 REPLY



**Antoinette Kunda** 5 days ago

Here is an update on actions to take

<https://jamesroguski.substack.com/p/reject-digital-enslavement>

1 REPLY



**Andrew Holmes** 5 days ago

It appears bizarre to me to ascribe Gates' choices to a profit motive. He's spent billions to increase the dividends he receives from his investments in pharmaceutical companies? Get a grip. Rather than focus on solving every problem through the uplift of all societies, he chooses to cure the sick now with vaccines. The former is nebulous, the latter is measurable and real.

0 REPLY



**mike otter** 7 days ago

What a coalition of interests! – Hancock, Gaites and Tedros. The latter, though he says some crazy stuff (EG concern for Ukranian war victims is racist against black people –BBC News. 13 April 2022) is probably the only one who has genuinely helped others. His record in Ethiopa is best yet for a Minister of Health – if spoilt by his agreeing to wash over Mugabe's brutal abuses in return for a vote for his WHO election campaign.

-1 REPLY



**Richard Barrett** 4 days ago

A Facebook critic of this article has made the following points:

"Some of the more obvious untruths: 1. The WHO is an advisory UN body which can fund programmes but cannot tell governments what to do; 2. Vaccinations are not imposed on poor countries. Their collaboration with WHO and NGOs has led to the most dramatic health improvements in history: end of Smallpox, errors inroads in eradicating River virus, malaria, leprosy etc. Etc. In spite of the best efforts of Reagan, IMF etc to defund them. Poor countries are achieving what colonial powers said was impossible. 3. Herd immune to us code for letting old and sick people die. 4. The problem with big pharma is that they are not investing on medicines and vaccines which cost a lot but in sugar water labelled as 'natural remedies' (see Ben goldacre 'bad pharma' and 'bad sciebce'. Much more, bit that's a start."

Are the above criticisms valid?

 -2   REPLY



**Mashie Niblick**  7 days ago

Unconvinced.

 -4   REPLY

Tagged [Bill Gates](#), [Gates Foundation](#), [Pandemic](#), [Vandana Shiva](#), [WHO](#)

## Explore

- [Grouphink](#)
- [Capitalism](#)
- [Flyover country](#)
- [Faith & Meaning](#)
- [Confessions Podcast](#)

## Quick Links

- [About UnHerd](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Columnists & Writers](#)
- [Old Queen Street Cafe](#)
- [Terms & Conditions](#)
- [Privacy Policy](#)
- [Community Guidelines](#)
- [Vacancies](#)

## Contribute to UnHerd

We welcome applications to contribute to UnHerd – please fill out the form below including examples of your previously published work. Please [click here](#) to submit your pitch.

## Advertise with us

Please [click here](#) to view our media pack for more information on advertising and partnership opportunities with UnHerd.