

# WHO preps one-world government

 [cnav.news/2023/04/24/editorial/talk/who-preps-one-world-government/](https://cnav.news/2023/04/24/editorial/talk/who-preps-one-world-government/)

By Terry A. Hurlbut

April 24, 2023



The World Health Organization (WHO) will, on or about May 31, deliver a new treaty arrogating total sovereignty to itself. Its proponents moan that the new Pandemic Treaty “lacks teeth” and will be unenforceable. But power is as power acts, so because the Biden Administration will *act* as if they are under *force majeure*, they will use this WHO Treaty as cover for their agenda. More likely, however, what WHO says, will go. So we need to ask ourselves now: “WHO” TF do they think they are?

## What does WHO have to say for itself?

On 24 February, WHO published this [FAQ](#) on the Pandemic Treaty, or actually a “convention, agreement or other international instrument.” That’s what they call their instrument for “pandemic prevention, preparedness and response control.” That very word *control* should give pause to anyone who values his liberty. The so-called “COVID Pandemic” was not nearly as serious as WHO claimed.

If you doubt that, try this thought experiment. Do you remember, at any time during the height of various “national emergencies,” seeing diener squads pushing “meat wagons” down the streets of any cities, towns, or villages, while ringing bells and shouting “Bring out your dead!” or “;Traigan a sus muertos!” or “Sortez vos morts!” or “Fate uscire I vostri morti!” or “Holt eure Toten raus!” or “Haal je doden tevoorschijn!” or “Vytaskivaytye svoikh mertvyetsov!” No? You don’t remember anything like that? Hm-m-m-m. I thought not, but I had to ask, just to be sure.

But WHO would have you believe these diener squads did make such rounds. And they must have learned much from Sol Asch of Swarthmore. He [showed](#) how easy it is to enforce conformity even to overriding perception of reality. (And I, who graduated from Yale College,

thought Stanley Milgram had done a Bad Thing! My apologies, Dr. Milgram; you have *nothing* on Dr. Asch.)

## What WHO proposes

---

Here is their ostensible goal:

The new accord could represent a global commitment to work together, as an international community, to help prevent disease outbreaks from impacting individuals, communities, countries and the world in the same way as the COVID-19 pandemic did.

Lay aside here that the COVID-19 pandemic didn't "impact" individuals, communities, countries or the world. WHO did it – they and their fellow travelers in most (but, happily, *not* all) countries. But now see what that organization takes upon itself – and unto itself.

Importantly, any new accord would be expected to establish principles, priorities and targets for pandemic preparedness and response, with the aim to:

build resilience to pandemics;

support prevention, detection, and responses to outbreaks with pandemic potential;

ensure equitable access to pandemic countermeasures; and

support global coordination through a stronger and more accountable WHO.

Accountable to whom? If to itself, then it is accountable to no one. Elsewhere they speak of "global preparedness and response arrangements, including at the human-animal interface." What can that mean? Seizing and "putting down" your dog or cat, using as their excuse the old "bat soup theory" of SARS-CoV-2? A theory no one with any common sense believes anymore?

## What others are saying

---

Also two months ago, the Associated Press heard some definite Uh-Oh signs – of building popular resistance. For instance, they heard this from an Instagram poster whom they preferred not to name:

Biden is about to give the China-controlled WHO power to control the United States. This will cover lockdowns, supply chains, surveillance, and "false news."

*The Epoch Times*, fortunately, gave some necessary detail:

The Biden administration is in the process of finalizing a deal that would give the World Health Organization (WHO) near-total authority to dictate America's policies during a pandemic.

Once this “legally binding” deal goes into effect, it will give the World Health Organization—the United Nations’s health agency based in Geneva—the authority to control what U.S. policies are during a pandemic.

And so, while the WHO has been up until now an advisory body in Europe that U.S. officials in the CDC and the FDA can turn to for advice, it would instead become the ones to actually determine which policies the United States implements, like vaccine policies, lockdown policies, school closure policies, the contact tracing of U.S. citizens, and even the monitoring of online speech if that speech goes against the official narrative.



Watch Video At: [https://youtu.be/Y\\_Pj1GN2HJI](https://youtu.be/Y_Pj1GN2HJI)

## A cringeworthy response

---

So the AP, not to let Sol Asch outdo it, published this screed that ought to have made Charles Boyer blush.

False. The voluntary treaty, which is in draft form and is still far away from ratification, does not overrule any nation’s ability to pass individual pandemic-related policies, multiple experts, including one involved in the draft process, told The Associated Press. The treaty lays out broad recommendations related to international cooperation on pandemic prevention, preparedness and response. Nowhere in the 30-page document are lockdowns, closures or specific citizen surveillance systems mentioned.

Oh, yeah? Let’s see.

This treaty is in fact chock full of “woke” catch phrases:

- “International cooperation and obligations for States to act in accordance with international law, including to respect, protect and promote human rights.” *No sovereign State lies under any obligation to cooperate with anyone.* Furthermore, CNAV saw not an ounce of respect for human rights during those lockdowns. And “human rights” sounds like a reference to the “Human Rights Campaign,” the world’s LGBTQIA+ advocacy group.
- “All lives have equal value, and that therefore equity should be a principle.” Frankly, if an *equitable* distribution of “the vaccine” means less of it for the United States, that would be *good*. But more likely, “equity” sounds like something one associates today with the concepts *diversity* and *inclusion*.
- “Central role of WHO, as the directing and coordinating authority on international health work.” *What!?* Says who? Says WHO. Of all the arrogant, pompous statements in that treaty, that is the worst.

## More cringe

---

“A pandemic situation is extraordinary in nature, requiring States Parties to prioritize effective and enhanced cooperation with development partners and other relevant stakeholders to address extraordinary challenges.” *Stakeholders?* What does that mean?

We now turn to some of its points. Point Two speaks of a “right to health.” Health is something each individual has the responsibility to maintain for himself. This cannot be a right, but an allowance – for which WHO proposes to dun the already healthy.

Points Four, Five, and Nine mentioned “equity,” “solidarity,” and “inclusiveness.” More “woke” buzzwords. Point Eleven, “Gender equality,” clearly does not mean taking care of women as well as of men. It even talks about a “gender responsive/transformational” approach. This has nothing to do with management of communicable disease – and everything to do with sexual reassignment.

Point Fifteen says it all: “universal health care.” It plumps for international socialized medicine. Nikita S. Khrushchev must be crying out, “PLAGIAT!” Which is how you say *plagiarism* in Russian.

Point Sixteen: “Science and evidence-informed decisions.” We heard enough orders to “follow the science” from Anthony S. Fauci, M.D.

And *what* is this Pathogen Access and Benefit Sharing system? Why dare transport pathogens? You don’t want to transport pathogens; *you want to destroy them!* That is, unless you’re doing gain-of-function research on them. That doesn’t exist yet. Under this treaty, it will.

## Lockdowns bear no mention – but that’s irrelevant

---

And while the treaty does not reproduce the word L-O-C-K-D-O-W-N, neither does it forbid it. It says only that one may not discriminate against any particular group in applying – whatever measure. That’s an even worse hazard of that “human rights” phrase. *Nowhere does the document define them.*

In fact, this instrument offers *no* limit on the scope or power of this new pandemic governing body. It doesn’t even say how one defines a pandemic. So: WHO declares a pandemic whenever it sees fit. And “fitness” has everything to do with gaining and keeping power. If you’re a hammer, all the world is a nail. And to WHO, all the world is deathly sick with something worse than *Yersinia pestis*, and diener squads really *are* pushing meat wagons down the street, ringing handbells, and shouting “Bring out your dead!” in the local language. And they’re doing it because WHO says so.

Smriti Malapaty, writing in *Nature*, seems to be doing his (her?) part to play the modern Sol Asch. This person writes:

A draft of the agreement highlights vaccine and drug equity but lacks teeth to enforce it.

Oh, really? Michelle Bachmann, Dean of the Pat Robertson School of Government at Regent University, would beg to differ.

The image is a promotional graphic for Olive Tree Ministries. It features a blue background with a white dove in flight on the left. The text includes the organization's name and website, the title of a radio program, the date of the broadcast, and the name of the guest. Two small portraits are included: one of Jan Markell and one of Michele Bachmann. A note at the bottom indicates where to watch the video.

Olive Tree Ministries  
www.olivetreeviews.org

Understanding The Times Radio  
with Jan Markell

This Present Darkness  
(April 21, 2023)

Today's Guest is  
Michele Bachmann

You can watch this video by clicking on the links in the description below.

Watch Video At: <https://youtu.be/3NWnUI9CMxE>

## When WHO acts, how shall we?

---

So what happens when the WHO Pandemic “Convention, agreement, or other international instrument” gets its final vote?

*First*, and this need not wait but can happen now: call your Senators and Representative. Let their staff know you vote NO to any such instrument, however WHO wishes to call it. Let your Senators especially know that this is a treaty and you expect the Senate to pass judgment on it. And of course that you expect your Senators to vote “Nay.” Tell your Representative, too, that the House needs to pass a resolution demanding Senate action.

*Second*, the *minute* this administration takes or threatens *any* action in obedience to, or compliance with, WHO or its designated agency, call your lawyer. *CNAV* recommends Alliance Defending Freedom. They are the JAG Corps of the American Patriotic Militia, or at least one element of it. The other two are the American Center for Law and Justice and Judicial Watch. These organizations need two things:

- Financial assistance – as much as you can provide, and
- Full particulars of any harms you have suffered or are about to suffer at the hand of this administration in ostensible obedience to this treaty.

This will call for that peculiar form of warfare called *lawfare*. The law gives us the tools to fight this “instrument,” as they call it. We must use them.

And third – but the need for that will depend on the success or failure of the first two.