

NEWSBYTES

January 17, 2024

No. 1139

Since 2001

A ministry of Calvary Chapel of Appleton

“Let us be alert to the season in which we are living. It is the season of the Blessed Hope, calling for us to cut our ties with the world and build ourselves on this One who will soon appear. He is our hope—a Blessed Hope enabling us to rise above our times and fix our gaze upon Him.” Tozer

Dangerous Accord: U.S. Autonomy At Risk With WHO Pandemic Agreement



BY BEN JOHNSON/THE WASHINGTON

STAND | JANUARY 12, 2023

PROPHECY NEWS WATCH

Note - This is a lengthy report but every American needs to know what they are about to be put under. Read and then reread what is about to happen as our government prepares to sign this agreement June 1st.

Americans have just days left to weigh in on the Biden administration's plan to adopt a dangerous international accord that gives the World Health Organization (WHO) greater control over the way the U.S. responds to global health pandemics like COVID-19.

As this article will demonstrate, the WHO Pandemic Agreement:

- Threatens national sovereignty
- Equates the health of humans with animals and plants
- Calls on nations to "combat" any "misinformation" that reduces "trust" in the government or its measures, such as social distancing
- Would empower private-sector forces such as social media companies to ramp up censorship of disfavored viewpoints
- Worries citizens will have "too much information" about pandemics
- Supports quotas and "gender diversity"
- Aims to create equity-driven national health care systems around the globe

To make matters worse, the Biden administration lobbied WHO to rename the Pandemic Treaty, so it can adopt the measure without the Senate's ratification (which a treaty requires).

Background

The United States joined the World Health Organization in 1948. In March 2021, WHO members called for a new international pandemic "treaty" and began writing the first draft of the "legally binding treaty" on December 7, 2022. When the Biden administration signaled that it could not win Senate ratification as required by the Constitution, WHO transformed the "treaty" into the "WHO Pandemic Agreement" and released the negotiating text of the document last October. All 194 WHO member nations will vote on the agreement at the 77th World Health Assembly from May 27-June 1.

Eroding National Sovereignty

In its own words, the World Health Organization exists "to dispel the temptations of isolationism and nationalism." The Pandemic Agreement naturally follows from its globalist mindset.

Under the WHO Pandemic Agreement, nations would retain their sovereignty only "in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the general principles of international law" (Article 3:2). The current "negotiating text" of the agreement is an improvement over the February 2023 "zero text," which stated that nations have "the sovereign right to determine and manage their approach to public health ... provided that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to their peoples and other countries."

That would allow WHO to take action against any national policy which it unilaterally determined was not in the best interests of its people, even if its citizens overwhelmingly supported the policy. (Ironically, an Associated Press fact check quoted this sentence as proof the agreement posed no threat to national sovereignty.)

The WHO Pandemic Agreement places a number of restrictions and demands on U.S. sovereignty:

WHO takes a double tithing of U.S. vaccines, medicines, and equipment. "In the event of a pandemic," the United States must give WHO "a minimum of 20%" of all "pandemic-related products," such as vaccines or personal protective equipment, for global redistribution: "10% as a donation and 10% at affordable prices" (Article 12:4b(ii)(a)).

Real decisions are made by nameless, unaccountable bureaucrats from around the globe. The agreement creates a "Conference of the Parties," headed by a secretary, within one year of the treaty's ratification. It will meet annually, or at any member's request. "Only delegates representing Parties will participate in any of the decision-making of the Conference of the Parties" (Articles 21 and 24).

The agreement will create a global medical force at WHO's disposal. Member nations must create and fund "a skilled and trained multidisciplinary global public health emergency workforce that is deployable" to nations at their request to "prevent the escalation of a small-scale spread to global proportions" (Article 7:3).

It gives The Hague jurisdiction over members' disputes. If WHO is not able to solve disagreements between members, nations may agree to the "submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice." They may also settle things through arbitration by the Conference of the Parties (Article 34:2).

WHO: Abortion Is 'Essential' during Pandemics

Although it is not mentioned in the pandemic agreement, it is vital to understand that WHO considers abortion an essential service. In March 2022, WHO released a new "Abortion care guideline" stating that both chemical and surgical abortion should continue even during global health crises. "In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic ... WHO has included comprehensive abortion care in the list of essential health services," said the document.

It comes as little surprise WHO downgrades human life, considering its "One Health" proposal.

'One Health' Lowers Human Health to the Level of Animal and Plant Life

The most concerning aspect of the WHO Pandemic Agreement from a Christian perspective is its "One Health approach," which lowers the infinite dignity of human life to that of animals and plants. According to the agreement, One Health "aims to sustainably balance ... the health of people, animals and ecosystems," which includes "taking action on climate change." Treatments that preserve human life and policies that lead to human flourishing, but which WHO decrees violate the ever-changing theories of climate change, have no place under the pandemic agreement's One Health ideology. The agreement states One Health decisions can be based on "social and behavioural sciences" and will include "community engagement" (Article 5:4c).

While One Health is a new concept to most Americans, it has won support from one of the world's most prestigious medical journals. "Modern attitudes to human health take a purely anthropocentric view -- that the human being is the centre of medical attention and concern. One Health ... thinking entail[s] a subtle but quite revolutionary shift of perspective: all life is equal, and of equal concern," said a January 2023 editorial in *The Lancet*.

"One Health will be delivered in countries, not by concordats between multilateral organisations, but by taking a fundamentally different approach to the natural world, one in which we are as concerned about the welfare of non-human animals and the environment as we are about humans. In its truest sense, One Health is a call for ecological, not merely health, equity." (Its concern for "equity" and "decolonisation" led it to scold those "demanding that wet markets be closed to halt an emerging zoonosis." One Health, WHO's solution to global pandemics, would not halt evident pandemics.)

One Health's concepts have been embraced by none other than Dr. Anthony Fauci. "Living in greater harmony with nature will require changes in human behavior as well as other radical changes that may take decades to achieve: rebuilding the infrastructures of human existence, from cities to homes to workplaces, to water and sewer systems, to recreational and gatherings venues.

In such a transformation we will need to prioritize changes in those human behaviors that constitute risks," Fauci wrote in September 2020 article for *Cell*. He highlighted "the extraordinary importance of human population growth and movement," stating, "the more populous and crowded we as a species become, and the more we travel, the more we provide opportunities for emerging diseases." Yet Fauci's vision includes "minimizing environmental perturbations," such as "intensive animal farming," as well as "ending global poverty."

While preserving the environment will likely require a radically lower standard of living for human beings, "probably very many, of the living improvements achieved over recent centuries come at a high cost." He concludes that he would like "to bend modernity in a safer direction."

Theorists at the global level have already formulated the next revolution after One Health: granting human rights to animals. "Not long ago, the very notion of human rights for nonhuman animals was easily dismissed as nonsensical," but "each extension of rights to some new group has been 'a bit unthinkable,'" wrote Saskia Stucki of the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law in Germany. "The novel term 'One Rights' is proposed here as a normative companion to the scientific One Health approach.

One Rights encapsulates the union of (old) human rights and (new) animal rights ... The One Rights approach asserts that in a conceptual sense, human rights are animal rights and animal rights are human rights." In that conceptual framework, "the treatment of animals in factory farms may be comparable to concentration camps." Of course, "Some old human rights would be incompatible with fundamental animal rights and would need to be retired, such as the right to injure and kill animals for culinary pleasure," which she compared to "slave-owners' rights."

While the Bible forbids all unnatural cruelty, the Scriptures teach that God created only human beings in His image and likeness (Genesis 1:27) and that Jesus declared that humans are "much

better than" the animals (Matthew 6:26). The WHO Pandemic Agreement's "One Health" doctrine obliterates that two-millennia-old understanding.

Combatting 'Misinformation' and 'Infodemics'

WHO's controversial leader announced his desire to curtail dissent at the height of the pandemic. In February 2020, Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus declared, "We're not just fighting an epidemic; we're fighting an infodemic. Fake news spreads faster and more easily than this virus and is just as dangerous."

Yet WHO defines an "'infodemic' as too much information," as well as "false or misleading information" which "leads to mistrust in health authorities and undermines public health and social measures." (Article 1c. Emphasis added.) To assure citizens do not receive too much information, nations "shall" engage in "infodemic management" (Article 9:2d). Article 18 states this shall consist of "effective international collaboration" to "combat false, misleading, misinformation or disinformation." They must study messages that "hinder adherence to public health and social measures in a pandemic and trust in science and public health institutions."

The primary cause of public "mistrust" in public health institutions is those institutions' self-contradictory spread of misinformation and disinformation about such "social measures" as masking, social distancing, quarantines, and the COVID-19 shot. WHO officials are not inoculated against this malady. WHO chief Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, who gained his position with China's patronage, began the pandemic by opposing President Donald Trump's flight restrictions from Wuhan and claiming the Chinese Communist Party's handling of the coronavirus set "a new standard for outbreak control."

Elections will soon be a quaint relic of the past, says globalist Klaus Schwab, who points to AI as the coming King of Democracy

World Economic Forum founder and chairman Klaus Schwab showed his true Nazi colors today at Davos, saying that nations will soon no longer need to bother holding "elections" because voters could easily be replaced by artificial intelligence.

AI is more than capable, he said.

Schwab made the bone-chilling comments during a WEF interview with Google co-founder Sergey Brin, which was **posted to X** by Ezra Levant of *Rebel News*. Watch this astonishing exchange below:

One thing about technocratic globalists: They aren't bashful. They speak boastfully as if everyone shares their excitement about all of the death and dehumanization of the world they envision.

During the discussion Schwab and Brin were discussing "digital technologies," such as AI, and how they could be used to advance the WEF's globalist agenda.

"So technology now, and digital technology, mainly have an analytical power," Schwab said as Brin shook his head in the affirmative.

"Now, we go into predictive power and we have seen the first examples. Your company is very much involved in it," Schwab said, as if to give the little boy wonder from Google a fatherly pat on the back.

Schwab then came with the globalist goods, making a stunning comment that will no doubt be buried by the mainstream media and Google search engines. Schwab said "the next step" for digital technology would be to replace voters with A.I.

"But then the next step could be to go into prescriptive mode, which means you do not even have to have elections anymore because you can already predict," he said. "And afterward, you can say, **why do we need elections?** Because we know what the result will be."

Remember when Yuval Harari, who is Schwab's top adviser, said a few years ago that in an age of AI humans no longer have free will? That may be what Schwab is referring to here. If AI knows what everyone is thinking and is able to influence people's choices, at some point literally making all choices for them, then why would we need to even bother with "elections?" The world would, at that point, no longer be populated by humans but by remote-controlled transhumans. That's the ultimate goal of technocrats like Schwab — depopulate the humans and replace them with AI-augmented transhumans.

Western politicians who routinely boast about "defending our democracy" and "human dignity" are over there fawning in front of this anti-human Nazi Klaus Schwab. They could care less about democracy or freedom. Just follow the money! That's what Governor Brian Kemp of Georgia and the rest of the American dirtbag politicians are over there doing.