

Why the WHO Pandemic Treaty Is a Horrible Deal



by Roger L. Simon

FBI Director Christopher Wray has finally acknowledged that COVID-19 may have “leaked” from the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

Wray has even gone so far as to conclude that there “may” have been some cover-up involved from the Chinese authorities and their Communist Party (CCP).

Of course, these things were reported at *The Epoch Times* and elsewhere what feels like decades ago, but a tad of honesty for once is always appreciated.

We didn’t get much of that when it came to lockdowns (useless and destructive), masks (completely discredited), and vaccines (largely discredited).

Given all this, it boggles the mind our administration is playing into the hands of the CCP by participating in a [deal currently being negotiated](#) to give the World Health Organization (WHO) some form of international hegemony over future pandemics—real or imagined.

But never fear, our “fact-checking” friends at [The Associated Press](#) have stepped forward to correct the record.

“CLAIM: A legally-binding World Health Organization ‘pandemic treaty’ will give the organization the authority to control U.S. policies during a pandemic, including those on vaccines, lockdowns, school closures and more.

“AP’S ASSESSMENT: 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.”

But why would lockdowns, closures, or citizen surveillance need to be mentioned specifically? Aren’t they the very things we have seen employed in the “pandemic prevention, preparedness and response,” to horrific results nationally and internationally that are the putative reasons for this deal?

As is often the case, a game of semantics is being played here.

I reached out to 2024 presidential candidate Vivek Ramaswamy for his response that, it turned out, explained the dangers of that game quite accurately.

“This is shameful,” Ramaswamy responded. “President [Joe] Biden again cedes American self-governance to a corrupt

globalist organization and bends the knee to the World Health Organization, which is in the pocket of communist China. If Biden prevails, the U.S. would be bound to hand over 20 percent of its medical supplies to WHO for global distribution. America would no longer be able to prioritize treatments for its own citizens—WHO will call the shots on which countries get what supplies. America is always last in the name of ‘equity.’”

The candidate hits the nail on the proverbial head here by pointing to “equity,” that mendacious “woke” term—he is the author of “Woke, Inc.”—used to invoke sympathy for the impoverished and correct supposed unfairness by equalizing outcomes.

This is a masquerade, a deliberate lie. Most often the reverse is true. When it comes to who would really profit from an agreement like the one on offer, it’s almost always the pharmaceutical companies along with the aforementioned CCP that has long had a great friend in WHO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus.

Third World countries would get the products of BigPharma shoved down their throats.

I had an eye-opening personal experience in that regard. In the midst of the pandemic, some friends—an American and Bolivian couple—came to visit us from their home in Cochabamba. They recounted the problems their poor country, unable to afford vaccines, had been having with many dying. Then the Bolivian government decided to distribute free ivermectin with an antibiotic and all was well. Or so I was told.

On March 31, 2021, the WHO advised that “[ivermectin only be used to treat COVID-19 within clinical trials](#).” After all, it’s virtually free.

Such restrictions on medical freedom advocated by the WHO and

our CDC have led to egregious totalitarian acts like that just reported by *The Epoch Times*' Roman Balmakov: "[Police Forcibly Remove Doctor From Hospital After He Endorsed Ivermectin.](#)"

The worst part of the WHO deal is that it is a rather obvious backdoor into global communism—and not an inconsequential one.

A few years ago, considerable internet discussion revolved around whether Vladimir Lenin actually said: "Socialized medicine is the keystone to the arch of a socialized state."

Apparently not—at least no one has found it so far—but that doesn't mean it's not true. It is. Indeed, Lenin, cognizant of this fact, instituted full free socialized medicine at the very outset of the Soviet Union under the "Right to Health." (Sound familiar?)

The result, however, was not great. [Dr. Yuri Maltsev](#), an adviser to the last Soviet government on healthcare and currently a college teacher in Wisconsin, writes:

"In contrast to the impression created by the liberal American media, health-care institutions in Russia were at least fifty years behind the average U.S. level. Moreover, the filth, odors, cats roaming the halls, and absence of soap and cleaning supplies added to an overall impression of hopelessness and frustration which paralyzed the system."

Still want to put your healthcare in the hands of the WHO?

First published in the [Epoch Times](#).