

# Fact sheet on the non-transparent adoption of the new IHR

## **1. THE WHO IS BREAKING INTERNATIONAL LAW!**

When the World Health Assembly voted on the International Health Regulations (IHR), it was demonstrably not done properly: Article 55.2 of the WHO legal framework stipulates that the text of any proposed IHR amendment shall be communicated to all States Parties at least four months before the vote. This is the only way to give states sufficient time to review the amendments for all legal, financial and other consequences. At the World Health Assembly from May 27 to June 1, 2024, the more than sixty-page, complex treaty with many amendments was only presented to the delegates shortly before the scheduled vote. A clear breach of international law!

Furthermore, the vote was not taken by a show of hands or by roll-call. Instead, the chair simply asked the delegates whether there were any objections. As a result, citizens still do not know who actually voted for and who may have voted against the IHR amendments. Above all, it remains unclear whether the required simple majority was achieved at all. However, transparency would have been the order of the day, especially with such far-reaching changes to the IHR, possibly with consequences for the lives of every single citizen!

In addition, there are reports that various state representatives were put under massive pressure to vote in favor of the IHR amendments. If this turns out to be true, it would mean another scandal.

## **2. THE WHO JEOPARDIZES MINIMUM RULE OF LAW STANDARDS!**

### **2.1 The IHR do not provide for any independent supervisory bodies**

The powers of Director-General Tedros have been considerably extended by the questionable amendments to the IHR. In addition to a “public health emergency of international concern” (PHEIC), he can now even declare an escalated form, a “pandemic emergency” (Art. 12). Like the PHEIC, the pandemic emergency is also very vaguely defined and therefore particularly susceptible to arbitrariness: once an emergency has been “determined”, the Director-General can use so-called “recommendations” (Art. 15, 18) to urge the 196 States Parties, and thus almost all states in the world, to impose massive restrictions on civil liberties, including in particular compulsory vaccinations.

It is true that the IHR provide the Director-General with certain objective criteria on which he must base his declaration of emergencies (Art. 12.4, Annex 2) and the issuing of recommendations (Art. 17). However, there is no independent supervisory authority to review such far-reaching decisions! This means that the Director-General can declare (pandemic) “emergencies” and make “recommendations” arbitrarily and furthermore without disclosing his decision-making criteria, i.e. on a completely non-transparent basis! He does not even have to take the advice of his Emergency Committee, whose members he can appoint himself and remove at any time. It is completely unacceptable that the WHO does not adhere to control standards that are a matter of course for liberal states governed by the rule of law. For this reason alone, the WHO exerts permanent pressure on states to violate the human rights standards that are mandatory for them! In addition, a transparent procedure, e.g. along the lines of the German Freedom of Information Act, would be absolutely essential, i.e. all data relevant to the decision would have to be disclosed!

### **2.2 The IHR do not put a stop to corruption!**

The WHO is over 80% financed by donations, mostly earmarked, a considerable proportion of which comes from the vaccination and pharmaceutical industries. It is fitting that “relevant health products” are at the heart of the new IHR (Art. 1, 13.8, 13.9, 44, 44bis). It is also fitting that declarations by WHO experts about personal conflicts of interest, as well as any safety concerns, e.g. about certain “vaccines”, may be kept under lock and key. What is particularly fatal in this context is that the WHO

is not independently controlled, resulting in tangible conflicts of interest. It can therefore be assumed that the WHO has long been (externally) controlled primarily by lobby groups. In other words, private, non-governmental sponsors can exert massive influence on the WHO and in particular on its Director-General Tedros, so that he acts primarily in their interests, but not in the interests of the health of the world's population!

### **2.3 The IHR undermine the freedom of information!**

The new IHR place great emphasis on combating so-called “misinformation and disinformation” (Annex 1A.2c and 3.i). However, what is meant by this is not defined in more detail. This undermines free discourse, which is particularly important in scientific matters, as well as freedom of opinion and information. The WHO thus tries to secure a “monopoly on truth” in health matters that is contrary to fundamental rights – and also a “right” to suppress undesirable opinions and even expert opinions on social platforms.

### **3. SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS AGAINST DIRECTOR GENERAL TEDROS**

If you take a closer look at Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus and his shady past as Ethiopian minister, you come across shocking headlines:

05.06.2017: Deutsche Ärztezeitung: Human Rights Watch accuses Tedros of being responsible for the displacement of thousands of people and the murder of hundreds of opposition members as a member of the government.

20.04.2020: Deutsche Welle: “Dr. Tedros” – The controversial WHO chief

20.04.2020: Focus online: “In dealing with epidemics, of all things, the former health minister is still being severely reproached today.”

21.11.2020: Die Presse: Serious allegations against WHO chief Tedros: He also sought to supply weapons to the TPLF

18.01.2021: Focus, The Times: Serious allegations: WHO chief allegedly involved in genocide in Ethiopia

29.09.2021: www.welt.de: Black day for WHO: Serious allegations of sexual exploitation

The additional expansion of the Director-General’s authoritarian powers granted to him by the new IHR seems particularly explosive and irresponsible against this background.

### **4. THE WHO-COUP CAN HAVE DRAMATIC CONSEQUENCES FOR THE WHOLE OF HUMANITY!**

In the new IHR articles 13.8e and 13.9c, the WHO places particular emphasis on research and development in relation to “relevant health products”. This also and above all concerns highly dangerous modRNA substances as the basis for various other “vaccines”. In this type of “vaccine” research, viruses are artificially mutated in the laboratory, i.e. made more dangerous, so that modRNA “vaccines” can be developed against them as a precautionary measure.

However, this so-called gain-of-function research is always associated with the risk that the artificially modified viruses will leave the laboratory and thus also cause (real) emergencies.

It was not without reason that US President Obama imposed a moratorium on gain-of-function research in 2013. But: The US State Department, which funded the Wuhan-GoF research, granted exemptions and thus made the outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 possible!

The amendments to the IHR can thus result in Corona 2.0! In concrete terms, this would mean: far-reaching restrictions on freedom for billions of people, e.g. lockdowns, prescribed medical treatments and, last but not least, possibly also compulsory vaccinations with highly dangerous substances that have a proven high and completely unacceptable side effect profile and have already caused immeasurable damage to life and limb worldwide.