



Liberty Tree

Vol. 24, No. 5 — May 2022

The World Health Organization (WHO) was organized in 1948 to control many aspects of the world's population under the guise of public health. Officially, it was established to increase international cooperation towards improving "health." By "health," however, the WHO founders meant "a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity"¹ — in other words, whatever the powers who control the WHO decide is in the best interest of the men, women and children of Earth.

Or, as it now appears, the best interest of the global predators who fund the organization and staff it with technocrats.

One of the tools the WHO has at its disposal is the "International Health Regulations" (IHR), a so-called "legal framework that defines countries rights and obligations in handling public health events and emergencies that have the potential to cross borders."² The IHR was established in 1969 in response to "deadly epidemics that once overran Europe" — cholera, bubonic plague, yellow fever, smallpox, relapsing fever, and typhus — diseases that at the time posed no infectious threat!

The IHR were amended in 2005, purportedly in (belated) response to the so-called "AIDS" and

AFRAID OF
THE WHO?



"SARS" epidemics. The purpose of the IHR is allegedly to "prevent, protect against, control and provide a public health response to the international spread of disease."³ Countries who have agreed to the IHR are expected to assess health-related events within their

territories and report them to the WHO, and the WHO is authorized to verify, assess, and 'assist' with such reported event. If the WHO determines that there is a public health emergency of international concern (PHEIC), that is, a disease at risk of spreading via international movement of travellers, baggage, cargo, containers, postal parcels, etc., it is to disseminate the disease-related information it has gathered to State parties (bureaucrats),

and finally, to the public. There are no real enforcement mechanisms for this international agreement, other than the individual countries pointing fingers at each other. The last clear outcome of the WHO's spread of such 'information' led to world-wide lockdowns and the forbidding of international travel for all except those who took experimental clotshots or baseless PCR tests.

Manufactured crisis means more for the WHO

Propaganda surrounding the corona circus blamed China for the purported pandemic, and fingers were pointed at China's noncooperation with the WHO as reason the WHO supposedly declared a PHEIC too late. Alternatively, the WHO was accused of being biased towards China, and thus failing to alert the world fast enough.

On these grounds, President Trump sent a letter to the U.N. Secretary-General July 6, 2020, giving him one-year notice that the U.S. would withdraw from the WHO. But the very day the Imposter⁴ "took office" on January 20, 2021, his regime issued a letter retracting that withdrawal.⁵ Indeed,

(Continued on page 2)

1. WHO Constitution. See <https://apps.who.int/gb/bd/PDF/bd47/EN/constitution-en.pdf>
2. www.who.int/health-topics/international-health-regulations. These regulations were revised from the "International Sanitary Regulations" adopted by the WHO in 1951.
3. IHR 2005, Article 2, see <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/246107/9789241580496-eng.pdf>, at page 18.
4. Joseph R. Biden, who did not achieve enough votes to become President of the United States.
5. www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/01/20/letter-his-excellency-antonio-guterres/

the regime has recommended that the WHO have more flexibility to declare PHEICs. No longer should the WHO be obliged to wait on the cooperation of any country to declare an emergency: the IHR should allow the WHO to declare a PHEIC independently, with much less lead time. It could be speculated that the global predators seeking depopulation believe that the faster PHEICs can be declared, the faster lockdowns and travel restrictions can be implemented, catching freedom-loving peoples off guard. At any rate, some are raising the alarm that if the IHR amendments proposed by the U.S. are implemented, we face the loss of “the independence and authority of every nation” to the WHO.⁶

It is not immediately apparent that the amendments proposed to the IHR,⁷ which will be voted on this month, would significantly change the way in which the “public health” systems of each country would *respond* to a PHEIC, however. Indeed, the world-wide lockdowns and border closings have shown us that no additional WHO authority is necessary for the globalists to cause nearly every nation to do their bidding. The plan to control population based on “public health” have been set up over at least three decades; the Rockefeller Foundation “lockstep” scenario is well underway.⁸ The corona cabal is now signalling that lockdowns/masking are returning in the near future – surely just in time for America’s mid-term elections!

What is perhaps more concerning is the clamor of the usual suspects for a WHO “pandemic treaty” – a new multilateral agreement giving more power to the WHO “to protect the world from future health crises.”⁹ A group of technocrats is working on this “treaty” now. Dr. Tess Lawrie, who was on a call with WHO staff, CEPI, UNAIDS, etc. on April 13, 2020, said that there were calls for “human security centric” rather than “health security centric,” indicating the desire to control not just bodies, but every aspect of human life.¹⁰

With respect to the States united, what power could such multilateral treaty have to change the

6. See, e.g., <https://www.americaoutloud.com/what-you-should-do-now-about-the-who-takeover/>

7. See p. 4 at https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA75/A75_18-en.pdf

8. See https://issuu.com/dueprocesstv/docs/scenario-for_the-future-for-the-Rockefeller-Foundation-document.

9. <https://www.who.int/news/item/30-03-2021-global-leaders-unite-in-urgent-call-for-international-pandemic-treaty>

10. <https://drtesslawrie.substack.com/p/urgent-my-video-call-with-the-who>

11. All emphases added, unless otherwise noted.



**Listen to LWRN
anywhere and any time!**

**Download the APP
Smartphones or iPhones**

Visit **www.LWRN.net** and
Click on the links to the left on home page!!

powers of the Federal and State governments, or to abrogate We the People’s rights under our Constitutions? Without knowledge of the Constitutions, it is impossible to assess the actual threat the proposed pandemic treaty poses.

Authority to make treaties

The U.S. Constitution rests the power to make treaties in the President, but only with the consent of two-thirds of the Senate:

Article II, Sec. 2, Cl. 2

[The President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, *provided two thirds of the Senators present concur*;¹¹

Further, all treaties entered into must be made “under the authority of the United States”:

Article VI, Cl. 2

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, *under the authority of the United States*, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Since the authority of the federal government is circumscribed by the enumerated powers of the Constitution, as well as the rights reserved to the States and the People, treaties can only be the “supreme law of the land” when they are in accordance with the actual powers granted to the federal government.

As pointed out by the Supreme Court in *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, 197 U.S. 11, 25 (1905), the “police power” over public health concerns is “a power which the State[s] did not surrender when becoming [members] of the Union under the Constitution.” Since the federal government has no jurisdiction over the “public health” affairs of the States, the secessionists of this country have sought power instead through areas over which the federal

government does have authority, such as international trade or travel across U.S. borders.

With respect to the WHO and the IHR, however, no treaty appears to have been entered into at any time by the United States.

On June 14, 1948, the House and Senate approved a Joint Resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization, P.L. 80-643, 62 Stat. 441, authorizing the President to accept membership for the United States in the WHO.

Note that this Resolution does not represent the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate to approve a treaty. Furthermore, the Resolution states, at Sec. 4, that in adopting the resolution, “Congress does so with the understanding that, in the absence of any provision in the World Health Organization Constitution for withdrawal ... the United States reserves its right to withdraw from the Organization on a one-year notice [provided that the financial dues are paid in full for the current fiscal year].” (This is the provision which Trump relied on in 2020.) Congress could enact legislation at any time to abrogate this provision and withdraw immediately, of course — who could stop them?

In addition, Sec. 5 of the Resolution passed in 1948 says that “nothing in the Constitution of the World Health Organization in any manner commits the United States to enact any specific legislative program regarding any matters referred to in said Constitution.” This acknowledges that WHO edicts have no power over Congress.

The IHR are on even more shaky legal ground. No resolution, treaty or agreement has ever been passed by the Senate or Congress with respect to the IHR. Instead, it is entirely an *executive agreement* entered into



G. Brock Chisholm (1896-1971) (R), First WHO Director-General, formalizing the WHO as a specialized agency of the U.N. with U.N. Secretary-General Trygve Lie (L), circa 1948.

Search for G. Brock Chisholm on the Internet, and one of the first results to appear will be a *fake* quote attributed to him: “To achieve world government, it is necessary to remove from the minds of men, their individualism, loyalty to family traditions, national patriotism and religious dogmas.” Chisholm, co-founder and first Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO), never stated his ideas so succinctly, apparently. But in surveying what he *did* speak and write, one might conclude that this contrived quote represents a fair summary of his beliefs.

Chisholm began his career as a Canadian soldier in WWI, then became a psychiatrist, eventually attending Yale where he specialized in the mental health of children. In WWII, he rose to the top medical position, Director General Medical Services, of the Canadian Army — the first psychiatrist ever to do so. After the war, he moved to the newly created Canadian position of Deputy Minister of Health, and shortly thereafter, in 1946, became executive secretary of the Interim Commission of the World Health Organization, one of 16 “health experts” who drafted the U.N. agency’s first “constitution.” In that document, health is defined as “a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” The charter views health as a fundamental human right necessary to the attainment of world peace and security. In other words, it is for public health overlords to define what individual physical, mental, and social well-being is, and they will enforce their vision upon all others. (The Chinese lockdown of Shanghai these past few months should be sufficient to show this is no more than tyrannical rationalization to visit horrible mental, social and physical horror on individuals.)¹

As a psychiatrist, Chisholm believed that psychiatry and the scientific attitude would be the salvation of the world. He was opposed to traditions and religious dogma, which he believed were the cause of wars. “It is only through exercise of the scientific attitude that new knowledge can be gained. I believe that what hope there is lies in the realm of scientific attitude as I have defined it,” he wrote.² Freedom

(Continued on page 4)

force on July 18, 2007.

Reservations and understandings

Part from the fact that the U.S. Constitution does not grant the President power to enter any executive agreements with other countries or supranational organizations, the “agreement” to the 2005 IHR contains “one reservation and three understandings.” The reservation informs the WHO and its member countries that the executive branch has primary obligation to uphold the Constitution:

The ... United States of America reserves the right to assume obligations under these Regulations in a manner consistent with its fundamental principles of federalism. With respect to obligations

12. See page 68 at <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstreamhandle/10665/246107/9789241580496-eng.pdf>

concerning the development, strengthening, and maintenance of the core capacity requirements ... these Regulations shall be implemented by the Federal Government or the state governments, as appropriate and in accordance with our Constitution ... To the extent that such obligations come under the legal jurisdiction of the state governments, the Federal Government shall bring such obligations with a favorable recommendation to the notice of the appropriate state authorities.¹²

In short, the WHO has no power over We the People. Nevertheless, it is certain that it provides a convenient excuse for federal and State secessionists to enact unconstitutional “mandates” which ignorant people will follow. Remember:

“If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, ... it expects what never was and never will be.” – Thomas Jefferson, letter to Charles Yancey, January 6, 1816.



Godless science (Continued from page 3)

from the old “unthinking” ways frees people to think in “mature” ways, he stated.

“We must not think in terms that include the idea that the welfare of any one group is more important than that of any other group — which still remains the original premise of unthinking people in the world today. It is quite clear that major problems are going to be decided and settled only by the peoples of the world, whenever they grow up enough and are able to behave maturely enough to be able to cope with those problems.”³ Of course, the “peoples of the world” need to be guided by technocrats like himself, who are mature scientists. Indeed, Chisholm felt his ilk had far superior intellect to all who came before: “Let us be our own authority. We know far more than any of our ancestors. Scientists of this generation have no obligation to admit superiority of knowledge or of wisdom in any body of traditional belief or authority.”⁴

This is the rationale used to found and continue the WHO, now a tool for world domination, by the globalists, in the name of “health for all.”

In the beginning, injections ...

Injecting people with poison was always a foundation for “health” to the WHO. Chisholm’s god Science also inspired him to state:

It is not yet possible to lay a manslaughter charge against parents who allow their untoxoided or unvaccinated child to die quite unnecessarily of diphtheria or of smallpox. Children still die because their parents say, “I do not believe in

toxoid or vaccines,” or, “I believe it is sinful to introduce these things into the human body,” or even, “There is no longer any diphtheria or smallpox around our town, so why bother?” This problem is no longer the germ of diphtheria or of smallpox, but rather the attitudes of parents who are incapable of accepting and using proven knowledge for the protection of their children. Were enough people to adopt these attitudes, founded on their neurotic disabilities, the great epidemics which decimated Europe and other parts of the world in the past would soon reappear. It is apparent that in the field of prevention of other diseases, the behavior disorders and neuroses have important adverse effects; that if present knowledge could be applied in relation to many diseases, countless lives could be saved and much misery prevented. That which stands in the way is ignorance and moral certainty, superstition and vested interest. Against these handicaps headway is being made in at least some directions. Cults and reactions repeatedly arise which temporarily and locally block rational progress with new faiths or retranslations or disinterments or reaffirmations of old ones, but in spite of all these retreats to, and reanchorings in, our mistaken past, there seems to be perceptible movement toward intellectual honesty and truth.⁵

This is the belief and rationale of the useful idiots who founded the WHO, now a tool for globalist world domination in the name of ‘public health for all.’



2. Chisholm, Brock. *Prescription for Survival*, Number Ten, Bampton Lectures in America, Columbia University Press, NY, 1957, p. 23.

3. Id., p. 13.

4. Id., p. 19

5. Chisholm, G. B. “The Psychiatry of Enduring Peace and Social Progress,” *Psychiatry*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (February 1946), p. 15.