

## Important Update On The WHO with James Roguski Noor Bin Ladin Calls... S02E04.

Source: <https://rumble.com/v4bk5vi-important-update-on-the-who-with-james-roguski-noor-bin-ladin-calls...-s02e.html>

### Transcript

**NBL:** Hey James, how are you?

**JR:** I'm doing great. Thanks for having me back and I'm looking forward to a chance to talk to you and all the people who watch this video.

**NBL:** Me too, James. This is the second time we're doing the podcast, and I'm so happy to have you on. It's always a pleasure. I follow your work very closely because I try to cover different subjects, and so you're my trusted go-to when it comes to a very thorough follow-up with the WHO (World Health Organization), and what they're up to in my hometown of Geneva.

I thought it would be a great time to do a kind of update podcast episode. I just came back a couple of weeks ago from Davos where I was covering the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting. The usual suspects were there, including Director General Tedros Ghebreyesus of the WHO on a viral panel entitled "Preparing for Disease X", where they were sprinkling their fear mongering as usual and pushing the "pandemic accord". And so let's just get into all the different advancements or progress that they've made with the pandemic accord, but also the International Health Regulations amendments, and what's happening also on a local level and the different member states are driving this essentially.

**JR:** I will dive in, but give me some direction because there's just so much to talk about. What's at the top of your mind, what's the first question that comes to mind about all of this?

**NBL:** Well, the first question that comes to mind, and I agree, there's a lot we're going to cover in this episode. The first one is bouncing off of that panel with Tedros who pushed the pandemic accord and talked about the progress, and considering we have the World Health Assembly coming up in May of this year, the 77th WHA. where this accord is to be signed according to the timeline, can you update us on the progress of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body? The INB. We know that they've had several sessions since we last spoke. So what's the status of that accord?

**JR:** Well to discuss the current status, let me try to start at the beginning of why that's even a thing. Okay. If you go back to December 1st of 2021, a little more than two years ago, the WHA, the World Health Assembly — which is the 194 nations that are supposed to be the governing body of the World Health Organization — so it's supposed to tell the WHO what to do. They're supposed to set policy. The WHO is supposed to follow whatever policy is set at these yearly meetings.

They told the WHO that: “we want the Secretariat and the bureaucracy to oversee negotiations”. Because what was going on at the time was essentially a trade dispute. Now, what they should have said is, “hey, let's talk to the World Trade Organization because we're not happy with how pandemic related products are being distributed around the world”. Now, your audience, I'm certain, is going to have to erase the things that they are aware of in regards to whether or not things like ventilators and Midazolam and Paxlovid and Molnupiravir and Remdesivir and all of the many jabs, are products that should even be allowed in international commerce. Okay? You gotta erase that part from your mind. They're arguing that they didn't get enough of all that wonderful stuff. And I'm obviously being facetious. And so wonderful life saving, technologically advanced, you know, wonder drugs. If you erase what you know, and you allow yourself to put yourself in the position of relatively small nations in 2021, looking at the year's worth of distribution of all of this wonderful stuff, well, you know, Canada ordered 400 million jabs for 40 million people, 10 per person, right? The European Union, Sweden just threw away however many million jabs. The European Union did that a little while ago. They bought up all of this stuff because they had the capability of either printing money or digitally transferring money and just throwing it at the pharmaceutical companies. So they got delivery of all this wonderful stuff and the relatively poor nations are looking at that going, “wait a minute, that's not fair”. Then on top of that, if you remember this thing called Omicron, whatever the heck that was, when South Africa and Botswana identified some genomic sequence and announced that to the world as they felt they were obligated to do to be a good member of the international community, “hey, we found something here, it could be an international problem”. They were not greeted with praise and thankfulness. They didn't get a ticker-tape parade. They got travel restrictions that hurt their economy and that information turned into more billions of dollars for Pfizer and Moderna because they turned that into the boosters. And they're looking at this going, “we're getting screwed here”. How is this really any different than old school colonialism where wealthy nations come in, they take the forest, take all the lumber, dig up the ground for iron ore or you know, diamonds or gold or silver or whatever raw material, now it's lithium and cobalt or whatever, take it back to their nation, turn it into a value added product, and then it's so expensive, the people where the raw materials came from can't afford to buy the product. You know, most people working in a cobalt mine can't buy a Tesla. Well, if you exchange the raw materials of gold and forestry products and mining and all these sort of things, with genomic sequences and pathogens... one of the things that they're arguing about is tied to a 1992 conference for biological diversity. Which sets up a path. Well, that one didn't set up for pathogens, but essentially access to natural wisdom, indigenous people who learned about a certain plant. And then the pharmaceutical companies come in and they get the knowledge, they isolate a chemical, they tweak it a little bit so they can patent it, and then they go and make billions. The Convention for Biological Diversity says, “No, no, no, no, no, you've got to share the benefits”. So that is now being applied, that idea is being applied to pathogens. What they're negotiating in this accord, and it's got so many darn names, I'm not going to call it anything other than what it currently is, which is a “framework convention”. They want to set up a pathogen access and benefit sharing system, where they feel that they're obligated and they're being forced to go seeking out pathogens all around the world and have to hand over any genomic information or the pathogen that they find. They want to set up a central WHO hub. You know, do we really need more Wuhan Institutes of Virology? That's, really big. That's really big.

**NBL:** When I was studying all the documentation on the WHO website for last year's World Health Assembly in May, genomic surveillance was just all over their documentation and they are constantly launching new initiatives as part of this surveillance hub.

**JR:** When you look at it from a different couple of different perspectives, the pharmaceutical companies have very clearly said, "intellectual property is ours and we don't have to share it". They've got some know-how, know how to make lipid nanoparticles and fill them with all kinds of garbage. They've got the manufacturing capacity, to actually do this and the cold storage and yada, yada, yada. Well, that's their bread and butter. That's how they've made billions by getting nations to find pathogens with pandemic potential, bring them into a lab, concoct, you know, in the computer their genomic sequence, turn that into an mRNA that they've convinced the regulatory agencies to just not have to test it, it must be safe and effective simply because they say so, even though obviously it's not. What we're dealing with here is a trade dispute, because the poor nations want in on the game. They're not questioning whether any of those drugs or jabs are of any benefit, the game is "let's go find something that has the potential to harm people, bring it into a whole new laboratory network that the WHO is in complete control of, it's got to be in a WHO certified laboratory". If you sign a document handing over that genetic information, then you're in line to get some of the benefits. And currently the benefits are 20 percent of whatever might be produced. Based on that research that you did to find something that in the future will be used to scare and harm people.

Now, this is such a good business model because in that dynamic, they've been able to convince governments to just... well, printing money is antiquated. Digitally, you just make money out of thin air, go into debt. Become beholden to the IMF or the Federal Reserve or the Bank of International Settlements or, you know, wherever money is created and throw it at the pharmaceutical industry. That's their game. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is a puny little player when you compare that to, "hey, we can just have money rain down from the sky when people are afraid". And so if you look at it from the pharmaceutical industry's perspective, they enjoyed just the best business plan imaginable. Let's scare the crap out of people. Let's get the government to help us develop these projects. We'll work with the Defense Department. They'll use all of their capacity to manufacture it. We don't have any liability. They're throwing money at us. And all we gotta do is stick a bunch of junk in a vial and tell people it's safe and effective. And they're taking the money to the bank. Well, the poor nations looked at that and said, "can we have some of that? You know, you guys are making all the profits. We've got all the pathogens, and you're making all the profits. We want a pathogen access benefit sharing system". Who is this good for? Is this good for you? Is this good for me? Okay, this is good for the people who were in the room at the B20 in November of 2022. This is when the whole thing crystallized for me a year and a half ago. The Indonesian health minister was talking to the B20, not the G20, the B20. And he said to them, because he knew that the United States primarily had been working with a handful of other nations and the World Bank, and that they had announced the World Bank Pandemic Fund. They knew that it was going to be put forth in legislation in the United States in December and it was ultimately, but this meeting was in November. So he was talking about something that he knew was coming. And what was coming was they adopted in the National Defense Authorization Act, a billion dollar a year pledge by the United States to be matched by many other nations up to 10 or 11 billion to promote what they call the global health security agenda, the National Defense Authorization Act. We're talking Defense Department, in my colloquial language, doing biological research in warfare and development. And so he said to this

group of business people in Bali, they've got this multi billion dollar fund — this is a great investment, a great business opportunity. Go invest. And I'm like, “duh, okay. That's what this is all about”. This is about building out what I call the Pharmaceutical Hospital Emergency Industrial Complex. They go find a pathogen that has potential to harm people, but to be turned into products. If you're afraid of the story, disease X is coming, okay? They'll find something to put in its position. You know, disease X is not a thing. It's a term. It's a word of art for propaganda purposes. Plug anything in to scare the bejeebers out of you. And if they can convince government authorities who are so conflicted, their interests are so in conflict, to go, “oh yeah, we'll just create money and give it to the pharmaceutical companies”. That's a good business model. That's going to be written up at some business school somewhere in the future, going, “look at what they did”. That is fascism. That is the collusion of government and business to harm the people. Benito Mussolini would be proud of you all. That's what we're dealing with here. With an interesting mix of communism. So let me explain that. What I've been talking about, because you asked - I'll come back to the communism in a minute, because your question was, what's up with the “accord”? Well that all started December 1st, 2021, they said to the WHO...

**NBL:** if I may interrupt you before you finish your point, for people to really understand what you're describing here is that essentially they've created a fear based economy. And what is going on behind the scenes is that you have backroom deals that are being negotiated in terms of who gets in on the business.

**JR:** Oh, you just nailed it. That wasn't a question. That was a statement. So who gets in on the business? The WHO gets in on the business. And so I think Justina Walker, we did an interview that I think you've seen, she put it really, really well. They are the moderators, okay, between two competing factions, pharmaceutical companies and the relatively small nations. They're coming together to try to haggle this out because the smaller nations want in on the deal, and then the WHO gets to manage the entire operation, right? They're not innocent bystanders you know, an uninterested party. They really want this deal to go through because then they are the ones who are seen as being in charge of the entire operation. Because when they say there's an emergency... let me finish talking about the agreement, accord, I'm going to call it a “framework convention”. That's what they said they wanted more than two years ago. The independent panel that was supposed to determine what was done right and done wrong over the last couple of years, they didn't do that. They concocted a plan where they said that they wanted a framework convention, and they wanted to have an independent council of global leaders to be in charge of this, which loosely translates to the way this is working out as a conference of the parties. They want a framework convention, much like the framework convention for climate change where we're all going to agree to whatever the heck they agree to. It doesn't have to have any substantially important things agreed upon. They just have to agree to agree. And then they can pat themselves on the back “oh, we're saving the world. We haven't finished all of the details yet, but we'll meet on a yearly basis”. And whomever we send as delegates to the conference of the parties then they will decide. And those protocols, much like, you know, think how wonderful the framework convention for climate change is working out. All of the nations agreed in 1992, and they have a conference of the party year after year after year after year. And the most insane ideas are funnelling quietly into our local levels where you're not allowed to drive your car down a certain street at a certain time of day. And if you go more than X miles away, you're going to be fined and charged. They're crazy drunk on power.

**NBL:** For those who are listening, convention of parties, “COP” conferences. So we have those ones for climate change. We just had COP 28. And so you're saying they want to do the same model with this framework convention for quote, “health emergencies”.

**JR:** If you were going to sign a contract for some kind of business venture, and the other party came in at the last minute and said, “hold on, I got this sheet of blank paper. Let me put that in the contract and we'll bind it all up together. You sign it and we'll have our people work out the details later. You're good with that, right?” Okay, good. Look, look at this big contract that we signed. Okay. Once your words that make your head freeze over, the part you got to look for is in the latest version, chapter three. Where they go, “oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, we'll be meeting once a year to work out the details off into the future forever”. Okay, see, here's how Tedros is... it's interesting that not too many people have seen it, but once I mentioned this to you, it will be so obvious, right? He will say something like he pandemic accord, which, well, if you hear him use any word to describe this. Understand that every document that WHO puts out has a number. So if he doesn't say, like in their meetings, they always go 75/9, or whatever their nomenclature might be. If he doesn't say, “this document that I'm holding up here right now”, you know, XJ7932, whatever the heck it is. That document does not give sovereignty or authority over to the WHO. Then you could go look at the document and you can see for yourself. When he says the pandemic accord, that doesn't mean a damn thing. That's not a document. That's a word of art to confuse you. Pandemic accord, pandemic treaty, framework convention, CA+, CALL agreement, you know, whatever the heck it is they call it. If he's not referring to a specific document, it's a sin of omission. He's telling you something that you'll believe and fall for, but he's not actually telling you the whole truth. And so what he'll say is, “well, that will not give the WHO any more authority”. You're right, Tedros. I agree with you. It would set up a conference of the parties, a totally new bureaucracy, that will be meeting when the World Health Assembly is meeting. Yes, that's not the WHO, that's a new tentacle on the octopus of global governance. So, what he says is, “well, it's not going to give the WHO any more authority”. That's a partial truth. You go looking in the document, you gotta go to chapter three. It would set up this conference of the parties. And so, if you like how climate change has been working out for you, this framework convention where they keep coming up with the craziest of ideas. You got to do this. You got to do that. You got to do the other thing. Well, all of our nations signed on. The United States did have the Senate give consent, two thirds were a party and we send a delegate to the conference of parties, but there were like 80,000 people there this time. Did you go? Did I go, were we invited? No. Did, anybody poll the people? You know, what do you think about 15 minute cities and low emission zones or whatever the heck it is they're doing? Do you like using your electric vehicle in Northern Canada? When it's all frozen up? Do you like the fires that they're starting? Do you like the brownouts and the load sharing and you know, what in the world are these people doing? Well, it's the technocratic, progressive, expert driven world where they're not suffering from their decisions because they still get to fly in their private jets, right? They still get to do everything and they're blaming the people for the problems that they are creating so that they can be seen as offering the solution. It's the Hegelian dialectic, they create the problem. They come in to save the day. They package this up as something wonderful and if they can simply get the leaders of the nations to sign on to an open ended framework, they can stick in there whatever the heck they want and meet on a yearly basis going forward. So the details of the pathogen access benefit sharing system have hit a snag because I think they made a mistake. They should have talked about the money first. Because they're not going to find enough money to make the pharmaceutical companies happy enough to give up their intellectual property and their

manufacturing know how. They're struggling right now to figure out how to launder tens of billions of dollars, craft language that tricks we the people into thinking, oh, this is such a wonderful thing. We should be throwing money at it so that they can pay off the pharmaceutical industry to let in new players in the third world and give them a piece of the pie rather than, you know, they cannot seem to let go of the colonial exploitation model. The pharmaceutical companies want to come in. Rape the countryside, take all of the intellectual property of the pathogens. They got the best Ebola and the best Zika in various nations, okay? The pharmaceutical companies want to pillage those raw, materials, those natural resources. And they don't want to have to pay a portion of their profits. And the nations don't want just a piece of the profits. They want know how. So that they can pillage their own land, pick up all these genomic sequences, and fear monger their own people. It's just a darn profitable business. This is what they're negotiating. Now, people are talking about a whole bunch, a lot of things, and much of what's going on is what's in the other documents, in the amendments. A lot of times people don't differentiate. All the stuff that I've pretty much been talking about. I'm pretty sure a hundred percent, because you asked, is in what most people call the treaty. Just calling it a treaty is a psyop. It's a framework convention that could be adopted by the Senate, at which point it would be considered to be a treaty. A treaty implies, well, you come to an agreement and you're done, right? And that hides, you know, it's an accord, it's an agreement, it's a treaty.

**NBL:** A treaty is fixed. This would not be.

**JR:** Right. This would be a living breathing zombie organization called the Conference of the Parties, exactly like the Framework Convention for Climate Change, where we would be giving away a future of insanity to fund and give some sort of pseudo international legal fiction respectability to a cabal of people who are using that organization to fear monger you know, an order of magnitude more with, 10 times the money that they had going in to just feed themselves and harm people. With drugs and jabs that are boom, you know made like that and not tested, so forth and so on. And so in terms of that agreement, I think you asked me how's that going? I give you a 40 minute answer. They're having trouble and I'm very happy that they're having trouble because those who have don't want to give to those who want, and as they keep saying, nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. And so, they're having difficulty agreeing because they're fighting over money. They're not looking, you know, they don't have doctors or nurses or health experts talking about how do you actually help people, avoid any kind of disease or recover. If they have it, that's not even part of the conversation. These people are so out of their league. They're conducting a trade dispute. They're arguing over trips waivers for trade related internet intellectual property, because what's going on is you've got intellectual pirates who want to continue to pillage the knowledge base of the third world nations. And they're saying, "Oh, no, you don't. You took Omicron and you made billions. We're not letting that happen again. We want to make our own billions off of the poisons that we inject in our own people".

**NBL:** I think that's important for people to understand that the point of contention has to do with the trade aspect of the deal. Everything that has to do with the surveillance, with the digitization of health care, with the "vax passports", all of this, obviously, they're all on the same page to use these emergencies. And you know, these health concerns or emergencies... what's the term? PHEIC potential?



**JR:** Let me keep this super duper clear, okay? Because two of the things that you mentioned are in the other agreement. Okay. And so let's maybe, we'll wrap up for now. Anyways, the discussion of the framework convention, primarily when they say surveillance, most people think, "oh, there's a camera or a microphone or something". Well, the surveillance they're talking about, there's a recent thing that has been put out there. They're testing wastewater and blackwater (and I don't mean the company) on an airline, right? The sewage system of the airline. They want to test that to see if anybody on the plane had some kind of new pathogen. Now, they propose that as being for our benefit. But what that really is, is akin to exploring for oil or digging a test drill, drilling a test hole for oil. Okay. "Oh, where might we find a really good pathogen? Let's go dig it in your poo!" Right. That's, I mean, when people say surveillance or when people hear the word surveillance, they normally think, well, there's a camera, you know, shows the street and what's going on or in a store or in your home or wherever, on your phone, that's watching you... they're talking about genomic surveillance. What could we find in your septic system, in your wastewater treatment plant, in the black water? That comes in your system, on an airplane. Or people who have a recreational vehicle, they've got grey water and black water. They want to check your poo. Maybe you've got some new kind of polio, you know, festering in there. Maybe you go to every hospital and everybody who walks in has to be tested, right? Stick something up your nose or some, someplace else. All of that testing. It's not necessarily the case that they're going to tie it to you as an individual. This is exploration. They're looking for the pathogen to scare you with. So they go, "oh well, we can open up the manhole cover in your street". And literally, I'm not kidding, they do this. Put a test thing down, take some poo and see what they can find. And they've been doing this for years. I spoke to someone in North Dakota, whose daughter went to university there, and they were testing each dormitory, and they were planning on locking down the entire dorm if they found some COVID 19 in the sewage system for the entire dorm. So, they find something in your poo, They believe that would give them authority to do something to a whole group of people. Imagine a favela in Rio. And not that there's necessarily sewage systems, but wherever there's a sewage system, they can say, "oh, well, that's sewage system". They know on the map where it came from. "Oh, well, we got to lock down that whole area because we found a little bit of something in your poop, right?" Who knows what they actually found because these tests are, who knows, you know? They can plant something. I mean the logic or in any case the issue here is that they want to use something that they can then patent in order to create "this business opportunity". The surveillance is essentially to help them find the raw materials that they need to turn into the next mRNA. And the argument is, well, "hey, wait a minute. We want a piece of the pie". And they don't just want in the latest version of the pathogen access benefit sharing system in the framework convention. It says that they have to give 10% of the products that are manufactured based on some genomic information, 10% have to be given to the WHO, and 10% have to be given at cost or affordable pricing. And so that sets the WHO up as the middleman who will be in charge of distributing that. The poor nations are saying "20%, that's not enough. How about all the profits from the other 80%?" And so that's what the sticking point in the negotiations are. And what I think they're trying to figure out is, well, how do we throw money at this? So that the pharmaceutical companies make their profits, but somehow that those profits are being shared. The smaller nations are done with the colonial exploitation. They want the knowledge, the information, the investment capital. So that, basically they want to build the refinery. They want to build the manufacturing plant. They want to make the value added product. You know, if, if somebody works in a diamond mine, and it's taken and cut somewhere in Switzerland or wherever and the person working in the diamond mine can't afford the De Beers engagement ring, right? They want to be able to bring that technology to their own nation so that

they can identify their own pathogens. They can create their own products. They can fear monger their own government to throw a lot of money at them to inject a lot of people to make more people have dysfunctional immune systems. So the entire industry profits, right? These treatments do not cure. They are customer acquisition tools. If you go for a test to trick you into thinking that you have an asymptomatic disease. I mean, it's too comic, right? Diseases now are because somebody said we found something and it means you have a dis-ease even though you are completely at ease in your body. If you fall for that, well, bad on you. Stop falling for that. The PCR is a laboratory process, it's not a diagnostic test. Stop spitting on Karey Mullis' grave. What he did was amazing and wonderful. Don't abuse it and misuse it, but that's what they're doing. And, the jabs I've said this before, I'll say it again. If you hear someone say anything in life, anything at all is safe and effective, you immediately should understand that they are lying. What they're supposed to say, what they're obligated to say is "we've studied this extensively, for like eight mice and three days, and here are the benefits and here are the potential risks". You've got a benefit risk ratio. It's your decision to determine whether or not, for you... are you an 8 week old baby? Are you an 80 year old person? Are you somewhere in between? Do you trust that information? The decision is yours to determine for you, as an individual, whether you think the benefits outweigh the risks. Nothing in life is safe. You pretty much won't catch me jumping out of an airplane with a parachute on. Not because, it wouldn't be fun and exciting and all that sort of stuff. For me, it's not important for me to take the risk. Now, when I'm 90, hey, you know, let's live a little. Because if I'm going to die, I might as well go out with a bang, right? It's a personal determination. And so if anyone ever, ever, ever says anything is safe and effective, they're violating what should be your awareness. And, and the best example I've found to use is how they use this language. You could say, if you're familiar with Russian roulette, you have a revolver, a six shooter, you put one bullet in one of the six chambers, you spin it, and then people point at their head and pull the trigger. That's 84 percent safe. Okay, but that one bullet is very effective. Well, wait a minute. What does that really mean? So coming back to wrap up what's going on with the framework convention that they want to call an accord or a treaty or an agreement or whatever. They're having trouble. Back in April they were having trouble, and they said to all of the nations, "send us all of the text that you want to be in this agreement". And I just about a week ago finally got my grubby little hands on that document. It's a 208 page compilation text. All of the nations said, "here's what we want". And instead of publishing that and making that available on April 22nd, when it was first created, or when everything had to be submitted, they buried that. They buried that until now, more than half a year. And instead, they published the Bureau's text. Which was only, only 43 pages in June. Well, all summer long, the nations were like, "hey, we told you what we wanted. How come what we wanted isn't in the Bureau's text?" And the WHO keeps saying "Oh, this is a member nation led process". This is no, no, no, no, no. This is the United States and the European Union nation led process. Many of the smaller nations think that they're controlling what is allowed into the negotiating text. They told them, go back to the drawing board. We're not happy. So they came out with a newer version in October. October 16th is when it was first released quietly. And then the 30th is the official one. It shrunk down to 30 pages. And so the other nations said, "wait a minute, you're going in the wrong direction". No, they're not going in the wrong direction. They're going in the direction of, "we don't need no stinking agreement. We just need to set up the conference of the parties. Hey everybody, we'll do this down the road. Don't put anything in here that's controversial. Let's put the smallest amount of stuff that we can agree to, so that when people look at it, they miss the fact that we're setting up a new bureaucracy go on forever".



And so the smaller nations are not having it. They want commitments for money in writing. They want commitments for investment and intellectual property. They want all of that in writing. They don't trust the colonialists, you know, ask any Native American what a promise means to the people who are colonizing your territory. They don't want an empty document with promises down the road. They want it to be in writing, and larger nations are not giving that up because they're running a fascist operation in league with all of the pharmaceutical companies that will not give up their intellectual property.

Now, none of this has got anything to do with health. None of it. And so the people who are in the midst of these negotiations... It's being conducted in the wrong place. They're not interviewing doctors about how to save lives, right? They're not talking about, "wow, wouldn't it have been great if there was a software based system, computer based forum, where every doctor on the planet could have access to input their clinical observations. Oh, we just had a patient come in, had this weird thing, right? Never seen it before. Here's all of the information that we got from them. We don't need to tell you who they were. We just need to share that clinical experience". And every other doctor in the world could see the information about the ailment that the person was suffering from. And whatever it was that that doctor did in the clinic, on the ground, in real life, with a real person, at the end of the day, they have their staff type it into this global system of information and let everybody see. Okay? They could do that for a pittance, and that would be a reasonable thing to have to help prevent the next pandemic, but that wouldn't make any money for the pharmaceutical industry because that would actually solve the problem. "Oh, we did this. Oh, and the person died. Mmm. That was horrible. That didn't seem to work. Some other doctor in some other nation has a similar situation, does something else, and the person gets better". You go, "Oh, that's not proof, but I would try that before I would try the other thing". And then very, very quickly Richard Fleming who's both a doctor and a doctor of law as well, he set up a study early on in COVID where the way the study was designed, I felt, was very appropriate, if not brilliant. I don't know that it's really brilliant. I mean, he's a brilliant man, but it was just appropriate. You have a situation where you don't know what the heck is going on. You don't know why people are getting sick. The study that they set up randomized many, many trials all around the world and they had 15 or so essential medications that were currently in existence. And so if somebody came in with a certain set of symptoms, they were randomized to you know, 1 through 15. They looked at them after a day or two and they determined are they getting better or are they getting worse? if they were getting worse they gave him something different. If they got better, they gave them something in addition. But everybody got nutrition. Everybody got vitamins and minerals and all that sort of thing. And in a very short order, they identified three different cocktails of three different medications. Ivermectin was not one of them, that just wasn't in the realm of thinking at the time. And three of the cocktails had, I think two had a 100 percent survival rate. And the other one was like 99 point something. That's what should have been done. That's what should always be done when you don't know how to treat something. Nobody's mentioned that. Nobody's mentioned that that is how doctors around the world actually deal with an unknown something. Somebody presents in their clinic, they review what's going on, and they go "well let's try this. If it works, great. If it doesn't work, let's try that". That's what the scientific method is, and they don't want that to be. They want a statistical probability study to be done, and this is the thing that people don't understand. You never, ever actually hear about the scientific method in any of the studies that are published. They are all statistical probability studies, and that's different. And if you don't know the difference, give me a phone call. 310 619 3055. People need to know the difference between the scientific method and a statistical

probability study that's designed to sell product. If you have individual doctors treating individual patients, responding to their individual reactions to the treatment, that is not a frickin anecdote, that is actually the scientific method. When you have protocols that say, "don't look at the patient, just make a determination in five minutes based on a couple of symptoms, and give everybody the same damn thing", that is murder. Okay? And that is profiteering. And that's the system that you're living in. Okay? And, so got off on a little rant there, my apologies. But, in terms of the framework convention, understanding what it is that they're trying to stick in there and realizing the most agreeable details are what they're shooting for. They would love to have a blank piece of paper attached to chapter three that says, "you know what, we can't figure this out right now, but we're going to agree to create a new bureaucracy, the conference of the parties". And they'll meet year after year after year, and we're just going to throw money at them and they'll come up with some good ideas down the road, okay? So if you loved the Framework Convention for Climate Change, here's the brand new Framework Convention for Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness, and Response. My answer is — I wanted a curse there, but I'm keeping it clean — No, no, no, no. The details matter.

**NBL:** Hell no.

**JR:** I was using another four letter word, but the point is they want to create a new bureaucracy. So when Tedros lies to your face by telling a partial truth, not the whole truth, and he says, "oh, the Accord will not give the WHO more authority", well, I don't know about that because it would give 20 percent of all of the materiel to the WHO to distribute, okay? But the authority would essentially be given to the conference of the parties to make stupid decisions to control your life going off into the future forever. No. The answer is no. Period. End of story. No treaty, no agreement, no framework convention, no accord. No, no, no, no.

**NBL:** Okay. So that's for the framework convention, which people refer to almost always as the pandemic treaty. So tell us now about the international health regulations. And I heard you say on this podcast with this lady, Justina, you you mentioned that the international health regulations were actually signed during the moon landing, so everybody was distracted watching that on television, and then that's when they signed these regulations in essence.

**JR:** Well, the only thing I would change is that nobody signed nothing. That's when they negotiated and they agreed to it. But you can't find a wet signature of anybody putting their name on any of these documents, which is the other clue that you need to understand that they're fraudulent. So just to be clear, for the most part, everything we've talked about so far is this framework convention. Now, what's been going on for the last year and a half or so is there's been a lot of information. I actually have a little prop here. There's currently a 30 page framework convention that they're currently calling the proposed negotiating text for the pandemic agreement, is its official name. They're in a state of flux. Framework Convention has been kicked to the curb, the last version, and they're doing a rewrite. It may get bigger, it may get smaller, no way to know. That organization, the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body, has meetings February 19th to March 1st, and then at the end of March, they've got two sessions, each two weeks long, to try to pound out an agreement. There will be a new version at some point, February most likely. So it's impossible to say what the heck is gonna be in there. It doesn't matter. The answer's freaking no. You don't get to create a new bureaucracy from now until the end of time to control us with a framework convention. Like the one for climate change. No.

**NBL:** just to clarify for people to understand so within the WHO they have this group called the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body they're working on this framework of convention aka the pandemic treaty and this is supposed to be ready for the World Health Assembly in May. So that's one of the two tracks that we've spent the whole time up to now speaking about.

**JR:** Because that one, I have said for quite some time, is the decoy. Because going back, and this is going to be a longer story than that one. So, you know, hang in there folks. Currently that version is only 30 pages. Okay. This is the amendments. Hundreds and hundreds of pages.

**NBL:** so it's just for the audience, because your audience is so familiar with all of this, but for my audience maybe who don't know, for those who don't know the details, aside from the quote "pandemic treaty / framework convention", there's the second track where the WHO and their member states are seeking to make amendments to the International Health Regulations. That's the second track which you have right there. So you're saying what we discussed up to now is which one is the decoy?

**JR:** Well, you know, it's all real but confuses people. Okay, what has been happening is there's this enormous mass of proposals. Most of what people are talking about are not the things that we just discussed. They're not talking about building out the pharmaceutical hospital emergency industrial complex. They're not talking about the framework convention. They're talking about the information that we're going to be talking about now. Which are amendments to originally the 1969 International Health Regulations, which is an existing document. All of the details associated with that, people generally go, well, the treaty. No, it's a different document. So anytime Tedros says they're dealing with misinformation, on one level he's correct. Because if people say the treaty is going to do any of the things we're about to talk about, technically, that is incorrect information. Because framework convention will not do that. These amendments have hundreds of pages of ridiculous things going on in them. And so what has been happening is people have been cross pollinating. And so Tedros gets up there all, you know, high and mighty, and he goes, "oh, that's misinformation". Well, what it really is, I've come to understand, that they've found a term for missing-information. When we provide the missing-information that exposes them, they want to brand it as misinformation. It's the information that you're missing out on, and they don't want you to see it. They don't want you to understand what's going on. And so, now I'll rewind and do the history of what's going on with the international health regulations and all of the amendments that are going on. So, you really have to understand, all the way back to the 1940s, for the United States, we never signed or got involved in a treaty that was properly given the consent of two thirds of the Senate. What happened back in 1948 is Congress passed a joint resolution that was signed by Harry Truman. Not two thirds of the Senate, just the simple majority of both houses. But that agreement said, "yeah, yeah, yeah, we'll join the WHO". But nothing the WHO says would require the United States to do anything, okay? So in our agreement with the WHO, we're like, "yeah, we'll, we'll help out. We'll give you some money. We'll, you know, talk to you. We'll give you advice. We'll go to your meetings, but you can't tell us to do a damn thing". That's crystal clear. In 1969, when everybody was looking up at the moon, right, whether there were men landing on the moon or it was a basement in the Hollywood soundstage somewhere, whatever. I was nine years old. I was watching a black and white TV, or black and white film. They were meeting at the 22nd annual World Health Assembly in Boston, and the delegates there, very much like a conference of the parties, essentially that's what the World Health Assembly is. It's a

new bureaucracy that they meet once a year, and they make decisions that control your lives. They could call the World Health Assembly a conference of the parties. Your national head of state sends a delegate. And you don't get to tell them what you want. Most people don't even know who that delegate is. The whole back story with all of that. So they made a decision to agree to the first version of the International Health Regulations. Well, what they didn't put in there was a stipulation to all of the delegates. "Well, go back to your country and have this be properly ratified by your Congress, your Senate, your Parliament, whatever". I haven't found anybody who can find any information where anyone ever signed on behalf of their nation that had the authority to do so to enter into that agreement. Now, maybe that does exist somewhere, but what they put in there was this silence procedure type of agreement process where these unelected, unaccountable, unknown delegates come to an agreement while everybody's distracted. And they go, look, as long as nobody objects for the next nine months, everybody's good. And so, if they just keep it quiet, and their agreement is, this will become legally binding on the first day of 1971, so long as no nation formally objects, it's entering into a contract by default. If I knocked on your door and I said, "hey, all of the neighbors have reached this agreement, and if you don't say no in nine months, your party to it as well by default". Well, nobody paid it any attention. They just ignored it. And so it became accepted as legally binding. It didn't follow any kind of representative democratic ratification process. Where is a document that has a wet signature of some authorized person for each government saying, "Oh yeah, we went through our proper procedures and, you know, our nation's good with that. It's fine". Silence.

**NBL:** This is so important for people listening to understand because it's still the way the WHO operates to this day where they propose these agreements or treaties or whatever you want to call them. And they wait the allocated number of time or the decided amount of time where no member state is going to object, the populations are not even aware because there's so many things going on at the same time. The information is not shared and then boom, the timeframe is lapsed and there's nothing you can do about it.

**JR:** Exactly. And so nine months went by. There's another extra period of time to give nations to craft whatever legislation they need, allocate money or set up an office or whatever they need to do. There's always a little period of time. And then after that, January 1st, 1971, thank you very much Richard Milhous Nixon, it went into, quote unquote, legally binding effect. Legally binding is an interesting term. I'm just going to refer people to my Substack. I had a wonderful conversation with a gentleman, Bruce Parly. Please go watch the discussion with Bruce Parly. Legally binding does not mean what you think it means in international law. And so people get all confused about that. I'm going to leave that because that's a whole other four hour conversation. So what happened after 1969 was, you know, this agreement goes along quietly. They made some changes in the 80s and 90s and so forth. But then there was rumbling that it wasn't working because it wasn't all inclusive. It was very targeted with certain ailments, certain pathogens. And so after SARS one, there was a big push. In 2005, they reached another agreement. It took them many, many years this one they're rushing and they agreed to a multitude of, you know, pretty much a complete rewrite. And so the current version that I held up from 2005, I challenge anybody on the planet, find a document that shows where your procedure in your nation to adopt an international agreement was properly followed, and there's a signature of some person who has the authority to speak for your name. I mean, for your nation, who has the authority to put their name on a document on behalf of all of you. Where is it? Okay. And so unelected, unaccountable, unknown bureaucrats create a fiction, a legal fiction. Nobody questions it. I mean, many times I feel like the little kid in the story of the emperor who has no clothes. Y'all have no

authority. There are powers of persuasion and hypnosis and programming. Well, it's the law. There's a hilarious skit from a comedy team called Key and Peel, where they're on an airplane. And they're saying that, "oh, you know, the seatbelt sign is on, so you have to sit down". And one character keeps saying, "but is it a law? " Well, you see the sign, right? But is it a law? Well, the sign is on, but is it a law? Right? Are you authorized? Do you have authority? You know, when did I sign a contract with you... Oh, you crafted something? And because people decades ago did not object to it, you think you have the authority to apply it to me now? Again, the answer is freaking no. Okay, so for 19 years now, since 2005, it actually went into effect in 2007, that is the agreement that all of the nations were working under. When COVID, the period of time that we call the COVID period happened, what they're trying to say is that that agreement was inadequate and where this is really coming from. And this is going to bend everybody's brain. I apologize in advance, but this is what I've come to understand. If you think about just the law of the land, legally right, from international law, the 2005 amendment regulations, who amongst us, myself included, were deeply involved and understood that international affairs in regards to an emergency situation were quote unquote governed by the 2005 International Health Regulations.? Did anybody say anything about that back in January of 2020? Nobody. But that's what the WHO was using. That's what all the nations had said, "yes, we will follow these rules". And so, what happened was, I'm just gonna say, something happened in China. And everybody is saying, "well, we need to get the information". Well, under the International Health Regulations, there were rules that were governing what the WHO could or could not do. United States wanted the WHO to go bust it into China, to bust into the Wuhan Institute of Virology and get all the information. And China expressed their sovereignty and they said, "get out of here. We're trying to hide shit. Give us a moment. We got some shit to hide. Go away". The WHO, under the internationally agreed guidelines, what if the WHO had said, "hey, we want to come in and see what's going on in Fort Detrick. We want to come into the National Institutes of Health and we want to get Fauci's emails. We want to know what's going on with all this gain of function that you guys are funding in China." What if the WHO had busted into China and it led all the way back to Fort Detrick and the Defense Department?

**NBL:** And Eco Alliance in the UK.

**JR:** Yeah, all of that. And so the reality of what happened in early 2020 with hiding Hydroxychloroquine's benefits and all that sort of stuff. The soap opera that was the first half of 2020 is being rewritten every day. Everybody's reconstituting what people did and did not do. You know, should we have lockdowns? Well, the international health regulations were designed so that information could be sent and received amongst nations. And the purpose of the IHR is so that commerce does not stop. That the information is transferred while you keep the channels of commerce open. That's what was supposed to be done with the IHR. It was supposed to be you don't lock down. If you read your 2005 version, you'll be like, wait a minute, nobody followed this. And so, the vast majority of the nations violated the existing agreement. So, you know, who, and I don't mean the WHO, who makes people adhere, makes nations adhere to an agreement? Well, obviously, that didn't happen. Almost every nation violated their agreed upon responsibilities under the IHR. And so when this was being pushed forth in 2022, the first round of amendments, which we'll talk about, I put out an article and there were thousands of people who sent emails to their members of Congress going, "Hey, hey, hey, what are you doing?". And they got replies back that were very befuddling, because it was Republican Congress people in support of the Biden proposed amendments in 2022 and people were going, "wait a minute, my Congress person is a

Republican and he's supporting Biden's proposed amendments. This doesn't make any sense". And I published an article on May 17th, 2022 from representative McCaul from Texas who proudly shared the Republican party minority report. That is, I believe, the source of the idea to strengthen the WHO and strengthen the international health regulations to strip away the sovereignty and enable and empower the WHO to have more power to intervene in another nation's affairs in regards to some kind of outbreak. The Republican Party started this mess because they wanted to use the WHO to beat up on China. Well, okay, but if you put that into law, then the WHO would have that same additional authority to do that anywhere. Did you really think this through? And so what we're dealing with is a bunch of Republicans who wanted to strengthen the WHO to bust into China and you know, I get it, it's a complicated issue. If you want people to respect our sovereignty, well, you have to return the favor. And what they wanted to do was empower the WHO to be their lackey, to go get what they want from China. Now, needless to say, the other nations of the world, after Biden had proposed those amendments on January 18th, 2022, in the four months run up before the May Assembly, it was very clearly known that the other nations are like, "you're out of your mind. We're not letting the WHO bust into our nation". And now that's just one piece of it, but that's a piece that nobody talks about and bigger problems. And what the Biden administration was pushing with that batch of amendments from 2022 was the period to reject amendments. As we talked about, it's currently 18 months. So if amendments are adopted, there's supposed to be an 18 month period where nations can reject them. And then a six month period beyond that for a total of 24 months. Where each nation has 24 months to sign legislation to enact whatever they've agreed upon. He wanted to shorten both of those down to six months. They're in a rush to try to bust into China and go get information, years after the fact. It's like, well, hold on, six months? To consider an international agreement? What might be the reason why? Well, they knew that this plan to do what we're in the middle of right now, that they wanted to make all these changes in May of 2024. That session in May ends on June 1st, 2024. You go six months in advance of that, you're still in the Biden administration. They wanted to be able to ram through these changes because if it goes any further, if there's a different president, January 20th, 2025, who might reject these amendments, well then it's all for nothing. So Biden's proposal was completely kicked to the curb. And here's where I believe fraud begins, that was just kicked to the curb on May 24th, 2022, a new set of amendments was presented by the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, European Union, handful of other nations that had five articles that they would change, and that violated article 55. Article 55 says, if you all want to make any changes, any amendments, any nation can do that but you have to submit it four months in advance. Well, they busted right in to the middle of the assembly, dropped a document. May 24th. I mean, they literally said on camera, "hold on, we're going to close this meeting. We've got a room in the back. We're going to go hash this out". And then they came back on the 27th. They had a committee meeting where they purportedly voted on it, but it's not really a vote. It's literally 10 seconds where they go "you guys all good with this? Okay, fine. Boom". Then they were supposed to have a full assembly meeting vote on that. Change these amendments. And they published a document with the amended articles, and it said on there that it was agreed to during the eighth meeting. Well, little problem. The eighth meeting is recorded, and they never voted. There was no vote. They just said that it was agreed upon. There's no record of any vote, but they say that it was adopted. Now, 18 months to the day after that, a dozen members of the European Parliament wrote a letter to the WHO Director General Tedros, and they said, "well, we don't see any proof that this was ever properly voted on, so they're null and void".



In August, of all nations, Iran rejected the amendments. And so, Iran is smart enough to know that that's bullshit. A couple of other nations at the last moment have done some things that may or may not qualify as a rejection. It appears that they attempted to put in a reservation, which is not a thing. That's one of the things that was changed. But New Zealand and the Netherlands maybe are on the cusp of saying, "no, we reject them", but that's not the point, not a single nation on the planet, not a single politician on the planet that I know of other than those 12 members of parliament have said, "hey guys, you didn't actually vote on that". That's a problem. That was the letter that was sent to Tedros. How is that not an international scandal? In the United States, there's a lot of argument over the counting of votes, but at least they pretend to have an election. At least they pretend. The WHO just said, "yeah, yeah, yeah, it's good".

**NBL:** But so wait, these members of the European Parliament, they sent that letter to Tedros. I think I followed you when that was happening late last year. Did Tedros reply?

**JR:** To my knowledge, you know, silence again. Everybody drops the issue. So the article that I wrote back in November of 2023 was "Follow The Damn Rules", right? So the letter is available there. All the information is available there. All of the rules in their constitution and in the IHR about how things are supposed to be voted on. They just didn't freaking vote, but they said it's all good. Okay, and this is what we're dealing with. They make a decision, they go forward, and if you don't challenge it, it's like any other bully, they'll keep abusing you until you push back and say no. And that's, to me, astonishing. The media, obviously, is a foregone conclusion that their purpose is to distract you from important things. So, I don't expect the mainstream media to report on that. But the alternative media has dropped the ball. That should be a scandal. The evidence is there. Members of Parliament have said about it, you know, spoken about it. Why? Are people distracted by less important things? Now, there are more important things. World War, central bank digital currency, controlling your lives, food shortages, all these many things, I grant you, are more important. But to report on some of the ridiculous things that you see in the media and not expose a violation of international law claiming that an agreement was voted on with no vote, never happened, ought to be at least a little tiny bit of a scandal that should bring Tedros down.

**NBL:** Listen it's incredibly important and I do think that everything that you so thoroughly report on should be a top priority for everyone in the quote alternative media space, because you mentioned, CBDCs and other things that are really important and the fact that the globalists want to control our lives, but the WHO is an intrinsic part of this. It is a key tentacle of the octopus that is global governance. And so can you tell us a little bit about what these amendments are that they're pushing through?

**JR:** Before I do that, I'll have a little bit of fun. You know, for anybody who wants to have a shorter version of this interview, by no means should you ever call me at 310 619 3055. You shouldn't use Signal or WhatsApp or Telegram, or don't go to James.Roguski on Skype. You know, you'll never be able to find me. I'll never pick up the phone, so don't even try, okay? Obviously I'm being facetious. Yes. 310 619 3055. So you have to understand the lay of the land again, going back to what we talked about earlier on December 1st, 2021, the nations told the WHO, "we want you to negotiate a new agreement". In that atmosphere of them saying, "hey, you guys are hogging up all the jams". The Biden administration on January 18th proposed the amendments that we were just talking about. And the nations essentially said, "did you not hear a freaking word we just said?" We don't want to be told that we have to do all of these many more things and that you want to

shorten the timeframe to implement more changes. That's just more colonial behavior. That's just more Global North telling the Global South what to do. They kicked it to the curb. And at that meeting, these are my words, I feel like they said, "Oh, you want to change the international health regulations? We'll show you how to change the International Health Regulations. Thanks for the idea". And so they agreed to set up a process to create the working group for amendments to the international health regulations. And they said, "okay, nations, by September 30th, 2022, you tell us what you want". So what is it? So this is what they presented. So Biden wants to change a few things, speed up the process and the nations return with, 94 nations total, 197 pages of changes, 300 plus amendments and a process that we're in the middle of right now that they knew they needed to have in their words, this was what their direction was from the December agreement, a package of targeted amendments. They didn't want to rewrite the whole thing. They said they wanted to target it. A package of targeted amendments to the International Health Regulations in alignment with Article 55, which means they have to submit it, oh, wait a minute, on January 27th, which is four months in advance of the beginning of the May 27th meeting. Well, they kept that secret until December of 2022. I've been reporting on it ad nauseam since then. I actually published back in June or July, "The People's Guide to the International Health Regulations". I took out about 19 of the most egregious amendments and made it into a little booklet that looks like a Cliff Notes book, if you're familiar with Cliff Notes, a summary. And what they're not proposing is, again, probably more important than what they are proposing. They want to have these regulations come in under Article 19 of their World Health Organization Constitution, which gave them five authorities, the World Health Assembly — not the organization, the Assembly — they have five authorities that they can write regulations or standards, but they're not. Now they could be defining terminology like vaccine or pandemic and it remains to be seen if they're going to actually define those terms. They could and should be setting standards for determining the cause of death. That's literally listed in the constitution that they have the authority to set standards for that. Well, you know, did people die from or with COVID? That would have been a good thing to have. They can set standards for diagnostic tests. Well, they're using this BS you know, PCR. They could set standards for purity in biological and pharmaceutical products. Well, there's many, many, many reports, anybody who says that the jabs and the vials that contain them have been properly tested independently to determine whether they are pure and actually contain what they're supposed to contain and not a whole bunch of other stuff, would be lying because number one, there are no international standards because they've failed for 76 years to ever agree at the World Health Assembly to go read the International Health Regulations and if you can find any standards for the things I just mentioned, let me know because they've never done it. And the last thing is they could set standards for advertising and labelling. Well if they had standards internationally for labelling, you wouldn't have seen the blank inserts with all of the jabs. Okay. And so the negotiations that would actually improve the International Health Regulations would be discussing the things that I mentioned. Well, there's no authority in the regulations for many of the things that they are negotiating. Now, I mentioned earlier when we were talking about the pathogen access benefit sharing system. And the way they want pharmaceutical companies and governments to work hand in hand, is really fascism. What was proposed in these amendments as a solution to the trade dispute, that is the purpose for these negotiations, is the nations want equity. An equitable distribution of pandemic related products. And so Bangladesh and the 47 nations of the WHO's African region submitted proposed amendments to the same, to create a new Article 13A. Now, their proposals are really, they're not identical, but man, they're pretty darn close. And what they said they wanted was that they know that the Director General can declare a public health emergency of international

concern, PHEIC, or FAKE, that's already his power. He's obviously done that with COVID and monkey pox and he can declare a PHEIC “fake” anytime he wants. The words ought to give you a clue, you know, that's the acronym.

**NBL:** That's the acronym. I couldn't say it earlier, Public Health Emergency of International Concern. I always forget that one.

**JR:** Yeah. “Fake”. I mean, literally. And so what Article 13A from both of these groups proposed would be that after he declares an emergency, he would be given the sole authority to determine what was required to respond to the PHEIC. Then he would set up an allocation mechanism and he could then tell developed nations, “Well, you have to have your manufacturing capacity. Make the things that he says are required and deliver them to where they're needed”. Now, in a wonderful kumbaya, we're all in this together. You've got something and it can help other people, of course. But, you know, if in your neighborhood, if your neighbor knocked on your door and said, “Hey, my power tool broke and can I borrow yours or we're baking a cake, you know, and we ran short on some ingredient, do you have it, can we borrow it?” People in general, “yeah, of course, here you go”. But if somebody, a third party down the street knocked on your door and said, my buddy across town needs something and I know you have it, you've got to deliver it to him. Be like, you know, where did you get that authority? That system is pretty darn classic Marxist, communist, put the centralized control of the means of production and distribution in the hands of a dictator. So that would make the WHO's director general into the dictator general and well, he doesn't have that authority. So Bangladesh proposed crossing out the phrase non-binding in the definition of the word recommendation. And Malaysia made an amendment to Article 42 saying that recommendations shall be implemented. Now, how did those two nations manage to just randomly craft language that would empower Director General to be able to tell nations that they have to do what he says, even the International Health Regulations Review Committee's final report, which is going to be one year old on February 6th. So that's in that pile that I held up. Go to the Working Group's records for WGIHR. Go back to their February 20th meeting. The International Health Regulations Review Committee that was a panel to advise Tedros about the amendments that the nations had put forth said, wait a minute, that would bring liability down upon the WHO. The WHO is an advisory body. If it becomes a command and control center, if he demanded that nations provide this, that, and the other thing, and said you had to use this, that, or the other, he would be liable for those decisions. They prefer to be able to make recommendations, and then blame everybody else. Oh, it's just a recommendation. Okay? And so the nations, this is where everybody's getting confused. It's not just that the W.H.O. wants more money, power, and authority. Many of the nations want to give the W. H. O. more power and authority because they think they can control new power and authority to get what they want. And so what the small nations want in the amendments is they want Tedros to be able to boss around all of the pharmaceutical companies and say you've got to make this and give it to them. Well, I'm certainly not a fan of the pharmaceutical companies, but that solution apparently is still on the table in these negotiations that were supposed to be presented on January 27th. They're having meetings February 5th to the 9th for another session of the working group after the deadline that they know they've already missed back in October at their meeting, they were scheduled to have one more meeting in December and what was supposed to happen was at that December meeting. They were supposed to wrap it all up and submit amendments to the review committee to dot all the I's cross all the T's and then submit it to Tedros in mid-January. They know that, but in October, and I reported on this many, many times now, they said, we're not going to meet the

deadline because, you know, this isn't a battle between good and evil. This is a battle between big evil and little evil that wants to get bigger. The small nations want in on the Pharmaceutical Hospital Emergency Industrial Complex's game. I'd like to help you remember that acronym because for the last year, I've been stealing it. P H E I C is not just the PHEIC of the Public Health Emergency of International Concern. It's also the bigger PHEIC of the Pharmaceutical Hospital Emergency Industrial Complex. I woke up one morning and that was in my head. And so the smaller nations want intellectual property. They want manufacturing know how. They want investment capital in the amendments. It actually says, I believe it's annex one, but it might be annex 10. They're kind of similar. It says that they want developed nations who have a responsibility, very much like they're talking about with climate change, because this is where it comes from. Oh, well, you make more of the pollution, so you have to put in more money and make more changes. Well, you know, their view is that the developed nations have to fund a build out of what they call core capacity. All of the infrastructure, the laboratories, the testing, the manufacturing plants to build state of the art infrastructure in developing nations. Well, if you look at that from the point of view of the Pharmaceutical Hospital Emergency Industrial Complex. They failed to get their jabs into poor people around the world. The wealthier nations threw money at the problem. People lined up and voluntarily said, yeah, give me 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 of those. And were suffering the consequences with ill health from all of that poison that was injected. But they missed out on a large swath of the population. So the demographics for them to build out their industry is in the smaller, poorer nations because they can't afford to pay top dollar for pharmaceutical products. So the growth area in the pharmaceutical industry is in impoverished nations. Oh, don't spend billions on heart disease and stroke and cancer and diabetes, leukemia and you know, malaria and tuberculosis. No, no, no, no, no. Build out our genomic sequencing laboratory capabilities so that we can scare the crap out of you and throw more money at the jabs and the drugs to prevent something that just has the potential to cause a pandemic. And they want to change that language as well. All the while turning the vaccine passport into a global digital health certification network. You have to get the jab, you have to have the test, you have to have the prophylaxis, you have to take the drugs, and you have to document that you are compliant if you want to travel internationally. And, and so this set of negotiations has been locked up so tight that while they're obviously negotiating for a year, there's never been a second draft, or a working draft, or a negotiating text, or any of that sort of thing. This is where the action really is, because the nations who want what they want, would prefer it to be in the International Health Regulations, because it already applies, I think, illegitimately, but all of the nations are already a party to the IHR. And so if they can make the changes in the IHR, they get everybody. If they go for a new framework convention, nations would have to opt in and they might not get everybody to opt in. So their preferred choice is to cram it all into the International Health Regulations, because then it would be assumed that everybody's fine with it. And nations would have to be like Iran, who said, "nope, we reject it". And so the rejection process is simple, but not too many national leaders have the cojones to push back against globalism. And so what we're dealing with here are secret negotiations designed to fund a massive build out of the pharmaceutical hospital emergency industrial complex, and nations that are tired of being colonized by the big global North, they don't want the pharmaceutical industry to own what's going on in their nations. They want to own it. They want a piece of that pharmaceutical profit so that they can do their own pandemic profiteering because it is a great business model. You look at the profitability, right? The WHO has said that investment in their operations give a 35 to one return on investment. They're in the middle of trying to raise money for their general program of work, number 14. They say that for their four year plan, you know how Soviet Russia used to do a

five year plan and China does a 10 year plan. They have a four year plan to fund, working towards the health related sustainable development goals. They're begging for billions. They need to raise over 7 billion for the next four years, and so they're going to spend 5 million at the end of 2024 to have some, I would imagine, pretty swanky events to wine and dine national leaders and foundations, boards of directors and corporations. It's a new type of fascism. It's government, corporations, and foundations who work together in a triad against we the people for their benefit. So these negotiations, I think, could be summarized in that fashion. We're dealing with 21st century fascism with a little tinge of dictatorial, totalitarian, communist, control of the means of production to essentially get public money to make pandemic profiteering an ongoing business opportunity. And the answer is no, that's not what we need to stop the next pandemic that would guarantee it. And that's why they keep saying "oh, it's not if, it's when". If I had to make it out, they're going to make it happen.

**NBL:** Absolutely. Just like they did the first time around and Tedros on that panel said something to the effect that COVID could be seen as the first quote disease X. But what I wanted to say is that if you wanted to put it in even simpler terms from everything you described so precisely, we are essentially dealing with criminals that are trying to organize their crime. This is what these negotiations are about.

**JR:** Their crime is pretty darn organized. They're trying to put it into an internationally bind, you know, it's like global international crime with the seal of approval as being internationally legally binding. The answer is no. And clearly it's not just about what people have been talking about. I think that this undercurrent of building out their RICO organization, their criminal conspiracy. It is a conspiracy. It's not a theory. You can look at what they're doing, and we, the people, if we're not aware of what they're actually doing, if we're pushing back in the wrong direction and yelling at the wrong people and not seeing what's going on over here, because the media and the alternative media is really good at saying, look, look, look, look, look, while they're quietly secretly negotiating a transfer of wealth of trillions of dollars into an industry, that is enormous, enormously profitable for them because they convince government to put the stamp of approval. Safe and effective, safe and effective, safe and effective. You gotta do it, you gotta do it. You don't gotta do it, but you gotta do it. People are brainwashed, they're hypnotized, they're in fear, and they allow that to influence them. And they voluntarily line up to be injected with some unknown substance. I live about 20 minutes from downtown Los Angeles, and this is absurd, but I actually think it's an accurate analogy. You, the infamous you, everybody out there has no idea what is in the hypodermic syringe that gets injected when people go for a vaccine. You really don't know what's in there. You just trust whoever's injecting you that, oh, that's a good thing. You could go down to Skid Row. In Los Angeles in the middle of the night, roll up your sleeve and ask any stranger on the street. Do you have something that you can inject in my arm? And you would know probably more about what's in there than you have any idea of what's in the jabs that you get at a pharmacy or at your clinic or doctor's office. And the doctors and hospitals are incentivized to do that to you. The more they do it to you, the more money they get and they don't obey. What was put forth in the Nuremberg trials, the Nuremberg Code of Full Disclosure. And it's impossible to know what is in those vials and what their ingredients are. Very simply stated, there's a document in the United States, a list of ingredients that are generally recognized as safe. And so if there's any ingredient in those vials, that is not generally recognized as safe. If anybody says it's generally recognized as safe, they're lying. And there's a whole host of things in there that are absolutely harmful. Just, what I call Franken lipids. I did an article on Pandora's vaccine.

Just the lipids that are man made, that make up the lipid nanoparticle. That's the delivery mechanism to bring the payload to explode in your cells. The ingredients in there have more reactivity than ammonia, I believe, was the chemical that they related it to. Those particles alone are lipids that would incorporate themselves into every membrane of every cell in your body. And people maybe have heard of unsaturated fats or partially hydrogenated, I'm sorry, not unsaturated fats, hydrogenated oils or partially hydrogenated oils. These make those look like a wonderful thing. When these artificial lipids incorporate themselves into the nucleus around the cell in your body that holds the DNA or the membranes in every nerve cell and every other cell in your body. It is destructive to health on a universal level. And it's in all of these jabs. Anything that has the lipid nanotechnology delivering capacity is messing up every membrane of every cell in your body. And so for them to say that it's safe and effective should be immediately identified for the lie that it is.

**NBL:** And the crime that it is. I mean listen, I'm not a doctor and I haven't done so much research to understand the intricacies, the medical intricacies of these jabs, but from day one I was extremely vocal in not injecting anything that was proposed on the back of this fear campaign. And you described it incredibly well throughout this podcast, James, and I mean, through all the work that you do, but there is really a business model, that is being built on the back of this fear mongering. And they saw that it worked the first time around. They made so much money. You mentioned it before 35 to 1. And they're going to perpetuate the system until we stay no, and until we stop them.

**JR:** Absolutely. Yeah. And so in anything, if you're aiming at the wrong target, you have a problem. And so what they are negotiating is a trade dispute. And luckily, the big evil on one side and the little evils on the other side who are trying to get a piece of the pie, are haggling over intellectual property and manufacturing know how and investment capital and when people come to be aware that that is what is really going on, it's an easy decision. Oh, hell no. If you're talking about other things, they will say, oh, that's misinformation. That's fake news. Okay, but they won't then give you the whole truth and say, no, what we're doing over here is a business deal. We're trying to set up a cabal to control your lives off into the future. We want a conference of the parties and we want all kinds of money being put in to build the infrastructure that we're going to use to find the things that will plug into the concept of Disease X so that we can scare you into having your government print more money for our endeavors. And it was crystal clear. When the Indonesian health minister was talking about the multi billion dollar World Bank pandemic fund back in November 2022. He said, go invest this, meaning the pandemic fund was a great business opportunity. Now, if you're a greedy bastard and you want to make a whole bunch of money and you think their agreements are going to go through, well, what should you be investing in? Well, diagnostics, genomic sequencing, laboratory equipment. People have told me that they overheard conversations at one of these Geneva events where they were talking about machines, laboratory equipment that could do thousands of PCR procedures. And it costs like a dime to process one sample. Well, it's not just the money being made processing all these tests. It's the fact that if they find something that is of interest, if there's a pathogen with pandemic potential, they've hit a goldmine, but they can, they will hit on something with all these iterations.

**NBL:** And you mentioned Carrie Mullins earlier in this conversation, he must be rolling in his grave, seeing what they're doing with with these so called tests.



**JR:** Yeah. And so when they say surveillance, it's in certain contexts, yes, it's cameras and microphones and tracking and all that kind of stuff. But what they really mean is surveilling the flow of genomic information. If somebody does a swab, they want to have the data. If you bring your dog or cat to the veterinarian's office and they take a stool sample, they want that data. If you've got a chicken coop and the officials are coming in looking for bird flu in the straw bedding, they want to know if it's in a pigsty or a horse stable or in wastewater treatment or the black water from an airplane traveling internationally the surveillance that they're talking that is the collection of genomic sequences that they can use to scare you into thinking that you need another mRNA jab. And that's a profitable venture if you're evil and greedy. It's a great business opportunity if you're a regular person, you realize that that's, as you put it, organized crime trying to become the way we are governed. And we see it all around that government and business and foundations have created a triad that is, quite frankly, modern day fascism. It's working for the benefit of the few against the benefit of everybody else. If you can see it, you can stop it, but if you're off looking over at something else, pushing at the wrong lever of control, looking at Taylor Swift and this NFL guy that is all over all the time in the news, then you miss all of this.

**NBL:** And this is critical and James, the work you do, there is no one like you, that has just stuck to this and who goes and reads all the nitty gritty documents that these these psychopaths put out.

**JR:** Well, you know, I'm done with the WHO I want to get on with the new okay? But for anybody who has sat through this two hour rant, I appreciate that. I encourage everybody to give me a phone call. 310 619 3055. I've learned people who have questions identify themselves as people who are still able to think. Because the people who don't have the capacity, right, to sit through two hours of me ranting about what I find interesting, but most people would, you know, "Oh, I want to go watch this bullshit Taylor Swift". If you're here now, I want to get to know you, right? You're the people who are going to save the world from this evil because you care enough to give two hours of your time to try to get at the information. You don't need to know all of this. All you need to do is take this video, take the link, share it with whomever, and don't waste your time trying to convince them. You don't have to know all of this stuff. It's all knowable. You just have to identify whether or not the other person is an ally who can still think for themselves, is willing to take some time to hopefully learn something over this past two hours. And if they come back to you and they go, I had no idea, that really opened my eyes, what are we going to do? The answer is still the same. Spread the word. Identify your allies. Don't try to convince people who would rather be watching, you know, whatever they want to watch. Identify the people who give a damn. And reach out to me. There are many groups around the world who are organized, who are talking about this, who are taking action. There are petitions and actions and many, many, many, many things. If you waste all of your time trying to convince people who refuse to listen, that's time that you could be spent identifying who your allies are, and identifying what action is appropriate for you to take wherever you may be, but it starts with awareness.

And so maybe we'll close on one thing. I pronounce an English word differently than most people. It all starts with awareness. If people don't know. You kind of, sort of can't blame them unless they're in a job where it's their obligation to know. But the average person, there's an endless list of things of which I am unaware. So nobody, nobody knows everything. Once you've raised someone's awareness and you say, "hey, did you watch that two hour rant that James did on Noor Bin Ladin's podcast? You really should listen to that". After they've listened to it, they have

the choice to ignore it or spread the word. And everyone can choose to be ignorant. That's what it means. It doesn't mean you're stupid. It means that you know, but you don't care. Okay? Well, okay, fine. Everybody makes their own choices. Now that you know, what you know, after having watched and listened to what we're doing here, the question is, are you going to censor this information by not sharing it? I spend most of the evening on my phone many days just sharing information with all of the people that I know. And usually when I wake up in the morning, "Oh, thanks. I had no idea. Oh, thanks. I had no idea". A lot of people don't care. That's okay. I did my job. I shared something that I thought was important with them to try to raise their awareness. It's not for me to beat them over the head and convince them. Work with the willing. You know, anybody who gives me a phone call, it's always a wonderful conversation because they're like, "what do I do? How can I help? This is crazy". If you've gotten to this point in this video, the action to take is to go through your phone book, go through everybody you've ever texted or emailed or sent a direct message on any of the social media platforms. And, I don't know which one of your podcasts Noor has had the most views ever, but it ought to be this one. Now, if people start watching and they give up five minutes in and they want to go watch the Super Bowl and see if, you know, Taylor Swift is going to do something. Don't waste your time. That's just what it is. But I'm telling you, there are millions of people around the world who get it. And we're fundamentally aware of what is going on. And the answer is very simply, no. We will not allow the pharmaceutical industry to build out their hospital emergency industrial complex with public money so that they can use biological weapons to harm the health of people around the world so that they can have lifetime customers that are customers of the pharmaceutical industry, because they were customers of the pharmaceutical industry. You take a drug, you get sicker, you take another one to treat the symptoms, you get sicker. That is their cash cow. And what we need to do, is to get people to be aware that industry does not have your best interest at heart. This is a wealth transfer, not you know, the World Health Organization. It's a world crime organization.

**NBL:** It really really is. Thank you so much for your tenacity for your time, for dedicating so many hours to explaining all of this to us. Me included. I really turn to your Substack when I want to be updated on on the W.H.O. And it really helps for my work as well. So thank you so much for that and the one last thing I wanted to say is if you'd consider it, it would be great if you came to Geneva in May for the World Health Assembly. I would be happy to organize everything on the ground and it would be great to meet you in person.

**JR:** And you know, let me know what's going on and we'll see what happens. My hope is that this is seen to crumble so completely before that, and that's what I'm working towards. Oh, that would be, that would be extraordinary. They have no right at this point, because they missed their deadline for the amendments, right? They're just working for 2025 at this point. And with the quote unquote framework convention they just had problems with, the discussions at the World Trade Organization about intellectual property they're in a world of hurt in terms of trying to reach an agreement. And it's really very simple: no, we will not have another framework convention for climate change. We're not going to have a framework convention for pandemic prevention, preparedness and response. That is not a, that is not a difficult decision. The answer is freaking no. Freaking no, hell no. However you want to say it.

**NBL:** And just for the audience, what we need to be aware of building up or leading to the World Health Assembly in May. Today we're recording this on the 4th of February. Tomorrow they start with another session, the 7th session, I believe, of the working group for the IHR amendments

later in February, you mentioned earlier as well. They have another session for the INB for this framework of convention that we discussed. So what do you expect for the next few months ahead of the World Health Assembly?

**JR:** A lot of secrecy probably, but they have their meetings, they're negotiating, they're trying to make a mess of it. I've always seen this as a job of educating people as to what they're doing. And many, many, many people - and I get it - they have told me, "Oh, Jim, you know, you have to make it simple. You have to keep it short. You got to do the tick tock videos". And I get it. And those things are out there. But what I have witnessed is that when people get a little teeny bit of information, rather than sit through a discussion like we've just had, they go someplace else and they get misinformed. And so I'm sorry that this is two hours of your life, two hours of my life, but I'm not sorry because this is what's really going on to the best of my ability to determine. If anybody has additional information of which I am not aware, by all means, please reach out to me. One of the other things that hopefully you can put in the description is the "[peoplesdeclaration.com](http://peoplesdeclaration.com)". It's a relatively short summary. It's got some graphics... We really don't want more Wuhan Institutes of Virology. We don't want more people going into bat caves, digging to find the next pathogen with pandemic potential. That doesn't seem to be a good idea. What we need is a ban on gain of function research, weaponization of pathogens for profit. That's what the "[peoplesdeclaration.com](http://peoplesdeclaration.com)" is all about. Let's leave it there. We've taken up enough of everyone's time, but I appreciate everyone's attention. Do everything you can to invite everyone to just take the link to this video. If people want the truth it's available. If they can't handle it, move on. Find the people who want to make the future a better place. And I'm pretty darn sure that the future does not include the WHO and the Pharmaceutical Hospital Emergency Industrial Complex getting tens of billions of dollars in a legally binding, governance mechanism to put all of the control over your health in their hands. It's not going to happen.

**NBL:** Thank you so much, James. It was important that we take the time because they design it to be so obscure and confusing for everyone. And so it does take exactly that time to un-peel all the layers. I'm very glad that we could have this conversation and that we could discuss all these things. So thank you so much.

**JR:** Thank you.