

WHO Reform

Swiss Federal Council without critical distance mRNA vaccinations and WHO strategy unquestioned

by Dr med. Sabine Vuilleumier

It's almost unbearable: The "European Medicines Agency" (EMA) admits that the mRNA coronavirus vaccine is not a proper vaccination. It prevents neither the passing on of the virus nor infection with it.

Nonetheless, the Federal Council announces a "vaccine strategy for times of crisis", pointing out that the coronavirus pandemic has shown that these new technologies (mRNA technology as an example of next-gen technologies) have "produced very efficient vaccines at an early stage".¹ On the same day, 29 November 2023, the Federal Council starts the consultation on the partial revision of the existing "Epidemics Act" (including the "transfer of certain elements of the Covid-19 Act into the EpG") and describes this as a "review of the Covid-19 epidemic".²

For many months, broad sections of the population and specialists in immunology, biotechnology, medicine, and jurisprudence have been calling for a fundamental review of the coronavirus years – an objective, scientific examination of the measures taken by the Federal Council during the pandemic, the vaccines, and the appalling consequences of their worldwide administering.

This demand is not being heard at official political level. On the contrary – the Federal Council and the *Federal Office of Public Health* (FOPH) are turning a deaf ear. Everything indicates that they are instead aiming to align federal legislation with the guidelines of the *World Health Organisation* (WHO).

In 2022, 83 per cent of the WHO's funding came from voluntary contributions, with the USA in first place, followed by Germany and the *Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation* in third place. Of these voluntary contributions, 88 per cent were specific grants with a narrow earmarking. These donors therefore largely determine the activities of the WHO.³

The focus on the WHO is also confirmed in the Federal Council's explanatory report on the par-

tial revision of the Epidemics Act: "The revision will also take into account, as far as possible, the developments of the ongoing international amendment process to the IHR [International Health Regulations] (2005)."

Obligation to vaccinate and compulsory vaccination

If the Federal Council were to take the admission made by the *European Medicines Agency* (EMA) on 18 October 2023⁴ seriously, Art. 6c para. b and c in the *consultation draft of the Epidemics Act*⁵ would have to be thoroughly reconsidered regarding mRNA vaccinations. Among other things, the Federal Council could oblige doctors to carry out vaccinations. It could also make vaccination compulsory for certain groups of people.

The EMA expressly states that COVID-19 vaccinations have not been authorised to prevent transmission from one person to another. The possibility of preventing transmission was not even investigated, which was already known when the vaccines were authorised. The indication for vaccination was to protect the vaccinated person themselves from the outset.

It is a monstrosity if, following this widespread publicity, healthcare professionals are to be obliged to administer these vaccines – people whose highest ethical professional maxim is "primum nil nocere", i.e. "first do no harm". If a vaccination "only" protects the vaccinated person, it can only be voluntary and must be preceded by a full explanation of the possible side effects by a specialist.

There is hardly any interest in coronavirus booster vaccinations among the population today, as the level of awareness of vaccine adverse effects has increased. And yet the Federal Council continues to rely on mRNA technology. It wants to conclude more reservation contracts with pharmaceutical companies in return for payment and to strengthen Switzerland's position at international level.

Switzerland is already involved in the WHO and participates in important alliances such as the *Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations* (CEPI). – Once again, where is the review to address the damage caused on many levels during the coronavirus pandemic?

“Special event” when the WHO ...

The *partial revision of the Epidemics Act* is intended, among other things, to define more precisely the conditions for a special event in which certain measures can be taken. The “special event” is “now determined by the Federal Council”. And the Federal Council is complying with the Epidemics Act, which has already included the WHO guidelines in Art. 6 para. b since 2016.⁵

Switzerland has approved the *International Health Regulations* (IHR), which have been in force since 2005, without reservations. Critical information on the ongoing revision of these WHO health regulations and the pandemic treaty currently being drawn up is of the utmost importance.

Serious consequences of consent

Zurich lawyer Philipp Kruse, a profound expert on the subject,⁶ summarises the practical consequences for individuals of agreeing to the amendments to the *International Health Regulations* and the *pandemic treaty*:

“Your family doctor is retiring. His successor is a health manager who says he wants to sign a contract with you. The contract should protect you from harm and apply for the rest of your life. The health manager will determine which of your symptoms are indicative of an illness;

the illness could also progress without symptoms. If he diagnoses an illness, you must follow his instructions to the letter, there is no room for suspicion, he has never been wrong. He has a range of measures at his disposal, including tests and substances provided by good colleagues. Second opinions are not sought, there are no alternatives. Should you suffer any damage, he accepts no responsibility, he is immune. Would you sign such a contract? Probably not. And what would you say if such a contract were to apply to the entire population of a country?”

The adoption of both proposals by the *WHO World Health Assembly* is planned for May 2024. The Federal Council is not yet prepared to reject them. This must change.

(Translation “Swiss Standpoint”)

¹ <https://www.admin.ch/gov/de/start/dokumentation/medienmitteilungen.msg-id-99071.html#:~:text=Bern%2C%2029.11.2023%20%2D%20Der,und%20Herstellung%20von%20Impfstoffen%20stärken.>

² <https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/de/home/strategie-und-politik/politische-auftraege-und-aktionsplaene/revision-epidemiengesetz.html>

³ Peter Kuster. «Die Finanzen der WHO». In: «Schweizer Monat», Sonderpublikation «Politisierte Medizin», November 2023

⁴ https://tkp.at/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/2023_10_18_Letter_to_MEP_Marcel_de_Graaff_Request_for_the_direct.pdf

⁵ <https://www.bag.admin.ch/bag/de/home/strategie-und-politik/politische-auftraege-und-aktionsplaene/revision-epidemiengesetz.html>, Dokumente: Vernehmlassungsvorlage (PDF)

⁶ Lawyer Ph. Kruse at press conference of the association «Pro Schweiz», 14 June 2023: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yHVcaBweigA>