

**Stiftung Corona Ausschuss (Extra-parliamentary committee of lawyers  
investigating the Corona Crisis), 7 March 2021**

**Testimony from Dr. Astrid Stuckelberger**

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jdl\\_tVFYqc4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jdl_tVFYqc4) (29 minutes)

Reiner Fuellmich: Dr. Stuckelberger, can you hear us?

Dr. Stuckelberger: Yeah.

Reiner Fuellmich: Can you tell us what you do. What is your background?

Yes, I've been my whole life a scientist, actually, a health scientist. I started in biology, then I have a complicated CV [curriculum vitae or resume], as many women who survived in the academic world, but mainly I've been doing research and training, teaching, my whole life, but more so, more and more, since very early on, I was in WHO doing my masters degree on Mental Health Differential in Cross-Cultural Diagnosis, which I have even posted on my website ([www.astridstuckelberger.com/](http://www.astridstuckelberger.com/)). And then I was taken in a geriatric unit with WHO collaborative studies, in a hospital in Geneva, Switzerland, to do research. And research was always, and more and more, for political decisions. So, since the 1990s I've been the Deputy Director of the Swiss National Programme on Aging, 12 million francs, and we had to do science for politics, for politicians, for decision-making and for the people.

I was also Deputy Director at the same time for the Interdisciplinary Centre of Gerontology and Geriatrics. So my first part of life, was a lot on aging, the life course, health, differential, men, women, a lot of multidisciplinary factors. And I was paid by the faculty of medicine, although I started in psychology, then I went to medicine very quickly.

So I did a PhD on population aging, health – subjective versus objective health – on a big cohort. Because of my positions, I collaborated very quickly with WHO [World Health Organization]. We created an international network on aging. This is how I understood more and more how the United Nations works, how WHO works. Since 1994, I was an expert there, taken as a rapporteur, a young rapporteur, speaking all those languages, and then the politicians started asking me to do events. And I organized twice the UN open days (event).

So, that was my first part of life, I got a prize from Kofi Annan [former UN Secretary-General] for doing so much work in science, for politicians, science for people. Then the second part, from 2000 on, was in public health. And this is where I started more and more to be in WHO in the capacity of ... on the Research Ethics Committee for four years – you know, I have all the credentials, so no conflict of interest.

And then, what happened in these courses where I was teaching public health, actually my PhD, I have always been in public health. It's just not a topic that is recognized academically, you have to know that. [Although] it's starting now. So Geneva University asked me to take a mandate with WHO because I was so involved with the United Nations. And I did that, and it was on international health regulations, and that was in 2009. And it was a very interesting mandate.

So I was collaborating closely with WHO Lyons, the education programme, and WHO Geneva, because I know everybody in the Alert and Response Unit. What is interesting in what I am going to say is, I've experimented [experienced] the will to stop training people on preparedness plan, because we did an implementation programme for three years with Georgetown University, Pretoria, and me for the University of Geneva.

The whole international health regulation is to prepare countries and member states to be ready for a pandemic, to prevent a pandemic and to act quickly and readily. So the aim then, I thought was very noble, and very good. I helped WHO Europe to also do a preparedness plan for the Eastern Bloc during the workshop, I have all the documents. I have everything.

And then we won the renewal of the mandate of three years in 2013, and suddenly they announced that there is no funding, Japan has not paid for that. When we had not trained all the regions at all, we had trained part of Africa, part of Saudi Arabia – the Middle East, Europe part, America part, but it was definitely not – and I always said we should do a publication of the training and they never did. I did one for ethics.

So I saw there that there is something wrong, already. Then I started teaching this at the University of Geneva on the Global Health and Human Rights summer school that I organized with colleagues. And I was in charge of the International Health Regulations Week, which I was doing. And WHO – Bruce Plotkin, a lawyer, who was working on the international regulations in WHO, came to tell me that I cannot teach this. And I told him, “Who are you to tell me what I can teach and not?” And we had a lunch at WHO that was quite “muscly” because I said it's my right to teach whatever I want, and I don't understand why *you* don't teach this. I was involved also with the European Union, and I have a lot of international expertise. And so that's where I am now. And if I come to you, I mean, I have more to say, but I want to go to the topic.

The International Health Regulations were adopted in 2005, but implemented and came into force in 2008. And from 2008, they wanted to do implementation training for all the regions.

Reiner Fuellmich: Ah, that makes a lot of sense! In particular, when I see it in the context of what Frau Behrendt just told us.

Dr. Silvia Behrendt: Because what I did not mention previously was that I also did country missions for the IHR [International Health Regulations] Secretariat and also know Bruce Plotkin.

Dr. Stuckelberger: Ah. You know him!

Dr. Silvia Behrendt: He worked there as well and did some guidance issues and things. So, I think we have to speak to each other.

Dr. Stuckelberger: Okay, it's great you know them. Switzerland is the centre, and I say that as a Norwegian. It's the centre of a lot of corruption, because there we have one of the most important NGOs. It's GAVI, the Global Alliance for Vaccine Initiative, which is the foundation that Bill Gates has. Which has, I tell you, I have the papers, total immunity – total, total. They can do whatever they want. The police cannot come and look in their computer!

And when the pandemic happened, what they say is a pandemic, I was in South Korea for a big meeting, and I realized there is something not right, and not corresponding to the International Health Regulations. When I travelled back. I think, this is very weird, the news says one thing and people don't behave the same in the airports.

So, I started to look and I realized, over this whole year, all the breaches, compared to the International Health Regulations, and the preparedness plan. And I'm working now for a lawyer in Quebec, who is called Dominique Déjarlet [?]. You know, I organized the Stockholm Peace Summit post-Covid, where I invited you and you couldn't come. And he was there with two other lawyers, Rocco Galati and Maitre Brusa for France. Because I don't think we will solve this public health problem and population/economic problem without lawyers. It's impossible. So what I'm doing now with Maitre Déjarlet [?], I'm finding out a bit more, and I have four points I can talk to you about.

First, as Silvia is there and that's great because she can confirm and just complement. First, that this obligation is signed by 194 [WHO] member states, but it is embedded in the constitution of WHO. So, they don't need to adopt it. It is immediately approved and it's an obligation. So it is legally binding.

Reiner Fuellmich: What, the International Health Regulations or what?

Dr. Stuckelberger: Yes, the International Health Regulations. And this is the trick, because nobody knows this, it's in the papers. But you have to go and dig, and that's what I'm finding out. You have to go and dig. The inconsistencies of everything they are doing, to see that they are directing as a corporate agency, WHO.

Because on behalf of the health security of the International Health Regulations, they have made a third edition, because the 2005 edition is the second edition. The first one was in 1969. But the booklet of 2005 – I don't know if you've seen it – the booklet, this one:



*[Available here in the six UN languages: International Health Regulations (2005), **Second edition**:  
<https://www.who.int/ihr/9789241596664/en/>.*

*[Available here in the six UN languages: International Health Regulations (2005), dated 1 January 2016, **Third edition**, containing a revision to Annex 7 adopted by the Sixty-seventh World Health Assembly in 2014:  
<https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241580496>]*

It's 2005, but it's written "second edition", and the third edition comes, I assume, just now, in 2014, would enter into force in 2016. And this has made the health security a dictatorship, where the Director General can decide on his own to sell vaccines, to sell the PCR instead of all the documents that say you have to have confirmation of a clinical ... and – there are other tests than PCR. So I'm finding out some inconsistencies that have not been used at all in law.

So the first one is this, it's an obligation. So if it's an obligation, what Tedros – I call him Tedros – says, this "Secretary General terrorist" in WHO – when he says something, all the countries have to obey, under law.

Reiner Fuellmich: All the member states of the WHO? Everyone who signed the agreement with the WHO, because automatically, as you are saying, this is part of the constitution of the WHO, this is binding law for everyone [meaning every country] who's a member of the WHO.

Dr. Stuckelberger: Right. With two reservations, because I was teaching that, so I know. There were two countries in 2009 in the second edition that made reservations, and it's very interesting: it's the USA and it is Iran. They don't want to obey the WHO completely. The 2016 third edition. What happened in WHO – but maybe Silvia you were there when it happened. Bill Gates was already around. He was already mingling, saying that he pays so much money. But he became visible when – I think it was in 2017, you can correct me. I know this from my colleagues there. He requested to be part of the Executive Board of WHO, like a member state.

Reiner Fuellmich: Ah!

Dr. Stuckelberger: And it's incredible! I was shocked. I said, “How can he dare to do this?” And they went to the vote. The Executive Board meets every January. And it changes every year, and the lobby – they tried to lobby the other countries, of course he tried to bribe. And it's really an event because it is not mentioned. Maybe we can get the minutes of the Executive Board. They even accepted that he would be considered as a member state because of the money he gives. So this is unprecedented in a constitution of member states.

Reiner Fuellmich: Is he now being considered as a member state?

Dr. Stuckelberger: Not officially. Not that I know. Maybe there are documents ...

Reiner Fuellmich: But unofficially yes? And that's probably because – that's why he has this immunity, right?

Dr. Stuckelberger: He has total immunity in Switzerland.

Reiner Fuellmich: Unofficially he probably holds that kind of status, right?

Dr. Stuckelberger: Yeah. I can tell you why it is very suspicious. I think he has done something with every member state, the same contracts. What I found out with Swissmedic (Swissmedic is the FDA [US Food and Drug Administration] of Switzerland)<sup>1</sup> – because I gave the paper to a journalist and now I can't find it, Swissmedic has signed a contract with Bill Gates and WHO.

Reiner Fuellmich: Aha!

Dr. Stuckelberger: And this is abnormal.

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: So basically he literally tried to lobby himself into the WHO as a member state to basically found the country of BillGatesistan. That's basically what he did. I mean, at that point he would have been basically a one-man country.

Dr. Stuckelberger: Yes, he could be a dictator because he can influence the ... But the fact that he was not accepted by vote, that's why the minutes would be very interesting. By vote, to be a member State. He then started to sign papers for

---

<sup>1</sup> Swissmedic is the Swiss national authorisation and supervisory authority for drugs and medical products. <https://www.swissmedic.ch/swissmedic/en/home.html>

countries, that's my hypothesis, because he did it with Swissmedic. So WHO, Bill Gates, and the country in charge of accrediting treatments and vaccination, are signing contracts, and ...

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: He didn't get in, in an official capacity, he didn't get voted in, so then he tried to circumvent that, and just basically went around the middle man.

Dr. Stuckelberger: Yeah. How can you, if your country signs a contract between three signatories – Bill Gates, a country, and WHO? Because WHO signs with countries, but not ... And even that I find pretty weird. Why does WHO have to sign with a country, an agreement?

This is a corporate agency doing that, but not WHO. I mean, correct me, Silvia. But WHO accepts to have a company, a private company, selling ... a merchant, signing together, the three, to make the surveillance and to choose the medication. I think that Swissmedic had posted it on the website. I think that every country – that's my hypothesis – they have done this everywhere. That's why everybody says the same thing in the train, the same message, every week there's the same thing happening.

Reiner Fuellmich: Tell us more about this immunity. How does this work?

Dr. Stuckelberger: Ok, yeah. I can find again the document, it's also in German because Switzerland is also in German, and you can have a look. It's shocking. Normally, NGOs – because I have been an NGO and I'm an NGO activist with academics in the UN since 20 years. An NGO has a status of accreditation to the United Nations. You can come and speak, you're an observer, but you cannot intervene in many things. And you don't have immunity. If you open an office, you are submitted to taxation. [GAVI has no taxes to pay](#). Already this is very strange, that Switzerland is hosting an international NGO that doesn't pay taxes, and that has total immunity. There are clauses in there, you can just read them. I will find it for you. I mean, the police cannot come and take a computer if there is a criminal problem in the office, the police cannot get in.

#### [16.05]

Reiner Fuellmich: So they're criminally immune?

Dr. Stuckelberger: Yes. Criminally immune.

Reiner Fuellmich: Immune from any criminal sanctions.

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: I just looked it up. They have qualified diplomatic immunity within their area of operations, since ...

Dr. Stuckelberger: What is the name?

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: They have “qualified diplomatic immunity”. I think they have qualified diplomatic immunity, and they don't pay taxes since 2009 – I just looked it up. They ratified the law in Switzerland in 2009.

#### [16.31]

Dr. Silvia Behrendt: [German] *Immunity ... it is also the subject of investigation, these “shared responsibilities”, that's how I know that, because they took it up in 2014, the work as I said, I can only confirm this.*

Reiner Fuellmich: Very good.

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: Because he just said nobody knows about that, actually, that it's actually even published on Wikipedia.

Reiner Fuellmich: Yeah, but people don't know it and nobody cares because obviously ...

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: That's the thing: nobody cares.

Dr. Stuckelberger: The details, we don't even think that it's possible.

Reiner Fuellmich: Yes. Exactly.

Dr. Stuckelberger: ... as citizens.

Reiner Fuellmich: That's why we're not thinking about that. That's why we're not thinking about where is the basis for all this. Because we simply accept what is being told, and now we're gonna start thinking. And I think many more people are gonna start thinking because this is extremely important information. Everything is out there in the open, but most people don't want to see it because they don't believe that that can be possible.

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: And I mean, it's not about saying that anyone's doing, you know, running around harvesting organs from African children or something like that, something horrible like that. Nobody's claiming that Bill Gates is doing that or anyone is doing that.

Dr. Stuckelberger: But he could!

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: Yes, that's the problem. We, as a society, should ask ourselves: should we endow any single person or any conglomerate of persons with such an incredible amount of power without any kind of democratic responsibility and legitimacy behind themselves? That's the question we should ask ourselves. Not if somebody's going to abuse that power, because the abuse is inevitable. As soon as somebody has this kind of power, they're going to abuse it. Not today, not tomorrow, but eventually, they're going to abuse it because simply yeah, simply because they can.

Dr. Stuckelberger: But why them and not us? I have NGOs. Why can they do this, and not another NGO? This is the question.

Viviane Fischer: And also, there's a difference with a normal diplomatic immunity, because this is usually, you know, these people come, and they work on relationships, and maybe they have a speeding ticket, or ...

Reiner Fuellmich: And they have some kind of political legitimacy. Not in this case, nobody ever voted for him.

Viviane Fischer: Someone comes into another country and has total immunity also for all business transactions and all that. I mean, that is really, that's crazy. It's absolutely crazy.

Dr. Stuckelberger: They have less immunity than Bill Gates. Apparently, that's [what] my friends are telling me, so maybe you know more. But diplomats don't have total immunity.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: We had a similar revelation when we were dabbling with European agencies. We found out that, in the national regulations about, for example, the European Central Bank in Frankfurt, they have literal diplomatic immunity and there is no regulation to lift it. So, the head of the European Central Bank, for example, if he says, "I don't want any kind of seizure of my computers" or "I don't want the police in here", they can't go in. It literally says that in the law. When he says no, they can't do it.

Dr. Stuckelberger: Yeah.

Dr. Justus P. Hoffman: And that's basically the same for every European agency. And there are no regulations in place, who would be responsible to lift that immunity. It's not even conceptually possible to do that. And here it's the same. But at least with European agencies, you have at least some kind of democracy behind it. And here, it's just, well, now there's immunity and he can do whatever he wants.

Dr. Stuckelberger: And the extent of this is much bigger, because I know also that in Basel, they have the Bank for International Settlements [BIS], which is, I think, a very important organ of this whole supranational ...

Dr. Stuckelberger: ... which can take the property away from people or something like that. I'm not a specialist in that. But what I'm saying is that it's not only GAVI, it's a whole organized system. It's very interesting to look at the historical chronology. Because in 2009, was the first year of the implementation of this huge health security governance, and that's when Bill Gates started to sign things and started moving.

Reiner Fuellmich: And that's how – we just learned about these public-private partnerships. I mean, I've known for a long time that this exists, but from what Frau Behrendt told us, it becomes very clear that the private part of this public-private relationship, has taken over control. And not only have they taken over control, they're immune from everything. They're not responsible for anything. This has got to stop.

Dr. Stuckelberger: I'm wondering what is the role of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and of the Commission of Human Rights here. Because they are very interested – I made a manifesto. I can give it to you, from Stockholm – that was the aim, where I'm asking for a survey where they have to go make order in everything, we have to review everything in the United Nations. Because the United Nations has been brought into this corporate agency, I have no doubt. They have not done anything since the beginning of this Covid.

---

<sup>2</sup> Rules of diplomatic immunity are set out in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 ([https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/9\\_1\\_1961.pdf](https://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/9_1_1961.pdf)). It has been adopted by almost all States in the world. There are two types of diplomatic immunity under the Vienna Convention. The first one, personal diplomatic immunity, protects certain mission members irrespective of the nature of the act performed. The second one, diplomatic immunity *ratione materiae*, however, only protects official acts performed by a mission member. PhD thesis available at <https://era.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1842/33152/Shi2018.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.



Reiner Fuellmich: Yes, I know. Well, we've seen a few statements from individuals that are members of the United Nations or work for the United Nations, which looked encouraging, but you're right. There's nothing, no official action, just like we've seen nothing from the churches. No official action that would have told the population that there is help, that there's another way of doing this, that they would step in to stop the most egregious activities of these criminals. This is a very clear picture now. We are dealing with a bunch of criminals. But we've seen nothing from the United Nations. So that's another one of those organizations that we really seriously need to think about. Do we need them?

Dr. Stuckelberger: They actually are meeting this week, until 31 March. And I would really suggest that you write to the High Commissioner on Human Rights [Michelle Bachelet] very quickly and request really that things move, and that lawyers take a hand on this, because ...

Reiner Fuellmich: We will, we will. We've spoken with human rights lawyers last night, and we are in the process. They've prepared something for us and we just have to read it. We have so much stuff to read.

Dr. Stuckelberger: You saw the statement of the [UN] Secretary-General, that there is massive human rights violation, and that the United Nations has to take care of it.<sup>3</sup>

Reiner Fuellmich: OK, very good.

Dr. Stuckelberger: He said it two days ago. I posted it on my Facebook right away. But 50% good, 50% he's promoting the vaccine. So my hypothesis is that he's changing but he cannot change completely, otherwise they will put him out or something. Because he has had a discussion with Pompeo a month ago or two months ago, so there are some signs that he is a good guy but he cannot move on.

Reiner Fuellmich: OK, good to know. Frau Stuckelberger, we are in a little bit of a bind because our next guest has only so much time. Is there something else that we need to know?

Dr. Stuckelberger: I'll tell you very quickly, then. I can send you an article from David Fidler, who's a lawyer who has written an article "From International Sanitary Conventions to Global Health Security".<sup>4</sup> He was very worried about the international health regulation when he wrote this, saying it is becoming a global governance. So I think that would clarify some things, too. The second is that you have to see very clearly that the change of definitions of two major things in this pandemic that justifies this international emergency declaration from all the countries is mortality and the

---

<sup>3</sup> Possibly a reference to this speech: António Guterres : l'impact de la Covid-19 sur les droits civils & politiques. 22 February 2021. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sl44H4X7eZ0>.

<sup>4</sup> Fidler, David P., "From International Sanitary Conventions to Global Health Security: The New International Health Regulations" (2005). Articles by Maurer Faculty. 397. <https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/facpub/397> Abstract: "In May 2005, the World Health Organization adopted the new International Health Regulations (IHR), which constitute one of the most radical and far-reaching changes to international law on public health since the beginning of international health cooperation in the mid-nineteenth century. This article comprehensively analyses the new IHR by examining the history of international law on infectious disease control, the IHR revision process, the substantive changes contained in the new IHR and concerns regarding the future of the new IHR. The article demonstrates why the new IHR constitute a seminal event in the relationship between international law and public health and send messages about how human societies should govern their vulnerabilities to serious, acute disease events in the twenty-first century."



number of cases that are sick. But it's not only that. They are taking definitions that they changed in 2009. Two things, very important: the pandemic definition changed from being the number of cases abnormally high in deaths and in disease, to “Oh, there are diseases that are spreading all over the world”. They changed in 2009.

Reiner Fuellmich: The definition originally existed of three elements, one is that there's a worldwide disease, that there a high number of abnormally or enormously high number of very sick people, and an enormously high number of deaths. And they have cut out the last two, and now the only requirement is that we have a worldwide disease. And that means that any flu can be turned into a pandemic. Actually, any cold can be turned into a pandemic. Yeah.

Dr. Stuckelberger: And it comes from WHO. And I think when Bill Gates started to change, with his crowd, the definitions, what we just talked about, the immunity, everything. The other one, you know they changed the definition of immunity, right?<sup>5</sup> So now the only immunity is vaccines ...

Reiner Fuellmich: [in German] *Yes, that is very important and this is something that we also want to talk about, the WHO ...* And this is probably no coincidence, because this happened in 2009 and that's when Bill Gates appeared in the picture, right?

Dr. Stuckelberger: Yes. The definition ... but immunity is very recent.

Reiner Fuellmich: Yes, but he's still there.

Dr. Stuckelberger: And the last small thing, very rapid. I'm sure that you saw that WHO has issued twice now, on 7 December and 20 January, a medical alert to a product called PCR. It is written in small [letters] ... that it is an alert. So it is intentionally criminal to say “Alert: this PCR does not work” with the CTs [threshold cycles] – you have to find the CTs, and to not say [if you do not also say] “Stop!”<sup>6</sup>

Reiner Fuellmich: I didn't know that.

Dr. Stuckelberger: Oh, ok.

Reiner Fuellmich: They have an official alert meaning you can't use PCR test to detect infections, and at the same time they're still pushing the PCR test as the only means, or the best means, to detect infections. That is very interesting to know. OK.

Dr. Stuckelberger: And it's intentional. Because they say in the recommendation, “You have to ask for the CT when you do the PCR”, that in fact I can give you the

---

<sup>5</sup> “WHO Deletes Naturally Acquired Immunity from Its Website.” 23 December 2020. <https://www.aier.org/article/who-deletes-naturally-acquired-immunity-from-its-website/?fbclid=IwAR00KsN8TaJHbjWslqgkUtPPZ3ZWpmdWN11lfpsAIWiYrU56-ddMSeHw> Excerpt: “*In effect, this change at WHO ignores and even wipes out 100 years of medical advances in virology, immunology, and epidemiology. It is thoroughly unscientific – shilling for the vaccine industry in exactly the way the conspiracy theorists say that WHO has been doing since the beginning of this pandemic.*”

<sup>6</sup> “WHO (finally) admits PCR tests create false positives.” 18 December 2020. *Warnings concerning high CT value of tests are months too late ... so why are they appearing now? The potential explanation is shockingly cynical.* <https://off-guardian.org/2020/12/18/who-finally-admits-pcr-tests-create-false-positives/>

reference and you can look. Because this is a key. They are intentionally putting a small alert. They are delaying the time and they are not saying "Stop it".

Reiner Fuellmich: OK. Wow! I think we've pretty much covered everything thus far. We're probably going to meet again, but I'm very grateful for you taking the time and being here with us today. Same with Frau Behrendt [continues in German] *I thank you both, Frau Stuckelberger and Frau Behrendt, that was extremely informative in areas we did not know anything about before.*

Dr. Stuckelberger: [in German] *I thank you, too, for your work. It is really important.*

Reiner Fuellmich: [in German] *We couldn't do it without people like you! See you!*

Dr. Stuckelberger & Dr. Behrendt: *Tschüss!*