

June 20, 2024

Hon. Ron Johnson
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Johnson:

We are writing to thank you for your extraordinary leadership in opposing efforts being made by the Biden administration and other globalists to surrender our national sovereignty, states rights and personal freedoms in the name of advancing “global governance.” Your commitment to the oath you swore to support and defend our Constitution is an inspiration – and indispensable to the fight to stave off the very real threats to that document and the Republic it established currently being posed by, among others, the World Health Organization (WHO).

As you know, your successful efforts to that end to enlist all forty-eight of your Republican colleagues in the U.S. Senate contributed materially to the WHO’s decision to postpone negotiations aimed at foisting upon us a deeply problematic, so-called “Pandemic Agreement.” Those talks are scheduled to resume, however, on July 17th.

Worse yet, the World Health Assembly did manage to finalize what amounts to another treaty amending the organization’s existing International Health Regulations (IHRs). While concerns expressed by you and your Senate colleagues – along with twenty-four of our states’ governors and twenty-two attorneys general – contributed to the removal of a number of the worst of those amendments, this IHR treaty remains unacceptable for a number of reasons.

The most important of these is a provision that, in the words of constitutional legal expert Michael Farris, JD, LLM “requires every nation that has membership in the WHO’s World Health Assembly to appoint a ‘National IHR Authority’ – in essence a National Pandemic Czar – who is to be given the power to implement the WHO’s pandemic ‘regulations’ into domestic law. Moreover, the Regulations specify that national laws must be changed as needed to create this position.”

Mr. Farris goes on to note that:

In the WHO Constitution, which our Congress approved in 1948, it expressly gives the World Health Assembly the ability to make regulations for the control of pandemics. However, our ratification document contains a very important limitation. It says that this WHO Constitution was adopted with the express understanding that the United States can never be required by the WHO to change its national law.

The precise wording of [the joint resolution](#) reads as follows:

SEC. 5. In adopting this joint resolution, the Congress does so with the understanding that **nothing in the Constitution of the World Health Organization in any manner commits the United States to enact any specific legislative program regarding any matters referred to in said Constitution.**

Michael Farris also noted:

Indeed, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Arthur Vandenberg (R-MI), speaking on the floor of the Senate in 1947 assured a questioner: “The World Health Organization, under its constitution, has no authority except to recommend, and each member of the organization is free to accept or reject the recommendations.”

In addition, the treaty amending the International Health Regulations involves three other problematic undertakings we call the “Three M’s”:

- The IHR treaty commits the world’s nations to institute what amount to surveillance state apparatuses, ostensibly for the purpose of **monitoring** actual *or potential* “public health emergencies of international concern” (PHEICs).
- The IHR treaty also obliges member states to “address” **misinformation** and disinformation. The predictable effect would be to mandate the censoring and sanctioning of speech and other actions at odds with the WHO Director General’s declarations and prescriptions in response to PHEICs. And,
- The IHR treaty entails open-ended commitments of **money** to the WHO and its activities.

Finally, a further consideration argues for the rejection of this accord: The WHO’s Director General, Tedros Ghebreyesus, secured the approval of the International Health Regulations treaty *illegally*. Under those regulations’ own Article 55.2, member states are sensibly to be afforded “**at least four months**” to inspect and consider any amendments to the IHR.

On June 1st, they were not even given four *hours* to examine the final version of the treaty. They effectively rubber-stamped it at the last possible moment via a “consensus” that belied objections – both substantive and procedural – subsequently expressed by a number of nations.

This sets an unacceptable precedent for future amendments that would make the WHO and its Director General even more of a threat to our sovereignty and freedoms. It surely emboldens the negotiators of the Pandemic treaty to do the same.

Accordingly, we urge you and every one of your colleagues – Republicans, Democrats and Independents alike – to insist upon the submission of this insidious, anti-constitutional accord to the U.S. Senate for its early consideration *and rejection*. While the Senate has not insisted on that process for previous amendments to the International Health Regulation, in light of the aforementioned, acute problems with this set, we believe that they can only be constitutionally addressed as a treaty requiring the approval of two-thirds of the body.

Sincerely,



Frank Gaffney
Co-Founder, Sovereignty Coalition



Reggie Littlejohn
Co-Founder, Sovereignty Coalition