

Letter to [Member of Congress]

Dear [Name]

I am writing to express profound concern about the proposed amendments to the World Health Organization's International Health Regulations (IHR).

There has been much debate about whether the IHR amendments involve the US ceding sovereignty to the WHO.

Did you know that while the US will technically still be making our own decisions, the IHR amendments would oblige us to make sure that we decide whatever the WHO tells us we should decide?

While not technically a loss of sovereignty, this is most certainly agreeing to take directions from an offshore body, whose officials are not elected by or accountable to the American people.

I am most perplexed and extremely concerned as to why the US government would want to do this. We can certainly commit to considering advice from the WHO - that's what it's there for - but agreeing to abide by its binding recommendations in the event of a public health emergency is very disconcerting.

I am trying to understand how committing to complying with future binding "recommendations" from the WHO could be in the US's national interest.

So I am writing to ask you to carefully consider the following question:

In an emergency, should we:

A) Do what the Director General of the WHO determines is best for everyone globally,

or

B) Do what we determine to be in our national interest, which may or may not be following the WHO's recommendations?

If we opt for B it doesn't mean that our country is selfish or irresponsible. We can make our decisions carefully, weighing advice from the WHO and wherever else we feel appropriate. We can discern our moral and legal obligations as responsible global citizens before deciding on the best course of action for the US.

On the other hand, if we choose option A, we are committing to following the WHO's recommendations every time. This is what we would be signing up for, if we go along with the proposed IHR amendments.

Did you know that our congress does not need to pass any law to enable our advisory health bodies to follow the WHO's recommendations? So if our federal government intends to comply with the amended IHR, the framework is already in place for them to lead the US public health response in direct line with the WHO dictates, without the need for congressional debate or scrutiny and certainly without any need to pass legislation.

In conclusion, I would be most grateful to receive your considered response to the following question:

If an election was called on this issue today, would you be in support of option A or option B?

The current federal government appears to be fully in support of option A.

Which option do you support?

Your voice carries significant weight, and your decision on this matter will shape the democratic principles we hold dear. Silence, in this instance, may be construed as consent.

I sincerely hope you will stand against the amendments to the World Health Organization's International Health Regulations, aligning yourself with the people you represent and resisting the influence of unelected, unaccountable, international bureaucrats that these amendments appear designed to support.

Yours sincerely

[Name]