

# Government by silent immobility: an effective ruling innovation developed by the globalists, capitalizing on natural human aversion to hard work, conflict and pain.

FOIA requests to Department of State re: delegation of authority for treaty negotiation and ratification.



Katherine Watt 

Apr 4

 151

 96



[Orientation for new readers](#). [Reconstitution starter pack](#).

Following up on:

- March 30, 2023 - [Sen. Ron Johnson gets senators on record re: international contracts that enslave Americans to globalists through the World Health Organization and pharmaco-martial law](#).

and James Roguski reporting and analysis:

- May 21, 2022 - [Questions](#)
- March 14, 2023 - [Truth Bomb](#)

Below is a summary of Roguski's findings about the legal procedures used by delegates from member-states, to the World Health Organization World Health Assembly, to negotiate, adopt and trigger enforcement of

1. amendments to existing WHO International Health Regulations (IHR), which is classified by WHO as a "[legally-binding instrument of international law](#);" and
2. a proposed, new "pandemic treaty"

## Amendments to WHO International Health Regulations

Under the IHR amendment process, the **default** position is that amendments adopted by "consensus" at the World Health Assembly each May are automatically enforceable in each member state 24 months later.

A nation-state government can act to block the enforceability after the World Health Assembly meeting concludes and the delegates go home.

But if the nation-state government doesn't do anything — if the executive, legislature and courts remain silent and immobile — the amendments go into force.

Consensus means without voice, roll call, or any other formal delegate vote. The amendments are passed by the simple mechanism of nobody objecting for a few minutes after someone introduces a resolution on the floor of the assembly.

WHO officials and/or each country delegation then must formally notify the federal executives and legislatures that the amendments have been adopted; that the nation-state government has 18 months to file a rejection letter; and that if the rejection letter isn't written and sent, the amendments will enter into force in 24 months.

In other words, IHR amendments adopted this way automatically go into force in all the WHO member countries 24 months after the WHA acts, *unless* within 18 months of being notified about the amendments, any individual government moves, speaks and sends a letter saying "No, we don't agree to this."

- [1946 WHO Constitution](#)
- [2005 WHO International Health Regulations](#)

Article 59, Paragraph 3 of the IHR of 2005 informs each WHO member-state of its obligations — under Article 22 of the WHO Constitution — to “**adjust its domestic legislative and administrative arrangements** fully with these regulations within the period set out in paragraph 2 of this article” — currently 24 months.

Article 59, Paragraph 3 informs member-states that **failure to adjust** domestic legislation and regulations by the deadline, requires the member-state to “submit within the period

specified in paragraph 1 of this Article [18 months] a declaration to the Director-General regarding the outstanding adjustments and achieve them no later than 12 months after the entry into force of these regulations for that State party.”

The WHO Constitution and International Health Regulations created and now keep in place the **global kill box** and the **American statutory and regulatory framework**, through the criminal complicity and nonfeasance of Congress, US Presidents, Cabinet secretaries, state governments, and federal and state courts.

The United States delegation to WHO led the most recent round of amendments, which were submitted by HHS Assistant Secretary Loyce Pace to the United Nations/World Health Organization on **Jan. 18, 2022**.

On **Jan. 20, 2022**, WHO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus transmitted the US-proposed amendments, as “Provisional agenda item 16.2,” to each WHA member-state delegation for initial review.

On **April 12, 2022**, Tedros submitted the US-proposed amendments to the WHA delegates for consideration at the late May 2022 meeting in Geneva.

On **May 24, 2022**, the delegations from the US, UK, EU, Australia, Japan and several other member-states formally circulated the US-proposed amendments to the World Health Assembly as a draft resolution.

On **May 27, 2022**, the World Health Assembly “adopted” the resolution through the consensus process outlined above, which requires no recorded votes, simply the absence of formal objections.

Two of the US-proposed, WHA-adopted amendments will reduce the time windows between WHA adoption and automatic enforcement at the nation-state level.

Effective May 27, 2024, *unless* countries individually reject the amendments by 18 months from May 27, 2022 (by Nov. 27, 2023) — any subsequent amendment packages, will go into force 12 months from “consensus” adoption at World Health Assembly (down from 24

months), *unless* countries send letters of rejection within 10 months of the consensus adoption (down from 18 months).

**Currently, to the extent that the WHO governmental procedures are construed as legitimate by nation-state governments, no Senate or Parliament, or President/Prime Minister, or health secretary anywhere in the world has an opportunity or an obligation, to review, debate, vote on, formally ratify or put his or her signature on any IHR amendments.**

**By default, any amendments passed by consensus at a WHA meeting become enforceable in all the member-states 24 months later.**

## Treaties

Treaties, such as the proposed "pandemic treaty," sole-executive agreements, and other international contracts, are subject to a different set of negotiation, adoption and ratification procedures at the member-state and World Health Assembly levels.

In the United States, Roguski has found, international agreements are governed by State Department regulations about notification to the State Department that someone wants to negotiate a treaty and what the content of the treaty is about, so that the State Department can conduct legal review of the contract; classify it as subject to or exempt from Senate ratification, and/or other contract types; and then issue a formal pre-authorization letter to the negotiator, to go ahead and negotiate.

Roguski has looked for State Department legal review documents, treaty classification reports, authorization documents, and Federal Register notices addressing the "delegation of authority" for individuals claiming to represent the United State Government, to negotiate or cast WHA votes.

He's looked for those documents relating to *both* amendments to the 2005 International Health Regulations — which he argues pose the primary threat to the world's people, and relating to a new pandemic treaty which he believes is mostly a decoy to keep public

relating to a new pandemic treaty, which he believes is mostly a decoy to keep public attention away from the IHR amendment process.

He has not located any such documents or authorizations.

It's possible that none of the required legal reviews, legal classifications, delegations of authority, notifications to Congress, Senate ratifications and other procedures have been conducted, potentially voiding the 2005 IHR amendments, the May 2022 IHR amendments, the planned May 2023 IHR amendments, and the proposed "pandemic treaty."

It's also possible that there is a collection of pertinent records that will come to light to render the US Government's acts pseudo-legal and on-paper compliant with pseudo-laws whose sole purpose is to prevent Americans from understanding that criminals pretending to be US Government officials are engaged in a global war to control, injure, sicken, impoverish and kill billions of people.

It's important to note that, because the US delegation is the source of the May 27, 2022 amendments to the 2005 International Health Regulations, the odds of the same delegates, or the President, sending a rejection letter to reject those amendments, are very small.

The odds go up if social and political pressure continues to build, pushing more members of Congress and federal judges to overcome their default setting of silence and immobility, and choose to deal with the Constitutional crisis in a loud, confrontational way instead.


I filed a FOIA request to Department of State, requesting (paraphrased):

1. ...All **notifications** sent from WHO to US Government officials, announcing the **May 27, 2022 World Health Assembly adoption of amendments to the 2005 IHR**; and informing the US Government of its right, under Article 22 of the WHO Constitution and Article 61 of the 2005 IHR, to formally reject amendments.
2. All notification sent by US Government officials, to the WHO, pertaining to **US rejection or reservation** of the May 27, 2022 IHR amendments... between May 27, 2022 and the present.

3. All notifications sent by any **non-US** government officials (any WHO member-state other than the United States) to the WHO, pertaining to **rejection or reservation** of the May 27, 2022 IHR amendments.
4. All **legal reviews** conducted by the Department of State Office of the Legal Advisor... **classifying adopted and/or pending IHR amendments** under statutes and regulations governing negotiation, review and ratification procedures for "treaties," "international agreements other than treaties," and "sole executive agreements" including but not limited to 1 USC 112a, 1 USC 112b, 22 CFR 181, 11 FAM 720 et seq., and Department Circular 175 of 1955, between Jan. 1, 2000 and the present.
5. All **legal reviews** conducted by the Department of State Office of the Legal Advisor, **classifying adopted and/or pending "pandemic treaties"** under statutes and regulations governing negotiation, review and ratification procedures for "treaties," "international agreements other than treaties," and "sole executive agreements" including but not limited to 1 USC 112a, 1 USC 112b, 22 CFR 181, 11 FAM 720 et seq., and Department Circular 175 of 1955, between Jan. 1, 2000 and the present.
6. All authorizations and/or related **delegation of authority documents** authorizing any individual to represent the United States during treaty and/or treaty amendment negotiation and adoption proceedings at the World Health Assembly of the World Health Organization, between Jan. 1, 2000 and the present.
7. All **notices published in the Federal Register**, regarding "**delegation of authority**" for negotiation of "treaties," "international agreements other than treaties," and "sole executive agreements," between Jan. 1, 2000 and the present.
8. All **notices submitted to members of Congress**, informing them of drafts and/or negotiations for pending, ongoing or adopted IHR amendments and/or "pandemic treaties," under 11 FAM 725.1 and related statutes, regulations and guidance documents, between Jan. 1, 2000 and the present.








The Last Supper. Painting by Leonardo da Vinci.

## 96 Comments



Robert Kernodle Apr 5 📌 Pinned

The phrase, "become enforceable" is a passive construction with no subject, and so my question is EXACTLY what entity or agency or person/people does the actual enforcing? Somebody has to DO the enforcing -- who exactly would that be? What form would the "enforcing" take? What would be the consequences of just refusing? --Exactly what entity or agency is going to come after you? What would the REAL consequences be? I doubt that agents or soldiers from the United Nations would come after leaders of the countries that just ignored it all. Or am I wrong here?

♡ LIKE (1)    💬 REPLY    ...

1 reply by Katherine Watt



ronvrooman Writes Ron's Newsletter Apr 4

Talk talk talk. Please consider taking additional action such as: May I have a discussion about Article III, the one supreme Court claiming original jurisdiction? Where a man can find remedy against the state, Constitutionally! Have you ever attempted to locate that court? Mookini 303 declares any court whose name begins with the United States is not an Article III court. That is all of them the de facto has to offer.

An Article III one supreme Court claiming original jurisdiction is found in Amendment VII whose jury verdict has no appeal in law.

There is The United States of America stiled in the Confederation and perpetual Union's articles, their Constitution created the United States of Washington District of Columbia a management service government unincorporated with 23 enumerated responsibilities. It has been usurped by martial law/Lieber code/FEMA a color of law, de facto, incorporated governance, illegal or illegitimate; bankrupt US Inc in some form since March 1861. Except on Oregon. There a two legal and lawful names The United States of America and the United States. Any other iteration of the name such as United States of America is fraud or deception or ignorance. In any case not true. The last lawful iteration was 1859. When Oregon became one of the several states in our Union. All previous iterations are artifacts just as it was designed.

"Natural rights inherent in people. We declare that all men, when they form a social compact are equal in right: that all power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness; and they have at all times a right to alter, reform, or abolish the government in such manner as they may think proper. —"

 LIKE (18)  REPLY ...

21 replies

94 more comments...



