



10 June. 2025

The consultation trick game

How to forge consent - legally

The summer of silent winking

The Federal Council has come up with something very special: it doesn't want to publish the report on the results of the IHR consultation (revision of the WHO's International Health Regulations) until the end of June 2025 - coincidentally just before Parliament leaves for its summer break. Some will then disappear somewhere between a swim in the Aare and a hiking hut, while others work on their sunburn with a piña colada in the Maldives. What remains: no debate.

The deadline is clear: an opting-out (objection) must be formally submitted by **July 19, 2025** if Switzerland does not want to commit itself under international law to transposing the new IHR into national law (i.e. the Epidemics Act). In plain language:

When the last parliamentarians have left the Federal Parliament, the drop has been sucked. **The Federal Council plays its hand - the people lose.**

The real scandal: No information on weighting

National Councillor Rémy Wyssmann wanted to know exactly: What criteria does the Federal Council intend to use to weight the consultation responses on the IHR amendments? His [interpellation 25.3132](#) of March 18, 2025 asks explicitly:

"What criteria will be used to weight the consultation responses on the IORP revision, especially if they diverge in their substantive assessment?"

The Federal Council's answer? Zero. No procedure. No scale. No scheme. Instead, a reference to the Consultation Act - and a meaningless sentence:

"The examination of the consultation results is carried out in accordance with the ordinary procedures under the Consultation Act (VIG, SR 172.061). The consultation report is submitted to the Federal Council and made available to the public. The comments are published on the website of the Federal Chancellery (Art. 9 para. 1 let. b VIG). In accordance with Article 8 VIG, the opinions are evaluated and weighted."

This means that the Federal Council reserves the right to decide for itself what counts and what does not. An invitation to arbitrariness - or to political weighting manipulation behind closed doors.

WIR say: That's not how it works.

If the Federal Council remains silent, we will take this opportunity to show how easy it is to bend the result - depending on who counts and how it is weighted. During the current summer session, we are shedding light on a procedure that otherwise remains in the shadows until it is too late.

Because weighted democracy is manipulable democracy - if no one is looking.

Model A: Weighting according to the Federal Council method

If the Federal Council does not say how it weighs things up, then we will disclose it - according to what political experience and previous procedures in the past suggest:

Example: 100 consultations received

- **20 WHO-related institutions, federal agencies, FOPH** → count for 60 %

- **30 Cantons and business associations** → count for 30 %
- **50 Critical organizations, lawyers, citizens, experts** → count for 10 %

Total: 100 % – r mathematically correct, democratically questionable.

Because: What is WHO-compliant, administration-friendly and close to the system is upgraded. What argues critically, independently and constitutionally is devalued.

For example, a three-page, well-founded article by a professor of constitutional law is given less attention than a two-page approval report by a cantonal health authority that works closely with the FOPH.

This is not a democratic evaluation, but a political pre-selection. Democracy as a simulation backdrop.

Model B: Weighting according to the WIR principle

The WIR association has looked at all consultation responses - not just by sender, but by content. And came up with its own weighting method:

100 consultation responses received - this is how WIR weights them:

- **30 well-founded legal or constitutional objections** → count for 70 %
- These include references to the Federal Constitution, the ECHR (European Convention on Human Rights), the Epidemics Act, human rights concerns and legally substantiated criticism.
- **40 Experience reports from practice and everyday life** → count for 20%
- Doctors, teachers, nursing staff and citizens speak here. What they say is often very specific - and highly relevant.
- **30 Opinion pieces without arguments** → count for 10%
- Opinions also count - but only if they are comprehensible.

Total: 100 % – democratically and honestly weighted.

This method gives a completely different picture:

- Proximity to federal agencies is not the deciding factor,
- but proximity to reality and the constitution.

Result: Clear majority against the IHR revision.

Two models, two realities:

A simple example calculation with 26 cantons

Hypothesis: 126 responses were received to the IGV consultation:

- 20 of 26 cantons say YES, 6 say NO
- 20 private individuals and lawyers say YES, 80 say NO

So: 40 votes in favor, 86 against

Model A: The Federal Council counts heads - but with different weights.

What counts here is not the content, but the sender.

- Each cantonal vote is heavily weighted (e.g. 3-fold)
- Votes from private individuals, on the other hand, are only weighted slightly or even reduced (e.g. 0.25 times)

This is how the Federal Council calculates (analogously):

Group	Number Weighting Effect		
Cantons YES	20	×3	60
Cantons NO	6	×3	18
Private YES	20	×1	20
Private NO	80	×0.25	20
Total YES			80
Total NO			38

Model B: The association WIR counts arguments

What counts here is the content - not the business card.

- Well-founded constitutional objections = ×3
- Experience reports = ×2
- Pure opinion = ×1

Group	Number Weighting Effect		
Cantons YES	20	×1	20
Cantons NO	6	×1	6
Private YES	20	×1	20
Private NO (80):			
→ 50 with experience	50	×2	100
→ 30 with critique	30	×3	90
Total YES			40
Total NO			196

Conclusion: What do we actually count?

People or opinions? Constitutions or business cards?

Model A feigns approval - through political weighting.

Model B shows the will of the people - through fairness of content.

This method gives a completely different picture:

- Proximity to federal agencies is not the deciding factor,
- but the proximity to reality and the constitution.

Result: A clear majority against the IHR revision.

Why this matters - and what to do now

Anyone who abuses weighting in order to cement politically predetermined results is engaging in democratic smoke and mirrors. The consultation process is not a PR tool, but a protective mechanism - against exactly what is happening now.

Therefore demand WIR:

- Disclosure of the weighting criteria by the Federal Council
- An independent evaluation of the consultations (and not by the FOPH)
- An IHR opt-out (objection) before July 19, 2025 - as the only logical consequence regardless of the results report

Because one thing is certain: the clock is ticking. The manipulation is underway. And Parliament is on the verge of allowing what is probably the most serious international treaty in years to go through by standing still and remaining silent, even though nothing less is at stake than our physical integrity, our freedom of choice and our democratic self-determination.

Déjà-vu with announcement

We all remember: contact bans. School closures. Visiting bans in nursing homes. Masks for children. Vaccination pressure at work. Digital certificates as a ticket to public life. Millions suffered. A few benefited. And in the end it was said: "We didn't know any better."

But now we know better. And what is the Federal Council doing?

It creates the basis for a system that not only copies measures, but cements them: global, mandatory, digitally enforced. No longer a temporary state of emergency, but a permanent emergency protocol at the touch of a button.

The IHR supplements are not a protective shield. They are the door opener for a permanent state of emergency. Anyone who has forgotten this has not understood anything. And anyone who ignores it is complicit.

But one thing is equally clear: WE will never take part in this again. Not with fear campaigns. Not with emergency law at the push of a button. Not with global obedience on demand. Because we have understood one thing: They rehearsed back then how far they could go - and we learned what form we would have to take next time. And that won't happen by singing and dancing around the Federal Constitution.