

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

January 15, 2023

RE: Primary Vulnerable Stakeholder Comment Regarding IHRRC Submission On The Proposed IHR Amendments

Notice to Principle is Notice To Agent. Almost 2 months ago Interest Of Justice filed official charges and the W.H.O. has failed to reply. We also sent a W.H.O. freedom of information request for the contact information to the WGIHR, and all delegates with no response thus far. Please ensure all intended recipients are in receipt of this legal notice and demand because we are unable to obtain all the emails and contact information at this time.

To: Director General, IHRRC, WGIHR, WHA and Delegates.

Dear Friends,

Our organization **Interest of Justice is considered a “relevant” and “interested” stakeholder by the INB**, which they say in this context includes non-State actors with a demonstrable interest in pandemic preparedness and responses, such as: international organizations; civil society organizations; private sector organizations; philanthropic organizations; scientific, medical and public policy institutions; academic institutions; and other such **entities that have relevant knowledge, experience and/or expertise related to pandemic preparedness and response to share.**

We claim our organization is systematically being excluded from meaningful participation by the WHO, and as a result we are being denied our right to communicate with international organizations as we are asserting our responsibility, duty and obligation to defend human rights.

On the basis of our mandate, mission and responsibility, we wish to point out the following:

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

It has come to our attention there are certain ideas & proposals to amend the IHR circulating within the World Health Organisation:

It is our understanding that the proposed amendments would:

1. Change the overall nature of the World Health Organization from an advisory organization that merely makes recommendations to a governing body whose proclamations would be legally-binding. (Article 1). This would create an unacceptable imbalance of power detrimental to health.
2. Greatly expand the scope of the International Health Regulations to include scenarios that merely have a *“potential to impact public health.”* This is a hypothetical and conjectured potentiality of danger or impact to public health, rather than a real and concrete danger required for public health interventions. The vague nature of the language is void for vagueness and therefore PROHIBITED under common law norms and customary law.
3. Seek to remove *“respect for dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms of people.”* Which are legally significant words, and supplant them with arbitrary unilaterally defined words that may conflict with member states definitions and health policy in violation of Article 3(4) (Article 3). This is tantamount to war on humanity and is disrespectful of the trust placed by humanity in the WHO to safeguard public health in the context of human rights.
4. Give the Director General of the WHO control over the means of production through an *“allocation plan for health products”* to require developed states parties to supply pandemic response products as directed. (Article 13A). This is Fascism, unsustainable, overly burdensome

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

and akin to slavery of member states (slavery is legally defined as “being under the will of another”).

5. Give the WHO the authority to require medical examinations, proof of prophylaxis, proof of vaccine and to implement contact tracing, quarantine and TREATMENT. (Article 18).

6. Institute a system of global health certificates in digital or paper format, including test certificates, vaccine certificates, prophylaxis certificates, recovery certificates, passenger locator forms and a traveller’s health declaration. (Articles 18, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36 and 44 and Annexes 6, 7 and 8)

7. Redirect unspecified billions of dollars to the Pharmaceutical Funders of the WHO in a great appearance of conflict of interest, with no accountability. (Article 44A)

8. Allow the disclosure of personal health data in violation of human rights norms and member states constitutions. (Article 45). This is where WHO’s constitutional mission to control all global health data conflicts with member states constitutions promising to protect private data from global monopolies, seeking to control private data, such as the WHO.

9. Greatly expand the World Health Organization’s capacity to censor what they unilaterally consider to be mis-information and dis-information. (Annex 1, page 36) It cannot be overstated that the ‘Trusted News Initiative’ and UN’s ‘program to combat misinformation and *rumors* are not in conformity with law and as applied ubiquitously worldwide, is a clear overreach and violation of the UN charter and international Human Rights norms. The use of the term “*in*

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

conformity with the law” in Article 21 of the ICCPR, should not be interpreted to imply any lower standard of legality for limitations on the right of peaceful assembly than other limitations within the ICCPR. It should be the same standard that applies to interpreting the language of “*provided by law*” within Article 19 of the ICCPR, as elaborated in the Committee’s General Comment No. 34:[1] “For the purposes of paragraph 3, a norm, to be characterized as a “law”, must be formulated with sufficient precision to enable an individual to regulate his or her conduct accordingly and it must be made accessible to the public. A law may not confer unfettered discretion for the restriction of freedom of expression on those charged with its execution. Laws must provide sufficient guidance to those charged with their execution to enable them to ascertain what sorts of expression are properly restricted and what sorts are not.” The laws regarding ‘health misinformation’ do not describe what exact speech is defined as health misinformation, in order to: a) be able to challenge the validity of the science and law to know if its really true or false misinformation (with a final res judicata judgment) and b) to give due process to the people that WHO is applying global censorship to. As a result, the WHO-UN global censorship programs (‘Trusted News Initiative’ and UN’s ‘program to combat misinformation and rumors) that indisputably confers unfettered discretion for the restriction of freedom of expression on those charged with its execution is in violation of the legal order and absolutely null. Importantly, the creation and execution of the global UN-WHO ‘Trusted News Initiative’ and UN’s ‘program to combat misinformation and rumors should ultimately be determined to systematically deny human rights which is a national security threat in all nations. [1] HR Committee, General Comment No. 34 on Article 19: freedoms of opinion and expression, CCPR/C/GC/ 34, 12 September 2011; at

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

para. 25. Conclusion: The persecution and censorship of scientific debate and even peer reviewed studies being suppressed by the WHO is a systematic denial of the human right to equal treatment by design which is reinforcing a grave systemic violation of human rights, which is a vice or defect that negates the very motive, content and purpose for WHO's existence. We assert the IHR cannot be legitimately amended to expand the World Health Organization's capacity to censor what they unilaterally consider to be mis-information and dis-information. (Annex 1, page 36).

10. Create an obligation to build, provide and maintain IHR infrastructure at points of entry. (Annex 10). This places an unnecessary and undue burden on member states and requires a lengthy discussion of the foreseeable inherent structural defects.

The amendments to Articles 18, 23, 24, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36 and 44 and Annexes 6, 7 and 8 would create unprecedented intrusion into liberty and fundamental freedoms, human rights and autonomy. The contact tracing and vaccine passport schemes interfere with privacy and dignity, therefore, adopting these unnecessary, overly burdensome, disproportionate, unreasonable and tyrannical policies is tantamount to internationally wrongful acts and under the mandate of our organization they must not be allowed.

Removing respect for dignity human rights infernal freedoms is a grave error for the world health organization because it is impossible for you to do this and stay within your legal limits of authority.

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

Even the mere suggestion and attempt to remove respect for dignity and human rights violates your own stated mission in the WHO constitution and UN Charter.

No international public servant in your position has the right or authority to negotiate, propose or enact any of the aforesaid detrimental policies.

This open letter is to demand that you adhere to your duties and responsibilities, and a drawn from applying any further attempts to subvert the dignity, human rights, and fundamental freedoms of all of the people of earth. Furthermore, we demand that you abstain from your monopolistic attempts to subvert nationstate sovereign health policy by creating legal instruments and definitions which may conflict with national health policy intention is the use of unilaterally draft in terms of art and coercion of member states to agree, exceeds the authority granted to the international public servants that work at the world health organization.

It is our understanding that you have met in secret all week in order to negotiate these spurious amendments to the IHR with the intention to propose the final draft on Sunday, January 15, 2023. On and for the record, this is a formal protest and objection of all secret negotiations to design global public health policy by Interest Of Justice. We are acting on our own behalf and also on the behalf of the international community, as conscientious objectors who are also stakeholders as recognized by the INB with an interest in pandemic, preparedness and response.

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

We have written many times to meaningfully participate in the design of the pandemic treaty and IHR Amendments. We have demanded to be included on Annex E of the treaty negotiations, with no response. Our organization, as well as its vulnerable primary stakeholder members are treated with contempt and marginalized by the WHO, through non feasance, denying us right to meaningfully participate and communicate with the WHO in the design of all health policy which may affect us, including these proposed IHR amendments.

It is in the WHO's best interest to prevent any IHR Amendments which would remove respect for dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms, or allow for vaccine or climate passports, precisely because the WHO will be exceeding granted authority, breaching human rights obligations and clearly interfering with commerce which implies waiving sovereign immunity and accepting responsibility for serious breaches of internationally wrongful acts.

Under our mandate to hold you responsible and in compliance with international law and internal regulations, we demand that any intention to cooperate with any of the aforementioned efforts will be considered in strict violation of international law, and you will be held accountable for such acts.

We do not accept the WHO's illegitimate authority in this matter because they are clearly attempting to change customary law. Jus cogens norms do not allow this unnecessary oppression and disrespect to the balance of rule of law, dignity of man and human rights norms. The proposals if enacted, pose a serious threat by disrespect and cause unnecessary limitations and derogations to the fundamental freedoms of man and human rights.

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

Frankly, the vaccine passports and other undignified proposals are obscene, outrageous and unconscionable, as well as void. We demand the INB, IHRRC, WGIHR, WHO and favored stakeholders that are invited to participate in these secret negotiations stay within their legal and moral limits. This means the international law and WHO's prior obligations to protect respect for human rights requires that you do not amend the IHR in such fundamental ways, at this time, without meaningful public participation and lengthy debate, first proving the necessity, proportionality and legality.

It is important to note that under international law and the WHO constitution, at no time will it ever be acceptable to cross out respect for dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms in the IHR or a treaty. In our opinion, it reflects very badly upon the WHO, the mere suggestion that this idea was even entertained and negotiated in secret. Judging by the public response the WHO has lost a lot of credibility with this outrageous attempt to oppress people using international legal instruments to increase power not conferred by law, and to use as a weapon to strip humanity of dignity.

Interest of Justice not only protests and objects to the secret negotiations and spurious proposed IHR amendments, we condemn them as internationally wrongful acts which the WHO is responsible for, if actually submitted, proposed and adopted.

CIVICS AND LAW
MONITORING COMMITTEE

Thank you for your prompt assistance in this serious matter and appreciate your help working with us.

Respectfully,

Dustin Bryce,

Interest Of Justice,



Dustin Bryce As Rights Recovers



Law and Civics Oversight Committee

www.interestofjustice.org

Mailing address- contact@interestofjustice.org

Telephone# 323-244-2960