

(Name)  
(Address)  
Tel: ( )  
Email: ( )

Dated: [date]:

For the attention of (Name of your MP)  
(Address of MP)

Dear [MP's Name]

I have been watching developments surrounding the Covid19 issues and in particular the vaccine passport question and have previously kept my own counsel but now I am moved to write to you because I am getting increasingly concerned with the developments surrounding 'vaccine passports' and the government's attempts at imposing illegal conditions upon the people of Britain.

I am fully aware that nothing has yet been decided in law and most of what I read and hear in the press and on main stream media is merely talk and suggestions/discussions regarding the 'domestic vaccine passport' issue.

I would like to share one or two thoughts with you and hear your own ideas on the subject and particularly to ask if you are happy with our government breaking international human rights laws in an attempt to enforce their narrative?

The subject of the domestic passports will affect how people are able to access normal services, shops, cinemas, transport etc. and will also prevent international travel if the individual has not been vaccinated using an untested, unproven cocktail of drugs.

First to highlight a few issues with the vaccination itself that I urge you to consider whilst reading this document.

### **The Experimental Covid19 Vaccination**

Firstly, this is not legally a vaccination definition, it is experimental Gene Therapy that is in stage three of its testing procedure (mass testing), which is due to end in 2023, and uses mRNA technology that has never been used on human subjects. It is ONLY licenced for emergency use and is not licenced for general marketing. To further highlight the implications of this, please consider the following details:

- There is no accurate test data to support safe use of the 'vaccine' alongside other prescribed medication that a patient may be required to take for their continued healthcare because this subject has not yet been tested.
- There is no accurate time related test data explaining the long term effects of taking the vaccine on any demographic group, again because no tests are possible given the development time of the vaccine.
- Fast tracking of time trials is simply not possible
- There is no accurate test data that gives results of applying the vaccine to vulnerable demographic groups as it was only ever given preliminary tests on fit and healthy subjects.
- There is no test data proving that the vaccine is capable of stopping transmission of the virus

- There is no test data proving that the vaccine is capable of stopping infection of the virus
- There is no accurate test data to show the effect the vaccine has on children or young people, again simply because it has not yet been tested on these groups.

In fact Ruud Dobber - an Astra Zeneca Executive expresses his concerns to questions regarding indemnifying the vaccine that his company has developed and distributed and has quoted the following thoughts on the matter.

---

"This is a unique situation where we as a company simply cannot take the risk if in ....four years, the vaccine is showing side effects"

Ruud Dobber

source: <http://www.Reuters.com/article/us-astrazeneca-results-vaccine-liability-idUSKCN24V2EN>

Clearly this demonstrates that Astra Zeneca have not tested the product to any prescribed protocol and equally, they have no idea of any potential side effects, lethal or otherwise over any time period because it has only been developed in the last 6-9 months.

In fact every other vaccine developed has been fully tested, with all such effects or reactions researched and documented before being licenced. The information within these documents being offered as part of the 'informed consent package' to patients who may be considering the appropriate preventative treatment.

In fact every other vaccine without exception has been tested to this level with the obvious exception of any variant of the Covid vaccines. Could you explain why this is acceptable, could you also explain, considering the above listed facts, where the safety of this vaccine has been proven?

It may be of interest to note that the swine flu vaccine was actually regarded as unreliable because it had only taken three years to develop and bring to market, the usual time being somewhere between five and ten years to full development and testing of a typical vaccine development life cycle and yet the Covid vaccine has only taken somewhere between six to nine months in its development cycle and this is being declared as safe. Interestingly, this is not borne out in the licencing details which clearly states that it is licenced for emergency use only and not for marketing because of the limited testing it has been subjected to and further testing is needed to confirm safety and efficacy.

There are alternative treatments available, that are further down the testing route and that has been proven to be 98% effective in 1 to 11 days after treatment with a proven track record in patient safety.

<https://www.drugs.com/medical-answers/ivermectin-treat-covid-19-coronavirus-3535912/>

Therefore there is no emergency situation that would require the use of the Covid vaccine.

There are many other breaches of protocol surrounding 'informed consent' and information being offered to patients when considering the experimental Covid vaccine. This is discussed later in this document

This lack of information, has serious implications when considering the question of consent without

being given adequate information to make such a informed consent decision. This last point has major consequences when examining our human rights issues.

In short the vaccine does not stop infection or transmission of the virus, only offering a slight decrease in symptoms but in doing so exposes the patient significant risks from known and unknown side effects but this information is also being withheld from the general public despite it being essential information in forming part of the 'informed consent' required when considering treatment.

The vaccine does however, offer many recorded side effects that can be scrutinised by examination of the UK Yellow Card reporting system and the VAERS (vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System). Both links included below.

<https://vaers.hhs.gov/data.html>

<https://yellowcard.mhra.gov.uk/>

The practice being used at the moment to administer the vaccines is a direct breach of our human rights by not giving all available information to enable the patient to make a decision based on all information being made available to them and so are unable to give informed consent. This is in direct conflict with Article 6.1 of the UNESCO (bioethics human rights) statement and so is therefore illegal in its application.

### **2005 UNESCO(bioethics Human rights) statement**

[http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=31058&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31058&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

The 2005 UNESCO(bioethics Human rights) statement is a statement, largely but not exclusively based on the Nuremberg code, created in 1947 to protect humans from being the subject of torture and treatment that had been witnessed by the allied forces when investigating Nazi atrocities during and by the end of world war 2 (1939 -1945). The Nuremberg code, never having been made law in any country remains as a document of reference to these times.

The **2005 UNESCO(bioethics Human rights)** statement is required to be integrated into the laws of every member state, of which the UK is a full member and so the statement is active within the legal structure of the UK and at this present time is law.

It cannot be removed or changed by any single state, providing protection from individual governments who may try to ignore or circumnavigate these laws.

I would like to draw your attention to article 6 of the statement (repeated below for clarity)

=====

### **Article 6 – Consent**

1. Any preventive, diagnostic and therapeutic medical intervention is only to be carried out with the prior, free and informed consent of the person concerned, based on adequate information. The consent should, where appropriate, be express and may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason without disadvantage or prejudice.

2. Scientific research should only be carried out with the prior, free, express and informed consent of the person concerned. The information should be adequate, provided in a comprehensible form

and should include modalities for withdrawal of consent. Consent may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason without any disadvantage or prejudice. Exceptions to this principle should be made only in accordance with ethical and legal standards adopted by States, consistent with the principles and provisions set out in this Declaration, in particular in Article 27, and international human rights law.

3. In appropriate cases of research carried out on a group of persons or a community, additional agreement of the legal representatives of the group or community concerned may be sought. In no case should a collective community agreement or the consent of a community leader or other authority substitute for an individual's informed consent.

---

Looking at article 6.1 it is clear that any preventative medical intervention (Covid19 vaccine) can only be carried out with the consent of the person concerned. We also learn that the person concerned must be given adequate information to make an informed decision regarding consent (discussed above). In the same paragraph, the article states that consent is to be expressed and that it can be withdrawn at any time without disadvantage or prejudice

### **Vaccine passports**

We have established that the vaccine cannot ever be a mandatory procedure as per article 6.1 of the statement, Informed consent must also be expressly given by the person involved who has to be given adequate information with which would enable that person to make an informed decision.

**It is equally clear that if preventative treatment is refused, the person removing consent can not be disadvantaged or prejudiced because of this decision.**

Although terms for such a vaccine passport have not been finalised, I would point out that ANY restriction of services, amenities, shops, cinemas, travel (domestic or otherwise) being imposed by not holding a so called vaccine passport, breaches our human rights by imposing disadvantage or prejudice based on a refusal or withdrawal of consent and is therefore illegal.

I would now draw your attention to article 3 of the statement, again reproduced below for clarity.

---

### **Article 3 – Human dignity and human rights**

1. Human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms are to be fully respected.
  2. The interests and welfare of the individual should have priority over the sole interest of science or society.
- 

This clearly states that our human rights and fundamental freedoms are to be fully respected and that the interests and welfare of the individual has priority over the sole interest of science and society. Therefore an argument cannot be suggested that says because of the 'pandemic' individual human rights can be breached.

**A vaccine passport would clearly breach the human rights of those who had not received a vaccination for whatever reason.**

Please also take time to look at article 14.2 (a)(b)(c)(d)(e) of the statement

---

### **Article 14 – Social responsibility and health**

1. The promotion of health and social development for their people is a central purpose of

governments that all sectors of society share.

2. Taking into account that the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition, progress in science and technology should advance:

(a) access to quality health care and essential medicines, especially for the health of women and children, because health is essential to life itself and must be considered to be a social and human good;

(b) access to adequate nutrition and water;

(c) improvement of living conditions and the environment;

(d) elimination of the marginalization and the exclusion of persons on the basis of any grounds;

(e) reduction of poverty and illiteracy.

---

**In each case, the introduction of a vaccine passport would breach article 14.2 (a-e) in one way or another. Medical treatment is already being denied without having a Covid 19 test and/or vaccine.**

The vaccine passport is clearly a breach of the following articles and subsections of the article, meaning that this is an illegal act :

- Article 14.2(a) Already healthcare has virtually stopped for anything other than covid19 despite the article expressly stating that a person has the right to access quality healthcare and to essential medicines. By demanding that patients are tested or vaccinated before healthcare is administered is a clear breach of article 14.2(a). An introduction of a vaccine passport would add serious and illegal consequences to receiving or being refused healthcare based on the vaccine passport alone.
- Article 14(b) would be a direct result of not being allowed to buy food, or nutrition based on a refusal to allow an unvaccinated person into a shop or other retail establishment based on the vaccine passport alone.
- Article 14.2(d) by creating a marginalised society based on vaccinated or unvaccinated persons being treated differently creates an illegal act breaching this article
- Article 14.2(e) A person not in possession of a vaccination passport would have limited access to employment, where under coercion from the UK government employers are now demanding that employees are tested/vaccinated even if no symptoms of Covid exists and are illegally demanding a vaccine passport as part of the employment contract, thus specifically breaching the reduction in poverty clause.

**[name of recipient]. Based on the 2005 UNESCO(bioethics human rights) laws that are enshrined into the UK legal system, I am now asking you as my elected Member of Parliament to address these issues using all of your powers of persuasion to highlight this illegal act of the government (highlighted above) and to oppose such illegal and unconstitutional measures such as these vaccine passports that our government are attempting to introduce with all their might.**

**Yours sincerely**

**[name]**