

Daniela Prousa, M.A. in Psychology (Dipl.-Psych.), Human Rights Defender
from Germany, meanwhile “fled to” Switzerland
via e-mail: [REDACTED]

To
Her Excellency
Ms. Michelle Bachelet Jeria
UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
via e-mail

OPEN LETTER, published on September 13, 2021:
PROFOUND THREAT TO OUR HUMAN RIGHTS, TO HISTORICAL ACHIEVEMENTS
AND TO SOCIAL PEACE through the Covid-19 Policy

Honourable High Commissioner, Ms. Bachelet Jeria,

After exhausting all more moderate means (legal actions in Germany, case at the ECtHR, 1-person-demonstration in front of your authority and others throughout July and much more) I am now writing this substantial letter to you personally.

For the sake of brevity, concision and appreciation of your competences, in the following I deliberately refrain from listing all possible sources of the partially presupposed knowledge.

I would like to ask you these seven questions in public:

1) When **the case numbers** of SARS-CoV-2-infectious people generated contrary to WHO regulations are reported aggravated by up to 80%, do you see any problem with this or not, with regard to the prohibition of arbitrariness, human rights, social peace, democracy and rule of law? (Sources: University Duisburg-Essen, WHO; see separate e-mail, first sent in July, sent again just now.)

2) The very significant Pandemic Preparedness Meeting “**Event 201**” in October 2019 was highly biased, with only representatives from the digital-technocratic, capitalist, pharma-investment and related research medicine sectors.

Natural medicine, nutritional medicine (inc. vitamins), psychology, psychosomatic and psychoneuroimmunology with its prophylactic possibilities were completely excluded.

This clearly led to the highly one-sided fixation on “**vaccines as the only solution**”.

It must be considered very anti-democratic.

Do you see any problem in this or not, regarding the choice of the mildest measures, a critical examination of the unilateral proposals and thus a human rights relevant benefit-harm balance in a larger context?

(And do you think that under the current undeniable high political pressure and one-sided vaccination-propaganda possible dangerous adverse effects of vaccination can be perceived without bias and officially registered without scruples, in nearly correct numbers? – To my knowledge this is not the case.)

3) Do you consider it a problem or not that **wide use of milder means has definitely not been exhausted** (such as gargling with sage, iodine solution, saline solution or potassium permanganate in order to reduce the potential viral load *as prophylaxis*; strengthening the immune system by vitamins C, D and zinc; taking magnesium to strengthen the blood vessels – Covid can be finally a disease of the blood vessels)?

In this context it also seems potentially significant that there is scientific evidence of the great (90%!) antiviral effect of mere mustard-oil on enveloped viruses like H1N1 (University of

Gießen, Germany) in lung endothelial cells in vitro – don't you miss any discussion about such less severe means?

4) The **worldwide gain-of-function research** which makes viruses more dangerous among other aspects (faster than by natural development) is a clear risk for the emergence of pandemics according to experts (generally mentioned in the report "A World at Risk", WHO / GPMB 2019, as the accidental or deliberate (!) release of viruses from labs).

If this research continues on this scale, there will easily be (more) virus outbreaks from laboratories in the future that **threaten / destroy our human rights**.

Do you see any problem in that or not?

5) The inner-state use of the "**Green Pass**" / **the Covid certificate** means division of society.

A division linked to privileging fundamental rights and to the advocacy of those in power for one of the divided groups is called **apartheid**.

Psychologically, sociologically it is very dangerous: It can easily lead to violence on the one hand and isolation on the other hand. Both can equally lead to the death of human beings.

Can you see this problem, please?

If yes, what would you like to do to counteract?

(Apart from that, there are other dangerous processes of "**dehumanization**" in many states, also in Germany, in the context of the Covid-19-Agenda: defamation, discrimination, victim-blaming, psychological conditioning of "well behavior" and of fundamental rights, partially coercion or even physical violence against people who cannot wear a mask due to health reasons, for example, political intimidation of critical doctors and scientists – I can personally list 10 such people off the top of my head, one ended in suicide, another emigrated.)

6) Does the **World Economic Forum** with its digital-technocratic agenda and its very broad influence actually have a near monopoly on determining our future? As a critical citizen one can have the impression.

What does Klaus Schwab's widely cited statement mean: "**In 2030 you will own nothing and be happy?**"

Is the basic political direction a world-socialist one, politically aligned, and thus more or less a totalitarian one, with a digital-technocratic and transhumanist agenda?

Or is this question a pure conspiracy theory that certainly will not come true? Can you assure us?

7) Undeniably we are in a highly concrete threat to proportionality, to our democracies, to our human rights, our concepts of human being, our jurisprudence, our social stability and our social peace right now.

We need YOUR raised voice for human rights NOW.

We need your concrete substantive engagement with the points listed here.

There is no time left.

Historical achievements (Nuremberg Code, fundamental and human rights, separation of powers,..) are so terribly vulnerable....

Please give us your answers.

Don't allow the impression that human rights are just something to take an abstract stand on at this time, and that concrete engagement with human rights' protection might be reserved now for gender, racism, the Taliban and climate change.

The threat to our human rights outlined here is probably even more current and tangible, more time-sensitive to your intervention, and more far-reaching in its historical implication at this point in time.

Please, assure us of your concrete commitment. What are your exact steps to intervene?

Yours faithfully

Daniela Prousa

