



laetus in praesens

Alternative view of segmented documents via Kairos

11 January 2021 | Draft

Licensed to Live? Licensed to Lie? Unlicensed to Die?

Implications of universal vaccination -- voluntary or otherwise

- / -

Introduction

[Mandatory vaccination in the light of human rights](#)

[Parallel between "disinformation" and "diabolus in musica"?](#)

[Reframing living, lying and dying as contractual responsibilities?](#)

[Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a licensing template](#)

[Documents on related issues and forms of presentation](#)

Introduction

The question as to whether vaccination against COVID-19 should be voluntary or mandatory is now widely discussed. Increasingly any questions as to the value or dangers of such vaccination are framed as misinformation -- if not deliberate disinformation and a feature of conspiracy theories, necessarily to be deprecated. This extends to complicity of some scientific authorities with proposals for government justifications for censorship, "taking down" websites and accounts, and possibly criminal proceedings

There is almost no sense of perspective on these matters. Information is now either valid, as having been confirmed by authorities, or to be framed as misinformation or worse -- disrupting the coherence of the response to COVID-19. The limited array of strategic tools deployed -- vaccination, social distancing, lockdowns, masking, sanitisation and contact tracing -- are now framed as constituting a panacea. This applies in particular to vaccination, with associated proposals for an "immunity passport"

Unfortunately it has been necessary to recognize that these measures, and vaccination in particular, only reduce the risk of infection. It is increasingly implied that:

- more than one vaccination shot will be required to increase the level of protection, although with no guarantee that this will be complete
- new mutations are emerging for which current vaccinations may -- or may not -- constitute adequate protection
- there are various problems with the distribution of the vaccines and the priorities to be accorded to those deemed most at risk
- there will necessarily be a percentage of people vaccinated who will suffer unspecified side-effects, however incidental this is held to be in terms of the benefits to others
- it is unclear for how long the protective capacity of the vaccinations will last, and whether vaccination will be required regularly (as with flu shots)

For some there is considerable concern that any debate concerning these matters is increasingly deprecated or suppressed. Few media now dare to raise questions in this regard -- for fear of being framed as purveyors of misinformation. Indicative exceptions include:

- C. J. Hopkins: [The Vaccine \(Dis\)Information War](#) (*OffGuardian*, 23 February 2021)
- Wayne Dupree: [Fauci's latest prediction on masks shows this is all about controlling people rather than controlling Covid](#) (*RT*, 22 February 2021)
- Larry Chin: [Planetary Hysteria: manufactured COVID-19 "Health Crisis" pushes humanity, global society to total shutdown](#) (*Global Research*, 21 February 2021)
- Meryl Nass: [The Corona Crisis: Over and Over, We Have Been Hoaxed](#) (*Global Research*, 22 February 2021)
- Kit Knightly: [5 questions to ask your friends who plan to get the Covid vaccine](#) (*OffGuardian*, 15 February 2021)
- Nandita Bose: [White House working with Facebook and Twitter to tackle anti-vaxxers](#) (*Reuters*, 21 February 2021)
- United Health Professionals: [International Alert Message about COVID-19](#) (*Global Research*, 18 February 2021)
- Paul Craig Roberts: [The Covid Deception Serves An Undeclared Agenda](#) (*Global Research*, 19 February 2021)
- Peter Koenig: [The Twilight Zone: Covid, the World Economic Forum \(WEF\) and Eugenics](#) (*Global Research*, 19 February 2021)
- Adam Dick: [Truth Slips Out in Coronavirus Vaccine Deaths 'Fact Check'?](#) (*Ron Paul Institute*, 17 February 2021)
- Ralf Arnold: [The Mainstream Bubble](#) (*OffGuardian*, 6 February 2021)

- Rosemary Frei: *The Modelling-paper Mafiosi: the pandemic modellers have a conflict of interest problem* (*OffGuardian*, 18 February 2021)
- Jule Klotter: *The Censorship Pandemic* (*Townsend Letter*, 8 January 2021)
- Jon Rappoport: *COVID, a disease in name only: the non-existent virus undercuts all other stories* (*OffGuardian*, 3 February 2021)
- Kevin Smith: *Why I Became a "Covid Denier": explaining to a beginner in 15 minutes* (*OffGuardian*, 18 January 2021)
- Meryl Nass: *Pfizer Admits Vaccine Does Not Prevent COVID* (*Mercola*, 29 January 2021)
- Children's Health Defense Team:
 - *329 Deaths + 9,516 Other Injuries Reported Following COVID Vaccine, Latest CDC Data Show* (*The Defender*, 29 January 2021)
 - *653 Deaths + 12,044 Other Injuries Reported Following COVID Vaccine, Latest CDC Data Show* (*The Defender*, 12 February 2021)
- Tony Allen-Mills: *Covid Passports: a freedom certificate that may get the world travelling again* (*Sunday Times*, 17 January 2021)
- Arthur Firstenberg: *A Pandemic of Insanity* (*Global Research*, 7 January 2021)
- Luis Miguel: *It's Official: Facebook Will Purge COVID-19 Vaccine "Conspiracy Theories"* (*New American*, 6 December 2020)
- American Institute for Economic Research: *Lockdowns Do Not Control the Coronavirus: Peer Reviewed Reports* (*Global Research*, 19 December 2020)
- Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.: *Death by Coincidence? Declarations by health officials and vaccine makers that deaths and injuries following COVID vaccinations are unrelated coincidences are becoming a pattern* (*The Defender: children's health defense*, 14 January 2021)
- Alex Chapman: *COVID vaccine side effects 'may have contributed' to deaths of frail, elderly recipients* (*7News*, 16 January 2021)
- Lars Erik Taraldsen: *Norway Warns of Vaccination Risks for Sick Patients Over 80* (*Bloomberg*, 15 January 2021)
- Kenneth Garger: *Alarming number of US health care workers are refusing COVID-19 vaccine* (*New York Post*, 1 January 2021)
- Liz Peek: *Twitter and Facebook to censor vaccine discourse -- this must stop* (*The Hill*, 21 December 2020)
- James Corbett: *The Future of Vaccines* (*The Corbett Report*, 392, 23 December 2020)
- Laren Chadwick: *Which European countries are likely to be most hesitant about a COVID-19 vaccine?* (*Euronews*, 9 December 2020)
- Arjun Walia: *The New Pandemic: COVID vaccine hesitancy among medical professionals* (*Principia Scientific International*, 7 December 2020)
- Kashmira Gander: *Unknown COVID Vaccine Side Effects May Appear After Millions Immunized -- But Benefits Outweigh Risks* (*Newsweek*, 3 December 2020)
- Joseph Mercola: *Spy Agencies Threaten to "Take Out" Mercola* (1 December 2020)
- Cheryl K. Chumley: *COVID-19 vaccines' scary side effects must not be dismissed* (*The Washington Times*, 26 November 2020)
- Jon Stone: *Coronavirus vaccine: Labour calls for emergency censorship laws for anti-vax content* (*The Independent*, 15 November 2020)
- Judy Wilyman: *Censorship of Public Health Science* (*Vaccination Decisions*, 23 October 2020)
- Lisa M. Krieger: *Why vaccine hesitancy is growing during a deadly pandemic* (*The Mercury News*, 31 October 2020)
- Valerie Richardson: *Thousands of scientists urge end to 'devastating' lockdowns* (*The Washington Times*, 8 October 2020)
- Stephen Kruiser: *Censorship Has Mutated and Is Thriving During Coronavirus Pandemic* (*PJMedia*, 19 May 2020)
- Jennifer Margulis: *Science is Never Settled: scientific debate critical to end pandemic* (12 April 2020)
- Jacob Mehangama, et al: *Coronavirus Has Started a Censorship Pandemic* (*Foreign Policy*, 1 April 2020)
- Mallory Simon: *Over 1,000 health professionals sign a letter saying: Don't shut down protests using coronavirus concerns as an excuse* (*CNN*, 5 June 2020)
- *Why were US media silent on Pfizer vaccine deaths?* (*Global Times*, 15 January, 2021)
- *Six months on, most COVID patients still have at least 1 symptom* (*Al Jazeera*, 9 January 2021)
- *"Careless Talk Costs Lives" -- Fresh Calls To Silence Pandemic Skepticism* (*OffGuardian*, 6 January 2021, # 335)
- *Red Cross President Demands Big Brother Censorship to Muzzle Skeptics of COVID-19 Vaccines* (*CLG News*, 3 December 2020)
- *Silencing discussion? UK Labour Party demands online crackdown on 'anti-vax disinformation' ahead of Covid-19 vaccine rollout* (*RT*, 15 November 2020)

A particular example is offered by media complicity in marginalization and suppression of alternative views by relevant scientists with regard to responses to COVID-19 and vaccination -- exemplified by institutional responses to the *Great Barrington Declaration* (4 October 2020), notably signed by epidemiologists. It is to be expected that reports of problematic side-effects will be treated as statistically incidental rather than of any wider significance -- following the pattern of tolerable "collateral damage".

Online platforms claim to be able to design algorithms to detect misinformation in order to "take down" sites. Given the ease with which this is purportedly done, it is appropriate to ask whether such algorithms are more sophisticated than the clumsy design of government lockdown policies. These have rendered evident the obvious inability of authorities to distinguish zones of high risk from those of lowest risk -- a matter of *data granularity*.

With respect to any understanding of the "acceptable" collateral damage associated with the strategic responses implemented by authorities in response to the pandemic, beyond the only too evident economic costs (and the consequences of unemployment) are those about which little said in terms of the effects on the *psychosocial fabric of society*, including *civil rights and democracy, domestic violence, suicides, education, inequality, elderly care, and people with disabilities*:

- Amanda Mull: *The Pandemic Has Erased Entire Categories of Friendship* (*The Atlantic*, January 2021)

- Jacqueline Howard and Andrea Kane: *CDC study sheds new light on mental health crisis linked to coronavirus pandemic* (CNN, 13 August 2020)
- Katherine Kam: *Mental Health an Emerging Crisis of COVID Pandemic* (WebMD, 8 May 2020)
- *A Step to Ease the Pandemic Mental Health Crisis* (Scientific American, February 2021)
- *The Social Impact of COVID-19* (United Nations, 6 April 2020)

Strikingly **absent is any capacity to consider these contradictory phenomena with any scientific objectivity**. The focus is on the need for the perspective of government authorities to prevail at any cost -- assisted by scientific institutions dependent on government funding, and reinforced by media complicit with government policy. Any challenge to that is consequently framed as a threat to public health and meriting the strictest response by authorities. This echoes a policy articulated with respect to other issues: **There is No Alternative** (TINA). It remains unclear how the trend towards excessive **authoritarianism** will progress in the absence of more insightful approaches to the challenge of COVID-19.

These issues are exacerbated by the tardy recognition by WHO of the limits on testing for COVID-19 -- despite widespread publication of shock statistics on "cases" -- with implications variously discussed:

- John O'Sullivan: *WHO Finally Admits COVID19 PCR Test Has A 'Problem'* (Principia Scientifica, 17 December 2020)
- *FDA Admits PCR Tests Give False Results, Prepares Ground For Biden To "Crush" Casedemic* (ZeroHedge, 5 January 2021)
- *Right On Cue For Biden, WHO Admits High-Cycle PCR Tests Produce COVID False Positives* (NewsWars, 21 January 2021)
- *Now That Biden's In Charge, WHO Finally Admits "Gold Standard" In COVID Testing Not Reliable* (Tea Party, January 2021)
- *Evidence emerges that COVID tests are faulty. FDA and CDC admit as much* (LifeSite News, 1 December 2020)
- *Landmark legal ruling finds that Covid tests are not fit for purpose. So what do the MSM do? They ignore it* (RT, 27 November 2020)

Mandatory vaccination in the light of human rights

Use of the human rights declaration as a template: There is therefore a case for a speculative exploration of the implications of universal vaccination -- whether voluntary or otherwise -- in the light of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948). As a legal formalization and enrichment of *habeas corpus*, this could be recognized as an effort to define the desirable characteristics of life in a global civilization. With vaccination now asserted to be the primary guarantee of life in the face of the pandemic threat, **has vaccination become a Licence to Live?** The sense of a "licence" is especially emphasized by plans for an "immunity passport" of some kind, despite foreseeable problems (Darius Tahir, *How vaccine 'passports' could go wrong*, *Politico*, 3 February 2021).

As an exploratory reframing device, the original declaration has previously been used as a template to explore somewhat related issues:

- the rights of collectives, now highlighted by groups variously organized on social media (*Universal Declaration of the Rights of Human Organization: an experimental extension of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 1971)
- human responsibilities as a necessary complement to rights (*Universal Declaration of Responsibilities of Human Intercourse: a draft proposal*, 2007).
- responsibility for the effects of technological innovation, now emphasized by the production of vaccines (*Universal Declaration of Patent Responsibilities: a draft proposal*, 2007)

Given the discourse with regard to "immunity", of interest with respect to the latter are the protections in place for the pharmaceutical industry if exposed to an "adverse event following immunization" as defined by WHO (and otherwise known as a vaccine injury). In the USA the *National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program* (VICP) went into effect in 1988 to compensate individuals and families of individuals who have been injured by specified childhood vaccines. As of October 2019, \$4.2 billion in compensation (not including attorneys fees and costs) has been awarded. In the UK a *Vaccine Damage Payment Scheme* (VDPS) has been in place since 1979, although thousands of unsuccessful claims have been made. As of 2005, the British government had paid out £3.5 million to vaccine injury patients since 1997.

The vaccine injury situation with regard to COVID-19 now appears highly problematic, at least in the US (Ken Alltucker, *Government program tapped to pay for COVID-19 vaccine injuries rarely sides with consumers*, *USA Today*, 27 December 2020; Bernard Condon and Matt Sedensky, *Rare vaccine injury claims steered to obscure federal office*, *AP News*, 23 December 2020). The broader challenge has also been described (Sam Halabi, Andrew Heinrich, and Saad B. Omer, *No-Fault Compensation for Vaccine Injury: the other side of equitable access to COVID-19 vaccines*, *New England Journal of Medicine*, 3 December 2020; Nicholas Wood, *Who pays compensation if a COVID-19 vaccine has rare side-effects?* *The Conversation*, 20 October 2020).

In the following use of the UNDHR template, the **Preamble** has been omitted, thereby placing the focus on the 30 Articles. These have been presented in abridged form in the following table. Against each article three columns are added for consideration:

- **Licensed to Live?** These items together frame the extent to which vaccination (and any associated "immunity passport") effectively constitutes a "Licence to Live" -- in the light of the aspect of life to which the Article carefully refers. In response to **vaccine hesitancy**, constraints are now envisaged (or in place) for the unvaccinated, including: international travel ("**no jab; no fly**"), use of public transport, educational institutions ("**no jab; no school**"), access to shops, access to accommodation ("**no jab; no bed**"), financial benefits ("**no jab; no credit**"); employment ("**no jab; no job**"; "no jab; no pay"), recreation ("**no jab; no fun**"; "**no jab; no play**"; "**no jab; no party**"; "**no jab; no pub**"); access to health facilities and welfare ("**no jab; no Jobseeker**"; "**no jab; no baby bonus**"), . Given the possibilities of inheriting infection, a further constraint on procreation could be anticipated ("**no jab; no f*ck**").

As with any licence, but as yet unexplored, the "immunity passport" will in all probability have an "expiry date". It will become

invalid unless "renewed" (typically for a fee). As with a driver's licence, notably for the elderly, this may require both further testing and a new jab. So the "immunity passport" issued after the first jab may well be only a ["provisional licence"](#) -- with the second jab being a necessity to ensure efficacy. How often this process may need to be repeated is as yet unclear. Delays in getting any required "follow-up" jab in time (due to predictable resource constraints) may then result in the Licence to Live being effectively withdrawn -- as with passports and many licences.

The future will no doubt perceive it as extraordinary how the processes with which living is associated are increasingly constrained by licences issued by authorities -- with one remarkable exception. No licence of any kind is required to engender new "mouths to feed" and people are free to engender as many as they wish. Curiously those in a licensed role who refer to how [overcrowding](#) may render the population vulnerable to the spread of disease (or to other problems) may well face effective withdrawal of that licence

- **Licensed to Lie?** These items frame the extent to which government and other authorities have a right to misrepresent the implications of the constraints in regard to each case -- and to deny that this is the case. This especially applies with respect to how their development may be envisaged to increase authoritarian control of populations and to suppress criticism in that regard -- all in the guise of promoting health security. The difficulty for authorities is that, in **having the power to misrepresent, there is no possibility of proving the truth of what is asserted**. There is of course the irony that authorities are necessarily obliged to misrepresent the arguments of critics as misinformation -- however valid in scientific terms

The understanding of "lie" in politics was reframed by [Plato](#) in the *Republic*. Any misrepresentation by authorities can then be justified as a [Noble Lie](#). This is a myth or [untruth](#), knowingly propagated by an elite to maintain social harmony or to advance an agenda. Any mainstream narrative could indeed be seen in this light. When associated with religion, it could be understood as a pious fiction, namely a narrative that is presented as true from one perspective, although considered by others to be fictional (albeit produced with an altruistic motivation). There is clearly a major challenge in distinguishing a noble lie from the much-deprecated [Big Lie](#), namely a propaganda technique used for political purposes. This has been notoriously described as a lie so "colossal" that no one would believe that someone "could have the impudence to distort the truth so infamously" (Alex Nowrasteh, *Against the "Noble Lie" -- COVID-19 Edition*, *Cato at Liberty*, 25 March 2020; Matthew Walther, *The noble lie about masks and coronavirus should never have been told*, *Yahoo News*, 4 April 2020; Scott Morefield, *Our overlords are using the "Big Lie Technique" to convince us masks work*, *Townhall*, 30 November 2020). As declared by the former US Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, strategic truths sometimes need be defended by a "bodyguard of lies". (John G. Mason, *Leo Strauss and the Noble Lie: The Neo-Cons at War*, *Aldeilis.net*, 15 February 2006)

Having framed vaccination as effectively a panacea -- despite the reservations as to its longer term efficacy -- vaccination is in process of being reframed metaphorically as a response to information contrary to the facts purportedly disseminated by authorities (*Immunizing the public against misinformation*, *WHO*, 25 August 2020; Sander van der Linden and Jon Roozenbeek, *COVID-19 misinformation: scientists create a 'psychological vaccine' to protect against fake news*, *The Conversation*, 20 January 2021).

Given that disinformation is notably engendered by the use of AI, there is a degree of irony to the attempt to use AI to detect and remove it (Hannah Murphy, *The new AI tools spreading fake news in politics and business*, *Financial Times*, 10 May 2020; Samuel Woolley, *We're fighting fake news AI bots by using more AI -- That's a mistake*, *Technology Review*, 8 January 2020; John Villasenor, *How to deal with AI-enabled fake news*, *Brookings*, 23 November 2020). Clearly there is a trend toward recognizing AI as a form of "licensing authority" for authorised information -- despite its role in engendering disinformation (presumably as authorised by other authorities).

- **Unlicensed to Die?** These items frame the paradox associated with the absence of any implied licence. One implications is that authorities accept no responsibility for the risks to life of those who resist vaccination (and receipt of any "immunity passport"). Authorities may well enable their death by negligence or otherwise -- as is already evident in the constraints on delivery of vaccines to the disadvantaged (consistent with difficulties in delivering food to the starving). A contrasting implication frames the ironic sense in which any "Licence to Live" in no way allows the unlicensed either to accept the risk of dying or to opt for death (if they experience their suffering as unbearable). A further consideration is the extent to which governments arrogate to themselves the right to kill those they deem to be a threat -- namely a ["Licence to Kill"](#) (through negligence or otherwise).

A further irony has become apparent through the declaration of Pope Francis that opposition to vaccination against COVID-19 is "suicidal denial" (*Pope Francis to get vaccinated next week; slams vaccine deniers*, *MSN*, 10 January 2021). The irony derives from the degree to which all matters relating to death are assiduously framed by Catholic dogma. Successive popes have been exemplars of denial with respect to related matters -- with tragically suicidal consequences for some. This includes the predictable deaths resulting from the application of such dogma to withholding assistance in dying from those in a terminal condition -- withholding a "Licence to Die". It is most evident in the case of the millions who die -- and will do in the future -- as a result of systematic encouragement of unconstrained procreation without adequate food resources (*Assessing the unpredictable: faith-based death warrants effectively authorised?*, 2018). The latter can indeed be recognized as a "Licence to Kill" -- despite the [plausible deniability](#) deployed in defence of such policies. History may choose to compare the announced campaign of the Pope in favour of vaccination with campaigns of centuries past against heresy -- in the light of the treatment accorded so dramatically to those who failed to accept indoctrination.

Experimental application of the UNDHR template to vaccination: To facilitate the following argument, the UNDHR template is

presented below as a concluding section

Legality in the light of human rights: The implication of institutional initiatives for human rights has notably been specifically addressed to some degree by the OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (*Pandemic and Human Rights in the Americas* (Resolution 1/2020, adopted by the IACHR on 10 April 2020)). The UN Secretary-General issued a [policy brief](#) highlighting how human rights are critical to shaping pandemic response, as they put people “centre-stage” while also preserving human dignity (*UN agencies uphold human rights considerations in COVID-19 data collection*, *UN News*, 20 November 2020)..

However issues in that regard have been variously highlighted:

- The 2020 *Freedom of Thought Report* report of Humanists International (*Pandemic measures misused to roll-back rights of humanists and the non-religious*, 10 December 2020) The report warns of how the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated pre-existing inequalities and served as an opportunity to crackdown on dissenting voices.
- A Freedom House report (*Democracy Under Lockdown: The Impact of COVID-19 on the Global Struggle for Freedom*, October 2020) is reviewed by Malaka Gharib (*The Pandemic Is Not Good For Freedom And Democracy. But There Are Exceptions*, *NPR*, 10 November 2020)
- In a televised address on the occasion of International Human Rights Day, the UN Secretary-General indicated that:
 - the pandemic has had a "disproportionate impact on vulnerable groups" including frontline workers, the elderly, disabled people, women and girls, and minorities".
 - the virus "has thrived because poverty, inequality, discrimination, the destruction of our natural environment and other human rights failures, have created enormous fragilities in our societies"
 - responses were simultaneously providing leaders with a pretext to impose "heavy-handed security responses and repressive measures that curtail civic space and media freedom".

Specific consideration has been given as to the violation of human rights by mandatory vaccination:

- Y. Tony Yang and Dorit Riubinstein: *A Federal COVID-19 Vaccine Mandate: dubious legality, faulty policy* (*The Hill*, 23 July 2020)
- Justice Center: *The issue of mandatory and forced vaccination in light of COVID-19* (7 May 2020)
- Charles S. Johnson III: *Does Mandatory Vaccination Violate Rights?* (*Law.com Daily Report*, 26 November 2016)
- Sarah Fujiwara: *Is Mandatory Vaccination Legal in Time of Epidemic?* (*AMA Journal of Ethics*, 2006)
- A. Pawlowski: *Will the COVID-19 vaccine be mandatory? What the law says* (*Today*, 4 September 2020)
- Camille Caldera: *Fact check: COVID-19 vaccine mandates don't violate US employment law* (*USA Today*, 31 December 2020)
- Jenni Fink: *Can the Government Force You to Get a Coronavirus Vaccine?* (*Newsweek*, 26 May 2020)
- Meiling Lee: *Denmark Citizens Refuse Law Mandating Forced COVID-19 Vaccine* (*Truly*, 19 November 2020)
- Cecilia Anthony Das and Kenneth Yin: *Can my boss make me get a COVID vaccination? Yes, but it depends on the job* (*The Conversation*, 4 February 2021)
- *'Health dictatorship': French citizens who refuse Covid-19 jab may be BANNED from public transport under 'Green Passport' plan* (*RT*, 23 December 2020)

Of some relevance is the petition (now closed) to the US House of Representatives initiated prior to the current pandemic by Cory Anne Stickel (*Declaration of Medical Freedom Regarding Vaccine Choice*, *Change.org*, 2015). Cautionary comments with regard to this controversial matter have been articulated by Alan Phillips (*Why NOT to Give Your Doctor an Anti-Vaccine Liability Form*, *GreenMedInfo*, 13 July 2012).

Violation of the Nuremberg Code? Emerging as a consequence of World War II, like the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, the Nuremberg Military Tribunals, prosecuted doctors and administrators for their roles in conducting medical experiments on concentration camp inmates -- thereby providing a definition of "Permissible Medical Experiments". Since the COVID-19 vaccines are necessarily experimental, as has been authoritatively emphasized, the controversial question has been raised as to whether mandatory vaccination constitutes a violation under the rules of the *Nuremberg Code* (1947), as widely claimed on social media.

- Vernon Coleman: *Doctors and nurses vaccinating without explaining the risks are war criminals under 1948 Nuremberg medical experimentation rules* (*Truth11.com*, 5 February 2021)
- Marisha Goldhamer: *Principles in the Nuremberg Code are compatible with vaccination* (*AFP Fact Check*, 30 May 2020)
- Saranac Hale Spencer: *Nuremberg Code Addresses Experimentation, Not Vaccines* (*FactCheck.org*, 8 June 2020)
- Anna Von Reitz: *The Nuremberg Code makes FORCED vaccination illegal? A Plague of Liars* (*PoinTTalkers*, 30 November 2020)
- Mary Holland: *N.Y. Law Professor Addresses U.N. on Government Vaccine Policies Violating the Nuremberg Code* (*Vaccine Impact*, 26 April 2016)
- Karen Harradine: *Beware the tyranny of a forced vaccination* (*The Conservative Woman*, 2 December 2020)
- Evelyne Shuster: *Fifty Years Later: The Significance of the Nuremberg Code* (*The New England Journal of Medicine*, 13 November 1997)

Efforts to invoke the *Nuremberg Code* in challenges to enforced vaccination have been dismissed as supported only by "pseudo-legal" arguments. Policies like "no jab, no travel" and "no jab, no job" of course avoid any restrictive interpretation of the *Nuremberg Code* -- thereby reframing the question as to what is "forced" in the light of issues of [structural violence](#). The argument can be taken further in questioning whether "no jab; no job" policies constitute coercion intended to evoke consent.

Of interest in that respect is a case of human experimentation in the USA (Katie Dowd, *The San Quentin prison doctor who performed over 10,000 human experiments*, *SFGATE*, 13 August 2019). The physician named in the latter, [Leo Stanley](#), merits comparison with

Josef Mengele, renowned for his experiments as a physician at Auschwitz (Ethan Blue, *The Strange Career of Dr Leo Stanley: remaking manhood and medicine at San Quentin State Penitentiary, 1913-1951*, *Pacific Historical Review*, 78, 2009, 2). If the prisoner is offered a special privilege (additional food?). at what point is the consent evoked to be interpreted as coercion in the light of the *Nuremberg Code*? "No jab; no job"?

Parallel between "disinformation" and "*diabolus in musica*"?

Diabolical information? Disinformation as perceived by authorities, and specifically deplored by the World Health Organization, merits exploration with a potential historical parallel, namely the so-called *diabolus in musica*, as specifically condemned, banned and avoided by the Roman Catholic Church. The latter formulated rules for what music was acceptable during services -- a form of "licence" for acceptable harmony. As clarified by [Richard Merrick](#):

Music that did not adhere to the rules for 'sacred music' was then considered impure. More specifically, some intervals were considered 'perfect' while others were 'imperfect.' Of all the intervals in an octave, the most impure and imperfect musical interval was the tritone that divides an octave.

The tritone was considered not only an unfit and displeasing interval by the Church fathers -- it was believed to be an *evil* interval that could adversely affect our character when used in music. It was even referred to as *Diabolus in Musica*, or *Devil in Music*, and expressly forbidden under Church canon law. To this day the Church officially maintains a policy of tritone avoidance as set forth in the decree of 'universal liturgical music in Gregorian chant,' most recently reaffirmed in the 1903-1967 *Musicam Sacram* (*Secret - Tritone / Devil's Musica*, *Token Rock*, 2011).

Other clarifications are available (Jon Wiederhorn, *The Devil's Chord: The Eerie History of 'Diabolus in Musica'*, Fender; Daniel Esparza, *The "devil's chord": A forbidden medieval musical sequence*, *Aleteia*, 25 October 2018; *Why is the Augmented 4th the "chord of evil" that was banned in Renaissance church music?* *The Guardian*). Whether the Church ruling constitutes a formal ban is itself disputed. As a strong recommendation on the musical enhancement of belief, this does however merit comparison with the pressure from authorities for "voluntary" vaccination and against any hesitancy in that regard. An offer not to be refused -- "tritone in; funding out"?

Sacred information? Are authorities, with the leadership of WHO, framing the information for which they are responsible as effectively "sacred", if only in a secular sense? Is any disagreement with that then to be recognized as an offensive impurity in any celebration of the common weal -- and therefore legitimately framed as "evil"? The parallel is all the more appropriate in that the tritone is condemned as sounding "false" in comparison with the coherence of the acclaimed harmonies of sacred music. Does the sense of being false merit comparison with what is deemed repugnant in so-called fake news?

In contrast it is appropriate to recognize the role played by the tritone in many forms of popular modern music -- superseding the restrictive framing of the Catholic Church. This frames the question as to the function of "disinformation" and "fake news" in modern society -- in contrast to what WHO is effectively claiming to be the sacred nature of the restrictive truth it promulgates and authorizes (*Varieties of Fake News and Misrepresentation: when are deception, pretence and cover-up acceptable?* 2019).

Rather than seeking to impose a particular understanding of consonance in the manner of the Catholic Church -- and in contrast with the fundamental right to freedom of opinion -- is there a case for WHO to learn to embrace the wider understanding of complex systems exemplified by dissonance and those who identify with it?

Insights from strategic playbooks of the past? In seeking to preserve its understanding of the sacred, the Catholic Church has in the past developed an approach to dissemination of information which bears comparison with the current approach of authorities to suppression of "disinformation". This took the form of the [imprimatur](#), namely a declaration authorizing publication of a book -- effectively a "licence to read". This pattern has continued to this day under certain circumstances -- whether explicitly or effectively through indirect pressures on publishers, or on the [self-censorship](#) which authors are made to consider it wise to practice. This is in contravention of Article 19 of the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#) guaranteeing [freedom of speech](#) from all forms of censorship.

In the case of the Catholic Church the imprimatur was accompanied by the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* ("List of Prohibited Books"), namely a list of publications deemed [heretical](#) or contrary to morality, and which Catholics were forbidden to read without permission (see *List of authors and works on the Index Librorum Prohibitorum*). It included authors such as [Simone de Beauvoir](#), [Jean-Paul Sartre](#), [Voltaire](#), [Denis Diderot](#), [Victor Hugo](#), [Jean-Jacques Rousseau](#), [André Gide](#), [Nikos Kazantzakis](#), [Emanuel Swedenborg](#), [Baruch Spinoza](#), [Immanuel Kant](#), [David Hume](#), [René Descartes](#), [Francis Bacon](#), [John Milton](#), [John Locke](#), [Nicolaus Copernicus](#), and [Galileo Galilei](#). The 20th and final edition appeared in 1948, and the *Index* was formally abolished on 14 June 1966.

Arguably current efforts to "take down" websites, and to prevent expression of views by authors considered to be spreading disinformation contrary to the views of authorities), merit consideration in this light. As with the Catholic Church, authorities are considered to be unquestionably right in implementing these practices. There is little consideration of the challenges of oversight implied by the insight from the Roman Empire: *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?*

Vaccination as an indulgence? As with censorship, the manner in which vaccines are being sought, produced, marketed and framed as highly desirable -- if not mandatory -- merits comparison with the sale of [indulgences](#). These were a means of reducing the amount of punishment for sins that a person has to undergo in the afterlife -- possibly understood as saving one's soul. The abuse of indulgences, mainly through their commercialization, became a serious problem which the Church was unable to restrain effectively. Is this pattern to be foreseen in relation to vaccination, to immunity passports, and to health certificates?

Has the dubious complicity between Church and State of those times now shifted to a dubious complicity between the Corporate world

and State -- exemplified in this case by the role of Big Pharma? What vaccination abuses will become evident as a consequence?

With respect to vaccination, is there now a case for an analogue to the famous 95 theses of [Martin Luther](#) (*Disputation on the Power and Efficacy of Indulgences*, 1517)? The profusion in the printing of books promoting Protestant theology following Luther's initiative impelled Catholic leaders to suppress Protestant books, ultimately leading to the *Index* in which the works of Luther and John Calvin were later included.

Given the manner in which some religions continue to oppose vaccination, from a symbolic perspective there would appear to be a case for careful attention to the degree to which it can be compared by some to rape (Harry Readhead, *Australian anti-vaccination group under fire for 'rape poster'*, *Metro*, 23 Apr 2015; Alana Schetzer, *Australian Vaccination Skeptics Network compares vaccines to rape*, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 22 April 2015; Natasha Hinde, *'Insensitive' And 'Reckless' Advert Comparing Vaccinations To Rape Removed From Facebook After Backlash*, *HuffPost*, 23 April 2015).

Why is any comparison of inoculation with rape framed as obscene and irresponsible, despite the dubious arguments of men (notably in the legal system) regarding [penetration without consent](#) -- as extensively highlighted by feminists? Were the heretical arguments of Luther deemed similarly irresponsible and dangerous by the Catholic Church? Is there no meaningful sense in which the pressure to be vaccinated is comparable to the pressure on many to be raped -- whether metaphorically or otherwise?

Reframing living, lying and dying as contractual responsibilities?

The argument of authorities for mandatory vaccination is in process of reframing the understanding and formalization of individual responsibility to the the collective. Specifically the focus is on minimizing the infection of others whilst maximizing individual protection from infection. Achieving a high level of vaccination is also presented in terms of achieving the elusive goal of herd immunity.

The exploration above with respect to the implication for human rights can therefore be extended to include that of human responsibilities. A case has long been made for a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities as a complement to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A draft *Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities*, was proposed by the [InterAction Council](#) in 1997 (as amended in 1998) for consideration by the United Nations as such a complement. No action has seemingly been taken on the original proposal (available in many languages). In a reaction to it, the UN approved a *Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* (53/144, 9 December 1998).

Related initiatives with respect to human responsibilities: A draft proposal for a very comprehensive *Declaration of Human Duties and Responsibilities* was adopted in 1998 in Valencia, under the auspices of UNESCO and the Valencia Third Millennium Foundation, by a high-level group (chaired by Richard J Goldstone) and then submitted for consideration to UNESCO in 1999 as the "Valencia Declaration" (but without any apparent follow-up). An earlier proposal, known as the *Trieste Declaration of Human Duties* (also known as the *Carta of Human Duties*), had been drafted from 1992 by the [International Council of Human Duties](#). The *Earth Charter* (completed in 2000) has also been considered to be a Declaration of Human Duties and Responsibilities even if it does not bear that name -- notably by recognizing the need for "reproductive health and responsible reproduction".

Since the adoption of the 1948 Declaration, the peoples of the world have been witness to the totally irresponsible, self-interested pursuit of human rights by signatories of it or by those invoking its clauses. They have also been witness to [massacres](#) on a scale commensurate with those it was designed to prevent, which continue at this time -- and with merely token response by a United Nations arguably complicit in the process to some degree (as with [Srebrenica](#) and [Rwanda](#)).

In a [Universal Declaration on Democracy](#) (adopted in 1997), the Inter-Parliamentary Union specifies: *Democracy is inseparable from the rights set forth in the international instruments recalled in the preamble. These rights must therefore be applied effectively and their proper exercise must be matched with individual and collective responsibilities.*

Whilst there has long been a [UN Commission on Human Rights](#), there is no such Commission on Human Responsibilities. The process of [Dialogue among Civilizations](#), initiated by the United Nations in 2001, was immediately followed by the arrogation of the right by some permanent members of the UN Security Council to engage in a "war against terrorism" -- sustained by a religious and strategic mindset regarding a "clash of civilizations". In so doing they set aside some human rights enshrined in international law, notably with regard to the use of torture. Terrorism may be understood as one inappropriate form of human intercourse, just as its causes are another, and as may be the reaction to it. The UN Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (*A More Secure World: our shared responsibility*, 2004) might be seen as another effort to reframe the question of human responsibility.

Insights from corporate social responsibility? In considering how to formalize individual responsibility with respect to the collective, It is appropriate to note the potential relevance of efforts to formalize collective responsibility. These have notably focused on [corporate social responsibility](#) (CSR). Various international laws have been developed and various organizations have used their authority to push this beyond individual or even industry-wide initiatives. For example the *United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights* (UNGPs) is an instrument consisting of 31 principles implementing the UN *Protect, Respect and Remedy* framework on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises.

The relevance of CSRs to responsibility with respect to vaccination and masking is all the greater given the questionable efficacy of those measures in practice and increasing recognition of the irresponsibility and impunity of corporations (John Dudovskiy, *Criticism Associated with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)*, *Business Research Methodology*, 26 July 2012; Matthew Lynn, *Corporate Social Responsibility has become a racket - and a dangerous one*, *The Telegraph*, 28 September 2015).

The most obvious question is how CSR principles frame, or fail to reframe, the strategies of vaccine manufacturers (*WHO chief warns of 'moral failure' as coronavirus vaccine rollout favours wealthier nations*, *ABC News*, 19 January 2021; Matt Taibbi, *Big Pharma's*

Covid-19 Profiteers, *Rolling Stone*, 13 August 2020; Sharon Lerner, *How Big Pharma Prepares to Profit from the Coronavirus*, *The Intercept*, 14 March 2020). Given the dramatic contradiction with respect to CSRs evident in the [Volkswagen emissions scandal](#) ("Dieselgate"), might an equivalent become evident in the case of Big Pharma and vaccine production?

As with any drug, **who provides effective oversight to ensure that vaccines are not diluted** -- or replaced by some ineffective or counterfeit product -- especially in times of great pressure on availability (Palina Kolvani, et al, *Pandemic Backsliding: democracy and disinformation seven months into the Covid-19 pandemic*, *V-Dem Institute*, 2 October 2020). Given the understanding of "trial" in relation to drugs, there is considerable irony to any comparison of media publicity of vaccination of celebrities with the much deprecated "show trials" of dictatorships.

Human responsibilities as reframed by threats to humanity and the environment: Despite the failure of past initiatives, does the manner in which the requirement for vaccination is presented by authorities now constitute a curious "back door" approach to international formalization of individual responsibility -- if not through a form of subterfuge?

The role of overcrowding is now increasingly recognized as a major factor in enabling COVID-19 infection. This contrasts with a marked tendency to avoid reference to this, as previously argued (*Prohibition of Reference to Overcrowding: draft proposal for an International Convention*, (2019)). Although now recognized to some degree, the argument does not extend to the challenge of overpopulation, as may be similarly argued (*Social Distancing under Conditions of Overcrowding: Weaponising mass distraction from overpopulation denial?* 2020). However conspiracy theories abound with regard to the use of vaccination as a feature of a hidden agenda to reduce global population numbers -- "population culling".

It can of course be argued that most issues resulting in human suffering and death, that are of concern to the United Nations, are a direct consequence of irresponsible human intercourse -- including global warming and the consequent climate change. From that perspective, the set of rights invites exploratory adaptation, as noted above (*Universal Declaration of Responsibilities of Human Intercourse: a draft proposal*, 2007).

With respect to vaccine technology, as yet to be clarified are the responsibilities associated with patents in that regard (*Universal Declaration of Patent Responsibilities: a draft proposal*, 2007). With respect to constraints on availability of vaccines, it is argued that the European Union does not have enough vaccine because manufacturers are not fulfilling their contracts. Sharing patents in times of crisis could speed up production and solve global problems, as argued by Barbara Wesel (*Europe must fight for its coronavirus vaccines, and share them*, *DW*, January 2021). Such responsibility clearly has implications for the widely promoted role of artificial intelligence -- and its predicted dramatic effects on unemployment.

Licensing as a formalization of individual contractual responsibilities: If human responsibilities are indeed to be recognized to a far greater degree as a consequence of the required response to the pandemic, any notions of a [social contract](#) can then be understood as effectively taking the form of a licence.

Ironically, in the light of the reference to CSRs, of potential relevance are the insights which might be offered by recognition of [corporate personhood](#) whereby a corporation has at least some of the legal rights and responsibilities enjoyed by [natural persons](#). If corporations are indeed to be understood as having responsibilities to society -- as articulated by the UN [Global Compact](#) -- does the thinking in that regard offer insights into the responsibilities of individuals?

Following the articulation above, this then suggests the need for further reflection on:

- **Responsibility to live?** How is any contractual responsibility to live to be understood, especially in the light of the controversial institutional attitude to assisted dying in any form -- especially as this relates to any individual loss of the will to live?

Are humans to be understood as having a responsibility to live under all circumstances -- and at any cost, most notably to others? How is this understanding related to notions of "live and let live"? How is any contractual responsibility to "live within one's means" to be understood when some choose to "live beyond their means"?

- **Responsibility to lie?** Given the arguments above with respect to the appropriateness of lying by authorities, is there a case for recognizing a responsibility to lie -- if only under some circumstances? Is there a responsibility of parents to lie to children under certain circumstances? To what extent do many forms of advertising have a responsibility to lie to some degree in order to achieve marketing objectives -- a process blithely justified by the legality of [puffery](#)?

Clearly representatives of authorities are deemed to have a responsibility to lie -- as was epitomized by the formal assertions of [Colin Powell](#) in order to justify "humanitarian intervention" in Iraq (*Remarks to the United Nations Security Council*, U.S. Department of State, 5 February 2003). Deliberate use of disinformation to confuse the enemy is a classic responsibility in any conflict. It is unclear whether there are any constraints on that responsibility, especially when it is deemed necessary to be upbeat and positive, irrespective of information suggesting the contrary. Have CSRs been interpreted as a responsibility to lie -- if only to corporate employees desiring to identify with remedial environmental strategies?

- **Responsibility to die?** Given the prospect of people living to an ever greater age, and the associated challenges of aging populations, it is appropriate to ask how any implied obligation to die might then be understood. Some guidance in this respect is to be found in the so-called [sunset provision](#), namely a measure within a statute, regulation or other law that provides that the law shall cease to have effect after a specific date, unless further legislative action is taken to extend the law. Other guidance is offered by contractual obligations recognizing responsibilities in the event of individual incompetence.

It could be argued that some have a responsibility to die -- especially when faced with a threat demanding human sacrifice, as in

the military ("dying for one's country"). Drama explores situations in which this responsibility is tragically evident -- notably when there are "too many mouths to feed".

Curiously the institutionalization of a required [age of retirement](#) could be recognized in terms of a contractual responsibility to die - given the extent to which retirement may be experienced as a form of death, if only in the eyes of others, metaphorically and symbolically (Ann Brenoff, *Early Retirement May Be The Kiss Of Death, Study Finds*, *HuffPost*, 29 April 2016).

Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a licensing template

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty;

Articles of Declaration of Human Rights (abridged; see original)		Possible implications (tentative)		
		Licensed to Live?	Licensed to Lie?	Unlicensed to Die?
1	All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights....	Provided they have a vaccination	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the efficacy and dangers of vaccination	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
2	Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration...	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
3	Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
4	No one shall be held in slavery or servitude...	Unless they resist vaccination or oppose it	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
5	No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment	Unless they resist vaccination or oppose it	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
6	Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
7	All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law...	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
8	Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
9	No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile	With the exception of those who resist vaccination or promote opposition to it	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
10	Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal...	With the exception of those promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
11	Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty...	With the exception of promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
12	No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence...	With the exception of those promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
13	Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each State	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
14	Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution	With the exception of those promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
15	Everyone has the right to a nationality	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities

16	Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to form a family....	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
17	Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
18	Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion...	With the exception of those promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
19	Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression...	With the exception of those promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
20	Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association	With the exception of those promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
21	Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives	With the exception of those promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
22	Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security...	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
23	Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
24	Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
25	Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family...	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
26	Everyone has the right to education...	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
27	Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community...	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
28	Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized	Provided they have been vaccinated	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
29	Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible	With the exception of those promoting what is framed as misinformation by authorities	Authorities have a right to misrepresent the envisaged constraints associated with vaccination hesitancy	None have a right to die, unless enabled by authorities
30	Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein			

Documents on related issues and forms of presentation

- *Reframing Fundamental Belief as Disinformation? Pandemic challenge to advertising, ideology, religion and science* (2020)
- *Jabbercovid from the Jabberplex: ensuring a jab-for-all as a global panacea* (2020)
- *COVID-19 as a Memetic Disease: learning from pandemics of the past* (2020)
- *Cowering for One's Country in the War against Coronavirus* (2020)
- *Existential Challenge of Detecting Today's Big Lie* (2016)
- *Dying to Live, Living to Die, Lying to Live, and Living a Lie* (2015)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

For further updates on this site, [subscribe here](#)

