

## **Dr Silvia Behrendt: WHO - Legal Foundations in Theory & Practice in the "Corona"-Management**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yBx2w32dOsw>

Transcript by Dennis Schneble,

Translated from German to English using online translator:

<https://www.deepl.com/de/translator>

<http://dschneble.tssd.de/blog/?p=9666>

---

At the 41st meeting of the Corona Committee on February 26, 2021, legal expert Dr. Silvia Behrendt, among others, shed light on the basis of international law for the current pandemic "measures", particularly in connection with the WHO, as well as the influences of private parties, especially in the context of public-private partnerships. Ms. Behrendt is from Austria and completed her PhD on the topic at the University of Sankt Gallen in Switzerland in 2007/2008. (There may be minor transcription errors).

---

Transcript

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** (...) This is the only legal, internationally binding set of treaties, so it is pure international law, has existed since 1850 and has actually been included in the international, that is, in the World Health Organization. It's an ancient treaty. You can also tell because it has very old-fashioned parts. In 2005, it was significantly revised, namely also in the course of the outbreak of SARS. And there are of a, there used to be a list of diseases that are reportable and then a complex number of border regulations. (...)

**Reiner Füllmich:** So what is this regulation called again?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** International Health Regulations. And that is the binding legal treaty that is relevant under international law. (...) Anyway, it was the

basic building block of the World Health Organization, actually what the World Health Organization was built around. Those quarantine and sanitation guidelines were certainly the cornerstone. Eventually, because of public health, it was certainly somewhat forgotten and moved into the background until just SARS, among other things, came up. And then - now it gets interesting - the concept was changed. From a simple list of diseases to a completely open concept, (...) every initial suspicion that is relevant to health is included in the concept of a public health emergency. This concept has been reinvented carried to the international level. This is this Public Health Emergency of International Concern, so in short one says PHEIC to it, in the technical language so to speak.

And this PHEIC now suggests that we have an international emergency. And that was my topic of investigation for the dissertation. (...) "The Executive Authority of the World Health Organization during Public Health Emergencies." So, what are the executive functions of the World Health Organization during such a public health emergency? And does such a concept even exist under international law? And one has to say quite honestly that in international law, such a concept does not exist yet. It is a terminology that is used that lacks all conceptual and legal background and structural mechanisms. And it is not possible, after all, that there is a world government - that is, after all, the desire, this world government - that there is. But we don't have an international army that demands that, yet. Thank God for that. And we don't want that either.

And that terminology is the only reason we have these public health emergencies, as we call it. It is yes then, so this contract has always been legally disqualified and is now being disqualified. Because there are very well relatively moderate approaches in it. Only they are completely blanked out. Yes, I have prepared some slides that I can explain briefly.

So, this is the WHO side. (...) This body of law regulates the whole global health emergencies. And it is under the public, public health scholars (...).

There is a view, a (...) only legal framework. But that's not true, because it's just pure international law that's being applied here. And now there is an interesting paradox. There has been this global health security agenda developing, which I'm sure you've all heard about? Yes, it's always about global health security. And that's actually the counter-concept to this legal approach, that you say you need a legal way to fight infectious diseases. Which is a legitimate concern in itself; the concern is not misguided. The question is how to do it.

And this Global Health Security Agenda aims to regulate states, in terms of implementing these international regulations - but only unilaterally. And only in terms of capacity strengthening of these institutes. So there are these, in the treaty institutional mechanisms are prescribed. These are the intermediaries between WHO and the nation state. They are officially called International Health Regulations Focal Points. And the RKI, for example, is involved. And now they are trying to expand these agencies as a power center. And this is also possible in the course of the revision.

But perhaps I can explain first how it comes about that the WHO establishes this situation. Because I believe that the PCR test is also based on this. And there are some legal subtleties in it, which one should sue for in some way (...) or make public. (...) There are by this treaty the states are obliged to make an uninterrupted monitoring of the health status, or the epidemiological surveillance. And then have a reporting obligation within 24 hours if they identify an extraordinary event. And there are relatively many. And there's (...) a decision chart flow on how to proceed. And in there you can find the in and of itself important questions. First of all, that it comes to the fact that this report to the WHO takes place (...). For example: Is this unusual? Does it have a serious public health impact? Is there an international spread? (...) As a result: do you have to (...) affect trade, (...) transport and economy, internationally?

Now I forgot to say the most important thing: It was a balancing instrument

from the very beginning. It was never just about containment, it was never just about the pure epidemiological view, but it was always about balancing trade and transport. Because since time immemorial, that has been set as a trade restriction measure. And the states have always been aware of that. And that's why it's also in the very first Objective Purposes that you can only limit the health risks in this balancing act with a way of health protection measures that is as restrictive as possible.

**Reiner Füllmich:** So something like a proportionality principle was built into it?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly. And only the least restrictive measure may be used. So completely contrary to what we are experiencing now.

**Reiner Füllmich:** But there are forces in the WHO that want to go back in this direction? At least that's what we hear again and again. And there are always reports from the WHO that what is happening in Germany, for example - I think this has also been said at the EU level - is going much too far.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly. And that's exactly how it is. And I'll get to that in a minute. So now when the declaration is made, then an emergency committee is formed. And the emergency committee gives these recommendations, so to speak, which were supposed to be this kind of emergency declaration, that didn't quite work, this system at the international level. But these emergency recommendations are then published together with the (...) Director General. Only, unfortunately, the system is very fragile or is executed by non-lawyers. And now the absurdity arises that one, these recommendations then look like this, on the website, (...) these are six recommendations. And on the basis of that, the health measures may be set. And as a contracting state - and we have the 196 contracting states - one may not choose an overshooting implementation. And this is the problem we have at the moment. It is these additional health measures according to Article 43

that just (...) force the state to justify. So the state has a duty to justify and a duty to disclose (...) why it sets health protection higher. There are very precise regulations. And that's why you have to call on the public. Because we have not been informed about this until now. (...)

And that is also the information that we are missing. That's exactly why we don't know why this way was chosen? Why the hard lockdown? And what justification was given to the WHO? Because, (...) none of these recommendations - even remotely - imposed a lockdown. And there is an accountability in these international health regulations; which is completely ignored. So, that's dramatic how unilaterally that's being applied. As soon as it comes to declaring this public health emergency and all the consequences, with vaccination, everybody is on it, that is the legal instrument, and it is used by the global health security agenda. To really say, we have the legal measures in hand. And we can fight a war now with these emergency laws. In reality, this is really a fine-tuning and a balancing mechanism inside that (...) wants to do exactly the opposite. But these regulations remain unapplied.

Now there is a revision. (...) And that is also interesting, because the chairman of this revision (...) is (...) Prof. Lothar Wieler.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Oh shit!

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** And that's why this is relatively explosive, (...) because the revision now takes place in such a way that these centers of power, these control centers, i.e. the RKI and also the - I think it's called - National Situation and Competence Center or some funny name, in Germany. That they are strengthened. And the focus is exclusively on response. Preparedness and response. The legality of the measures is not even mentioned. So they don't even mention what's in the principles. And in the principles, (...) which are the basics of the implementation: The (...) dignity of the human being, human rights and fundamental freedoms, the UN Charter (...). So (...) the entire

implementation must be based on these basic prerequisites. But we are far away from that. So all that is ignored; maybe it will be abolished, I don't know. But we will not allow that.

**Reiner Füllmich:** What is it exactly now? Statement to the 148th Executive Board of the Review-Committee of the Functioning of the International Health Regulations. Who is the statement from?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** The statement is from Wieler.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Oh, I thought so.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Prof. Lothar Wieler, there's his speech inside. The most important points of the revision. And the revision, or the most important aspects, are to be adopted in May at the next World Health Assembly. Therefore, it is also important to make it public relatively quickly. And that was also my intention; that simply this legality of these health measures that are set as a result of the Covid outbreak, that this legality has to be demanded, and the accountability. And not the further response. (...) So the general analyses in the international field and from the Public Health Scholars, are all on preparedness and response - all. Other questions are not asked. It is the general assertion (...), and the general basic tenor is: We were too slow, we did too little, we worked too inefficiently. You can't really understand where that comes from.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Yes, but now I understand the context. Now I understand why the public discussion is no longer concerned with the fundamentals at all. Especially what you just mentioned, the legality and accountability (...). We actually need (...) a sustainable basis in fact, for what is happening here. We don't even talk about that anymore, we just talk about it all the time: Is this response sufficient or not? Do we have to have a tougher lockdown and so on. Keep going for now, and I'm sure there will be more questions.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** So very briefly on these infection control law changes. This is based on the Global Health Security Agenda. It only analyzes this law and it is called (...) Joint External Evaluation. And this has been purposely reclaimed to again only these aspects, so when the Leopoldina or whoever reviews this - again only Response and Preparedness and legal changes - always the Legal Framework, needs more implementation - are incorporated. That is, not a single other aspect will be reviewed. And here is, for example, the page from RKI, where they also write that exactly: What is the IGV Monitoring & Evaluation Framework of the WHO? It doesn't matter at all. It is a legal treaty, a treaty under international law, which needs an overall implementation. And it is contrary to the international treaty to completely ignore Object and Purpose and to ignore everything and to only focus on Response, Response, Response.

So that's this global health security agenda. We found a presentation here, for example. They explain the differences. You can see quite clearly that they have done it themselves, this Global Health Security Agenda, where states are involved and the WHO, public-private partnership is that. So again, it's a voluntary mechanism with the WHO. It's always voluntary. But the voluntary actors are pushing this (...) actually wrong legal approach to the IHR. And they then suddenly become relevant again only where this agenda allows it. And that is actually (...) the legal problem behind it. Where the agenda allows it or approves it; this public-private agenda - you always have to add, there are also private actors in it, but you don't know them, they stay in the background, but it's not hard to identify them anyway - checks the states regarding their implementation.

And that can't be the case. And that is a huge legal problem, to keep public-private partnerships responsible. Because this is also relevant in connection with vaccinations. (...) First of all, it is very important (...) that the vaccinations for - one may demand vaccination status according to these international health regulations for exit and entry, i.e. for entry and exit. But

they are as good as always recommendations. That one simply goes here and says, one may not travel any more, because it is internationally so - that is not correct at all, that is completely wrong. It is even said that no vaccination may be carried out without prior consent. And you have to be informed exactly about the risks. So that one simply vaccinates and that in addition also still on an Emergency Use - that is, would not be so from the guidelines angedacht.

And the next problem is the (...) emergency use listing. This is a new invention. And I would qualify it as problematic. Emergency use listing is a completely new possibility for the World Health Organization to grant prior approval for vaccines or for the entire field of invitro diagnostics - including PCR tests. And in my opinion, the World Health Organization does not have this competence. It assumes a global competence for (...) companies to contact the WHO and immediately grant approval if the conditions are right. But who is checking this now?

**Reiner Füllmich:** That alone would not be enough, Ms. Behrendt. Because (...) don't the member states then still have to be involved in their respective - what do you mean, that's enough?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** I was surprised myself. They made a procedure and published it. And that is enough, without Member States, without World Health Assembly, without Executive Board, at least. I haven't done that much research, but it seems to be, I have to look into it, that this Emergency-Use-Listing-Procedure according to internal regulations - how they check it exactly, there is a procedure - then come to the conclusion - and now it gets interesting - (...) among other things for this Covax-Facility, which then does the global distribution. And also makes it possible for countries (...) that do not have such authorities to obtain approval, rapid approval, to sell these vaccines, i.e. to sell them.

**Prof. Martin Schwab:** May I ask something about that from the off? So in principle, the WHO is becoming a regulatory authority, a supranational

institution ...

Global!

**Prof. Martin Schwab:** ... globally. We have heard that India said, the Pfizer/Biontech vaccine, we will not allow it; we want to know more. Then the application for approval was withdrawn. Now, if I understand these regulations correctly, the WHO would say, screw the Indian regulatory authorities. We, the WHO, hereby allow this vaccine to be marketed in India. Now I ask myself the question: Try to imagine that I am now the Prime Minister of India. And I would now say that I would at least like to protect the sovereignty of my state institutions, regardless of whether I think these vaccinations are good or bad. Would I then have any chance to oppose it without immediately leaving the WHO?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Extremely difficult. It's a huge legal space, but all the more global. The more public-private partnership, the less legally tangible. So it's incredible.

**Reiner Füllmich:** That can't be. That's what we actually feel wafting around here all the time, as lawyers. That there has obviously been such a strong intermingling between our government institutions, elected by us, and these private individuals who control and collect everything from behind. That in the meantime they actually, in fact, make the rules for whether there are such emergency use approvals. Or in Europe it is called - I think - conditional approval? But it comes down to the same thing. So this is now being done by these public-private partnerships that have no connection to any constituencies. So they're coming down on us from above. Perhaps Mr. Trump did the right thing when he said: Get out of the WHO. It has to be said, doesn't it?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly. So there is, for example, this overview of what has already been approved, here on the page, on the far right you can see

what has already been approved, so to speak. So that they can be sent to Ghana, for example, which is the first country to receive these Covax shipments on the basis of this procedure. This will then be used immediately. And now it's getting exciting again for the liability aspects. Now there is also a completely, how do you say, a no-case compensation program.

**Reiner Füllmich:** strict liability compensation program.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** They have invented an advance payment; so that (...) you no longer have to conduct these difficult legal proceedings, you get a small sum - I don't know how big it will be, but it won't be hundreds of thousands - if you do have an adverse effect.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Which is the rule at the moment.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly. And that is super problematic.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Yes, but a program is running here, floating completely freely in a vacuum, without any connection to the national electorate, a regulation is running here, which has exclusively (...) financial advantages for private individuals. At the expense of the taxpayer. That's how it goes with the tests, we pay for them, or they are paid for with printed money. The vaccines too. Surely this cannot be true? But nobody really seems to realize that?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly. And then they are still deprived that they take legal protection possibilities from the state. By granting in advance that they take this sum and are thus compensated. So this is the first time that such a global program is made possible.

**Reiner Füllmich:** So, is it really true what we see also on the European level, that via health, hygiene - racial hygiene comes to my mind, because that was done in the same way back then - they are now trying to achieve world

domination, via health. Last time in the last session, you may also be aware of this, we heard about a program - called Hera - at the European level, through which the competences that actually lie in the national area - health - are to be shifted to the European level, so that the EU Commission is ultimately in a position to penetrate the individual national sovereignties through health regulations. Hera I think is called Health Emergency Response - what do I know - Agency or something.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** That's where I happened to be watching and then I picked that out. (...) All efforts go in the direction of emergency laws, suspending everything, no justification, no fundamental rights, every health measure is right - the main thing is that it is against the dignity of the person. In other words, a completely contrary approach to the law, which cannot be justified by this single international health treaty. And we have to find legal mechanisms to bring this treaty back into a more or less moderate form.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Or else, they say, just like Donald Trump, as soon as we have ended this (...) state of emergency imposed on us by exactly these guys, we'll get out of the WHO. They can continue to play their games on their own. And because it's so nice, out of the EU as well; let's rebuild it back to an EEC. So that these abuses of power, which are taking place here right now, will no longer be possible. I don't think there will be any other way. It will have to be radical. I don't think we can continue to work with this structure at all.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly. And then we need the states to stop participating. Because the problem is that the WHO and the states can't do anything if the states don't participate. And that's the real problem, that the states are joining these private sectors, merging with them and (...) then doing what they want with the WHO. Because that is actually an empty entity and would only do what they want. And that is the goal and purpose. And these emergency laws - that is unbelievable - to simply adopt a legal system that is only a semantic one. There is nothing behind it in international law,

there is no such thing. It sounds great - and that is adopted as the only basis, without (...) international law basis. And that's where I complain to all international law experts and others. This is simply not worked out.

**Reiner Füllmich:** But now we also understand why, at the national level, these advances are always dared, some of which are perceived as brazen impertinence. Because people believe that on this basis they are operating in a legal vacuum. You can afford anything. You can bypass the national governments and, above all, the national judicial systems. That's how it explains itself now. And that means more, that's where we have to step in. Trump was right, get out of WHO. And we have to see that we say goodbye to the EU, in its present form. Back to the EEC, then we'll keep our national cultural characteristics that actually make us attractive in the first place.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** So you kind of have to look at (...) there are initial approaches, which are of course all highly theoretical in nature, that is, Shared Responsibilities for Public Private Actors. There is also a dissertation on this. (...) So the first approaches are to try to break up all coalitions, which are all very difficult to be legally liable. And the next level is to try, for example, what I'm trying to do right now, to create a kind of NGO that can then claim responsibility at the international level; as a counter-concept. So instead of public health security, establish a public health responsibility and say it's all well and good, but legal. We are not calling for anything other than legality, verifiability, and what is the point if a state has to say when it does something; this is an international obligation and not an act of mercy. That is what it is all about at the end.

**Reiner Füllmich:** But (...) it's basically very, very simple: We're in an area where we only talk about response. And no longer think about what a response is actually based on. No one is talking any more about the sustainable basis in fact, which, according to our findings, does not exist at all. And that must

become clear to the public that we are ultimately talking about a non-existent condition here, but one that leads to responses. Which are killing people here and dismantling companies and the economy. That is unbelievable! So it's very good that you explain this background, because now I also understand the self-image of these maniacs. They have to be stopped. And here fits the picture we had at the beginning, (...) with the footbridge, (...) that concerns us as a population, who just have to decide not to play along anymore. Then the madmen crash. But that can be transferred just as well to this state level. Because as you just said, if the states no longer play along, then they stand there as an empty shell. It is only through this empty shell that they have control over us. That is much simpler and bolder than I had even imagined.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** So, according to these international health regulations, there is a blatant violation of international law, what the (...) restrictive states afford. Blatant unconstitutionality, if you analyze quite objectively, starting from Object and Purpose, there legally that. They have not provided any justification for their additional health measures, they have to apply to the WHO. They should actually disclose this transparently; unfortunately, we are not there yet. But really, there is a very reasonable reason, ways of dealing with (...) public health threats. You don't have to stand at the border with guns.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Yes, the way it is now. Yes, obviously, within the framework of this mass hypnosis that has taken place, and mass panic, they are trying to make all the people just stare in panic at the supposedly highly dangerous virus. And in the back, next to us, we don't even notice any more how all kinds of illegal activities are going on here, with the sole purpose of packing as much taxpayers' money as possible into private suitcases. My dear man!

**Viviane Fischer:** But this construct, is there any (...) method to attack it? So now legally, apart from these considerations actually? I mean, it affects (...) our fundamental right, so to speak, because we can no longer get away with it, but in principle, at least the judiciary, adheres to this doctrine, (...) this strange

one.

**Reiner Füllmich:** The judiciary is probably not even aware of these possibilities, because just as among normal lawyers this knowledge is not available, because we namely never see it in daily life and never need it. But now suddenly in a state of emergency. In exactly the same way this might apply to the majority of the judiciary. As long as I have nothing to do with this matter and do not need it, I do not know it.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Yes, the subject is completely underrepresented in law. And we're getting the tit-for-tat now. But the international health regulations have been quite properly implemented (...) or incorporated into German law and there is an implementing law for the international health regulations. And that is actually the only basis on which all the answers have to be based.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Yes well, but then we are in the middle of the discussion also about the PCR test. Because that would be the sustainable basis in fact, if such a test would really be able to detect infections, which it is not, but we have to talk about that. Is that within the framework of this Article 43 IHR or where is that to be anchored?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** So I have to explain briefly. (...) The first emergency committee met on January 22 and 23 and concluded that they could not definitively say whether a public health emergency should actually be declared and then made no recommendation to the director general. And have said to each other, they will meet again in 10 days. During that time, this PCR test was actually used more. And now I copied that out of there. And that's what it says inside, that's what Dr. Holzeisen also has in her complaint. That because of the new possibilities diagnostic tools, so the PCR test, you could now go from previously 557 confirmed cases, (...) over 12,000 suspected cases and 7,000 confirmed cases. And that's why this PHEIC was then recommended and declared here. And there is the PCR test in the background, because in this

original publication of Drosten, this Corman-Drosten protocol, is also definitely in there, which was handed over to the WHO on 13.01, and this first Technical Guidance has also only this one footnote with this Eurosurveillance protocol.

**Reiner Füllmich:** That means that is the basis for everything? Just as we have always attacked it. That's the basis for everything - and that can't suffice without being checked. That's why this retraction paper was so insanely important. And that's why half the world on the other side tried to prevent that paper from being retracted. Because if it had been withdrawn, (...) it would have been established at the same time that all the measures had no basis in fact and were therefore illegal. And: compensation for damages. Okay, the whole game is simpler than I thought.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** It's not difficult, it's totally simple, I think. So quite simply, once you know the one legal basis and know that there is no other, then the game is actually quite simple. That's why I always wonder why it's so complicated.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Yes, because not many people have the knowledge of this particular area of law. What's more, it's part of international law, and international lawyers know it - and international lawyers don't usually have anything to do with liability law. However, we will now be able to manage this balancing act of standing on both feet, i.e., using international law to pull the lever and then using tort law to demand compensation for damages. That was really very, very important information, Mrs. Behrendt. Very, very important. (...) Is there anything missing from your point of view?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** The basic mechanism is super simple. But if you have understood it and if you know that (...) everything else is floating in a legal void, you can actually work with it relatively well. And then think about it in the context, (...) the revision needs just now the question and the review of these

Corona measures on a global level. How the legality of the response and also the diagnosis problems and the scientific criteria must be redefined. Because, the scientific criteria - it must be possible that (...) in science is always a falsification possibility. So there is no absolute in science. And there must always be the possibility for scientists to make their new, contra-indicated results public and also to be allowed to argue. And these are also all aspects that in and of themselves belong in the revision, if one would proceed properly. And that is quite urgent. And if one sees that these (...) diagnostic possibilities and these case definitions are not correct, that one can check that, legally. That one can complain about it.

**Reiner Füllmich:** When was this (...) review statement by Wieler?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** (...) This is from January. (...) This is brand new. And that was off any channels, at least I hadn't found it anywhere.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Can you send us the documents over? Very, very good; we have to use that in the proceedings. (...) These are simple legal bases, but nobody knows them. So that already here, one must say, on the level of international law, even the foundations are laid for our problem of damages. It's all there.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly, two things: legality and legality. And not declaring why public health needs this measure. (...)

**Viviane Fischer:** But that also means that Wieler, so to speak, knows exactly what is being played.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Is a liar before the Lord.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Everybody knows it. They know it very well.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Why do they do that? Is it about money?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** So in my opinion, I'm not psychic, with the global security agenda. These guidelines were absolutely uninteresting until now. Until they went in the direction of Public Health Emergency, and in the direction of vaccinations. And in the direction of influenza. And that means, of course, if you take that into an emergency, a basic concept, that it becomes a permanent concept. (...) So in and of itself, the pandemic declaration, it is legally irrelevant, so from a purely international law perspective, but only this declaration of public health emergency. And there, in and of itself, it was already said in the international health regulations that the, a new influenza strand, can already lead to a public health emergency. And that was led also then in 2009 very prominently and very long. Only the response of the states was - not there. (...) That's when the system was tested, with very little consequences for the public. People knew there was vaccination and it was pushed, but it didn't spill over into public life. And that leap has now been made with Covid. To really impact and cripple public life in terms of a war scenario.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Yes, the lever health was used to gain control over the population. What all people believe serves health, serves in reality, because there is no actual background, only the control of the population. Possibly, we will have to find out, so that the population does not realize how it has been plundered for at least two to three decades. And people always look in the direction of Corona - and don't realize that the action is taking place on a completely different side.

**Viviane Fischer:** Or it's like this: It's a very simple sales aid.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Or that would be the simplest explanation. But then we wouldn't need a permanent pandemic.

**Viviane Fischer:** Yes, yes - I can always continue to sell.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Oh yes, a new vaccination every three weeks, because everything mutates, including Klabauterbach.

**Viviane Fischer:** And it's fascinating, (...) probably there is a calculation. You would have to talk to an actuary or something, because this sum that is called up for the people or in principle a contract at the expense of third parties, so to speak, also under the aspect. So I'm saying that you won't get any more money - that's how I understood it - than this sum, which is then put in there as compensation. That's probably a calculation. Okay, let's say 10% get more serious damage or die, however much. And it's still worth it, because I can throw out a lot of this stuff and (...) it occurs so late that I can't prove it anymore; maybe there's also an exclusion clause after two months is the end. Or I don't know what. And then people will only get that. And that will still be worth it. So it's absolutely absurd. It's totally calculable, even then, what comes out of it.

**Reiner Füllmich:** It shows us again more that we have to solve the whole thing on a legal level. The legal level is crucial. But we need the support of the public, so the educational work is still of utmost importance. Because this knowledge has to get out to the public - and preferably worldwide. We will discuss this with the Americans this evening. And apart from that, I do believe that this can be a calculation. That you say to yourself: Okay, with this compensation, with this fare, some person in Ghana might get 100 euros for the fact that his relative died. But for that we can vaccinate a few hundred thousand people. And so (...) it always pays off.

**Viviane Fischer:** And one more thing comes to mind. The thing is, they save themselves all marketing, so to speak. All marketing costs. Because it's all done by the state. As we see with our vaccination campaigns, and we see it from the panic paper. So all the propaganda, which - do we really have to call it now - which leads to the fact that people have to "buy" this product or

somehow have to have it applied, however, runs from another side. And that means that, as a kind of compensation for the normally multi-million, multi-billion budgets for pharmaceutical advertising, for example, I now only have this relatively manageable ...

**Reiner Füllmich:** No, I don't have any costs anymore, even the posters here in the city - who pays for them?

**Viviane Fischer:** I don't have them anymore, they're paid for by the state.

**Reiner Füllmich:** We pay for our own destruction.

**Viviane Fischer:** But instead I have this small obolus, which I have to pay if someone reports in time. And who really comes through with his claim that he has somehow experienced an injury. So that's it, I'm really flabbergasted.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** There's a lot to work through, especially with this Covax facility. The whole funding of donations and donations back and donations forth. A complex web of gifts.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Yes, you have to put it that way. We know who is behind it. We know who these private partnerships are. We know that (...) at least the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation plays a leading role here, perhaps even the leading role. At least at the WHO. But what role does China play in this?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Difficult. Well, they are also in these Emergency Committees, also a Chinese, so from the state. But what role China really plays, I can't answer that legally.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Well, it's not relevant for us, so it's not relevant for the decision, I would say. Because, we get along in the legal disputes, even without investigating these - one would almost have to say - deep-state backgrounds. We get along just fine that way. After all, we see which people

are in front. Drosten, Wieler now increasingly in the spotlight, also at the latest after this information from you. So we have to grab them because they are the key players out there. Even if we know that they are hanging on the strings of others.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly. And Wieler (...) is the chairman of this review committee, which could come in May for adoption - or pretty much will come. And he is the chairman thus also of this review of the Covid measures globally. On an international law basis, so to speak.

**Reiner Füllmich:** That's actually incredible! A man who can't get a straight sentence out and who stammers away and tells us, we will have a vaccine; I don't know what it is, if it will do anything, how it will work, but we will pretty much have a vaccine ... Such a complete moron, so really times, such a complete moron has such decision-making powers! This has to be stopped. This is really unbelievable. Let's see where he got his doctorate and his professor title. If you take a closer look. But now well. Okay, so Ms. Behrendt - that was frightening. But at the same time reassuring. Because it's actually quite simple. If you just take a closer look.

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** Exactly. That would be quite simple. The legal problem is in itself quite simple to resolve. It just has to be dragged before the courts somehow.

**Reiner Füllmich:** Yes, I think we will also have to include that in the claims for damages. Because these are at least principles of international law that make it possible to argue that these principles have been completely violated here. Even under international law, this cannot stand. This has an impact on both levels. It has an impact both in terms of international law and directly in the compensation process, because the same considerations play a decisive role there. Namely, there is always the question of the factual basis. And there is not. Okay.

**Viviane Fischer:** Ms. Behrendt, I have another question: (...) Can one say that this is really absolutely prevailing opinion, so to speak? Or is there no other possible interpretation of this whole event, on the level of international law?

**Dr. Silvia Behrendt** So what I find, what shocks me, is that there is no legal analysis that I have found so far that would do yes times the legality and what is really going on. Because there are relatively many new publications about the international health regulations. But always just Preparedness, Response, Enforcement. Always just the same direction. So that somebody writes once a reasonable essay, which is outside this 08/15-Health-Security-Model, I haven't found yet. And that would be my goal, to do that. With some kind of NGO, agencies, Global Health Responsibility it will be called. The agency is being set up right now. But how far I will really succeed, that is ...

**Reiner Füllmich:** We're happy to work with you, because I think it's important that we also form alliances here, international alliances. Just like everywhere else. But it's a very simple construction here. We can state on this construction basis: There is always only talk about response - but never about what the response actually refers to? Proportionality; none of this has been touched upon to any degree. And that is also the reason why the entire public discussion in the mainstream media is always about how we can make an even tougher lockdown, without anyone ever asking: Do we even need a lockdown? All right. So, all very, very, very interesting. Very interesting, we'll even continue this, I think, because, Ms. Behrendt, Dr. Astrid Stückelberger - I don't know, she might even tell you something? - is next on the line with us. Do you know her? Sounds like a German, but she's not. Just the name. And I think that follows on directly. Dr. Stückelberger, can you hear us?

See also

Dr. Silvia Behrendt on the WHO international treaties | Platform RESPECT

-----

The lawyer Dr. Silvia Behrendt reports on the international treaties of the WHO with the member states, their contents and their legally binding nature. The recommendations of the WHO have legal status and would have to be observed by the member states. This is just not known. Dr. Behrendt clarifies this.

<https://odysee.com/@plattform-respekt:7/silvia-behrendt-who:9>

---