

QUESTIONS

I. All stakeholders (core questions)

General

1. Has your country taken any policy action or initiative in relation to neurotechnology and human rights at the national level? If so, please share any relevant information.

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #1: On a National level, neither the executive or legislative branch have taken any policy action to protect neurotechnology and human rights. However, at a state level, on March 10, 2023, The Colorado Medical Society (CMS) adopted an ethical neurorights framework to promote the protection of mental privacy, personal identity, free will, fair access to mental augmentation and protection from bias, as it pertains to the coming wave of neurotechnology. The five adopted neurorights set forth are the following:

1. **PRIVACY:** Any neural data obtained from measuring neural activity should be kept private. If stored, there should be a right to have it deleted at the subject's request. The sale, commercial transfer, and use of neural data should be strictly regulated.
2. **PERSONAL IDENTITY:** Boundaries must be developed to prohibit technology from disrupting the sense of self. When neurotechnology connects individuals with digital networks, it could blur the line between a person's consciousness and external technological inputs.
3. **FREE WILL:** Individuals must have ultimate control over their own decision making, without unknown manipulation from external neurotechnologies.
4. **FAIR ACCESS TO MENTAL AUGMENTATION:** There should be established guidelines regulating the use of mental enhancement neurotechnologies. These guidelines should be based on the principle of justice and guaranteed equality of access.
5. **PROTECTION FROM BIAS:** Countermeasures to combat buyers should be the norm for algorithms in neurotechnology. Algorithm design should include input from user groups to foundationally address bias.

2. Is there any actor in the public or private sector developing this kind of technology in your country? Please provide information, if possible.

Targeted Justice has provided key evidence that the CIA and US military began developing this technology in the 1950's under the MK-Ultra program:

<https://www.targetedjustice.com/cia--mk-ultra.html>

This illegal program continues today under the funding of the CIA.

Timeline for developments of the key technologies:

<https://www.targetedjustice.com/timeline-for-satellite-weapons.html>

The main U.S. Patents that are involved with the technology today:

US Patent 4345220 - Vircator microwave satellite weapon. (First launched into orbit in 1984).

"Titan DEW Capabilities" This is the technical paper written by engineers of the Titan Corporation, confirming that they built the Vircator microwave weapons, under contract to the US Air Force.

U.S. Patent 4,877,027 - Microwave Auditory Effect. These frequencies can be broadcast from a cell tower. It can be used to create subliminal messages that are broadcast at everyone in a city. This is currently happening in the United States and Europe.

<https://www.targetedjustice.com/v2k.html>

US Patent 10,164,694 - Beamforming using an Antenna Array on Cell Towers.

The microwave beam is pointed at Targeted Individuals every day. Digital beamforming is a weapons technology - typically using 4 panel antennas on a cell tower.

Other key evidence of the neurotechnology weapons:

<https://www.targetedjustice.com/key-evidence.html>

3. Indicate your level of awareness (high/medium/low) in relation to the state of development of neurotechnologies and preparedness to tackle the challenges posed by the early commercialization of these technologies.

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #3: Our organization is HIGH in relation to the state of development of neurotechnologies and preparedness to tackle the challenges posed by the early commercialization of these technologies. Targeted Justice (TJ) has demonstrated its ability to advocate for victims of neurotechnology abuse, to provide guidance and support for those who have been negatively impacted by the misuse of such neurotechnologies. Operating from a knowledgeable stance, understanding the technology which has been developed, used and misused, TJ has been able to assist and litigate for its members, and others, globally. The leadership of TJ comes from all walks of life and can adequately advise on a wide range of areas where unrestricted neurotechnology influences, affects and curtails individual rights. From an aerospace engineer with a master's degree in mechanical engineering, to two Attorneys, an MD specialized in Havana Syndrome, an Assistant Superintendent of Schools, to everyday Moms and Dads, Targeted Justice counts with a diverse staff of volunteers committed to recovering privacy in the realm of the brain.

Impact, opportunities and challenges

4. What human rights will be mostly impacted by the development and use of neurotechnologies? Identify the three rights most impacted and briefly explain why.

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #4: The three human rights most impacted by the development and use of neurotechnologies include, but are not limited to the following:

1. PRIVACY- having access to one's brain matter is quite invasive and extremely personal.
2. FREE WILL - it is said that these technologies use mind control by impacting what one perceives or experiences through his or her senses which influences his or her decisions,
3. SELF IDENTITY - altering how one views him/herself in any manner is within the realm of capabilities with these technologies.
4. THEFT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY. By means of patented remote neural monitoring, unconsented use of brain technologies can serve the purpose of stealing trade secrets, intellectual property and work product.

What are the biggest challenges and risks that the development, test and use of neurotechnologies pose to human rights? Will such risks be amplified by the development of consumer-oriented neurotechnologies?

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #5: The risks are numerous and unrestricted. The most prominent one is the "unreasonable search and seizure" of the mind by powerful actors hiding behind the cloak of national security convert civilians' brains into state property.

The biggest challenge is tackling a long-overdue regulatory framework for these technologies. As they can easily be weaponized, consumers would be able to cause harm to others, often in anonymity. Manufacturers would be willing to produce and sell such for monetary gain.

5. What groups are more vulnerable or at risk? Please, identify three and explain why.

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #6:

1. Targeted Individuals named in the Terrorist Screening Data Base (TSDB) are the most vulnerable. As non-consenting human experimentation subjects, they are victims of remote neural monitoring, microwave auditory effect and the non-consensual placement of medical devices/implants to alter their thoughts, behavior, and body functions. Thus, Targeted Individuals are the most vulnerable and most likely victims of these neurotechnologies.

2. The percentage of population who are subject to subliminal messaging, mind control and hypnosis are the second most vulnerable to mind control experiments and subliminal messages often used by these neurotechnologies. For example, it would be easy to influence these people, in anonymity, to do, say, feel, hear, and even see things which would influence their perception.

6. What methods can be used to identify and assess the potential risks and impact of these technologies on human rights, in particular the human rights of persons with disabilities and other groups in vulnerable situations? Will such risks be amplified by the development of consumer-oriented neurotechnologies?

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #7: Cradle-to-grave regulation of medical devices should be implemented on a worldwide scale, making manufacturers absolutely liable for the non-consensual placing of their devices in any one person. This would minimize the clear and present risk and practice that entails the illegal placement on millions of innocent civilians.

Free or affordable-access neural artifact detection and removal clinics should become a priority for nations.

Whistleblower protection for radiologists and surgeons that detect and remove medical implants placed without the individual's consent should be a standard policy adopted in all industrialized countries.

7. From a human rights perspective, what opportunities could the use of neurotechnologies bring? Can these opportunities be balanced against the identified risks and impact?

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #8: Currently neurotechnologies have been used to deprive innocent civilians from their human rights. From unfair warfare tactics to the torture of innocent targeted individuals, neurotechnologies still have to prove were created to save lives. The cases of reduction in epileptic seizures or recovering the capacity to walk are the exception of their current uses. Neurotechnologies have been abused to experiment on nonconsenting individuals.

National framework

- 8. Is the national legal framework adequate to face the challenges that the development, test and use of neurotechnologies pose to human rights? Please explain briefly and indicate the relevant pieces of legislation and whether there are plans to develop any (or further) legislation.**

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #9: Absolutely not. Currently, the TJ lawsuit speaks to over 300,000 subjects in the USA and millions around the world who have been subjected to the weaponized use of neurotechnologies. Rogue intelligence agencies have exponentially increased the use of neurotechnologies to modify behavior, carry out mind control, and even induce violent behavior. This corroborated unrestricted use of neurotechnologies certainly outweighs any common good consideration.

- 9. Does national legislation on privacy and data protection cover mental privacy¹ and/or personal brain data?² Please explain.**

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #10: Absolutely Not. With the onslaught of 5G and these neurotechnologies, new legislation (similar to that adopted by CMS under the guidance of Professor Rafael Yusté) has become an urgent necessity. Refer to Answer #1.

- 10. From a human rights-protection perspective, what are the main domestic regulatory gaps that can be identified? What legal (or other) measures are necessary to avoid human rights violations arising from the use of neurotechnologies in your opinion?**

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #11: We believe one efficient way to counteract the current unlimited abuses perpetrated through the use of neurotechnology would be the inclusion of federal officials as liable for their conduct under law under the Civil Rights Act. Currently, this statute only applies to state actors. Federal officials are held liable by means of a limited judicial vehicle.

The lack of tracking of cradle-to-grave of implantable medical devices by the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission is a travesty that must be looked at urgently.

The lack of control in the construction and operation of cellular towers weaponized with microwave beam producing microchips is the main culprit for the world-wide overwhelming abuse of neural rights.

- 11. Is your national institutional framework for human rights well-equipped to address the new challenges posed by neurotechnologies?**

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #12: YES. Targeted Justice has the expertise, intellectual independence and credibility to address this critical issue.

¹ “Mental privacy” refers to the explicit protection of individuals against the unconsented intrusion by third parties into their mental information (be it inferred from their neural data or from proxy data indicative of neurological, cognitive and/or affective information) as well as against the unauthorized collection of those data. Ienca, M. and Andorno, R. “Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology”, *Life Sciences, Society and Policy*, Vol. 13, n. 5, 2017.

² “Personal brain data” or “neural data” is defined as the data relating to the functioning or structure of the human brain of an identified or identifiable individual that includes unique information about their psychology, health or mental states (OECD, 2019).

12. What national entity would be best placed to exercise scrutiny and oversight to prevent potential abuses or misuses derived from the use of neurotechnologies? Is there any procedure in place to that effect?

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #13: The United States lacks a governmental entity that could carry out the oversight and scrutiny of the abuse of neurotechnologies. Manufacturers control the Food and Drug Administration that regulates medical devices. The Department of Defense exerts absolute control of the weaponized neurotechnology used to control the population through the use of remote neural monitoring, subliminal messaging and microwave torture effect torture.

Targeted Justice has the expertise and resources to work with the United Nations in the effort of devising and implementing the necessary procedures to exercise national and international scrutiny and oversight in the prevention of abuse of the use of neurotechnologies.

International framework

13. What are the main international regulatory and governance gaps that you have identified as regards neurotechnology and human rights?

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #14: See answer to # 10 above.

14. What actions would you advocate for to address these gaps and potential human rights impact at the international level? Please elaborate on specific normative or institutional measures you would propose and assess the feasibility of their implementation.

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #15: Full audit of the various "MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT" signed between the United States and foreign nations exchanging information on their citizens for the illicit use of torture neurotechnologies on them.

Any agreements which violate foreign citizens neurorights must be banned.

Developed nations have the military technology to shield their citizens from lethal neurotechnologies used to monitor, control, or in any way attack their minds. Each developed nation should make use of that technology in a defensive mode to protect their innocent civilians.

15. What international organization, bodies, or agencies would be in your opinion best placed to oversee and prevent potential abuses or misuses resulting from the use of neurotechnologies?

TARGETED JUSTICE RESPONSE TO #16: Targeted Justice's experience, credibility, journalistic integrity and international membership makes it the best suited to develop the solutions necessary to tackle at a global level the most prevalent neurotechnologies being used for noxious goals. See answers to #24-26.

II. Private actors and other stakeholders with experience or expertise in the subject-matter, such as medical and technical communities, and academic institutions (specific questions)

16. What specific characteristics would you emphasize as unique and distinctive of neurotechnologies?

N/A

17. Have you introduced or are you considering introducing any adjustment to your activities or business model such as incentives, indicators or performance metrics of governance in response to these specific characteristics? Please explain.

N/A

18. Has your company/organization undertaken any specific action or measure to mitigate impacts arising from the use of neurotechnologies? Are any of these actions or measures specifically addressed to mitigate human rights risks?

N/A

19. Does your company or organization implement the principles for responsible innovation in neurotechnology?³ Please elaborate.

N/A

20. Has your company or organization developed or plans developing (or adopting) an ethical code of conduct or human rights strategy for the development, testing or commercialization of neurotechnologies? Please outline such initiatives and provide a copy of relevant documents, if possible.

N/A

21. What national regulation or framework do you consider is needed to avoid a potentially negative human rights impact of neurotechnology?

N/A

22. Which regulatory framework such as application of specific, sectorial, national, autoregulation or a combination of them do you believe is best suited to the specific characteristics of neurotechnologies?

N/A

III. International and regional organizations; United Nations agencies, funds and programmes; national human rights institutions; and civil society (specific questions)

23. Please outline the relevant work that your organization, agency or department has done in relation to neurotechnology and human rights. Please share the main outcomes and recommendations (if applicable).

Targeted Justice has spent a great deal of time trying to inform Congress and the legislative branches of government in the United States. During 2019, we made three trips to Washington DC, where we went door-to-door and left information for 300 Congressmen and Senators. Some of the Congressmen and staff were already aware of the illegal program, but were afraid to confront the CIA or FBI about the program.

Raising awareness of the program is the main obstacle right now. Most people are unfamiliar with the technology, and they find it to be unbelievable.

TargetedJustice.com

³ See, for example: OECD, "Recommendation of the Council on OECD Legal Instruments Responsible Innovation in Neurotechnology", 2019.

24. Please describe any measures undertaken aimed at coordinating, collaborating or seeking synergies with the work of other organizations in relation to neurotechnology.

We are in regular communications with ICATOR.be organization in Europe, as well as *PACTSItl.org*. There are other smaller organizations worldwide.

25. What are the main international regulatory and governance gaps that you have identified as regards neurotechnology and human rights?

The main obstacle is the technology. Most people do not believe the technology already exists. The National Academy of Sciences authored a report in 2020, proving that some scientists are aware of the technology, and its ability to be directed using beamforming methods, such as US Patent 10,164,694.

The use of beamforming technologies from cell towers must be outlawed. It is a weapon system. The FCC did not foresee the development of this technology and continue to use policies from the 1980's that allow it to continue. Corruption within the FCC is also problematic.

Please read the diagrams on our Home page, which describe some of the technologies, and how they are deployed.

IV. Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council (specific questions)

26. Has your mandate considered the issue of neurotechnology and human rights? If so, please indicate the main outcomes and recommendations and include relevant references and links.

N/A

27. What impact of neurotechnology do you foresee in relation to the human rights within your mandate? What actions would you propose or undertake to mitigate any adverse impact or risk? Please highlight the risks attached to this issue and potential opportunities, if relevant.

N/A

28. What actions could be undertaken by the Coordination Committee of Special Procedures to address any negative human rights impact arising from neurotechnology?

N/A

29. What are the gaps, if any, in the existing international human rights protection framework to address the impact of neurotechnology? How could they be best addressed?

N/A

30. How could the current international human rights framework be best used or developed to address the impact, opportunities and challenges of neurotechnology with regard to the promotion and protection of all human rights?

N/A

V. United Nations Treaty Bodies (specific questions)

- 31. Has your treaty body considered directly or indirectly the issue of neurotechnology and human rights (while considering individual complaints, examining periodic reports or elaborating general comments)? If so, please indicate the main outcomes and recommendations (include relevant references and links).**

N/A

- 32. What impact of neurotechnology on human rights do you foresee from the perspective of your mandate? Please highlight the risks attached to this issue and potential opportunities, if relevant, and indicate what actions would you propose or undertake to mitigate risks.**

N/A

- 33. What are the gaps, if any, in the existing international human rights protection framework to address the impact of neurotechnology? How could they be best addressed?**

N/A

- 34. How could the current international human rights framework be best used or developed to address the impact, opportunities and challenges of neurotechnology with regard to the promotion and protection of all human rights?**

N/A

VI. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (specific questions)

- 35. What work is OHCHR currently carrying out in the field of neurotechnology and human rights? Please provide any relevant information such as links to reports, background material, sections or units involved, etc.**

N/A

- 36. What are the gaps, if any, in the existing international human rights protection framework to address the impact of neurotechnology? How could they be best addressed?**

N/A

- 37. How could the current international human rights framework be best used or developed to address the impact, opportunities and challenges of neurotechnology with regard to the promotion and protection of all human rights?**

N/A

Date: July 1st. 2023

For any inquiries, please write to TJustice2@proton.me and RLighthouse@protonmail.com.

Contact information: +01 713-306-8287 or +01 832-234-3046