

Utrecht, The Netherlands, December 10, 2019

Our Quest for Life

The Speaker of the US House of Representatives, Ms. Nancy Pelosi
Our fellow users of Consciousness Altering Substances

Subject: request that the formal impeachment inquiry initiated by you, Madam Speaker, against Mr. Trump, for “betrayal of his oath of office, betrayal of (y)our national security and betrayal of the integrity of (y)our elections”, be widened to include his commission of the crime of incitement to genocide of our fellow users of consciousness altering substances in the Philippines.

Dear Madam Speaker, dear fellow users of consciousness altering substances,

01. PRESENTATION

We, the undersigned users of consciousness altering substances, write to you to invite you on this International Human Rights Day to jointly contribute to the salvation of democracy, the rule of law and the protection of human rights. You may at first be surprised at the equivalence ascribed to the addressees of this letter. Indeed, you, Madam Speaker, have become the highest authority in the world willing to challenge the democracy-deniers who occupy Washington's White House when you took on the mission to prevent that the rule of law is replaced by the law of these rulers. We users, to the contrary, belong to the lowest human caste the international order, established under the Pax Americana, has devised with the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs: criminals, the scum of modern history, the henchmen of the evil from which humanity must be delivered. But today, December 10, happens to be the day of the annual celebration of the recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family. Today we and our fellow users may address you, Madam Speaker, and all people in the world, as equals. Today we may aspire that for this exceptional occasion the Prohibition of substances will suspend for a moment its self-attributed moral superiority, its indifference and willful ignorance, and listen to the users of mind altering substances as we speak out about the denial of our rights and freedoms, our status 'to be hunted down' in a permanent open season.

Today we users are reminded that, as a rule, we may be excluded from the protection of human rights, up to the point that increasingly even the decision to destroy us physically is no longer a matter of the courts but the strongest, whether mafioso, pharmacist or president. The acceptance of the punitive prohibition regime of the 1961 Convention competing on a par with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) as an alternative '**common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations**', has caused gross violations of users rights and freedoms worldwide. The resulting official double talk has not only lead to the ostracism of generations of users but has lately culminated in the extra-judicial mass-killing of members of our group, most openly in the Philippines. This is genocide. It was on several occasions endorsed by US President Trump.

The unqualified acceptance by the US Chief Executive of this genocide, considered the crime of crimes by the world community, amounts indeed to incitement to genocide by your Government if the US Congress, its co-equal branch, fails to publicly disavow it and take all necessary measures to undo its consequences. Since the US criminal justice administration has not seen fit to prosecute Mr. Trump for this crime under federal law, and since

the International Criminal Court seems to be sidelined by the president -please see below- we herewith ask you to take the lead to help prevent the further killing of users by re-establishing the rule of law.

02. REQUEST

To that end we ask that you embrace our request that the **formal impeachment inquiry initiated by you, Madam Speaker**, against Mr. Trump, for his “betrayal of his oath of office, betrayal of (y)our national security and betrayal of the integrity of (y)our elections”, be widened to include his commission of the crime of incitement to genocide of our fellow users of consciousness altering substances in the Philippines. Prevention of genocide has been defined as a matter of national security in the US’s **‘Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018**, signed into law on **January 14, 2019 by president Trump** himself. Equally, incitement to genocide has been defined as a crime under **US Code Title 18 §1091(C)**, as well as under international law, **art. 3(C) of the 1948 UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide** (ratified by the US), and **Art. 25(3)(e) of the 2002 Rome Statute** of the International Criminal Court (ICC).

Please find attached the “Report on the incitement to genocide by the 45th US president”. We are confident that it presents an irrefutable case of an impeachable ‘high crime’ and meets the criteria set forth when you asked your House Committees for the best cases on potentially impeachable offenses by the president to be put together: clear cut, easy for everybody to understand and no need for further proof, as there exists, in this case too, an **official transcript** of an incriminating call between president Trump and his Filipino counterpart, Mr. Duterte. As the presidential incitement to genocide was nowhere mentioned on **the lists of cases under review**, you decided to focus on the sole Ukraine/Zelensky case. Yet we trust that the advantages of inclusion of this new case in your impeachment inquiry may help you overcome the US nation’s growing inability to separate your opponent’s fictional narratives from the objective realities, because, contrary to president Trump, no decent US politician has dared to glorify a genocide to achieve political goals. We are moreover convinced that the overt rejection by the US Congress of the abject statements by the 45th US President is crucial to avert our liquidation and to restore the world’s confidence in US adherence to our shared values.

03. PROCEDURAL JUSTIFICATION OF THE CHOICE FOR THE IMPEACHMENT REMEDY

To appreciate our request for an impeachment procedure in the US it is useful to review the case history as it will demonstrate how other legal options of prosecution have been attacked by the White House, practically excluding these options.

On February 18, 2018, the prosecutor with the International Criminal Court, Ms. Fatou Bensouda, announced that a **Preliminary Examination had been opened into the situation in the Philippines**, to “analyze crimes allegedly committed in this State Party since at least 1 July 2016, in the context of the “war on drugs” campaign launched by the Government of the Philippines.” Given the total silence of the US government with regard to the incitement to genocide by Mr. Trump, the Netherlands-based Drugs Peace Institute (DPI) asked the ICC Prosecutor on **January 1, 2019** and **January 27, 2019**, for the inclusion in the Preliminary Examination of the crime of incitement to genocide by Mr. Donald Trump. On April 4, 2019, the **Office of the Prosecutor informed the DPI** that its requests had been received and “will be analyzed in this context.”

Although the above-mentioned Rome Statute has not yet been ratified by the US, its provisions nevertheless apply to its nationals if they commit a crime within the territorial jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court. Such is here the case as the last of the three incitements made by Mr. Trump occurred on the territory of the Republic of the Philippines while that country was a State Party to the Rome Statute. Despite the Philippines' subsequent [withdrawal](#) from the Rome Statute, pursuant to art. 127.2 of the Statute the Court retains its jurisdiction over crimes committed during the time in which the State was party to the Statute and may exercise this jurisdiction even after said State's withdrawal. The crime allegedly committed by Mr. Trump therefore would fall within the ICC jurisdiction.

The court's jurisdiction applies only if national courts are unwilling or unable to investigate or prosecute such crimes themselves. This principle of complementarity is met if there is evidence of grave inaction by the state, which seems to be the case here as no investigation of Mr. Trump for the commission of the crime of incitement to genocide has been opened in the US. It seems nevertheless very unlikely that the ICC will authorize a formal investigation by the Prosecutor into Mr. Trump's alleged incitement to genocide after its pre-trial chamber turned down, on April 12, 2019, a November 2017 request from Ms. Bensouda for an investigation into a case of US war crimes in Afghanistan. The Prosecutor was particularly interested in looking at the alleged abuse of detainees taken in by US forces and the CIA. Although the pre-trial judges said there was a basis to believe crimes had been committed, a lack of cooperation from the United States, Afghan authorities and the Taliban made the chances of success of prosecution remote and would not serve the interests of justice, found in the overarching objectives underlying the Statute: the effective prosecution of the most serious international crimes, the fight against impunity and the prevention of mass atrocities. Although the chamber's decision dealt with a different case, the motivation leading to the conclusion that an inconclusive investigation would not be in the interest of justice seems to hold for all cases involving American nationals and *ipso facto* Mr. Trump.

The ICC decision came after threats made by Trump's National Security Adviser Mr. Bolton: "The United States will use any means necessary to protect our citizens and those of our allies from unjust prosecution by this illegitimate court." "We will ban its judges and prosecutors from entering the United States," he added. "We will sanction their funds in the U.S. financial system, and we will prosecute them in the U.S. criminal system. We will do the same for any company or state that assists in an I.C.C. investigation of Americans." On April 5, 2018, the United States added a first deed to the word and [revoked the entry-visa for the ICC's prosecutor](#). This outrages and United Nations-demeaning affirmation by Bolton further tightens the worldwide US ban on non-US prosecutions of international crimes committed by American nationals. It seriously flouts the sovereignty of the countries where crimes are committed because it protects not only US nationals against extradition to the place of prosecution but even against the investigation of their alleged crimes, whether in their absence or presence.

US hostility towards international criminal justice, the jewel on the crown of the rule of law in the free world, didn't come as a surprise. The mafia style abdication by the US of its accountability for victims of atrocity crimes by threatening judges, witnesses and member countries of the Court confirmed its abandonment of its international moral and legal obligations. Although Bensouda's request said there was reason to believe that members of the U.S. military and intelligence agencies had "committed acts of torture, cruel treatment, outrages upon personal dignity, rape and sexual violence against conflict-related detainees in Afghanistan and other locations" and two [US Senate Committees](#) had extensively documented many of these abuses, president Trump called the April 12 ICC decision "[a major international victory, not only for these patriots, but for the rule of law.](#)" "Any attempt

to target American, Israeli or allied personnel for prosecution will be met with a swift and vigorous response,” Trump added.

Bolton had claimed that “as a democratic, constitutional society we are capable of holding our own citizens accountable”, but it appeared the president had meant to exclude not only supra-national but US attempts at prosecution as well. A case in point is the November 15, 2019, presidential clearing of three army officers. One accused, two convicted in the US military justice system of war crimes, including murder, committed in Iraq and Afghanistan. As the president presented the pardons as a sign of approval instead of forgiveness, many, including top Defense officials who opposed the pardons, view them as a disregard for the rule of law, providing impunity for atrocity crimes committed by US military and its allies at the price of denial of justice for the victims and of undermining discipline, morale and military effectiveness of the US army. The pardon of the accused officer who was still awaiting court-martial, is the most troublesome. Military justice was not given the chance of determining the facts as the judicial process was put aside in favor of the interests of one man, albeit the chief, who claims that the Constitution gives him “the right to do whatever I want”, including “condoning the aberrant conduct of those convicted or accused of flouting the laws of war.” The law of this ruler is lawlessness.

In the meantime, the genocide in the Philippines continues as president Duterte reinforces his grip on the Philippine’s Congress and Judiciary. A possible ICC investigation into his responsibility for the ongoing slaughter is henceforth heavily compromised as he is openly supported by his ally and possible co-defendant, the US president, against whom eventual charges in the case could be expected to be dropped, as an obstruction of justice on his part has already been announced in advance.

With both US and international criminal justice systems proving unable to proceed now that the opposition of the alleged perpetrator determines the interest of justice to prosecute and given the absence of other effective remedies, it seems that only the instrument of impeachment remains.

The outcome of this exercise may be disappointing but at least your worldwide audience will be informed and have a better chance to judge the facts when there is no dispute about what took place. Paraphrasing the chairman of your House Intelligence Committee, Mr. Schiff, the question has then become: if incitement to genocide is not impeachable conduct, what is?

Would the Senate decide upon impeachment by your House, that incitement to genocide by the US president is covered by the US constitution, your inquiry will provide the American people with the chance for an informed correction in the 2020 elections. Thus, although the immediate failure of the impeachment would seem to confirm the earlier The Hague decision that it is not in the interest of justice to condemn, or even to try president Trump for incitement to genocide, the ultimate result cannot be other than that the crime committed has finally met its opposition.

04. MORAL JUSTIFICATION OF THE CHOICE FOR THE IMPEACHMENT REMEDY

Madam Speaker, fellow users, the moral justification for us to request impeachment of Mr. Trump is our duty to prevent that people may fail to recognize this incitement to genocide. It could occur if the impeachment inquiry remains limited to the Ukraine/Zelensky case, because although the US media have extensively reported on the

Philippines' massacre, there is no national awareness of US responsibility for its legitimization. In the US, Mr. Trump's interventions were mostly treated as single incidents dealing with a foreign local drug problem instead of consequent expressions of endorsement of an extermination policy, the way it is viewed in Manila and expressed in Filipino government statements (see in the attached report : 'From incitement to cooperation?').

Would therefore president Trump be impeached and convicted on other grounds than incitement to genocide, his message to incite could well survive and determine future drug wars, the same way the war on drugs, started by president Nixon in 1971, survived his resignation upon his impeachment and resulted in escalating levels of arrests and incarceration in the subsequent decades.

The two grounds of moral justification we do invoke here deal respectively with the recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family and, secondly with users' belief in a just society where the sovereignty of individuals over their minds and bodies will help prevent and reduce the harms of drug abuse.

a. The first ground is enshrined in the International Bill of Human Rights, the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world, adopted by both the Philippines and the United States, and hailed in 1998 as "A Magna Carta for all humanity". With the drama of Europe's Holocaust still fresh in the world's memory, the drafters of the 1948 Universal Declaration -the first of three documents included in the Bill- straight away declared in the **Preamble** that barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind -and would become known as 'genocide'- were the result of disregard and contempt for human rights. Supporting our impeachment request therefore signifies only the rejection of genocide of users and testifies of respect for human rights. This statement implies that drug use does not justify extra-legal manslaughter and that users also belong to humanity, to whom rights apply.

In the Philippines, where politically incorrect social behavior, economic poverty, indigenous belonging, ideological activism, prohibited consumption, indeed any deviation from the Duterte line is confronted with the terror of an authoritarian regime, users are excluded from humanity. The focus of the opposition to Oplan Tokhang -Duterte's anti-drug war campaign- therefore is on respect for the rule of law and individual rights and freedoms. In the Philippines it is a fight for the survival of democracy. A heroic fight by courageous individuals betrayed by the American president's endorsement of Duterte but hardened by their recent history of victories over other unscrupulous rulers. A textbook example of democratic opposition to dictatorship, driven by an informal group of four outstanding Filipino women, profiles in courage and social engagement:

Ana Theresia "Risa" Hontiveros, a politician, community leader and journalist, she was representative (2004 – 2010) and is senator since 2016. She is one of the lead figures in the country's democratic socialism movement and LGBT rights movement and a key opposition figure against the country's controversial drug war. Her legislative agenda focuses on the human and civil liberties of various minority groups. In July 2019 the Philippines Police filed sedition charges against Ms. Hontiveros, dubbed as acts of political persecution by the opposition.

Leila Norma de Lima, a lawyer, human rights activist, politician and law professor, senator of the Philippines since 2016. She was Chairperson of the Philippine Commission on Human Rights (05/2008 – 06/2010) and

DRUGS PEACE INSTITUTE

Secretary of the Department of Justice. (2010 – 2015). She opposed Duterte’s drug war from its beginning and was arrested in February 2017 on allegedly trumped up non-bailable charges of involvement in drugs trade.

On November 20, 2019, supporters and colleagues of Ms. de Lima gathered to protest her “unjust” detention of already 1,000 days.

Maria A. Ressa, a journalist and CEO of the online news site Rappler. She worked as a lead investigative reporter in Southeast Asia for CNN. She was included in Time's Person of the Year 2018 as one of a collection of journalists from around the world combating fake news. She was arrested in February 2019 for "cyber libel" amid accusations of falsified news and corporate tax evasion. An outspoken critic of Duterte, her arrest is seen as politically motivated. Ms. Ressa is free on bail.

Maria Leonor “Leni” Robredo, a lawyer and social activist who is the 14th and incumbent Vice-President of the Philippines and a vocal critic of Duterte’s drug policy. She is frequently assailed and threatened by the president. As Drug Czar (05/11/2019 – 24/11/2019) she was the first to introduce a paradigm shift in the counter narcotics program, from an emphasis on crime to one on health. She was fired as Czar after 3 weeks for fear that she would leak "state secrets" to the UN.



From left to right: Ms. Hontiveros, Ms. De Lima, Ms. Ressa and Ms. Robredo

We feel that the exemplary contribution to democracy and the values it embodies by the Filipino opposition represented by this Filipino group merits all our attention and unconditional support: first of all from the users of mind-altering substances as we too meet a rare example of unconditional support in a situation where the defense of our fellow users is a risky undertaking which puts human rights defenders in permanent peril and constant harassment;

but most of all from you, Madam Speaker, as the defense of our human rights, in the first place our right to life, can best be secured by your House of Representatives’ impeachment of president Trump for incitement to genocide.

b. The second ground of moral justification for impeachment of president Trump for incitement to genocide of drug users is not to be found in positive law but in the rejection of an immoral law. In the present period of the

crisis of truth, in which the lie has raised its head again to crush democracy and its many achievements, it's time to expose the failure of prohibition and its historic relationship to deception.

Modern drug prohibition, a war on consciousness presented as a politically neutral response to a public health problem, is the ideal driver for the persecution of unwanted minorities. It is a fake health policy functioning as cover-up for universally prohibited discrimination. As [Nixon aide, John Ehrlichman](#) explained: "We knew we couldn't make it illegal to be either against the [Vietnam] war or black, but by getting the public to associate the hippies with marijuana and blacks with heroin, and then criminalizing both heavily, we could disrupt those communities. We could arrest their leaders, raid their homes, break up their meetings, and vilify them night after night on the evening news. Did we know we were lying about the drugs? Of course we did." [Ms. McFarland Sanchez-Moreno](#), of Washington's Drug Policy Alliance, confirms: "The Philippines is a stark example of how the drug war can so easily serve as an excuse for targeting vulnerable people, and harassing critics, and punishing opponents." And [Olusegun Obasanjo](#), former president of Nigeria and member of the [Global Commission on Drug Policy](#), agrees; "Prohibition is used as a social control tool. It is time to ask ourselves what moral order is being preserved by pursuing, through harsh penalties, the illusion of a "drug-free world". Beliefs and ideology should not govern public policy decisions when we have scientific evidence as to what works and what does not."

Scientific evidence wasn't available in the first 11.000 years of the Holocene when, with the rise of standardized religious traditions and mega-societies with populations of over one million people, moralizing gods emerged who would increasingly punish moral violations in interactions between humans as well as direct affronts to themselves, like failure to perform sacrifices or consumption of the mind altering substances, up till that moment known as "plants of the gods." The reasons for punishment couldn't be checked because they fell outside the reach of human inspection, protected by the privileged communications between religious hierarchy and the heavenly rulers.

As the separation of church and state, devised in the second half of the second millennium has been maintained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), a different motivation for prohibition had to be given for the 1961 Single Convention. With the devastating results of the Chinese opium wars (chemical warfare) and of the unlimited over-the-counter sales in the west of addictive painkillers fresh in the post-WWII memory, public health seemed the ideal substitute for divine commands.

The facts meanwhile showed that the War on Drugs had failed, and that the punitive prohibition system had not delivered on its promises. That is so because the objectives had changed, as it was no longer the observance of a religious ban as part of the adherence to a belief system, but the confidence in the genuine promotion of the common interest of public health that now determined success. Burning the witches is the goal of the witch hunt, saving the life of an opioid-treated patient is the essence of health care. This subtlety is lost on the drug warriors however as they continue to view their mission as a moral crusade wherein opiate overdose reversal drugs, syringe exchange programs and supervised consumption sites are considered obstacles to establish a drug free world. Hence the disregard for evidence-based conclusions, the need to obfuscate and confound the data and the lies to claim fake successes. The Duterte mass murder is a case in point. The total number of users, people in police custody, users who surrendered to the police and people killed are regularly 'updated' by different government units in order to further raise the fog curtain. Each claim by opponents can be ridiculed while Duterte himself manipulates the data at will. The numbers he cites do suit his own ends: the 5.500 people killed are the lowest estimates available and do better support his claims that only those people who fight back when arrested

are killed; the 8 million drug users, a Duterte invented 344% increase between 2015 and 2019, point to a critical mass of users that can be presented as public enemy number one to justify a full-blown war on drugs.

The Filipino dictator Ferdinand Marcos, [Duterte's hero and ideological predecessor](#), invented the assassination attempt on [Juan Ponce Enrile](#) to justify his declaration of martial law. Comments Rappler: "[The present drug crisis in the Philippines is no different](#): it's the centerpiece of Duterte's policies precisely because it's an easy vehicle for him to consolidate power and execute his authoritarian style of leadership." This is the man president Trump congratulated with his murderous drug policy. A failure, sustained by lies only, but that he won't admit.

According to the [Washington Post's "Fact Checker"](#) database of the false or misleading claims made by President Trump since assuming office", the president made 13,435 false or misleading claims in the 993 days up to the last update on Oct. 9, 2019. The US president can be considered an expert liar. Not in the sense that his lie is indistinguishable from the truth, but that in a plethora of lies the liar creates a new world that can appeal to listeners for as long as new lies maintain the fake construction he has created. Simultaneously the critics who accuse the liar of lying are themselves accused by the liar of lying. There now exist two fake worlds. The world of Trump we call fake and the world of our truth he calls fake. Which world will gobble up the other one? Which world will prevail?

There is only one means to beat the lie of prohibition: to tell the truth. But how to recognize the truth? That is easy: by telling the truth where the persons addressed know it. The difficulty may be that to have a person change worlds, the truth to be told should uncover a lie not only of the world of the listener, who may disregard your message because it comes from your fake world, but from the world of the truth teller herself. By incriminating his own world when admitting a lie that rules both fake worlds will the truth teller offer the listener an added value. To expose the lies of the others we must expose our own lies. To make the other accept our truth we must expose common lies, made over time by everybody. Thus, we should expose a lie we have in common with president Trump. A lie he uses to incite to the genocide of drug users which we condemn on the basis of our adherence to higher principles, ones he dislikes. A lie that has brought so much misery to people that they gladly will change worlds if you admit to the lie they know to be a lie. A large majority of Americans want the end of the War on Drugs because they recognize the lies about the danger of using some drugs, like marijuana, and about punishment as the best solution for the use of other drugs, like opioids.

As it happens your House is now processing the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement (MORE) Act, a Bill acknowledging the need to repair the extensive damage done by prohibition. We again cite Ms. McFarland Sanchez-Moreno, your moral sponsor: "This legislation won't make up for the full scale of harm that prohibition has caused to its victims. It's not going to return anyone their lost dreams, time lost at the mercy of the criminal justice system; or the years spent away from their families. But this legislation is the closest we've come yet to not only ending those harms at the federal level, but also beginning to repair them. Now it's up to Congress to do the right thing and swiftly pass the bill to ensure justice is not delayed a moment longer."

The House of Representatives of the 116th United States Congress has taken the first steps on the road to recognizing the lies that are at the basis of the massacres of the War on Drugs provoked by the 1961 Single Convention. We wish to congratulate you and the House Judiciary Committee for your hopeful and promising vote in this fight to end the US War on Drugs and to begin the search for a humane and effective drugs policy.

05. OUR QUEST FOR LIFE

Drugs are the gift of nature to re-establish spiritual, physical and emotional balance whenever a person needs it. Determining this need is based on a strictly personal experience in which third parties may only intervene if it can reasonably be assumed that without this intervention the person in question cannot determine that need autonomously and suffers or is at risk of suffering because of this use. This reasonable assumption will always be based on facts and scientific, controllable evidence. That is the implicit requirement set by the Bill of Rights, for if a person is to enjoy the rights with which (s)he is endowed this person shall be able to appreciate the extent of the freedom granted and the grounds for regulation, according to objective and verifiable norms so that the dignity and worth of the human person can be respected. This seems also to be the vision of the Drug Policy Alliance for a just society, in which the use and regulation of drugs are grounded in science, compassion, health and human rights.

The DPI prefers to translate these same thoughts in the universally accepted code of recognition of human needs in their confrontation with the public interest, by the establishment of rights and freedoms and of the necessary restrictions. As the human rights and freedoms that ought to protect the use of consciousness altering substances fail to do so because they have been arbitrarily declared non-applicable for such use, and as many of the rights that protect every person are denied to drug users, in violation of the text and spirit of the Bill of Human Rights, we propose the creation of a human right that protects us from arbitrary denial of our need to use consciousness altering substances and that provides society the tools to restrict this use when truly necessary in the public interest. It is our belief that only in this way the arbitrary distinctions made to exclude drug users from protection under the universal human rights order can be stopped and that a clear legal basis will exist to hold governments accountable for its violation and in particular for genocide.

The right to freedom of consumption

1.a Everyone has the right to freedom of consumption of goods and services. This right includes the right to freedom of production and distribution of goods and services.

1.b The exercise of the right to freedom of consumption can be restricted only by law, when it is necessary, in a democratic society, to serve a legitimate aim of general public interest.

2. Everyone has the right to freedom of consumption, without distinction of any kind, including race, skin color, sex, language, preference of consumption, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, wealth, birth, age, health, disability or any other situation.

We believe that the lies that with [Harry Anslinger](#), the US primal Drugs Czar, came to determine the drug policy of the United Nations ultimately led through the War on Drugs to the failure of that policy. Instead of contributing to the world's public health, the punitive prohibition policy has to the contrary caused havoc and death. As the [UN Secretary General Mr. Antonio Guterres underscored](#) in 2018, some 450,000 people die every year from overdoses or drug-related health issues. For the prohibition policy to change, the truth should be told.

First of all by the global community of users of mind-altering substances, the experience experts who know the truth from the lies and may claim that no user should be killed for the consumption of his drugs of preference. To each and everyone of them we ask to please, inform [Human Rights Watch](#) that you would like them to transmit



DRUGS PEACE INSTITUTE

your request for the impeachment of president Trump for incitement to genocide of drug users by the US House of Representatives, to Speaker Nancy Pelosi.

But most of all by you, Madam Speaker, as the continuation of the War on Drugs by president Trump will only invite more lies and more death. The call for change is worldwide and is addressed at the United States, *in casu* at you. At the occasion of a meeting on the global opioid epidemic, which has been called the worst drugs crisis in history, the president of the Global Commission on Drugs Policy, former Swiss president [Ruth Dreyfuss](#) **proposed** the only possible solution to this crisis driven by overprescription: don't leave public health in the hands of the black market, don't abdicate but regulate. We ask you to prevent that the US president will clear, in advance, the mass murderers of users of consciousness altering substances, the way he cleared the murderers in the US military. We are confident that your impeachment of Mr. Trump for incitement to genocide will equally help the ICC Prosecutor to obtain the authorization of the International Court to investigate Mr. Duterte. We hope you will agree that the work of Ms. Eleanor Roosevelt's contribution to the drafting and the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be finalized if we wish to prevent the demolition of her contribution to mankind by Mr. Trump.

Dear Ms. Pelosi, we thank you for your attention and consideration. You know like we do Madam, that whatever you decide you'll be making history. We hope history will be proud of you.
Dear fellow users, history calls us to react if we wish to secure our future.
Let's support Ms. Pelosi and let it be known.

Sincerely yours,

Adriaan Bronkhorst Buller
ex-PoWoD
for the
Drugs Peace Institute

cc:
Office of the US President
Office of the ICC Prosecutor
Office of the UN Secretary General
Office Director Human Rights Watch