

Dear Mr Calzada,

Further to my letter of 12 January 2021 to you, with reference to your (apparently illegal) authorization to act on an investigative panel, you would have been required, under ST/AI/2017/1 para 6.5, to sign a declaration acknowledging the absence of any conflict of interest.

I find this perplexing, as, if my information is correct, you are currently a D-1 in the in the Department of Global Communications. Your professional obligation, therefore, must be to promote the interests of the United Nations, guard against reputational risk, and defend any statements the Organization has made, to the media in particular.

Where a staff member gives information to member states and the media that conflicts with the Organization's official position, this is clearly a problem for the Organization. In court case UNDT/GVA/2017/052 (currently suspended), the UN lawyers argue a specific right of the Organization to lie to the media about the UN's actions and policies in order to protect the reputation of the Organization. Your job description would presumably require you to similarly protect the reputation of the Organization, despite the apparent conflict with your obligation as a UN staff member to act with honesty and integrity.

There is no argument on the facts in court - the UN lawyers in fact argue that my reports were "unreasonable" because everyone, up to and including the Secretary-General, knew about my reports and did not act to stop or change the practice of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights sharing the names of human rights activists with the Chinese Government. The lawyers helpfully repeated this point no fewer than four times, and I will be requesting official permission to release those recordings to stop the ongoing defamation by the UN. The UN lawyers were clear that this is an ongoing practice (I had actually believed it to have stopped, but following the UN position in my court cases uncovered evidence disproving this). Names continue to be handed over in full knowledge of the likelihood of their family members being arbitrarily detained, disappeared, tortured, and subjected to forced labour in concentration camps. When asked by the press, the OHCHR spokespersons knowingly and openly lie about the practice, variously claiming it stopped in 2015 (some two years after my reports, and a decade after the practice began) despite a 2017 press release admitting it in the present tense, that it never happened explicitly because of how dangerous it would be (that denial on video: <https://www.foxnews.com/world/un-human-rights-office-china-dissidents>), and systematically defaming me in an effort to discredit my reports, which, again, are acknowledged in court as being factually accurate.

The reason I had to reply to enquiries from the Member States and the press is because the UN lied about me and about my reports in public statements and press releases. Prior to his illegal removal, the judge in my case (who should be interviewed if this travesty of an "investigation" continues) noted that the UN made untrue public statements about me, yet objected when I responded publicly with the truth. It is clear that the Department of Global Communications, having done nothing to correct the misrepresentations about me and my reports, has a vested in protecting the official line - regardless of how far removed from the truth that official line might be. Protecting the official line is presumably part of your job description. I would appreciate it if you could send me a copy of your job description.

Particularly given the aforementioned obligation of honesty and integrity on the part of all UN staff members, which I presume applies equally to communications staff, I find the position of the Department of Global Communications morally indefensible. This is even more the case because dissidents may rely on these official lies and apply to attend meetings of UN human rights mechanisms falsely believing that they are not in danger of having their names shared with the Chinese government. It is difficult to see how that would not amount to criminal complicity in human rights abuses subsequently perpetrated by the Chinese government on their family members.

For the purposes of confirming whether this investigation is “duly authorized” on the specific issue of your apparent conflict of interest, I would be obliged if you could send me a copy of the declaration you signed when accepting this role, claiming the absence of any conflict of interest.

I assume you are interested in retaining your position with the UN and - if I may be so bold as to suggest it - that you are hopeful of further promotion. Please therefore also respond with an explanation of how you reconcile your personal ambitions with your signature on that declaration.

A further ground of apparent conflict is the fact that I have repeatedly reported misconduct by your colleagues working on communications in OHCHR, with whom you presumably have a close working relationship. These reports have included the open lies told by Rolando Gomez in the video linked above, the repeated lies of Rupert Colville on this issue, and his active defamation of whistleblowers. While I do not have copies of emails in which similar language is used about me (though I have seen some), I reported in particular his reference to Mr. Anders Kompass - incidentally also investigated for fulfilling his obligation to report misconduct externally where internal reports failed - as “shitty”, “duplicitous” and “dishonest.” You may have seen that email, which was sent to a journalist *after* the CAR panel exonerated Mr. Kompass and noted his persecution as a whistleblower. The UN refused to investigate that clear misconduct, as well as refusing to investigate complicity in human rights abuses against members of the families of human rights activists who were actively endangered by the UN Human Rights Office. Odd indeed that investigating me for what would seem a lesser offence of telling the truth is such a priority.

I copy Ms Fleming, who necessarily must have released you to perform this role, and has a significant conflict of interest herself in doing so. I ask her to withdraw that release on the basis of your conflict if you do not yourself withdraw from this retaliatory and illegal “investigation.”

I look forward to your detailed response by 20 January 2021. In the absence of such response, and proof that you had reasonable grounds to believe this “investigation” to be duly authorized, I will comply with my obligation as a UN staff member to report misconduct.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Reilly". To the left of the signature is a horizontal line with an arrowhead pointing to the right, which appears to be a stylized flourish or part of the signature.

Emma Reilly