

WHY ARE ANTI-COVID GENE SERUMS TO BE CONSIDERED ILLEGAL WEAPONS?

If experimental gene sera were used as a weapon of war, would they be legal?

Why Anti-COVID Gene Serums are to be considered weapons illegal? [1]

by Marco Saba, for the legal journal "[Freedom in Law](#)," No. 2, 2023, pp.101-105.

Background: from Dec. 27, 2020 to May 5, 2023, [WHO](#) instructed a global experimental campaign called "vaccination" as part of Operation Pandemic Covid-19, which involved the forced inoculation of "anti-COVID" gene serums. After 24 million excess deaths ascertained globally, the sovereign people are demanding that all those responsible for the campaign that turned out to be disastrous in health, economic and political terms be tried in court. The identified perpetrators could resort to the expedient of declaring that it was a real "war" in which weapons-named "vaccines"-could be legally used. The present article refutes this attempt.

Anti-COVID Gene Serums can be considered illegal weapons because they violate the principles of humanitarian law.

According to the rule of three limitations applicable to all weapons in war, to be legal weapons must:

- 1) Be directed against legitimate military targets
- 2) Have proportionate side effects
- 3) Meet ethical standards for human experimentation.

Anti-COVID Gene Sera do not meet these criteria:

- 1) They are injected indiscriminately into the civilian population, not against military targets.
- 2) Severe and lethal side effects on large sections of the population, including children, cannot be considered proportionate.

3) Forced inoculation methods violate the standards required for medical experiments by failing to comply with wartime uses.

In addition to the previous reasons, Anti-COVID Gene Serums:

- cannot be contained in the 'legal battlefields'
- continue to act even after the end of hostilities
- Are inhumane in the way they can kill and harm
- can have long-term negative impacts on the environment.

A weapon is made illegal in two ways:

(1) With the adoption of a specific treaty prohibiting it; and

(2) because it cannot be used without violating existing law and customs of war.

A weapon made illegal only because there is a specific treaty prohibiting it is illegal only for countries that ratify that treaty. A weapon made illegal by existing law is illegal for all countries.

This is true even if there is a treaty on this weapon and a country has not ratified it. Since there is no specific treaty banning Anti-COVID Gene Serums, their illegality must be established in the second way.

The laws and customs of war (humanitarian law) include all treaties governing military operations, weapons, and the protection of war victims, as well as all customary international law on these subjects. [2] In other words, to assess whether a particular weapon is legal or illegal in the absence of a specific treaty, the entire body of humanitarian law must be consulted. [3]

There are four rules derived from the entire humanitarian law on arms:

(A) Weapons can only be used in the legal battlefield, defined as legal military objectives of the enemy in war. Weapons cannot have an adverse effect outside the legal battlefield. (The "territorial" test).

(B) Weapons can only be used for the duration of an armed conflict. A weapon that is used or continues to act after the end of the war violates this criterion. (The "temporal" test).[4]

(C) Weapons cannot be unduly inhumane. (The "humanity" test). The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 use the terms "unnecessary suffering" and "unnecessary injury" for this concept. [5]

(D) Weapons cannot have an unduly adverse effect on the natural environment. (The "environmental" test).

Anti-COVID Gene Serums fail all four tests.

(a) They cannot be "contained" in legal battlefields and therefore do not pass the territorial test. In contrast, Anti-COVID Gene Serums are inoculated away from legal targets and reach illegal (civilian) targets: hospital staff, school staff, jurists, children, youth, adults and the elderly in general, and even uniformed personnel with whom the pharmaceutical industries are not at war.

(b) They cannot be "inactivated" when the war (COVID campaign) is over. In fact, Anti-COVID Gene Serums continue to act even after the end of hostilities and thus fail the time test. Even with strict care of personnel in war zones (COVID campaign), particles inoculated into the body can continue to kill and harm military and civilians long after the war is over (COVID campaign).

(c) They are inhumane and therefore fail the humanity test. Anti-COVID Gene Serums are inhumane because of the way they can kill -- immunosuppression, myocarditis, cancer, neurological diseases, etc. -- and also long after the end of hostilities, when sudden premature deaths should stop. Anti-COVID Gene Serums are inhumane because they can cause infertility, miscarriages, birth defects (genetic), side effects from breastfeeding from serous mothers, thus affecting children who can never be a military target and who are born even after the end of the war (COVID campaign). The teratogenic nature of Anti-COVID Gene Serums and the possible burdening of the gene pool of future generations suggest that the use of Anti-COVID Gene Serums is genocidal.

(d) They cannot be disposed of without unduly harming the natural environment with their nanoparticles and therefore fail the environmental test. Damage to the natural environment includes contamination of water and agricultural land necessary for the

subsistence of the civilian population well beyond the lifespan of that population. Reclamation is an inexact science and, in any case, extremely expensive, far beyond the spending power of a poor country.

One of the most useful provisions of treaty-based humanitarian law is the "Martens Clause" of the 1907 Hague Convention, repeated in subsequent humanitarian law treaties. The Martens Clause states that in situations where there is no specific treaty provision (such as in the case of Anti-COVID Gene Serums), the international community is nonetheless bound by "the rules of the principles of the law of nations, as they result from the established usages among civilized peoples, the laws of humanity, and the dictates of public conscience." [6] There is a huge international "NO-VAX" effort by a wide range of groups representing every aspect of civil society. The existence of the network against Anti-COVID Gene Serums is legally relevant to the finding of the illegality of Anti-COVID Gene Serums and strengthens the arguments that the use of Anti-COVID Gene Serums is a war crime or a crime against humanity, and can play a decisive role in stopping the proliferation of these gene weapons.

All of this demonstrates how Anti-COVID Gene Serums, while not prohibited by specific treaties, violate general principles of humanitarian law and in particular the rule of three limitations. Therefore, they must be considered illegal weapons.

A multilateral discussion is desirable to impartially reconsider the development and use of genetic vaccines according to international standards that respect their potential utility, in parallel with the need to withdraw those currently distributed.

Notes:

1] This brief is inspired by U.S. attorney Karen Parker's work on uranium weapons, "The Illegality of DU Weaponry" (2003): <https://guidetoaction.org/parker/duweaponry2003.pdf>

2] Customary international law, which includes: Hague law (governing military operations) and Geneva law (governing protected parties in time of war) is binding on all countries. The Supreme Court of the United States has

consistently upheld the binding nature of customary law, including customary humanitarian law. All international law, including the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, reflects the binding nature of customary law.

3] In 1996, the International Court of Justice, in the "[*Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*](#)" case, ruled that all weapons must be evaluated according to the criteria of humanitarian law, but it does not state what those criteria are. I wrote this article based on Karen Parker's memorandum to make explicit the criteria that had not yet been fully extracted from humanitarian law.

4] The first two tests ("territorial" and "temporal") together constitute the rule that weapons should not be "indiscriminate."

5] Article 23 of the 1907 Hague Convention, Regulations. This article also prohibits "poisonous or poisoned weapons." Some might argue that Anti-COVID Gene Serums are necessarily poisonous, and therefore directly prohibited by Article 23.

6] The 1907 Hague Convention, 8th paragraph preamble. The "Martens" clause (named after the Russian scholar who formulated it) is repeated in the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Additional Protocols to the Geneva Conventions. The United States is a party to the Hague Conventions and the 1949 Geneva Conventions. The U.S. Supreme Court, in a 1942 case (Ex Parte Quirin), ruled that this clause is U.S. law. This principle applies only to humanitarian (armed conflict) law, not human rights law, although the latter is evolving in this direction. For example, the International Court of Justice, in the Corfu Channel, ruled that 'elementary considerations of humanity [are] even more to be demanded in peace than in war' (1949)." (1949 Report of the International Court of Justice, p. 22).