LEGAL, ETHICAL, AND REGULATORY FAILURES IN THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC RESPONSE

A CALL FOR COMPREHENSIVE REFORM

First published 2020; Last updated January 20, 2026
Catherine Volz

Note: This independent white paper was developed and iteratively revised between 2020-2026; following thematic reorganization, references are cited as originally numbered and may appear out of numerical sequence.

Contents

Executive Summary

The COVID-19 pandemic response marked an extraordinary deviation from established medical, legal, and ethical standards. Emergency powers were triggered using unverified foreign data, coercive public health measures were enforced without scientific consensus, and experimental biotechnology was deployed across vulnerable populations without informed consent. This paper presents the legal framework, scientific inconsistencies, and ethical failures behind these actions and proposes essential reforms to restore trust, protect public rights, and prevent future abuse.

I. Legal Authority, Historical Precedent, and Threshold Questions

This section establishes the legal and historical foundations of pandemic declarations, exploring prior abuses of power and contextualizing the reported COVID-19 fatality data.

1. Illegality of the Pandemic Declaration

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) declared a national emergency on January 31, 2020, based exclusively on foreign outbreak reports and internal confirmation by Dr. Anthony Fauci—whose NIH division had funded gain-of-function research at the Wuhan Institute of Virology[1]. This declaration lacked a demonstrable domestic threat, making it inconsistent with statutory criteria for national emergency powers.

2. No Mandates—Historical and Legal Basis

The imposition of medical mandates during the COVID-19 pandemic violated long-standing legal and ethical precedents protecting bodily autonomy. The Supreme Court historically upheld the right of individuals, particularly wealthier classes, to decline unwanted medical treatments (e.g., during the 1905 Smallpox epidemic[49]). The two-tier system of medical choice underscores the injustice of coercive mandates.

History is rife with abuses under coercive medical policies, including:

Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment (1932-1972): African American men with syphilis were deliberately left untreated to study disease progression, violating informed consent and causing needless suffering and death[50].

Thalidomide Tragedy (1950s-60s): A drug prescribed to pregnant women caused severe birth defects worldwide (33 children per every 200 moms), highlighting the catastrophic consequences of insufficient drug testing[51]

Vioxx Concealment (1999-2004): Manufacturer Merck manipulated the clinical trial design and hid evidence that their painkiller increased heart attack risk, leading to ~100,000 heart attacks and ~55,000 premature deaths before withdrawal[52].

Forced Sterilization of Puerto Rican Women (1930s-1970s): Up to one-third of Puerto Rican women were sterilized without informed consent under government and medical policies promoting eugenics[53].

Sterilization of Inmates in the U.S. (until 2010): Prisoners were sterilized without proper consent, revealing ongoing institutional abuses of bodily autonomy[54, 55, 56].

Nazi Medical Experiments (WWII): Inhumane experimentation on concentration camp prisoners, including forced sterilizations and deadly testing, represents the most extreme violation of medical ethics in history[57].

Forced Lobotomies (1940s-1950s): Thousands of patients, including children and institutionalized persons, underwent invasive brain surgeries without informed consent, resulting in permanent disability[58, 59].

U.S. Eugenics Movement: From the early 20th century, eugenics policies led to forced sterilizations, marriage restrictions, and discriminatory laws, reflecting systemic violation of reproductive rights[60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65].

Such abuses demand absolute prohibition of mandates to prevent repetition of atrocities.

3. Covid Fatality Rates Were Misrepresented

Infection Fatality Rate (IFR) for those under 70: ~0.06-0.08%[35]

IFR for children: <0.002%[35]

Despite these numbers, extreme measures were imposed, including school closures and child vaccination campaigns that offered no net benefit.

II. Origin, Intent, and Institutional Incentives

Building on the legal framework, this section examines origin, intellectual property dynamics, and institutional incentives that shaped early pandemic responses.

1. Uncertain Origin and Bioweapon Potential

The origin of SARS-CoV-2 remains unresolved. U.S. intelligence agencies and scientific publications continue to explore both zoonotic and laboratory-based explanations[2]. If synthetic or manipulated, the public health event may fall under dual-use biowarfare implications, necessitating additional international accountability and biosecurity oversight.

2. Patent Timing, Sequence Overlap and Institutional Incentives

Moderna, founded in 2010 as a modified RNA platform company[82], received early funding from U.S. government agencies including DARPA, BARDA, the Department of Defense and the NIH[83], and had not brought a product to market prior to the COVID-19 emergency use authorization[84]. Following deployment of its COVID-19 vaccine, Moderna entered a royalty-bearing license with the NIH covering patented vaccine technology, reportedly including an approximately $400 million catch-up payment and ongoing royalties[85]. Federal agencies thus occupied overlapping roles as funders, patent holders, regulators, and financial beneficiaries.

Separately, a 19-nucleotide sequence of the SARS-CoV-2 genome (including its furin cleavage site)—appearing in Moderna's U.S. Patent US 9,587,003 B2 (filed 2016) was a 100% complementary match with a segment of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein at the specific site selected as the vaccine's sole antigenic target[86]. This correspondence does not involve peripheral or functionally irrelevant regions of the viral genome, but the spike protein itself, chosen for vaccine design and ACE2 interaction. Given the ~30,000-base-pair length of the SARS-CoV-2 genome, the localization of this overlap within the vaccine target rather than elsewhere is notable.

Whether this correspondence reflects coincidence, design convergence, or another explanation cannot be resolved from publicly available records. The proprietary modRNA sequence used in the vaccine has not been disclosed in a form permitting full alignment against prior patent claims, precluding definitive exclusion or confirmation of reuse. What is established is that the relevant patent filings predate China's public release of the SARS-CoV-2 genome in January 2020[87], and that gain-of-function research has historically been conducted in service of vaccine development[88].

Taken together—defense-linked early funding, patent control, government royalty participation, emergency authorization, and unresolved sequence correspondence within the vaccine's exclusive antigenic target—these facts warrant documentation rather than dismissal. They illustrate how regulatory authority, intellectual-property incentives, and emergency powers converged during an unprecedented global intervention. No claim of intent or causation is made; the record preserves observable facts so that future evaluation remains possible.

3. CDC Patents and Genetic Ownership

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) holds multiple patents related to SARS-related spike proteins and diagnostic methods[3, 4]. Patents cannot be issued for

naturally occurring biological materials, suggesting prior synthetic manipulation and calling into question the CDC's neutrality during the pandemic response.

III. Pre-Rollout Knowledge, Suppressed or Misused Interventions

With institutional incentives clarified, the focus shifts to pre-rollout safety signals, suppression of alternative treatments, and inappropriate treatment protocols, highlighting regulatory and ethical implications.

1. Pre-Rollout Safety and Efficacy Red Flags

Peer-reviewed and preprint research identified key biological and mechanistic concerns before COVID-19 vaccines were authorized. COVID vaccines were never intended—or biologically able—to prevent infection. Intramuscular or circulatory immunization has long been recognized as incapable of generating protective mucosal immune responses[69]. By design, the vaccines did not target the correct tissue for blocking transmission. COVID-19 spike-protein vaccines elicit antibodies against the ACE2 receptor-binding domain (RBD), which is expressed in multiple organs—including the heart, kidney, intestines, vasculature, male and female reproductive tissues, and placental trophoblasts—but is relatively scarce in the respiratory tract, the primary site of viral infection[70,71].

Early coronavirus vaccine research raised concerns about antibody-dependent enhancement (ADE), where antibodies could worsen infection rather than protect[72]. Scientists also warned that spike-targeted vaccines could prime the immune system in ways that might misfire or trigger autoimmune-like responses[73].

Lipid nanoparticles (LNPs) deliver mRNA into cells but are not biologically inert. Preclinical studies showed that they can trigger strong inflammatory responses and accumulate in multiple organs, including the liver, spleen, and gonads, raising concerns about unintended tissue exposure[74]. Animal studies also showed that very high doses of synthetic RNA delivered with LNPs can overwhelm cellular control systems, including pathways that protect against DNA damage and uncontrolled cell growth, causing liver injury and death[75]. These findings demonstrate that LNPs are biologically active carriers capable of shuttling material into cells, including theoretically any residual nucleic acids from manufacturing, and that inappropriate accumulation could disrupt critical cellular processes.

Some scientists raised a theoretical concern early on (2020) that mRNA from COVID-19 vaccines could be reverse transcribed via endogenous LINE-1 machinery and potentially integrate into host DNA[76]. Domazet-Lošo also argued that mRNA vaccines satisfy the molecular criteria for retroposition, making integration biologically conceivable[77].

Early research also raised a theoretical oncogenic risk from RNA and DNA viral-vector COVID vaccines. For adenoviral-vector vaccines, scientists pointed to possible integration of vector DNA into human genomes. For mRNA vaccines, activation of LINE-1 retrotransposons could, in theory, reverse-transcribe mRNA into DNA and insert it into genes that control cell growth and tumor suppression. While these risks remained hypothetical pre-2021, they illustrate why careful long-term safety monitoring was warranted[76, 78, and 79].

Before the COVID-19 vaccine rollout, evidence already showed that polyethylene glycol (PEG), a component of the lipid nanoparticles, could trigger immediate serious hypersensitivity and anaphylaxis[80]. In 2016, widespread anti-PEG antibodies were documented in the population, and it was demonstrated that re-exposure to a PEGylated RNA aptamer, (e.g. repeated boosters), can produce more severe reactions[81]. These findings suggest PEG-related risks were identifiable prior to large-scale vaccination campaigns.

2. EUA Misuse, Treatment Suppression, and Improper Treatment Protocols

Under 21 U.S. Code § 360bbb-3, the FDA may issue an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) only if: (1) no adequate, approved, and available alternatives exist; (2) the product may be effective; (3) benefits outweigh risks; and (4) informed consent is obtained unless waived. EUA law explicitly prohibits authorization if effective alternatives exist. Despite early evidence (e.g., Rajter 2020, ICON; Lenze 2020, fluvoxamine) supporting efficacy of repurposed drugs like ivermectin, hydroxychloroquine, and budesonide[5,6,7,8] these were actively suppressed, preserving EUA eligibility for mRNA and adenovirus-based injections.

This occurred against the backdrop of a pre-lockdown surge in Gilead Sciences' stock[96] tied to remdesivir's "compassionate use" rollout.[97] Remdesivir has been associated with multiple-organ-dysfunction syndrome, septic shock, cardiovascular adverse reactions and acute kidney injury[99, 100]. Improper care home and hospital protocols—particularly sedation, early intubation, and enforced reliance on EUA-authorized agents—were deployed at scale, generating credible allegations of foreseeable, preventable deaths and widespread iatrogenic injury.[101]

IV. Claimed Benefits vs Empirical Outcomes

Following the discussion of pre-rollout knowledge, this section evaluates the reported benefits of interventions relative to observed epidemiological outcomes.

1. Vaccination and Transmission Uncorrelated

A study across 68 countries and 2,947 counties in the United States found no relationship between the percentage of population fully vaccinated and new COVID-19 cases at both international and US county levels. In fact, it observed a slightly positive association, implying that counties with higher vaccination rates sometimes had higher case rates.[36] Vaccines lacked sterilizing immunity. This nullifies the basis for vaccine mandates and health passports.

2. Scientific Evidence Against Masking and Mandates

A study encompassing 602 million people found that mask mandates correlated with increased mortality[32].

The Cochrane Review found no strong evidence that masking reduces COVID transmission[33].

The “6-foot rule” was not based on SARS-CoV-2-specific data[34].

These measures were enforced despite limited or negative public health impact.

3. Mandates for Unregulated Devices and NPIs

Mask mandates, PCR testing, and social distancing policies:

Lacked FDA pre-market safety or efficacy review[30, 31];

Were imposed without public understanding of experimental status;

Functioned as unauthorized human behavioral experiments.

Further, RT-PCR positivity for SARS-CoV-2 detects RNA fragments, but does not reliably indicate active infection or infectiousness[98].

V. Manufacturing, Quality, and Reporting Failures

Having assessed outcomes, this section addresses production, quality control, and reporting failures that impacted both safety and public trust.

1. Manufacturing and Quality Control

Regulatory agencies are legally obligated to rigorously test and verify vaccine batches, enforcing compliance with safety standards. However, the FDA’s own laboratory found DNA contamination levels exceeding regulatory limits by hundreds of times[66], yet no public recalls or warnings were issued. Pharmaceutical companies have a fundamental duty to ensure the safety and purity of their products, especially when administered to millions of people worldwide. Residual DNA contamination in COVID-19 vaccines exposed serious ethical and regulatory failure. Incidents such as Japan’s suspension of Moderna doses[67], and cross-contamination at U.S. facilities, which included destruction of 400 million doses of COVID-19 vaccine[68], highlight inadequate quality control. These failures underscore the urgent need for independent oversight, batch-level testing, and stronger enforcement to restore public trust and ensure safety.

2. Vaccine Injury Reporting System Failures

Federal systems such as VAERS, DMED and V-SAFE lacked:

User accessibility and promotion;

Transparency and follow-up;

Public trust and regulatory utility[24].

The Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) lacks transparency and rigorous follow-up, leading to underreporting and data misinterpretation. The system’s backend remains largely inaccessible, impeding independent analysis of vaccine safety. Adverse event signals arising from >1.5 million reports, including deaths, strokes, myocarditis,

autoimmune disorders, reproductive harm and neurological disorders were ignored or dismissed, leaving injured individuals without recognition or recourse. Injured individuals could not sue manufacturers, and the Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program (CICP) has a one-year filing deadline and <1% payout rate.

VI. Iatrogenic Harm and Long-Term Risk Domains

Analysis now turns to potential iatrogenic harms, including vulnerable populations, genetic integration, and unexamined long-term risk domains.

1. Harm to Vulnerable Populations

Liability-free experimental injections were aggressively administered to:

Military personnel, under threat of discharge[10];

Healthcare workers, via professional license coercion;

Women of childbearing age, without reproductive toxicity data[11];

Children, despite near-zero risk and no long-term safety data[12];

Elderly and immunocompromised patients, often without meaningful consent.

2. Genetic Integration and Long-Term Risk

Emerging evidence shows:

Reverse transcription of vaccine mRNA into DNA within human liver cells[13];

Endogenous LINE-1 reverse transcriptase activation[14];

Presence of SV40 promoters in vaccine DNA fragments[15];

Non-random chromosomal integration at chromosomes 9 and 12[16, 17, 18];

Inheritable immune disruption in animal models[19].

Despite these findings, regulatory agencies did not classify the injections as gene therapies.

3. NMDA-Mediated Plasticity in Neuroscience: An Unexamined Risk Domain

NMDA receptors, established in neuroscience since the early 1970s, are central to learning, memory, mood regulation[89], and language, and are directly implicated in schizophrenia, suicidality[90], cognitive decline, and dementia[91]. By controlling calcium influx into neurons, NMDA receptors function as a biological switch that strengthens or weakens synaptic connections. This process—synaptic plasticity—is the cellular basis of cognition, affect regulation, language function, and memory across the human lifespan[91].

This was not obscure or peripheral knowledge. NMDA-mediated plasticity was taught as foundational neuroscience and made visually explicit on the cover of *Principles of Neural*

Science (4th edition) [91], which depicts experiments using synthetic mRNA to manipulate synaptic plasticity in the brain. Generations of physicians and neuroscientists were trained with this relationship in plain view. The link between mRNA-driven protein translation, cellular stress, and synaptic regulation was canonical. Any professional with formal neuroscience training should have recognized that interference with these pathways carried potential neuropsychiatric risk.

Documented lipid nanoparticle biodistribution beyond the injection site—including experimental evidence of passage across the blood–brain and blood–placental barriers and detectability in breast milk[92]—raises unresolved questions regarding central nervous system exposure. Synthetic mRNA vaccine platforms introduce exogenous mRNA into human cells and compel protein production through intracellular pathways that influence immune signaling, cellular stress responses, and synaptic regulation, directly intersecting with glutamatergic signaling and NMDA-mediated plasticity governing mood, thinking, understanding, behavior, learning and memory[93, 94, 95]. Despite this, no long-term studies were designed to evaluate outcomes such as depression, suicidal ideation, schizophrenia-spectrum symptoms, language disturbance, cognitive decline, or dementia. Given the established role of NMDA-mediated plasticity in these domains, the absence of such evaluation represents a distinct, foreseeable, and ethically significant omission.

4. Nanotechnology and Vaccine Research

Magnetic nanoparticles can change how cells behave when exposed to external fields. Nanoparticles are already used in food, drugs and cosmetics, yet regulators do not routinely evaluate the mechanical, genetic, or clot-related[39] risks these materials can pose. Tiny iron-oxide nanoparticles can physically poke holes in cell structures when exposed to a weak magnetic field, which can trigger cell death[40]. Because the effect happens at realistic field strengths and with very small particles, there's potential risk if similar particles end up in the wrong cells in the body. These particles are being studied for vaccine delivery, meaning people could be exposed. FDA regulators should also consider whether everyday low-level magnetic fields from wiring, appliances, or small devices could interact with such particles in the body, since current safety testing doesn't account for this new kind of non-thermal mechanical toxicity.

A thorough review of the genotoxic potential of engineered nanomaterials found these materials can significantly damage DNA, causing effects such as chromosomal fragmentation, DNA strand breaks, point mutations, oxidative DNA adducts, and altered gene expression patterns.[41]

Independent researchers—including Young[42], Delgado Martín, Campra[43] and Noack—have reported graphene oxide and magnetic nanoparticles in Covid vaccine samples. These findings are unverified, but they reflect materials already used in experimental vaccine and drug-delivery research. Graphene oxide has documented immunotoxic, inflammatory, and pro-coagulant effects[44, 45]. Magnetic nanoparticles may influence biological tissues under

external magnetic fields, raising concerns about unintended effects on human physiology and potential for covert manipulation.[46, 47, 48]

While peer-reviewed research to date has not identified magnetic nanoparticles in authorized COVID-19 vaccines, the growing field of magnetically responsive nanotechnology raises important ethical and regulatory considerations. Magnetic nanoparticles—already used in experimental drug delivery, cancer therapy, and vaccine research—demonstrate the capacity to alter biological activity under external magnetic fields. These developments underscore the need for preemptive ethical frameworks, particularly regarding transparency, complete ingredient disclosure, independent testing, informed consent, and long-term safety monitoring. As nanomedicine advances, regulatory bodies must ensure that novel technologies, especially those capable of remote or systemic biological influence, undergo rigorous, publicly accountable review.

VII. Regulatory Capture and Systemic Failure

This section examines how conflicts of interest and regulatory capture created systemic failures that exacerbated both safety and oversight gaps.

1. Regulatory Capture and Conflicts of Interest

High-level public health officials held patents or received funding from vaccine manufacturers[25, 26, 27, 28, 29] raising serious questions about impartiality. Regulatory decisions were made by individuals with financial or professional ties to the very products they approved.

2. HIPAA Violations and Surveillance Expansion

The COVID-19 pandemic response introduced unprecedented intrusions into the private medical lives of ordinary citizens. Under the guise of public safety, businesses, employers, airlines, restaurants, and educational institutions were permitted — and in some cases required — to demand access to individuals' personal health records for the purpose of discrimination. This practice constituted a stark departure from long-standing ethical and legal norms protecting medical confidentiality.

Notably, this occurred despite scientific evidence that COVID-19 vaccines did not prevent transmission (i.e., lacked sterilizing immunity), rendering such disclosures scientifically and ethically questionable. The pressure to disclose or comply led to coercive social dynamics, including exclusion from public life, discrimination based on medical status, and in some cases, falsification of records or participation in underground resistance (e.g., sit-ins at New York City restaurants). The centralization of electronic medical records (EMR) under federal and state systems, while operationally efficient, introduced new vulnerabilities — making personal health data a potential target for misuse, hacking, or politically motivated surveillance.

Digital contact tracing and health passport systems were launched in partnership with private firms[23], collecting sensitive health data without informed consent or adequate

HIPAA protections. These tools laid groundwork for broader digital identity systems that threaten privacy and autonomy.

VIII. Suppression, Coercion, and Loss of Medical Freedom

Beyond systemic failures, this section explores suppression, coercion, and the erosion of medical and religious freedoms in the pandemic response.

1. Systemic Informed Consent Failures

Mass administration of EUA products occurred under coercive conditions, including job loss, travel restrictions, and social exclusion. Original trial participants were unblinded early; long-term safety remains unclear. For young, healthy people (especially children), COVID risk was low, while vaccine risk was non-zero. Recipients were not fully informed of the experimental nature, known risks (e.g., myocarditis, blood clots, menstrual changes), unknown long-term risks, or available treatment alternatives[9], violating domestic consent laws and international bioethics norms (e.g., Nuremberg Code, Helsinki Declaration).

2. Elimination of Medical and Religious Exemptions

States including California and New York introduced legislative changes abruptly before the pandemic, restricting physicians' authority to issue medical exemptions[22], while religious exemptions were eliminated. These measures undermined patient rights, violated constitutional freedoms, and removed individualized medical judgment.

3. Censorship and Criminalization of Medical Dissent

Physicians, researchers, and public health critics faced systemic censorship. California's AB 2098 criminalized dissenting medical speech as "misinformation"[20], while federal coordination with social media companies silenced opposing viewpoints[21], in violation of First Amendment protections.

IX. Ethical, Human, and Spiritual Harm

Moving from institutional and systemic analyses, this section considers broader ethical, human, and spiritual consequences of policy and medical interventions.

1. Protection of Minors and Bodily Autonomy

Minors, particularly children and adolescents, must be protected from irreversible medical interventions, including experimental vaccines and gender reassignment surgeries, which carry permanent sterilization risks and cannot be consented to by minors[37, 38]. This protection is essential to uphold fundamental human rights and bodily autonomy.

2. Isolation of the Dying

During the COVID era, countless individuals died alone in hospitals and care homes. People were denied final moments with loved ones, and, in many cases, essential spiritual rites.

These policies, while framed as protective, often inflicted deep and lasting emotional harm—a cost that must not be overlooked.

3. Spiritual and Ethical Foundation of Bodily Autonomy

Bodily autonomy is a fundamental human birthright grounded not only in law but also in universal principles of dignity, freedom, and respect for individual conscience. Recognizing this inherent right is essential to preserving humanity's moral compass and protecting against abuses of power.

Across law, ethics, medicine, neuroscience, and regulatory oversight, the signals were ignored, deprioritized, or dismissed—revealing a collective failure of vigilance at the very moment when stakes were highest. The result is a record of foreseeable harm ignored, a professional dereliction of duty so profound it cannot be overstated.

X. Remedy and Forward Action

Finally, the report outlines a legislative and regulatory reform agenda, drawing from prior sections to propose actionable pathways for restoring oversight, autonomy, and accountability.

1. Legislative and Regulatory Reform Agenda

Prohibit all medical mandates and coercion. Enact a federal ban on mandates for any medical procedure, therapeutic, or prophylactic—including vaccines, medical devices, and diagnostic tests—especially those under Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) or lacking full regulatory approval. Include explicit protections against coercion, such as social, financial, employment, or institutional pressure.

Enforce manufacturing oversight and quality assurance. Establish independent, third-party oversight for all manufacturers of biologics, gene therapies, and nano-enabled medical products. Mandate batch-level safety and contaminant testing before public distribution. Require transparent reporting of quality control failures, with criminal penalties for concealment or falsification. Reform FDA/EMA/WHO regulatory pathways to remove expedited loopholes that bypass safety checks.

Reinstate unrestricted religious and medical exemptions. Guarantee the right to decline any medical product or procedure based on personal or religious beliefs, or personal medical history, without punitive measures or institutional retaliation.

Repeal liability shields under the PREP Act. Eliminate blanket immunity for harm caused by vaccines, biologics, or therapeutics. Restore the right of injured parties to seek redress through civil courts.

Regulate gene therapies and gene-altering technologies. Classify all RNA, self-replicating RNA, lipid nanoparticle, synthetic DNA and genetically engineered monoclonal antibody

technologies as gene therapies under strict regulation, subject to long-term studies, labeling, and restricted use.

Ban use of viral promoters without independent risk review. Prohibit inclusion of SV40 and similar viral promoter sequences in gene therapy platforms without robust, independent cancer-risk assessments and public disclosure.

Protect medical speech and dissent. Repeal laws such as California AB 2098 that criminalize or censor dissenting medical opinions. Enact protections for doctors, researchers, whistleblowers, and health professionals to speak freely on emerging scientific concerns.

Prohibit vaccine passports and health-linked digital ID systems. Ban any technology or program that links access to services, travel, commerce, or employment to personal health data, vaccine status, or biometric profiles.

Strengthen health data privacy (HIPAA modernization). Expand HIPAA to include genomic, biometric, wearable-device, nanotech, and environmental exposure data. Prohibit data sharing with non-medical third parties without explicit informed consent.

Enshrine medical privacy as a civil right. Guarantee all individuals the legal right to private health decision-making. Ban corporate, governmental, or commercial access to personal health data without judicial oversight and consent.

Criminalize health data abuse. Create specific federal criminal penalties for unauthorized access, coercive use, collection or monetization of personal health or biometric data.

Prohibit medical discrimination. Make it illegal to discriminate based on vaccination status, genetic profile, or medical history in employment, education, housing, public accommodations, commerce and travel. Include criminal penalties for coercive policies by employers, schools, corporations, or government programs.

Reform adverse event surveillance systems. Overhaul VAERS and V-SAFE to provide transparent, user-accessible, real-time reporting with built-in follow-up, data validation, and independent review panels.

Ban conflicts of interest in regulation. Prohibit individuals with financial ties to pharmaceutical or biotech companies from serving in regulatory decision-making roles. Mandate public disclosure of all affiliations.

Restore Congressional oversight of emergencies. Require domestic, independently verified data as a condition for federal emergency declarations. All such declarations must receive majority approval from Congress within 30 days.

Establish independent genetics ethics boards. Create non-governmental, non-corporate ethics review panels with public transparency to evaluate any technology altering human genetic, reproductive, or cognitive integrity.

Mandate nanomaterial disclosure and labeling. Require full disclosure and public labeling of engineered nanomaterials—including graphene, carbon nanotubes, and magnetic particles—in medical, cosmetic, food, and consumer products, with labeling that allows individuals to make informed choices. Require independent long-term safety studies.

Create oversight for field-responsive biological technologies. Establish an independent (separate from corporate or defense influence), interdisciplinary body to evaluate technologies that can remotely influence biological systems (e.g., magnetogenetics, neurostimulation), with authority to halt or restrict development if ethical risks outweigh benefits.

Prohibit covert use of bio-responsive tech. Criminalize the use of magnetic field–responsive or nano-enabled physiological modulation systems on humans without fully informed consent, including in law enforcement, intelligence, or behavioral influence contexts.

Protect vulnerable populations from coerced experimentation. Enact special protections for children, pregnant women, women of child-bearing age, the elderly, military personnel, incarcerated individuals, and healthcare workers to ensure freedom from medical coercion or unconsented experimentation.

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic response revealed deep legal, ethical, and regulatory failures. Unconstitutional overreach, corporate capture, suppression of dissent, and deployment of experimental genetic technologies without consent represent an assault on human dignity and civil liberties. We must defend the sacred right of bodily autonomy as a foundation for justice and freedom. Comprehensive reforms are urgently needed to restore trust, uphold medical ethics, and ensure no future crisis justifies the sacrifice of fundamental human rights.

Throughout history, under sustained fear and moral coercion, most humans predictably fail. Love is the refusal to reduce or define someone by their worst act or their gravest oversight. It is the refusal to dehumanize or annihilate. Humanity does not depend on goodness or innocence; it resides in the moral essence of each person, who always retains the free will to choose differently, even if change is rare. Moral failure does not make anyone less human. If it did, none of us would survive our worst moments.

References

1. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). (2023). Judicial Watch: Records Show Funding for EcoHealth/Wuhan Institute Research to Create Coronavirus ‘Mutants’

2. Office of the Director of National Intelligence. (2021). Updated Assessment on COVID-19 Origins.

3. US Patent 7,220,852. Coronavirus isolated in humans. (2003). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

4. US Patent 7,776,521. Coronavirus isolated in humans (with methods of detection). (2004). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

5. Lenze EJ, et al. (2020). Fluvoxamine vs Placebo and Clinical Deterioration in Outpatients with Symptomatic COVID-19: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA.

6. Ramakrishnan S, et al. (2021). Inhaled budesonide in the treatment of early COVID-19 (STOIC): a phase 2, open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet Respir Med.

7. Zelenko Protocol. (2020). Ried K, et al. (2021) Therapies to Prevent Progression of COVID-19, Including Hydroxychloroquine, Azithromycin, Zinc, and Vitamin D3 With or Without Intravenous Vitamin C: An International, Multicenter, Randomized Trial. Cureus.

8. Caly, L., et al. (2020). The FDA-approved drug ivermectin inhibits the replication of SARS-CoV-2 in vitro. Antiviral Res.

9. Roberts Law (2021). INTENTIONAL MISCONDUCT – FAILURE TO PROVIDE INFORMED CONSENT – COVID-19 JAB/"VACCINE".

10. Pentagon to mandate COVID-19 vaccine for military (2021). The Hill.

11. Kons KM, et al. (2022). Exclusion of Reproductive-aged Women in COVID-19 Vaccination and Clinical Trials. Womens Health Issues.

12. Kostoff, R., et al. (2021). Why are we vaccinating children against COVID-19? Science Direct.

13. Aldén M, et al. (2022). Intracellular Reverse Transcription of Pfizer BioNTech COVID-19 mRNA Vaccine BNT162b2 In Vitro in Human Liver Cell Line. Curr Issues Mol Biol.

14. Zhang, L., et al. (2021). Reverse-transcribed SARS-CoV-2 RNA can integrate into the genome of cultured human cells and can be expressed in patient-derived tissues.

15. Kämmerer, U., et al. (2024). BioNTech RNA-Based COVID-19 Injections Contain Large Amounts Of Residual DNA Including An SV40 Promoter/Enhancer Sequence.

16. McKernan, K. (2023). U.S. Food and Drug Administration 182nd Meeting of Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee. (4:58:49—5:03:02)

17. Buckhaults, P. (2023). South Carolina Senate Medical Affairs Pandemic Preparedness Listening Committee. (3:34:00—4:09:30)

18. McKernan, K. February 23, 2024. International Covid Summit 5 (ICS-5) Day 1. Plasmid derived dsDNA contamination in mRNA vaccines.

19. Qin, Z., et al. (2022). Pre-exposure to mRNA-LNP inhibits adaptive immune responses and alters innate immune fitness in an inheritable fashion. PLoS Pathog.

20. California Legislature. (2022). AB 2098: Medical misinformation bill.

21. House Judiciary Committee. (2023).

22. US News. (2019). California Law to Restrict Medical Vaccine Exemptions Raises Questions of Control.

23. Axios. (2020). Apple, Google team up on coronavirus contact tracing.

24. The Vault Project. (2023). CDC Ignores COVID-19 Vaccine Safety Signals, Maintains Secret Database.

25. Kennedy, R., Jr., (2016). CDC Scientists Expose Agency Corruption.

26. Children's Health Defense. (2019). Close Ties & Financial Entanglements: The CDC-Guaranteed Vaccine Market.

27. Public Citizen. (2020). The NIH Vaccine.

28. Project on Government Oversight. (2020). Some FDA Advisors Tapped to Review Coronavirus Vaccines Received Payments from Vaccine Companies.

29. Andrzejewski, A. (2024). Open The Books. Big Pharma Paid $690 Million to Fauci's Agency Through Secret Third Party Royalties During Pandemic Years.

30. McCarty, K. (2020). Navigating FDA Policies for PPE, and Liability Protections. Sheppard Mullin.

31. Zuckerman, D. (2021). Emergency Use Authorizations (EUAs) Versus FDA Approval: Implications for COVID-19 and Public Health. Am J Public Health.

32. Spira, B. (2022). Correlation Between Mask Compliance and COVID-19 Outcomes in Europe. Cureus.

33. Jefferson, T., et al. (2023). Physical interventions to interrupt or reduce the spread of respiratory viruses. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.

34. USA Today. (2024). COVID guidelines caused millions to suffer. Now Fauci admits 'there was no science behind it.'

35. Pezzullo, A. (2022). Age-stratified infection fatality rate of COVID-19 in the non-elderly population. Environ Res.

36. Subramanian, S.V., et al. (2021). Increases in COVID-19 are unrelated to levels of vaccination across 68 countries and 2947 counties in the United States. European Journal of Epidemiology.

37. American Council On Science and Health. (2025). Trans Care for Minors: When Law and Medicine Collide.

38. US Department of Health and Human Services. (2025). HHS Releases Comprehensive Review of Medical Interventions for Children and Adolescents with Gender Dysphoria.

39. Feng, L., et al. (2019). Silica nanoparticles trigger the vascular endothelial dysfunction and prethrombotic state via miR-451 directly regulating the IL6R signaling pathway. Particle and Fibre Toxicology. (16).

40. Lopez, S., et al. (2021). Magneto-mechanical destruction of cancer-associated fibroblasts using ultra-small iron oxide nanoparticles and low frequency rotating magnetic fields. Nanoscale Advances. (2).

41. Singh, N., et al. (2009). NanoGenotoxicology: The DNA damaging potential of engineered nanomaterials. Biomaterials.

42. Young, R. (2022). Scanning and Transmission Electron Microscopy Reveals Graphene Oxide in CoV-19 Vaccines. Acta Scientific.

43. Campra, P. (2021). Detection of Graphene in COVID19 Vaccines. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (FOIA Document).

44. Dudek, I., et al. (2016). The molecular influence of graphene and graphene oxide on the immune system under in vitro and in vivo conditions. Archivum Immunologiae et Therapiae Experimentalis, 64, 195–215.

45. Feng, R., et al. (2015). Impact of graphene oxide on the structure and function of important multiple blood components by a dose-dependent pattern. J Biomed Mater Res A. 103(6), 2006-2014.

46. Del Sol-Fernández, S., et al. (2021). Magnetogenetics: Remote activation of cellular functions triggered by magnetic switches. Nanoscale, 14(6), 2091-2118.

47. Dobson, J. (2008). Remote control of cellular behaviour with magnetic nanoparticles. Nature Nanotechnology, 3, 139–143.

48. Tay, A., et al. (2017). Remote neural stimulation using magnetic nanoparticles. Curr Med Chem. 24(5), 537-548.

49. Ravid, A. (2021). Jacobson v. Massachusetts: How a 1905 Court Case May Determine the Legality of Vaccine Mandates. Find Law.

50. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). About The Untreated Syphilis Study at Tuskegee.

51. Bilinski, A., et al. (2025). Sins of Omission: Model-Based Estimates of the Health Effects of Excluding Pregnant Participants From Randomized Controlled Trials. Annals of Internal Medicine.

52. Union of Concerned Scientists. (2017). Merck Manipulated the Science about the Drug Vioxx.

53. Business Insider. (2023). Between 1930 and 1970, around one third of all women in Puerto Rico were sterilized to address concerns of 'surplus population'.

54. NPR. (2013). California's Prison Sterilizations Reportedly Echo Eugenics Era.

55. The Marshall Project. (2017). Our long, troubling history of sterilizing the incarcerated.

56. Michelson, N. (2024). Brutality Behind Bars: Forced Sterilization in Prisons. Public Health Post.

57. Spitz, V. (2006). Doctors from hell: The horrific account of Nazi experiments on humans. J Clin Invest.

58. Wikipedia. (n.d.). Howard Dully.

59. Caruso, J., et al. (2017). Psychosurgery, ethics, and media: a history of Walter Freeman and the lobotomy. Neurosurg. Focus.

60. Wikipedia. (n.d.). Eugenics in the United States

61. Arizona State University. (2016). Making sense of a dark chapter in America's past.

62. Lombardo, P. A. (2015). Eugenics and involuntary sterilization: 1907—2015

63. Wikipedia. (n.d.). Buck v. Bell.

64. Comfort, N. (2009). U.S. scientists and the eugenics movement.

65. Stern, A. M. (2005). Sterilized in the name of public health.

66. Science, Public Health Policy and the Law. (2024). FDA’s Own Study Finds DNA Contamination in Pfizer Vaccine.

67. Takeda. (2021). Notice of Suspension of Use of Specific Lots of Moderna’s COVID-19 Vaccine in Japan.

68. Maryland Matters. (2022). Congressional Report: Baltimore Manufacturer Mishandled 400M COVID-19 Doses.

69. Feng, S., et al. (2016). Induction of mucosal immunity through systemic immunization: Phantom or reality? Hum Vaccin Immunother.

70. Hikmet, F., et al. (2020). The protein expression profile of ACE2 in human tissues. Mol Syst. Bio.

71. Wang, et al. (2020). scRNA-seq Profiling of Human Testes Reveals the Presence of the ACE2 Receptor, A Target for SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Spermatogonia, Leydig and Sertoli Cells. Cells. 9(4).

72. Tseng, C. (2012). Immunization with SARS coronavirus vaccines leads to pulmonary immunopathology on challenge with the SARS virus. PLoS One. 7(4).

73. Kanduc, D. and Shoenfeld, Y. (2020). Molecular mimicry between SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein and mammalian proteomes: implications for the vaccine. Immunol Res. 68(5).

74. Kedmi, R. et al. (2010). The systemic toxicity of positively charged lipid nanoparticles and the role of Toll-like receptor 4 in immune activation. Biomaterials. 31(26):6867-75.

75. Grimm, D. (2006). Fatality in mice due to oversaturation of cellular microRNA/short hairpin RNA pathways. Nature. 441(7092).

76. Zhang, L. et al. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 RNA reverse-transcribed and integrated into the human genome.

77. Domazet-Lašo, T. (2022; see also the earlier OSF preprint; Domazwt-Lašo, 2021). mRNA vaccines: Why is the biology of retroposition ignored? Genes (Basel). 13(5).

78. Doerfler, W. (2021). Adenoviral Vector DNA- and SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-Based Covid-19 Vaccines: Possible Integration into the Human Genome - Are Adenoviral Genes Expressed in Vector-based Vaccines? Virus Res.

79. Acevendo-Whitehouse, K. and Bruno, R. (2023). Potential health risks of mRNA-based vaccine therapy: A hypothesis. Med Hypotheses.

80. Sellaturay, P. et al. (2020). Polyethylene Glycol-Induced Systemic Allergic Reactions (Anaphylaxis). J. Allergy Clin Immunol Pract.

81. Ganson, N. (2016). Pre-existing anti–polyethylene glycol antibody linked to first-exposure allergic reactions to pegnivacogin, a PEGylated RNA aptamer. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 137(5).

82. Moderna. (n.d.). “Our Story.”

83. Lalani, H. et al. (2023). US public investment in development of mRNA covid-19 vaccines: retrospective cohort study. BMJ.

84. Garnett, A.G. (n.d.). Moderna, Inc. Britannica.

85. Sagonowsky, E. (2023). Moderna pays US government $400M 'catch-up payment' under new COVID-19 vaccine license. FIERCE Pharma.

86. Ambati, B., et al. (2022). MSH3 Homology and Potential Recombination Link to SARS-CoV-2 Furin Cleavage Site. Frontiers.

87. Burki, T. (2023). First shared SARS-CoV-2 genome: GISAID vs virological.org. Lancet Microbe.

88. Office of Science Policy. (2015). The Gain-of-Function Deliberative Process. NIH Office of Science Policy.

89. Ghasemi, M., et al. (2014). The role of NMDA receptors in the pathophysiology and treatment of mood disorders. Neurosci Biobehav Rev.

90. Erhardt, S. et al. (2013). Connecting inflammation with glutamate agonism in suicidality. Neuropsychopharmacology.

91. Kandel, E., et al. (2000). Principles of Neural Science (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill. [Cover image.] Wikipedia Commons.

92. Pateev, I., et al. (2023). Biodistribution of RNA Vaccines and of Their Products: Evidence from Human and Animal Studies. Biomedicines.

93. Sharma, V., et al., (2023). mRNA translation in astrocytes controls hippocampal long-term synaptic plasticity and memory. Proc Natl Acad Sci.

94. Zipp, F., et al. (2023). Cytokines as emerging regulators of central nervous system synapses. Immunity.

95. Dupois, J., et al. (2023). NMDA receptor functions in health and disease: Old actor, new dimensions. Neuron.

96. Yahoo Finance. (n.d.). Gilead Sciences, Inc. (GILD) historical stock prices.

97. Zacks Equity Research. (2020). Gilead up as remdesivir shows promise in treating coronavirus. Nasdaq.

98. Fomenko, A. et al. (2022). Assessing severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infectivity by reverse-transcription polymerase reaction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Rev Med Virol.

99. Bansal, V., et al. (2021). Mortality Benefit of Remdesivir in COVID-19: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front Med.

100. Blair, H. (2023). Remdesivir: A Review in COVID-19. Drugs.

101. Janssens, W. et al. (2022). Terminal care in oldest old dying from COVID-19 in the acute hospital. Z Gerontol Geriatr.