

ÉDITIONS GALAAD

Infamy of the State

(Reality of unconstitutional acts practiced by the
French State in violation of its constitution).

(Revised and completed version – reissue of December 24, 2024)

Booklet 4: various realities to take into account.

**IMPORTANT:
Free book cannot be sold.**

Kenny Ronald MARGUERITE

Table of contents

° 1 – Presentation of the booklets.....	5
– 1. Good to know:.....	7
– 2. Contents of the booklets:.....	8
° Folder: various realities to take into account.....	9
° 2 – Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State for the harm suffered by Mr. MARGUERITE.....	10
° 3 – Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State in the establishment of incomplete laws in the management of the discipline of civil servants who are at fault and in the damages they have caused to Mr. MARGUERITE	23
° 4 – The reality of material and psychological damages and loss of opportunity generated by unconstitutional laws established in French legislation and the possibilities of financial compensation envisaged.....	28
° 5 – The reality of the “mirror to larks” of the “vaccinal pass” instituted by the French government under cover of covid 19	43
° 6 – The titanic fight between the clay pot and the iron pot, David and Goliath version.....	72
° 7 – Of Suffering and Ink.....	76

Thanks to my fiancée Nicole

Thank you to my fiancée Nicole who co-wrote this book, which would never have seen the light of day without her.

I'm going to tell you about my fiancée Nicole, and to do this, I would tell you that she has collaborated on all my books, including this one, giving shape to my words and by magnifying my ideas without altering them.

It is she who gives meaning to my ideas and manages to faithfully transcribe my thought by giving it a lighter tone. Thank you for the help and support she gave me throughout the writing of this theme. She was able to give coherence to my ideas.

May God bless her!

ÉDITIONS GALAAD



(Of Feather and actions)

Culture is the lever allowing men to aspire to excellence.

Do not neglect it.

Copyright©2024 ÉDITIONS GALAAD
Californie 97232 Le LAMENTIN (MARTINIQUE)
<http://kenny-ronald-marguerite.com>

All rights of reproduction, adaptation and translation, in whole or in part, reserved for all countries The author is the sole owner of the rights and is responsible for the contents of this book.

GOOD TO KNOW:

This file could not be corrected by a professional proofreader and was written by a French speaker since the urgency of the situation required that it be published as soon as possible. In doing so, you will certainly find spelling, conjugation and grammatical errors, I apologize in advance.

1 Presentation of the booklets

To begin with, it is important to note that in order to change things, so that my rights are no longer violated by unconstitutional laws, I have taken legal action. My case is still ongoing. You will find in this book a compilation of the files that I have filed, supplemented by other important elements for the themes addressed.

This book is made up of two parts, the first is the legal file that I have set up in order to defend my rights and the second presents the research on realities linked to the abuses of Mr. MACRON's governments, having had to manage the health crisis, as well as other testimonies that I provide. Please note that as a result, given the different nature of these two writings, the legal parts, taken from the files of my case, will present as the subject **"Mr. MARGUERITE"** instead of the personal pronoun **"I"**, used for the other part.

Thus, this book presents legal bases, from legislative texts that will allow all those who, like me, have suffered discrimination and financial losses due to the existence of these two illegal laws, vaccinal against covid 19 and Sunday (dominical), to defend themselves.

Thus, this book is not simply intended to present a story, but is also a "legal sword" that should help all those who have suffered, or are still suffering, harm because of these laws that I incriminate, to defend themselves.

To present to you what I have experienced, I will give you a strong image that symbolizes what the Sunday (dominical) and vaccinal laws against covid 19 have made me endure, for years and are still making me endure:

To do this, I would tell you that my story, if I could not prove that it really existed, thanks to the evidence that I provide, could easily pass for a B-series soap opera in bad taste.

And yet! It is indeed my life and the unconstitutional laws, Sunday (dominical) laws and vaccinal laws against covid 19, have come to undermine all my efforts, for my social integration. In hindsight, my feeling is to have been on a greased pole.

At the top is success, social integration, professional and personal fulfillment. Unfortunately, this mast is greased with the most viscous liquids, which are the legislative texts, unconstitutional, which carry both the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday (dominical) laws.

Starting from nothing, I fought to reach the top of the mast, by willpower and by the grace of God, and I was able to touch the rewards so much expected, but lo and behold, the perfidious grease of these insidious laws made me slip and I find myself again at the foot of the mast.

From then on, my condition is much worse than before because I have been soiled by this pernicious grease that are these unconstitutional laws, which have stained my clothing. This is exactly the image that comes to mind when I think of everything that has happened and which makes me dizzy. Incredible!

I ask that justice be done, because until now, neither the President of the Republic, nor the ministers concerned, nor the high authorities established on public finances have seen fit to put in place what I am asking for and which is none other than to live in dignity and no longer be kept in precariousness by laws and administrations, which have exceeded their rights and prerogatives.

I come to you, through this book, so that we do not regress and that my story is not this exception, which demonstrates that the blood of those who established our Nation, France, has not flowed in vain. My goal is that those who have suffered under the iniquitous yoke of the Sunday (dominical) and vaccinal laws against covid 19, can be compensated.

Thus, in view of what has been presented in this book, I ask that justice be done to me, as well as to all those who like me, have suffered, under the rule of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, which themselves are unfounded, because they contravene the "Declaration of Helsinki" and by extension European law.

The same goes for those who have suffered and are still suffering because of the Sunday (dominical) laws, which are nevertheless unconstitutional. I ask that we can be compensated for the losses and abuses suffered, but at what price!

Unfortunately, this compensation will never be able to provide an answer and compensate for the pain of the families of those who, under the pain, have killed themselves because of the loss of their jobs.

Thus, it is not only the covid 19 virus that kills, but also unfair and unfounded laws established in complete illegality that have led or are still leading some to the grave prematurely.

For my part, I am alive, but the tears shed for our constitution (French) have been in vain.

To continue, I would like to tell you that it is important for me that you understand that these situations that I have been confronted with, I did not want them because, before coming to defend my case before the courts, I believed in the integrity of the Secular Republic that is France. and for which courageous men and women shed their blood and gave their lives, as early as 1789, during the French Revolution.

This, just like for the maroon negroes (*Black Slaves Who Rebelled and Fought Against Slavery*), in search of freedom, who rose up against the colonists.

Just before I could experience the unthinkable, I had faith in our secular republic that is France and in the fact that our constitution assured us, as citizens, that no powerful iniquitous person would come to mistreat a French citizen.

Yes, my naivety was very great, I admit it!

Unfortunately, considering my history, what was decreed at the beginning of the constitution (French), liberty, legality, fraternity seems to me, today, to be nothing more than a myth, a utopia. Indeed, what I suffered while the highest French authorities were aware of it and that nothing concrete has been put in place, is in my opinion, unworthy of a country such as France.

How can a strong nation, a Republic where human rights are the banner, allow a citizen who starts from nothing, and who does not want to remain a burden for his Nation, fights like a Lion in order to ensure a better future for his children and himself and who, having reached a status that makes him a Frenchman with an average income of **3 500 euros**, to be forced to receive as an income, for several months, **less than the minimum subsistence**, because of laws that flout Marianne, therefore our Nation (France) and to be lowered by those who, coming from the people, have sworn to serve the citizens. We will see it!

To you, who are reading me, can you imagine what I am going through? Often the best way to understand a person who is suffering because of a stone in their shoes is to wear them for a while.

Can you, even for a moment, put on my clogs. I am just a simple Frenchman, I do not have a prestigious name or wealthy parent, I was only naive enough to believe in the values of the Republic (French), in this inestimable heritage that is our constitution that was bequeathed to us, at the cost of the blood, of men and women of great value?

I want you to know that despite the vicissitudes that have largely been my lot, in recent years, I continue to believe in, freedom, legality, fraternity and justice.

I will tell you my story, and I will tell you that I am coming out of this misadventure, sore.

You who read me, you remain on this day my last hope.

I would like to tell you, to you who read me, that I am convinced that my story and especially the facts that I present in this book will mark the spirits. At least, I believe it. May this book, that we took pleasure in writing and offering you, be the glimmer of hope that will open up better tomorrows.

1 Good to know:

To continue, I would tell you that this is an excerpt from a larger digital book, which contains 236 pages, entitled “Infamy of the State (Reality of unconstitutional acts practiced by the French State in violation of its constitution).”

If you would like more details, when I refer to a chapter, you can find it in the full version of the book. Finally, I would like to point out that this full version has been split into 4 booklets, including this one.

The purpose of these booklets is to be in a more manageable and transportable format, providing you with better reading comfort.

They will also allow you to more easily choose the theme that suits you.

However, they are all available to you in digital version, booklets and full version book. I invite you to download them from my site:

<https://www.kenny-ronald-marguerite.com/infamy-of-the-state>

You can share them with your loved ones or talk about them around you.

2 Contents of the booklets:

° **booklet 1: Of faith, suffering and action.**

- ° STATEMENT OF FACTS.
- ° DISCUSSION.
- ° New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, as head of the FIP accounting department other categories, in the alleged external illegality.
- ° New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Rodolph SAUVONNET, as Regional Director of Public Finances of Martinique, in the alleged external illegality.
- ° New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Jérôme FOURNEL, as Director General of Public Finances, in the alleged external illegality.
- ° Presentation of the loss of opportunity and loss of earnings that the covid 19 vaccination laws generated against Mr. MARGUERITE.
- ° New evidence on the alleged internal illegality of the decrees relating to the solidarity fund.
- ° Presentation of the reality of Mr. MARGUERITE's rights discriminated against by the administrative court of Martinique in the context of his case.
- ° Brief career synopsis, philosophy of life and discriminatory oppression.
- ° Of Suffering and Ink.

° **booklet 2: the illegal nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19.**

- ° On the alleged internal illegality of the vaccinal laws against covid 19.
- ° The reality of the legislative activation of the already programmed obsolescence of the vaccine laws against covid 19.
- ° Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, which contravene the right of Mr. MARGUERITE, as a Frenchman, not to be vaccinated against Covid 19 because of his faith.
- ° Of Suffering and Ink.

° **booklet 3: the illegal nature of Sunday laws.**

- ° Historical and legislative reality of the unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws.
- ° Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws.
- ° Open Letter: Case to Repeal Catholic Sunday Law That Oppress Sabbath Observers and Shabbat Observers.
- ° Of Suffering and Ink.

° **booklet 4: various realities to take into account.**

- ° Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State for the harm suffered by Mr. MARGUERITE.
- ° Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State in the establishment of incomplete laws in the management of the discipline of civil servants who are at fault and in the damages they have caused to Mr. MARGUERITE.
- ° The reality of material and psychological damages and loss of opportunity generated by unconstitutional laws established in French legislation and the possibilities of financial compensation envisaged.
- ° The reality of the “mirror to larks” of the “vaccinal pass” instituted by the French government under cover of covid 19.
- ° The titanic fight between the clay pot and the iron pot, David and Goliath version.
- ° Of Suffering and Ink.

Folder: various realities to take into account.

“In France and other countries, we have come to see the rights of citizens trampled underfoot by those who have sworn an oath to protect them, who hold power in their hands, who use it and abuse it, martyring those who are subject to them in the process. Nevertheless, the despotism of the iniquitously powerful only temporarily on they who are weaker than them!

For, through the pen and without violence, every oppressed person is destined to become the worst nightmare of those who demean them. Indeed, ink and paper are far more powerful than we give them credit for, for the knowledge that every citizen can acquire gives us the ability to change our future as individuals and as a nation.

In the history of mankind, many dominators who thought they were unshakeable have been overthrown by those they oppressed.

We have the example of the proud sans-culottes of the French Revolution, or in the West Indies, the proud and impetuous maroon negroes who rose up against the despotism of the iniquitous powerful who, at their whim, bullied weaker people than themselves without anyone raising an eyebrow. They thus broke the yoke of their dominators and became free men and women.

By my feather (pen), I bring you this powerful weapon, what is this book, so that certain chains of servitude which still remain in France and which are erected by those to whom the citizens have given power, can be broken.”

[Quote from Kenny R MARGUERITE].

2 Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State for the harm suffered by Mr. MARGUERITE

Let us now look at the responsibility of the French State in the situation of exclusion and great poverty that Mr. MARGUERITE now experiences because of the repercussions of the laws, which are nevertheless unconstitutional, on his life and therefore contravene European law. To begin with, it is important to understand that French legislation has had to adapt to European legislation and must be subject to the latter.

The text [*Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. Introduction. Tiré du site internet: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr>*] establishes the following: “The European Union right (EU) influences from now on increasingly diversified sectors of Member States' legislation, for example in economic and monetary legislation, banking law, asylum and immigration law. The acts of derivative right, regulations and directives, precisely cover very broad areas of our law.

By its institutional characteristics and the scale of its normative production, the European Union constitutes, according to the expression of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), a “legal order” in its own right which is integrated into the national legal orders of the Member States.

[...] In this context, the French administrative judge is led, within his field of competence, to apply and interpret European Union law. His case law fully ensures its integration into national law and establishes its special place in the hierarchy of standards.”

As we can see, European law must be considered as an integral part of the law of its Member States because it covers a very broad field, we must now take into account European law. This reality has positive impacts or repercussions, because the range of European texts covers increasingly diverse sectors and increasingly influences legislation, particularly French legislation.

European case law is so dense that French administrative judges can fully use it on a daily basis, and they are called upon in this context to interpret and implement within the administrative courts the law established for all by the European Union.

Now let's discover in the following texts how European legislation has become established within the various legal texts of French administrations:

- [*(French) Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. Partie 2.1.2 le contrôle exercé par le juge administratif s'est adapté aux exigences propres du droit de l'union Européenne. Tiré du site internet: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr>*],
- [*(French) Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 1) Le juge administratif assure pleinement l'intégration du droit de l'Union européenne dans l'ordre juridique national. 1-1 La reconnaissance des spécificités du droit de l'union par le juge administratif: Effet direct et primauté du droit de l'union Européenne. Tiré du site internet : <https://www.conseil-etat.fr>*],
- [*(French) Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 1-2 L'autonomie institutionnelle et procédurale : un mécanisme de subsidiarité juridictionnelle inhérente aux techniques d'application du droit de l'union. Tiré du site internet: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr>*],
- [*(French) Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 1-3 La reconnaissance des spécificités du droit de l'union Européenne emporte des conséquences importantes pour l'administration Française. Tiré du site internet: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr>*].

What we discover in these texts in connection with European law is crucial in the context of Mr. MARGUERITE's case.

We are informed that the administrative judge is called upon, when judging a case, to take into account first and foremost the European directives. He cannot consider and take as a basis for his judgment a French legal text, to the detriment of a European directive.

The thing is such that if an administrative act is based on a legislative provision instituted in France and which therefore finds its legitimacy in French legal texts while it is contrary to European Union law, it is presented as being devoid of legal basis and in doing so, the administrative judge must annul it.

Any standard, therefore any national text or writing, which would be contrary to or contravene a standard of European Union law must be annulled by the administrative judge. From reading these texts, it emerges that the supremacy of European laws over those of member nations, including France, implies that in their proceedings before national and European courts, citizens can rely on European texts to assert their rights.

Member States have an obligation to comply with them in their legal systems. Thus, when a State has not yet established a legal basis that is equivalent to that of the European Union and that allows its citizens to defend themselves in an equivalent manner, it is the European texts that take precedence.

In the above, we also see that French administrative judges are above all “ordinary law judges applying Union law” who fully ensure the integration of European Union law into the French legal order.

These texts also affirm that the rights conferred by European texts on citizens of Member States must be effectively applicable.

This dominance of European legislative texts over the French allows, in the event of a dispute between a citizen and an administration, the liability of the State to be incurred, which is in this case accused of violating European Union law, and this **“regardless of the State body whose action or omission was the cause”**.

Thus, as was the case with Mr. MARGUERITE, due to the behavior of these officials and the government's inaction to regularize the situation, the French State must be held responsible, in accordance with what European texts have established.

Thus, when an administrative authority implements administrative acts that contravene European Union law and, by extension, citizens, the French State is held responsible.

The primacy of the European Union over France and other Member States requires them not to apply certain laws that they have voted on but that contravene European texts. In this context, European States must **“instruct [their] services not to apply them”**.

In addition, the administration at the origin of these rules that contravene both European law and that of an individual must stop applying them, and the State that had implemented this text must cancel it, therefore repeal it. Now, here is a strong, very explicit image:

To do this, we will tell you that what is good when we "hunt" on other people's lands, or when we come to eat the fruit of their harvest, is that they know the value of what is theirs.

Thus, we do not have to come and teach them that their oranges are sweet as honey or that their game is tender.

By analogy, since this file is intended for administrative judges, the Council of State and the Constitutional Council (French), the content of this part did not even have to be supported to convince you of its merits.

Indeed, being from the pen of the Council of State, it is normally perfectly known to all of you. We will now see how the French State contravenes what we have just seen.

Now that we have discovered the bases that European law has laid down and to which France is subject, let us discover the responsibility of the French State for the damage that Mr. MARGUERITE has suffered under the yoke of the vaccinal laws against covid-19.

This reality that we have just presented is evident in the letters that Mr. MARGUERITE addressed to the President of the Republic and where he asked for his help, as well as in the feedback he received from various ministers and state organizations following his discussions with the Head of State. (see production no. 12).

To be clear about what we have just presented, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that what Mr. MARGUERITE experienced under the yoke of the covid 19 vaccinal laws is directly linked to the completely irrelevant behavior of this aforementioned official.

See part entitled **“New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, as head of the FIP accounting department other categories, in the alleged external illegality”**.

These facts cannot be ignored, because the French State or one of its representatives cannot commit acts that prevent justice from being done.

In this context, when the integrity of France is undermined by a representative of the State, to understand who must act, we must first consider *[(French) Article 5 de la Constitution du 4 octobre 1958]* which establishes the following:

“The President of the Republic ensures compliance with the Constitution. He ensures, through his arbitration, the regular functioning of public authorities as well as the continuity of the State. He is the guarantor of national independence, territorial integrity and respect for treaties.”

The President of the Republic is the guardian or guarantor of respect for the French Constitution and treaties, and therefore of France's total adherence to European law. It is he who ensures, through his arbitration, the proper functioning of public authorities.

Thus, when a situation or acts committed in the Republic contravene the Constitution (French) or European law, he must intervene.

It is on this basis that Mr. MARGUERITE decided to send emails to the President of the Republic to present to him the violations of his rights by this oft-mentioned civil servant, in connection with the vaccinal laws. (see production no. 12).

These discriminations that he presented to the Head of State, had as a backdrop the unspeakable acts of this civil servant who, under cover of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, initiated the blockade that opposed Mr. MARGUERITE to the Lamentin tax service, meaning that he could not receive the solidarity fund, although he was entitled to it.

He also presented to the President of the Republic the reality of his extremely precarious state in which he found himself due to the non-payment of the solidarity fund, to the point where he could no longer provide for his most basic needs and pay child support to his children.

This reality is corroborated by this extract from the following email that Mr. MARGUERITE sent to the President of the French Republic on **March 22, 2021**:

“Good morning, I allow myself to return to your services, following my letter of 03/01/2021 in which I requested your help. Indeed, I highlighted the fact that the COVID aid for companies in difficulty was no longer paid for my two companies, both of which are publishing houses whose head office is located in Martinique (Le Lamentin).

I received a response from your chief of staff on March 5, 2021, who informed me that my request had been registered and was following its course.

I know that administrative delays are very long and that I am not the only one to be in difficulty, given the context, nevertheless, my situation is more than precarious.

I now live on less than the bare minimum, because the non-payment of this aid for weakened businesses, as well as the restrictions that have been put in place for culture, mean that to date, I only have the activity bonus, of €203.05, that the CAF pays me.

So, this month I have not been able to meet my expenses, and above all I have not been able to pay child support to my two children. [...]" (see production no. 12).

In this email, as in his other letter that he cites here, Mr. MARGUERITE presents his situation of great precariousness to the President of the Republic.

This reality is also evident in this other email that Mr. MARGUERITE sent to the President of the Republic on **June 7, 2022:**

"Good morning Mr. President, my name is Kenny Ronald MARGUERITE, I have already come to you to tell you about the extremely precarious situation in which I found myself.

I am this company manager that a tax officer of Lamentin (Martinique) has robbed by refusing me the subsidy allocated to companies impacted by the health crisis due to COVID, while I was entitled to it.

This arbitrary decision has completely impacted my life, reducing me to receiving a social minimum lower than that of a homeless person. In doing so, I lived or rather survived thanks to the assistance of my relatives and with the complementary RSA amounting to 201, 16 € / month, revalorized to 286, 54 € / month (I am not eligible for the RSA "base" because of my status as a company manager).

More than a year ago, your chief of staff, Mr. Brice BLONDEL, gave me a feedback which made me hope that a favorable follow-up would be given to my request, unfortunately, it was not. If I allow myself to come back to you, it is because my situation has become unlivable, I can no longer continue like this, especially since the subsidy is owed to me.

In my previous letters, I announced that I would not remain silent if justice was not done to me. To this end, I undertook to rewrite my book in which I recount this descent into hell, I entitled it "Fight of a business leader that the vaccinal laws have despoiled and led to bankruptcy.

(Elements to defend his cause, as well as that of all unvaccinated)." In this election period, when everyone is on the lookout for significant events, I sincerely believe that the content of this work can be of weight and I intend to make it available free of charge, to politicians and to as many people as possible, from June 8, 2022, 6 p.m., Martinique time. My book can be downloaded by clicking on the link below: <https://kenny-ronald-marguerite.com/charte-de-defense-des-non-vaccinescontre-la-covid-19>. For now and until 08/06/22, to access it, enter the code: [...].

As already presented, I would like to point out that I wrote this book because I could not accept such injustice without reacting and that my life was turned upside down without the people who could solve my problem having intervened.

But before its release, it seems to me wise to collect your position as Head of State, especially since the period lends itself to it.

However, given the deadline for the legislative elections, time being limited, I cannot delay its availability after the date previously mentioned.

I am therefore at your disposal for any comments or new facts that would allow me to delay its release.

Finally, I leave you a strong image which is presented as follows: **"Or what king, when he sets out to meet another king in battle, will not first sit down and consider whether he is strong enough with ten thousand men to encounter the one who is coming against him with twenty thousand?**

Or else [if he feels he is not powerful enough], while the other [king] is still a far distance away, he sends an envoy and asks for terms of peace". [Luke 14 verses 31-32, Amplified Bible (AMP)].

I leave this advice to your meditation. May the Lord give you the wisdom you need in this matter. Yours sincerely, Mr. Kenny Ronald MARGUERITE". [translated into English from the original text]. (see production no. 12).

In return for these two emails from MARGUERITE, through his chief of staff Mr. Brice BLONDEL, the Head of State sent him two letters and assured him that the Prefect of Martinique and Ms. Olivia Grégoire, Minister Delegate to the Minister of the Economy, Finance and Industrial and Digital Sovereignty would contact him in order to find solutions to the problems he had submitted to him in his messages and which presented the discrimination he was experiencing. (see production no. 12).

It is true that in accordance with what the Head of State announced, Mr. MARGUERITE was indeed contacted by the Prefect of Martinique and by Ms. Olivia Grégoire, Minister Delegate to the Minister of the Economy, Finance and Industrial and Digital Sovereignty. (see production no. 12). However, the prefect, in his letter of April 28, 2021 to Mr. MARGUERITE, informed him that the Commissioner for Business Life and Productive Development would contact him, this was never followed up.

The same is true for Ms. Olivia GRÉGOIRE, Minister Delegate to the Minister of the Economy, Finance and Industrial and Digital Sovereignty who, in the letter that her chief of staff sent on September 26, 2022 to Mr. MARGUERITE, assured him of a diligent examination of the aid that could be provided to him. It was further specified that to do this, he would be contacted by Mr. Jérôme FOURNEL, Director General of Public Finances in order to take stock of his file, the latter having to keep her directly informed of the follow-up that could be reserved.

Mr. Jérôme FOURNEL never contacted Mr. MARGUERITE. See section entitled **“New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Jérôme FOURNEL, as Director General of Public Finances, in the alleged external illegality”**.

What we have just seen unequivocally establishes the responsibility of the French State in the discrimination and the state of exclusion and great poverty in which Mr. MARGUERITE finds himself today.

To understand the reality of the State's responsibility in the situation that Mr. MARGUERITE had to face and which led him to bring this case before the courts, we must not lose sight of the fact that in this email of June 7, 2022 (see production no. 12), he highlights the extremely precarious situation in which he finds himself, having as an income the supplementary RSA of an amount of **€201.16 / month**, revalued to **€286.54 / month**.

It is important to note that when Mr. MARGUERITE specifies in this email sent to the President of the Republic **“I am not eligible for the RSA "base" because of my status as a company manager”**, this reality referred to the solidarity fund that he was supposed to receive. Indeed, he could not claim the RSA base because of the payments already made for the solidarity fund which was then, on average, 1,500 euros. (see productions n° 28 and 29). However, when this subsidy was not paid to him, he found himself with resources lower than the social minimums.

In his email of June 7, 2022 (see production n° 12), Mr. MARGUERITE also presents what is the basis for this unconstitutionality of the vaccination laws against covid 19 which finds its reason for being in the fact that these laws contravene the supranational bases of the **“Declaration of Helsinki”** which is imposed on European States. Mr. MARGUERITE's book made available to the President of the Republic reported these realities; the same is true for the brief he provided on January 2, 2023 via the citizen's tele-appeal in the context of his case no. 2200745 (see productions no. 39 and 40).

It should be recalled that the defendants in Mr. MARGUERITE's case No. 2200745 (recorded on December 22, 2022 by the Administrative Court of Martinique) are, among others, the General Secretariat of the Government and the Ministry of Economy, Finance and Industrial Sovereignty.

Therefore, the French State could not ignore the unconstitutional nature of the covid 19 vaccinal laws, nor the great precariousness, therefore the state of poverty in which Mr. MARGUERITE found himself and still finds himself.

Thus, to understand the responsibility of the French State in the face of what Mr. MARGUERITE experienced, under the yoke of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, we must not lose sight of this essential element, the unconstitutional nature of these laws.

This reality, as well as the situation of exclusion and great precariousness in which Mr. MARGUERITE, the President of the Republic, found himself and still finds himself, and therefore by extension the General Secretariat of the Government and the Ministry of Economy, Finance and Industrial and Digital Sovereignty-DAJ, were and still are fully aware of it, as we have seen, but have allowed the situation to continue.

From the above, it follows that the French State is liable in this case against Mr. MARGUERITE because, having knowledge of the unconstitutional nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, which contravene the "Declaration of Helsinki", a legislative text with supranational value, therefore which constrains the European States which have the obligation to apply it in their legislation.

Thus, the Head of State and his government should not have freed themselves from this obligation and should have taken the necessary measures so that these laws are repealed. Indeed, the vaccinal laws against covid 19, although suspended, still retain legitimacy because they are not repealed, which, in accordance with what we have just seen, this repeal should have been implemented by the French State, in accordance with the provisions of European law.

We will now look at the responsibility of the French State in the difficulties that Mr. MARGUERITE still encounters in terms of his professional reintegration, keeping him still in precariousness.

We have already seen it, because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and their repercussions on his future post coronavirus, not having the means to pay a deposit and rent for a new home, from then on, he came to swell the ranks of the homeless (SDF).

As we have seen, Mr. MARGUERITE is currently being hosted by a friend free of charge and is being monitored by the SIAO (SAMU SOCIAL "le 115") of MARTINIQUE, in order to submit an application for CHRS housing (*this acronym describes the accommodation and social reintegration centers that provide reception, housing, support and social integration for individuals and families experiencing serious difficulties in order to help them in a process of accessing or returning to autonomy*). (see production no. 20).

Furthermore, no longer being able to provide for his most basic needs, he was able, on August 19, 2024, to join the inclusion jobs program intended to reintegrate those who are excluded, registered under **PASS IAE number: 999992708306. (see production no. 20).**

Let's now look at what social inclusion or exclusion (French) is, by reading an excerpt from the text [*Ministère du Travail de la Santé et des solidarités. Définitions et mesures du CNLE. Taken from the website: <https://solidarites.gouv.fr/definitions-et-mesures-du-cnle> (translated into English from the original text)*] which establishes the following: "[...] **Social inclusion: The concept of social inclusion was used by the German sociologist Niklas Luhmann (1927-1998) to characterize the relationships between individuals and social systems. Social inclusion is considered the opposite of social exclusion.**

It concerns the economic, social, cultural and political sectors of society*. [...]

Social exclusion [...] We simply speak of social withdrawal which designates an essentially economic poverty, in the process of disappearing due to economic growth and social protection institutions. [...]

The concept of social exclusion goes beyond that of poverty since it corresponds to the non-realization of basic social rights guaranteed by law. [...] **Definitions of poverty: Approaches to the concept of relative poverty: [...]** Poverty is the state, the condition of a person who lacks resources, material means to lead a decent life (Trésor de la langue française). [...] **Precariousness is the absence of one or more of the securities allowing individuals and families to assume their basic responsibilities and enjoy their fundamental rights.**

[...] Definitions of monetary poverty: [...] The poverty threshold is determined in relation to the distribution of living standards of the entire population. Thus, the European poverty threshold is now set below 60% of the median income. [...]"

For greater consistency in what we want to develop, it is important to complete what we have just seen with the text *[Observatoire des inégalités. À quels niveaux se situent les seuils de pauvreté en France ? Publié le 17 juillet 2024. Taken from: <https://inegalites.fr/A-quels-niveaux-se-situent-les-seuils-de-pauvrete-en-France> (translated into English from the original text)]* which establishes the following:

"[...] A person living alone is considered poor in France when their monthly income is less than 811, 1,014 or 1,216 euros (2022 data according to INSEE), depending on whether we use the poverty threshold set at 40%, 50% or 60% of the median standard of living. The median standard of living refers to the amount for which half of the people receive less and the other half more."

In order to be able to fully understand the discrimination and loss of opportunity that the French State has caused to Mr. MARGUERITE, because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, we must consider this extract of text *[Observatoire des inégalités. Salaires : combien gagnent vraiment les Français ? Taken from: <https://inegalites.fr/Salaires-combien-gagnent-vraiment-les-Francais> (translated into English from the original text)]* which establishes the following:

"[...] In France, the average monthly salary is 1,800 euros according to INSEE [1], all employees combined except interns, agricultural workers and cleaning ladies employed by individuals. This average hides differences (deviations). Women earn 1,600 euros on average, men 2,000 euros. Workers, 1,300 euros, senior executives, 3,500 euros. This is what everyone really earns. [...]"

These texts that we have just seen present to us the realities that were those of Mr. MARGUERITE before the sanitary crisis and those that he knows now, because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19. Before this terrible pandemic, his average monthly income was **3,500 euros (see production n° 4)** that is to say that of an executive, therefore well above the average monthly salary which is **1,800 euros**.

Now, his income being less than **811 euros monthly (see production n° 3, 4, 14, 18)**, which is however the basis establishing that a person is poor, his situation is therefore very precarious and he lives in exclusion.

This reality is corroborated by the fact that he was able to join the inclusion jobs program intended to reintegrate those who are excluded, registered under the **PASS IAE number: 999992708306** and that he had to put in place a request for assistance with the **SAMU SOCIAL (115) of MARTINIQUE. (see production no. 20).**

This inclusion employment program as well as the CHRS housing program in which Mr. MARGUERITE was able to register demonstrate that he is in social exclusion and lives in economic poverty.

Thus because of the discrimination that Mr. MARGUERITE suffered, under the yoke of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and whose repercussions continue to persist, **he went from the status of business leader whose average monthly income, before the sanitary crisis due to the coronavirus, was of the order of 3500 euros to a status of homeless and excluded from society.**

Now that these bases are laid, to understand the responsibility of the French State in what Mr. MARGUERITE experienced and is still experiencing, let us look at the obligations that the French government has in terms of social inclusion, by reading this other extract from the text *[Ministère du Travail de la Santé et des solidarités. Définitions et mesures du CNLE. Taken from the website: <https://solidarites.gouv.fr/definitions-et-mesures-du-cnle> (translated into English from the original text)]* which establishes the following:

“[...] Active inclusion: Inclusion concerns both Europe and each Member State. The European Commission gives a definition of active inclusion:**

Active inclusion is about enabling every citizen, including the most disadvantaged, to participate fully in society, and in particular to exercise a job. In concrete terms, to achieve this objective, it is necessary to:

- **Adequate income support as well as support in finding employment, for example by linking benefits to inactive and active people, and helping people obtain the benefits to which they are entitled;**
- *Labor markets open to all by facilitating entry into these markets, tackling in-work poverty and avoiding the vicious circle of poverty, as well as factors discouraging work;*
- **Access to quality services that help citizens to participate actively in society, and notably to return to the job market.**

For the commission, “Active inclusion aims to address different problems: poverty, social exclusion, the poverty of those who work, segmentation of labour markets, long-term unemployment, inequalities between men and women”. [...]

Is an excluded person still a citizen? : Legally, a French citizen enjoys civil and political rights and fulfills (acquits himself) obligations towards society. The citizen therefore has a special quality that allows him to take part in public life.

The citizen has different types of rights: Civil rights and essential freedoms: Right to marry, to be an owner; right to security, to equality before the law, before justice and in access to public employment; freedom of thought, opinion and expression, of religion, of movement, of assembly (of meeting), of association or of demonstration;

[...] Social rights: right to work, right to strike, right to education, to Social Security.

The [loi n° 98-657 du 29 juillet 1998 d’orientation relative à la lutte contre les exclusions], in its article 1, “aims to guarantee effective access for all to fundamental rights throughout the territory in the areas of employment, housing, health protection, justice, education, training and culture, protection of the family and childhood”.

National solidarity: [...] State intervention in economic and social life appears necessary in order to combat poverty and inequalities and to ensure national cohesion. This awareness is enshrined in the preamble to the French Constitution of 1946 (taken up by that of 1958), which guarantees the right to work, health protection, access to education, material security [...].”

This text presents us with the obligations incumbent on the French State in terms of inclusion. We first discover that inclusion is not a matter that only concerns the European Union because each of its Member States must **“enabling every citizen, including the most disadvantaged, to participate fully in society, and in particular to exercise a job.”**

To achieve this objective in concrete terms, each European State must allow each of their citizens to have adequate income support and help them obtain the benefits to which they are entitled. We have also seen that for the European Commission, **“Active inclusion aims to address different problems: poverty, social exclusion, the poverty of those who work, segmentation of labour markets, long-term unemployment, inequalities between men and women”. [...].**

We have also seen that a person who is in a state of exclusion, among other things financial, always remains a citizen and has rights which include: **Civil rights and essential freedoms: right to security, equality before the law, before justice [...] Social rights: right to work...**

French legislation has also established that the *[(french) loi n° 98-657 du 29 juillet 1998 d’orientation relative à la lutte contre les exclusions], in its article 1, “aims to guarantee effective access for all to fundamental rights throughout the territory in the areas of employment, housing, health protection, justice, education, training and culture, protection of the family and childhood”.*

To conclude with this text, we also discovered that the State was required to fight against poverty and inequalities and to ensure national cohesion, these realities being **“in the preamble to the French Constitution of 1946 (taken up by that of 1958), which guarantees the right to work, health protection, access to education, material security [...]”**.

Based on what we have just presented, we can affirm that Mr. MARGUERITE was discriminated against, because he was unable to fully enjoy the obligations that **the State is required to ensure for every citizen, including the most disadvantaged, to participate fully in society and in particular to exercise employment, or to be able to enjoy access to education, training and material security without discrimination.**

To tell you about it, we will tell you that after the death of his mother, having lost his premises that the latter had made available to him, he registered with Pôle emploi. In order to be able to integrate, he applied for a new diploma training course in hairdressing which was to take place from January 8, 2024 to June 18, 2024, at Greta in the Paris region.

He was accepted and Pôle Emploi confirmed the coverage of this training, as well as the price of the plane ticket, and an allowance was to be paid to Mr. MARGUERITE. (see production no. 17). As this training took place over 2 days per week, Mr. MARGUERITE had agreed with the manager of the company MADIN' BEAUTY to establish a working partnership. (see production no. 17).

Thus, he would take advantage of the other days when he would not be in training to collaborate with this structure in order to carry out hair assessments, hold seminars, workshops around the theme of hair management for black and mixed-race women. (see production no. 7). Unfortunately, the training was cancelled by GRETA, the number of participants being insufficient. (see production no. 17).

Let us now come to the responsibility of the State in what we have just presented. This qualifying training being a great plus for the professional future of Mr. MARGUERITE, as a hairdresser advising on hair problems for black and mixed-race women, he approached another school a few months later which was actually supposed to offer this training.

Having already been entitled to have this training covered by Pôle Emploi a few months earlier, he therefore approached France Travail in order to reapply for coverage, but, to his great surprise, this training was no longer covered by this organization since it became France Travail. (see production no. 17).

France Travail has probably revised its conditions for validating the coverage of training. This reality is evident in the words of Fabrice GERONIMO, the director of France Travail in Lamentin (MARTINIQUE), who publicly declared the following about Mr. MARGUERITE:

“In the case you presented to me, there are several things. I could not go into detail and give you the most detailed answer possible.

But what I want to tell you is that France Travail... the CTM remains at the side of these job seekers, but we prioritize, in light of these budgetary constraints, training actions that allow a significant return to employment.” *(translated into English from the original text).*

You can watch this interview with the director of France Travail du Lamentin (MARTINIQUE) which is in French, in the report, broadcast on the Martinique la 1re television news, on August 3, 2024 (see the second subject presented on the news) using the following link:

https://la1ere.francetvinfo.fr/martinique/programmevideo/la1ere_martinique_journal-martinique/diffusion/6327959-edition-du-samedi-03-aout-2024.html

Let us return to the statements of Fabrice GERONIMO, which we have just discovered, because he demonstrates a most surprising paradox. He states, regarding the rejection of Mr. MARGUERITE's request for training by France Travail, that:

“[...] we prioritize, in light of these budgetary constraints, training actions that allow a significant return to employment”.

It is important not to lose sight of the fact that this training that Mr. MARGUERITE requested from France travail and which was rejected had already been accepted by Pôle Emploi, which demonstrates that it was an **“actions that allow a significant return to employment”**, otherwise it would not have been accepted in advance. (see production no. 17).

This fact is also proven in reality, because it should be noted that as this collaboration was one of the only possibilities left to Mr. MARGUERITE to resume his professional activities, he tried to put in place the various steps that would allow him to make his trip to metropolitan France and settle there temporarily, among other things, he requested mobility assistance for the plane ticket from ADOM, which was granted to him and he also approached social landlords in Île-de-France. (see production no. 17).

Unfortunately, his request did not receive a favorable opinion, given the very low 2023 turnover for his companies (see productions no. 3 and 4).

In doing so, since the training support was rejected by France Travail, Mr. MARGUERITE's collaboration with MADIN' BEAUTY was no longer possible.

Today, given these elements, he cannot consider leaving under these conditions and he therefore still finds himself in a very precarious situation.

However, by refusing to take charge of this training which had been approved by Pôle Emploi, France Travail has thus penalized Mr. MARGUERITE and contravened his rights listed above, and which are, we remind you, defined as follows:

The State is required to ensure that every citizen, including the most disadvantaged, can participate fully in society and in particular can be employed, or can enjoy access to education, training and material security without discrimination.

Other facts that imply the responsibility of the French State have come to hinder his reintegration, these are the repercussions of the Sunday laws which force him not to work on Sundays as an employee of a hairdressing salon, and this while he does not work, to respect his faith, on Saturdays.

We present this reality to you in the section **“Brief career synopsis, philosophy of life and discriminatory oppression”**.

It is important to note that the Sunday laws are obstacles that also keep Mr. MARGUERITE in a precarious situation for years, while they are unconstitutional. Because of the discrimination that Mr. MARGUERITE has suffered, under the yoke of the Sunday laws, which are nevertheless unconstitutional, damages will be claimed.

In the sections entitled **“Historical and legislative reality of the unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws”** and **“Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws”**, we provide you with evidence that these laws are unconstitutional and contravene European law.

This reality is due to the fact that the Sunday laws are of a religious nature, because they have been supported for centuries by the Catholic Church and they have created discrimination against French people who observe the Sabbath or Shabbat, preventing them from having the same chances of succeeding in their professional lives as the rest of the citizens.

Based on what we have just seen, it is clear that the Sunday laws being in “contrary” both with the French constitution which does not recognize any religious basis and with European legislation, they should never have seen the light of day and especially imposed on all French people under constraint.

Unfortunately, it is clear that this is not what happened in the case of Mr. MARGUERITE and the Sunday laws. It all started because he had suffered all these losses with his companies because of the restrictions of the vaccinal laws against covid 19.

No longer able to carry out his activities in his companies, which were on technical unemployment due to lack of finances, he began looking for a job.

However, because of the Sunday laws, he was hindered. He therefore requested by registered letter with acknowledgment of receipt intended for the DEETS of Martinique on August 12, 2022, a request for an exemption which would allow him, as an observer of the Sabbath, to work as an employee for an employer every Sunday, especially since some companies were in favor of it. (see production no. 35).

Then, to defend his case, Mr. MARGUERITE also filed a hierarchical appeal with the General Directorate of Labor (DGT) on January 26, 2023. (See production no. 37).

These two letters remained unanswered and nothing was undertaken, neither by DEETS nor by the DGT, with a view to setting up the mandatory process that the European Union has instituted, with a view to its Member States and their administration being able to remove from their legislation any text or law that contravenes European law.

In accordance with what we presented at the beginning of this chapter, following the letters from Mr. MARGUERITE which provide evidence of the unconstitutional nature of the Sunday laws that contravene European law, these two administrations should have **“instructed [their] departments not to apply”** these laws and ensure that they are repealed.

Thus, as soon as Mr. MARGUERITE wrote to the DEETS and the DGT, the French State should not have waited for the judges, the Council of State and the Constitutional Council to rule on the unconstitutional nature of the Sunday laws and their repeal.

Indeed, European legislation requires it to remove any text that contravenes European law. In doing so, since Sunday laws are unconstitutional, as the French State has allowed their perpetuation in its legislation, its liability is therefore engaged in the discrimination that Mr. MARGUERITE has suffered and which is still his, due to their application.

As is the case for the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday laws, France is therefore required to act in order to implement the process necessary for their repeal. Having failed to react, these administrations, the (French) Directorate of Economy, Employment, Labor and Solidarity (DEETS) and the (French) General Directorate of Labor (DGT), have engaged France's liability in the context of the unconstitutional nature of Sunday laws that contravene European law.

We have just seen the responsibility of the French State in the obstacles that were put in place and which, through unconstitutional laws, led Mr. MARGUERITE to go from being a business manager earning an average of **€3,500 per month** before the pandemic to being a homeless person. Let us now discover other facts.

He had as income to live on for the month of September 2024 (apart from the €265 housing benefit paid to his landlord), **€323.42** RSA, **€31.57** activity bonus and **€50** for his professional income, i.e. **€404.99** to live on (see productions no. 14 and 18).

It is important to remember that the minimum subsistence level that must be provided by the State to a citizen is, since **April 1, 2024**, in Martinique, **€598.73**, which represents the amount of the RSA.

To find out more, I invite you to consult the following links:

- *[Le revenu de solidarité active (RSA) – Drees. PDF. Tiré de : <https://drees.solidarites-sante.gouv.fr>. 2021-09].*
- *[Outre-mer : le revenu de solidarité est revalorisé. Tiré de : <https://www.service-public.fr/particuliers/actualites/A15530>].*

We already understand that Mr. MARGUERITE, by having only had €404.99 to live on in September 2024 instead of €598.73, the amount of the mandatory minimum subsistence that every citizen must receive in Martinique (French), the French State has contravened the *[(French) Article 11 du Préambule de la Constitution de 1946 (translated into English from the original text)]* which establishes the following:

“It guarantees to all, especially to the child, mother and old workers, the protection of health, material security, rest and leisure.”

Now that this basis has been established, we will present to you the reasons that led to such a situation. To do this, we will tell you that because of the repercussions of the covid-19 vaccinal laws that forced Mr. MARGUERITE and his companies into technical unemployment, the situation at the end of the health crisis was such that in order to have a minimum of resources, he was forced to apply for basic RSA, which was granted to him from February 21, 2023. (see production no. 14).

From then on, the RSA was taken into account for Mr. MARGUERITE until January 2024. (see productions no. 14 and 18). From then on, the CTM (the territorial community of Martinique) automatically put Mr. MARGUERITE's rights to the RSA back under review and in doing so, his file remained under investigation for 5 months.

In doing so, during this long, very long time of studying Mr. MARGUERITE's RSA file, for certain months, such as April 2024, (apart from the €265 housing allowance paid to his landlord), this income was €31.57 in activity bonus and €35 in professional income, or €66.57 to live on (see productions no. 14 and 18).

According to Mr. MARGUERITE, it is inconceivable that the territorial community of Martinique (CTM) charged by the State with the management of the RSA, could take 5 months to process a file, which was a renewal (see production no. 14) while leaving him, during this time, in total destitution. In addition to what has just been described, it is important to note that after the 5 long months during which Mr. MARGUERITE's RSA file was under investigation by the CTM, the payments were indeed made but with calculation errors, in light of the elements provided. (see production no. 14).

Indeed, for the year 2022, the tax results of his company (as well as the income) of Mr. MARGUERITE were €1,231.65, which resulted in a payment of RSA of €508.13 per month for the months of November and December 2023.

On the other hand, while for the year 2023, the tax results of his company (as well as his income) were lower since they were €908.67, yet he was allocated for the months of May, June and July 2024, the sum of €307.02 per month for the RSA.

In order for the situation to be resolved, Mr. MARGUERITE sent a complaint to the President of the CTM, which was received by this administration on August 5, 2024. (see production no. 14). Unfortunately, there was no response within the legal two months.

In doing so, Mr. MARGUERITE continues to receive an amount of RSA reduced by almost €200 per month. He is therefore still discriminated against, by having an income below the minimum subsistence level. His rights are therefore violated and the State is held responsible.

To continue, it is important not to lose sight of the *[(French) Article 5 de la Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)]* which provides the following: **“[...] Everything that is not forbidden by the Law cannot be prevented, and no one can be forced to do what it does not order”**.

This text corroborates the above. Without a valid law, no constraint can be exercised on a French citizen, thus, these two laws, vaccinal against covid 19 and Sunday, contravening European texts, they cannot therefore continue to find, any longer, a sustainability in France, a member state of the European Union, subject to European legislation, therefore, they must be repealed.

If such facts continue to be perpetuated, therefore unconstitutional laws and which contravene European law which would continue to have a sustainability in France with the perfect assent of the legislators without the President of the Republic who is the guardian or guarantor of the Republic, intervening, in order to put into action the process to repeal these laws and so that their victims are compensated, it would be the symbol, of the rejection of the dominance of European law over France.

In this context it would be the end of the French Republic as we know it, this reality has as its main axis this text *[(French) Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 1) Le juge administratif assure pleinement l'intégration du droit de l'Union européenne dans l'ordre juridique national. 1-1 La reconnaissance des spécificités du droit de l'union par le juge administratif : Effet direct et primauté du droit de l'union européenne. Taken from the website: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)]*, which establishes the following:

“For the ECJ, the primacy of European law over national laws is absolute: all European acts with binding force benefit from it, whether they come from primary law or secondary law, and all national acts are subject to it, whatever their nature (ECJ, 17 December 1970, Internationale Handelsgesellschaft, C/ 11-70), therefore including constitutional ones. [...]

The Council of State has gradually extended the benefit of the regime of Article 55 of the Constitution to all legal acts of the European Union, which it has agreed to give precedence over laws [...]”

We discover here that European law prevails over all French legislation, and even over our constitution. Thus, as no one is supposed to be ignorant of the law and even less those established to be its guarantors and to enforce it, in doing so, by not repealing the vaccinal laws against covid 19, and the Sunday laws, the French State contravenes European law and thereby *[(French)Article 55 de la Constitution du 4 octobre 1958]*.

In doing so, by these acts that we have just presented, the French State directly contravenes its constitution and by extension, if this state of affairs continues, signs the end of the Fifth Republic, because this is what the *[(French) Article 16 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)]* has established:

“Any society in which the guarantee of rights is not assured, nor the separation of powers determined, has no constitution”.

By having established the supremacy of European law over its legislation including its constitution, in doing so, as a European state, when France contravenes European directives, it also flouts its constitution and therefore finds itself in a state of anarchy.

Everything we have just seen is not acceptable because the legislative texts of the European Union prevail over those of its Member States, of which France is a part.

The legislation of the Member States of Europe, therefore of France, is subject to the legislation of the European Union and the law resulting from the European institutions must therefore be integrated into the legal systems of these Member States which are obliged to respect it.

This primacy of European law over the law of the Member States is absolute.

Thus, as we have just demonstrated, with supporting evidence, the responsibility of the French State is well and truly engaged in the situations that we denounce because, for many months, the unconstitutional nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday laws has been brought to the attention of various French administrations and nothing has been done to repeal them, to allow those who have been largely impacted by these discriminatory and unconstitutional laws to be compensated.

3 Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State in the establishment of incomplete laws in the management of the discipline of civil servants who are at fault and in the damages they have caused to Mr. MARGUERITE

Let us now look at another area where unconstitutional or incomplete laws have come to flout, in all “legality”, the rights of the French and for which the responsibility of the French State is also engaged.

To tell you about it, we will tell you that we live in France, within a secular Republic, whose established rules allow that civil servants are not personally prosecuted when they commit a professional fault, except in the case of personal fault separate from the exercise of their functions, from then on their responsibilities can be engaged by the citizen who has been harmed [(French) Article L134-2 du Code général de la fonction publique].

This is what should normally be done, but we are far, far from it. To explain things, we will present you with a concrete demonstration of what the legislation says and what happened in reality and which seems to illustrate what is called “**the spirit of the law to the detriment of the law itself**”. To support our statements, we must take into account the realities presented in the following:

- [Article 4 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789],
- [Article 5 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789].

Here we discover that our freedom stops when our actions will harm our neighbor. The limit of our freedom is determined by the law, which is established in order to defend the harmful actions that some do to others. Finally, if a law has not decreed a ban, citizens are not required to submit to it. In administrative matters, it has been established in the following texts that civil servants have obligations:

- [(French) Articles L121-8, L121-9, L530-1 du Code général de la fonction publique],
- [(French) Article 27 de la Loi n°83-634 du 13 juillet 1983].

Civil servants are responsible for carrying out the tasks assigned to them, even if they have delegated this task to a subordinate. Among these tasks, they are required to satisfy citizens' requests for information. If a civil servant contravenes one of these bases, he is at fault and must be sanctioned.

We find ourselves here in the context where the fault of Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, with regard to Mr. MARGUERITE, is recorded, it is described in the part entitled “**New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, as head of the FIP accounting department other categories, in the alleged external illegality**”. In the event that a civil servant violates his obligations and flouts the rights of a citizen, firstly, the individual must make an appeal which may be, among other things, hierarchical, according to the bases of the [(French) Article L410-1 du Code des relations entre le public et l'administration].

Once this appeal has been put in place, everything is in the hands of the superiors of the offending official, who must normally put in place the terms of the [(French) Article L532-1 du Code général de la fonction publique] which establishes the following: “**The disciplinary power belongs to the authority invested with the power of appointment or to the territorial authority which exercises it under the conditions provided for in sections 2 and 3.**”

Let's also consider the text [Sanctions disciplinaires dans la fonction publique. Extrait de la partie : Procédure disciplinaire. Taken from the website: Le site officiel de l'administration Française : <https://www.service-public.fr>] which establishes the following:

“[...] The disciplinary board is notified by a report from the administration. This report indicates the facts alleged against the civil servant and the circumstances in which they occurred. The civil servant is summoned by the chairman of the disciplinary board at least 15 days before the meeting date, by registered letter with acknowledgement of receipt.

[...] The disciplinary board deliberates in the absence of the civil servant being prosecuted, his or her defender(s) and the witnesses. It makes its decision by a majority of the members present. It thus makes one of the following decisions:

- Favorable opinion on the sanction proposed by the administration,
- Unfavorable opinion on the sanction proposed and proposal of another sanction,
- Proposal not to impose a sanction. *The disciplinary board may also not make any proposal if the majority of the members present have not reached an agreement. In all cases, the opinion of the disciplinary board is justified and communicated to the civil servant and the administration. [...] The administration is not obliged to follow the opinion issued by the disciplinary board and may impose a more severe sanction. In any case, his decision must be justified.”*

As we have already seen, it is the hierarchical superior of the offending civil servant who must sanction him, by presenting him before a disciplinary council.

Here we have just discovered what the law has established and which seems fair. Now let us go to meet the dark side of this legislation and discover the anti-type of the law leading to justice, called the spirit of the law. To do this, let us read the text *[PDF présenté comme étant établi par: SNAPS UNSA. La procédure disciplinaire de la fonction publique. Tiré du lien internet: http://www.snapseducation.fr/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/la_procedu_06102_006_1838.pdf] which establishes the following:*

“1 The disciplinary investigation. The initiation of proceedings: *I It is up to the hierarchical authority (the one invested with the power of appointment). But in the event of deficiency, it may be up to the Ombudsman of the Republic to initiate “disciplinary proceedings or, where appropriate, submit a complaint with the repressive court” (“French” loi du 3 janvier 1973 instituant un Médiateur).*

Since disciplinary action is imprescriptible, proceedings may be initiated at any time, according to the principle of the opportunity of proceedings: It is up to the hierarchical authority to assess whether or not prosecute, and it may refrain even when there is no doubt as to the disciplinary offence.”

To understand the reality of what this text presents, we must consider it in the light of what Mr. MARGUERITE experienced, what the administrative court decided during the first judgment of his case by considering this *[Extrait de l'audience du 25 avril 2024 et de sa décision du 7 mai 2024 de l'affaire N° 2200745 que M MARGUERITE a mise en place au niveau du tribunal administratif de la Martinique]* which establishes the following:

“On admissibility: 6. Firstly, the decision by which an administrative authority imposes, in the exercise of its disciplinary power, a sanction on an agent under its orders has the sole purpose of drawing, with a view to the proper functioning of the service, the consequences that the behavior of this agent entails on his situation vis-à-vis the administration.

Therefore, a third party has no interest in referring to the judge of abuse of power the decision by which the administrative authority implements, or refuses to implement, disciplinary action against an agent. It follows that the conclusions of Mr. Marguerite, seeking the annulment of the decision of the Regional Director of Public Finances of Martinique not to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the agent of the service who was his contact, are inadmissible and must be dismissed.”

To understand the nonsense of what we have just seen, we must return to the consequences of the administration's refusal to sanction this civil servant who violated Mr. MARGUERITE's rights in a discriminatory manner.

To do this, let's return to what we have already presented to you:

We have seen that Mr. MARGUERITE in his professional career was like a salmon, swimming against the current of lakes and waterfalls, he fought tirelessly to have a future and not remain in a state of welfare. Without having the culture of entrepreneurship, willingly or unwillingly, he tried the adventure of becoming a business leader, in order to be able to provide for his own needs and those of his family. He made many mistakes over the years and he paid the price by seeing his businesses fail (decline). Nevertheless, like the phoenix, he rose from the ashes of his businesses, and he finally arrived at this long-awaited El Dorado.

The reward being that despite the adversities, at the cost of his sweat and perseverance, he was able to receive monthly income of €3,554 for the last five months of 2019 and €4,646.50 per month for January and February 2020.

Then this terrible pandemic arrives and the French government sets up the solidarity fund to support companies that are impacted. With this grant, Mr. MARGUERITE is not content to sit back and relax, but he undertakes to reinvest a large part of it in order to correct his books, already with the end of the crisis and the future in mind.

But there, like a fox entering a henhouse, this civil servant Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, comes to destroy all his future plans, bringing his companies, for which Mr. MARGUERITE fought so hard to a state of nothingness, making him go from business leader with a radiant future to a life of welfare, where he is forced to live on what people are willing to give him, meaning that for months he has not been able to pay child support.

In return, if we stick to this text, presented as being written by the SNAPS UNSA union and to the decision of the administrative judges who judged the case of Mr. MARGUERITE, the hierarchical superior of Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, has the leisure to decide not to have this civil servant at the origin of this "beautiful disaster" appear before a disciplinary board.

In return, if we stick to this text (French), presented as being written by the SNAPS UNSA union and to the decision of the administrative judges who judged the case of Mr. MARGUERITE, the hierarchical superior of Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, has the leisure to decide not to have this civil servant at the origin of this "beautiful disaster" appear before a disciplinary board.

Thus, this implies that this civil servant may not be worried, he who acted in all unfairness, who processed Mr. MARGUERITE's requests, according to his good will, by omitting to transmit the supporting documents to the persons concerned, by depriving him of the subsidies to which he was entitled and this without a legal law or a hierarchical order authorizing him to do so, leading Mr. MARGUERITE to go from the stage of business manager, to a lower status than that of a homeless person, since they are entitled to the minimum vital to live, which was not the case for him for many months. (see productions n° 3, 4, 14, 15 and 18).

And in return, Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT will not have to answer for any of his actions.

In addition, it will be the same for this line manager who did not initiate the required procedure so that this official can answer for his failings, towards Mr. MARGUERITE, before a disciplinary council. Thus, it appears that in the current state of affairs, several civil servants were aware of the serious and damaging shortcomings of their colleague, Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, and they did nothing, allowing him to escape any possible sanction. Thus, Mr. Rodolph SAUVONNET, who as director of the DRFIP who did not respond, within two months, to the requests for hierarchical appeals that Mr. MARGUERITE filed against Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, (see contested acts 1 and 2 and see production no. 13), causing the latter to escape, until then, the sanctions he deserves for this discriminatory treatment against him or who did not respond to the requests of the administrative judges, may not be sanctioned for these acts.

The acts of Mr. SAUVONNET, against Mr. MARGUERITE, as director of the DRFIP are recorded in the part entitled **“New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Rodolph SAUVONNET, as Regional Director of Public Finances of Martinique, in the alleged external illegality”**.

The same is true for Mr. Jérôme Fournel, who as director of the DGFIP, did not comply with the directives emanating from the President of the Republic, through his hierarchical superior, which would probably have made it possible to put in place steps intended to get Mr. MARGUERITE out of this spiral of suffering into which the vaccinal laws against covid 19 have plunged him, because of the poor orchestration of Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT.

So here we are, moving from fiction to reality, where France could be compared to Sherwood Forest, where Prince John, the Sheriff of Nottingham and his henchmen, plunder and mistreat the people, with complete impunity.

As you can see, there are loopholes in administrative legislation (French) that mean that civil servants manage not to answer for the abuses they commit against French citizens.

The primary reason for this is that those who should sanction civil servants are none other than their “peers”. This reality is evident in *[(French) Article L532-1 du Code général de la fonction publique]*.

In addition, French law provides in *[(French) Article L532-2 du Code général de la fonction publique]*, that after three years after the administration has become aware of the misconduct of one of its civil servants, if the latter has not been sanctioned, he can no longer be, thus becoming untouchable.

To continue, we will tell you that the spirit of the law, in what we have just seen, is not very beautiful and is discriminatory for citizens, like Mr. MARGUERITE who find themselves confronted with civil servants whose actions contravene both the French constitution and European law. It is important to understand that as a French citizen, it is up to Mr. MARGUERITE to assert his rights when he considers that they have been infringed, by requesting that the public official responsible for this state of affairs be able to answer for his actions before an independent and impartial tribunal, previously established by law so that his case is heard fairly.

By not allowing Mr. MARGUERITE to hold Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT to account, through a disciplinary council, the Regional Director of Public Finances of Martinique, Mr. Rodolph SAUVONNET, has contravened *[(French) Articles 7 de la Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen du 26 août 1789]*.

Given the context that we have described in detail, we understand that France can no longer continue to limit the sanctions to be applied to civil servants who fail in their duty to the goodwill of their superiors, without the latter being held accountable when they do not bring the incriminated officer to court, ignoring the hierarchical appeals of citizens.

As a legal vacuum remains in this area, it would be wise to put in place a new system which would force hierarchical superiors to present before a disciplinary council any civil servant whose misconduct has been reported by an individual, provided that it has been proven. To do this, the text *[(French) Article 40 du Code de procédure pénale]* which establishes the following, could serve as a basis:

*“The public prosecutor receives complaints and denunciations and assesses the follow-up to be given to them in accordance with the provisions of Article 40-1. **Any constituted authority, any public officer or civil servant who, in the exercise of his functions, acquires knowledge of a crime or an offence is required to give notice of it the public prosecutor without delay and to transmit to this magistrate all information, reports and acts relating thereto.**”*

Here we see that a civil servant who, while performing his duties, acquires knowledge of a crime or an offence must inform the public prosecutor without delay and send him what supports his statements.

From the elements seen previously, we understand that this is mainly a situation where a civil servant sees an individual committing an act that the law condemns. On the other hand, as wolves in the same pack do not eat each other, when it is a crime committed by one of their colleagues, civil servants have the freedom to **“refrain even when there is no doubt as to the disciplinary fault”** from presenting the alleged offender before the authorities who have the power to sanction him.

This is the famous **“double standards on the scales of justice”**.

It is time for things to change. We saw in the section entitled “Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State for the harm suffered by Mr. MARGUERITE” that when the legislation of a European State is insufficient and implies that the legal acts that are carried out contravene European law, laws must be enacted to remedy this.

It would therefore be necessary to legislate on the basis of this text for the failures of civil servants in the exercise of their functions, making it possible for any civil servant who is aware of a professional misconduct by one of his colleagues, having led to unfortunate consequences for a citizen, to refer the matter to the appropriate authority, so that a disciplinary council can be set up. This is not a question of vain denunciation but of allowing any recognized serious misconduct to be sanctioned.

Similarly, the civil servant who is aware of this serious misconduct and who keeps quiet about it, must himself be liable to a sanction. The same applies to a superior who does not respond to the appeals of an individual reporting serious misconduct by a civil servant liable to a disciplinary council and whose lack of response would render the action null and void.

Why, in the democratic Republic that is France, would a law take away from citizens the right to demand justice, even in the face of senior civil servants?

It would also be necessary for *[(French) Articles L530-1 du Code général de la fonction publique], [(French) Article L532-1 du Code général de la fonction publique], [(French) Article L410-1 du Code des relations entre le public et l'administration], [(French) Article L532-2 du Code général de la fonction publique]* which establish that civil servants must answer for their failure to provide that when the procedure is obstructed or not implemented, that it is the administrative judges who have the authority to judge the civil servant in question.

Thus, as French laws are deficient, or incomplete, in this area, it would be necessary to legislate to supplement them or even repeal these aforementioned texts so that it is the foundations of the French constitution and European law translated into the following texts which henceforth become the administrative standard:

- *[Article 15 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789],*
- *[Charte des droits fondamentaux de l'Union européenne, Article 47 - Droit à un recours effectif et à accéder à un tribunal impartial],*
- *[Articles 6, 13, 17 de la Convention Européenne des Droits de l'Homme],*
- *[(French) Article 15 de la Constitution du 4 octobre 1958].*

Based on everything we have seen so far, two possibilities of judgment would present themselves for the officials who flouted Mr. MARGUERITE's rights:

- The first solution would be that, within the framework of *[(French) Article 61-1 de la Constitution du 4 octobre 1958]* that invested with its authority, the Constitutional Council could, in the case where a citizen is faced with a situation that pits him against a civil servant who has flouted his rights, and that a French law contravening supranational laws, preventing any judgment, allow that it is the administrative judges who have the power to judge the accused.
- The second solution would be that the Constitutional Council could rule, that within the aforementioned framework, the administrative judges, receive the authority to set up a referral that decrees the holding of a disciplinary board, according to the bases already established in *[(French) Articles L530-1 à L533-6, Code général de la fonction publique],* for the civil servant who is accused by an individual.

4 The reality of material and psychological damages and loss of opportunity generated by unconstitutional laws established in French legislation and the possibilities of financial compensation envisaged

To begin with, we will tell you that, as a French citizen, Mr. MARGUERITE cannot be discriminated against by laws that prevent him from being able to work, because of his religious beliefs.

The first discrimination to have been brought against him, his faith and his finances, was by the Sunday laws which, while being of a religious nature, and therefore unconstitutional because, having no place within the Secular Republic that is France, nevertheless prevent him from working on Sundays as an employee for an employer wishing to hire him.

In the sections **“Historical and legislative reality of the unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws”** and **“Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws”**, we demonstrate the unconstitutional nature of the Sunday laws.

The second discrimination that was brought against Mr. MARGUERITE, his faith and his finances was by the vaccination laws against covid 19, which prevented him from exercising his activity without being vaccinated and this while they are institutional, because they contravene the **“Declaration of Helsinki”** to which European and French law are subject. We explain these realities in the sections entitled **“On the alleged internal illegality of the vaccinal laws against covid 19”** et **“Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, which contravene the right of Mr. MARGUERITE, as a Frenchman, not to be vaccinated against Covid 19 because of his faith”**.

Everything we have just seen, in this brief, supporting documents in hand, attest to the losses that Mr. MARGUERITE has suffered because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, but also because of the Sunday laws which both contravene the French constitution.

Now let us discover, legally, the remedies that he wishes to put in place, so that justice is done to him and that damages can be paid to him.

To begin with, we will tell you that for a long time, there was no mechanism that existed at the legislative level allowing those who were impacted by a law recognized as unconstitutional, which ended up being repealed, to be compensated for the damages suffered. Things have recently changed.

The text *[Par une décision rendue aujourd'hui, le Conseil d'État juge qu'une personne peut obtenir réparation des préjudices qu'elle a subis du fait de l'application d'une loi déclarée contraire à la Constitution par le Conseil constitutionnel. Extract taken from the website: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)]* establishes the following:

“Since 2007, the Council of State has ruled that it is possible to hold the State liable to obtain compensation for damages suffered as a result of the application of a law contrary to international – and in particular European – commitments of France. On the other hand, it had never, until now, decided the question with regard to a law contrary to the Constitution.

Since the constitutional reform of 2008, in fact, a law that has already entered into force can be repealed by the Constitutional Council if it deems that it violates the Constitution.

This is the procedure of the “priority question of constitutionality” (QPC). When a law is thus “repealed”, it no longer has any effect from the day of its repeal, determined by the Constitutional Council.

In its most solemn judgment formation, the Litigation Assembly, the Council of State now admits that the responsibility of the State can in principle be engaged because of a law declared contrary to the Constitution.

It thus judges that if people have suffered damage (financial loss, prejudice of all kinds, etc.) directly as a result of the application of this law before its repeal, they will be able to obtain compensation by seizing the administrative judge. State liability is in principle open, subject to several conditions.

The Council of State specifies the conditions necessary for such a request for compensation to be successful: It is possible within the limits set by the decision of the Constitutional Council, which derives from the Constitution the power to specify the effects in time of the declaration of unconstitutionality of a law and can therefore always decide to close or restrict the way to any claim for compensation;

The damages suffered must be directly caused by the application of the unconstitutional law;

The request must be made within four years following the date on which the damages suffered can be known in their entirety, without the decision of the Constitutional Council reopening this period (quadrennial prescription rule which can be opposed to the plaintiff by the administration).

In the case submitted to it and which concerned legislative provisions relating to employee participation in company results declared unconstitutional by the Constitutional Council in 2013, the Council of State considers that there is no direct causal link between the unconstitutionality of these provisions and the damage suffered by the plaintiffs, in this case two companies and an employee.

He therefore rejects their claim for compensation”.

It therefore appears that before this 2008 reform, no possibility of compensation was offered to those who considered themselves wronged by an unconstitutional law, which, having been recognised as such, was repealed. The 2008 reform changed things.

Thus, it was established that as soon as the Constitutional Council abrogates a law that “disregards the Constitution” a procedure of “priority question of constitutionality” is set up. Within this framework “the Litigation Assembly, the Council of State now admits that the responsibility of the State can in principle be engaged because of a law declared contrary to the Constitution”.

Thus, the State's liability is in principle engaged but several conditions are set in order to be compensated for the damages caused by any law declared unconstitutional and which has been repealed.

It appears that it is the Constitutional Council which has all the power to decide whether compensation is possible and to what extent. This reality is presented as follows:

“The Council of State specifies the conditions necessary for such a request for compensation to be successful:

It is possible within the limits set by the decision of the Constitutional Council, which derives from the Constitution the power to specify the effects in time of the declaration of unconstitutionality of a law and can therefore always decide to close or restrict the way to any claim for compensation”.

Furthermore, the period that may be covered by this compensation cannot exceed the last 4 years preceding the repeal of said law, this reality is presented as follows:

“(quadrennial prescription rule which can be opposed to the plaintiff by the administration)”.

These two points, although established within a QPC, cannot be the basis of Mr. MARGUERITE's case in the compensation should be given to him following the damages he suffered under the yoke of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday laws, which are unconstitutional.

To understand our argument, we must come to the reality of the type of law dealt with in this specific case.

To do this, let's read this extract from this text and then we will develop it:

“Since 2007, the Council of State has ruled that it is possible to hold the State liable to obtain compensation for damages suffered as a result of the application of a law contrary to international – and in particular European – commitments of France.

On the other hand, it had never, until now, decided the question with regard to a law contrary to the Constitution.

Since the constitutional reform of 2008, in fact, a law that has already entered into force can be repealed by the Constitutional Council if it deems that it violates the Constitution.”

Here a distinction is made between two types of law, the first group presents those which are “contrary to international – and in particular European – commitments of France”, the second highlights those which disregard the Constitution (French). What particularly attracts attention in what has just been recalled is what has been put in place since 2007, and which is thus notified:

“It is possible to hold the State liable to obtain compensation for damages suffered as a result of the application of a law contrary to international – and in particular European – commitments of France.”

We are in exactly this context with the French laws against covid 19 because, due to their oppressive nature, they have not established the right of withdrawal available to the French to allow them to refuse to become the guinea pigs for an experimental medical product in the “clinical trial” phase.

Thus, they contravene the “Declaration of Helsinki”, and by extension the European law subject to it.

The same is true for Sunday laws. These two laws, which we have just presented, both contravene the right that European legislation confers on its citizens, including the French, not to be discriminated against either on the basis of their faith, or on the level of their finances or their access to employment, as the following texts state:

- *[(French) Article 2, loi n° 2008-496 du 27 mai 2008 portant diverses dispositions d'adaptation au droit communautaire dans le domaine de la lutte contre les discriminations],*
- *[Article 9 de la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme Liberté de pensée, de conscience et de religion, articles 1 et 2],*
- *[Protocole numéro 12 à la Convention européenne de sauvegarde des droits de l'homme et des libertés fondamentales, articles 1 et 2 (Interdiction générale de la discrimination)].*

The same is true for French legislation, in the following texts:

- *[(French) Articles 5 et 11, du Préambule de la Constitution (Française) de 1946],*
- *[(French) Article L1132-1, Code du travail],*

Thus, for these two laws, “vaccinal against covid 19” and “Sunday (dominical)” which contravene European law, it is the legislation of the European Union which takes over here. France is not sovereign, at the legislative level because it is subject to the primacy of European law, it cannot in any case contravene a European standard.

Thus, in the context of compensation, to be paid to those who have suffered discrimination and losses because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and / or Sunday laws, we must be interested in what European legislation recommends in such cases.

Let us now discover what the European texts say, which will allow us to better understand what must be done in terms of compensation for the victims, therefore for Mr. MARGUERITE as soon as the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and Sunday laws are recognized as unconstitutional.

To do this, we invite you to read the text [*Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 2-2 Un dialogue des Juges [4] a permis de concilier l'office du juge administratif Juge national et comme juge de droit commun du droit de l'Union Européenne. 2-2-1 le conseil Constitutionnel, le Conseil d'État et la CJUE ont jugé que le contrôle prioritaire de la constitutionnalité des lois était compatible avec le droit de l'Union. Taken from the website: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)] which establishes the following:*

“The Council of State was led to rule on the question of the articulation of the mechanism of the priority question of constitutionality (QPC hereinafter), instituted by the constitutional reform of July 23, 2008, and the European legal order.

Under the provisions of Article 61-1 of the Constitution, this procedure allows any person party to a trial or proceeding to argue that a legislative provision infringes the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.

If the question satisfies certain conditions, it is up to the Constitutional Council, seized on reference by the Council of State and the Court of Cassation, to rule and, where appropriate, to repeal the legislative provision concerned.

By its decision Rujovic (CE, May 14, 2010, no. 312 305) the Council of State applied the interpretation given by the Constitutional Council in its decision of May 12, 2010 Law on online games (no. 2010-605 DC) in order to articulate the QPC procedure with EU law.

It follows that the provisions relating to the QPC do not prevent the administrative judge, the common law judge of the application of EU law, from ensuring its effectiveness, either in the absence of a priority question of constitutionality, or at the end of the procedure for examining such a question, or at any time during this procedure, when urgency so requires, in order to immediately put an end to any possible effect of the law contrary to EU law. [...] In a judgment of 22 June 2010, the CJEU ruled that, as conceived, the QPC did not conflict with any rule of Union law (CJEU, 22 June 2010, Melki and Abdeli, cases C-188/10 and C-189/10).

By adapting its jurisprudence to view a priority control mechanism of the constitutionality of laws as compatible with Union law, provided that the national judge remains able to ensure the effectiveness of this law at all times and by referring to the case rights, in particular, of the Constitutional Council and the French Council of State, the Luxembourg Court found a solution that makes it possible to reconcile the primacy and effectiveness of European law in the order of the Union and that of constitutional law in the internal order.”

The text [*Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 1) Le juge administratif assure pleinement l'intégration du droit de l'Union européenne dans l'ordre juridique national. 1-1 La reconnaissance des spécificités du droit de l'union par le juge administratif : Effet direct et primauté du droit de l'union Européenne. Taken from: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)] which establishes the following: **“For the ECJ, the primacy of European law over national laws is absolute: All European acts with binding force benefit from it, whether they come from primary law or secondary law, and all national acts are subject to it, whatever their nature (ECJ, 17 December 1970, Internationale Handelsgesellschaft, C/ 11-70), therefore including constitutional ones. [...]***

The Council of State has gradually extended the benefit of the regime of Article 55 of the Constitution to all legal acts of the European Union, which it has agreed to give precedence over laws [...] *The regulations (CE, 24 septembre 1990, Boisdet, n° 58 657) and the guidelines (CE, Ass. 28 février 1992, S.A. Rothmans International France et S.A. Philip Morris France, n° 56 776). [...]*

The text [*Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 1-2 L'autonomie institutionnelle et procédurale : un mécanisme de subsidiarité juridictionnelle inhérente aux techniques d'application du droit de l'union. Taken from: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)*] which establishes the following: **"In addition, the guarantee of rights arising from EU law must benefit all individuals under the same conditions. The principle of effectiveness implies that if a right is recognised for individuals by the European Union rights, the Member States are responsible for ensuring its effective protection, which most often implies the existence of a judicial remedy. In other words, this principle aims to prevent a procedural provision of a State from making the application of European Union rights impossible or excessively difficult. [...]**

The ECJ also clarified that if national law did not include a procedure for implementing European Union rights, it was appropriate to create one."

The text [*Conseil d'État. Dossier thématique du 10 mars 2022. Le juge administratif et le droit de l'Union européenne. 1-3 La reconnaissance des spécificités du droit de l'union Européenne emporte des conséquences importantes pour l'administration Française. Taken from the website: <https://www.conseil-etat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)*] which establishes the following: **"[...] Finally, the Council of State has established the liability of the State for court decisions contrary to European Union law: it is incurred in the event of a manifest violation of a provision of Union law intended to confer rights on individuals (CE, 18 June 2008, Gestas, no. 295 831). [...]"**

In these texts, we learn, among other things, that the QPC (priority question of constitutionality) which was instituted on July 23, 2008 under the provisions of *[(French) Article 61-1 de la Constitution Français]*, under the control of the European legal order is intended to be used by all those who bring a case in which they want to have it recognized that a legislative provision infringes the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.

The establishment of a QPC is above all intended to align the procedure with European Union law.

The main purpose of the QPC is to stop the application of any French legislative text that contravenes Union law.

In addition, the European Court of Justice has ensured that the foundations of the QPC would not contravene any rule of Union law, the objective being to have, through this means, a priority control over French legislation, in order to verify its compatibility with Union law.

The ultimate goal is therefore to ensure that no French text contravenes European standards and thereby to ensure the primacy and effectiveness of European law over French constitutional law.

These texts also mention that **"the primacy of European law over national laws is absolute"**, including over constitutional rights, which implies that the French Constitutional Council is subject to European rules and cannot establish standards that contravene European law. This reality is based, among other things, on the *[(French) Article 55 de la Constitution du 4 octobre 1958]* establishes the following:

"Treaties or agreements duly ratified or approved have, upon their publication, an authority superior to that of laws, subject, for each agreement or treaty, to its application by the other party."

Thus, the French State has acted that it accepts that all its legislation is subject to the precepts of the European Union. As a result, there is the possibility of filling the legal void that would exist following the filing of a QPC where no French text would automatically guarantee compensation for victims of a law recognized as unconstitutional.

This is the obligation imposed by the European Union on its Member States to allow all litigants to benefit in the context of their affairs, from the terms of European law that protects them or is favorable to them.

The objective is that the legislation of a European Nation cannot make the application of European Union law excessively difficult or impossible, allowing citizens to defend themselves.

Here, we move into the concrete, concerning the laws and decrees instituted by the Member States of the European Union that contravene European legislation.

It is now possible, in the event of an attack on our rights and freedoms guaranteed by the European Constitution, to go further than the usual trial against an institution by setting up a QPC procedure governed by the *[(French) Article 61-1 de la Constitution]*.

This procedure allows, after verification of the merits of the QPC request, that the Constitutional Council (French) referred to by the Council of State (French) can proceed to repeal the provisions of the law in question. This procedure is carried out in accordance with European law.

Thus, thanks to the QPC when urgency requires it, the administrative judges, the Council of State and the Constitutional Council have the authority to immediately put an end to any possible effect of the law contrary to Union law.

In addition, as soon as an administrative judge (French) realizes that European legislation is undermined, in a case, by texts that contravene European provisions, he must refer a preliminary question to the Court of Justice of Luxembourg.

The European Court of Justice has ensured with the QPC that no rule of Union law would be undermined (mishandled) by the legislation of the Member States.

This is how Europe has ensured that it retains full control over the laws of its Member States, so that none of their legislative or regulatory texts have the effect of nullifying a European provision, particularly in cases that would oppose the State to an individual.

As a result, this QPC procedure, governed by *[(French) article 61-1 de la Constitution (Française)]* of 23 July 2008, referred to above, is a practical implementation of European supremacy over French legislation.

The European Union has not only instituted that any legislative text of its Member States that contravenes European provisions must be annulled, but it has laid the foundations for this to be effective. In view of the above, it appears that the predominance of Europe over the legislation of its Member States is not a myth, but a reality, and we can see its relevance in the case that concerns Mr. MARGUERITE today.

Indeed, we have already demonstrated the unconstitutional nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, forcing Europeans, particularly French people, to be vaccinated under penalty of not being able to exercise their professional activity and this without receiving, in return, a compensatory allowance, equivalent to their usual income.

What is our argument based on?

We have already explained it, but it seems relevant to us at this stage to come back to it, because it appears to us as the prerequisite established by the European Union to frame the placing on the market of a medicine or a substance, still in the experimental phase, therefore in the "Clinical Trial" phase, intended for the health of human beings.

This is why substances still in the experimental stage can only be administered to a human being with their informed consent, on the condition that they have been fully informed beforehand of all the risks inherent in this act.

It follows quite naturally that, in this specific case, any person who refuses to be administered such a substance, during the clinical trial phase, should not suffer any harm.

And yet! We are far from that, considering what happened in France.

On the Sunday laws side, the plethora of texts prohibiting discrimination against citizens, particularly by an administration, among other things because of their faith, or which deprive them of the same chances of professional reintegration, and which we have already considered demonstrate to us that these laws contravene European law.

The case of Mr. MARGUERITE perfectly illustrates everything that we have just seen and, throughout this thesis, we have developed these aspects by providing evidence.

These texts that we have seen earlier also attest that when a European Nation rejects the texts of European law used by an individual to defend themselves, and which grant them rights, it engages the responsibility of this State because of the court decision that has been ratified and which would be contrary to it.

Now that these bases are laid, let us look at the possibilities of compensation for victims that have been established on the European and international level. To do this, let us focus on the text [*Guide sur l'article 7 de la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme. I. Introduction (translated into English from the original text)*] which establishes the following: **"Article 7 of the Convention – No punishment without law "1. No one shall be held guilty of any criminal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offence under national or international law at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the criminal [...]**

1. The guarantee enshrined in Article 7, which is an essential element of the rule of law, occupies a prominent place in the Convention system of protection, as is underlined by the fact that no derogation from it is permissible under Article 15 in time of war or other public emergency.

It should be construed and applied, as follows from its object and purpose, in such a way as to provide effective safeguards against arbitrary prosecution, conviction and punishment [...]"

What is presented here is easy to understand! No penalty without law.

Thus, in the context of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, as well as for the Sunday (dominical) laws, the legislation that carries them is null and void, because France is under the dominance of the European Union, which does not allow discrimination to be carried out on one of its citizens.

For the vaccinal laws against covid 19, the thing is even more true, because the European legislation is subject to the "declaration of Helsinki", we have already seen it many times, with regard to "clinical trials", and in this context, all Europeans having the right to refuse to be vaccinated, thus the decrees requiring vaccination against covid 19 being arbitrary and unfounded, because they have no law to support them, are outside the law.

We present to you, this reality in the part entitled **"On the alleged internal illegality of the vaccinal laws against covid 19"**.

In doing so, once the covid 19 vaccine laws are repealed, the possibility of compensation that exists is directly linked to the above but also to the text [*Déclaration d'Helsinki de L'AMM – Principes éthiques applicables à la recherche médicale impliquant des êtres humains. Adoptée par la 18e Assemblée générale de l'AMM, Helsinki, Finlande, Juin 1964 et amendée par les : 29e Assemblée générale de l'AMM, Tokyo, Japon, Octobre 1975, (...) 59e Assemblée générale de l'AMM, Séoul, République de Corée, Octobre 2008, 64e Assemblée générale de l'AMM, Fortaleza, Brésil, Octobre 2013 (translated into English from the original text)*] which establishes the following:

"[...] Scientific requirements and research protocols: [...] The protocol should contain a statement of the ethical considerations involved and should indicate how the principles in this Declaration have been addressed.

The protocol should include information regarding funding, sponsors, institutional affiliations, potential conflicts of interest, incentives for subjects and information regarding provisions for treating and/or compensating subjects who are harmed as a consequence of participation in the research study. Research Ethics Committees: The research protocol must be submitted for consideration, comment, guidance and approval to the concerned research ethics committee before the study begins. [...]".

It is clear that any person who, by having participated in medical research, therefore who was a guinea pig to test a drug and who suffered harm through his participation in this "clinical trial", must be compensated. It is true that generally, this reality is simple, because any person who serves as a guinea pig must give his informed consent in order to be able to participate in the experiment and no pressure, neither from those who experiment with this new molecule, nor from the State, must come to influence his choice and if the decision is made to withdraw before having started the experiment, no harm must occur.

On the other hand, in the case of vaccination against covid 19, we are in another context, where it was a question of the participation of the French in a "**clinical trial in large scale**", without prior informed consent, meaning that the results of contaminations of covid 19, both for the vaccinated and for the unvaccinated were counted and those refusing to be vaccinated were affected by the law and could not, among other things, as was the case for Mr. MARGUERITE, exercise their professional activities.

The fact that a person who refused to be vaccinated against covid 19, found himself without income, because of the vaccination laws reflects a transgression of the "Declaration of Helsinki", which poses the responsibility of the French State towards those who have suffered discrimination against their right enacted at the level of European and international legislation.

Should it be recalled that this "**clinical trial in large scale**" falls outside the legal framework established by the "Declaration of Helsinki" and is therefore without legal basis?

Based on the above, we understand that any harm suffered during participation in medical research entails compensation. In doing so, by deduction, as without law, there is no possibility of compelling, all those who were subject to the vaccination obligation and who were forced into unemployment, if they were not vaccinated against covid 19, and all those who were forced to participate in this "**large-scale clinical trial**" and who suffered harm and losses must be compensated.

Indeed, the law that forced them, itself contravened the French constitution and European law and above all the "Declaration of Helsinki", which takes precedence over both. It is important not to lose sight of the fact that before marketing the vaccines against covid 19, those who put them on the market were required to include in their protocol the possibility of compensation for those who would suffer harm due to their participation in the research. It is important not to forget that Europe and by extension France are subject to the "Declaration of Helsinki", so in the case of the covid 19 vaccine laws, as soon as they are repealed, their victims will have to be compensated.

Let us now come to the Sunday laws, to understand the importance of the compensation that must be provided to victims according to the above. We will share with you our questioning, which is as follows:

Can a law that is baseless and unconstitutional continue to despoil all or part of French citizens and then be dissolved without compensation being paid to those who have been cruelly impacted by its effects? Such a reality is, in our opinion, inconceivable in France, the country of human rights and freedoms!

To understand the nonsense of these bloody laws, we must draw a parallel with another sinister period in our history, when Shabbat observers, therefore Jews, suffered abominations because of their faith and of which we have brought you the proof in the part entitled "**Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws**".

To do this, allow us to ask you a few questions that seem relevant to us and will demonstrate the nonsense of the perpetuity of Sunday (dominical) laws in this century:

For those of you who know the abomination of Nazism and the martyrdom suffered by the Jews under Hitler, do you think that the Nazis were right to deprive and kill the Jews? The question itself grieves me, and I know that your answer is like mine: No! We recognise that justice was done when the Nazis had to pay for their crimes by being arrested, tried and convicted and that the property looted from the Jews was returned to its owners.

What about the property that the Catholic Church took from the Jews? Would the plundering of the Jewish people be more justifiable because it is carried out by men of the Church? **Example:** Take a painting by a great master, such as a Picasso or a Gauguin, which has belonged to a Jewish family for ages and which, because of despotic laws, was taken away from them to adorn the walls of their tyrant's home! Is it not plundered booty, even though this dominator is called His Holiness the Pope? When I look back and take the time to compare what others like the Nazis had done to the Jews and what the Catholic Church did to them, I don't see any difference.

Yet the Catholic Church has never been judged for these acts and it has never had to return property that had been plundered. Would the value of things change legally in France or in Europe depending upon whether or not a murderer and a thief were wearing the so-called "robe of the holiness"?

Thus, the laxity of the European authorities in the face of the spoliation and genocide by the Catholic Church of the Jews and Sabbath observers is incomprehensible to me.

When we think about this and we ask ourselves, we ask ourselves if the Catholic Church is above French and European laws?

Mr. MARGUERITE wanted to leave you with this reflection, because being only a simple man of the people, these things must certainly be beyond him!

In addition, he would like to draw your attention to the following:

Do you think that in this century, the laws of totalitarian and despotic regimes founded at the cost of countless martyrs are still justified in our civilised societies?

Of course not! And yet, the laws prohibiting Sunday working have not been called into question in France.

At most, they have been "*dusted off*", but they are still as active as ever. It is thanks to the arguments developed in Mr Bailly's report that all this was possible.

This framework has become the new standard that reinforces the regulations for the compulsory Sunday rest in France. In his report, which has become the backbone of the laws prohibiting Sunday working in France, Mr Bailly underlines the historical importance of Sunday through the collective consciousness of the French.

Although in his argument he obscures the bloody foundations on which these laws were instituted they nevertheless existed. Through these laws, the rights of the Jewish people and of those who observe the Sabbath continue to be violated.

In spite of the plundering, genocide and the degradation of the Jews and Sabbath keepers, the dominical rest has become a permanent feature of French life.

Basic human decency would require that such decrees should not still be in force in a State, such as France, where human rights are advocated and where its President of the Republic has positioned himself as a "**protector of secularism and defender of anti-Semitism**".

Certainly, the French State no longer strips Sabbath or Shabbat observers of their property, but they are discriminated against, as we have already presented, in terms of their chances of professional success. It is true that in this century, they are no longer put to death, but their faith and finances are still put to the test.

Mr. MARGUERITE is living proof of what we have just presented, and his story, which we present in the section entitled **“Brief career synopsis, philosophy of life and discriminatory oppression”**, attests to this.

Thus, we understand that it is therefore necessary not only that the Sunday laws be repealed or adapted so that Sabbath or Shabbat observers can have the right to work as employees every Sunday, if that is their choice, in a company that would agree to hire them, but they must also be compensated for all the suffering and losses they have suffered and this, for as long as it has lasted.

In return for all the suffering that Sabbath and Shabbat observers have endured for centuries, under the rule of the Sunday laws, if these laws are repealed by the Constitutional Council (French), it is, you will understand, quite normal that those who have been oppressed by them be compensated, for the number of years they have suffered harm.

To continue, we will tell you that the following texts present to us realities which, in our opinion, should be taken into account for the compensation of victims of Sunday laws:

“In the occupied regions of France, the German Reich exercises all the rights of the occupying power.

The French government undertakes to facilitate by all means the regulations relating to the exercise of these rights and their enforcement with the assistance of the French Administration.”

[...] **“The French government will proceed with the repatriation of the population in the occupied territories, in agreement with the competent German services”** [...]

“All German prisoners of war and civilian prisoners, including prisoners on remand and convicts who have been arrested and sentenced for acts committed in favour of the German Reich, must be handed over without delay to the German troops” [...]

“The French government is bound to deliver on demand all German nationals designated by the government of the Reich and who are in France, as well as in French possessions, colonies, territories under protectorate and under mandate”.

[Articles 3, 16 et 19, de la Loi sur le statut des Juifs du régime de Vichy (translated into English from the original text)].

Let us complete with this other text: **“A problem remains posed by the unclaimed Jewish inheritances. In the Seine department alone, there are approximately 3,000 of them. They correspond to as many families deported and entirely exterminated.**

A text is currently being prepared concerning the devolution of these assets”. *[Les Restitutions, Paris, La Documentation française, Notes et études documentaires, n°1108, 13 avril 1949 (translated into English from the original text)].*

Here we discover what happened during the Second World War, or with the complicity of the Vichy regime, the German Reich, with Hitler at its head, deported, robbed and exterminated Jews without mercy. These facts are proven and historical.

Nevertheless, laws were instituted in order to compensate the Jews who suffered the monstrous tyranny of the Nazis.

Thus, the property of the Jews who were robbed by the Nazis and their collaborators must be returned to their owners or beneficiaries and this **“regardless of the applicable statute of limitations”**.

It is important to note that these assets are among others funds from **“blocking of bank accounts, the looting of housing, the spoliation of property left by internees in the camps, insurance contracts or even copyrights-composers.”**

The following texts attest to this: *“[...] In a letter sent on February 5, 1997 to Jean Mattéoli, then President of the Economic and Social Council, Mr. Alain Juppé, Prime Minister, defined the outlines of this mission:*

“[...] In order to fully enlighten the public authorities and our fellow citizens on this painful aspect of our history, I would like to entrust you with the mission of studying the conditions under which property, real estate and furniture, belonging to the Jews of France were confiscated or, in general, acquired by fraud, violence or fraud, both by the occupier and by the Vichy authorities, between 1940 and 1944.

In particular, I would like you to try to assess the extent of the spoliation that may have been carried out in this way and that you indicate to which categories of persons, individuals or legal entities, these have benefited.

You will also specify the fate that has been reserved for these goods since the end of the war until today. [...]” The Mattéoli Mission has notably worked on economic “Aryanization”, the blocking of bank accounts, the looting of housing, the spoliation of property left by internees in the camps, insurance contracts or even copyrights-composers.

This work is accompanied by precise statistical data which testifies to the extent and nature of the spoliations suffered: 80,000 bank accounts and 6,000 safe deposit boxes blocked; 50,000 “Aryanized” companies; 40,000 apartments emptied of their contents; 100,000 works of art and millions of books stolen. They also specify the effects of the restitution and reparation procedures implemented after 1945.

The conclusions of the research led to a series of recommendations whose objective is to consolidate the work of memory on this period.

On November 17, 1998, President Mattéoli proposed to the Prime Minister to “create a body responsible for examining individual claims made by victims of anti-Semitic legislation established during the Occupation or by their heirs.

It would ensure follow-up on the processing of requests and would be responsible for providing responses that could take the form of redress.”

[Extrait de : La Mission d’étude sur la spoliation des Juifs de France connue également sous le nom de Mission MATTEOLI, du patronyme de son président, a été instituée par arrêté du Premier ministre le 25 mars 1997 (translated into English from the original text)].

Let us complete with the following: **“It is one of the most painful pages of Parisian history that the Paris Council of October 28 had to address, after the revelations on the origin of certain property of the City’s private domain. [...]**

Faced with this dark period when Paris, occupied, was no longer the capital of our country, when the French State was no longer even the Republic, we have, collectively, a duty to remember. It would be immoral for the City to proceed today with the sale of property that would have been acquired as a result of spoliation.

I am delighted that the Council of Paris was unanimous on this point.” [Éditorial de Jean Tibéri, maire de Paris, paru dans le magazine d’information de la Ville de Paris, Paris Le Journal, n°69, 15 novembre 1996 (translated into English from the original text)].

To continue, we will tell you that this sentence from Mr. Jean Tibéri specifying that as French people, faced with the dispossession of the Jews during the Second World War, **“we have, collectively, a duty to remember”** is heavy with meaning.

Thus, this duty of remembrance for the atrocities committed against the Jews during the Second World War, decades later, seems perfectly relevant.

What about what they, as well as the Sabbath-observant Christians, have suffered for centuries and are still suffering? We have already seen that the sufferings that Jews and Sabbath-keepers are undergoing in this century are acts initially committed by the Catholic Church and which continue to be perpetuated through the Sunday laws.

This **“duty to remember”** is that in all cases of discrimination, inequities of spoliation, in the face of a law, compensation is total, without application of this mention relating to the **“four-year statute of limitations that may be imposed on the claimant by the administration”**.

It is necessary that when the laws which have led to the loss of freedom and the lowering of the victims are repealed, rules such as those presented in the following texts can be enacted in order to preserve them:

“Certain damage, material and direct, caused to immovable or movable property by acts of war in all French departments and overseas territories, it stipulates, gives rise to the right to full reparation.” [*Journal officiel de la République française, 29 octobre 1946, pp. 9191-9198 (translated into English from the original text)*].

Let us complete the picture with the following: **“Recommendation No. 8 of the Mattéoli Commission's General Report lays down the general principle with regard to individual restitutions: “When a property whose existence in 1940 is established has been the subject of spoliation and has not been returned or compensated, compensation is right regardless of the limitation periods in force.”**

[*Excerpt from: La Mission d'étude sur la spoliation des Juifs de France connue également sous le nom de Mission MATTEOLI, du patronyme de son président, a été instituée par arrêté du Premier ministre le 25 mars 1997 (translated into English from the original text)*].

On this day we solemnly demand that all Jews and the Christians who observe the Sabbath be compensated for all the years of harassment suffered under the yoke of the Sunday laws that have discriminated against them and prevented them from having the same chances of success as those who observe Sunday as a dominical day of rest, and this according to the basis of the income they should have received if these laws had not hindered them.

In doing so, in return for all the suffering that Sabbath and Shabbat observers have endured for centuries, under the yoke of the Sunday laws, if these laws are repealed by the Constitutional Council (French), it is, you will understand, quite normal that those who, like Mr. MARGUERITE, have been oppressed by them be compensated for the number of years they have suffered harm.

To do otherwise would be unacceptable, it would be to subject Sabbath and Shabbat observers to a double prejudice when the Sunday laws recognized as unconstitutional are repealed.

The first comes directly from what these laws had established and the second is materialized by the fact that the losses suffered will not be compensated. Let us take the case of Mr. MARGUERITE as an example:

Let us consider that the Sunday laws end up being repealed, but that the Constitutional Council (French) does not decree that those who were the victims, can be compensated.

The result would be that these Sunday laws have caused him so much prejudice by keeping him in precariousness, and this for 27 years, and the French State do not offer him the compensation legitimately expected. Do you think that such a thing is acceptable, in the country of human rights?

If these laws are repealed, it should be accompanied by provisions on compensation for those who have suffered discrimination from the Sunday laws instituted, as we have seen, at the cost of blood and the dispossession of the property of Jews and Sabbath-observant Christians.

This is all the more relevant since French laws could not be repealed, before 2008, at the simple request of a citizen, and did not offer the possibility of compensation to those who were largely impacted by their application. Today, provisions exist that make it possible to denounce laws that transgress the rights of Europeans.

To continue, and in accordance with the above and the new elements that we report below, we present to you what we believe should be taken into account for the compensation of victims of Sunday laws and vaccinal laws against covid 19.

The text [*Conseil de l'Europe. Service de l'exécution des arrêts de la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme. Article 41 de la Convention européenne des droits de l'Homme. Tiré du site internet: <https://www.coe.int/fr/web/execution/article-41> (translated into English from the original text)] establishes the following: **“Just satisfaction: If the Court finds that there has been a violation of the Convention or the Protocols thereto, and if the internal law of the High Contracting Party concerned allows only partial reparation to be made, the Court shall, if necessary, afford just satisfaction to the injured party.***

*[...] When the Court finds against a State and observes that the applicant has sustained damage, it awarded the applicant just satisfaction, that is to say a sum of money by way of compensation for that damage. The damage is distinguished in the following way: **Damage in general: Compensation for damage can be awarded in so far as the damage is the result of a violation found.***

No award can be made for damage caused by events or situations that have not been found to constitute a violation of the Convention, or for damage related to complaints declared inadmissible at an earlier stage of the proceedings.

The purpose of the Court's award in respect of damage is to compensate the applicant for the actual harmful consequences of a violation.

It is not intended to punish the Contracting Party responsible. The Court has therefore, until now, considered it inappropriate to accept claims for damages with labels such as “punitive”, “aggravated” or “exemplary”. **Pecuniary damage: The principle with regard to pecuniary damage is that the applicant should be placed, as far as possible, in the position in which he or she would have been had the violation found not taken place, in other words, restitutio in integrum.**

This can involve compensation for both loss actually suffered (damnum emergens) and loss, or diminished gain, to be expected in the future (lucrum cessans). [...] Normally, the Court's award will reflect the full calculated amount of the damage.

However, if the actual damage cannot be precisely calculated, the Court will make an estimate based on the facts at its disposal.

Non-pecuniary damage: The Court's award in respect of non-pecuniary damage is intended to provide financial compensation for non-material harm, for example mental or physical suffering.

It is in the nature of non-pecuniary damage that it does not lend itself to precise calculation. If the existence of such damage is established, and if the Court considers that a monetary award is necessary, it will make an assessment on an equitable basis, having regard to the standards which emerge from its case-law.

Costs and expenses: The Court can order the reimbursement to the applicant of costs and expenses which he or she has incurred – first at the domestic level, and subsequently in the proceedings before the Court itself – in trying to prevent the violation from occurring, or in trying to obtain redress therefor.

Such costs and expenses will typically include the cost of legal assistance, court registration fees and suchlike.

They may also include travel and subsistence expenses, in particular if these have been incurred by attendance at a hearing of the Court. [...]

Let's complete with the text [*Droit européen des droits de l'homme/Convention EDH et présomption de préjudice. Article par Katarzyna Blay-Grabarczyk. Appartient au dossier: “Existe-t-il un préjudice inhérent à la violation des droits et libertés fondamentaux?” RDLF 2013, chron N°02. Taken from the site: <http://www.revuedlf.com/cedh/convention-edh-et-presomption-de-prejudice-article/>, (translated into English from the original text)] which establishes the following:*

“In order to encrypt the material damage, the ECHR Court relies precisely on the evidence provided by the parties.

The applicant and the respondent State must respectively provide information in support of their respective claims.

The need to provide proof of the material damage suffered appears particularly clearly when the information provided to the European judge does not prove to be sufficient.

[...] The Court therefore regularly rejects, as in the case of liability litigation, claims for compensation submitted by applicants if they have not shown that the material damage suffered was the direct consequence of the violation found.

In such cases, the European judge merely notes, without giving specific reasons, that the direct causal link between the violation found and the loss of profit or material damage has not been established.

On the other hand, there are cases in which the Court has relaxed its requirement of a causal link between the proven breach and the alleged damage by introducing the notion of “loss of chance”.

In this case, its approach then comes a little closer to the possibility of damage inherent in the violation of a treaty provision. This concept, mainly used in the field of Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 [...]

Allows the Court “to grant the applicant, in certain cases, appropriate compensation for loss of real opportunities” [...].

Mainly used as a subcategory of material damage (by making it possible to circumvent the qualification of damage and by remedying the uncertain causal link between the generating event and the cause), the notion of “loss of opportunity” can also appear as the justification for award of compensation for non-pecuniary damage.

It is in the field of moral prejudice that the presumption of prejudice, due to the violation of a conventional provision, can under certain conditions, be retained. [...]

The existence of the presumption of harm in the event of non-pecuniary damage The possible presumption of harm would, on the other hand, manifest itself in a different way in the field of non-pecuniary damage.

According to this hypothesis, an infringement of one of the conventional freedoms would de facto lead to the existence of a moral prejudice giving rise to a right to compensation.

Theoretically, under the logic of Article 41 of the Convention, it is up to the applicant to provide proof of the moral damages suffered.

Thus, following this line, the ECHR Court sometimes rejects a claim for compensation insofar as the applicant fails to demonstrate the existence of the non-material damage claimed [...].”

We will now decipher what these texts present to us, in order to see to what extent we can implement what is presented here, concerning the possibility of compensation reserved for victims.

It is stated here that people who suffer harm based on a violation of the European Convention on Human Rights or its protocols by a State have the right to be compensated. This compensation resulting from recognized material or moral damage will also take into account the reimbursement of the costs that the victim had to pay to defend themselves.

We have also seen that in the case of a manifest violation of the rights set out in the European Convention on Human Rights, evidence attesting to the material damage must be provided and that it must be demonstrated that this damage suffered was “**the direct consequence of the violation found**”.

Apart from that, we discover, among other things, that moral damage can, just like material damage, give rise to the right to compensation.

We understand that this type of damage is easier to prove. Indeed, whenever there is an infringement of one of the freedoms conferred by the European Convention on Human Rights, there is in principle moral prejudice at stake.

However, even if it is easier to demonstrate, here again, it is necessary to be able to prove and explain moral prejudice, which represents the physical or mental suffering that the act in question has caused to the victim.

Here, the thing is relatively simple, in the context of those who have been forced into unemployment by the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and/or Sunday laws and who therefore have had no income, it is enough to present the repercussions in the lives of these people, that these bans on working that these unconstitutional laws have generated.

Example: Concerning, Mr. MARGUERITE, for the moral prejudice, linked to the vaccinal laws against covid 19, we will tell you, that nothing can quantify, 4 years of empty plates of meals that he has not been able to offer to his children because of laws, unconstitutional moreover, which have deprived him of his income, or that he finds himself with two companies that would have been prosperous with the finances discounted but which are on life support, because of the losses generated by these unfair laws.

Mr. MARGUERITE's feeling is that those who enact certain unfair laws have not taken the time to think about the possible repercussions that they will, like eddies, generate, generate. A law is normally supposed to be established for the good of citizens and for the balance of life in society and not to contravene the constitution, European rights and those of individuals.

Apart from the material damages that are taken into account, the European Court of Human Rights, on the basis of the European Convention on Human Rights, also deals with the **“loss of opportunity”** that the violation of an individual's rights has generated.

Concerning Mr. MARGUERITE, we believe that we have largely proven, throughout this brief, the reality of the material and moral damages and the loss of opportunity that he has suffered, because of the Sunday and vaccinal laws against covid 19. There is no point in going back over it.

Nevertheless, what can we learn from all this and how can we apply it to our context? Here we discover, as is the case in any court of justice, that the applicant who comes to present his application will have to provide the evidence intended to support his rights.

We have presented this evidence to you, throughout this brief.

Furthermore, in these texts, we have seen that when there has been a violation of the Convention or its protocols, the injured party must be granted, if applicable, just satisfaction.

This represents all sums that the State has agreed to pay to the applicant party, therefore to the person who has been a victim of the governmental system.

In practice, the damages that the State must give to the victim are called **“just satisfaction”**, which represents a sum of money intended to compensate for the damage(s) suffered.

Considering the above, let us come to what Mr. MARGUERITE experienced and what we can support, to demonstrate the reality of the harm he suffered and the compensation, which in our opinion, should be paid to him by the French State.

To do this, we will tell you that in order to be able to quantify the reality of the damages to be paid to the victim, it must be taken into consideration that he must **“should be placed, as far as possible, in the position in which he or she would have been had the violation found not taken place, in other words, restitutio in integrum.**

This can involve compensation for both loss actually suffered (damnum emergens) and loss, or diminished gain, to be expected in the future (lucrum cessans).

[...] Normally, the Court's award will reflect the full calculated amount of the damage.”

5 The reality of the “mirror to larks” of the “vaccinal pass” instituted by the French government under cover of covid 19

To begin this chapter, I would say that since the beginning of this book we have highlighted many realities, linked to the obligation to vaccinal against covid 19, but which were largely of a legislative nature, therefore of juridical scope. We are now going to change our approach and to do this, we are going to take into account the human interactions that allowed these vaccinal laws against covid 19 to see the light of day in France and I will focus on some of the most saddening events, in my opinion.

The objective of this chapter is that every French person, whatever their vaccination status against covid 19, vaccinated with a complete vaccination schedule, vaccinated and “outlawed” for not having had their booster dose(s) or even unvaccinated, can realize in their soul and conscience that our rights as citizens do not seem to be the priority of our politicians, in their great majority, despite what they want to display.

During this sanitary crisis that made the earth tremble with fear, we had become, in France, for them like **a flock of Panurge's sheep or even good little soldiers that they guided as they pleased**, according to an unacknowledged but unfortunately well-known design.

We are going to decipher the iniquitous acts that certain “politicians”, Mr. Emmanuel MACRON, at the top of the list and some of his ministers, have practiced, under the cover of a pandemic and by which they have acted in a discriminatory manner towards French citizens. To get to the heart of the matter, I invite you to reread the text [*Loi renforçant les outils de gestion de la crise sanitaire et modifiant le code de la santé publique. Décision n° 2022-835 DC du 21 janvier 2022 – Communiqué de presse (translated into English from the original text)*] which sets out the following:

*“In its decision no. 2022-835 DC of January 21, 2022, the **Constitutional Council ruled on the law strengthening health crisis management tools and amending the public health code, which had been referred to it by two appeals from more than sixty deputies and more than sixty senators respectively. The applicant deputies also challenged the provisions of Article 1 of the law referred, allowing access to a political meeting to be subject to the presentation of a “sanitary pass”.***

[...] By this yardstick, the Constitutional Council considers that, by adopting the contested provisions, the legislator intended to make access to meetings that present an increased risk of spreading the epidemic due to the occasional meeting of a large number of people likely to come from distant places, subject to the presentation of a “sanitary pass”. It thus pursued the constitutional objective of health protection.

The Constitutional Council notes that, however, unlike the provisions which specify the conditions under which the Prime Minister may make access to certain places subject to the presentation of health documents, the contested provisions did not require the enactment of such measures by the organizer of the political meeting neither on the condition that they are taken in the interest of public health and for the sole purpose of combating the covid-19 epidemic, nor on the condition that the health situation justifies them with regard to viral circulation or its consequences on the health system, or even that these measures are strictly proportionate to the health risks incurred and appropriate to the circumstances of time and place.

He deduced that, under these conditions, the contested provisions do not achieve a balanced reconciliation between the aforementioned constitutional requirements. It declares them contrary to the Constitution. [...]

The first point I would like to highlight here is that this decision of the Constitutional Council (French), which allows me to debate today, exists through the referral of these French deputies and senators who spoke out against this liberticidal law which was the basis of the “vaccinal pass”.

Following the intervention of these parliamentarians, this part of the vaccinal law against covid 19, aimed at allowing an exception to be made so that access to political meetings is possible with a “sanitary pass” was rejected, and even declared contrary to the French Constitution.

For the record, on the date these legislative bases were enacted, January 21, 2022, we had **348 senators** and **577 deputies** in France, or **925 elected** “of the people”. It is therefore a tiny part of our representatives who, at this time, spoke out.

The presidential majority, for its part, has continued to hammer home the “iniquitous nail” of the covid 19 vaccinal laws, which has led part of the population to become pariahs of society. These are of course those not vaccinated against covid 19 but also those vaccinated who did not have a so-called complete vaccination schedule and who joined the ranks of this first category.

In France, they no longer had the “right of citizenship”, or of sharing with those who were up to date with their vaccination.

Let's first discover the showcase exposed by the French government to its citizens and to the world regarding the “fierce” fight it has led against this pandemic. Then, in a second step, I will show you the other side of the decor, much less glorious. Let's join the dance, to discover the tip of the vaccinal against covid 19 iceberg, the one that was presented to everyone. To present these realities to you, I invite you to read part of the speech given by Mr. Jean CASTEX on **December 17, 2021** [*Service Communication, Hôtel de Matignon, le 17 décembre 2021. Déclaration de M. Jean CASTEX, Premier ministre. Mesures de lutte contre la COVID-19 (translated into English from the original text)*] which establishes the following: **“Nevertheless, a new wave of contaminations is coming at a time when we are already at a very high level and, as I said, our hospitals are already under great pressure and will remain so in the weeks to come. To better prepare and protect ourselves, we must therefore take new measures.**

[...] This of course requires strict respect for the barrier gestures that the French know by heart: Wearing a mask, avoiding hugs, regularly airing closed places because the more you air out, the more you drive out the virus.

This requires a simple recommendation that our Scientific Council will recall in an opinion published tomorrow: *Rather than a specific number – 6, 8 or 10 – let's rely on a principle of common sense: the fewer of us there are, the less risk we take. Whether at home, in a restaurant, party hall or bar: Let's avoid big parties, big gatherings or big dinners which we have seen in recent days in Norway and Denmark how much they can create uncontrollable clusters of viral spread.* [...]

With regard to large gatherings and outdoor events, in particular the evening of December 31, the prefects will prohibit wild gatherings, the consumption of alcohol on the public highway and will invite the municipalities to give up the organization of large gatherings on the public road, in particular fireworks or concerts, particularly when they result in high concentrations and do not allow either distancing or respect for barrier gestures.

In this spirit, because everyone is aware that the month of January is the month devoted to good wishes, I appeal to everyone's responsibility to find other methods than large gatherings and to avoid in any case the moments of conviviality which are traditionally attached to it. These measures complement the closure of nightclubs and the ban on dance evenings in bars and restaurants:

They are harsh and I understand the frustration of having to limit ourselves in these festive moments, but they are essential and we owe them to our caregivers. [...] *But what our caregivers expect from us is that we be careful and above all, above all, that we get vaccinated, because even today nearly 6 million people are still not vaccinated.*

[...] **More than 17 million French people are already fully protected and 25 million will be by the end of the year.** [...]

While we have given time, a lot of time, to these French people who had hesitations and doubts, in January we will strengthen the incentive to vaccinate.

Because it is not acceptable that the refusal of a few million French people to be vaccinated puts the life of an entire country at risk and affects the daily lives of the vast majority of French people who have played the game since the start of this crisis, we have decided with the President of the Republic that a bill will be submitted to Parliament at the beginning of January, in particular to transform the sanitary pass into a “vaccinal” pass [...]

From now on, only vaccination will be valid in the pass. At the beginning of next week, I will hold preliminary consultations on this project, as well as on any other useful measure to extend vaccination to the maximum. We take responsibility to put the burden on the unvaccinated, because critical care and resuscitation units are filled for the most part with unvaccinated people.

[...] My dear fellow citizens, ladies and gentlemen, I share with you a situation that we would have liked to have been different. I share with you that it can create weariness. But I also share with you that vaccination allows us to arm ourselves against this new threat, provided that we are together as vigilant as possible in the coming weeks [...]”.

Here, we discover through the French Prime Minister, that the government and the Head of State at the head, had “made plans” to protect us, the citizens.

To do this, like loving parents, they watched over our health by urging us to be vigilant, in particular by practicing barrier gestures.

At first glance, this advice is quite relevant. In addition, the highlight of these measures intended to protect us was the following, we must put in place **“a principle of common sense: the fewer of us there are, the less risk we take”**.

To do this, we must avoid large parties, large gatherings or large dinners because they can create uncontrollable clusters of spread of covid 19.

In order to ensure that no one would violate these rules during this festive period, the Prime Minister decreed that **“With regard to large gatherings and outdoor events, in particular the evening of December 31, the prefects will prohibit wild gatherings.”**

In addition, it is recommended that **“municipalities to give up the organization of large gatherings on the public road, in particular fireworks or concerts, particularly when they result in high concentrations and do not allow either distancing or respect for barrier gestures.”**

The objective of all this being to **“avoid in any case the moments of conviviality which are traditionally attached to it.”**

Finally, nightclubs were closed and dance parties in bars and restaurants were banned, all of these places generating large gatherings and not allowing barrier gestures to be practiced.

The only objective “obviously” that motivated the implementation of such a draconian plan, taking away the freedom of the people, was “of course” our safety.

How could it be otherwise? In his speech, at the time, the Prime Minister even showed great empathy, sympathizing with us about the situation, sharing our weariness.

Let's continue, in the same vein, he had then announced that he was going, on behalf of the government and under cover of the head of state, to crack down by forcing those who had not been vaccinated against covid 19, presented as irresponsible since they represented a danger to the population and in particular at the origin of the restrictions which then persisted and which unfortunately constrained “those who had played the game”, the vaccinated.

The central axis of all these measures was the hospital overvoltage.

It is therefore to support our caregivers that all these restrictions on the freedom of the French were put in place and that the “vaccinal pass” was instituted.

I have just presented the setting, the tip of the iceberg, here we have the impression of living in a world where politicians have the well-being of the people as their primary objective and, having put on their shining armour and mounted their superb steed, seek at all costs to protect us.

With all this in mind, I would say that if I had not read this text – yes, the one that serves as my basis, the one that sets out and establishes the reasons for the Constitutional Council (French) – my eyes would not have opened and I would have said to myself that we should deviate from the rule and reverse the roles to offer the Legion of Honour to the President of the Republic, his Prime Minister and each member of his government.

Yes, because what is presented here is most moving and their actions seem to be most heroic. But there you go, I know!

Yes, I see, by the grace of God, beyond the veil and I will now present to you the fruit of this new vision of things, based on real and tangible facts.

Let's now look at the base of the iceberg, the one that I consider to be the hidden face as well as the true reality on which, in my opinion, the speech of the French Prime Minister Mr. Jean CASTEX and the vaccinal laws against covid 19 were based.

To begin with, let's go back to this decision of the Constitutional Council. We discovered that, if during the electoral campaign for the 2022 presidential election, no pass was required, neither "sanitary" nor "vaccinal" to access political meetings, it is because in the law it was not specified that they were mandatory for this type of gathering.

This small detail, these two little words "political meeting", not being part of the list like bars, restaurants, cinemas, leisure facilities, at the time the proposed vaccinal law against covid 19 was amputated from this paragraph recognized as being unconstitutional.

Here, I could have said that this suited the politicians who were able to campaign in great pomp for the presidential elections, but I will refrain from doing so, let's stick to my train of thought.

So, one might think that the desire to subject access to political meetings to the presentation of a sanitary pass meant that the government was keen to ensure that participants were not contaminated and therefore that the sole objective was the health of the French. But then, if this is really the case, I would like someone to explain to me certain points that struck me in this text that has been referred to many times.

To begin with, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the members of the Constitutional Council have noted that the process of requesting a "sanitary pass" to access political meetings was a good thing.

Here is what is said precisely on this subject: *this approach pursued* **"the constitutional objective of health protection"**. Also note this: **"[...] access to meetings that present an increased risk of spreading the epidemic due to the occasional meeting of a large number of people likely to come from distant places [...]"**.

Based on these elements, we easily understand that the context of the political meeting is conducive to mass contamination.

The reasons given by the government to make the "sanitary pass" mandatory at the entrance to political meetings were in accordance with the Constitution (French), because they were intended to protect the people from this terrible pandemic.

The only concern was the small grain of sand that comes to jam the machine:

"[...] The Constitutional Council notes that, however, unlike the provisions which specify the conditions under which the Prime Minister may make access to certain places subject to the presentation of health documents, the contested provisions did not require the enactment of such measures by the organizer of the political meeting [...]"

It is because, as we have already seen and reviewed, that the words "political meeting" were forgotten in this list, that this article of this bill was rejected.

Until then, let's give the benefit of the doubt, and say that it seems just an oversight by the legislators, which led to this exception in the law.

Anyone can make an omission, right? In this, we cannot in any way accuse Mr. Jean CASTEX or his government, or even Mr. MACRON of not having as their primary ambition, within the framework of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, the well-being and health of the French. That would be a trial of intent.

On the other hand, the fact that they have not since corrected the situation changes the situation. Let me explain:

The Constitutional Council has recognized the constitutional validity of requesting a "sanitary pass" to access a political meeting, because it helps protect the health of the French.

The only point that was missing is that the term "political meeting" was not included in the list of places where this "pass" was recognized at the legislative level. Here, "the bread was already falling all cooked into the beak".

It did not seem complicated to me, it was enough to vote a law that would supplement the one that already existed by decreeing that "political meetings would also be subject to the sanitary pass".

With this overwhelming majority at the level of the National Assembly that this French government held at the time and the fact that the Constitutional Council had already recognized the merits of this approach, this amendment to the law would certainly have passed without any problem, yes, "like a letter in the post".

Hum... from the date of the decision of the Constitutional Council, namely January 21, 2022 and until March 14, 2022, the date of the suspension of the "vaccinal pass" in mainland France, have you heard such an announcement, has the sound or the tinkling of such a bill reached your ears?

I ask you the question because I have not heard anything of the sort.

All this could pass for a simple oversight, or as being secondary for the French government of Mr. MACRON's first five-year term, but it was not, because as we have seen, a drastic organization that leaves nothing to chance is supposed to have been put in place to supposedly protect the French from covid 19.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the primary objective that the Head of State and the members of his government had set to justify the implementation of the "vaccinal pass" has been, according to what we have just seen, set aside.

To understand it, let's read this other extract from the speech of Prime Minister Mr. Jean CASTEX [*Extract from: Service Communication, Hôtel de Matignon, le 17 décembre 2021. Déclaration de M. Jean CASTEX, Premier ministre. Mesures de lutte contre la COVID-19 (translated into English from the original text)*] which establishes the following: "**[...] Our hospitals are already under great pressure and will remain so in the weeks to come. To better prepare and protect ourselves, we must therefore take new measures. [...] We take responsibility to put the burden on the unvaccinated, because critical care and resuscitation units are filled for the most part with unvaccinated people. [...]**

You have understood it: Even if we are still facing a part of the unknown on the effects of this Omicron variant, the duty of the Government is to anticipate and prepare the country for this new threat. My dear fellow citizens, ladies and gentlemen, I share with you a situation that we would have liked to have been different. I share with you that it can create weariness."

Here, there is no possible ambiguity about what is displayed, take measures in anticipation to counter the effects of **the Omicron variant**, the intended purpose being to "**limit its impact**", always with this main objective, isn't it, that of preserving populations and avoiding increasing pressure in hospitals.

It is with a view to remedying this situation that the leaders of the French people then "**to put the burden on the unvaccinated**".

How can we understand this little sentence as a conclusion **“I share with you a situation that we would have liked to have been different”**.

Yes, certainly, but where is the diligence in the face of the urgency of this pandemic, when an amendment to a law is not proposed when it would allow us to remain in this concern for protection so well displayed until then; especially since political meetings, let us remember, attract thousands of people. Well, well, well!

Now, in light of what I have just presented, we can clearly see the inertia of this French government, which could very well have changed the law to make access to political meetings conditional on the presentation of a “sanitary” or “vaccinal” pass.

If this had been done, we could then say that their primary motivation was really the well-being and protection of the French.

Indeed, since these places (political meetings) carry significant risks of contamination, this situation would have been translated at the legislative level.

Two weights, two measures and not the least !

So when it suits them, Mr. Emmanuel MACRON, his ministers and other elected representatives of the majority, have “turned a blind eye” to places that were likely to become “virus nests” and suddenly, the health of the French seemed to be relegated to the background but at the same time, for other areas of our daily lives, they have oppressed us with these liberticidal “pass”.

Look for the error! As soon as we are able to step back from a situation, we immediately see things from a different angle.

In this specific context, as I said, the decision of the Constitutional Council (French) opened my eyes and the questions poured in.

Yes, because if the “pass” were primarily intended to protect us, wasn't it more worrying that a large number of French people could gather in this way at political meetings?

Was it only in the context of our family, fraternal or leisure gatherings that the constraints of the “liberticide pass” were useful and the virus active?

It is true that this is about politics and we are not naive, there is indeed in this case an interest in acting! In the context of political meetings, the safety and health of the French people so highlighted in other areas of our lives suddenly took second place at the time since, for those who are behind the laws, such a gathering no longer seemed to present any risk at all.

Of course, we must not hinder the freedom of the French people, who can come in large numbers to support their candidates without an oppressive “pass” being able to constrain them.

Thus, politicians were able, in the context of the French presidential elections, to hold, among other things, large meetings in order to win supporters to their cause and “gather” votes.

To better illustrate this reality, let's look at the figures announced for the political meetings that attracted the most participants, they will speak for themselves:

- **4000 participants for one of the candidates,**
- **8000 participants for one of the candidates.**

These figures are staggering, especially when we know that no “pass” was required to access political meetings, while on the contrary, other gatherings were prohibited in leisure places, without a “vaccinal pass” or “sanitary pass” until March 14, 2022 for mainland France and April 9, 2022 for the overseas departments (French).

How do you expect in this case, that the great speeches justifying the drastic measures taken by the government are credible?

It is certain that this window opened by the Constitutional Council (French) has given pride of place to all the candidates, even those who initially wanted the “sanitary pass” to access political meetings. On the other hand, what about the “pro-vaccines”, those who campaigned for the “vaccinal pass”?

If their primary objective was to protect the French, how can they accept exposing their supporters by allowing them to meet in such large numbers?

Let us return again to the position of the presidential majority by playing the naive, we have seen that it could have proposed an amendment to the law to include political meetings in the list of places and activities subject to the pass. It did not do so.

With this foundation, I will now present to you a political deception worthy of the great detective novels, which has as its epicentre the backstage of power, and as its “turkey of the farce”, the French, in their opinion.

First of all, let us set the scene for this dramatic fresco, by reading the text [*La Martinique face au COVID-19 : mesures, attestations, recommandations. Taken from : <https://www.martinique.gouv.fr> (translated into English from the original text)*] which establishes the following:

“[...] As of April 09, the rules of reception of the public evolve in the ERP (this French acronym qualifies the establishments receiving the public):

- Wearing a mask will be strongly recommended in all enclosed places and places where people are concentrated, and no longer compulsory. However, it will remain mandatory in public transport, in health establishments and for contact cases.

*- **The sanitary pass will be suspended. It will no longer be required in ERP (restaurants, sports halls, cinemas, etc.) except for health establishments and medico-social establishments (excluding emergencies).***

*- **Concerning places of worship: Suppression of the gauge.***

- The mask is no longer mandatory but remains highly recommended. Regarding commercial activities:

*- **Abolition of the 8m² gauge per person in stores.***

*- **Removal of mandatory seating for restaurants and entertainment. [...]***

First of all, it is important to emphasize that this text comes from a reliable source, that of the prefecture of Martinique.

Until April 9, 2022, those who live in Martinique but also in Guadeloupe and Guyana, among others, could not access restaurants, gyms, cinemas, etc. without a “sanitary pass”.

Gauges still remained at places of worship and in stores.

Now let's go back to mainland France. Here is what happened several days earlier: **“Emmanuel Macron’s campaign team announced this Wednesday March 16, 2022 that the President of the Republic would indeed organize a meeting on April 2. But the place where it would be held had not yet been revealed”.**

[Présidentielle 2022. Emmanuel Macron organisera un grand meeting le 2 avril. Taken from the website: <https://www.ouest-france.fr> (translated into English from the original text)].

Let us complete with this: **“The candidate president held his big campaign rally this Saturday in front of more than 30,000 activists. As the gap with Marine Le Pen narrows in the polls, he again detailed several of his proposals, targeted his far-right opponents and called for “general mobilization.”**

[Présidentielle: ce qu’il faut retenir du premier (et unique) grand meeting de Macron. Taken from the website: <https://www.leparisien.fr> (translated into English from the original text)].

Before getting to what is presented here, I would like to represent to you the reality that I was experiencing, while Mr. MACRON was holding a meeting in front of **30,000 people:**

In a little over two years of pandemic, because of the French decrees that are illegal, therefore unconstitutional, I was not able to hold a seminar.

Thus on April 2, 2022, the date of this “huge” political meeting held by Mr. MACRON, for my part, because of the “sanitary pass” which was still active and was until April 9, 2022 in the Antilles, I still could not hold a seminar.

However, my seminars generally bring together a maximum of 350 people. Because of this reality, I went from being a business leader to a status lower than that of a homeless person. To provide for my needs, I had to go to the town hall of my commune with my head down to ask for food aid.

This place where I had already held a seminar a few years ago. So, while in a single day I could have got my head above water, unfortunately the “sanitary pass” continued to oppress us in the Antilles, during this time Mr. MACRON held a meeting in front of 30,000 people!

Now that this foundation is laid, let's return to Mr. Emmanuel MACRON.

While the oppressive “sanitary pass” was still keeping me in poverty, MONSIEUR was holding a meeting in parallel with the aim of being re-elected.

Can you please remind me of the number of people who came to attend Mr. Emmanuel MACRON's meeting:

300, 3000, 10,000, 20,000, um... no, let's go up a little more, **30,000!** Yes, thirty thousand people! **It takes my breath away.**

I feel like I'm in a movie where on one side we see the suzerain feasting lavishly, while his subject is wasting away from hunger. To highlight the nonsense of what we have just seen, I will present it to you, in the form of satire:

First of all, let us recall the oppressive nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 enshrined in the “sanitary and vaccinal pass”.

For a certain period of time, all French people over the age of 16 could no longer access *“bars and restaurants, leisure activities (cinemas, museums, theaters, sports arenas, gymnasiums and performance halls, etc.), trade fairs and exhibitions, large shopping centers by decision of the prefects and interregional transport (planes, trains, buses)”*.

Nevertheless, it would seem that not everything was negative! “YES”, because the French government of Mr. MACRON's first five-year term and its parliamentary majority which instituted the “vaccinal pass” being “great lords” and not wanting us ordinary citizens to be cut off from social life, they had sought at all costs to pardon us! In their great “self-denial” and so that we have the most fulfilling social life, they wanted to make access to political meetings conditional on the presentation of the least restrictive pass, the “sanitary pass”, but there you go, they did not win their case. What a great opportunity!

They offered us something even better, to keep this framework that the Constitutional Council (French) had established, and where from now on “the villain (bad guy) and oppressive pass” was no longer required.

We could therefore come as a family and in a large group, with a view to loudly chanting the name of the candidate of our choice.

Wow, we were finally free to get together, with family, friends... I am so moved.

I feel so supported and loved, yes, our government and the majority of elected officials had thought of us so that we could take crowd baths during political meetings, as part of the presidential election, and this in complete freedom, without these liberticide “pass” coming to hinder us!

How generous of them!

Who would have a handkerchief to pass me, the emotion that overwhelms me is so strong that I cry with joy. What can I say except:

Yay... because in this context, the oppressive “sanitary pass” or its little, but nevertheless more virulent, brother the “vaccinal pass” has been defeated here.

Blow off the fireworks, it's a day of celebration and joy...!

How “altruistic” our politicians are and think of us the people. Yes, because it seems that it was more dangerous to go to the cinema, or to a restaurant, than to a political meeting where there are more than thirty thousand people.

Indeed, it was apparently more dangerous to meet in a bar or a small restaurant which brings together on average **30 people**, or even much less, than in a political meeting which can attract thousands of individuals, as we have seen, one political meeting brought together **8,000** participants and that of **candidate MACRON, 30,000**.

It seems that covid 19 is more fond of restaurants, bars and cinemas than political meetings. Thus, like a homing warhead that is armed to hit only a well-defined target, the corona virus is supposed, it seems, to target only those who are in places of leisure to “hit” them and avoid those who are in political meetings. High technology!

WARNING DANGER: French people, my fellow citizens, be vigilant... the virus targets you according to where you go... so do not go to restaurants, bars, cinemas... because you are in danger of death, because the corona virus primarily targets these places...

On the other hand, go and listen to our politicians without moderation!

If the objective of the French government of the first five-year term of Mr. MACRON and his parliamentary majority was, with this “vaccinal pass”, to protect the populations, do you think that they would have remained on this refusal of the Constitutional Council and would have allowed the French to be exposed to this deadly virus by going to political meetings with such a crowd.

We can see that the truth is elsewhere!

Thus, if it was possible for a large number of people, thousands, to gather at a political meeting without having the “sanitary pass” or the “vaccinal pass” as a sesame, it was therefore just as conceivable that the French could access places of leisure or their workstation with the same fairness.

Throughout this book, I have already demonstrated to you, by referring to the appropriate texts, that the vaccinal obligation was contrary to the Constitution (French) and should be declared null and void. However, as we have seen, although suspended, it continued to constrain the medical and similar sectors, where unvaccinated agents could not carry out their activities without being vaccinated and this, until this law of May 13, 2023.

Thus, in view of what I have noted, it would seem that everyone is trying to “defend their bread” or even their political ambition.

So, if these politicians can assert “their privileges” to defend “their bread”, and this to the detriment of the people, we the citizens must also defend ours.

With all that we have just seen, it seems important to me to consider the following: **“The guarantee of the rights of Man and of the Citizen requires a public force: This force is therefore instituted for the advantage of all, and not for the particular utility of those to whom it is confided”**. *[(French) Article 12 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].*

What is presented here and which constitutes one of the bases of our Constitution (French) is clear, and presents those who have authority over France as not having to (they are forbidden from doing so) work for their own interests to the detriment of the needs of their fellow citizens.

Is this what we have observed during the past months?

Thus, while the French State had decreed that without a “vaccinal pass”, in mainland France, no one could work, in certain sectors, or have fun because of the pandemic and had put restrictions in place, he could not at the same time fail to regularize an “oversight” which meant that despite the yoke of the “vaccinal pass”, there was no longer any restriction on participating in political meetings.

That the Constitutional Council (French) rejected the article of law that subordinates entry to political meetings to the presentation of the “sanitary pass” is one thing, but that the government did not act diligently to repair this “oversight” is another.

Isn't it also unconstitutional to have allowed this deficiency to exercise this “double standard” for months?

Furthermore, let us not forget that in its decision the Constitutional Council recognized that this article of law was consistent with **“the constitutional objective of health protection”**.

In doing so, such a legal vacuum could not remain, otherwise it would contravene this obligation to protect the health of the French that the Constitution confers on them and that the government is obliged to provide them.

Furthermore, the rejection of this paragraph of the vaccination law that we are looking at, means that it is the elected officials who have been favored to the detriment of the needs of the people and in particular their right to be protected, which is highlighted with the vaccinal laws against covid 19 for all other areas of our daily lives.

This article of the law, aimed at only authorizing access to political meetings upon presentation of the “sanitary pass” had created an imbalance between the right of the French to be protected in terms of their health and that of being able to enjoy their freedom and their leisure. This is precisely what the Constitutional Council (French) noted.

As we have seen, when a law fails to establish a balance between the various articles of the Constitution (French), it is unconstitutional and must therefore be repealed immediately.

To continue, I would say that I understood that the position of the French government, faced with this liberticidal law which was the basis of the “vaccinal pass”, was not the one it wanted to display, It's saddening and revolting at the same time. Indeed, behind the veil of the pandemic, a showdown was played out between their people and them, the objective being to bring as many people as possible to bow under the rule of the State.

This reality is clearly displayed in the words of the President of the Republic, Mr. Emmanuel MACRON and several of his ministers.

To begin this part, I invite you to read these words which have certainly not escaped you. Here is what Mr. Macron said to the journalist: **“Emmanuel Macron assured, in an interview with the newspaper Le Parisien, that he intends to “completely piss off the unvaccinated”**.

“Almost all of the people, more than 90%, have adhered” to the vaccination and “it is a very small minority who are refractory”, he added”.

[France 24. Post: Emmanuel Macron se dit déterminé “à emmerder les non-vaccinés jusqu'au bout”. Tiré de: <https://www.france24.com/fr/france> (translated into English from the original text)].

The first point I would like to make is the context in which this exchange took place. It is not a private conversation that was recorded without his knowledge, but a public statement whose words were carefully weighed. To understand the scope of Mr. MACRON's statements, let's take a concrete example:

Imagine yourself in the courtyard of a kindergarten and there a little rascal chooses to “piss off”... oops Sorry... such a term is far too vulgar for young ears, so we will say importunate his little comrades, and in addition he proclaims it loud and clear and is proud of it. What do you think will happen when the headmistress finds out? Will she laugh about it with him? I do not believe that!

Because we live in a society where there are rules and the first one is to respect your little friends, and by extension your neighbor.

I find it shocking that this elementary rule that has been inculcated in us and that we inculcate in our children, from their youngest age, is ignored by Mr. MACRON, the President of the Republic.

Thus, while fathers and mothers could not feed their children or meet their financial obligations, because the current government has outrageously deprived them of their rights, Mr. Macron “has fun with them” as would a brat who takes pleasure in tearing off the wings of flies, just to see them struggle.

Since when, in a civilized society and moreover a Republic, can we make plans to “piss off”, therefore harm our neighbor, and proclaim it loud and clear, without there being a backlash to such acts?

In any case, I will not keep quiet!

Mr. Macron has “posted” his message for all the French people who are not vaccinated, so for me. This book is therefore the answer that is sent to him in return, from one of those he takes pleasure in “piss off”!

He did not stop at these intolerable remarks, let's see what happens next: “[...] *In his interview with the readers of Le Parisien, published on Tuesday January 4, the President of the Republic not only assumed his “desire” “to piss off the French”.*

He also felt that unvaccinated people were “irresponsible”. “**When my freedom comes to threaten that of others, I become an irresponsible. An irresponsible is no longer a citizen**”, did he declare”. [Post: “*Un irresponsable n'est plus un citoyen*”: cette autre phrase de Macron sur les non-vaccinés qui choque. Taken from the website: <https://www.francetvinfo.fr> (translated into English from the original text)].

To speak to you about what is presented here, I would say to you that the fact of saying on a media that he wishes “**to piss off the French**” is already a serious fact, but in the world of the abject, the waves which follow can be devastating, Mr. MACRON, demonstrates it to us here.

In order to take the scope of these remarks, we must first of all, keep in mind what are the rights and duties of French citizens. To see this term thus “*overused*”, moreover, by the highest figure in the State, is extremely shocking.

It is an attack that is brought to the notion of the citizen, as the latter appears in the French Constitution which advocates these values of freedom, equality and fraternity.

If we are no longer citizens, who are we, sub-humans, without rights?

To discover the meaning of this pillar that founds the Republic, we will review several articles of the French Constitution.

Before “*unpacking*” these articles, I would like to say that there is no more beautiful hymn to citizenship than this [Déclaration des droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (*Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of 1789*)], because it was born thanks to the valiant defenders of the Republic of the past, at the cost of their blood.

The first objective of these great conquerors was that no powerful iniquitous person would come to outrage or scorn the rights of French citizens.

Today, we can see that the reality is often quite different and that these beautiful and noble principles sometimes remain theoretical.

The link is quite found to return to the declarations of Mr. MACRON, let us see the continuation of his remarks:

“When my freedom comes to threaten that of others, I become an irresponsible. An irresponsible is no longer a citizen.”

After the first shock, let's analyze this sentence with regard to the following articles to see if it finds its translation: **“Art. 4. Freedom consists in being able to do all that does not harm others:**

Thus, the exercise of the natural rights of each man has no bounds (limits) other than those which assure the other Members of the Society the enjoyment of these same rights. These bounds (limits) can only be determined by law”. [Articles 4 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].

We discover here that one of the duties of the citizen is to always act in such a way that his freedom cannot harm others. This first text seems to be in line with the declaration of the President of the Republic, but is it really the case?

Should we use this article of the French Constitution to call on all unvaccinated against covid 19 French people to accept vaccination in order to protect others?

Does acting otherwise really make “vaccination recalcitrants” **“irresponsible”**, who are no longer worthy of having the status of **“French citizens”**, as advocated by Mr. Emmanuel MACRON.

To answer this question, it is useful to go back to the reality of vaccination.

We now know that being vaccinated does not make us immune to covid 19 and that we can infect others.

Admittedly, it is said that the vaccine protects against serious forms and reduces the viral load, this would be scientifically proven, but here again, this statement is not unanimous among doctors.

Thus, we are not in a context where the vaccine can protect us with certainty as well as those we approach, so if we are not vaccinated against covid 19, we do not contravene this paragraph of the law.

In addition, it is also declared in the French Constitution the following: **“The Law has the right to defend only those actions that are harmful to society. Everything that is not defended by the Law cannot be prevented, and no one can be forced to do what it does not order”.** [(French) Articles 5 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].

Coronavirus vaccines, let us recall, were not and still are not “mandatory”, as childhood vaccines are in France. Thus, those who refuse to be vaccinated are not breaking any law. Furthermore, it is unconstitutional to want to force a citizen to do something that the law does not order. Before continuing, it is important to note that when Mr. Jean CASTEX, French Prime Minister, publicly declares **“[...] We take responsibility to put the burden on the unvaccinated [...]”**, in doing so, the French government is contravening the [(French) Articles 5 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789].

Yes, because without a law that stipulates it,, no one can claim to force a French citizen to act against his will. Thus, the members of the French government of Mr. MACRON's first five-year term, having contravened the law, therefore become punishable by it.

To continue in this way, let us discover the following article which is flouted when we consider the declaration of Mr. MACRON:

“The Law is the expression of the general will. All Citizens have the right to contribute personally, or through their Representatives, to its formation. It must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes.

All Citizens, being equal in his eyes, are equally admissible to all dignities, places and public employments, according to their capacity, and without any other distinction than that of their virtues and their talents". [(French) Article 6 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].

The French Constitution has established that no one can be discriminated against in relation to employment, yet this is precisely what happened with the compulsory vaccination against covid 19 for certain professions. And yet!

We have demonstrated, with supporting texts, that these vaccinal laws against covid-19 which, although suspended, continue to be active, because they have not been repealed, have no reason to exist, because they contravene the "Declaration of Helsinki".

Indeed, this compulsory vaccination against covid 19 had been established for vaccines in the research phase without the possibility of exercising informed consent, which is nevertheless essential, being offered to the French.

In addition, we have also seen that since the vaccine against covid 19 is no longer the only alternative to the pandemic, the framework that the French Constitutional Council has set for compulsory vaccination is obsolete.

Let us continue to list the reasons that demonstrate that it is, on the contrary, the French State that is in a criminal position since on many points, it transgresses established laws.

We have also seen that the unvaccinated, just like the vaccinated, could be carriers of the covid 19 virus and infect others.

With all this in mind, since the the vaccine against covid 19 does not confer immunity against this virus, no one should be forced, against their will, to be vaccinated and in no way be legally struck if they refuse to do so. In view of the arguments that we have developed throughout this book, we easily understand that forcing the French to be vaccinated in order to keep their jobs is quite simply "against the law", the State (French) contravening the laws of its Constitution.

In the same vein as what we have just seen, it is important to read the following: "**No man can be accused, arrested or detained except in the cases determined by the law, and according to the forms it has prescribed.**

Those who solicit, expedite, execute or cause to be executed arbitrary orders must be punished; But any citizen called or seized by virtue of the Law must obey at once: he makes himself guilty by resistance". [(French) Articles 7 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].

As we see here, no one can be wrongly accused.

Thus when the President of the French Republic, Mr. MACRON, declares, speaking of French people who do not want to be vaccinated "**When my freedom comes to threaten that of others, I become an irresponsible. An irresponsible is no longer a citizen**" he is making defamatory remarks there, because I have proven to you legislative texts in support, that it was not so.

By his words, he contravenes the law and for that he is punishable by it, at least when he can no longer invoke his immunity as President of the Republic.

Let's discover another important point by reading this: "**Any society in which the guarantee of rights is not assured, nor the separation of powers determined, has no constitution**". [(French) Article 16 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)].

Thus, the government has flouted the rights of French citizens through these false allegations which are, as we have seen, defamatory and contrary to the provisions of this Constitution that they are called upon to defend. In this regard, I wonder, would the qualifier used by Mr. MACRON to designate those not vaccinated against covid 19 not rather apply to his own camp?

Let us review these incriminated remarks once again:

“When my freedom comes to threaten that of others, I become an irresponsible. An irresponsible is no longer a citizen.”

If we stick to these qualifiers, to these insulting remarks that Mr. MACRON made against those who did not comply with this injunction to be vaccinated against covid 19 – while the vaccinal laws against covid 19 contravene supranational standards and the French Constitution –, we can legitimately wonder who the real irresponsible people are!

Furthermore, I would say that in light of what follows, the declaration of Mr. Emmanuel MACRON, seems to me almost comical, considering what the French constitution presents as a danger to the French:

“The Representatives of the French People, constituted as a National Assembly, considering that ignorance, forgetfulness or contempt for human rights are the only causes of public misfortunes and the corruption of Governments, have resolved to expose, in a solemn Declaration, the natural, inalienable and sacred rights of Man, so that this Declaration, constantly present to all Members of the social body, constantly reminds them of their rights and their duties;

So that the acts of the legislative power, and those of the executive power, which can be compared at every moment with the purpose of any political institution, are more respected;

So that the reclamations of the citizens, henceforth founded on simple and indisputable principles, always turn to the maintenance of the Constitution and to the happiness of all.

Consequently, the National Assembly recognizes and declares, in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being, the following rights of Man and of the Citizen”. [*Introduction ou préambule de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789 (translated into English from the original text)*].

Yes, it is when Mr. MACRON and the members of his government act according to works of intolerance, put aside and despise the rights of their fellow citizens that they bring misfortune on our country. This definition is very different from theirs.

Let us review what is said: **“ignorance, forgetfulness or contempt for human rights are the only causes of public misfortunes and the corruption of Governments”** and that it is with a view to remedying this that it was enshrined in the French Constitution.

One of these primary objectives is to constantly remind **“Members of the social body... their rights and their duties”**, the ultimate goal being the happiness of all, through acts carried out in compliance with the maintenance of the Constitution (French).

These realities are absent in the statements of the President of the Republic and of several of his ministers.

On the contrary, they contravene, as we have seen, several articles of the French Constitution. To continue to develop this theme which is not yet exhausted, on the discriminatory words pronounced by Mr. MACRON, I would say to you that often we speak without taking the range of what we say.

The thing is serious for the average citizen, but it has an “apocalyptic” scope for a president, moreover, the one of the French Republic.

To deepen what we have just seen, I am now going to establish some realities by a reasoning by the absurd, which you will see, is not so much.

I remind you that he affirms that the non-vaccinated threaten the freedom of the others, therefore of the vaccinated ones and by doing so they, sorry, we are, according to Mr. MACRON, irresponsible, and as such we are not citizens.

To begin this reflection, we must return to certain bases which are part of the foundations of the French constitution:

The first is that any act that we do even if it finds its basis in an article of the French Constitution, but contravenes another of these articles is unconstitutional.

In addition, the [(French) Articles 4 et 11 de la déclaration des droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789], established that every French person must be able to enjoy his freedom, in particular to share his ideas in any legal form.

Nevertheless, in these same articles that I have just cited, it was also established that the freedom that is that of every French citizen is limited to not doing what can harm others and which contravenes the law. Thus our words must not contravene the law.

It therefore appears that we can present our ideas in the republic without constraint, nevertheless our words cannot be defamatory towards our neighbor, because from then on we contravene the law and are punishable for it.

It is important to understand that no one in the republic can defame his neighbor without there being consequences. Here is what the French legislation has established in this matter: **“Defamation is the allegation or imputation of a fact that undermines the honor or consideration of a person.**

It does not matter whether the fact in question is true or false, but it must be precise enough to be the subject, without difficulty, of verification and contradictory debate.

It must be possible to answer yes or no to the question: “Did so and so commit the fact”? [...] *There is defamation even if the allegation is made in a disguised or doubtful form, or if it is insinuated. For example, if the author uses the conditional.*

Defamation is also characterized if the allegation targets a person who is not expressly named, but identifiable (if his function is given, for example). If the accusation is not a verifiable fact, the allegation is an insult.

Public defamation: Public defamation is defamation that can be heard or read by an audience other than the perpetrator, his victim and a limited circle of individuals connected to them.

It is the case of remarks pronounced in the street, published in a newspaper or on an Internet site. Comments made on a social network can also be considered public defamation.

Depending on the locking chosen by the account holder, the comments made may be accessible to any Internet user or to a more or less restricted circle of friends.

If the remarks made are broadcast on an account accessible to all, it is public defamation. [...] Public defamation is punishable by a fine of €12,000. [...]. [Diffamation – Direction de l'information légale et administrative (Premier ministre), Ministère chargé de la justice. Taken from the website: <https://www.service-public.fr> (translated into English from the original text)].

Well, well, well, to you who did not make the choice of vaccination and that Mr. MACRON prevented in particular, by the “vaccinal pass” to work, be in the joy because, I have a good news for you, it offers to us all, therefore to the not vaccinated, **12,000 €!**

Yes, because it is the amount of the fine for public defamation and we saw that he held against us, publicly defamatory remarks. More seriously, we are discovering here the basics of defamation and especially public defamation and we see that the words of the French Head of State fit well with all this.

We have already seen that these statements portray the unvaccinated against covid 19 as people who, by their freedom, threaten others, making them irresponsible and disqualifying them as citizens.

These remarks are defamatory, because the law allows those who wish to do so to choose not to be vaccinated – they have the possibility of asserting their right to informed consent to refuse an experimental vaccine –.

We have also seen that vaccinated or not, we can be carriers of the virus and therefore transmit it to others.

Here again, Mr. MACRON's words are discriminatory and also contravene the freedom conferred by the French Constitution to every citizen, allowing him to make his life choices, as long as he carries them out within the framework laid down by the law. How can we accept these insulting words of the president, MACRON, against the non-vaccinated against covid 19, judged irresponsible, unworthy of being French citizens.

What is the fault they are accused of? Not to subscribe to a vaccination obligation which is supported by a law, itself infringing because it flouts the principles of the French Constitution and the supranational regulations.

Let's see now, in the following article, the requirements imposed to him by the French Constitution as Head of State: **“The President of the Republic ensures respect for the Constitution. He ensures, through his arbitration, the regular functioning of the public powers as well as the continuity of the State. He is the guarantor of national independence, territorial integrity and respect for treaties”**. [(French) Article 5 de la Constitution de la Ve République relatifs au président de la République, son mode d'élection, ses prérogatives. Titre II: Le Président de la République “à jour de la révision constitutionnelle du 23 juillet 2008” (translated into English from the original text)].

As you can see, the privileges that are those of the Head of State also go with his responsibilities.

The Head of State is the guardian of the French Constitution, which requires him to have, at all times, a posture that can in no way contravene his office and this responsibility, and in no case can flout even a paragraph or one line of the constitution.

We are not at all in this context with the comments he made. Would we be in a state of lawlessness, where the first magistrate of the Republic can do as he pleases, coerce the people through anticonstitutional means?

This behavior “transpires” in this “[...] **We take responsibility to put the burden on the unvaccinated [...]**” claim.

These remarks which flout the constitution are serious enough, in my opinion.

Here, in such a context, has he not failed in his duties? In this case, here is what is provided for by the Constitution: **“The President of the Republic can only be dismissed in the event of a breach of his duties manifestly incompatible with the exercise of his mandate”**. [(French) Article 68 de la Constitution du 4 octobre 1958. Version en vigueur depuis le 24 février 2007 (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's keep in mind that the President of the Republic is the one who **“ensures respect for the Constitution”**. In doing so, he cannot be both a shepherd and a ravaging wolf, he cannot ensure its proper application and at the same time flout the rights that the French constitution confers on citizens.

Here we are, we are done with **“this reasoning by the absurd”**, a bit long, I concede, but up to the enormity of the remarks made by the French head of state. Everyone can learn from it, if they see fit.

For my part, my objective was to demonstrate that as President of the Republic, Mr. MACRON does not have all the rights, he cannot allow himself certain freedoms by stigmatizing and discriminating against part of his people, because his charge forbids it.

The health context was difficult, trying and measures had to be taken, certainly, but with respect for the Constitution (French) and without arrogating to oneself rights that are not at all consistent with the exercise of the function of a president.

To continue our study, we are now going to leave France in order to refer to History to consider what it tells about the rights of every human being not to be, in spite of himself, a guinea pig. We will also see what happens when this right is not respected.

To present this reality to you, it seemed appropriate to tell you about one of the most important judgments of this century, the one which took place in *Nuremberg* and which gave rise to a code which bears the name of this town. To do this, read this:

“The “Nuremberg Code” is an extract from the criminal judgment rendered on August 19-20, 1947 by the American Military Tribunal (acting within the framework of international provisions) in the “trial of the doctors”. It is about the list of the ten criteria used by the Tribunal to assess the licit or illicit nature of the human experiments accused of the twenty-three defendants, most of whom are doctors.

This list quickly circulated independently under the name “Nuremberg Code/code de Nuremberg”; It has been read in political and medical circles as a corpus of deontological precepts and moral maxims binding on experimenters. [...]

[Text taken from document: Pour citer : Amiel P., ““Code de Nuremberg”: texte original en anglais, traductions et adaptations en français”, in Des cobayes et des hommes: Expérimentation sur l'être humain et justice, Paris, Belles Lettres, 2011, appendice électronique: <http://descobayesetdeshommes.fr/Docs/NurembergTrad> (translated into English from the original text)].

Let's complete our study with this other text: “[...] **The protagonists of the practice of human experimentation justify their views on the basis that such experiments yield results for the good of society that are unprocurable by other methods or means of study. [...] They were non-German nationals, including Jews and “asocial persons”, both prisoners of war and civilians, who had been imprisoned and forced to submit to these tortures and barbarities without so much as a semblance of trial.**

In every single instance appearing in the record, subjects were used who did not consent to the experiments; Indeed, as to some of the experiments, it is not even contended by the defendants that the subjects occupied the status of volunteers.

In no case was the experimental subject at liberty of his own free choice to withdraw from any experiment. In many cases experiments were performed by unqualified persons; were conducted at random for no adequate scientific reason, and under revolting physical conditions. [...]

Manifestly human experiments under such conditions are contrary to “the principles of the law of nations as they result from the usages established among civilized peoples, from the laws of humanity, and from the dictates of public conscience. [...]”

[Text taken from document: Pour citer : Amiel P., ““Code de Nuremberg”: texte original en anglais, traductions et adaptations en français”, in Des cobayes et des hommes: expérimentation sur l'être humain et justice, Paris, Belles Lettres, 2011, appendice électronique: <http://descobayesetdeshommes.fr/Docs/NurembergTrad>. (translated into English from the original text)].

Here, I have only taken up two of the ten criteria of the “Nuremberg Code”, not because the others are not important, but because they are the ones that particularly concern us for our study. In addition, some are already taken up and explored in the more current “Declaration of Helsinki”, which, in my opinion, is better able to defend the rights of those not vaccinated against covid 19.

This is why it is the central axis of my argument.

Now that this point has been made, let's get to the heart of the matter, but first, I prefer to anticipate any outcry, any protests, that would arise against this parallel made between the **Nuremberg Code** and the **vaccines against covid 19**. I would like to point out that I am not comparing the two situations, which are in no way identical.

To emphasize this, I note this context:

“In many cases experiments were performed by unqualified persons; were conducted at random for no adequate scientific reason, and under revolting physical conditions.”

It is certain that we are not in such a situation with the vaccines against covid 19, however, I want to alert and above all highlight certain points that have caught my attention.

One of the safeguards against such acts is the obligation to require informed consent from any person participating in medical research (an experimental vaccine is one of them).

*In the “Nuremberg Code”, it refers to any person who is placed in an oppressive situation (**the loss of his job, for example, in the case of our study**) which forces him to participate in clinical research (**the experimental vaccine against covid 19**), where he cannot “[...] Free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion [...]”.*

This seems to fit perfectly with the mandatory vaccination against covid 19.

We discover in the “**Nuremberg Code**” that these doctors and other Nazi accomplices were convinced that they were working, through their research, for the good of humanity. This comes out very clearly in their defense arguments.

They argue that their experiments were intended to produce “[...] **results for the good of “society” that are unprocurable by other methods or means of study. [...]**”. (*Large-scale clinical trials against covid 19 are part of it*).

Doesn't what we have just read remind you of anything? Yes, the compulsory vaccination against covid 19! To a lesser extent, of course, but nevertheless, we find some similarities. It is by considering the benefit/risk ratio of vaccines against covid 19 that the French State and other nations have instituted compulsory vaccination.

These vaccines against covid 19, being supposed to produce a positive effect in the context of this pandemic, and this, for the good of the greatest number. Although at the base such a motivation seems relevant, let us not forget that these products were still in the “**clinical trial** (research phase)” phase during the period when the “sanitary and vaccinal pass” had decreed the compulsory vaccination against covid 19 for the French under penalty of not being able to enjoy their leisure activities or work in certain sectors.

It is with a view to protecting human beings so that they do not become, in spite of themselves, guinea pigs that the “Nuremberg Code” and then the “Declaration of Helsinki” were instituted.

It is unthinkable that we could relive today, a trial such as that of Nuremberg, however we must be vigilant so as not to find ourselves on “a slippery slope” which would open “the skylight”. The obligation to vaccinate against covid 19 with all the loopholes that the law contains, as we have seen, all the inconsistencies that it generates, appeared for some socio-professionals, as the exercise of pure constraint, of the power in place whose watchword seems to be:

“Obey! The consequences, we will see later”.

There can be no overall support in such a context. Are we really in a Republic?

One could, for a moment, think that we have returned to that time when no one could stand up to the feudal power that once prevailed! This reality is truly evident when, arguing the number of French people vaccinated against covid 19, therefore the majority, the government announces that it has chosen “[...] **We take responsibility to put the burden on the unvaccinated [...]**”.

Are you aware of what is being presented here and the scope of such remarks?

Let's meet those who are stigmatized, those described as irresponsible by Mr. MACRON and who according to him deserve to lose their status as citizens!**For what serious fault?**

That of having chosen in their soul and conscience not to be vaccinated against covid 19, what's more, with a vaccine at the experimental stage.

We could imagine the scene of the small Gallic village of a famous “comic strip”, where the inhabitants fight for their rights, in all legitimacy. However, they are chased away because they are considered a danger to the rest of the population.

In reality, who is this minority, in mainland France, majority in other regions, notably those overseas? Extremists, anarchists whose goal is to fight against the Republic by burning cars and damaging other people's property?

Are they classified in the category of thugs and anti-socials? Is this a small, shadowy cell that acted like terrorists in order to strike the “good” French vaccinated against covid 19 who, for their part, obeyed the motherland?

Which would make them dangers to the Republic! Furthermore, how many of these “diehards” are there, **100, 1,000, 10,000?** Hmm... wait, let's not look any further, Mr. Jean CASTEX gives us the answer, it is **6 million French people** who, at that given moment, chose in their soul and conscience not to be vaccinated.

Among them were my parents, who were **76 and 79 years** old, people well integrated into society, kind and helpful grandpas and grandmas who are examples of integrity, subject to the rules of society.

However, for having chosen to walk according to their conviction, by not opting for the vaccination against covid 19, these 6 million French people were discriminated against and presented as a scourge on society.

It is true that often, some major media outlets that armed themselves with the “cream (gratin)” of “right-thinking” people, tended to portray those not vaccinated against covid 19, the majority in the Antilles/Guyana (Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyana) as insane people who were endangering the lives of others.

For the record or for information, on February 2, 2022, we were less than 50% of the inhabitants of each of these three French overseas departments not to be vaccinated against covid 19.

Nevertheless, I want to assure you, you “right-thinking” people who think this way, that this is not the case!

So that you can better understand our reality, I will tell you a little about us. The insurrection situation in the overseas departments, linked in particular to the refusal of the compulsory vaccination against covid 19 for certain trades, was widely reported by the national media at the end of 2021.

Shops were looted, cars burned, roadblocks set up to obstruct traffic. Small thugs had set themselves up as a militia and were extorting money from motorists at roundabouts, etc. Seen from this angle, things are dramatic and anarchic.

Nevertheless, it is important to look beyond appearances, because these facts were acts of individuals who were not seeking to defend their rights, but to violate those of others.

However, the root of the problem came from the compulsory vaccination against covid 19 introduced by the French government and which remained, as we have seen, for certain professions, those in the medical sector and similar.

Here are people who, having chosen professions in the service of others, very often by vocation, found themselves **“from one day to the next” deprived of their jobs, banished, as the worst criminals would be.**

What they were criticized for was not being vaccinated. It is true that given the extent of the damage and the number of deaths that covid 19 has already caused, one could think that not getting vaccinated is an antisocial act and that those who act in this way are selfish, some even called us “navel-gazers”.

Before getting lost in judgments, I remind you that here, in the Antilles, just like in mainland France, among those not vaccinated against covid 19, there are doctors, nurses, firefighters, or even those who like me work in the world of events, entertainment or even in the world of leisure, in restaurants, bars, etc.

As you can see, at no time can these people be petty delinquents, unsavory people who have no respect for society.

There was even a time, at the beginning of the pandemic, some of these unvaccinated against covid 19 were applauded every evening, like **“Heroes”**.

Indeed, it is important not to lose sight of the fact that it is these same people, particularly healthcare workers, who are so criticized because they chose not to be vaccinated against Covid-19, who saved a large number of lives, even though they did not even have the necessary protective equipment.

Let's see what the French Prime Minister, Mr. CASTEX, said about it: **“For almost 2 years, our caregivers have been fighting foot by foot against the virus, against these successive waves and this feeling of an endless fight.**

They are our heroes, and we owe them a lot. First, we owe them our gratitude for their commitment during the holidays, as they will continue to be tirelessly on deck.”

[Service Communication, Hôtel de Matignon, le 17 décembre 2021. Déclaration de M. Jean CASTEX, Premier ministre. Mesures de lutte contre la COVID-19 (translated into English from the original text)].

The French Prime Minister who stigmatized the unvaccinated against covid 19, which also includes a part of this section of society that are our caregivers, however, he cannot help but congratulate them here for the excellent work they are doing.

However, we have been able to measure the considerable impact of the obligation to vaccinate against covid 19 on those who are subject to it, *forced leave, suspension, unemployment in the long term* and possible retraining. Incredible!

A whole life turned upside down with the consequences that this implies.

Thus, I am surprised at the type of **“laurel crown”** that France offers to **“these great fighters and heroes to whom we owe so much”!**

During the time of the Roman Empire, it was gold, social position and/or political fame that rewarded conquerors who won great victories for the empire. Conversely, in this generation in France, it seems that the trend is quite different. Indeed, it is scarcity (dearth) and unemployment that the government offers as a reward.

It is therefore this crown for service rendered, which gratifies those who **“go to war”**, to defend us against covid 19, at the risk of their lives.

All this, because the objective of the French government is to put pressure on the unvaccinated, no matter how badly they suffer.

And yet, I repeat, the vaccines against covid 19 are experimental products that as such cannot be imposed against an individual's will. *Alas!*

It is because of these vaccines against covid 19, in the research phase, that our caregivers, etc. were unable to work for months, and now that the covid 19 vaccinal requirement has been lifted, or rather should I say suspended, they can certainly return to their posts, but at what price?

No compensation is offered to them and the long months they were suspended are not taken into account for the seniority of their careers.

I would now like to return to the pseudo “experts” who came on TV sets to discriminate against those not vaccinated against covid 19 and make us look stupid or insane.

I will now present to you some of the reasons why many are reluctant to get vaccinated against covid 19. Covid 19 vaccines are, needless to say, at the experimental stage.

Therefore, even if they have health benefits because, according to the figures given, they prevent the development of serious forms in those who are infected, there are still gray areas regarding the negative repercussions of these products in the medium and long term.

Which is easily understandable, since these are experimental products that have not yet revealed all of the effects they generate.

Can you imagine the long struggle that the victims of these medications and/or their families had to go through, for those who unfortunately succumbed, in order to get justice for them? Of course, you will say that you don't understand since this was not reserved for the West Indies, as mainland France was just as affected.

This is true, but in addition to these medication scandals, there are others, very specific this time. Indeed, in terms of health, we have already had to pay a heavy price, in which we are still mired.

This reality of a product harmful to health, authorized for decades by France, we know it well in the French West Indies because it had the effect of poisoning its population, particularly that of Guadeloupe and Martinique, you will have Understood, it's **chlordecone**.

This pesticide which was still authorized by exemption in these regions, whereas it was prohibited in France Hexagonale, as well as everywhere else, spread in the water tables, contaminating the drinking water. The result is that many cancers, particularly of the breast and prostate, have developed among these populations.

Today, only prostate cancer has been recognized as a disease resulting from prolonged exposure to chlordecone with compensation provided only for men who have worked in the banana fields.

Thus, many metropolitan French people do not understand the reluctance of the West Indians to be vaccinated against covid 19, but they have not been poisoned, with impunity, for decades by their mother country. Today, there is no mention of the care that would be put in place in the event of serious effects that would be scientifically recognized, following the vaccination against covid 19.

We rather hear "It is not scientifically proven", even when patients describe symptoms that appeared following the vaccination against covid 19. For example, in the event of cancer that would develop following the vaccination against covid 19, what would be the compensation etc.? This question may seem mercantile, but how many people today find themselves completely helpless following chlordecone poisoning, with no hope of care.

How, when we have not yet emerged from this chlordecone scandal, because of these exemptions from France, responsible for our poisoning, can we still trust an oppressive and discriminatory government, which stigmatizes those not vaccinated against covid 19?

Some will probably say that this is irrelevant and that we are "mixing genres" but can we dissociate these two contexts when the end result is the same, the possible impacts on our health, not yet measured?

This, especially since the management of the health crisis, by Mr. Emmanuel MACRON, is presented in the following text as having been built on lies:

"Mr. Stéphane Ravier. Mr. Chairman, my question is for the Prime Minister. Life goes on. There is no reason, other than for vulnerable populations, to change our outing habits". This sentence is a month old, almost to the day.

It is from the President of the Republic, Emmanuel Macron, about the Covid-19 crisis. In one sentence, here is summed up all the unpreparedness and incompetence of the State, but it is not a surprise. Since then, our compatriots have discovered and suffered the litany of your lies, because you lied, and you knew!

You knew, since January 11, when Agnès Buzyn warned the President of the Republic and your entire government.

You knew, and you chose to lie.

You lied, and French people died. On February 18, the Minister of Health, Olivier Véran, declared that France was ready. On February 26, Jérôme Salomon, Director General of Health, stated that there was no shortage of masks. On March 20, it was Laurent Nunez who refused to acknowledge the lack of masks.

But then, why did Jérôme Salomon say, in private, four days earlier:

“Stocks of masks are limited and we are looking for them everywhere”. Why, on April 5, did Christophe Castaner call on the French to give their masks to hospitals? On March 13, Mr. Prime Minister, you yourself stated that wearing a mask was useless.

The reality is that you lied about the masks to buy time, knowing full well that the strategic stocks had disappeared years ago and that France no longer had any.

Consequence: Today, the prefect of the Grand Est region is requisitioning the 6 million masks intended for the health care personnel of the Bouches-du-Rhône and you are requisitioning the 4 million masks ordered by the Bourgogne-Franche-Comté region.

This is turning into anarchy. You have even succeeded in shattering national unity.

Unable to foresee, you are unable to protect the population. If French people are in intensive care, whether the sinister police prefect of Paris likes it or not, it is because your government did not know, could not or would not protect them!

You are responsible for all these tragedies. And perhaps you will be found guilty of this tomorrow.

Here is my question: do you think, Mr. Prime Minister, that your successive lies fall under the jurisdiction of the Court of Justice of the Republic? [...]

[Stratégie en matière de port de masques de protection 15e législature. Question d'actualité au gouvernement n° 1256G de M. Stéphane Ravier (Bouches-du-Rhône – NI). publiée dans le JO Sénat du 09/04/2020. Taken from the website: <http://www.senat.fr> (translated into English from the original text)].

First of all, it is important to note that these remarks are not "fake news" that would circulate like "free neutrons" but on the contrary serious reflections and questions from the Senate (French) website.

Here we rediscover or discover the behind the scenes of the management of the health crisis.

Probably caught off guard by this unprecedented health crisis, the French government preferred to distort the truth. We saw that Mr. MACRON allowed himself to stigmatize those not vaccinated against covid 19 by presenting them as "irresponsible" threatening the freedom of others and becoming unworthy of being "French citizens".

For his part, as a "responsible" man, while the pandemic was raging, he called on the French to continue to live normally.

How then, given everything that the media have broadcast or that this text recounts, can we feel safe, when our senior leaders working in the highest echelons of the State have made announcements with serious consequences without really mastering their subject.

Is it not legitimate not to feel safe and to refuse to be injected with a new substance, the contraindications of which are not yet fully known?

The Constitution gives us the right to choose in our soul and conscience to be vaccinated against covid 19 or not.

We therefore have the intelligence to exercise this right which is ours, just as it is yours, our detractors, to want to be vaccinated against covid 19.

I also noted in the speech by Prime Minister Mr. Jean CASTEX which caused so much ink to flow, this small but powerful sentence:

“Only the pronouncement is authentic”.

Thus, what he declared, he recorded it, and **“he persists and he signs”**.

What is being claimed here is the deliberate choice of the French government of Mr. MACRON's first five-year term to force as many French people as possible to get vaccinated against covid 19 by using the "martinet of iniquity" that was the "vaccinal pass" to strike down anyone who balked.

We will not review all the members of the French government of Mr. MACRON's first five-year term, but I cannot end this chapter without talking about the Minister of Solidarity and Health, Mr. Olivier VÉRAN, particularly his condescending attitude during a session at the National Assembly to debate the “vaccinal pass”.

In front of my television, I was both admiring and stunned.

Admiring the fight led by some of our deputies, here it was those of the opposition who sought to make the cries of the French people heard. Mr. Véran was asked some very pertinent questions to obtain clarification:

These included the relevance of vaccinating children, the possible risks that are potentially dangerous for this young audience, especially since the negative repercussions have not yet been controlled, statistics on serious forms resulting in deaths, etc.

Totally legitimate questions that many parents ask themselves.

I also told you that I was stunned. Yes, this state of stupor comes from the fact that this minister, faced with all these questions, remained stoic and did not deign to answer any of them.

The image that came to me that day, when I looked at Mr. Olivier Véran, was that of a feline entering a chicken coop, where it knows it will encounter no resistance, because no one has the power to defeat it. What followed reinforced this reality, because all the amendments from the opposition deputies were rejected.

However, they were intended to qualify this draft law on vaccination against covid 19 by providing answers to the legitimate concerns of the French, with regard to vaccination against the coronavirus.

Faced with this disconcerting attitude of the Minister of Health, we can only draw one conclusion, that of manifest contempt for proposals that are not from his camp.

The obvious objective is to submit (to lower), oops Sorry, to “piss off” all those who do not bend to the “Macronian” discipline.

So, at the time when these unspeakable words were pronounced by Mr. MACRON, “**completely piss off the unvaccinated until the end**”, the millions of French people who at the time were not vaccinated against covid 19, and we have already seen that they were not thugs, were apparently, for Mr. MACRON and his majority, nothing other than sub-humans.

Let us not forget, according to them, we are “irresponsible” and as such, we deserve to be stripped of our status as “citizens”. Here, in the context of the covid 19 pandemic, the constraint was exercised through the “vaccinal pass”, but this desire to constrain, we can transpose it to other areas.

This is a reality that I experience as a Sabbath-keeper, who sees his rights flouted by Catholic decrees instituted in French legislation. And yet, France is supposed to be a republic not subject to religious laws.

I have experienced this and have often come up against this contradiction. How can we understand the allegiance given to the Pope by the various presidents when there is a separation between Church and State.

My painful experience gave rise to the chapters entitled “**Historical and legislative reality of the unconstitutional character of the Sunday laws**” and “**Reality of the unconstitutional nature of the Bailly report, an essential support governing the French Sunday laws**”, as an outlet in which I report on this Republic, several of whose laws are religious laws, stigmatizing and “**stripping**” minorities who do not revere Catholic dogma.

My historical research has allowed me to note that:

The iniquitous Sunday decrees of the Catholic Church, which were instituted at the cost of the dispossession, torture and death on the infamous stake of a myriad of Jewish and Protestant Christian martyrs, continue to have their longevity among the French people.

To continue, I would say that generally, what characterizes us and makes known who we are, are not so much the good or beautiful words that we pronounce, but the actions that we perform in reality.

With this reality in mind, with regard to the literal reality of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and their impact on all or part of French citizens, let us look at what Mr. Emmanuel MACRON advocates and what he has practiced and still practices, a contrario.

To illustrate this state of affairs, I will take as an example the steps that I took to make my voice heard after my rights were violated by this tax official. You will thus see the gulf that exists between the words and actions of Mr. Emmanuel MACRON. Let us now get to the heart of the matter.

I did not remain inactive while Mr. GUILGAULT, “skinned” me alive, – I have already reported the frivolous behavior of this agent in charge of processing my file – because I have, among others, sent emails to Mr. MACRON, President of the Republic. Following my emails, I received response letters from various Ministers and the Prefect of Martinique.

You will find more details in the chapters entitled **“Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State for the harm suffered by Mr. MARGUERITE”** and **“New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Jérôme FOURNEL, as Director General of Public Finances, in the alleged external illegality”**.

What struck me most in this affair is how great is the void that separates the words of the President of the Republic from his actions.

Let us reread part of what he promised me:

“Sir, The President of the Republic has received the mail that you wished to send him.

Sensitive to the concerns you express and attentive to your personal situation, the Head of State has entrusted me with the task of assuring you that it has been taken note of.

Mr. Emmanuel MACRON is fully aware of the difficulties faced by his fellow citizens as well as the economic, social and psychological consequences caused by this unprecedented health crisis we have to face. [...]

In this book I demonstrate to you, with legal and legislative texts to support it, that this tax agent whom I have cited many times, has exceeded his prerogatives as a civil servant, I therefore appeal to the highest authority of the nation, the head of state, who informs me that he is **“Sensitive to the concerns that I have expressed to him and that he is attentive to my personal situation”**, yet these words are not followed by concrete actions.

Do you realize that I asked for help from Mr. MACRON, **“President of the French Republic”** more than three years ago and to this day, apart from returns acknowledging receipt of my letters and saying that my requests would be forwarded to the appropriate authorities, no follow-up has been given, leaving me to **“stew in my suffering juices”**!

How can one, as President of the Republic, promise to help a person who is in great difficulty, in the most complete destitution, and let him fall?

But first, let's reconsider the President's speech delivered just after his re-election: *“I know that you have spared no effort, given so much energy, shared so many convictions.*

It is by striking at the heart that the truth comes. Thank you. I know what I owe you. THANKS! [...] My dear compatriots, my dear friends.

Today you have chosen a humanist project, ambitious for the independence of our country, for our Europe, a republican project in its values, a social and ecological project, a project based on work and creation, a project to liberate our academic, cultural and entrepreneurial forces.

I want to carry this project with force in the years to come, by also being the repository of the divisions that have been expressed, and of the differences, and by ensuring respect for everyone every day, and continuing to work for a more just society [...]

We will also need, my friends, to be benevolent and respectful, because our country is steeped in so many doubts, so many divisions. So we will have to be strong. But no one will be left by the wayside.

It will be up to us together to work for this unity by which alone we will be able to live happier in France and meet the challenges that await us, the years to come will certainly not be peaceful. But they will be historic!

And, together, we will have to write them for our generations. My dear compatriots, it is with ambition and benevolence for our country, for all of us, that I want to be able to tackle the next five years by your side. This new era will not be the continuity of the quinquennium which is ending.

But the collective invention of a new method for five better years, in the service of our country and our youth. Each of us will have a responsibility in this. Each of us will have to commit to it. For each of us counts more than himself.

This is what makes the French people this singular force that I love so deeply, so intensely, and that I am so proud to serve again. Long live the Republic! And long live France!"

[Déclaration d'Emmanuel Macron du 25.04.22. Taken from the website: <https://avecvous.fr/publications/declaration-emmanuel-macron> (translated into English from the original text)].

We have just discovered part of the speech that Mr. Emmanuel MACRON gave under the Eiffel Tower on April 25, 2022, following the announcement of his victory in the presidential elections.

Hearing the president's words, I was filled with such a strong surge of love and solidarity that, for want of anything better, I hugged my pillow to the point where it exploded, filling my room with feathers. This emotion lasted for several days, because these words touched my soul... yes... I know more than ever that this man has the gift of the gab, and that all of us, the French people who listen to him, are his raven and our cheese that he seeks to steal is our freedom.

There is no doubt that the supporters of "**Macronism**" will shout to me that their leader has "**sworn to his great "gods"**", that a change has taken place in him and that the new five-year term will be different from the first.

In return, to them, I would say that I sympathize with the spirit of blindness that our president can instill when acting on some.

In all things, it is important to never forget that in life, what determines who we are is not only our words, but above all our actions.

To compare what our newly re-elected president is proclaiming here with what he practices in reality, I would like to return now to the last email that I sent him and that he received on June 7, 2022, a few days after his re-election and after his sermon, *Oops... Sorry...* after his great speech, from which we have just read an excerpt.

You will find an excerpt of this email in the chapter entitled "**Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State for the harm suffered by Mr. MARGUERITE**". In this email, I invited Mr. MACRON and his team to come and download my book. Thanks to the unique access code set up for this purpose, I was able to see that they had visited my site.

In this email, one of the points presented is the “illegal” nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, with the legal and legislative texts supporting my argument, this did not catch Mr. MACRON's attention.

In addition, through this email that I sent him on June 7, 2024, Mr. MACRION and his government learned of my testimony presenting the unspeakable behavior of this official in the processing of my solidarity fund application files, but nothing was done, this tends to demonstrate that the words of a small business owner who lost everything because of these covid 19 vaccination laws and the incompetence of this official do not move them.

To continue, I would say to you that, after recalling the inglorious behavior of the President of the Republic and the members of his government during the first five-year term, with regard to the reality of the vaccination laws against Covid-19, which, let us recall if need be, contravene the French constitution, we see that for this second presidential term, in this area, inertia is still the order of the day.

“Nothing new under the sun.”

Thus, I did receive acknowledgements of receipt from various Ministers and the Prefect of Martinique for the emails sent to the President of the Republic, but no concrete action followed.

Unfortunately, I was naive enough to believe that these responses received were not simple acknowledgements of receipt but that they really took my situation into account. However, it was indeed a play of light and shadow.

What is this reality? When we stand under the sun, there is generally our shadow that becomes visible, except in rare cases, especially at noon, when the shadow disappears.

Why this image? You will understand, it can be applied to what I experienced. Thus, my previously mentioned email, addressed on June 7, 2022 to the President of the Republic, was forwarded as announced, to the appropriate person with a response from each of the recipients making me hope for a favorable outcome.

In doing so, there is the shadow proving that a reality does indeed exist. However, more than three years later, no feedback, no shadow, no tangible reality.

It is therefore a clear total disregard from Mr. MACRON and his government for the situation that I brought to their attention.

So, when I hear in his speech, following the announcement of his victory in the presidential elections **“no one will be left by the wayside”**, I still wonder what exactly he is talking about, because he remained insensitive to my situation of great precariousness following very specific facts that I denounced, with supporting documents.

How then should we interpret these words **“benevolent and respectful”** pronounced by the candidate MACRON who has just been re-elected?

It should also be noted that our president, recently re-elected, says he loves us, the citizens, **“deeply”** and **“intensely”**, and claims to be **“proud to serve us again”** and he presents himself as a man of light, since he declares that **“It is by striking at the heart that the truth comes”**.

However, while he gives the world the face of a person who cherishes the truth, his actions demonstrate quite the opposite.

We now know that Mr. MACRON and his government are fully aware of the unconstitutional nature of the covid 19 vaccinal laws, and of the fact that it is in the most glaring inequality that our caregivers have been deprived of work and income, but the suffering of the people does not matter to them.

To continue, I would say that it is important that you are fully aware that Mr. Emmanuel Macron and his supporters do not care about the **“little people” and our suffering**.

This reality is clearly evident in the debates on the high cost of living in Martinique, where I was confronted with a paradox. On the one hand, I was touched by this desire of everyone to work towards finding solutions, but on the other hand, the major player in this price reform, which is the French State, does not seem to care about us.

During this round table, no minister, from overseas, the economy or others, deigned to come and sit directly at the negotiating table. During this time, the prefect, who was at the negotiating table, having no authority to decide for the State, being overwhelmed, he had to call in the CRS 8, perceived as oppression.

When Mr. Jean Noël BUFFET, the “overseas minister” of this period, finally deigned to visit us in Martinique, during his interview on the television news, held on the airwaves of Martinique la première on November 12, 2024, it was, for me, disappointing. He brought in his bag a **20% reduction on 6000 everyday consumer products**.

Which still leaves us in a situation of great crisis in terms of our finances and acknowledges that the overseas territories do not have the same rights and do not enjoy the same consideration in the eyes of Mr. MACRON and his government.

The **6 million euros** of aid that will be released for Martinique as part of territorial continuity, which will be devoted to the transport of goods (approach costs), that the Ministry of Overseas Territories presents with condescension, will not deny this reality. We must not lose sight of the fact that for these same reasons and in this same framework, the French State has granted more than **230 million euros** to Corsica.

To understand the true scope of this masquerade that Mr. Jean Noël BUFFET presented to us, let us recall that on **January 1, 2024, Corsica has 355,528 inhabitants and Martinique 349,925 inhabitants**. Thus, to within a few thousand inhabitants, these two French departments are in the same demographics.

On the other hand, let us not forget that this aid provided to Martinique must be duplicated to all the overseas departments and territories, which for the same period of January 1, 2024 had **2.7 million inhabitants**.

Now that these bases are established, let us do a quick calculation:

There are 12 overseas departments and territories, which will most likely also receive **6 million euros** in aid, similar to what will be released for Martinique as part of territorial continuity. This therefore represents **72 million euros**. **Thus, the 355,528 inhabitants of Corsica will receive an amount of aid 3 times higher than the 2.7 million inhabitants of the overseas departments and territories.**

All this shows us that since it is in the hands of the State that the purse of finances is located, which can reduce or increase aid intended for the Antilles, Mr. Jean Noël BUFFET, Minister of the “colonies”, has therefore come to scorn us and to firmly establish the domination of Macronism over the overseas departments (French).

Here again, we have discovered the true face of Mr. MACRON, but fortunately the wind is turning, he no longer has the proud allure of the conqueror on his white steed, because his beast of Gévaudan, *[(French) Article 49-3 de la Constitution]*, has turned against him and has swallowed up, body and soul, his government with at its head its “herald” who was not heroic, his Prime Minister Michel Barnier.

It is important that you, who are reading me, can realize that we must ensure that Mr. MACRON faces his responsibilities. To do this, I bring you the foundations of a simple plan, in the part entitled “**The titanic fight between the clay pot and the iron pot, David and Goliath version**”.

Now this point noted, you who have become aware of the importance of these battles being waged, you must lend a helping hand so that the Sunday and vaccinal laws against covid 19 are repealed so that those who have been impacted by them can be compensated.

In a practical way, like a hot, red ember that must set alight a bag of coal, those who find my approach and my fight relevant must make this book known.

You must therefore take matters into your own hands, to do this, I invite you to share this book with as many people as possible, in its English and French versions, in order to raise awareness among a majority of people of the realities described therein and thus light the fire of change in them.

Both versions of this book, the English and French versions, can be downloaded from my website, the contact details of which are given at the end of this book. Like autumn leaves blown away by the wind, share them by all means:

By email, Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, Tik Tok, etc.

Make sure to reach the media in your country by all possible means. In addition, if you are a public or well-known person, talk about this book on the media, no matter what country you live in. This is how the greatest number on the face of the earth will know the truth and will be able to take a stand, so that things can change.

Now that this point has been made, we must look at a phenomenon that is taking place, one of the most saddening, in my opinion. It is the fact that caregivers who have not been vaccinated against covid 19, ostracized from society for many months, now that they can return to their posts, are being attacked by the mass of "right-thinking", who are vaccinated. One could say, all that for that?

These rifts (this division) have only one cause, a mandatory vaccination against covid 19 that should never have been because it was covered by a law that was itself unconstitutional.

So whose fault is it? Caregivers who in their souls and consciences chose not to subscribe to a vaccination in which they had no guarantee and, in view of the principles contained in the "Declaration of Helsinki", they were within their rights?

A government that instituted a law that flouts supranational regulations? When I take a step back, I am astounded by the reality of what is happening right now in France.

Could we be back in Sherwood Forest, where Prince John plays the good guy while Robin Hood and his merry men pretend to be the bad guys.

With these covid 19 vaccinal laws instituted without a legal legislative basis to support them and which have been the cause of enormous constraints sometimes with irreversible effects on some, how can we be targeting the wrong people today? How can we stigmatize caregivers who were so applauded yesterday?

Are you conscious of what is happening?

The illegal nature of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 has been widely demonstrated and supported by legal and regulatory texts in my file filed with the administrative court and transmitted among others to the power in place (the French state). This reality is therefore not unknown to them and yet! Those at the origin of this law which suspends the covid 19 vaccination obligation for caregivers, the president in the front line, are today considered to have shown leniency towards caregivers.

It's all smoke and mirrors!

Let's not forget that this is only a suspension of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 obligation but not a repeal. There is too much to say, the demonstrated unconstitutional nature of the covid 19 vaccinal laws, passed over in silence, swept aside with a wave of the hand, the compensation of those who have been impacted by these laws, of course, non-existent! If we must simply stop at this law which suspends the compulsory vaccinal against covid 19 for caregivers and similar, without looking at its real scope, everything seems normal and perfectly justified, in terms of employees who return to their posts.

However, by looking more closely, by lifting the veil, things are not so simple and hide a deep ignominy.

It is the power in place (the French state) which created this situation by wanting to force free men and women, the French citizens, to submit to laws, which contravene the French Republic and supranational regulations.

This reality is revolting to me, because those who have chosen to be vaccinated against covid 19 have come to demonize unvaccinated caregivers, and continue to blame them, by protesting against their reinstatement. You who stigmatize unvaccinated caregivers and want to see them remain in precariousness, without work, you are reproducing very sad mistakes of the past by supporting **“the armed wing”**, that of the strongest. And why?

Quite simply because they have made different life choices than you. The situation is serious, it is inconceivable that two camps oppose each other, “the vaccinated” and the “unvaccinated” against covid 19. Let everyone in their soul and conscience make the choice they deem right, but do not let yourself be won over by this fierce hatred fueled by laws, which themselves contravene supranational laws.

Throughout these lines, I have referred to the legal texts that allowed me to develop my argument. It is time for this situation to change! Now that you have read the content of this book, you must act, no matter where you live or who you are. This fight for the rights of the unvaccinated against covid 19 and of Sabbath and Shabbat observers is not, I remind you, only that of the French people.

This book is for all those, whatever their origins, who are subject to this constraint of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 or who have seen their rights flouted by the Sunday laws.

I also sincerely believe that opposing the obligation to vaccinal against covid 19, considering the bases on which it was instituted, should not be solely the business of the unvaccinated. The same is true for all those who have suffered under the yoke of the Sunday laws. It is important for you to understand that by leading the fight on the ground of French legislation and winning, thanks to you, the other Nations, the victory, we will create an international legal precedent, which will make it possible to break, Nation after Nation, the dikes of the Sunday and vaccination laws against covid 19.

In doing so, this fight that I am leading in France is the precursor of what you will subsequently be able to put in place within your respective Nations. Let us rise up, with one voice, across the entire surface of the earth like a powerful tsunami, according to the established rules, for gatherings in our countries and very importantly, without violence, because we are not thugs but patriots, so that the Sunday and vaccinal against covid 19 laws are swept away and destroyed like straws would be by a powerful hurricane!

I therefore call on all those who love justice and freedom and who have become aware of the unfair nature of against covid 19 and Sunday laws, leading men and women into precariousness, to join me.

I would like to remind you that I am not fighting against the anti-covid 19 vaccination, or so that all French people can work on Sundays, but against the laws that force the unvaccinated to be vaccinated or to die of hunger while suffering the unthinkable, as well as against the Sunday laws that lead Sabbath and Shabbat observers, as was my case, to go from being active to being almost homeless!

It is time that we can, in unity, vaccinated and unvaccinated against covid 19, up to date or not with their booster doses, Sabbath, Shabbat or Sunday observers, let out a great cry, like a lion, intended to overthrow these unfair and oppressive vaccinal laws against covid 19 and Sunday laws that have been instituted by certain nations.

From now on, in unity and brotherhood, it would be necessary as one Man, that our voices, whatever our vaccination status, or our religion, unite to be heard so that justice is done. That the “vaccinal pass” is not only suspended, that it is repealed, the same is true for Sunday laws, this is the reason for this book. However, we must not forget all those who have been wronged, who have been forced to lose their jobs or have had to be suspended. All those who have been impacted must be compensated.

6 The titanic fight between the clay pot and the iron pot, David and Goliath version

To begin this part, I would say that what is happening right now in France, this legal tug-of-war between Mr. MACRON and me that I present in these lines, few French people are aware of it and yet, I have the deep conviction that it is a page of history that is being written, as was once the case with the titanic duel between David and Goliath.

When considering this biblical story, often the feeling is that this little stone gave victory to David, nevertheless, my vision is quite different, because for me what made him victorious is contained in what he says a little before and that we find in [1 Samuel 17 verse 45, King James Bible] which establishes the following: *“Then said David to the Philistine, Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield: but I come to thee in the name of the LORD of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied.”*

The little stone here is nothing in itself, it is the power of the Holy Spirit that directed it to the right place, which was where Goliath had no protection, at the level of his helmet, between his two eyes. This is how the frail and young David was able, under the influence of the Spirit of God, to terrace this giant war dog of the most seasoned that all feared.

Power, true power, all-powerful, belongs to the Lord, the eternal God, and to him alone. The Lord does not change, there is not even a shadow of variation in him, what he has done in the past, he will do again. It is he who brought, through his servants Moses and Aaron, the ten plagues on Egypt because of the pride of the pharaoh of the time.

It is also the Lord who warned the king of Babylon to stop his abominations, through a dream that the prophet Daniel deciphered for him, however, not having repented, he became mad, during the time that God had decided.

Throughout the centuries, the powerful of this world have always believed to be the master of their future and their secular power, but this is not the case!

In this century, as was the case for Daniel, Moses, Aaron or David, the Lord gives me to stand up for justice and truth and the monarch of the present time whom I face, the President of the French Republic, Mr. Emmanuel MACRON, is just as proud and despotic as the pharaoh whom Moses and Aaron faced, or as the king of Babylon in the time of the prophet Daniel, and he does not fear the Lord as was the case with Goliath.

I shouted at Mr. MACRON, asking him, in the email I sent him on **June 7, 2022 (see production no. 12)**, to act according to justice and truth.

I presented to him the reality of the biblical text, [Luke 14 verses 31-32], but for his part, believing himself to be “all-powerful”, he had nothing but contempt for me and let me steep in **“my juice of suffering”**.

This email is reported in the section entitled **“Bases presenting the responsibility incumbent on the French State for the harm suffered by Mr. MARGUERITE”**.

Unfortunately for him, the Spirit of God showed me in a dream that the “all-powerful” of Mr. MACRON is only relative in the face of the plan that the Lord has foreseen, because as President of the Republic, he will have to bend and grant me what I ask, which is none other than justice. I saw that the splendor of Mr. MACRON was like that of a titanic buffalo and a majestic leopard, which seemed, in the eyes of all, invulnerable, but that, like David, I would defeat him using the legal weapon for this.

I also saw that these two laws incriminated in this book will be broken, in the powerful name of Jesus Christ. Like the leopard, which I saw in a dream and which seemed invulnerable is, in these troubled times, Mr. Emmanuel MACRON.

To understand this, I believe it is important to remember that the President of the Republic (French) has nothing more to lose, because he cannot claim a new quinquennium and he is also exempt from having to answer, after his mandate, for the decisions and actions taken within the framework of his function, unless it is proven that he has exceeded his rights.

In doing so, he has no use for the “common people”, only the wealthy, the powerful are the object of his affection, he pampers them, cajoles them, the objective being certainly to prepare a golden parachute for himself, by ensuring that he has the right contacts, for a dream life post-presidential mandate.

In response, I would say that my objective is to neutralize and weaken Mr. MACRON and his government, through legislative texts and to highlight to all French people, the reality that we have experienced, under the yoke of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, which are nevertheless unconstitutional.

What makes this action possible and which will allow us to constrain Mr. MACRON is *[(French) Article 68 de la constitution du 4 octobre 1958 (translated into English from the original text)]* which provides:

“The President of the Republic can only be dismissed in the event of failure to fulfill his duties that is manifestly incompatible with the exercise of his mandate. Dismissal is pronounced by Parliament constituted as the High Court.”

Furthermore, as a complement, we must consider the text of *[(French) Conseil constitutionnel. Le Président est-il responsable ? La responsabilité du fait des actes accomplis dans l'exercice du mandat présidentiel. Taken from: <https://www.conseil-constitutionnel.fr/la-constitution/le-president-est-il-responsable> (translated into English from the original text)]* which establishes, among other things, the following:

“The first paragraph of Article 67 of the Constitution establishes the principle of the irresponsibility of the President of the Republic for acts carried out in the exercise of his functions. However, two exceptions are provided for in the same paragraph: - the conviction of the Head of State by the International Criminal Court (Article 53-2 of the Constitution) in the event of crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes or aggression; [...]”.

Here, the foundations of the responsibility of Mr. MACRON, President of the French Republic are laid. This reality is due to the fact that, through his government, he enacted, in the context of the pandemic, vaccinal laws against covid-19, while not allowing the French to enjoy their right of retraction through informed conscience.

Which contravenes the “Declaration of Helsinki” and is therefore unconstitutional. To learn more about this topic, please refer to the chapter **“On the alleged internal illegality of the vaccinal laws against covid 19”**.

A situation of cause and effect, this vaccinal obligation against covid 19 resulted in the death of several vaccinated people, the deterioration of the health of many others and the bankruptcy of several of those who refused to be vaccinated and who found themselves in forced technical unemployment, as was my case.

What I have just presented establishes, in my opinion, the aggression that Mr. MACRON has shown against the French and that I would describe as **“socio-economic violence”**.

Thus, the vaccinal laws against covid 19 which established the vaccinal obligation, under penalty of forced technical unemployment for companies and restriction of individual freedoms for all French people, not having a legal or active legislative basis, are null and void. In doing so, by establishing these unconstitutional laws, Mr. MACRON and his government have forced the French, without a valid law allowing it, which contravenes the following legal texts:

- *[Guide sur l'article 7 de la Convention européenne des droits de l'homme. I. Introduction],*
- *[(French) Article 5 de la Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen de 1789].*

To continue, I would say that my objective, above all, based on the legislative texts, is to highlight to all French people the reality that has been ours, under the yoke of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, which are nevertheless unconstitutional, I remind you.

I bring you today what seems to me to be the solution to be victorious against these citadels. “The powerful weapon”, without false modesty, that I propose to achieve this flamboyant victory is my case that I must present before the Bordeaux Court of Appeal and which has as its epicenter the vaccinal laws against covid-19 and the Sunday laws for which I filed a QPC intended to enable the Constitutional Council, under cover of the Council of State, to repeal them.

What opens the field of possibilities in this matter, as we have seen, is *[(French) Article 61-1 de la Constitution du 4 octobre 1958 (translated into English from the original text)]* which establishes the following: **“When, during proceedings in progress before a court, it is argued that a legislative provision infringes on the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, the Constitutional Council may be referred to this question upon referral from the Council of State or the Court of Cassation, which shall rule within a specified period. [...]”**

This move to repeal the vaccinal laws against covid 19 will give us two possibilities for compensation:

1. The first, through a peaceful mobilization of the greatest number of French people whose goal would be to force Mr. MACRON to repeal these unconstitutional laws that are referred to in this book, accompanied by damages for those who have suffered losses or deprivations. In this context, I am hopeful that Mr. MACRON may find it wiser to put in place the system to repeal these two laws incriminated in this document and ensure that compensation can be paid to those who have suffered under their yoke. To do this, he could call on his government to use *[(Frenchh) Article 49-3 de la Constitution]*, to do the people justice, which would be a first. In fact, history has rather shown that he used it to impose laws that were unpopular in the eyes of the majority of French people or to nip in the bud those that did not go his way. What will happen to these? What will happen to them? It must be added that this article of law (French), commonly called the **49-3**, seems to be similar to the beast of Gévaudan that Mr. MACRON and Co. piloted, with mastery, it must be recognized. But hey... it is true that “that was before”, according to the popular expression. Today, “the wind has turned” and this beast has turned against his government, his Prime Minister M. Barnier and him.
2. The second solution would be for Mr. MACRON, his government and their supporters, to choose to resist the grievances presented here. Therefore, within the framework of my QPC, the objective sought, with the support and mobilization of all, is that the Constitutional Council (French) succeeds in repealing these incriminated laws and that damages are paid to the victims of said laws. The aim would be that once the vaccinal laws against covid 19 are repealed, the necessary procedures are put in place, including an appeal from as many people as possible so that Parliament can constitute itself as a High Court, with a view to Mr. MACRON being dismissed as President of the Republic.

Now that these bases are laid, it is important to note that with regard to the vaccinal laws against covid-19, the target is broad because it concerns all French citizens.

On the other hand, for the Sunday laws, those who are concerned are essentially the Sabbath and Shabbat observers, but also all business leaders, who cannot, if they do not have an exemption, allow their employees, who would like to, to work more than five Sundays per year. In this area, two fields could open up:

1. Once the Sunday laws are repealed, that compensation can be paid to those who have suffered, as was my case, losses because of them.
2. Once these laws are repealed, that a possibility of growth can open up to French companies, which could now, on a voluntary basis, allow their employees to work every Sunday, particularly those who have Saturday as their day of worship.

As you can see, my fight is that of all French people, however, I cannot lead it alone, because my established opponents in our Nation are powerful. In order to obtain help, I am counting on the fact that human beings are always inclined to fight for their own interests.

In doing so, for the moment this ogre that is these Sunday laws which have oppressed the observers of the Sabbath and the Shabbat for so many years, is only a news item for the majority of French people, which they discover between the cheese and the dessert, and which they forget once they leave the table.

We must therefore mobilize all French people, by drawing their attention to a possibility of compensation that could be paid to everyone, once the vaccinal laws against covid-19 are repealed.

This is how the greatest number will be able to mobilize, since they feel concerned and make Mr. MACRON bend on the points listed. With this chapter, my goal is therefore to reach out to the French people so that they mobilize en masse around my crusade, by drawing their attention to a possibility of compensation that could be paid to everyone, once the vaccinal laws against covid-19 and the Sunday laws are repealed.

Today, I need you, so that I can lead this crusade, on four fronts:

1. For the moment, I have a law firm that has been assigned to me ex officio, but time is pressing and the appeal file and the QPC that I have put together are each 120 pages long, this case will most certainly be too time-consuming to be defended in this context. In doing so, for my case to be brought to a conclusion, I would need the assistance of lawyers specializing in administrative matters and who can mobilize to achieve the repeal of these incriminated laws because I do not have the finances, in the immediate future, to mandate a lawyer to initiate this procedure.
2. The second of my needs is that all of France can hear my story and read my book as a free download, the goal being that like a hurricane, we can make my cause heard, which is also yours. Like autumn leaves carried away by the wind, share my book entitled **“Infamy of the State”** by all means:
By email, Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, Tik Tok, etc.
3. My third need is to obtain logistical means in order to be able to travel around France and hold meetings, where I would present my fight and therefore my book. The objective is always to mobilize the greatest number.
4. To those who have influence, I also need your help so that the national and international media can receive me, so that my fight is known to all.
The desired goal is that the greatest number can hear my story and read my book entitled **“Infamy of the State”** for free download so that, **like a tsunami, we can break the despotic and monarchical reign of the “self-proclaimed all-powerful sovereign”, Mr. Emmanuel MACRON.**

In order to be victorious, I need as many people as possible to mobilize, because my fight concerns us all, so that justice is done for the deprivations of liberty and the losses we have suffered. Like union making strength, thank you for your attention to my request. I hope that this support (Book), which I am making available to you, will allow us to be heard by as many people as possible and to be victorious.

May we all, in collegiate unity, join my request to these individual efforts, intended to fill “the bag of our grievances” and thereby give it weight in the face of the French State, which now works on its nation like Prince John, supported by the Sheriff of Nottingham and his henchmen. Thank you for your attention to my request. I remain at your disposal.

Best greetings,

M. Kenny Ronald MARGUERITE

7 Of Suffering and Ink

To begin this part, I would say that generally in life, following the experiences that I live, particularly the negative ones, I sit down and reflect and in a spirit of prayer, I seek to understand what happened to me and the reasons for what I lived or suffered. With these established bases, in the case of Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, this unjust civil servant, I looked for avenues of reflection to explain his behavior.

Have other people, like me, experienced these misadventures, these tribulations under his yoke? Could it be my basis of faith that poses a problem for him, because the very names of my companies demonstrate that I am a Christian, because the first is called Éditions Dieu t'aime sas (EDT SAS) which means in english Edition God loves you and the second has the trade name Éditions Galaad.

So, is this gentleman anti-Christian? Or is he a fanatical follower of the Catholic Church and is he aware of my books which denounce the abominable acts as well as the transgressions of the word of God which are behind this religion?

To discover these realities, I invite you to read my books entitled **“Inquisitiô (The three angels' message), volume II The reality of the attack of the little horn of Daniel 7 against the Law of God and the times of prophecy. Historical part”** and **“Inquisitiô (The three angels' message), tome III. The reality of the attack of the little horn of Daniel 7 against the Law of God and the times of prophecy. Prophetic part”**.

To continue, I would tell you that to this day I am fighting like a lion so that my cause is heard. In doing so, when I realized that the President of the Republic, Mr. MACRON and his government would not provide me with any concrete help, not wanting to give up and with a view to diversifying the potential possibilities of support, I therefore undertook to make my situation known to elected officials.

To do this, I wrote an open letter that I sent on August 10, 2021 to all French senators and deputies, on their messaging services available on the websites of the Senate and the National Assembly.

Unfortunately, no one intervened. Perhaps I was naive in hoping for a response? I also sent an email to the president of the territorial community of Martinique on the same date (August 10, 2021), from this side, ditto, no response.

No one wanted to hear me at the level of the State and other political bodies, in doing so, on this day, December 18, 2024, I find myself in a more critical situation than a homeless person. Has Mr. GUILGAULT's plan finally been achieved?

Do you realize that I asked for help from the representatives of the people, our deputies and our senators, more than three years ago and no follow-up was given, leaving me **“macerate in my juice of suffering”**.

That the upper echelons of the State do not deign to hear my cry is one thing, but that the representatives of the people, the elected officials who are supposed to represent us, do the same, that devastates me. What analysis can be drawn from what is happening to me? How can we understand that no one has reacted, even by trying to inquire about my situation to know if what I am reporting is reality, especially since I have provided proof of what I am saying?

Nothing “abnormal” a priori about all this! A business leader can be prevented from working by the State, among other things because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19, therefore hindered in spite of himself and be broken, spolied by a civil servant, without anyone feeling concerned.

It is true that we know the administrative slowness but when I find myself with less than the minimum vital to live, does my case not deserve at least a verification of my statements?

To continue, I would say that the crowning glory of this affair is that this official whose name I have mentioned so many times, managed to bring a business leader who had two businesses that were beginning to prosper, to find himself in a worse financial situation than that of homeless people (SDF).

Here is an image that comes to mind when considering my situation:

I find myself like a man who was shipwrecked on a desert island with only a crate of canned goods for a living. On this island, there is no way to open these cans that do not have an easy opening. You can hit them with stones, but it only deforms them but does not open them because these cans are made of reinforced steel.

So, while there is a small fresh water point nearby, a cargo of canned goods that would have allowed him to live for months, here he is fainting, and on the verge of dying the most atrocious death, of hunger, on a load of canned goods.

This image represents well what I am experiencing because, on the one hand I have two companies, but I wasn't able to work there for months, because I am not vaccinated and the vaccinal laws against covid 19 forbade me to do so, while they themselves contravene the constitution.

On the other hand, this aid which could have allowed me to keep my head above water was no longer paid to me, because of the approximate handling of my file by this tax official. I have been living in great suffering for months!

Nevertheless, on this day, I realize that the ways of heaven are inscrutable and that the Lord guides us on the most incomprehensible paths so that we can work in his name.

When I took up the pen to write this book, my primary objective was simply to make my voice heard so that the blatant injustice of which I am a victim, under the yoke of Mr. GUILGAULT, would cease. To do this, I took several steps, I had, among other things, good hope of being heard by the President of the Republic, a deputy, a senator, the prefect of MARTINIQUE, a local elected official, etc. finally someone, but here it is, more than three years later none of them have moved.

I have already presented to you all the steps that I have put in place.

So, as already presented, at that time, things had become so difficult that I also intellectualized that from now on I was part of the "disadvantaged", by submitting, at the beginning of February 2022, an application for aid to the CCAS of my city of residence.

My words are in no way pejorative, they simply come from the fact that it is generally those who are in great precariousness who approach this organization.

In response, I was granted aid of 200 euros, 100 of which were paid in February 2022 and the rest in March. This approach that I undertook at the CCAS left two feelings in me:

The first is the need to ensure that justice is done to me and that the unspeakable acts of this tax official, making me go from the state of business leader to that of begging, are known by as many people as possible.

The second feeling that drives me towards this approach is gratitude, because seeing myself reduced to such a condition which is certainly very difficult, but that the Lord opened this door to me, allowing me to have this help from the CCAS filled me with joy.

I am grateful to those who are part of the committee for the allocation of this aid within the Lamentin Town Hall (MARTINIQUE). May the Lord bless and protect you all, as well as your loved ones.

It is comforting for me to know that these structures are listening to the needs of the little people. Yes, I still have not "digested" the non-return of the senators, the deputies or the president of the CTM, while I am in this great precariousness.

I am aware that I am not the only one in this situation, but even just a response to show that our fate does not leave our elected representatives in complete indifference would have made all the difference.

Did France need a new poor person, did it need a new person on welfare, living on minimum social benefits?

Where is France going, if from now on the iniquitous (malicious), the powerful, can oppress, with complete impunity, the little people?!

So, having found myself alone with my pain, with no one to help me, I had to do what the Lord gives me to do best, dissect texts to extract the substantive marrow. It is with a pen of suffering that I do it.

The end result is that the primary reason for which I undertook to write, and which is the chapter entitled “**New evidence on the responsibility of the civil servant Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT, as head of the FIP accounting department other categories, in the alleged external illegality**”, has become secondary and an insignificant part of my work presented in this book.

Today, I glorify God for guiding me on this path, for allowing me to search for texts in order to present my right to defend myself and along the way, by dint of “to potasser (studying)”, I came across a gold mine of information that allowed me to go well beyond my initial approach.

So, today, I am given the opportunity to defend the cause of those not vaccinated against covid 19 who have been bullied, stigmatized. Why? While the various texts that I report in this book clearly show that there is a transgression of the law in what is put in place, by France but also by many countries.

Then, in a second step, the Spirit of God inspired me to fight for my rights as well as those of all Sabbath and Shabbat observers who have been oppressed by Sunday laws for centuries.

What more noble fight than that of shedding light on what women and men have experienced and where they have unjustly lost their lives, under the wrath of the black widow that is the Catholic Church, just because they had chosen to remain faithful to the Lord and rejected the dogma of this religion.

This is how the result of my sufferings under the yoke of this iniquitous official who works in taxes gave a result in three poles which ended up in this book forming only one, as if by a fusion, thus, in these pages all my struggles found the same setting (jewel case), to be able to express themselves.

To continue, I would like to tell you a secret:

I am not a lawyer, and these subjects that are dealt with in this work, until recently, just before I started writing, I did not master them at all, and the texts that I quote in these lines were for the most part unknown to me.

Amazing, you might say, why, especially with regard to the vaccinal laws against covid 19, have lawyers not carried out these analyses that are presented here? How can a neophyte have the audacity to present such a file?

In response, I would tell you that it is the Spirit of God who guided me to these texts and I want to glorify the Lord for this spiritual sword that he gives me to carry to you, singularly, to those who are suffering because of these discriminatory laws which, concerning the vaccinal laws, prevented them from carrying out their activities because they were not vaccinated against covid 19 or, within the framework of the Sunday laws, which force them to be unemployed, in spite of themselves on Sundays.

I know that for many of you, presenting the all-powerful of God and highlighting the magnificence of his works may seem pure madness.

And yet! Only the future will tell if the legal cases that I am carrying out and which are presented in this book will be favorable to me. If I win my case, especially in the case relating to the vaccinal laws against covid 19, it will be clear that the Lord is indeed on my side and that I have not lost my mind, his all-powerful will thus be recognized. Because where jurists, lawyers, deputies, senators etc., have not been able to defeat the vaccinal laws against covid 19, I, who do not have legal training, under the aegis of God, have been able to.

So, listen, because the future will tell us what it is!

Some might have capitulated, would not have laid themselves bare by revealing such difficult and personal elements, but writing helps me to externalize the unthinkable, especially since I do not endorse violence as a means of dialogue, because other means of expression to make oneself heard exist.

Proof of this is, because although unjustly oppressed, cornered, I do not resort to violence but to the pen, to make myself heard and I thank the Lord for what he has done with me (makes me become).

One of the realities that is mine on this day is that I will not give up, until justice is done to me, and I will cry out with all my soul against the abominations that I have suffered. In the Mighty name of Jesus Christ, he the King of kings and the Lord of lords, all those who are at the origin of my downfall **“will not have my skin”**, I will fight to the end like a lion.

So, while the pitfalls present themselves like the Red Sea and the problems and difficulties follow me like the raging Egyptians. I am certainly destitute, but I continue to move forward despite life's storms thanks to my faith and the fact that I know I serve a great God. So I know he will act, one way or another!

In doing so, one thing is certain, although I am weakened by this extremely difficult and damaging situation for me (you now know the details of the case), these people will not destroy me because, as I have indicated, the Lord gives me the ability to put, through my pen, my experiences and my feelings, it is my outlet.

This book was written in French and English, so my story which goes beyond understanding will be known beyond borders.

I am not asking for vengeance, I am letting God act in his time. My goal is that justice be done to me, as well as to all those who have suffered and are still suffering the repercussions of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday laws, which are nevertheless unconstitutional and who therefore do not have the right to be in France.

To continue, I would say that we have come a long way, so far!

Throughout these lines I am convinced that I have armed you, with a view to asserting your rights or those of all those who are or have been suffering under the iniquitous rule of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 and the Sunday laws.

With this argument, the fruit of my reflection, I would like to challenge you, whether you are French or an inhabitant of another part of the globe:

1. Now that you have read this book, do you think I am paranoid?
2. Do my words seem like quibbles to you?
3. Do you think that in this century, in this country that is France, which prides itself on being the country of human rights, that what I have experienced has a reason to exist?
4. Can a civil servant, in an iniquitous (malicious) manner and without any reason, torment a business leader by forcing him to close his doors and reducing him to a state of begging, without anyone protesting...?
5. Can a government, which is supposed to serve the people, in the country that has the reputation of being the country of human rights, with impunity enact discriminatory and baseless laws and decrees in order to oppress a part of its people, without anyone protesting?
6. Where have gone the law, justice, fraternity and chivalrous qualities that make the honor of the human being?
7. If you were in my place what would you do, or if you were in the place of these caregivers who find themselves without resources, because they chose in their soul and conscience not to be vaccinated against covid 19, or that of these Sabbath or Shabbat observers who suffer the iron yoke of Sunday laws what would you wish?

To you who are reading me, do not forget that my current pain and that of the unvaccinated against covid 19 who have been forced into unemployment, or that of the Sabbath or Shabbat observers who are hindered by these iniquitous Sunday laws, could well be yours, or that of one of your loved ones.

Well, what you would have wanted for yourself, do it for us!

Let your cries rise from the depths of the universe to denounce these abominations that we are made to experience as those who are not vaccinated against covid 19, or as Sabbath or Shabbat observers or that I lived under the yoke of Mr. Vincent GUILGAULT without the representatives of the State intervening.

I expect your help, do not wait for death to strike us to come with flowers, cry on our graves and set us up as martyrs of the system.

It is now that we need you, today is the day when you must act, not only so that justice is done for me, but even more, in order to deliver all those who have lost their jobs because of the vaccinal laws against covid 19 or the Sabbath or Shabbat observers who are dispossessed by Sunday laws.

It is up to us to change things, by the grace of God.

To do this, (again I give you a little biblical wink), one of the beautiful images I have of unity that brings victory is presented in [*Ecclesiastes 4 verses 9-12, King James Bible*] which establishes the following: **“Two are better than one; because they have a good reward for their labour. 10 For if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow: but woe to him that is alone when he falleth; for he hath not another to help him up. Again, if two lie together, then they have heat: but how can one be warm alone? And if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken.”**

This text in its essence, presents, for me, the union as making the strength. The victory of the Allies, despite their faith or their diverse convictions, during the Second World War, shows us the value of the unity of all against tyranny.

You must now act.

My fiancée Nicole and I have done more than our part, because this book, as you have been able to realize, which is the fruit of a long and hard work, we offer it to you, so that you can change things.

Indeed, in accordance with what the Spirit of God inspired me, this document had to be free, so that all those who feel concerned by the cause can read it and mobilize.

Share this support (book) with as many people as possible, by all means, **by email, Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, Tik Tok, etc.**, I make it available to you in French and English, on my site. You will find these coordinates at the end of this chapter.

One of the blessings that God gave me was to touch the heart of my fiancée Nicole, so that she could agree to give shape to my ideas and correct this long document that you have in your hands in its French version.

Unfortunately, the correction could not be complete, since this file had to come out as soon as possible, so mistakes may remain, and we ask you to excuse us for this.

To continue, I would say that I have worked on average 8 to 12 hours a day on this file, in English and French versions, since October 2021 and I am in the process of finalizing it today, December 18, 2021.

The goal being that it comes out as soon as possible. At the same time, I continued, as I said, to work on my other works.

You received the fruit of this work for free.

In return, I have included a request for financial assistance that I am asking from those who will read me. Thus, even if I am currently in need, because of a situation beyond my control, I am hopeful of receiving help. Thanks to her, and this already makes me happy, I will be able to share my thoughts and convictions which will not fall into disuse.

My work will therefore not be in vain because it will, I am sure, enrich those who will read my books. So that you can understand my philosophy and my faith, I will present you with an allegory:

Imagine that you have an orange tree that gives you abundant oranges that are as sweet as honey, which you intend to sell. However, situated where you are, no one knows that you have any for sale. As a result, your oranges rot on the tree while you are in need. To change this situation, you make plans to sell them and to do so you present them at a fair so that as many people as possible can taste them. Knowing that they are as sweet as you want them to be, you know that those who come and taste them will be conquered and that you will be able to live off your harvest.

This persona that I adopt to present my books may seem presumptuous to you. Nevertheless, for me, my works are like oranges, since they are the fruit of extensive research and a lot of hard work. Given their content, I am confident that they will provide you with knowledge that will strengthen you. I still have much to tell you through my books, which are in the process of being published.

I invite you, through their lines, to make new journeys. Before continuing, I would like to make it clear that I did not study literature, I am above all a passionate author not a writer.

I address various themes in my books, as is the case in this one, which are dear to my heart and which highlight my deep convictions. This love of writing came to me one day when I had to reflect on the fleeting duration of our life on Earth.

Many people have worked, enjoy the fruits of their labour during their lifetime, but often after their death there is nothing left of what they were, of their thoughts, or of their convictions. They go down into the grave and **“wither away like the ether”**.

I have no knowledge of what my forefathers were like. What their convictions were or what they did during their lives. All of this remains a mystery to me. Especially since I hail from the Caribbean, I come from a people who have experienced the chains and alienation of slavery. My need to write and my passion for words have stemmed from these reflections! On the other hand, when I read books that great authors like Tertullian, Martin Luther or Ellen G. White, the great reformers, etc., wrote a long time ago, I get to know them and their writings strengthen me. My need to write and my passion for words have stemmed from these reflections!

My ambition in this life is neither wealth nor fame. My abiding goal is to bring my knowledge to this generation and to leave a literary legacy to future generations. My deepest wish is to convey my knowledge and convictions in writing in order to share my books with those who will enjoy them and who, I hope, will be inspired by them. **There is still much to do.**

If this book you have in your hands has strengthened you, I invite you to read and distribute my other works to as many people as possible, because they will certainly bring you knowledge that will certainly also be beneficial to you. Many of these books are, or will soon be, by the grace of God available for free download on my website.

Unfortunately for me, “money being the sinews of war”, since I have already invested all of my funds in the publishing of these first books that I presented to you before, in the section entitled “REMINDER OF FACTS AND PROCEDURE”, in doing so, I no longer have the means to continue this work. Indeed, apart from these books that I mentioned, I still have *5 other works (Book)* that I have already put in place the framework but which are awaiting completion.

To conclude this beautiful journey that we have made thanks to this book, I would say to you that I hope that it will find its audience and that you, who will be led to read it, will not remain insensitive to this call for help that I address to you. I therefore appeal to your generosity. If you have been touched by this book, please help me to continue to fortify and help the greatest number of people. To do this, if you feel like it, you have the possibility to make a donation on one of the tabs **“Donate (with Paypal)”** or **“Faire un don (avec Paypal)”** present on my site: **kenny-ronald-marguerite.com**. **NB:** (tab located on the screen, on the left for computers and at the bottom for the mobile phones).