

The following chapters were taken from „The American Inquisition“, to be downloaded free at http://schou.de/literature/American_Inquisition.pdf

Modern Weapons

The Geneva Convention and SIrUS

The Geneva Conventions were the results of efforts by Henry Dunant, who was motivated by the horrors of war he witnessed at the Battle of Solferino in 1859. The adoption of the First Convention followed the foundation of the International Committee of the Red Cross [ICRC] in 1863. This convention was modified in 1949, 1977 and 2005.

It was at Dum-Dum near Calcutta that the British Army modified a bullet in order to improve its stopping power. What exactly this bullet achieved is controversially described, but the name was adapted to bullets with a rather flat front. With the bullets having by now gained speed, they tended to traverse the body, being deadly only when they thereby penetrated vital structures such as the heart or big vessels, but otherwise drew their victim out of combat. The alteration changed the effect of the bullet: it now caused larger tissue destructions, spreading off from the place of entrance. This caused immediate condemnation, already in 1899 in the Hague Declaration [1357]. The text utilized that of the St Petersburg Declaration in 1868, which had condemned exploding bullets with the same effect.

1357

[http://www.icrc.org/Web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/irrc_849_Coupland_et_Loye/\\$File/irrc_849_Coupland_et_Loye.pdf](http://www.icrc.org/Web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/irrc_849_Coupland_et_Loye/$File/irrc_849_Coupland_et_Loye.pdf)

The following century, inspired by the great calamities of the World Wars, had the effect of bringing further restrictions to the means of warfare (from nerve gas to land mines), but with the exception of the recent ban on cluster bombs (see below). The SIrUS initiative of ICRC (an attempt to put a general ban on weapons causing “Superfluous Injury or Unnecessary Suffering”) to which I had the honour to participate, attempted to ban also weapons that were not invented or sufficiently elaborated (e.g., laser beams causing blindness); however, this attempt was not successful. In the third Millennium, all humanitarian efforts seem to have been blocked by evil forces. We now talk about ‘man-stopping ammunition,’ an old and forbidden concept.

A-Weapons

Only two nuclear bombs have been dropped over civil targets – those of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. However, largely unnoticed, much more radioactive stuff in the form of so-called “depleted uranium” [DU] has been distributed over countries like Serbia (by NATO, 1999), Afghanistan (by USA, since 2001), Lebanon (by Israel, 2006) and most intensively Iraq (1991 and since 2003). DU is also a suitable way to get rid of the waste products of nuclear power. The “Gulf-war-syndrome” from which many of the Allied veterans from then are suffering, is probably caused by DU also babies fathered by 482

American former soldiers showed an alarming increase in birth defects – and that was just what it caused on the 'guests.' Imagine what it caused upon those living among the radiation. Cancer rate in Iraq has increased tenfold, and the number of birth defects has multiplied fivefold times since the 1991 war. DU is the probable cause [1358].

1358 http://www.gulfwarvets.com/du_cancer_rates.htm

1359 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/The%20Unnoticed%20B-Weapon.pdf>

1360 <http://www.news.com.au/heraldsun/story/0,21985,24905242-5005961,00.html>

B-Weapons

The problem with biological weapons is that the Germs are not discriminating between friend and foe – unless (most of) the friends are protected and the foes are not. *It is hoped by the potential users of the B-Weapons that it might be possible to protect the own population while the man-guided pandemic rages.* So far, experiments with Ciprofloxacillin against Anthrax, Tamiflu against the laboriously revived "Spanish Flu" from frozen graves of the 1918 victims and vaccination against smallpox have not proved convincing results – probably only therefore have we not seen any such pandemics. But be sure, somewhere in the world, somebody is still working with the biological weapons [1359].

C-Weapons

That also chemical weapons are employed, is actually a war crime, although in accordance with the present-days deterioration in human values that the Bush administration in the US and the Sharon/Olmert in Israel can call their own product. **White phosphor** was used in 2004 over Fallujah – only, of course, to make light in the dark (but an ample amount of photos shows the 'enlightened' victims). Also Israel has in its recent war-fares against Gaza and Lebanon used some other sort of chemical weapon, Dense Inert Metal Explosives (DIME), an experimental kind of explosive, against its adversaries [1360].

D-Weapons

The extensive use of unmanned flying vehicles („Drones") in warfare and civilian surveillance, combined with the readiness to accept extensive collateral damage, justifies to consider this a separate category of abhorrent weapons.

E-Weapons

As such I characterize electrical weapons, notably the Taser [1361]. It is distributed as a milder alternative to shot-guns but has been widely abused by police forces, thereby having caused more than 300 deaths (Spring 2008). The manufacturing firm is eager to fight these adverse cases – in prosecuting the doctors who claim that their patient's death was caused by taser shocks [1362,1363]. However, there is ample evidence [1364,1365] proving that tasering can lead to cardiac arrest. In some of the witnessed, abusive cases, you can even talk about an 'electrocution.'

1361 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/Taser%20Just%20a%20Small%20Jolt.pdf>

1362 http://rawstory.com/news/2008/Judge_orders_all_references_to_Taser_0504.html

1363 <http://www.azcentral.com/news/articles/2008/05/02/20080502taser0503.html>

1364 <http://www.infowars.net/articles/may2008/220508Tasers.htm>

1365 <http://www.heise.de/tp/r4/artikel/27/27910/1.html>

1366 <http://www.schou.de/phem/landmine.html>

Landmines and Cluster Bombs

It may cause wonder that operation with landmines is still not considered what it actually is – a war crime. At another place, I have dealt extensively with these vicious devices [1366].

As was the case with the landmine treaty, various countries made their best (and partially successful) attempts to dilute the contents of the treaty text, to be signed in Oslo on December 8, 2008. There will be a transitional time of several years to get rid of the supplies (hopefully not by using them). Then there was the definition: Less than 20 kg must a cluster bomb weigh, be dispersed when used and contain more than 10 sub-ammunitions. Permitted is conversely a bomb that is larger, contains up to 10 small bombs, is target-related and contains self-destruction mechanisms. Also ammunition without explosives is allowed. It is also accepted that military missions are carried out with other nations that use cluster bombs, even when the very mission is included. Several NATO-members had wanted such a possibility, in order not to compromise their cooperation with Big Brother.

Both the landmine treaty and negotiations about the ban on cluster bombs have been ignored by the producer- and user-countries USA, Israel, India, Pakistan, Russia and China. Weapons of the kind are even evil and so are those who stick to them.

War-Crimes

The unlimited search for new weapons to increase suffering in this World must be seen in connection to the moral decay in the third Millennium [1367]. The torture scandal, including the so-called 'rendition' of prisoners to countries where they can be tortured [1368] is symptomatic of this mental change. This has first of all taken place in the USA, for which I find Michael Rivero's comment a suitable conclusion: "The US should just withdraw from **any** human rights accords to which it has been signatory just declare loudly to the rest of the world that the US does torture, and the sign-off on torture comes from the highest levels of this administration" [1369].

1367 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/Changing%20Moral%20in%20the%203rd%20Millenium.pdf>

1368 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/Torture-Scandal.pdf>

1369 <http://www.whatreallyhappened.com>

May 30, 2008
Revised February 21, 2009 485

Taser – Just a Small Jolt?

The spread of the tasers can be seen as symptomatic for a deterioration of the respect for human life in the third millennium, rather than a technical improvement. A huge discrepancy is found between the aimed safe and harmless weapon on one side and the lacking safety and horrendous abuse on the other.

A safe remedy

The current taser depends on a current and thus a wired connection between weapon and victim. That limits its use to a few meters but a wireless improvement may soon be available [1370]. Two small arrows ascertain the connection, not necessarily in the victims flesh – the high voltage, 5,000 V, suffices for the remaining transfer. The current delivers 1.6 mA over 1.5 sec, which is considered 'harmless' and generally does not create lasting marks. It does, however, suffice to create general muscular contraction and unconsciousness, whereby the victim falls to the ground and thereby possibly gains the marks, which the electric current primarily spared. The abuse of tasers against people who are already sitting or lying makes these marks less prone to occur in the general population of taser victims.

1370 <http://www.thestar.com/sciencetech/Technology/article/281670>

1371 <http://www.taser.fr/>

1372 http://rawstory.com/news/2007/Amnesty_International_Taser_victims_penalty_should_1126.html

1373 http://www.unog.ch/80256EDD006B9C2E/%28httpNewsByYear_en%29/D3DD9DE87B278A87C125739C0054A81C?OpenDocument

The firm wants to sell as many as possible, and in rogue nations it can be obtained even by private persons for around 300 \$. It is therefore to be expected that all claims of danger and torture are challenged. The French Taser Chief Antoine di Zazzo claims that he has tried it 50 times [1371] and also some security fanatics under the politicians occasionally claims they have tested it out (Le Pen in France, Christoph Blocher in Switzerland).

Tasers are widely used in USA, UK, France and Canada and are also present, but more cautious used, in Australia, New Zealand and Sweden. They are forbidden in Denmark and Norway, but Danish military police have obtained the device for use abroad – probably in Denmark's liberation fight at its South-Eastern border at Hindukush.

In November 2007, Amnesty International [1372] stated that "Police use of Tasers to subdue suspects can rise to the level of torture" and simultaneously, United Nations [1373] has declared "The Committee [against Torture] was worried that the use of TaserX26 weapons, provoking extreme pain, constituted a form of torture." The fine difference is that taser use is not necessarily equalized with torture but the abuse possibly is. That obliges the responsible to define the permissive use of tasers, understanding that abuse is beyond that definition. In New Zealand [1374], Police may only use the taser to:

- Defend themselves, or others, if they fear physical injury to themselves, or others, and they cannot reasonably protect themselves, or others, less forcefully, or
- Arrest an offender if they believe on reasonable grounds that the offender poses a threat of physical injury and the arrest cannot be effected less forcefully, or

- Resolve an incident where a person is acting in a manner likely to physically injure themselves and the incident cannot be resolved less forcefully, or
- Prevent the escape of an offender if they believe on reasonable grounds that the offender poses a threat of physical injury to any person, and the escape cannot be prevented less forcefully, or
- Deter attacking animals.

This must be compared to the actual abuse in various countries.

1374 <http://www.police.govt.nz/resources/2006/taser-trial/>

1375 <http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2007/10/18/18454575.php>

1376 <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2008/04/15/bc-transit-police-taser.html>

1377 http://prisonplanet.com/articles/april2008/042108_translink_cops.htm

1378 <http://www.thenewspaper.com/news/20/2062.asp>

1379 <http://infowars.net/articles/november2007/211107Tased.htm>

1380 <http://www.startribune.com/local/north/13841301.html>

1381 <http://www.whiotv.com/news/14719706/detail.html>

1382 http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in_article_id=479341&in_page_id=1770

1383 <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/september2007/020907Taser.htm>

1384 <http://www.phillyburbs.com/pb-dyn/news/103-11032007-1434893.html>

Taser Danger and Abuse

Probably more than 300 people have died after taser use – generally taser abuse – Worldwide [1375]. Some policemen have tried it on themselves – and thereafter omitted them in their hunt against criminals. Their description raises doubt if also the before mentioned persons have received the full amplitude, if any at all.

The abuse relate to the desire of some help-sheriffs not to catch fugitives but to exert punishment here and now, e.g. for train travellers without valid ticket [1376,1377] or for minor traffic offences [1378,1379], sometimes fatally [1380]. It has been used against pregnant women [1381,1382] and children [1383]. It has also been used in arrests as an obvious mean of torture and on a sleeping man in his home [1384]. In Florida, a student was tasered and arrested for asking John Kerry questions about the 2004 election [1385]. Fatal use on non-fugitive and unarmed persons has been documented in Vancouver Airport [1386]. Repeated use of the taser has been reported in many cases, including some of the fatal ones. Using it more than once can never be necessary for stopping a fugitive, indicating a desire for 'punishment' – which deserves to be called what it is: torture.

1385 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/worldlatest/story/0,,-6930305,00.html>

1386 <http://www.heise.de/tp/r4/artikel/26/26618/1.html>

In Summary

If understood as an alternative to the use of gunshots, the taser is probably an enrichment of the police arsenal, not refuting that it is still associated with a certain vital danger. However, its use must be restricted to such cases where the suspected crime otherwise would justify the use of firearms. The massive abuse recorded is indicative of that the malice and dangers associated with this device are not recognized by its users, or these must otherwise be considered as psychopathic criminals themselves, employing torture. Therefore, each use of the taser demands reporting as generally demanded for use of firearms. Private purchase must be abandoned.

April 27, 2008

Modern Nuclear Warfare

The Anxiety for nuclear warfare has persisted since the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki came to public attention after the Second World War. Unnoticed is, however, that nuclear weapons have been employed since 1991 and already has claimed thousands of victims.

What is 'Depleted Uranium'?

The prefix 'depleted' suggest us that this is a mild version, which could also be suggested as its origin as a waste product of a nuclear power station. However, radioactivity is a standard property of uranium, and one gram will always give off 12,000 "atomic disintegrations" per second [1387]. It is pointless to discriminate between mildly, moderately and highly radioactive uranium – all uranium is highly radioactive (though not necessarily enriched).

1387 <http://www.rense.com/general63/genome.htm>

1388 <http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=80443§ionid=351020202>

1389 <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1057150.html>

1390 <http://uruknet.com/?p=m54508&hd=&size=1&l=e>

The military interest in this metal was the discovery that it is readily producing immensely high temperatures when included in bombs, shells and bullets. It produces temperatures exceeding 6,000 °C and then vaporizes, the dust eventually entering the respiratory system of distant people, friend and foe alike. But the military interest is limited to the immediate gain of this heat production, enabling the disruption of previously invincible structures. This is the working mechanism of the 'bunker-blasting bombs.'

Uses 1991-2009

The introduction of the new weapon appears to have been the first Gulf war in 1991. 375 tons were distributed then – not much compared to later use but with detrimental effects to the own troops (and probably worse to Iraqi civilians, see later).

Since then, the radioactive weapon has been dispersed over Serbia in 1995-99, Afghanistan 2001-02, Iraq again since 2003 and Lebanon by Israel in 2006. Whether it has also been used in Israel's recent destructive war against Gaza remains to be proved [1388,1389,1390]; 75 tons were reported. It has further been tested on Okinawa (Japan) and in Costa Rica in 1995-96.

Compared to the use of nuclear weapons over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which killed ~¼ million people, a much higher amount of radioactive substances have been released.

Although it is attempted to hide the number of victims, it has also been suggested that their number may bypass the Japanese figures [1391].

1391 <http://www.uruknet.info/?p=m38389&hd=&size=1&l=e>

1392 <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=1771>

1393 http://www.wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=58181

1394 <http://www.heise.de/tp/r4/artikel/30/30034/1.html>

1395 <http://whatreallyhappened.com/forum/71754>

Victims – But Keep Silent, it's a Secret!

There are four kinds of victims to uranium-ammunition: 1) the original targets, the unhappy soldiers beyond the not-so-sure armour; 2) the 'allied' or Israeli soldiers inhaling radioactive dust for months; 3) civilians exposed to the same, but for years; and 4) children produced from radioactive soldier's couplings and the mentioned civilians with devastating birth defects. Possibly, it is reasonable to identify a fifth group of victims: the soldier's wives (radioactivity transferred with semen).

Concerning the second group, the 'Gulf War syndrome' caused extreme morbidity (in 2000, 325,000 of 580,400 soldiers participating in the 1st Gulf War were on permanent medical leave [1392]) and mortality was booming among a large part of the soldiers active in Iraq since 1991 – we know now, it is a radiation toxicity, often a predecessor of a malignant disease to which there is no treatment, no cure. Medical care is denied or delayed for all uranium exposed casualties while the United States Department of Defence and the British Ministry of Defence officials continue to deny any correlation between uranium exposure and adverse health and environmental effects.

The amount of severe birth defects in Iraq since 1991 has been very impressive, though hidden to a statistical evaluation. The children had committed the crime of being siblings to inhabitants of Saddam Hussein's regime, therefore we are not interested.

In Serbia, the recipient of thousands of tons of uranium-containing bombs, the general incidence of cancer has at least doubled [1393]. Here known as the 'Balkan Syndrome,' the use of depleted uranium shells are suspected of being responsible for the ill-health of both veterans and former peacekeepers [1394]. To the victims must also be counted the future victims, since this war-crime, the spread of radioactive substances, goes on.

Rivero [1395] quotes the four qualities in the consideration of possibly inhuman weapons: **The legality test:**

Temporal Test: Weapons must not continue to act after the battle is over.

Environmental Test: Weapons must not be unduly harmful to the environment.

Territorial Test: Weapons must not act off of the battlefield.

Humaneness Test: Weapons must not kill or wound inhumanely.

Depleted uranium weaponry fails all four tests.

The SIrUS Project [1396] from Red Cross, 1997 (Towards a determination of which weapons cause "superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering"), in which I had the honour to participate, rejects nuclear weapons in general but does, however, not mention 'DU.' Now we know, that it has been used since 1991 and the nature of this weapon was kept secret successfully for many years. Even today, the connection between DU and 'The Gulf War Syndrome' is rigorously rejected by the responsible ministries. Probably, they did not know then, but now you may wonder, how the responsible leaders exert their own soldiers to radioactivity, let alone millions of civilians.

1396 http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/SIrUS-project.pdf

1397 http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/100_Questions_to_9-11.pdf

1398 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/Responsible%20for%207-7.pdf>

1399 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/Terroritis.pdf>

1400 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/Mossad%20-%20Leading%20Terrorist%20Organization.pdf>

1401 <http://www.apfn.org/apfn/du.htm>

1402 http://scienceblogs.com/deepseanews/2007/06/munitions_dumping_at_sea.php

1403 http://www.greenpeace.de/themen/atomkraft/nachrichten/artikel/endlager_gorleben_gefaehrdet_trinkwasser/

1404 <http://www.taz.de/1/zukunft/umwelt/artikel/1/salzwasser-fliesst/>

The 'Dirty Bomb'

Having dispersed so many radioactivities over some countries and openly threatening a repetition over Iran in the near future, it almost looks as hypocrisy when 'dirty bombs' (i.e. bombs causing distribution of radioactivity over large civilian areas) are in focus as possible terrorist targets. However, knowing that the majority of terrorist activities are carried out by the very governmental organs that should protect us against them [e.g. 1397,1398,1399,1400], it must be feared that the dirty bomb may really hit us (as long as it does not hit 'them,' perhaps our best defence).

Disposal of Radioactive Waste

It deserves attention that there worldwide does not exist a single 'permanent' deposit for the nuclear waste from nuclear power plants, therefore numerous 'temporary' ones. The bombs containing depleted uranium are therefore an important way to get rid of the problematic surplus [1401]. Another way has been to dump it in the oceans [1402], where then dolphins have presented impressive burns from leaking barrels. In Germany, barrels with radioactive waste are rapidly rusting in the intruding salted water of an earlier mine [1403,1404] – the ground-water will soon carry the punishment out. 491

F35 - The New Starfighter?

Suppose, the doorbell rang and a man stood outside holding a drawing of an airplane up. "This is a new model air-craft with unique features, which will make your son's friends jealous if you buy it."

"Why don't you show me the plane instead of this drawing?"

"Well, it has not yet been set in production, but all your neighbours have bought it."

"Then it must at least be cheap."

"Not exactly, but it shall be brilliant (if it can fly), therefore it is also much more expensive." As you silently close the door, you hear him add, "But if you buy it, you can take part in our bubble-gum production and there are also other more personal advantages." From the window you see the unsuccessful seller part. His colleagues from Lockheed Martin had more success with their somewhat similar marketing of their ... eh ... product. Somehow, many politicians were fast in forgetting the problems around a similar construct from the same firm.

The technical details in this article were taken from various Wikipedia articles.

The Lockheed F-104 Starfighter

The Starfighter was used in the years 1958-2004. The poor safety record of the Starfighter brought the aircraft into the public eye. The subsequent bribery scandals surrounding the original purchase contracts caused considerable political controversy in many countries.

In particular the German nation was plagued by frequent accidents. Almost a third of the 916 planes they bought were lost by accidents – there would not have been much left for the enemy – and ironic designations as 'Widowmaker' or 'Flying Coffin' prevailed. In Denmark, 12 of 29 planes crashed.

Perhaps the F35 will fly better and possibly we shall not so easily discover the inevitable corruption scandals. However, from the little which is yet known about this ambitious project, I fear you will experience a 'déjà-vu.'

F35 - the Concept

Lockheed Martin F-35 Lightning II is a stealth-fighter not yet available. It is tested in different versions since 2006, but mass-production is still years ahead. It is a stealth-aeroplane, manoeuvred by an advanced technology, but it is also a single-engine plane, thus lacking an object of security that most fighter-planes now have. Different versions were projected, but if a single of these is realized, the constructors should now be happy.

It is claimed that the F-35 is superior to all other war-fighters, but this has been doubted – and remains to be proven with the availability of the real plane. In 2008 it was reported that RAND Corporation conducted simulated war games in which Russian Sukhoi Su-35 fighters apparently defeated the F-35.

F35 – the Price

We do not know, how much the F-35 will cost, but realistic estimates may surpass \$ 1/3 trillion a piece, to be combined with much higher maintenance

costs than previously known (perhaps one battle and then a week in service?). Thus, a Pentagon study found that it may cost \$1 trillion to maintain the entire fleet over its lifetime. No wonder, for several of the eager costumers, including the United States government, these huge expenses may contribute to their economic disaster.

Let the USA maintain aerial superiority (if the F-35 can really fly reliably). Other countries should then consider if they really need this enormous expense. There are alternatives which are well tested. There is no point in competing with the big brother, whether you consider him an ally or not.

The Danish War against Libya

Such economic considerations were taken in Denmark, origin of the author. Discussing if we need this crippling acquisition (nobody could fear the bankrupted country thereafter), even a conservative parliamentarian (and he also an officer) raised the provocative question, if we at all need an air-force. Hoping to answer it positively, the Danish air-force threw them into bombing Libya back to stone age from being the most sophisticatedly developed country in Africa. The army got its war in Afghanistan, the marine hunts Somalian pirates in the Indian Ocean and now the air-force got its air-planes-only war in Libya.

However. The air-force alone cannot win a war, and now, in the fourth, the parties in NATO are seriously discussing, whether or not they should ignore the UN-resolution permitting some limited air-force activity; this resolution talked about enforcing a no-fly-zone for humanitarian reasons, not about unilateral warfare with the purpose of inducing regime-change in a member-state, and the humanitarian aspect has long been lost. "The mightiest military alliance in history is only 11 weeks into an operation against a poorly armed regime in a sparsely populated country, yet many allies are beginning to run short of munitions," said Gates, the American Minister of war on June 10 [1405]. No, Mr. Gates, I do not consider myself one of your allies (I am not a fan of Mr. Ghadafy either). And the air-force can destroy a lot, but alone win no war.

1405 http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20110610/ap_on_re_eu/eu_gates_nato_doomed

18.6.2011

Expanding Bullets

An **expanding bullet** [1406,1407,1408] is a bullet designed to expand on impact, increasing in diameter to limit penetration and/or produce a larger diameter wound. Expanding bullets were given the name Dum-dum after an early British example produced in the Dum Dum Arsenal, near Calcutta, India, already in the middle of the 19th Century. The two typical designs are the hollow point bullet and the soft point bullet. Since both types were designed to expand upon impact, they are dealt with in common here.

1406 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expanding_bullet

1407 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hollow-point_bullet

1408 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soft_point_bullet

1409 <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/INTRO/130?OpenDocument>

1410 <http://www.schou.de/terrorwar/Responsible%20for%209-11.pdf>

1411 http://www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/SIRUS-project.pdf

Rather than penetrating the body, the bullet drives tissue in an ever broader diameter in the course of its progress (the bullet delivers more energy and increases thereby tissue damage). This tend to send the soldiers hit directly to the grave rather than to the hospital. Calling these bullets 'exploding' projectiles, the Declaration of Saint Petersburg (1868) was the first formal agreement prohibiting the use of certain weapons in war [1409]. Also in 1899, it was decided to prohibit the future use of the dumdum bullet. The Hague Convention prohibits nations which are signatory from using expanding bullets in warfare. However, this convention does not apply to individuals in non-warfare situations, such as law enforcement, personal use and hunting.

In Norway 2011, Anders Behring Breivik by an exceptional mass-murder killed 69 young people by expanding bullets (victims of the preceding bomb in Central Oslo are not considered here); when the trunk was hit, regardless where, it usually meant instant death to the victims. This trend seems confirmed by the regularly occurring massacres in 'Land of the armed citizens,' except that each incident deals with smaller numbers (written Aug. 2012).

In their eager one day to kill masses of airline passengers, "terror exerts" (the true terrorists) recommend using expanding bullets for marshals in (so far only American) airplanes. However, handheld guns are imprecise and it can be expected that only a minority actually hit the target; penetration of the cabin-wall is then likely, which in high altitudes means death to all onboard – and perhaps some on the ground. And all was made after the 9-11 tale, only there were no hijackers onboard in 2001 [1410].

According to the SIRUS-project (vain attempt to banish weapons causing "superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering" [1411]), expanding bullets were banished by an initiative by Czar Alexander II in the 19th Century. Nowadays, weapons are developed without respect for this quality (e.g. causing collateral damage) and are later banished by all humanist countries – but not by producers/users. Undoubtedly, ethical standards have deteriorated since the czar's time.