



Liberty Tree

Vol. 22, No. 8 — August 2020

A compulsory jab of crown poison* vs. your inherent right to control your body.

Part I

As the corona circus wears on through 2020, the drum beat for compulsory vaccination grows increasingly strident. On August 6, three “opinion contributors” wrote an op-ed for *USA Today*,¹ proclaiming that the only way to “defeat” the woofloo is to require vaccination for all. Compulsory vaccination, they claimed, is “not un-American,” but “patriotic.” The opinion was written by Michael Lederman of Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine with a professor of law and a professor of bioethics at the same university.

It is not new for Lederman to promote coerced vaccination. As a globalist apparatchik who depends on money from the National Institutes of Health, he has made his entire career since the 1980s on the bogus HIV/AIDS “disease”; the same fraud that shaped the career of Anthony Fauci of NIH for over 35 years. In January of 2019, a year before the corona circus, Lederman tweeted that “immunization could be a prerequisite for health insurance. Unvaccinated transmitters of preventable infections could be sued by individuals and communities who acquire them.”²

The *USA Today* op-ed — and likely many more to follow — is a planned step to soften the people up for compulsory vaccination and ‘immunity certificates.’ Stating that “getting vaccinated is going to be our patriotic duty” and that “a refusal to be vaccinated threatens the lives of others,” the schemes articulated by the pro-

fessors include:

- Make vaccinations free and easily accessible.
- Exempt only those with medical contraindications to immunization (But they claim medical conditions that prohibit *all* COVID-19 vaccines will be rare!)
- Do not honor religious objections. (Because, they say, the major religions do not officially oppose vaccinations!)
- Do not allow objections for personal preference, *which violate the social contract.*

This alleged social contract, and the mantra that “we are all in this together” represents the pandemic planners’ appeal to collectivism. Their tyrannical propaganda has drilled a false fear of death from CV into the public psyche, and inculcated the belief that face diapers protect *other* people and *save lives*, and that mask refusers are selfish and dangerous bioweapons; in sum, *individuals* who exercise their liberties are a threat to the collective. This brainwashing has caused the unhinged among us to attack the mask-free; many have already encountered this irrational behavior.

Face diaper compliance is mere training and prelude, however, for compulsory vaccination — also claimed to protect *others* and *save lives*. Significantly, Lederman *et al.*’s op-ed denigrates individual rights as merely “an American tradition” of “refusal to obey rules.” Another tradition, they say, is “coming together” when necessary, the “best example” being that “no one was allowed

(Continued on page 2)



Tyrant enabler
Lederman in 2007.

* “Crown” is derived from the Anglo-French *corone*, *coroune*, going back to Latin *corōna* “wreath, garland worn on the head as a mark of honor or emblem of majesty.” “Virus” is derived from Latin *vīrus* meaning “venom, poisonous fluid.”

1. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2020/08/06/stop-coronavirus-compulsory-universal-vaccination-column/3289948001/?fbclid=IwAR2SITzqbW4pY-zgpxiFW4cRPmnUH3vZuEWIS-NU2XU3FQayQjsf2R8-7Zs>

2. Michael Lederman (@mmllederman1) Jan. 6, 2019; https://twitter.com/mmllederman1/status/1081910812900552704?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw

(Continued from page 1)

to opt out [in the World Wars] merely because it conflicted with their sense of autonomy, and draft dodgers who refused to serve were subject to penalties.” This is classic communism: government coercion is equated with the community ‘coming together.’ Even conscientious objectors to war, says Lederman, were “obligated to ... [serve] in noncombatant roles. *There are no such alternatives for vaccination.*”

Likening the planned-demic to war — and compulsory jabs to the draft — echoes the Supreme Court decision in *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, 197 U.S. 11 (1905), a 7-2 opinion upholding Massachusetts compulsory vaccination law. This decision is heavily relied on today by the tyrannical health commissars to claim that compulsory vaccination is allowed by the constitutions of the States, and that it does not violate individual freedoms guaranteed by those constitutions.

Compulsory vaccination = compulsory ID

What scheme is proposed to *enforce* compulsory vaccination? Lederman *et al* say a broad range of not just governmental, but *private* sanctions for “vaccine refusers” ought to be employed: the government should deny refusers tax credits, benefits, and school attendance; health insurers should raise refusers’ premiums; private businesses should deny them employment and service; public and private transit companies should deny them transportation; and public and private auditoriums “should require evidence of immunization for entry.”

All of these sanctions, however, can only be possible if the vaccinated are *documented every time they are jabbed*:

A registry of immunization will be needed with names entered after immunization is completed. Adequate immunization may require more than a single vaccination, and the durability of protection by different vaccines may vary and may require periodic booster immunizations. Thus, immunized persons will need to receive expiration date-stamped certification cards, which should be issued to all who are immunized in the country, whether here legally or not.³

Universal vaccine certificates are indeed the plan of technocrat globalists, as confirmed by Bill Gates on March 18, 2020 on Reddit. When asked how businesses can continue to operate while “social distancing,” Gates replied, “Eventually we will have some digital certificates to show who has recovered or been tested recently or *when we have a vaccine who has received it.*”⁴ The



Bill Gates in front of the UN logo.

concept of everyone in the world having a digital certificate to store medical information, including vaccine history, has been heavily promoted and is being developed by the ID2020 Alliance, an organization backed by the UN, Microsoft, the Rockefeller Foundation, and GAVI (the “vaccine alliance” which claims the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation as a founding partner).

In 2018, ID2020 promoted immunization as the gateway to a digital child health card to give them a unique, portable digital identity early in life, the first step to establishing a “legal, broadly recognized identity.”⁵

Vaccine certification cards, digital or otherwise, without which a person will be denied opportunities to work, travel, buy and sell are planned for our future. It is not just the right to control your own body which will be forfeited on the altar of so-called public health, but a host of other natural rights too. If surrendering your right to control and medicate your own body as you see fit is the only way to be *permitted* to exercise your rights, then it is clear that work, travel, and buying and selling are no longer viewed as *rights*. It should be obvious to all but the most blinded that “vaccine passes” are simply another mark of the beast described in Revelation.

Vaccination trumps your rights?

The “constitutional scholars” of our time — or at least, the lawyers and law professors favored by the controlled media — boldly declare that compulsory vaccination is entirely “constitutional.” Alan Dershowitz, Harvard law professor emeritus, declared on Fox News: “It is not a debatable issue constitutionally. Look, they have a right to draft you and put your life in danger to help the country. The police power of the state is very considerable.”⁶

“[Y]ou have no right to refuse to be vaccinated against a contagious disease,” Dershowitz claims. Why? “Public health, the police power of the Constitution gives the state the power to compel that. And there are cases in the United States Supreme Court.”

Likewise, John Finn, Wesleyan University law professor emeritus, declares that the 1905 *Jacobson* ruling established the protection of constitutional liberties is conditional: “our exercise of rights must not endanger others (and in so doing violate their rights) *or the public welfare.*” This, he says, is a version of the police power doctrine. Further, “a global pandemic in which a serious and deadly communicable disease can be transmitted by asymptomatic carriers ... justifies a wide range of reasonable restrictions on our liberties.”⁷ Someone should inform the clueless Finn that, at a minimum, no



3. See FN1 for source. All emphases are added, unless otherwise noted.

4. <https://vigilantcitizen.com/latestnews/bill-gates-calls-for-a-digital-certificate-to-identify-who-is-vaccinated/>

5. <https://medium.com/id2020/immunization-an-entry-point-for-digital-identity-ea37d9c3b77e>

6. <https://www.foxnews.com/media/alan-dershowitz-forced-coronavirus-vaccinations-are-constitutional>

7. <https://theconversation.com/the-constitution-doesnt-have-a-problem-with-mask-mandates-142335>

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2)

COVID-19 is *not* such a deadly disease as he describes.

Public welfare and police power

No reasonable person would argue that the exercise of one's rights allows one to violate the rights of others. But what constitutes "endangering" others? Endangerment involves conduct that is *likely* to produce death or grievous bodily harm to another person (driving a vehicle at high speed in an opposing traffic lane while traveling, *e.g.*).

Even more difficult to ascertain is how a person can harm the "public welfare" through exercise of his rights. "Public welfare" is defined by *Black's Law Dic-*

tionary, 11th edition, as "[a] society's well-being in matters of health, safety, order, morality, economics, and politics." In the area of morality, this involves such crimes as indecent exposure and prostitution. In other words, the inherent right to control one's body can be infringed if one uses that body to engage in what the majority considers subversive to sexual order and decency, *a.k.a.*, the moral laws, or more aptly, God's law.

The authority to make laws and decide questions for the "society" regarding health, order, or morality has come to be known as the "police power." A 1904 treatise entitled *The Police Power* by Ernst Freund described it thusly: "it aims directly to secure and promote the public welfare, and it does so by restraint or compulsion."

"Police power" is defined in *Black's Law Dictionary*, 11th edition, as "the inherent and plenary power of the sovereign to make all laws necessary and proper to preserve the public security, order, health, morality, and justice. It is a fundamental power essential to government, and it cannot be surrendered by the legislature or irrevocably transferred away from government."

However, the notion that police power is an "inherent" power of "the sovereign" must be understood within the constitutional framework of American government. In our legal system, it is the *people* who are understood to be the sovereigns, and who themselves have ordained and established government. Thus, it is a power which cannot be surrendered by the people, *even if* delegated to their government agents. The Constitution of the United States begins with "We the People," and the State constitutions similarly declare that it is the people who have delegated authority to government officials. To examine the extent of the police power vs. individual liberty as treated in *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, we first see that the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts states precisely this understanding at Article V:

All power residing originally in the people, and being derived from them, the several magistrates and officers of government, vested with authority, whether legislative, executive, or judicial, are their substitutes and agents, and are at all times accountable to them.

The federal government has been delegated no "police power" by the people, since the Tenth Amendment states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." Any 'police power' inherent in the true sovereigns, the people, is retained by them, and only if the people delegate that authority to their legislature can the government exercise it.

Did the people specifically delegate police powers to the Massachusetts legislature? Justice John Marshall Harlan, who authored the opinion in *Jacobson v. Massachusetts*, referred to wording from the Mass. Constitution's Preamble and Article VII to conclude that they

Your help is needed to establish a brave patriot lawyer!!

LWRN radio host admitted to law school needs donations to continue her studies



As most patriots and members of the tax honesty movement are well aware, there are not many lawyers in America who will truly "go to bat" for patriots on tax and constitutional issues. The ranks of brave and uncompromising lawyers is thin, and those willing to tackle the labyrinth of tax law even more scarce.

One unwavering patriot, our own Tayra Antolick, talk radio host on the Truth Attack hour from 6 to 7 EST, Tuesdays, has been admitted to Liberty University School of Law in Lynchburg, Va. She started her studies this month.

Tayra is in need of financial assistance so that she can complete her studies. Assistance will fund tuition, fees, and books. **Please help!!!** Any donation is appreciated.

To contribute, (a) make any money orders or checks payable to "Liberty University School of Law," (b) enclose the donation with a note stating: "I would like the enclosed contribution to be applied to any balance due for tuition, fees, and books, in that order of priority, for any semester on behalf of Tayra de la Caridad Antolick, Student ID L29955837," and (c) mail the contribution to:

Liberty University School of Law
Attention: Michelle Phelps
971 University Boulevard
Lynchburg, VA 24515

To confirm that Tayra Antolick is a student, and her student ID number, or to donate using another method, please contact **Michelle Phelps**, Coordinator of Financial Aid at mjphelps@liberty.edu (the university switchboard is 434.592.5300). We recommend that you keep proof of the donation at hand, and check back to make sure that it was applied correctly to Tayra's account.

In times like these, it is difficult for most to look ahead and to continue the fight against legal tyranny. But lawyers who can fight for our liberties are more needed than ever! Thank you for donating.

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)

had. The Preamble states, in pertinent part: “The body politic ... is a social compact, by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good.” Article VII, in pertinent part, states: “Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity and happiness of the people; and not for the profit, honor, or private interest of any one man, family, or class of men ...” According to Harlan, the “good and welfare of the Commonwealth, of which the legislature is *primarily the judge*, is the basis on which the police power rests in Massachusetts.”⁸

Whatever the “common good” may be, however, it cannot justify the denial of fundamental individual rights. The Mass. Constitution also states, at Article I:

All men are born free and equal, and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights; among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness.

The supreme courts of Massachusetts and the United States refused to acknowledge Jacobson’s natural and unalienable right to preserve and defend his own body from invasion, or even, secondarily, that vaccination was at the very *least* as much of a threat to Jacobson’s life, safety and happiness as it was of benefit to the “public health.”

Tyranny in the name of the collective ‘State’

At the time of the *Jacobson* case, the Commonwealth had established, in its revised laws, c. 75, § 137, that:

... the board of health of a city or town if, in its opinion, it is necessary for the public health or safety shall require and enforce the vaccination and revaccination of all the inhabitants thereof and shall provide them with the means of free vaccination. Whoever, being over twenty-one years of age and not under guardianship, refuses or neglects to comply with such requirement shall forfeit five dollars.

This provision has remained nearly intact to the present day, including the fine of five dollars.

In 1902, the Cambridge Board of Health adopted a regulation requiring vaccination for smallpox because it was “prevalent to some extent” and was increasing in the city. Jacobson, who had become ill when vaccinated as a child, refused to be vaccinated, and was charged criminally and fined. The trial judge excluded any evidence in his defense relating to “alleged injurious or



John M. Harlan, on U.S. Supreme Court from 1877-1911.

dangerous effects of vaccination,” and refused to instruct the jury that the law was in derogation of the rights secured by the Preamble and the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. He appealed unsuccessfully to the Massachusetts supreme court, and so appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Justice Harlan fairly described Jacobson’s claim that the law was unconstitutional in that it constituted a legally sanctioned assault on his person:

The defendant insists that *his liberty is invaded* when the State subjects him to fine or imprisonment for neglecting or refusing to submit to vaccination; that a compulsory vaccination law is unreasonable, arbitrary and oppressive, and, therefore, hostile to the inherent right of every freeman to care for his own body and health in such way as to him seems best, and that the execution of such a law against one who objects to vaccination, no matter for what reason, is nothing short of an assault upon his person.⁹

Harlan did *not* disagree that forceful vaccination violated Jacobson’s liberty and body. Rather, he stated that “liberty for all” could not exist if individuals were free to use their own bodies “regardless of the injury that may be done to others.” It is, instead, a fundamental principle, Harlan wrote, that :

... persons and property are subjected to all kinds of restraints and burdens, in order to secure the general comfort, health, and prosperity of the State, ...

Even liberty itself, the greatest of all rights, is not unrestricted license to act according to one’s own will. It is only freedom from restraint under conditions essential to the equal enjoyment of the same right by others. It is then liberty regulated by law.¹⁰

What “right of others” could Jacobson have fairly be said to have violated when he sought to defend his own life against invasion? And what rights do those “others” have to assault his body? We will break down the details of this tyrannical opinion in the next issue of the *Liberty Tree*.



Listen to LWRN anywhere and any time!

Download the APP Smartphones or iPhones

Visit **www.LWRN.net** and Click on the links to the left on home page!!

8. *Jacobson*, 197 U.S. at 27 (citing *Commonwealth v. Alger*, 7 Cush. 53, 84).

9. *Id.*, at 26.

10. *Id.*, at 26-27 (citing other Supreme Court cases).