Liberty Tree

Vol. 23, No. 11 — November 2021

Deceived to Death

The NWO tyrants are pressing unconstitutional edicts built on lies. In the last issue, we revealed the pretend drug 'approvals.' Here, we will begin to examine 'mandates.'

Part 2

No FDA-approved COVID-19 vaccine is available in the United States. As pointed out in the last *Liberty Tree*, there are only emergency use authorization (EUA) COVID-19 jabs available in the United States, and under the law, everyone has a right to refuse administration of such drugs.[1] Despite this, the courts have upheld forced EUA jabs, using various excuses to allow forced vaxxes even for EUA drugs. In *Klaassen v. Indiana University*, No. 21-2326 (7th Cir. 2021), for example, wicked Judge Easterbrook upheld an Indiana University requirement for students to get vaccinated with an EUA drug or be forced to wear masks and be tested. In August 2021, seditious Justice Amy Coney Barrett further refused an emergency request from the students without even referring the case to the rest of the Supreme Court. Following this tyrannical decision — against the Fourth Amendment right to bodily integrity, *i.e.,* to be secure in their person — and the 'approval con' of Pfizer by the FDA, tyrannical state governors began issuing jab or job 'mandates' to state workers, including health care and education workers. Democrat-controlled counties and cities began to follow suit.

The military's 'mandate,' however, is based on a deception related to the head-fake biologics license (BLA) approval of Pfizer's jab COMIRNATY. This is because the only way for the armed forces to avoid the option of informing military personnel of their right to accept or refuse an EUA drug is if the president waives their right to be so informed if he "determines, in writing, that complying with such [info requirement] is not in the interest of national security." 10 U.S.C. 1107a (a). Since no such waiver appears to have been signed by the usurper, Sec'y. of Defense Lloyd Austin ordered mandatory vaccination only by "COVID-19 vaccines that receive full licensure from the [FDA]."[2]

No COMIRNATY; no military 'mandate'

The FDA assigns National Drug Codes (NDCs) which are placed on drug labels to serve as universal product identifiers for human drugs. The CDC publishes charts of these codes, and states, "COVID-19 vaccine codes ... will become effective for US vaccine administrations only upon EUA issuance and/or BLA approval of COVID-19 vaccine(s) by the FDA." Next to the NDCs for the only BLA approved 'vaccine,' *i.e.,* Pfizer's, the CDC displays the following:

> COMINARTY [sic] products *are not orderable at this time.* ... Pfizer has provided the following statement regarding the COMINARTY branded NDCs and labels: ...
>
> "At present, Pfizer *does not plan to produce any product with these new NDCs and labels over the next few months while EUA authorized product is still available and being made available for U.S. distribution.* As such, the CDC, AMA, and drug compendia may not publish these new codes until Pfizer has determined when the product will be produced with the BLA labels."[3]

Thus, as U.S. Senator Ron Johnson (Wisc.), confirmed in October: "... there's not an FDA-approved drug ...

(Continued on page 2)

1. 21 USC 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A) states: With respect to the emergency use of an unapproved product, the Secretary, to the extent practicable given the applicable circumstances described in subsection (b)(1), shall, for a person who carries out any activity for which the authorization is issued, establish such conditions on an authorization under this section as the Secretary finds necessary or appropriate to protect the public health, including the following:... (ii) ... conditions designed to ensure that individuals to whom the product is administered are informed-(i) that the Secretary has authorized the emergency use of the product; (ii) of the significant known and potential benefits and risks of such use, and of the extent to which such benefits and risks are unknown; and (iii) of the ***option to accept or refuse*** administration of the product, of the consequences, if any, of refusing administration of the product, and of the alternatives to the product that are available and of their benefits and risks.

2. https://media.defense.gov/2021/Aug/25/2002838826/-1/-1/0/MEMORANDUM-FOR-MANDATORY-CORONAVIRUS-DISEASE-2019-VACCINATION-OF-DEPARTMENT-OF-DEFENSE-SERVICE-MEMBERS.PDF

3. https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/programs/iis/COVID-19-related-codes.html. All emphases throughout have been added, unless otherwise noted.

(Continued from page 1)
they announced [that there was] so they could push through these mandates."

Accordingly, armed forces personnel should be aware that the only drug 'mandated' is COMIRNATY, having the NDC code 00068-1000-01,-02, or -03. Military employees should insist that until they see those codes on the packaging and vial labels of the Pfizer injections, they are under no requirement whatsoever to allow it to be forced into their bodies.

'Mandates' are not law

Fraudulent 'mandates' are as deceptive as the head-fake vax approvals. The first technique of the 'mandate' con involves the use of the word itself. As shown on this page, 'mandate' is not a *legal* term for executive orders or laws. The general dictionary definition does include, however, "an authoritative order or command, especially a written one." *Webster's New 20th Century Dictionary,* © 1977.

In America, proper authority flows from the people, who ordain the Constitutions, and from laws passed by elected legislatures which conform to the Constitutions. Thus, for any command from a government official to be *authoritative*, it must first be a command in accordance with the *authority* granted such official by the law. And in passing laws, legislatures must not delegate their law-making powers to the executive branch; the executive implements and enforces law, but does not *make* law. This is known as the nondelegation doctrine.

In the 1930s, the seditious New Deal legislation began to set up administrative laws in direct contradiction to the U.S. Constitution. When the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 included laws interfering with intrastate economic activities, the Supreme Court clearly articulated the nondelegation doctrine in *A.L.A. Schecter Poultry Cop. v. United States,* 295 U.S. 495 (1935).

First, the Court said, "Extraordinary conditions may call for extraordinary remedies. But ... [e]xtraordinary con-ditions do not create or enlarge constitutional power." *Id.*, at 528. Further, the Court said, "assertions of extraconstitu-tional authority were anti-cipated and precluded by the explicit terms of the Tenth Amendment." *Id.*, at 539. Finally, the Court said, "Congress is authorized 'To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution' its general powers. Art. I, 8, par. 18. The Congress is not permitted to abdicate or to transfer to others the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested."

This nondelegation doctrine is no less important in State governments. Since State legislatures, who are the elected representatives of the people, are the exclusive law-making bodies, they may not delegate law-making powers to executive branch officials.

The executive orders of governors in various states commanding certain government workers to submit to clotshots (c-vax) or lose their jobs are prime examples of *non*-authoritative orders; that is, orders that do not flow from constitutional or legislative authority, *i.e.,* the law. As an example, we'll take a look at the Massa-chusetts' Governor's edict.

misusing 'mandate'

Legally, a 'mandate' is an order from an appellate court to a lower court to take a specific action, or a command to an officer of a court to enforce a court order. In politics, a 'mandate' means overwhelming approval of a political platform (through voting in a certain candidate or party). This type of 'mandate,' an implied command from the principals (the public) to their agents (the representatives), is a reflection of the word as used in civil law. At civil law, a 'mandate' is "[a] written command given by a principal to an agent," or "[a] commission or contract by which one person [the *mandator*] requests someone [the *mandatary*] to perform some service gratuitously, the commission becoming effective when the mandatary agrees. See *Black's Law Dictionary, 7th Ed.* A prime example of a mandate is a grant of a power of attorney from one person to another.

The executive branch executes laws passed by the legislative branch. In examining the current commands (executive orders) from executive heads to their agencies or contractors, or to any sector of the public, to take a jab or lose their job, — actions and consequences which are not set forth in law — we can see that the term mandate, widely used by the media, is completely inappropriate. It is apparent that the political class and the media have used the term 'mandate' to decieve the public into believing governors and presidents hold the lawful authority to force vaccinations. They do not.

Courts ignore clear violation of law

Mass. Gov. Charles Baker issued Exec. Order No. 595 on August 19th.[4] In it, he orders the Human Resources Division (HRD) to establish a written policy that by October 17th, all employees and contractors of executive branch agencies be required to demonstrate that they have received the jab and that "going forward ... they demonstrate they are maintaining full COVID-19 vaccination." In other words, unending boosters will be required to keep their jobs or contracts. "[L]imited exemptions" are to be granted "where a reasonable accomodation" can be reached with employees who are medically disabled from being jabbed or who are opposed on "sincerely held" religious beliefs. HRD enforcement measures are suspension without pay for five days, followed by termination. No provision was made for testing or demonstrating natural immunity against SARS-CoV-2 as alternatives

(Continued on page 3)

4. https://www.mass.gov/doc/august-19-2021-executive-department-employee-vaccination-order/download?_ga=2.87813342.790734428.1629725302-968917506.1621280819

(Continued from page 2)

to jabs.

State troopers and correction officials filed suits to halt these novel employment terms and conditions. The State Police Association (SPAM) demonstrated that the governor's order violated the law, in that the Commonwealth did not negotiate the new vaccination policy according to G. L. c. 150E, §10. SPAM was denied a temporary restraining order against implementation of the policy in the State court — no surprise, since the Mass. Trial Court now requires vaccination reporting or testing of all employees![5] — on grounds that SPAM had failed to show that the implementation of the order would cause irreparable harm to SPAM members or that the public interest would be served by delay. Meanwhile, the prison union filed in federal court, claiming that guards wish to exercise their constitutional right to decline this medical treatment while continuing to keep their employment.

Federal judge Timothy Hillman, an Obama appointee, denied a preliminary injunction against the governor on October 15th primarily on grounds that the plaintiff union was unlikely to prevail in the suit. Among the many execreble reasons set forth by this petty tyrant for not granting an injunction, three things stand out: his disdain for facts, his disdain for fundamental rights, and his disregard for the fact that no Massachusetts law authorizes EO 595.

First, Hillman accepted as factual that COVID-19 was a "vaccine preventable disease," despite admitting that the "long-term negative consequences of COVID-19 infection, *even for those who were vaccinated before infection* or have only mild symptoms, are not fully understood."[5] So, even though vaccines *don't* prevent infection, and no one really knows the actual effects of COVID-19, government workers should still be vaccinated or lose their job? Similarly, Hillman stated that vaccination "benefits not only the person receiving the vaccine, but also others in that person's community, because a high population level vaccination rate reduces the *likelihood* of community spread of the virus, including 'breakthrough' infections." Here again, Hillman admits that the vaccination does *not* benefit the vaccinated, because they can become infected with 'breakthrough' infections. And since infected people transmit disease, then the vaccinated can spread

Low-IQ commie tyrant Hillman.

(Continued on page 4)

5. See ruling at https://d279m997dpfwgl.cloudfront.net/wp/2021/10/doc-suit-ruling.pdf.

violating 'vaccine'

Webster's New 20th Century Dictionary, © 1977, defines vaccine as: 1. Lymph ... from a cowpox vesicle, containing the causative virus and used in vaccination against ... smallpox. 2. Any preparation of dead bacteria introduced into the body to produce immunity to a specific disease by causing the formation of antibodies. This definition reflects the origin and evolution of the process of injecting cultured or killed disease material into a living body.

On January 19, 2021, Merriam Webster's online dictionary reflected this long-standing practice and defined 'vaccine' as: a preparation of *killed microorganisms, living attenuated organisms, or living fully virulent organisms* that is administered to produce or artificially increase immunity to a particular disease.

But just a week later, the online dictionary had changed the definition to: a preparation that is administered (as by injection) to stimulate the body's immune response against a specific infectious disease: a. an antigenic preparation of a typically inactivated or attenuated pathogenic agent (such as a bacterium or virus) or one of its components or products (such as a protein or toxin). So far, this is still in keeping with established vaccine preparation. But Webster's added a definition which reflects something never done before: b. a preparation of genetic material (such as a strand of synthesized messenger RNA) that is used **by the cells of the body** to produce an antigenic substance (such as a fragment of virus spike protein).

The new definition is intended to normalize injecting industrially engineered genetic material to induce a living body to make proteins toxic to itself. This is *not* what vaccines have ever been about before; Webster's is assisting Big Pharma and the global reset crowd's redefinition of the entire concept of 'vaccine' so that people who have been 'vaccinated' all their lives consider the new jabs to be more of the same. They are not.

(Continued from page 3)

the virus as much as the unvaccinated. This rationale provides no basis for a conclusion that vaccination serves a legitimate public health interest of stopping the spread of a disease.

Second, Hillman stated that "[t]he Supreme Court has rejected the idea of a fundamental right to refuse vaccination," citing *Jacobson v. Massachussetts*, 197 U.S. 11 (1905), and claiming that Justice Gorsuch explained, in *Roman Cath. Diocese of Brooklyn v. Cuomo*, 141 S.Ct. 63, 70 (2020) that the right to refuse vaccination is not a fundamental right. Gorsuch did no such thing, however. Rather, he explained that "in Jacobson, individuals could accept the vaccine, pay the fine, or identify a basis for exemption. The imposition on Mr. Jacobson's claimed right to bodily integrity, thus, was avoidable and relatively modest. It ... might have survived strict scrutiny, given the opt-outs available to certain objectors."[6]

Further, the "vaccination" of Jacobson's day was a procedure that had been practiced for over 100 years. The "vaccination" of COVID-19 is really injection with a gene-therapy drug which has never been injected into humans before. The term vaccine has been redefined in the year 2021 (see page 3), and neither judges nor executive tyrants care that the designer COVID-19 injections have nothing in common with the "vaccines" of yesteryear.

No authority, no 'mandate'

Finally, however, Hillman did not recognize at any time that EO 595 was not authorized by any law whatsoever. Indeed, the only authority cited by the tyrant Baker in his EO was "the authority vested in me by the [Mass.] Constitution, Part 2, c. 2, § 1, Art. 1." That authority reads: "There shall be a supreme executive magistrate, who shall be styled, The Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and whose title shall be -- His Excellency." A magistrate is a public civil officer, and an executive magistrate is a "person who *carries the laws into effect*, or superintends the enforcement of them." *An American Dictionary of the English Language (Webster's), 1828*.

NOTICE
TEMPORARY PHONE CHANGE
To reach Save-A-Patriot, please call the Liberty Works Radio phone number at
410-848-9191

Baker, then, has no authority to issue an order for vaccination of certain persons, even persons in the employment of the State, where the legislature did not grant him such authority nor pass a law requiring such 'vaccination.' This makes his EO void from inception. It has no "force of law," it is not a mandate, it is not an authorized command. Indeed, without a warrant based upon an affidavit of probable cause, seizing persons and violating their security by injecting them with toxins is forbidden by the U.S. Constitution. Thus, no orders or laws requiring injections, except *perhaps* judicial orders made on a case-by-case basis, could ever be mandates of any kind.

Unconstitutional OSHA goes outside the limits

On September 9th, the usurper declared a "new plan to require more Americans to be vaccinated" via a Department of Labor emergency rule. This rule, an Emergency Temporary Standard (ETS), was announced by OSHA in the Federal Register on November 5th. The ETS imposes a masking-and-testing regimen on all unvaccinated employees of firms with 100 or more workers, to harrass employees into accepting COVID-19 jabs. Within short order, 27 States filed lawsuits against this ETS. It is clear that OSHA, already unconstitutional, has far overreached its questionable legal authority. In *Jacobson, supra*, the Supreme Court held that requiring vaccination was reserved to the police powers of the States. Since the Constitution does not grant the federal government such police power, then OSHA's ETS is a forbidden attempt to circumvent the Constitution. On November 6th, the Fifth Circuit granted a stay of the ETS, stating that "there are grave statutory and constitutional issues" with the ETS.[7] Time will tell if this is a head fake, too.

The STATES begin to rebel!



Twenty-seven states have joined together in various combinations and filed suits in five courts of appeal against the unlawful and unconstitutional OSHA regulation "mandating" a vaccination or masking and testing regime on employers who have 100 or more employees.

6. https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/20A87. Jacobson did claim that the imposed vaccination violated his religious conscience, but that was not an "opt-out" available to him, nor did the courts recognize his right to religious exercise. By contrast, EO 595 provides for a religious exemption.
7. https://www.ca5.uscourts.gov/opinions/unpub/21/21-60845.0.pdf