God

Versus

U.S. Supreme Court

Barrett, Kavanaugh reject religious liberty in support of vaccine mandates

January 3, 2021

Part 6

William Bernard Butler posted an article that provides more detail about the upcoming U.S. Supreme Court ruling on the "Mandate" dilemma. I share this for anyone who is interested in where this will end. We now know that the Court will hear oral arguments on Saturday, January 7th.

After reading the first few paragraphs of Mr. Butler's article, it was evident to me that the esteemed gentleman is an attorney, and a Constitutional scholar and I'm just a retired pastor who had one course in Constitutional Law in college. My contentions have not changed one iota so I find that this is more than an interesting dilemma awaiting the nation. I might be risking having egg on my face if I am wrong or some might say I am a prophet if I am right. Regardless, I am not a prophet, I merely know church history and know that the Roman Catholic Institution led by Satanic Jesuits, never change.

Mr. Butler's comments become hugely important in this picture. I just ran the numbers of the government's reporting of deaths alleged to be caused by Covid-19 for 2021. The government reported **822,914 deaths for 2021**, and while that seems huge, we have to remember the national population reported by the U.S. Census Bureau was reported to be 331,000,000. By year's end it was 331,499,000.

The official U.S. death report of 822,914 is the equivalent or 0.24861450151057% of 331,000,000 or just 2/10th of one percent. Because of inflated numbers encouraged by CDC, NIAID, NIH, and WHO we will never know the true figures. There were massive false reporting, such as a motorcycle accident in Florida was logged as death to Covid, murder suicides were reported as Covid. We know from a previous report that the Biden Administration incentivized hospitals and physicians to pad the numbers. They paid off hospitals and health care agencies with money that came straight out of the Trump funding of the Covid-crisis. See link: Biden's Bounty on Your Life: Hospitals' Incentive Payments for COVID-19

Mr. Butler's article was posted at Lew Rockwell.com under the title of Putting the Final
Nail in the Covid Coffin
By William Bernard Butler WilliamBernardButler.com
December 29, 2021

Let's put an end to the pandemic charade.

If that is not enough to give the Supreme Court super migraine headaches, consider this stunning discovery by those suing the WHO for criminal activity regarding the Covid-19 crime. This is from one of the latest video discussions lasting around 19 minutes between **Dr. Reiner Fuellmich**, **Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg**, lawyer **Viviana Fischer** and UK doctor **Sam White** on the findings that a **small number of vaccine batches has been associated with the majority of deaths and injuries from the vaccines.** We remind readers of what we published on this back in early November.



Fuellmich: Dr. Mike Yeadon showed how they used batches within batches to try out what kind of doses are needed to kill people and maim them. From a legal perspective, it is inescapable evidence of premeditation. Once there is evidence of premeditation, there is no immunity for anyone.

Wodarg: It isn't true that there is the same stuff in all the vaccines. We have hard evidence that the batches of vaccine vials contain different ingredients.

Sam White: We have experts talking about the VAERS data and 'lots', not batches. And they have about 11 lots with 6 or 7% of the deaths, wow.

Wodarg: Doctors need to know that the BATCHES ARE NOT CONTROLLED.

Fuellmich: What Mike Yeadon came up with is that there is a 1 in 200 chance that you're going to run into one of those dangerous batches or lots. It's like Russian roulette.

Wodarg: this is not Russian roulette, it's a TRIAL, it's planned. The batches are sent somewhere, they're used and registered. What they've also found is that when one company, say Pfizer BioNTech, are up to something, the others will keep quiet. The others won't do the experiments. But then they'll step up and do something, maybe it's AstraZeneca next or Johnson and Johnson who want to try something out within these massive trials. The stupid doctors think they are giving the same injections. But it's not true. They are being misused for this very big trial where there is no ethics committee! It's an obscure trial where the people are just the victims. And perhaps they are genetically modifying human beings and they have patents on this stuff. There are 120 new vaccines in the pipeline. They all want to try out their products and now is the time they can do it because we're still afraid that we need a vaccine. It's worse than Nuremberg what's happening now. It is horrible – there are thousands of Mengeles now. Some of them don't know this, but some of them know very well what they are doing. And they kill thousands of people.

Fuellmich: Intentionally.

Wodarg: yes, intentionally.

Wodarg: this graph is proof that it's been planned.

Fuellmich: It's a coordinated effort or else they wouldn't do it in a synchronized way, first by BioNTech Pfizer, then Moderna, then Jensen. They're doing it in a highly coordinated way so they will not interfere with each other. Each one of them is doing their own experiments within an experiment. All of the pharmaceutical industry knows it. They all want to be part of it, including the Paul Ehrlich Institute, so it's just a matter of time until all the others join in and make it even worse because it is easy to extort those already committing the crimes, so that others will be admitted into this mass serial killing.

Fuellmich: This makes it easy for any lawyer in this world to show intent. It is inescapable – from these graphs, you can show intent. They are deliberately using different dosages, coordinated with each other so that they won't interfere with each other in order to try and find out what kills the best or maims the best.

These findings in particular have immense legal repercussions – immense, because once you arrive at the conclusion that they're doing this deliberately, intentionally or as Martin Schwab puts it maliciously, once you arrive at this conclusion, the floodgates are open in the United States for punitive damages. You can probably go up to 21 times the actual damage, which is added on top of the actual damage. In these cases, in fact, you may be able to go up to a 1,000 times because these people got so badly injured. This could be enough to dismantle the entire industry.

As I was reading the above article this morning, first one after opening my email file, I had a few seconds lag pinch-me moment, since this occurred to me around June of 2021. Until that moment in time, I was following the remarks of Dr. Sherri Tenpenny and her comments about the insert of the spike Protein (PEG). Gradually over the next six months we kept reading and hearing about additional things found in the vaxxes. We actually came to a point where eight different substances were identified in victims of Covid. It began to be really weird when the finding of Graphene Oxide hit the news sites. It did not get any clearer but it had all the markings of what Dr. Reiner Fuellmich is discussing in this transcript portion of a serial killer at work.

Dr. Reiner Fuellmich is a German lawyer and practices in Germany and Southern California. He is one of the four founding members of the German Corona Investigative Committee. Dr. Reiner is an international trial lawyer. He has sued some of the most successful large fraudulent companies like Volkswagen and Deutsche Bank. As according to his latest testimony, he said the coronavirus pandemic is a crime and they have the evidence.

Now I will return to Mr. Butler's article that was posted at Lew Rockwell.com under the title of **Putting the Final Nail in the Covid Coffin**:

The United States Supreme Court has decided that it will hold an expedited hearing on two out of four of the Biden vaccine mandates, with oral arguments scheduled for Saturday, January 7, 2022. The SCOTUS will be reviewing the Sixth Circuit's decision affirming the private employer OSHA mandates after the Fifth Circuit unanimously held that OSHA did not have jurisdiction over the seasonal flu and issued a nationwide injunction. The Court will also be reviewing the "CMS Mandate" dictating that health care workers working for authorized Medicaid and Medicare providers must also be vaxxed. Both the Eighth Circuit and the Fifth Circuit have enjoined the CMS Mandate, making the CMS Mandate unenforceable in 25 states. As of this writing, the Court will not be reviewing injunctions against the "federal contractor" mandate which has been halted by federal judges in Georgia and Florida.

I hope readers of this piece will be persuaded that whatever the Supreme Court decides, it will be a win for those who do not want to participate in federally coerced drug experiments.

If the Court follows the trend among Federalist Society judges and rules against the mandates, that will be a win because it will put an end to the make-believe pandemic and a so-called vaccine mandate that is in fact a massive medical experiment that violates informed consent and the Nuremberg Code. If, however, the Court is cowed by the Administrative Law State and issues another absurdly political decision and affirms the vaccine mandate like it did in the last health care mandate case—the Obamacare mandate decision—that will be an even bigger win. It will be a bigger win because it will cause the already very strong vax opposition to get stronger. The current divide between employers and the government will only grow bigger and become more irreconcilable if the Supreme Court affirms. As more employers opt out of this federal scheme, the federal government will rapidly lose credibility and then it will lose authority and legitimacy.

Smart employers, including <u>Boeing</u> and <u>Southwest Airlines</u>, have already gotten <u>the memo</u> and know how to keep their employees safe while at the same time complying with ALL federal laws, not just the diktats relating to vaccines. They do this by encouraging their employees to request vaccine exemptions. They grant every request, no questions asked. This complies with the law. If SCOTUS upholds the mandates, this strategy will continue to work because it places an unbearable administrative enforcement burden on the federal agencies. If OSHA/CMS attempt to attack an employer who is liberally granting exemption requests, they will be in the impossible position of second-guessing an employer for accepting its employee's lawful exemption request based on the employee's sincerely-held, subjective beliefs. Exemption requests therefore place the battle where federal agencies cannot win—the minds of employees. If the Supreme Court affirms the bureaucracy's mandates, OSHA/CMS will be faced with dissipating their limited resources in an unwinnable war over whether over 80 million people really believe what they have put in their exemption requests.

Game over.

For interested employees, the latest vaccine exemption request letter 3.0 is below.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW STATE CALLS THE SHOTS

As two very isolated judges on the Sixth Circuit have now made clear, the pandemic narrative was never about health or safety. It was always about obtaining mass vaccine compliance, by psychological hook or bullying crook. The Sixth Circuit's decision gives OSHA the green light to coerce private employers (with threats of federal fines) into coercing their employees to submit to a global drug experiment that violates the Nuremberg Code's informed consent principles. OSHA's emergency rule seeks to force employers into causing unnecessary friction in the lives of their unvaxxed employees with threats of termination, weekly testing, and masks which do not prevent the spread of anything and the only purpose of which is to stigmatize non-compliant employees. If the Supreme Court affirms the bureaucracy's "temporary" mandates, employers who blindly obey OSHA or the CMS will be putting their employees at risk and may be exposing themselves to significant liability if the federally mandated drug experiment goes awry as many credible doctors foresee.

If you are a private employer or Medicaid/Medicare care provider and have been going along to get along through the pandemic psyop, it's time to wake up.

Here is the Sixth Circuit's decision restated in plain English:

- (1) OSHA always has and always will have jurisdiction over the seasonal flu even though a co-equal court, the Fifth Circuit, in a unanimous decision issued just weeks ago stated that OSHA never had and never will have jurisdiction over the seasonal flu;
- (2) the 2020 seasonal flu (a/k/a "Covid") is a deadly, dangerous, and scary disease and we will keep repeating deadly, dangerous, and scary until you accept that it is true and stop asking for relevant risk information, things <u>like scientifically-determined</u>, <u>blood test verified</u>, <u>infection-to-fatality</u> (IFR) rates which show a greater than 99.83 survival rate in all but the over 70 y.o., multiple co-morbidity, and extremely isolated cohort; and
- (3) Dear Serfs and Employers of Serfs, this decision will put you on notice that we live in an administrative law state where the federal bureaucracy runs the show, determines what reality is, determines what is risky and what is not and has the power and authority to compel over 80 million innocent people to submit to a no-safety-net drug experiment against their will and sound judgment.

If you were wondering, like I was, how one co-equal federal circuit court can "overrule" another co-equal federal circuit court after the first court issued a nationwide order and determined that OSHA's case showed very little likelihood of success, there is of course a law that allows for such a thing.

The federal bureaucracy has seen to it. The federal bureaucracy invoked the law, and Price Waterhouse did not audit this "lottery" was held somewhere. lottery. Predictably, neither the mandate-thumping 8th Circuit or 5th Circuit won the lottery. The lottery "winner," the Sixth Circuit, Justice Kavanaugh's assigned circuit, then held a vote on whether the entire court should hear the case en banc, or whether it should be decided by a panel of three judges. The vote was 8-8 and a majority was needed to hear the case en banc. So it was decided by a panel of three judges and the decision was nevertheless 2-1 in favor of the mandates, with a vigorous dissent. To date, 25 federal judges have issued opinions on the mandates. 20 have opposed the mandates and only 5 have supported it. Great luck for the Administrative Law State that two isolated friendly judges were on the lottery-winning Sixth Circuit.

When even federal judges do not appear to be getting their way, it seems possible <u>that hideous bureaucratic strength</u> is pressuring them. The Obamacare decision is <u>Exhibit A</u> showing the impotency of federal judges when up against the federal bureaucracy.

The most pertinent sentence in the Sixth Circuit's decision:

But the ultimate determination of what level of risk constitutes a "grave danger" is a "policy consideration that belongs, in the first instance, to the Agency."

You read that correctly. Risk is not determined by facts, namely <u>a statistically proven</u> greater than 99.83 percent survival rate for everyone under 70 years old. Two lonely judges on the Sixth Circuit have temporarily turned the anti-vax tide and stated that the federal bureaucracy gets to ignore facts and determine what is risky for over 80 million private employees as a matter of "policy." The two Sixth Circuit Judges who issued the decision are <u>Jane Stranch</u> and <u>Julia Gibbons</u>. The dissent was authored by <u>Joan Larsen</u>.

Yet fear not.

ACCURATE INFORMATION, RISK, UNCERTAINTY, AND DEATH

The most valuable resource is not gold or silver or diamonds or rubies. It is accurate information. And accurate *risk* information is the most precious of all accurate information. The lack of accurate vaccine ("Shot") risk information and its <u>active concealment</u> is what has made the natives restless. The <u>Reptile Mind</u> hates concealment and hates uncertainty. It demands, and usually gets, vengeance when the truth finally is revealed.

Before the FDA was <u>subject to regulatory capture by the pharmaceutical industry</u>, the typical timeline for FDA drug approval was long, usually years. This is because it takes time and careful observation to gather accurate risk information on new, experimental drugs. This all began to change when, in 1992, <u>federal law was changed to require pharmaceutical companies to pay "user fees" for FDA approval</u>. Although pitched as a taxpayer relief bill, it was in reality a "he who pays the piper calls the tune" law that resulted in the FDA and other federal agencies serving as agents of Big Pharm. Today, over 50 percent of the FDA's budget comes from user fees. When the public absorbs

the fact that "FDA approved" actually means "Pfizer has bribed and coerced the FDA into approving," only then will the public be able to understand why and how the seasonal flu has been transubstantiated into a dangerous pandemic requiring mass and unending "vaccinations."

The Covid Scare and Donald J. Chump's September 19, 2019 Executive Order completed the regulatory capture. Look no further than Trump's acceptance of a \$1 million inauguration donation/bribe from Pfizer to understand why he might sign the 2019 EO declaring war against the seasonal flu. Trump's 2019 EO gave birth to Emergency Use Authorization, which really means fast, mass, no-safety-net, human experimentation. "Operation Warp Speed," as Trump dubbed it, was a joint big pharma, federal agency operation aided by a coalition of big media, big data, and big health, employing vast federal and private resources (let loose by Trump's 2019 Executive Order) tasked with the goal of transposing the normal seasonal flu, with its very real and very negligible risk (a proven survival rate of 99.83%) into a "pandemic" to scare people into submitting to a massive medical experiment without being first able to fully assess the risk. If you doubt this, ask yourself why even the federal government admits that the seasonal flu virtually disappeared in 2020 while Covid "cases" went parabolic. The answer is that Trump's 2019 Executive Order was the word-game hocus pocus that made **seasonal flu = pandemic** possible. The fear induced by the word "pandemic" was effective in turning off the herd's critical thinking about the normal, and very real, dangers of the seasonal flu.

The accurate risk of the 2020 Seasonal Flu (n/k/a Covid-19) is in–a greater than 99.83 percent survival rate for the under 70 cohort. The accurate risk information for the Shot is unknown and can't be known for many years, although there is much information that suggests that it is very dangerous.

With that context, the Sixth Circuit's decision dodges the fact that any employer involved in compelling the Shot (the compliance deadline has been moved forward to February so we can expect the Supreme Court to decide before then) will be violating the principle of informed consent. Informed consent assumes the ability to gather and curate accurate risk information in order to make an informed risk decision. If not enough time has passed or not enough data has been gathered, accurate risk information cannot be obtained and informed consent is therefore impossible. Every employer who blindly follows the Sixth Circuit rather than listening to the "still small voice" of his conscience and common sense will therefore risk violating informed consent as reflected in the Nuremberg Code. The informed consent terms of the Nuremberg Code are codified into U.S. law at 45 C.F.R. 46.116. All federal agencies conducting human health experiments, including OSHA and CMS, must first obtain informed consent.

In the present case, however, OSHA and CMS will not comply with 45 C.F.R. 46.116. OSHA and CMS can credibly claim that they are not conducting a human experiment. You know "the story." They are responding to a health emergency caused by a "pandemic"; a pandemic that has no serious adverse effects on 99.83 percent of

the population. And the fact is that these federal agencies are not actually conducting experiment. They are coercing employers into conducting an experiment. Smart employers must see through this. If the Shot mandate results in a future eugenic culling that many sober doctors fear, or even if the Shots only cause small numbers of serious injuries supported by the current anecdotal information. creative plaintiff's lawyers will not look to legally immune OSHA or statutorily immune Pfizer for collection, they will instead look to collect from employers who accepted illegitimate government promises and believed that liability waivers or "just following orders" would be a valid defense to sacrificing their employees on the Big Pharma altar. The "just following orders" defense did not work in the first Nuremberg trials and it won't work here after all the facts are in on the pandemic charade.

If the Supreme Court affirms the Sixth Circuit, employers would be unwise to trust any claim that immunity from liability will extend to employers. This is because, in the case of both the OSHA ETS and the CMS "temporary rule," they operate as a fast-tracked administrative rule. That is, the "temporary" rule goes into effect immediately and at the same time there is a 6-month "notice and comment" period in which OSHA can evaluate the temporary rule's efficacy and reasonableness. In the case of the Shot mandate, unwise employers will be demanding that their employees submit to the drug experiment Shot (and causing known health risks, including death and serious injury, to their employees) at the same time OSHA is receiving notice and comment "feedback." So, it is certainly possible that, after 6 months and X millions have been jabbed and Y million have been injured or killed, OSHA and CMS simply withdraw temporary rules based on the "risk." Of course, at that point the "risk" will be a "reality" and the potential culling will be irreversible. The Shots will then be in the subjects of the mass human experiment.

While the federal agencies may withdraw the temporary mass medical experiment rules at the end of the notice and comment period, the injuries and potential exposure to liability will nevertheless remain. OSHA/CMS and the pharmaceutical companies will not be left holding the risk bag. That is because they are not conducting the experiment. They are responding to an emergency caused by "a pandemic" in case you have forgotten the narrative. Any employer, therefore, who unwisely denies an exemption request from a worker who is later injured or killed in this medical experiment, will be exposed. If the <u>eugenics-loving</u> SCOTUS affirms, this bureaucratic pull-the-rug-out tactic is a distinct possibility.

There is ample, credible, accurate risk data available right now that shows: (1) the risk of contracting the seasonal flu, whether you label it "Covid" or "pandemic" or "death virus" is negligible—greater than 99.83 percent survival rate for everyone under 70 and in relatively good health; (2) the anecdotal Shot risk is real and significant and includes death by heart attack, myocarditis (heart injury), blood clotting, Guillain Barre Syndrome (paralysis), and miscarriage; and (3) the presently unknown and nascent future Shot risk, Shot uncertainty, is potentially catastrophic and could involve a range of auto-immune diseases and ultimate immune system collapse. Mandating employers are much more exposed to risky and uncertain adverse Shot outcomes than the

government or the pharmaceutical companies. If, as some doctors predict, the <u>Shots result in something like AIDS on a larger scale</u>, then liability waivers and "just following orders" will not be an effective defense. Again, it didn't work for the <u>the Nazi enforcers of the medical experiments</u> in the last Nuremberg trials.

THE WAY OUT

The good news for employers is that the vax mandate, unlike the Obamacare mandate, comes with a built-in escape hatch. Employees have a legal and moral right to claim exemption from the Shot mandate. Employers have the legal and moral right to grant every one of them. This battle, therefore, is much easier to win than Obamacare and will not require a change in law or federal policy. The "grant every exemption request" strategy shifts an unbearable enforcement burden onto the federal agencies that are attempting to coerce private employers into doing the pharmaceutical industry's dirty work. OSHA and CMS do not have the resources to determine if 80 million employees have legitimate exemption requests.

EXEMPTION LETTER 3.0

Below is Vax Exemption Letter 3.0, hopefully an improvement on "No Thank You," and "Yes, and..." Perhaps the final nail in the Covid coffin. It has a dual and unifying purpose: (1) to obtain an exemption for the employee; and (2) to gently awaken employers to the outrageous legal and moral risk that federal government agencies are attempting to foist upon them.

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you for your suggestion that I get vaccinated. I very much appreciate that you are concerned about my health and the health of my coworkers. I write this letter in the spirit of cooperation and in order to minimize the health risk to me and my coworkers.

And I would like to keep my job.

As detailed below, there are currently many unknowns surrounding the vaccination ("Shot")^[1]. As together we determine the right and lowest risk course of action, I would appreciate any accurate information you have that contradicts what is detailed in this letter. For your convenience, at the bottom I have provided footnotes with specific authority for all of the propositions contained herein.

If we cannot agree on the facts and cannot come to an agreement on how best to protect me and my family if I am harmed by the Shot, then please consider this my request for an accommodation and exemption from your request.

BACKGROUND

On September 19, 2019, President Donald Trump signed an Executive Order declaring, for the first time in history that the seasonal flu was synonymous with a "pandemic," [2] and also declaring, for the first time in history, that "[v]accination is the most effective defense against influenza." This Executive Order directed multiple federal agencies and

private companies to develop a comprehensive plan to combat the seasonal flu/pandemic within "120 days" of the Order. Exactly 124 days after this Executive Order, the first case of Covid was diagnosed in the U.S. [3]. Because Donald Trump's September 19, 2019 Executive Order appears to have significantly influenced government treatment and public perception of the 2020 seasonal flu, in the remainder of this letter I will refer to Covid-19 as what it would have been called prior to the 2019 Executive Order--the "Seasonal Flu" [4].

According to Dr. Robert Malone, the inventor of the m-RNA technology used in the Shot, m-RNA Shot technology is not a vaccine and it is not an appropriate vehicle for treating Covid or any other Seasonal Flu. See note ^[1]. Dr. Malone believes that the federal government, particularly the FDA, is wrong in mandating the Shot and that it has not done a careful and accurate risk-benefit analysis. It is Dr. Malone's view that that the federal government is nevertheless mandating the Shot because of economic bias and regulatory capture. According to Dr. Malone, because of a 1992 change in federal law requiring pharmaceutical companies to pay for FDA drug approval, the FDA is no longer independent and is unduly financially influenced by the pharmaceutical companies that it regulates.

Although I find this background information very credible, I do not expect you to accept it. I provide this background because it is relevant to me as I evaluate the risk and uncertainty involved in receiving the Shot and because I believe you, as my employer, should be aware of the man-made origins of the "pandemic." You should also be aware that the federal agencies that are ordering you to mandate the Shot may not be serving you and their motive may not be to serve public health.

INFORMED CONSENT AND RISK

There seem to be many laws and regulations implicated by the Shot mandates. The most relevant to me and my family, however, is the international Nuremberg Code [5], codified in U.S. federal law at 45 C.F.R. 46.116. The Nuremberg Code is relevant because it requires knowing assent to medical risk. The Nuremberg Code requires that anyone being subjected to drug or medical experiments be fully informed of all the known risks. If all risks are not disclosed prior to the experiment, then informed consent is not possible and the party compelling the experimental treatment is potentially responsible for violating the principles of informed consent.

Because of the very short timeline between the outbreak of the "pandemic" in January, 2020, the "vaccination" campaigns in 2021, and the present date, it is very difficult to assess the total risk associated with the Seasonal Flu as compared to the risk posed by the Shot.

Seasonal Flu Risk

Stanford professor, M.D., and statistician <u>John Ioannidis</u>, [6] has performed a credible analysis of the known risk associated with the 2020 Seasonal Flu. By his account, employing statistically relevant samples and using serum antibody tests rather than

PCR ^[7] tests, the 2020 Seasonal Flu was <u>a statistically normal flu season</u> ^[8] for the vast majority (>99 percent) of people. According to Dr. Ioannidis:

Across all countries (Figure 3), the median IFR was 0.0027%, 0.014%, 0.031%, 0.082%, 0.27%, and 0.59%, at 0-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60-69 years, using data from 9, 9, 10, 9, 11, and 6 countries, respectively.

This equates to a 99.83 percent survival rate for all people under age 70 and in relatively good health. I have found no data that would refute Dr. loannidis' risk analysis and IFR conclusions for the 2020 Seasonal Flu, now known as Covid-19.

Shot Risk

The actual risk of receiving the Shot is, on the other hand, presently unknown. There is an abundance of still-anecdotal evidence showing that the Shots have caused death, heart attacks, myocarditis (heart injury), Guillain Barre Syndrome (paralysis) and miscarriage. ^[9] It is impossible to fully assess the accurate risk or probability of these outcomes because there has not been enough time to gather all the facts and perform a meaningful statistical analysis. The Shots are being implemented under an expedited "Emergency Use Authorization" leaving little time to fully and accurately assess the risk.

The compressed timeline has meant that risks are being discovered in the process of delivering the Shot. These known risks are not being disclosed or communicated to shot recipients because of the EUA orders. Moreover, in addition to knowable and calculable risk related to the Shots, there is also incalculable uncertainty. Some reputable doctors credibly claim that the m-RNA technology in the Shot causes a systemic degradation of the immune system that will ultimately result in immune system collapse. [10] Whether this is an actual risk cannot be known for years and so is properly identified as uncertain risk.

Finally, because the pharmaceutical companies selling the Shots have no liability for adverse outcomes, ^[11] and because the federal government is also immune from suit for adverse outcomes, ^[12] there is very little incentive for those mandating the Shots or selling the Shots to communicate the known risks or in gathering information about the unknown and uncertain future risk.

If I, like you, were in the position of employing hundreds of people and I was being compelled by immune-from-liability government and pharmaceutical companies to force the Shot on my employees, these facts would concern me, particularly in light of the Nuremberg Code and 45 C.F.R. 46.116. I write this because I am concerned about the risk to you as my employer and I don't want this letter to be Exhibit A in a future Nuremberg Code lawsuit against you. "Just following orders" is not a valid defense when one knowingly puts other people's lives and health at risk. [13]

CRISIS OF AUTHORITY

I have searched and found no clear legal, moral, or other authority that any Shot mandate can be legally effective beyond a very limited and subset of federal government employees. The existing mandates <u>do not include the Post Office, members of Congress, their staffs, or members of the judicial branch.</u> [14]

Executive Orders; Agency Rules; and Federal Court Decisions

My research indicates that President Joe Biden signed two Executive Orders on September 9, 2021 relating specifically to federal executive branch employees ^[15] and federal contractors ("Contractor Mandate") ^[16]. On November 4, 2021, OSHA, via an administrative "emergency temporary standard" ("OSHA ETS") ^[17] announced that private employers of more than 100 employees would need to order their employees to receive the Shot in order to comply with the OSHA ETS. And on November 5, 2021, the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services, another federal agency, issued an administrative rule mandating that employees of Medicaid and Medicare certified providers receive Shots ("CMS Mandate") ^[18].

On November 6, the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals [19] unanimously held that OSHA did not have jurisdiction to mandate the Shots and that the OSHA ETS was not likely to survive father court review. On November 30, 2021, a Louisiana federal judge [20] held that the CMS Mandate was illegal as to employees of certified Medicaid and Medicare health care providers. On December 7, 2021, a Georgia federal judge [21] voided the Federal Contractor Mandate that the federal government does not have jurisdiction over private, federal contractors. On December 22, 2021, a Florida federal judge also voided the Federal Contractor Mandate. [22]

On December 17, 2021, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals <u>overruled the Fifth Circuit decision above</u> and held that OSHA had the legal authority to mandate compulsory Shots ^[23]. On December 22, 2021, the United States Supreme Court <u>agreed to review the Sixth Circuit's decision and also agreed to review the CMS stay decisions</u>.

I have included this history because, regardless of what the United States Supreme Court ultimately decides, it appears that many capable judges firmly believe that the Shot mandates exceeds the federal government's power and authority. The serious disagreement, confusion, and lack of clear guidance among the federal judiciary adds to the view that full informed consent is not possible in these circumstances. If a large percentage of federal judges does not believe that government has the authority to mandate the Shots, then it seems that agreeing to submit to the Shot, with known medical risks, would be accepting legal risk that many federal judges do not feel is legitimate. Because informed consent and the Nuremberg Code require full awareness of risk, discord among federal judges only highlights the risk and uncertainly involved in submitting to the Shots. Given these facts, I personally will not feel safer or more secure if five, or even nine, United States Supreme Court Justices say that a potentially corrupted federal agency has the power to compel you to compel me to receive an experimental Shot.

As one of the over 80 million employees who could be harmed or killed if the Supreme Court affirms the federal Shot mandate, I want you to be aware of all the facts, including this dispute among federal judges that is adding to the risk and uncertainty. Informed consent, under these conditions, is impossible.

SINCERELY HELD BELIEFS

I am very grateful for the Shot mandates and your vaccine request because they have caused me to reflect, do the work contained in this letter, and ask myself what I believe in and what I do not believe in. I am left with the conclusion that I am better off putting my fate in the hand of my Sovereign Triune God and my Lord Jesus Christ than I am to putting it in the hands of potentially corrupted federal agencies.

Please trust that I believe what is contained in this letter. Indeed, I view it more as perception of reality than a "belief." My position relative to the Shot mandate is based on an epistemological worldview: God is in charge here. I am just doing my part by using the brain and critical thinking skills that He gave me. If there are additional laws that accord with my worldview and you believe that such laws require that you cooperate with me, then please follow such laws. This will benefit both of us.

Again, I thank you for your vaccine request and look forward to working together in avoiding all unnecessary risk and uncertainty associated with the Shot mandates. Please grant this exemption request.

Sincerely,

Your Loyal Employee.

NOTES:

^[1] According to the inventor of the m-RNA technology, Dr. Robert Malone, an m-RNA shot is not a "vaccination" and is not an appropriate prophylactic treatment for Covid or any other seasonal flu. Dr. Malone states that because of 1992 changes to federal law requiring pharmaceutical companies to pay for FDA approval, the FDA is no longer an independent federal agency. In Dr. Malone's view, the FDA has been subjected to regulatory capture and its decisions are biased by the pharmaceutical companies that fund it. See Dr. Malone's interview here: https://evidencenotfear.com/tag/regulatory-capture/.

President Donald Trump also accepted a \$1 million inauguration day donation from the Pfizer pharmaceutical company. https://www.spectrumnews.org/news/health-companies-gave-generously-president-trumps-inauguration/

First case of Covid in the U.S. was January 21, 2020: https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/first-confirmed-case-of-coronavirus-found-in-us-washington-state

^{3]} Trump Executive Order 13887, (September 19,

2019): https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/09/24/2019-20804/modernizing-influenza-vaccines-in-the-united-states-to-promote-national-security-and-public-health

- ^[4] CDC data show that the seasonal flu virtually disappeared in 2020, despite increased testing: https://www.cdc.gov/flu/season/faq-flu-season-2020-2021.htm See also, Chart showing that data showing deaths from flu and pneumonia dropped vertically immediately after the first reported case of "covid" in the
- U.S.: https://rightwirereport.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Pneumonia-Chart.jpg
 ^[5] nuremberg.pdf
- [6] https://profiles.stanford.edu/john-ioannidis
- The inventor of PCR testing, Nobel Laureate Kary Mullis, indicated on tape that PCR testing can "tell you anything you want it to tell you," and said that it is an inappropriate tool for identifying viruses. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QPs86XB1OjE
- http://biomechanics.stanford.edu/me233_20/reading/ioannidis20.pdf. See also, https://patriotdailypress.org/2021/09/02/new-stanford-studies-on-covid-19-infection-fatality-rates-should-end-covidstan-forever/
- https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/adverse-events.html https://odysee.com/@Coronavirus:4e/Dr-Sucharit-Bhakdi-Organs-Of-Dead-Vaccinated-Proves-Auto-Immune-Attack:e
- ^[11] In 1986, Congress passed the National Childhood Vaccination Injury Act, <u>absolving vaccine manufacturers from liability and setting up a federal fund and system that allowed for recovery for victims of known harms, 42 U.S.C. 300aa-22. Under the Covid regime, the Covid Shot sellers were given <u>complete immunity under the PREP Act</u>, <u>42</u> U.S.C. 247d-6e.</u>
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sovereign_immunity_in_the_United_States
- The United States of America v. Karl Brandt et al., http://werle.rewi.hu-berlin.de/MedicalCase.pdf
- https://www.newsweek.com/members-congress-staff-exempt-biden-covid-vaccine-mandate-1627859. Postal employees are exempt from federal employee vaccine mandate: https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/postal-workers-exempt-from-new-vaccine-requirements-report/ar-AAOhiV0
- [15] Executive Order 14043, (September 9,
- 2021): https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2021/09/14/2021-19927/requiring-coronavirus-disease-2019-vaccination-for-federal-employees
- [16] Executive Order 14042, (September 9, 2021):
- https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2021/09/14/2021-19924/ensuring-adequate-covid-safety-protocols-for-federal-contractors
- https://www.osha.gov/coronavirus/ets2
- [18] CMS Mandate (November 5,
- 2021): https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2021/11/05/2021-23831/medicare-and-medicaid-programs-omnibus-covid-19-health-care-staff-vaccination
- [19] BST Holdings, LLC v. OSHA, No. 21-60845 (5th Cir. November 6,
- 2021): https://www.ca5.uscourts.gov/opinions/pub/21/21-60845-CV0.pdf
- OSHA itself concedes that it does not have juridiction <u>over state</u>, <u>county</u>, <u>or municipal</u> governments. <u>https://www.osha.gov/laws-regs/standardinterpretations/2006-10-11</u>
- 1. The CDC's jurisdiction over "disease" is limited, by statute, and excludes everything that happens exclusively within a state (does not cross state lines). 42 U.S.C. 264(c). Louisiana v. Becarra, No. 21-CV-0397 TAD/KDM (W.D. La. November 30,
- 2021): https://www.alabamaag.gov/Documents/news/CMS Nationwide Injunction.pdf

[21] Georgia v. Biden, No. 21-CV-00163 RSB/BKE (S.D. Ga.. December 7,

2021): https://www.scag.gov/media/1pfaybfp/federal-contractor-order.pdf

Florida v. Nelson, No. 21-CV--254 SDM/TGW (M.D. Fla. December 22, 2021): https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.flmd.395435/gov.uscourts.flmd.395435.37.0.pdf

^[23] In re: MCP No. 165, OSHA Interim Final Rule: Covid Vaccination and Testing, No. 21-7000 (December 17,

2021): https://www.opn.ca6.uscourts.gov/opinions.pdf/21a0287p-06.pdf https://www.supremecourt.gov/orders/courtorders/122221zr2_f20h.pdf

Copyright © William Bernard Butler

Before the New Year's holiday more than 180 members of Congress <u>filed a friendly brief</u> to the Supreme Court on Thursday as the high court prepares to hear arguments against the Biden administration's virus mandates issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). What's reassuring is that so many members not only understand that the Constitution is the final bulwark against tyranny, but that they were willing to say so publicly by signing onto that brief.

At issue is one of the primary guards against tyranny: the separation of powers. The founders determined that powers granted to the federal government by the Constitution should not only be limited, but that those limited powers should be separated into three parts: the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. By competing against one another the chances of government overreaching its authority would be greatly reduced. From the brief:

The separation of powers has long been known to be a defense against tyranny.... And so [quoting a previous Supreme Court ruling] it "remains a basic principle of our constitutional scheme that one branch of the Government may not intrude upon the central prerogatives of another."

The brief quoted from another Supreme Court ruling from 1983: "The principle of separation of powers was not simply an abstract generalization in the minds of the Framers: it was woven into the documents that they drafted in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787."

From another high court decision, the brief said: "To the Framers, the separation of powers and checks and balances were more than just theories. They were practical and real protections for individual liberty in the new Constitution."

When Congress passed the legislation creating OSHA, which was signed into law by then-President Richard Nixon in 1970, it violated that doctrine. In 1989 the high court ruled (*Mistretta v. United States*) that Congress could violate the Constitution as long as it placed restrictions and limitations on those powers it delegated to federal agencies. Justice Anton Scalia dissented, but he was in the minority.

Back to the brief:

When an executive agency overreaches the boundaries of its authority [granted by Congress] ... it undermines both the vertical [states versus the federal government] and the horizontal [the three branches of the federal government] separation of powers that protect the people.

Blessings,

Pastor Bob, <u>EvanTeachr@aol.com</u> <u>www.pastorbobreid.com</u> <u>http://jesusisthewaythetruththelife.com/node/22</u>