



# Why The Public Should Rebel Against Forced Vaccinations

There is no legal, moral or logical argument that justifies government entities demanding access to your body in order to inject foreign substances into you. Instead, it is simply a play for control and power: “You will do what we say, when we say, or else.”

The primary driver of globally-enforced vaccinations is Bill Gates. The Gates family has deep historic ties to the original eugenics movement, which continues to color everything Gates does today. He openly declares that his overriding goal is global population reduction while simultaneously stating that vaccines will help to save lives. You can't have it both ways. This pathetic exercise of the Hegelian Dialectic is designed to break down mental resistance to his core beliefs: “managing the herd” demands access to every body within the herd. □ TN Editor

The debate over the morality and practicality of forced vaccinations has been raging for many years, long before the coronavirus ever hit the US population. With the advent of the pandemic the narrative has shifted to one of “necessity”. The media and the majority of governments around the world now act as if mass vaccinations are a given; the “debate is

over”, as collectivists like to say when they are tired of having to deal with any logical or factual complaints.

In the case of the novel coronavirus there is no vaccine yet; unless of course the virus was engineered or evolved in a lab (as more and more evidence is suggesting), and then perhaps there is one already developed. Typically, vaccines take years to test and produce, and whenever a vaccine is rushed onto the market very bad things tend to happen.

The vaccine debate often revolves around the issue of safety. Is a particular inoculation safe or poisonous? Does it have long term effects that are dangerous? Does it harm children with highly sensitive and underdeveloped body systems? These are valid concerns, but ultimately the fight over vaccines has less to do with medical safety or effectiveness and more to do with individual rights vs government demands.

In other words, the more important questions are: Should social engineering by governments and elites be allowed? Do people have the right to determine how their bodies are medically augmented or manipulated? Does the “security of the majority” take precedence over the civil liberties of the individual? And if so, who gets to determine what freedoms will be taken away?

## **The Legal Argument**

The purveyors of the forced vaccination philosophy usually make a legal or technical argument first before they appeal to the idea of “the greater good”. They do this because they know that public perception often assumes (wrongly) that legal authority is the same as moral authority.

In 1905, the US Supreme Court was presented with *Jacobson vs. Massachusetts*, a case involving the subject of state enforced smallpox vaccination. The defendant argued on the grounds of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment that his bodily liberty was being violated by the state if he was subjected to arbitrary vaccination without his consent. The state and the Supreme Court felt differently (of course). The Supreme Court

ruled against Jacobson on the grounds that his refusal to take the vaccine put other people “at risk”, and that “for the common good” states have certain “police powers” that supersede personal liberties.

Whenever liberty movement activists argue against forced vaccinations on constitutional grounds, THIS is the counter-argument that the government and statist will make. They will bring up Jacobson vs. Massachusetts and then claim that is the end of the discussion.

Essentially, the Supreme Court argued that the federal government could not interfere with state imposed forced vaccinations on the grounds of states rights and the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment. Most people in the liberty movement will find this rather ironic, as it is bizarre to hear about the federal government defending states rights. But, this support of the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment is highly selective.

First, let’s not forget that the Supreme Court has been wrong many times in the past. In the Dredd Scott case in 1834, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of slavery and the right of states to enforce the institution. They also argued that the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment protected slave owners because freeing slaves meant depriving owners of their “property”.

The Supreme Court’s habit is to defend states rights and the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment when people’s individual liberties are being quashed. However, if a case involves states protecting citizens from federal intrusion, the court flips and attacks states rights when they work in favor of individual liberty or self determination.

The Jacobson vs. Massachusetts case may be the reason why Trump and the federal government have mostly left the lockdowns and emergency actions to the states. The legal precedence was already established in 1905 on quarantines and forcing vaccinations through state police powers, so it only follows that the establishment would utilize the states to carry out such measures in the near future.

The “states vs federal government” debate sets up a false paradigm. There is no separation between state and federal governments when it

comes to tyranny - both sides love it, though they pretend to be opposed to each other at times. That is to say, whether it is the federal government violating your constitutional rights or the state government violating your constitutional rights, the Supreme Court is often comfortable with both.

The truth they don't want to discuss is that at bottom the Bill of Rights overrules them regardless of federal precedent or the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment. The key to the Bill of Rights is that each American citizen has INHERENT LIBERTIES that supersede both federal and state power. These rights are inalienable. They cannot be violated today, and the law cannot be adjusted to violate them tomorrow. These rights and freedoms are ETERNAL.

The Supreme Court hisses with a forked tongue about the "spirit of the constitution" but ignores the clear and concrete intent as stated by the Founders. Statists argue in favor of the "living document" philosophy when it suits them as a means to change the original meaning and laws put forth in the Bill of Rights because this allows them to violate citizen freedoms under the guise of "legality". But "legality" is not the same as morality. Legality is meaningless, and the Supreme Court is meaningless if it acts against the constitutional bedrock of the Bill of Rights and individual liberty as they have done numerous times in the past.

## **The Moral Argument**

So, if we cannot rely on legality to protect us from state tyranny, what can we rely on? Forced vaccine advocates will say that morality is on their side as well, for if a person does not vaccinate they are putting the rest of society at risk of infection. Therefore, your individual rights must be violated in order to protect the rights of the rest of society. The problem is that *Jacobson vs Massachusetts* makes no logical argument supporting this assertion, and neither do forced vaccine proponents.

Look at it this way: How can a person that is not vaccinated "harm" people that are vaccinated? How are they putting those people at risk? If the vaccine actually works, then vaccinated people are safe from infection, aren't they? So, the only person "at risk" is the person that

chose not to vaccinate. This comes down to personal choice, there is no question of “the greater good” or social risk.

I find it fascinating that the people that argue fervently in favor of forced vaccinations (people like Bill Gates) also tend to be the same people that argue in favor of abortion rights. So, “my body my choice” is acceptable when it comes to women ending the lives of unborn children, but “my body my choice” is not acceptable when it comes to mass vaccinations even though an unvaccinated person is a threat to no one.

Some vaccine advocates will then claim that unvaccinated people could be host to “mutations” that threaten herd immunity. The problem is that there is no evidence to support this argument. The vast majority of viruses tend to mutate into LESS deadly or infectious strains, not more deadly. The only mitigating factors would be if a virus was deliberately designed or engineered to mutate in an unnatural manner.

Read full story here...