The Absolute Right of Informed Consent

By Edwin Vieira, JD

January 21, 2022

At the center of public attention throughout the United States today are various “mandates” from public officials and even private parties aimed at forcing unwilling Americans to accept inoculations with so-called “vaccines” being touted as the best possible protections against infections with the “Covid-19” “virus”and its apparently endless “variants”. Of no little concern is that the people aggressively pushing these “mandates” are turning blind eyes to the adverse short-term reactions suffered by countless numbers of Americans already injected with these “vaccines”—and appear to be even more recklessly indifferent to whatever long-term dangers these “vaccinations” may pose in the unknowable future, not only to all Americans subjected to them, but even to their un-“vaccinated” countrymen. The most worrisome aspect of this situation, however, is that, although these “mandates” harken back to a dark period of very recent human history, they also confirm the old adage that “the only thing one learns from history is that no one ever learns anything from history”.

A- The essential lesson taught by relatively recent events derives from what has come to be called “the Nuremberg Code”. Immediately after the defeat of Germany in 1945, as the result of the exposure of “medical experiments” coercively conducted on human subjects by “Nazi doctors”, the Nuremberg Tribunals established that, with respect to such experimentation,

"certain basic principles must be observed in order to satisfy moral, ethical, and legal concepts". The very first and most important tenet of the Code is that

> * * * [t]he voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.
>
> This means that the person involved should have the legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.
>
> The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity.

See Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10, Nuremberg, October 1946–April 1949 (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1949-1953), Volume 2, at 181-182.

Sixteen "Nazi doctors" who had violated this "duty and responsibility" were tried for and convicted of, not mere medical malpractice, but rather crimes against humanity–with

seven of them sentenced to death by hanging, and in due course executed.

As human history goes, these events happened just yesterday. Nonetheless, in certain circles in the United States today the rather stark lesson they teach has apparently already been consigned to Orwell's "memory hole". For "medical experiments"—from "lockdowns"; to "masking"; to "social distancing"; to "warp-speed" development of so-called "vaccines" against "Covid-19" based upon radically new and unproven technologies; to suppression of safe, effective, and inexpensive alternative treatments; to censoring of dissident medical practitioners and other scientists; and now to "'vaccine' mandates" imposed in this country since early 2020 through a concert of action among public-health bureaucrats and elected officeholders at every level of the federal system, certain pharmaceutical companies, the big "mainstream" media and Internet platforms, and even private businesses of all sorts—are proceeding apace, with scant evidence that anyone with "official" standing or influence intends or will prove able to put a pause, let alone a stop, to them.

B- In light of the source, the subject, and the seriousness of the Nuremberg Code, this situation is as truly ominous as it is amazing. For the Code is not an historically bounded set of principles applicable only to "medical experiments" performed specifically by *"Nazi* doctors" in the *Nazi* era. Rather, it defends the integrity of the human person against the assertions of *any* régime, at *any* time, that reduction of *any* human being to the level of an experimental animal for *any* reason is a matter merely of political expediency, whether the latter be cloaked in the mantle of "science" (in general) or of "medicine" (in particular).

It is easy enough to establish that the foremost "duty and responsibility" of the Nuremberg Code was not invented and applied as a compendium of "moral, ethical, and legal concepts" for the first time in human history as a product of

mere “victors’ justice” in Germany by the Allied powers in the immediate aftermath of World War II. Quite the contrary.

1, The Nuremberg Code is an obvious extrapolation of some basic precepts of Natural Law. For, in general “[n]atural laws are those, which mankind are obliged to observe from their nature and constitution”, and specifically “[t]he rights which a man has to his life, to his liberty, to his health, to freedom from pain, to the integrity of his body * * * are natural ones”. Thomas Rutherforth, *Institutes of Natural Law: Being the Substance of a Course of Lectures on Grotius De Jure Belli Et Pacis* (Cambridge, England: J. Bentham, 1754 and 1756), Volume the First, Chapter I, Section V, at 8; and Chapter II, Section VIII, at 36.

2, Not surprisingly, then, the “moral, ethical, and legal concepts” which the Nuremberg Code embodies in its reflection of Natural Law are inextricably part and parcel of America’s fundamental laws. To wit—

(a) The Declaration of Independence—the foundational human law of the entire American system at the present time, no less than in 1776—invokes “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” as “entitl[ing]” Americans “to assume among the powers of the earth” their own “separate and equal station”. Inasmuch as “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”—and nothing else—“entitle[d] the [Founders]” to that “station”, and were explicitly invoked and relied upon by them for that purpose, nothing which their descendants do in and as a consequence of that “station” today may violate those “Laws”.

Going further, the Declaration explained that, in order to “secure” the “certain unalienable Rights” with which “all men * * * are endowed by their Creator”, “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God” authorize Americans to “institute[ ]” “Governments” which “deriv[e] their just powers from the consent of the governed”. Therefore, even the American people as a whole cannot “consent” to delegate “[*un*]just powers”—that

is, “powers” which offend “the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God”—to any supposed “Government”. Indeed, a political establishment purporting to exercise “[*un*]just powers”—from *any* source supposedly derived—would as a consequence and to the extent of that misbehavior not be a “Government” at all. Being “[un]just”, those purported “powers” would be illegitimate. And because of their illegitimacy no one would be entitled to exercise them, nor would anyone be required to obey any purported exercise of them, whether legislative, executive, administrative, or judicial in nature.

As has been pointed out, the gist of the Nuremberg Code’s first “duty and responsibility” was a component of “the Law[ ] of Nature” throughout Western civilization long before the Declaration of Independence invoked that “Law[ ]”. For that reason, the substance of that principle bound even the entirety of the American people in their capacity as the human source of “Government” in 1776, continues to bind all Americans in that respect today, and limits their present “Government” to the exercise of “just powers” consistent therewith. Any denial or disregard of that “duty and responsibility” by contemporary public officials necessarily implies their arrogation to themselves of “[*un*]just powers”, which no public officials can ever be authorized or allowed to exercise, because no people can ever be entitled to delegate such “powers” to any “Government” or officials thereof.

The Declaration of Independence specifically posited that “among the[certain unalienable Rights]” with which “all men * * * are endowed by their Creator”—and which “Governments are instituted among Men” “to secure”, as those institutions’ only reason for existence—are “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness”. Plainly enough, an individual is deprived of “Life” when killed in the course of some “medical experiment” of which he becomes an unknowing or otherwise unwilling subject. No less clear, an individual is deprived of “Liberty” when coerced or cajoled to submit to a “medical experiment” by

force, fear, fraud, or the lure of some favor. And an individual cannot engage in "the pursuit of Happiness" fully, or perhaps even at all, when crippled, afflicted with chronic pain, or condemned to a span of life seriously reduced as the result of a "medical experiment" in which he has been compelled or cajoled against his better judgment to participate. Self-evidently, then, Americans have not delegated—because they are utterly incapable of delegating—any "just powers" to any "Government" to inflict such effects upon anyone.

A subject's unwillingness needs to be considered because, in abstract principle, a true "Government" might possibly be delegated a carefully constrained power to perform "medical experiments" to which the individual has freely and intelligently consented. But only on that condition, strictly and severely enforced against public officials in actual practice. For, in the very nature of a "medical experiment", any adverse consequences are entirely personal to the subject alone. So he is the only party who in the exercise of logic, moral reasoning, and rational human law is entitled, and therefore who must enjoy the full legal capacity, to give (or withhold) his consent, alone and with finality.

(b) As the Preamble to the Constitution announced, "We the People * * * ordain[ed] and establish[ed] this Constitution" "in Order", as one of their purposes, "to * * * establish Justice". Inasmuch as under the Declaration of Independence We the People's authority to "ordain and establish" any "Government" extended in 1788, and continues unto this very day, only to the delegation of "just powers" to that "Government", no official under the Constitution can claim a prerogative, authority, or license, under any circumstances whatsoever, to exercise any "[un]just power[ ]". For, obviously, no exercise of any "[un]just power[ ]" can "establish Justice" to any degree. Rather, every such exercise, howsoever rogue public officials may struggle to

rationalize it, prevents the "establish[ment of] Justice".

Presumably, the powers the Constitution delegates to the government of the United States are "just powers" in principle—provided of course that in practice they are not misconstrued or abused, and otherwise are executed for reasons and in the manners appropriate to their purposes. And the Bill of Rights was adopted precisely to secure as much. *See* Resolution of the First Congress Submitting Twelve Amendments to the Constitution (March 4, 1789), in *Documents Illustrative of the Formation of the Union of the American States*, House Document No. 398, 69th Congress, 1st Session (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1927), at 1063.

(c) Nonetheless, the question remains: What are the *standards* of "Justice" according to which "just powers" are to be evaluated in their definitions and judged in their applications? Plainly enough, these are never to be found in the platforms of political parties, in the promises of political candidates, in the propaganda of political campaigns, in the plebiscites which elevate candidates to public offices, or even in the policies and practices of public officials supposedly administering the "Government" according to their conceptions of "the public interest". For all of these are as inevitably shifting in their positions as the sands of the Sahara, and all too often as shifty in their intentions as a confidence man playing upon the gullibility of a mark.

Unfortunately, the Constitution does not spell out the standards of "Justice" according to which exercises of its "powers" (and recognition of its "disabilities", or absences of "powers") are to be judged, whether in the courts of law or the court of public opinion. (Apparently, the Framers believed that Americans of their time, and into the future, would already know or would be willing and able to ascertain those standards on their own.) In any event, neither in 1788 nor today could those standards be conclusively presumed to be

embodied even in public officials' arguably honest exercises of those "powers". For a public official might be scrupulously honest, yet entirely wrong about the rectitude of his actions. Even "powers" which the Constitution defines, and perforce of those definitions limits, can be accidentally misconstrued by careless or incompetent, or intentionally abused by dishonest, officials. And complex situations may create room for doubt and debate amongst men of good will as to what some "power" actually allows. So how, in the final analysis, can anyone tell whether someone's exposition of a presumably "just power" is capable in legal logic of "establish[ing] Justice", or whether some official's exercise of that "power" has in fact "establish[ed] Justice" or done the very opposite?

The answer to this question should be self-evident. In the American system, the controlling standards of "Justice" are to be found within "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" to which the Declaration of Independence appealed, and upon which its efficacy in positive human law is based. Both in principle in their exposition and in practice in their exercise, all "just powers" must be consistent with those supreme "Laws". All other purported "powers"—as well as all deviations from the parameters of admittedly "just powers"—are necessarily "[un]just", and therefor unlawful in the most fundamental sense possible.

3. Now, echoing the Declaration of Independence, the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution provides (in pertinent part) that no "person * * * shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law". And Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment provides (in pertinent part) that no State "shall * * * deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law". What is "due process of law", of course, takes into account *all* sources and aspects of "law" relevant to the situation at hand.

Obviously, a "medical experiment" performed at the behest of

public officials—or by private parties who are required to conduct such an "experiment" by, or are working in complicity with, those officials—can in fact deprive a subject, not only of his "Life", but also of his "Liberty", as well as of his "pursuit of Happiness" to the fullest degree of which he might otherwise be capable. As a pertinent example, "[t]he forcible injection of medication into a nonconsenting person's body represents a substantial interference with that person's liberty." *Washington* v. *Harper*, 494 U.S. 210, 229 (1990). So, too, with respect to the "property" which a subject has in his own body , and through the use of which he lives his "Life" in "Liberty" and engages in his own "pursuit of Happiness". For "[n]o right is held more sacred, or is more carefully guarded by the common law, than the right of every individual to the possession and control of his own person". *Union Pacific Railway Company* v. *Botsford*, 141 U.S. 250, 251 (1891).

Obviously, too, a "medical experiment" cannot conform to any acceptable conception of "due process of law" when it denies "informed consent", whether as to "information" or "consent" or both. For such a denial violates "the Law[ ] of Nature", which, being the "Law[ ]" that through the Declaration of Independence subtends and justifies the Constitution of the United States (and the constitutions of every State as well), is the ultimate source and supplies the controlling substance of "due process of law", no matter what political parties, candidates, electoral majorities, and public officials might insist to the contrary.

4. To like effect is the command of the Fourth Amendment that "[t]he right of the people to be secure in their persons * * * against unreasonable * * * seizures[ ] shall not be violated". *Every* form of real or pretended "vaccination" involves a medical procedure which invades a person's body. And the experimental nature of the present "Covid-19" "vaccines" maximizes the invasive nature of the process. Self-evidently, then, individuals

are not "secure in their persons" when their own bodies can be effectively "seize[d]" through a "'vaccine' mandate" for a "medical experiment" the arguable "reasonable[ness]" of which will be determined, if at all, only *after* (and perhaps *long* after) the "seizures" have taken place—and likely too long after to do anything about the adverse effects the subjects will suffer. Obviously, too, such "unreasonable * * * seizure[s]" deprive the victims of "life" (possibly), "liberty" (surely), and the "property" which an individual has in his own body (also surely), "without due process of law", in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

5. Moreover, with respect to the particular "due process" of "informed consent", the Constitution goes beyond those two Amendments, to recognize "informed consent" as an individual's *absolute* right.

(a) "Informed consent" with respect to any matter depends upon an individual's *personal beliefs* concerning the "information" available to him. And under the First Amendment "freedom to believe * * * is *absolute*". *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 303 (1940) (emphasis supplied). One cannot enjoy the freedoms enumerated in that Amendment—namely, to exercise his religion, to speak, to publish, to assemble and associate with others in order to petition the government for redress of grievances—unless he also partakes of the freedom to believe what his religion teaches, what he himself says, what he puts out through the press, and what his petitions assert. So, because the "freedom to believe" one set of facts, rather than another—that is, to be "informed" by what an individual *himself* understands and accepts, or rejects, as "information"—is "absolute"; and because "informed consent" is founded upon an individual's *own* beliefs as to relevant facts, not the beliefs of anyone else; therefore the freedom to "consent" to (or to dissent from) any action for which necessary and sufficient "information" is the predicate, and

for which "consent" *vel non* is necessary, must be "absolute" as well. "If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in * * * matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word *or act* their faith therein." *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 642 (1943) (emphasis supplied). As far as "informed consent" is concerned, "to confess by word" relates to being "informed" and "to confess by * * * act" relates to giving "consent"—and as to neither can some "orthodox[y]" be "prescribe[d]" by any "official, high or petty".

After all, whoever chooses which beliefs an individual can, may, or should hold determines the foundation for that individual's "consent". If an individual does not establish *for himself* which beliefs to accept, then (all appearances aside) *he* does not "consent"—someone else "consents" *for* (or, perhaps better put, *against*) him. No one freely "consents" to any action when his own beliefs relevant thereto can be disparaged, denied, and dismissed by someone else as "faulty", "false", "fictitious", "fatuous", "foolish", "fantastic", or even "fabricated"—and the individual then is required to "consent" to that action on the basis of beliefs which contradict his own.

(b) Right now, most objections to the "mandates" of experimental "Covid-19" "vaccines" based upon individuals' freedom of belief involve demands for exemptions predicated on the prohibition in the First Amendment that "Congress shall make no law * * * prohibiting the free exercise [of religion]", or the so-called "incorporation" of that disability into Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment as against the States. This makes perfect practical, political, and legal sense. For every such "mandate" is (at least supposedly) the spawn of some "law" enacted by Congress or a State's legislature, to be enforced by some executive official, bureaucrat, or judge. And no legislator, executive

official, bureaucrat, or judge in the government of the United States or the government of any State can, under color of such a "mandate", "prohibit the free exercise [of religion]".

Self-evidently, "the free exercise [of religion]" depends for its efficacy upon an individual's ability to form and hold religious beliefs, and to act upon them in appropriate manners under appropriate circumstances. Specifically, religious beliefs can provide the "information" upon which an individual relies to give (or withhold) "informed consent" to participation in some program of mass "vaccination". Inasmuch as the "informed" component of "informed consent" is *absolutely* within the control of the individual perforce of the First and Fourteenth Amendments, so too must the "consent" component be (as the latter depends upon the former). So, because neither Congress nor a State's legislature can enact any "law" which interferes with an individual's formation of or adherence to religious beliefs, no "'vaccine' mandate" promulgated under color of law can require an individual to "consent" to a "vaccination" which his religious beliefs oppose.

An individual's expression of "consent" to "vaccination" is itself an action, which then results in further action in the form of his submission to an injection of a "vaccine"—neither of which actions is specifically "religious" in nature in and of itself. Yet, although "mandates" for "vaccination" might not be intentionally designed to interfere with anyone's free exercise of religion, and might have some arguably valid secular purpose, yet in compelling "consent" in violation of the individual's religious beliefs they will surely interfere with that exercise—and are unconstitutional on that ground. *Compare, e.g.*, *Wisconsin* v. *Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, 218 (1972) (compulsory public-school attendance law violates practice of the Amish religion).

(c) The principle of freedom to believe as one wills (that is, absolutely), and as a consequence to "consent" *vel non* as one

wills (no less absolutely) in situations which involve the necessity of "consent", extends beyond religious to all other beliefs within the ken of the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

(i) Of principal concern here is the freedom to hold such *scientific* beliefs as—

- That "Covid-19" is far less dangerous than public-health bureaucrats claim.
- That safe, effective, and inexpensive alternatives to "vaccinations" are readily available (although unlawfully prohibited for that use by rogue "public-health" officials).
- That the "vaccines" are experimental in nature, and have proven to be neither safe nor effective. And
- That mass "vaccinations" through indiscriminate "mandates" threaten the health of "vaccinated" and un-"vaccinated" individuals alike, to the extent that "public health" in general is seriously endangered.

Necessarily, of course, for most Americans to form beliefs which they consider reliable with respect to such complex issues requires them to investigate, study, and accept the expert opinions of medical doctors and other scientists who more likely than not dissent from the official orthodoxies which "public-health" bureaucrats have spread throughout much of the federal system, the "mainstream" media, and the Internet. Although not explicitly mentioned in the First or the Fourteenth Amendment, the freedom of individuals to engage in associations of this sort in order to become "informed" about the exercise of their rights implicitly springs from the freedoms the First Amendment does catalog. "It is beyond debate that freedom to engage in association for the advancement of beliefs and ideas is an inseparable part of the 'liberty' assured by * * * the Fourteenth Amendment, which embraces freedom of speech"; and "it is immaterial whether the beliefs sought to be advanced by association pertain to political, economic, religious or cultural matters". *NAACP* v.

Alabama ex rel. *Patterson*, 357 U.S. 449, 460 (1958). *Accord, e.g., United Transportation Union* v. *State Bar of Michigan*, 401 U.S. 576, 578-579 (1971); *Bates* v. *City of Little Rock*, 361 U.S. 516, 522-523 (1960). This is particularly important with respect to expressions of "informed consent" (or, of more consequence, "informed dissent") as to "vaccinations", because with the advent of "mandates" these normally private decisions have become matters of intense public controversy. And "[e]ffective advocacy of both public and private points of view, particularly controversial ones, is undeniably enhanced by group association, as th[e Supreme] Court has more than once recognized by remarking on the close nexus between the freedoms of speech and assembly." *Patterson*, 357 U.S. at 460.

(ii) Also important with respect to "Covid-19", "vaccines", and "'vaccine' mandates" is each individual's right to base "informed consent" (actually, "informed dissent") on his own *political* beliefs. For example—

- That the "Covid-19" narrative to which public-health bureaucrats and other officials have been exposing Americans is a species of unreliable, often intentionally deceptive, "*political* science" (that is, a scheme of *pseudo*-"science" defined and driven by politics) .
- That this "political science" is the stalking horse for the entirely unscientific purpose of setting up, on both a national and an international scale, a system of pervasive police-state surveillance and control of individuals, using "'vaccine' mandates" administered through "'vaccine' passports" as the first step. And even
- That an individual who "consents" to cooperate in such an unscientific and politically malicious "medical experiment" thereby becomes complicitous in a crime against humanity.

Of course, as with purely scientific beliefs, to become

"informed" as to such political matters most Americans need to seek out and associate with experts in the field, as well as with other laymen.

(d) In all of these cases, individuals' "informed consent" cannot be subjected to any "official" inquisition as to "truth" or "falsity". For "under the First Amendment there is no such thing as a false idea." *Gertz* v. *Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323, 339 (1974). "Authoritative interpretations of the First Amendment guarantees have consistently refused to recognize an exception for any test of truth—whether administered by judges, juries, or administrative officials—and especially one that puts the burden of proving truth on the speaker. * * * The constitutional protection does not turn upon 'the truth, popularity, or social utility of the ideas and beliefs which are offered.'" *New York Times Company* v. *Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 271 (1964), *quoting NAACP* v. *Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 445 (1963). "The very purpose of the First Amendment is to foreclose public authority from assuming a guardianship of the public mind through regulating * * * speech * * * . In this field every person must be his own watchman for truth, because the forefathers did not trust any government to separate the true from the false for us." *Thomas* v. *Collins*, 323 U.S. 516, 545 (1945) (Jackson, J., concurring). And, of course, these principles apply even more insistently to beliefs than to speech—because beliefs typically precede and determine the content of speech.

Moreover, "'[f]ree trade in ideas' means free trade in the opportunity to persuade to action, not merely to describe facts. * * * Indeed, the whole history of the problem shows it is to the end of preventing action that repression is primarily directed and to preserving the right to urge it that the protections are given." *Thomas* v. *Collins*, 323 U.S. 516, 537 (1945), *the first sentence quoted with approval in NAACP* v. *Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 437 (1963).

C. It should be kept squarely in mind that, in the final

analysis, in every instance in which an individual asserts a constitutional exemption under the First, Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments from some "mandate" for compulsory "vaccination" against "Covid-19" (or any other experimental "medical treatment") on the basis of beliefs which form the foundation for his "informed consent" (actually, "informed dissent"), his right derives from laws even higher than those Amendments. That is of vital concern, inasmuch as the Judiciary claims a license to override every one of these Amendments if it imagines that public officials have a "compelling interest" in doing so, and proceed in a manner "least restrictive" of the rights the Amendments are intended to secure. Of course, this theory amounts to nonsense on stilts, inasmuch as: (i) the government's most "compelling interest" is to abide by the Constitution, not to expand its powers and evade its disabilities; and (ii) even the "*least* restrictive" abridgment of or infringement on someone's rights remains a restriction which by hypothesis the Constitution disallows. In any event, to date no court has dared openly to invent a "compelling interest" which supposedly can override "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" to any degree.

1. The most inclusive exemption from "'vaccine' mandates" rests upon the most obvious of "the Laws *of Nature*"—namely, the requirement of "informed consent" in aid of an individual's right to "health, to freedom from pain, [and] to the integrity of his body", now set out in the first "duty and responsibility" of the Nuremberg Code: namely that, no matter to what extent he has been "informed", no individual can be required to "consent" to participate as a human guinea pig in what he believes to be a "medical experiment".
2. A specifically religious exemption obviously derives from "the Laws * * * *of Nature's God*"—an individual's religion being the source of "information" which precludes even the thought of his own "consent", no matter to what degree some supposedly "scientific" data

might support "consent" by other people.

3. Other "Laws *of Nature*" also apply—the most prominent being: (i) the sciences which explain the workings of the natural world, thereby enabling the targets of "'vaccine' mandates" to assess the necessity, safety, and efficacy *vel non* of "vaccines", as well as alternative treatments, for "Covid-19"; and (ii) the intellectual discipline called "political science" (that is, the science of human nature with respect to politics), which enables individuals to understand how these "mandates" are the products of innate and applied human psychology, and especially of various psycho-pathologies which are largely responsible for causing most of the conflicts and disorders which plague society. *See, e.g.,* Andrew M. Lobaczewski, *Political Ponerology: A Science on the Nature of Evil Adjusted for Political Purposes* (Grande Prairie, Alberta, Canada: Red Pill Press, Second Edition, 2006). And
4. Ultimately, when "the good People" of the United States finally recognize that modern-day "'vaccine' mandates" are the latest and most dangerous of "a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object[, which] evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism", both "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God" will (as the Declaration of Independence attests) justify the exercise of "their right" and "their duty[ ] to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security". *See* T. Rutherforth, *Institutes of Natural Law, ante,* Volume the Second, Chapter X, Section XI, at 663-668.

D. Perhaps, though, it is too early for "the good People" to contemplate "throw[ing] off such Government", or even (as the Declaration of Independence also recognizes as their right) "to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government". There still remains a slim chance that a critical mass of Americans will finally realize how the requirement of

"informed consent" absolutely negates all "'vaccine' mandates"—and that mounting public resistance will pressure the clique controlling the present resident in the White House to abandon the "mandates", will embolden Governors and Legislatures in at least some of the several States to invoke the doctrine of "interposition" in order to block the imposition of "mandates" on their own citizens, and even will nerve five Justices of the Supreme Court to strike down the "mandates" as violative at least of the Constitution, if not (better yet) of the Declaration of Independence and "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God".

The evident problem right now is that all too few Americans seem ready and willing to call a spade a spade—bluntly put, to recognize that, with respect to "Covid-19", this country is not dealing with "science" at all, unless it be the science of criminology. Indeed, if Dostoevsky were writing a novel about the present "pandemic", he would be compelled to entitle it, not *Crime and Punishment*, but *Crime without Punishment*, inasmuch as the perpetration of serious offenses by rogue public officials, attended by no fear of exposure let alone punishment, is endemic to Washington, D.C., and all too many of the States as well. It is against *that* "pandemic" that Americans need a "vaccination" which will open their eyes, clear their minds, and steel their wills. For if *that* "pandemic" is not soon eradicated, this country's doom is assured.

E-Mail Edwin Vieira: edwinvieira@gmail.com