

Connecting the Dots
Vaccinations, Mass Media, Fascism and The Blueprint
by
Michael Mendizza

This is not a simple essay easily digested while dunking donuts on the way to work. It is a collection of articles that together bring into sharp focus a perception of our changing society, one that is not easily seen looking at each part separately. If even partially true what is revealed impacts your life and the lives of your children. mm

- **Children are herded like cattle into Maryland courthouse for forced vaccinations as armed police and attack dogs stand guard.**
- **Propaganda, Dirty Tricks and The Erosion of Democracy**
- **Jerry Mander: How Media Shapes Political Forms**
- **California Changing Vaccination Laws**
- ***The Fascist Blueprint*, by Naomi Wolf**
- **The Violent Radicalization Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007** (a return of McCarthy Commission and FBI's Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO) agencies that infiltrated, undermined and spied on civil rights and antiwar groups during the 1950s and 60s.)
- **How to Legally Avoid Unwanted Immunizations of All Kinds.**



Connect the Dots...

Seven years ago I was shocked when David Korten, a visionary economist and co-founder of YES (Positive Futures Network), used the word FASCIST to describe the current political climate and administration. <http://www.davidkorten.org/>

Fascism is both an attitude and a political agenda or force. Fascism is opposed to Democracies which equates a nation with the views of the majority. Fascism uses force to impose state control over all aspects of life: political, social, cultural, and economic, by way of enacting laws and a strong, sometimes brutal militia or police for enforcing them. For example...

Children are herded like cattle into Maryland courthouse for forced vaccinations as armed police and attack dogs stand guard. (see below)

Connect the Dots...

On the first, post 911, 4th of July the flag waving was so intense that I had visions of Nazi rallies as we sang praises to old glory. The flag was different but the mood was the same. So disturbed by the unprecedented use of disinformation, propaganda and censorship in mainstream media I drafted:

Propaganda, Dirty Tricks and The Erosion of Democracy: Attack Ads, Fear, Empty Rhetoric, Glittering Generalities, Character Assassination, Smear, Doublespeak, and The Big Lie.

You will be fascinated to see how many of these dirty tricks are standard tools used in today's spin-media. It was no coincidence that security threats were bumped to orange whenever an embarrassing event faced the White House. When the heat is on, shake a rattle and claim that the boogie man is outside. Do it over and over again and people believe it – **distracted** from the chicanery in their own back yard.

Take a look and then connect the Dots...

<http://www.ttfuture.org/pdf/Propaganda2004.pdf>

Then review our interview with Jerry Mander, author of *The Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television*. Better still read the book.

<http://ttfuture.org/services/newsletters/pdf/97fall.PDF>

<http://ttfuture.org/services/newsletters/pdf/97winter.PDF>

People's patterns of discernment, discrimination and understanding were taking a dive. They didn't seem able to make distinctions between information which was preprocessed and filtered through a machine, and that which came to them whole, by actual experience...

Far from being "neutral" television itself predetermines who shall use it, how they will use it, what effects it will have on individual lives, and if it continues to be widely used, what sorts of political forms will inevitably emerge.

Mander compares Orwell's 1984 with Huxley's Brave New World emphasizing how, in Huxley's future world, politically motivated social engineers induced apathy by keeping people focused on their own satisfaction, a preemptive strike against real discontent. Only mass media, skillfully manipulated, has the power to create, as Bush senior proclaimed, **A New World Order**, like it or not.

It was about that time Milton Mayer published "**They Thought They Were Free**" (But Then It Was Too Late), describing how a small group undermined German democracy in the 30's. <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/511928.html>

*"What happened was the gradual habituation of the people, little by little, to being governed by surprise; to receiving decisions deliberated in secret; to believing that the situation was so complicated that the government had to act on information which the people could not understand, or so dangerous that, even if the people could not understand it, it could not be released because of **national security**.*

"This widening of the gap, took place so gradually and so insensibly, each step disguised as a temporary emergency measure or associated with true patriotic allegiance or with real social purposes.

*"The dictatorship, and the whole process of its coming into being, was above all **diverting**.*

Connect the Dots...

In her new book ***The Fascist Blueprint***, Naomi Wolf describes ten steps taking place in America today that Lenin, Mussolini, Hitler, and numerous others have all used to shut down societies who thought they were free.

Here's how it works

1. Invoke a terrifying internal and external enemy
2. Create a gulag (Guantanamo and other secret prisons)
3. Develop a thug caste (private mercenaries not controlled by congress)
4. Set up an internal surveillance system
5. Harass citizens' groups
6. Engage in arbitrary detention and release
7. Target key individuals
8. Control the press
9. Dissent equals treason
10. Suspend the rule of law

(View her lecture and then connect the dots.) Courtesy of Brasscheck TV, San Francisco, CA 94115 <http://www.brasschecktv.com/page/177.html>

Toady in the Land of the Free and the Brave

What follows are several articles that help connect the dots of how our civil liberties and free society are eroding. How individual freedom, the gift and inspiration of our founding fathers, is systematically being replaced by centralized and often forced control and done so methodologically – by design. mm

Children are herded like cattle into Maryland courthouse for forced vaccinations as armed police and attack dogs stand guard

by Mike Adams

(NewsTarget) Following the State of Maryland's threats against parents who refuse to have their children vaccinated, children were herded into a Prince George County courthouse being guarded by armed personnel with attack dogs. Inside, the children were forcibly vaccinated, many against their will, under orders from the State Attorney General, various State Judges and the local School Board Director, all of whom illegally conspired to threaten parents with imprisonment if they did not submit their children to vaccinations.

The State of Maryland has now turned to Gestapo tactics to force its medical will upon the People, stripping parents of any right to decide how they wish to protect their own children from infectious disease. Health authorities there have already announced their intent to essentially kidnap parents and throw them in jail, removing them from their children for up to thirty days if they continue to refuse to have their children vaccinated. This will all be conducted at gunpoint, with armed personnel and attack dogs at the ready, making sure nobody steps out of line, and suppressing any attempt at public dissent against the Orwellian vaccination policies.

The entire campaign against these parents is blatantly illegal. There is no law in Maryland requiring the vaccination of children, thus parents who refuse to do so may not be legally charged with violating any law. Instead, Maryland health and school authorities are using Gestapo-like tactics, threatening to charge the parents with child truancy violations, criminalizing them for daring to protect their children from the dangerous chemicals found in vaccines (including thimerosal, a chemical additive containing a neurotoxic form of mercury).

The desperation of organized medicine is becoming increasingly apparent

As more and more parents are becoming informed about the dangers of vaccinations and their link to autism, state health authorities are increasingly turning to "Gunpoint Medicine" to force the People to submit to the poisons of conventional medicine. Parents who attempt to save their children from deadly chemotherapy chemicals are being arrested and having their children kidnapped by Child Protective Services

(see http://www.newstarget.com/Abraham_Cherrix.html

<http://www.msplinks.com/MDFodHRwOi8vd3d3Lm5ld3N0YXJnZXQuY29tL0FicmFoYW1fQ2hlc nJpeC5odG1s>), and oncologists who used to be armed only with radiation machines and chemotherapy injectors and now arming themselves with U.S. Marshals and other local law enforcement authorities who are using loaded firearms to enforce "the will of the State" against parents who resist.

Even the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS) announced its strong opposition to the Maryland "Gunpoint Medicine" vaccination campaign. In a press release published Nov. 16, the AAPS states:

The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons today condemned the "vaccine roundup" executed in Prince George's county Maryland this week, and promised to do everything it can to support parents who refuse to immunize their children.

"This power play obliterates informed consent and parental rights," said Kathryn Serkes, director of policy for the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons (AAPS), one of the few national physician groups that refuse corporate funding from pharmaceutical companies.

In a scenario reminiscent of cattle round-ups, the state's attorney has issued summons to more than 1600 parents of children who have not provided certificates of immunization for their children. But instead of toting a cattle prod, this state's attorney chooses to wield a syringe to keep the "herd" in line.

Read the rest of the press release at: <http://www.aapsonline.org/press/nr-11-16-07.php>
<http://www.msplinks.com/MDFodHRwOi8vd3d3LmFhcHNvbmxpbmUub3JnL3ByZXNzL25yLTExLTE2LTA3LnBocA==>>

Gunpoint Medicine: Why drug pushers must now rely on Gestapo tactics

Conventional (pharmaceutical) medicine is the only system of medicine in the world that is so unpopular with informed consumers that it must be administered at the barrel of a gun. There is no other system of medicine anywhere in the world that resorts to such tactics to recruit patients.

At the Nov. 17th event in Maryland, activists Jim Moody and Kelly Ann Davis from SafeMinds (www.SafeMinds.org

<http://www.msplinks.com/MDFodHRwOi8vd3d3LlNhZmVNaW5kcy5vcmc=>>) were able to get in front of TV news cameras and voice their opposition to the coerced vaccination policy. Yet, amazingly, most parents just lined up like cattle ready to be branded, not bothering to question the sanity or legality of the very system in which they were now agreeing to participate.

A health freedom blog called Center for the Common Interest (www.CommonInterest..

<http://www.msplinks.com/MDFodHRwOi8vd3d3LkNvbW1vbkludGVyZXN0Li4=>>) also covered the event, and it reports that a local activist named Donovan Hubbard videotaped the event and plans to make the video available online. (NewsTarget

would like to contact Donovan and / or publicize his video. If you know of a way we can contact him, please call us at (520) 232-9300 to let us know...)

What's next for Gunpoint Medicine?

As the truth continues to emerge about the extreme dangers of vaccinations and pharmaceuticals, Big Pharma is becoming increasingly desperate to coerce the public into relying on its products. It is now working closely with state authorities (including Governors of several states) to *mandate* the use of vaccinations on young children. This results in the criminalization of parents who refuse to subject their children to these dangerous chemicals.

In effect, **Big Pharma is hoping to turn natural health followers into criminals.**

The FDA has already criminalized nutritional supplement companies who dare to tell the truth about the health benefits of their supplements. (Read the true history of armed FDA raids on vitamin companies: <http://www.newstarget.com/021791.html> <<http://www.msplinks.com/MDFodHRwOi8vd3d3Lm5ld3N0YXJnZXQuY29tLzAyMTc5MS5odG1s> >)

Next, parents who refuse to subject their children to the chemical pharmaceuticals proposed by Big Pharma will be criminalized, rounded up and incarcerated for "refusing to comply with public health policy." This is all being done by the State in the name of "protecting the children" from their own natural health parents. (Insane, isn't it, to think that protecting your child from toxic chemicals is now a criminal act in the United States?)

The end game of all this is to apply Gunpoint Medicine tactics to everyone: Adults and senior citizens included. Anyone suffering from high cholesterol, for example, who does not submit to Big Pharma's statin drugs could be arrested, strapped to a table and medicated against their will. People with cancer could be arrested for choosing to treat that cancer with safe and effective botanical medicines instead of patented, high-profit Big Pharma drugs. If you think the prisons are full enough right now from all the arrests for marijuana possession and other victimless crimes, just wait until the State starts arresting all the natural health moms and dads across the country who refuse to participate in the utterly insane and extremely harmful system of medicine that now dominates U.S. health care today.

The State is very clear about medicine: **If you want to remain a free citizen, you must submit to the synthetic drugs made by the very same corporations that now control government health regulators.** Any person who resists such "treatments" will be branded a threat to public health -- a designation just beneath "terrorist" in the eyes of many government bureaucrats. As such, they believe there is no limit to the level of force they may use to coerce such people into submitting to Big Pharma's chemicals. Today, it's armed guards with attack dogs. Tomorrow, it might be water boarding or other torture methods. Think that's impossible? Think again: Just five years ago, nobody in their right mind would have thought that parents who did not want to get their children vaccinated would end up in prison, their children kidnapped by state authorities and forced to subject themselves to dangerous chemical injections at gunpoint. Yet that is precisely what is happening right now in the state of Maryland. It happened on Saturday, in fact.

Where is the outrage?

What's most interesting about this issue of using the threat of imprisonment to force vaccinations upon children is not necessarily who is speaking out against it, but **who has chosen to remain silent.**

The American Medical Association, for example, has said nothing in opposition to the policy. Neither has the Food and Drug Administration. Where is the outrage from the Maryland Hospital Association? None of these organizations seem to have a problem with Gunpoint Medicine. The idea of rounding up parents and coercing their children into receiving injections of toxic chemicals does not seem to bother these organizations. And why should it? All of these organizations are closely tied to Big Pharma. They're all in favor of vaccinations for all, it seems, and I have no doubt that some individuals in these organizations (especially the AMA) are strongly in favor of the Gunpoint Medicine coerced vaccination policy being played out in Maryland right now.

Organized medicine believes the People are too stupid to be allowed to make their own health decisions. Bureaucrats and physicians should be the ones making these decisions, we're told, and any person who disagrees with such decisions should be labeled a criminal, arrested and prosecuted. This is no exaggeration. It is, in fact, a shockingly accurate description of Maryland's current vaccination policy.

It wasn't too long ago that Americans would have stood up and rallied against this kind of medical tyranny. The major news networks would have denounced Maryland's vaccination policy with strong language and harsh accusations. People would have been marching in the streets, demanding their health freedom. But today, it's a different America. The People are drugged up on pharmaceuticals and dosed on fluoride. They're too intoxicated to think straight, and they're frightened into submission by a fear-based government that invokes domestic tyranny at every opportunity to control and manipulate the People into doing whatever it wants.

All content posted on this site is commentary or opinion and is protected under Free Speech. Truth Publishing LLC takes sole responsibility for all content. Truth Publishing sells no hard products and earns no money from the recommendation of products. Newstarget.com is presented for educational and commentary purposes only and should not be construed as professional advice from any licensed practitioner. Truth Publishing assumes no responsibility for the use or misuse of this material. For the full terms of usage of this material, visit (www.NewsTarget.com/terms.shtml [<http://www.newstarget.com/terms.shtml>](http://www.newstarget.com/terms.shtml))

The Tiburon Declaration - health and freedom advocates emergency statement on compulsory vaccination and forced drugging.

<http://www.healthfreedomusa.org/index.php/?p=460>

Now with links to two Action Steps: (1) to send a strong message to Congress and your state legislature and (2) how to "sign on" to the Declaration

More information about the Maryland Compulsory Vaccination Atrocity - 2,300 kids "shot" (with vaccines... 900 were "shot" a second time... the schools couldn't find their records !) <http://www.healthfreedomusa.org/index.php/?p=461>

The same thing is happening in California. mm

Vaccine Law Changing in California

public_health@10:11 am PST email to the editor
by Darrel Crain, Chiropractor

<http://www.planetc1.com/cgi-bin/n/v.cgi?c=1&id=1187025106>

Big Vaccine (son of Big Pharma) has been busy in Sacramento helping lawmakers come up with a scheme to do away with the annoying problem of public opposition to new vaccine mandates. After all, if it weren't for pesky parental opposition during legislative review, the controversial HPV (human papillomavirus) vaccine for young girls would already be on the long list of "mandatory" vaccines for California school children.

And controversial it is. As reported in the Miami Herald, in each state that has considered mandating the HPV vaccine, the debate has involved "some of the nation's most politically charged issues." These include teenage sex, parental control, state mandates and a "backlash against vaccines and a suspicion of drug companies."

The ingenious solution devised by vaccine enthusiasts to guarantee victory in Sacramento every time from here on out is to simply change the rules. The time-honored tradition in California of giving parents a chance to ask tough questions during the legislative review process for new vaccines may soon be overthrown.

In the future, look for rubber-stamp approval of all federally recommended vaccines without debate. In place of elected representatives getting a chance to vote thumbs up or thumbs down, a single un-elected bureaucrat at the top of the state's medical hierarchy will simply nod yes.

Should we be surprised to learn that the new system would add the HPV vaccine to the mandated list automatically, contrary to public sentiment?

Assembly Bill 16 is working its way through the California legislature and has already been approved by the Assembly. If signed into law, beginning in July 2008 every vaccine ever decreed by the CDC (Centers for Disease Control) will automatically become mandatory for California school kids.

The author of the bill, Assemblyman Ed Hernandez of West Covina, says his bill will "leave the decision as to how and when to implement a vaccine to the public health professionals best qualified to make that determination."

Hernandez's bill would force us to place blind faith in the experts, shove parental rights off the cliff, and allow our medical freedom to be dashed against the jagged rocks of medical authority below.

Ah, but doesn't the new law call for an opt-out clause that will protect parents' medical freedom to exempt their child from vaccines for medical, religious and philosophical reasons? The new bill may allow parents to opt out, but as Karen England, executive director of the Capitol Resource Institute has pointed out, "An opt-out provision is simply the government telling me that they have taken away my parental rights and in order to regain them I must file an affidavit with the school."

Why not make it an opt-in program for vaccines instead, such as the system in New Hampshire? Rather than making parents jump through hoops to exempt

their child from government mandates, the state government ought to present solid evidence to convince parents why each vaccine is a good idea.

My vote for the Grand Poobah of Vaccine Enthusiasm must go to Paul Offit, M.D., vaccine patent holder, consultant to the Merck drug company (maker of the HPV vaccine Gardasil), and one of fifteen policy makers on the CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices.

"Paul Offit is calling for an end to exemptions to vaccination unless approved by a medical doctor or government health official. He argues that the unvaccinated place themselves and others at risk for catching and transmitting infectious diseases and, therefore, government should force citizens to purchase and use vaccines without exception," writes National Vaccine Information Center director Barbara Loe Fisher.

Dr. Offit apparently finds it incomprehensible that catching and transmitting infectious disease is a scientifically valid strategy for developing a naturally robust immune system. As to whether the unvaccinated pose a risk to vaccinated people, if vaccines work as well as he claims, what risk is he referring to?

Offit shares his worries, "Given the increasing number of states allowing philosophical exemptions to vaccines, at some point we will be forced to decide whether it is our inalienable right to catch and transmit potentially fatal infections."

In response to his quandary I must answer an emphatic yes, Americans do have an inalienable right to catch and transmit potentially fatal infections (even though most will be benign) just as we have an inalienable right to refuse potentially fatal injections, vaccine or otherwise, for whatever reason suits us. I am sorry if medical freedom makes you nervous and interferes with your plans to vaccinate everyone with whatever you want Dr. Offit, but you are just going to have to cope.

It is true that vaccines can provoke temporary immune responses that result in circulating antibodies. But here is what is puzzling, this is considered proof of a vaccine's effectiveness even though there is universal agreement that antibodies are not predictive of an appropriate immune response. Indeed, each year we see outbreaks of infection in fully vaccinated populations with high levels of circulating antibodies.

Our medical leaders seem to confuse vaccination with immunity. In order to clear this up, the first thing we need to do is clean up our language. Let us change the term "vaccine-preventable disease" to the more precise term, "vaccine-alterable disease," since no disease has yet been prevented by a vaccine.

Dr. Offit has stated, "And the notion of requiring vaccines for school entry, while it seems to tear at the very heart of a country founded on the basis of individual rights and freedoms, saves lives."

Can he point to a single study that has ever compared the death rates of vaccinated and unvaccinated children to support his claim that vaccines save lives? The good doctor cannot because no scientific evaluation comparing the health of the two groups has ever been made.

Isn't it amazing that mass vaccination, the front-line strategy of modern medicine, is based entirely on an assumption that has never been tested or proven? The fact that the majority of the medical community shares Offit's "belief" that

vaccines save lives gives evidence of a widespread faith in vaccines, but does not confer scientific validation.

There are at least 300 vaccines in development, and our federal agencies have seemingly never met a vaccine they didn't like. If the rubber stamp system is enacted in California, this will no doubt influence adoption of similar laws in other states and the list of mandated shots will grow exponentially.

The only thing standing between the Big Vaccine druggernaut and its plans to inject every man, woman and child on a regular basis are two issues apparently viewed by our health leaders as trivial: scientific integrity and individual medical freedom.

*A friend for many years and one of the worlds's most distinguished theoretical physicists David Bohm was black-listed by the McCarthy Commission. He was forced to leave the country, a step that crippled his scientific works. In the process the nation lost one of its brightest minds. Note that what happened to David and thousands like him parallel steps Naomi Wolf outlines in **The Fascist Blueprint** (7. Target key individuals and 9. Dissent equals treason.). If you think it can't happen again, read on...mm*

The Violent Radicalization Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007

By Matt Renner

truthout | Report

Thursday 29 November 2007

A month ago, the House of Representatives passed legislation that targets Americans with radical ideologies for research. The bill has received little media attention and has almost unanimous support in the House. However, civil liberties groups see the bill as a threat to the constitutionally protected freedoms of expression, privacy and protest.

HR 1955, "[The Violent Radicalization Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act of 2007](#)", apparently intended to assess "homegrown" terrorism threats and causes is on a fast-track through Congress. Proponents claim the bill would centralize information about the formation of domestic terrorists and would not impinge on constitutional rights.

On October 23, the bill passed the House of Representatives by a 404-6 margin with 23 members not voting. If passed in the Senate and signed into law by George W. Bush, the act would establish a ten-member National Commission on the Prevention of Violent Radicalization and Homegrown Terrorism, to study and propose legislation to address the threat of possible "radicalization" of people legally residing in the US.

Despite being written by a Democrat, the current version of the act would probably set up a Commission dominated by Republicans. By allowing Bush and Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff to each appoint one member of the Commission, and splitting the appointment of the other eight positions equally between Congressional Democrats and Republicans, the Commission would consist of six Republican appointees and four Democrat ones.

The Commission would be tasked with collecting information on domestically spawned terrorism from a variety of sources, including foreign governments and previous domestic studies. The Commission would then report to Congress and recommend policy changes to address the threat. There is no opposition to this consolidation or research. However, the Commission would be given broad authority to hold hearings and collect evidence, powers that raise red flags for civil liberties groups.

Civil liberties activists have criticized the bill, some comparing the Commission it would establish to the McCarthy Commission that investigated Americans for possible associations with Communist groups, casting suspicion on law-abiding citizens and ruining their reputations. The Commission would be empowered to "hold hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Commission considers advisable to carry out its duties."

Odette Wilkens, the executive director of the Equal Justice Alliance, a constitutional watchdog group, compared the legislation to the McCarthy Commission and to the FBI's Counter Intelligence Program (COINTELPRO), which infiltrated, undermined and spied on civil rights and antiwar groups during the 1950s and 60s.

"The commission would have very broad powers. It could investigate anyone. It would create a public perception that whoever is being investigated by the Commission must be involved in subversive or illegal activities. It would give the appearance that whoever they are investigating is potentially a traitor or disloyal or a terrorist, even if all they were doing was advocating lawful views," Wilkens said.

In a speech on the floor of the House before the vote, Congresswoman Jane Harman (D-California), the chair of the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Intelligence and author of the bill said, "Free speech, espousing even very radical beliefs, is protected by our Constitution - but violent behavior is not. Our plan must be to intervene before a person crosses that line separating radical views from violent behavior, to understand the forces at work on the individual and the community, to create an environment that discourages disillusionment and alienation, that instills in young people a sense of belonging and faith in the future."

In the same speech, Harman explained why "homegrown" terrorists are a threat to the US. She offered the explanation that adolescents who might be susceptible to recruitment by gangs might also be potential terrorists.

"Combine that personal adolescent upheaval with the explosion of information technologies and communications tools - tools which American kids are using to broadcast messages from al-Qaeda - and there is a road map to terror, a 'retail outlet' for anger and warped aspirations. Link that intent with a trained terrorist operative who has actual capability, and a 'Made in the USA' suicide bomber is born," Harman said.

The bill specifically identifies the Internet as a tool of radicalization. "The Internet has aided in facilitating violent radicalization, ideologically based violence, and the homegrown terrorism process in the United States by providing access to broad and constant streams of terrorist-related propaganda to United States citizens."

In a press release, Caroline Fredrickson, director of the Washington American Civil Liberties Union legislative office, took issue with this characterization. "If Congress finds the Internet is dangerous, then the ACLU will have to worry about censorship and limitations on First Amendment activities. Why go down that road?" Fredrickson asked in a press release.

The ALCU has "serious concerns" about the bill. Fredrickson said, "Law enforcement should focus on action, not thought. We need to worry about the people who are committing crimes rather than those who harbor beliefs that the government may consider to be extreme."

According to Wilkens, the bill, in its current form, lacks specific definitions, which would give the Commission expansive and possibly dangerous powers. The Committee would be set up to address the process of "violent radicalization," which the bill defines as "the process of adopting or promoting an extremist belief system for the purpose of facilitating ideologically based violence to advance political, religious, or social change." According to Wilkens, the bill does not adequately define "an extremist belief system," opening the door for abuse.

"An 'extremist belief system' can be whatever anyone on the commission says it is. Back in the 60s, civil rights leaders and Vietnam War protesters were considered radicals. They weren't committing violence but they were considered radicals because of their belief system," Wilkens said.

The bill would also create a "Center of Excellence for the Study of Violent Radicalization and Homegrown Terrorism in the United States," on an unspecified University campus. Unlike other Centers of Excellence university-based government [research centers created by the Department of Homeland Security](#), the Center established by this bill could have a chilling effect on political activity on campus because of its specific mission to "assist Federal, State, local and tribal homeland security officials through training, education, and research in preventing violent radicalization and homegrown terrorism," according to Wilkens.

"If you are on campus and the thought police are on campus are you going to want to join a political group?" Wilkens asked.

Congressman and presidential candidate Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) was one of three Democrats who voted against the bill, but he has given no public explanation for his opposition and his office did not respond to a call for comment as of this writing.

Neither the Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi (D-California) nor Congressman John Conyers (D-Michigan), the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, voted on the bill.

The bill has been referred to the Senate Homeland Security Committee, chaired by Sen. Joseph Lieberman (I-Connecticut). With overwhelming support from the House, it is likely to pass quickly through the Senate.

Regarding intimidation immunizations Dr. Joseph Mercola published this impressive and detailed document that outlines your rights and how to use them to protect your children. mm

How To Legally Avoid Unwanted Immunizations Of All Kinds

©Copyright 2007 Dr. Joseph Mercola.

As you read this work and put its principles into practice, there are two basic axioms you never want to forget. They are the rock upon which all your actions are based.

1. ***Nobody, anywhere or any time and under any circumstances has the right or power in this country to immunize you or your children against your will and conviction.*** *If they attempt to do so, you can legally charge them with "assault with a deadly weapon" and have the full resources of our laws behind you.*
2. *At all times in attempting to avoid unwanted immunization, you have the Law of the Land behind you. Those who would try to vaccinate you against your will are on very shaky ground. Into every compulsory immunization law in America are written legal exceptions and waivers which are there specifically to protect you from the attempted tyranny of officialdom. It is not only your right, but your obligation to use them, if this is what your conscience tells you.*

Article 1

In all your contacts with any member of the school, public health, or legal establishment, always remain calm, courteous, and humbly reverent toward their position. You are only asking of them that which the law duty binds them to give you. There is no reason, or advantage, to be gained by antagonizing them.

Most of these officials believe they are discharging their trust as outlined by law. If they are overstepping the law, then you must very diplomatically bring the true facts to their attention, but without attempting to belittle them.

The more you can preserve their ego, the more easily and quickly you are likely to get what you desire - a waiver of immunization.

Rule No. 1: Do not harass, belittle, or antagonize officials unnecessarily.

Article 2

All compulsory laws concerning vaccination (including the military) contain exceptions and waivers. It is these protections placed in the laws that you may legally use to exclude yourself and your children. Surprisingly, these exceptions were placed there, not for your sake (although you may take advantage of them), but for the protection of the establishment.

How is this? Let us assume that these exceptions were not there and everyone was actually forced to be immunized. Should a child die or become mentally or physically disabled, the parent would have the perfect case to sue the doctor, the school, the health department, and even the state legislature for enormous damages.

Since they allowed no exceptions, they must accept full responsibility for all the adverse consequences of the law.

However, if exception waivers are placed in the law, the responsibility is then transferred back to the parent. If a child should be injured by immunization, the officials can say, "Well, the parent should have exempted him if they thought there was any danger."

Therefore, there is in truth no such thing as a compulsory vaccination law in this country. They are **ALL**, in essence, **voluntary**. The problem is that practically no one in authority will let you know this fact.

Rule No. 2: There are no compulsory vaccination laws. All are voluntary, and you are held responsible for the adverse results upon you or your children.

Article 3

While all immunization laws have exceptions you can use, the wording in each state differs, and you must know the exact wording for your state to make the proper request of waiver. This information can be obtained in one of two ways.

1. Go to the reference section of your local library- look in the State Statute Revised Law Book under Public Health Law or Communicable Disease sections. The list of immunization requirements will appear first and then the exemptions will be given. Usually one or two provisions will be listed: either on religious or medical grounds or both.
2. You may call or write your state representative and ask for a copy of the immunization laws in your state. Making this available is part of his job, and it will be sent promptly.

Rule No. 3: Know your own state law so that you can conform to its exact requirements for exemption.

Article 4

There are two basic reasons for exception - medical or religious. Which one you choose will often depend upon the wording of the law in your state and your personal convictions.

We shall discuss medical exemption first. While laws do vary, nearly all states require that a note or certificate of waiver be submitted by a physician licensed in the state of residence. In some areas where states are small and people continually travel from one to another for business, a statement from a physician in a contiguous state will be accepted.

In this letter it is usually necessary to state the reason for the requested waiver and the length of time it should extend. Many laws limit all such letters to a school year and they must be renewed each fall.

The two most valid reasons for medical waiver are "the fear of allergic reaction in a sensitive child" and "to prevent possible damage to a weakened immune system." Both of these can occur in a child who has been immunized, and since no one but the physician and the parent will be held responsible for their consequences, it is up to them to protect the child.

It is possible that some states may require the letter from an M.D. or D.O., but many will allow an exemption letter from a chiropractor if it is courteously and properly written, as outlined above.

Rule No. 4: Medical waivers are always valid but must be written to fit each state law and often need to be renewed annually.

Article 5

The foregoing may work for school exemptions, but are there any such waivers in the Armed Forces? Yes. All branches of the Service provide "immunization waivers."

Again, if they did not you could sue them for millions of dollars if a reaction occurred from their immunizations. Because of these waiver provisions, you become responsible if you react.

When you first sign up or enlist, you must state your objection to the vaccinations and tell whether it is "religious conscience" or medical reasons, such as allergies or a low tolerance to medication of any kind. If you do not show objection at this time, you have given the military the right to do what they will with you.

If there is any difficulty, the same rules apply here as in the school program. Never forget, even though you may be in the Service, no one has the right to immunize you against your will. You do not give up your constitutional rights when you join the Armed Forces.

Rule No. 5: The rules that govern school vaccination exemption also apply to the military. Never let anyone tell you otherwise. They do not know, or are hiding, the facts of the law.

Article 6

What about international travel? May I go around the world without vaccination?

The World Health Organization (WHO) in Geneva grants American visitors the right to REFUSE shots when traveling internationally. However, if an area you wish to enter is infected, you may be detained until the public health servant gives you the "go" (at his discretion).

Thousands travel world-wide each year without shots - so you may if that is your choice. Many of our co-workers have traveled over much of the world and have never taken any immunizations, nor were they ever detained.

It would be wise to request a copy of Foreign Rules and Regulations, Part 71, Title 42, on immunization when you receive your passport. Never forget the basic rule, "No one will vaccinate you against your will because by doing so they assume full responsibility for the consequences both legal and medical."

Rule No. 7: You may travel wherever you wish in the world without vaccination. The worst that can happen is that in very rare circumstances you may be detained temporarily.

Some Important Details

The above seven articles constitute all the basic rules. However, there are many important little "tricks of the trade" to having your legal requests honored. These will now be discussed.

While waivers and exemptions are written into all laws on immunization, most public health officials, doctors, and especially school officials are loathe to discuss their existence when questioned, and rarely, to our knowledge, volunteer such information.

A top Philadelphia school official was on the radio with the unequivocal statement, "NO SHOTS, NO SCHOOL."

This statement is of course completely counter to state law, with which presumably he is familiar. Such unwarranted dogmatism is common in the people you will encounter. Once the end of their legitimate authority has been reached, they will use their next most powerful weapon - INTIMIDATION.

They will threaten to keep your child out of school, take him from you, or send you to jail. These are all idle threats because they can do none of these things, if you follow our simple instructions.

The basic rules have been given to you, but there are a few important details to be considered if the officials start on this course of unlawful intimidation.

1. **You must send a letter** to the school to inform the education officials of your stand. A phone call is not legal. It can be a note from your doctor, minister, or a notarized letter from you stating your sincere objections to the immunization. If you do not do this and fail to have your child immunized, it could be construed as negligence on your part and in some states there is a possibility of legal action against you.
2. If the school should refuse to honor your letter, request that they give you a statement in writing outlining their reasons for refusal. If they won't, **their refusal is legally invalid**, and your letter stands; they must enroll your child. If they do (they rarely will) they take the risk of incriminating themselves, especially if they are acting contrary (as is common) to what is specified in the law concerning your rights for exemption. Remember they are on tenuous ground, not you. They are your servants, you are not their servant. If worst comes to worst and you have a very knowledgeable official who writes you a refusal and states accurately the lawful reasons for refusal, he will also in a negative way tell you what the accepted exemptions are, and then you can go about meeting them, by one of the routes suggested in this handout.
3. Child neglect is the one legal point you want to avoid at all costs. No legal parent or guardian can be charged with neglect unless he shows complete lack of concern or action to be more informed. Stripped of legal jargon, this simply means that if you can show that you have investigated the situation, have come to a specific decision concerning immunizations, and have informed the authorities of the same, no neglect charge can be brought. Neglect can be brought only when it can be shown that you have failed to have your children immunized, not out of respect for their medical or spiritual integrity, but only because you were too concerned with other matters.
4. At times there may be a question of whether you have given or withdrawn legal consent. Legal consent is dependent upon being properly informed on both the advantages and the risks in any choice or decision you make. In other words, if a physician were to tell you that vaccination is perfectly safe and effective to obtain your consent, such consent would not be legal because he lied and you have not been properly informed. Conversely, it could be argued that non-consent is not legal if you are not fully informed about the risks and advantages of immunizations.
5. What do I do if everyone refuses to give me a waiver?

This would be an extremely rare circumstance. But should it happen, you are not left without resources. Here is where we pull out one of our big guns. Send notarized letters by certified mail to the vaccine laboratory which makes the shot (ask your doctor for the address), to the doctor who is to administer the shot, to your school principal, to the school board, and to your local health department.

In these letters make it clear that since they have refused to give you a duly requested waiver, you can no longer be held responsible for what may happen to your child if they force these shots upon him. You then state that you will allow immunization if each will present you with a written signed guarantee of safety and effectiveness of the vaccine and that they will consent to assume full responsibility for any and all adverse reactions that your child may develop from the required shots. Of course none will give you such a guarantee. They cannot do so because all vaccines are considered potentially highly toxic. We have yet to hear of an instance of further harassment of parents after such letters have been sent.

That's about all that is needed to obtain the necessary exemptions for your children. All that has been said in this last section (1 to 5) is also applicable to the military and international travel, if required.

Potpourri of Ammunition

"As long as each individual who opposes vaccines has sincere objections, states them in writing, and signs his name - it is considered legal and proper action and must therefore be honored."

"Since many medical controversies exist surrounding immunization, drugs, and various other medications, it mandates that each individual have the right to control his own decisions and freedom of choice; anything less would be contrary to the constitutional laws that protect the citizens' rights. "

"When you deal with school officials and lawyers, you are playing with legal terminology - move the wrong words around and you get hung." The terminology used in this booklet has worked before and should work again.

"It is important to state your objections in such a way that it complies with your state's exemption provisions. They must then accept your request; if they do not, they are breaking their own law." That is why it is absolutely essential that you know your own state law word for word before submitting your objection.

"According to CDC (the federal Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Georgia), physicians are required to first inform their patients of the risks involved before they consent to vaccines." If they do not do so, it is prima facie evidence of deceit or negligence on the part of the physician.

This regulation by the federal government would also seem to assume that the patient has the right to refuse if he feels that the risks are too great. If this is so, is not the federal government on record as supporting voluntary immunization and, by obvious implication, against state-enforced compulsory immunization?

Should you ever have to go to court, or what is more likely, to appear before a "kangaroo" court of school and health department officials, here is some class A evidence you might find useful to mention.

- No vaccine carries any guarantee of protection from the laboratory that produced it or the doctor who administered it.
- The U.S. military allows no-nonsense "immunizations waivers."
- There is **NO FEDERAL LAW** on immunizations. They don't dare. Their lawyers know the consequences.
- Your rights have been infringed upon by officials attempting to use force against your will.

Most state officials like a nice, stress-free job. When you send in your objections and refuse to fit their ordered world by not having your children immunized, you make waves.

This rocks their quiet existence, and there are only two ways their life can become orderly again: either by forcing you to their will or acquiescing to yours. What you must do to obtain an early waiver is to make the latter the easiest path for them.

At first, however, an attempt will usually be made to bend you to their will by some form of intimidation. Many uninformed parents give in to this tack, and so it is tried again and again.

If you are adequately informed, as a reader of this publication should be, you will let the officials know in no uncertain terms that you understand your rights under the law and will not stand for any such shilly-shallying. Invariably, once they discover you are adamant and acquainted with the state law, your waiver will be rapidly forthcoming.

An Acknowledgment

The greatest part of the material on the first four pages is taken from the work of Mrs. Grace Girdwain, of Burbank, Illinois. Our staff has rearranged and edited the information, but we wish the full credit for its existence to go to this courageous woman who has for twelve years worked arduously, without compensation, to help her fellow Americans obtain their legal rights.

The following is an example of the state of Illinois law (where I live) relating to immunizations. Illinois, like most states has no philosophical objection, but does have a religious one.

Illinois Administrative Code Title 77: Public Health
Chapter I: Department of Public Health
Subchapter i: Maternal and Child Health
Part 665 Child Health Examination Code
Subpart E: Exceptions

Section 665.510 Objection of Parent or Legal Guardian

Parent or legal guardian of a student may object to health examinations, immunizations, vision, and hearing screening tests, and dental health examinations for their children on religious grounds. If a religious objection is made, a written and signed statement from the parent or legal guardian detailing such objections must be presented to the local school authority.

General philosophical or moral reluctance to allow physical examinations, immunizations, vision and hearing screening, and dental examinations will not provide a sufficient basis for an exception to statutory requirements.

The parent or legal guardian must be informed by the local school authority of measles outbreak control exclusion procedures per IDPH rules. The Control of Communicable Diseases (77 Ill. Adm. Code 690) at the time such objection is presented.

Section 665.520 Medical Objections

a) Any medical objections to an immunization must be:

- 1) Made by a physician licensed to practice medicine in all its branches indicating what the medical condition is.
- 2) Endorsed and signed by the physician on the certificate of child health examination and placed on file in the child's permanent record.

b) Should the condition of the child later permit immunization, this requirement will then have to be met. Parents or legal guardians must be informed of measles outbreak control exclusion procedures when such objection is presented per Section 665.510.