


"...build up the ancient ruins...raise up the foundations of generations past...and thou shalt be called the Repairer of the breach, the Restorer of the safe and prosperous paths of life..." (emphatic paraphrase) (Isaiah 58:12)

[Preaching the Word of God in Tennessee since 1991]



---

## Free Reformed Church of our Ancient Christian Faith and Heritage, Unincorporated

Robert Alan Balaicius, Minister  
P.O. Box 18,  
Mountain City, Tennessee, 37683  
stm@mounet.com

---

To Whom it may concern

This is to establish that \_\_\_\_\_ espouses the tenants of the true Christian faith which has as its standard the Word of God: the Holy Bible. The Bible contains God's "House Rules" and Moral Code by which He expects us to live... and contrary to what modernist churches preach, the Law of God has not been done away with. The nonobservance (whether due to ignorance or wilfull rebellion) of God's Law (or any law) does not invalidate the law. A change in law can only come through legitimate legislature and God has given no one the authority to Change His Word. Neither did Christ change it, contrary to modern unBiblical interpretation. Christ declared:

"<sup>17</sup>Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. <sup>18</sup>For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle [dotting on an "i" or crossing of a "t"] shall in no wise pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled. <sup>19</sup>Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least Commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven." (Matthew 5)

—Last time I checked the heavens and the earth were still there. *Ergo*, God's Law (all of it) is still in effect.

[See my book, What's Keeping God From Delivering the U.S., Britain, and Europe From Destruction, 112pp., pb., 10.50 + P&H). The Law is *not* for salvation. It *never* was. It is the way God expects us to live.]

Furthermore, the United States (contrary to what modernist disinformation specialists claim) *was* founded as a *Christian* nation and upon the laws and principles found in the Word of God, based also upon American Common Law, which stemmed from English Common Law, which was founded upon the Laws of the Bible by King Alfred the Great toward the end of the first millennia A.D. Information proving this is voluminous, inviolable, and irrefragable. Should this point need to be proven *thousands of pages of information can easily be provided*. Furthermore, mere dictatorial decree by some politician does not invalidate either the law or history. They cannot merely say, "The U.S. is not a Christian nation," and by magic reality conforms to their baseless claim. Simon Greenleaf (1783-1853), is considered one of the greatest jurists the U.S. produced (The London *Times* declared that more light on jurisprudence came from him than all the jurists of Europe combined). Greenleaf knew that Anglo-Saxon law and religion cannot be separated from each other, because Anglo-Saxon law is derived from ethics and morals and those ethics and morals were derived from the Bible. Greenleaf "wrote the book" on legal evidence. Originally a non-Christian, he followed his own dictum of never making your mind up about any significant matter without first considering the evidence. Therefore, he set out to investigate the New Testament claims of Christ's Divinity and in the process had to declare the New Testament to be a legally unimpeachable testimony that was true and the Christ was the Messiah, the Son of God. Greenleaf further declared, "Every document apparently ancient, coming from the proper repository or custody, and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine and devolves on the opposing party the burden of proving it to be otherwise." The burden of proof to prove the U.S. is not a Christian nation is on the part of the detractors—and if they attempt such a showdown they will lose because the weight of evidence proving the U.S. to have been founded as a Christian nation is too overwhelming. Again, simply because the composition of the nation has purposely been changed and therefore practice has changed, does not change history or lawful reality. Furthermore, any person who claims to follow the pure tenets of the true Christian faith (altogether of a different stripe from the modernist neo-"Christianity" followed mindlessly by the masses) cannot have his faith called into question and cannot be denied equal protection under the law in the sanctity of the free exercise of his religion in theory and practice.

\_\_\_\_\_ is a dedicated Christian who espouses the doctrine of this and other true Christian Churches based upon the Word of God, and desires to live a life in obedience to God and live in strict accordance with firmly and sincerely held religious beliefs, which freedom and right is secured by the Constitution, the Articles of the Confederation, and American Common Law, and the Holy Bible. No modern law can be legally passed if it contradicts or violates any Constitutional or Common Law right and the Constitution itself is subservient, a defender of the Common Law. Since the Common Law was founded on the Bible and the Constitution preserves the rights of the Common Law, then the Constitution, by its very nature, bows before the authority of the Bible, is subservient to and a defender of it.

It has come to my attention that \_\_\_\_\_ is seeking freedom from forced vaccinations which \_\_\_\_\_ is requiring. Vaccinations of any kind are an invasive act which violates the sanctity of a person's body (protected by the U.S. constitution and all valid law in the civilized world) and is also in violation of the Laws and principles found in the Word of God, the Holy Bible.

[Again, the fact that the majority of Christians today have themselves turned from (or never known) obedience to the Word of God does not change the fact that God's Word commands true Christians to live in accordance with these rules that God established for our good and as a matter of holiness. Even as ignorance is no excuse for breaking the law of man, so also ignorance (willful or otherwise) is no excuse for violating the Law of God. God commands us in His Word to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered" (Jude 1:3). Furthermore, the fact that corrupt politicians have perverted the law and passed unconstitutional laws does not invalidate the true law: for they have no authority to violate the constitution and as we shall see later, all unconstitutional laws are fraudulent and invalid.]

There is a plenitude of evidence to show that vaccines are not healthy, not safe, and not effective—even *dangerous* and *deadly* (but the main reason vaccines are being pushed *illegally* as "mandatory" is because they make *billions of dollars* a year for a handful of people). Many books, professional journals, and studies demonstrate this. Further, the fact that unvaccinated people are considered "a threat" to vaccinated people, seems to prove that vaccines are not effective: for if someone has been vaccinated (*if* vaccines actually work), that person should be "safe" and have nothing to fear from a non-vaccinated person. Yet more and more frequently, people are refused admittance to school (grade school to grad school) and threatened with termination of their job if they are not vaccinated. This is unconstitutional and illegal and people need to file civil and criminal class action law suits nationwide against any institution, private or public, that discriminates against those who refuse vaccination.

However, irrational dishonesty and hypocrisy and the inefficacy of vaccinations are not the issue here. The issue is one of *numerous* constitutional rights being grossly and aggravatedly violated: (Note: The Constitution does not "give" us these rights, *these rights are inalienable, God-given rights* which the Constitution secures for us.)

1. The freedom of religion (and protection from discrimination);
2. The right to contract (and equally the right **not** to contract);
3. The freedom to be secure in one's *person*, papers, houses, and effects;
4. The right to property (one's body is his property and the right to work is also property, since work produces substance or property);
5. The right to work;
6. The freedom from slavery. (Slavery is the condition in which someone else claims ownership and right over your body and your life, your labor, your children, and your property); and
7. the freedom from unlawful taxation (whether Obamacare is called a tax or a fee it is illegal).

Threatening to terminate a person's employment, a person's mode of earning a living—life itself—unless vaccinated, violates all these rights secured by the Constitution and is no different than threatening to terminate a woman's employment unless she has an abortion. It is a violation of a person's body and an assault upon a person's life itself. Regardless of the moral undertones and errors of *Roe v. Wade*, this landmark case did get one thing correct, that it is "a basic human right for a woman to make decisions about her own body" (though of course, the error of this ruling was not realizing that right ends when it factually destroys the life of another).

[One cannot be fined or penalized, defrauded, or have his rights violated in any way *a priori* any crime (before any crime has been committed)—and in order for there even to be a crime *a posteriori* (after the fact) there has to be a *corpus delicti* (a dead body or a factually injured party) and the burden of proving *criminal intent* (to commit a crime and injure someone) has to be established by the opposing party. In the absence of *both* a *corpus delicti* and the proving of criminal intent, no crime has been committed and someone cannot be charged with or penalized for a nonexistent crime. Furthermore, the criminal charges of negligence or depraved indifference cannot apply: for they also require the proving of intent; and beyond the proving of intent it has to be established that a person actually had an obligation and also it must be proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that it was indeed that person's neglect or indifference which directly caused another injury.]

The legal principles upon which this same landmark ruling of *Roe v. Wade* is based, applies to vaccines and applies equally to men (as well as women) and all issues concerning the sanctity of their bodies also. Modern pharmaceutical medicine has been around only for around 65 years. Most drugs are made from crude petroleum and line the pockets of a select few. Most of these drugs are *dangerous* (if they were not, they would not require a doctor's prescription) and have many deleterious contraindications / side effects. Many new drugs are taken off the market after a few years, after making a few billion dollars, before bodies and lawsuits begin to pile up. This is not hype or conjecture, but documentable fact. After years of rigorous and expensive testing, a decision is made—by the FDA, a government agency, the individuals of which are held legally responsible if they okay a drug that later turns out to injure people—to okay a certain drug, but that decision is not based on the merits of the drug's value. That decision is made by book-keepers and lawyers, to determine the profit margin compared to the liability. The same medical mafia tries to outlaw vitamins and herbs as “dangerous”—even though they are natural\*—

[\* This has already been done in Australia. The medical mafia here in the U.S. wants to outlaw herbs, because they cannot control and patent and make billions of dollars off a plant that God made, which anyone can grow (and that is why they are now genetically altering plants, so they *can* patent their “new creations”—regardless of whether they are deadly or not). People have used herbs for 6,980 years of man's history and many people and many countries still do. There are more diseases today (and greater percentages of people with many diseases that were practically unheard of before the advent of modern medicine)—yet no one makes the connection that *the drugs are part of the problem* (because that would be bad for business). Likewise, people have drunk raw milk for 6,980 years of man's history, and many people and many nations still do... yet armed SWAT teams are sent in to arrest those peaceful farmers who may sell it. Yet corrupt politicians are passing laws telling people they cannot buy a Big Gulp or bottle of soda larger than a certain allowable number of ounces. While soda *is* bad for people, it is their choice if they want to drink it or not—and how much. It is not that the medical mafia and out-of-control police powers care about people's health. Obviously, they are merely conditioning people into learned helplessness and accepting being treated like cattle being herded through a stall. Vaccinations are just one more step in this direction. Herd the cattle through and inject them in the butt, keep the line moving, you don't have a choice. Yet, hypocritically, they okayed Nutrasweet through unethical and illegal means, with complete disregard for all scientific evidence that proved it is deadly, because those involved stood to make *billions of dollars*. On the other hand, the U.S. surgeon general himself once said that over 40% of all by-pass surgeries are done for *inappropriate* reasons (that is, so that doctors can make a lot of money). “Government-funded” studies contradict each other frequently (like the commercials on tv that once declared, “eggs have 33% less cholesterol than we previously thought”—my question: Whoever did the first government-funded study that said eggs had 33% more cholesterol than they actually do... did they give that money back...? If not, it is fraud and they are guilty of many crimes in robbing the people—the true government of the U.S.).

These peripheral issues may seem irrelevant, but they all go to motive and a pattern of dishonest and criminal behaviour, lacking entirely in good faith, and are blatant violations of constitutional and all human, inalienable, God-given rights, often resulting in irremediable (even terminal) damage to life and livelihood.

By-pass is just one of the many modern medical procedures that is done for the wrong reason—and patients are never even informed they have a choice and other options... and if patients ask about other options, the doctors try to scare them out of “alternatives,” claiming they are illegal or they do not work. In such case doctors lie to their patients, at worst; or at best, they pass off their ignorance in the form of medical advice as the only valid truth—and in either case, doctors are legally culpable: for they are presumed to know these things and a nexus has been formed since the patient has put his life in the doctor's hands under the false presumption that the doctor actually knows what he is talking about and what is actually best for the patient's health—doctors are not indemnified for only presenting to the patient those health options that are lucrative for doctors and the medical monopoly and they are not judgment proof for only informing the patient of AMA-approved treatments. While doctors may be free from prosecution from the AMA (the medical monopoly) they are not free from prosecution by the people they injure by not informing them there are other alternative remedies that the patient should investigate on his own. To not do so is racketeering and fraud—and if injury results, then doctors are criminally liable.

Not informing the patient that there are natural options is also in violation of their oath. Their oath is “do no harm” — not “do no harm unless you can profit from it” or “do as little harm as possible in order to make a living.” Further, drug companies and medical research laboratories *do not want* cures. That too would be bad for business. They want a “control”—so that people are then *dependent on their drugs for the rest of their lives* (and also dependent upon *more* drugs and *additional* medical procedures to correct or control the side effects of the primary drug or medical procedure). An allopathic cure will never be found for cancer. It is a multi-billion dollar a year industry and has been for decades. They don't want a cure. There are many wholistic / natural, inexpensive, noninvasive cures (and plenty of documentation to prove it\*)... yet the medical mafia with gestapo-like tactics, will with violence intimidate, rob, shut down, assault, and incarcerate those who try to save other people's lives the inexpensive and natural way. This too violates the doctor's oath to do no harm. If there

is a cure, natural and inexpensive, and the medical establishment does not want people to be able to avail themselves of it, then they are committing what is tantamount to war crimes and genocide.

\* See <http://stm.christogenea.org/index.php/bulletin-board> which has a good assortment of information, but which does not even represent a thimble-full of the oceans of information and evidence there is.

More people die *in the U.S. each year* from aspirin alone, than have died from herbs in the entire world in all of recorded history. More people die each year in the U.S. from *iatrogenic* causes (that is, a fancy official term to hide its meaning: the patient was killed while under the care of a doctor or from the doctor's drugs) than have ever died in all of recorded history in the entire world from herbs and natural, so-called "alternative" remedies. Understand this: Before the advent of modern medicine, what are now termed "alternative" remedies were the only accepted remedies, and what are now considered the only accepted remedies were once the unproven, experimental, alternatives. The roles were switched when certain unscrupulous, powerful conspirators realized the enormous amount of money that was to be made—and corrupt politicians (who received bribes in one way or another) then illegally passed a Pandora's box full of laws (all of which are invalid) to create a medical monopoly which makes billions of dollars of people for those people who are part of the monopoly, and which criminally intimidates individuals into thinking they actually have no right concerning their own health or bodies and which irreparably damages the lives of many people.

This all goes to motive and all goes to pattern of criminal behavior. Each individual's right to life and choice of his own type of medical care infinitely outweighs the rights of drug companies to make billions of dollars, by bribing politicians to make laws in their favor, forcing people into thinking this is the only option and that they have no choice and no rights. Further, for the medical monopoly to lie and tell people that it alone has the only answer concerning health, is itself a criminal act. Doctors act like they are god before treatment, as if they are omnipotent and omniscient, but then when things go terribly wrong they claim they are not responsible, that they are only human, that they don't know everything, that medicine isn't really an exact science. Such subterfuge is itself evidence of criminal behavior.

Furthermore, in the most flagrant evidence of malfeasance and dishonesty, drug companies are bribing politicians into passing laws that will indemnify drug companies and doctors from any injury or death caused by the vaccines they have also bribed politicians into making "mandatory." This is genocide. A simple google search and even you-tube video search of the dangers of vaccines and those who have had their lives permanently ruined from vaccines should provide overwhelming evidence of this crime and should convince the skeptic of the foolhardiness of vaccinations.]

The right of a person's choice concerning the health of his own body is sacrosanct. Only totalitarian communist States claim to own the very bodies and lives of those it has enslaved. If judges and politicians and other *public servants* claim that the Constitution is a dead document and no longer matters, then they have declared war against the true government of the U.S. and are guilty of High Treason and should be convicted of such, paying the appropriate penalty (last time I checked, death by hanging). They took an oath to *defend* the Constitution, not subvert it. If they have done anything to subvert it, they are guilty of the attempted overthrow of the true government of the United States: the people. Thomas Jefferson said, "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform them!" Instead of doing this, the corrupt government (bribed by Big Business) has subverted the Constitution and deceived and brainwashed the people and conditioned them to learned helplessness and apathy.

It is a basic rule of natural law that one cannot confer upon another greater authority than he himself possesses. Therefore, *no* Constitutional amendment, law, or executive order can EVER strip the people (or the states, since the states are comprised of people, who are the sovereigns) of their rights or freedoms—INCLUDING the freedom and RIGHT to not contract (and the freedom from having any contract, obligation, or "benefit" *forced* on him), the right to disassociate, and even to secede. It was the people who formed the states, and the states, with assent of the people, formed the United States. The United States, which was formed by the will of the people and the states, cannot then EVER have autonomous authority over the people or the states who gave it its existence. If it attempts such, it shows itself to be an out-of-control monster like the one which Dr. Frankenstein created, which turned on its creator—and when government officials do that, it is an act of war and subversion and conspiracy and HIGH TREASON by the elected officials—PUBLIC SERVANTS—against the TRUE government of the United States: THE PEOPLE. Public servants (whether elected or appointed) certainly can without valid authority pass unconstitutional legislation—but that legislation is *illegal, fraudulent, and no one is bound to obey it*. This includes Obamacare\* and forced vaccinations and expulsion / termination from school or work if not vaccinated. If someone is refused entry to or forcibly removed from school, or if someone is not hired, suspended, fired, or forcibly removed from the workplace, their rights have been violated and crimes have been committed against them.

[\* If some wish to participate in Obamacare, great—more power to them. However, it is a crime to force Obamacare on anyone who does not want it. It is a crime to make someone pay for Obamacare if he does not want it, whether it is called a "fee," a "tax," or a "fine." It cannot even be falsified into a tax: for one cannot be forced to receive a benefit he does not

want and be taxed for it; taxation without representation is tyranny (and we have no representation: Congress represents Big Business and special interest groups who bribe politicians to pass laws in their favor, not in the people's favor) and most importantly, whether it is called a tax or something else, no law, tax or otherwise, is valid, if it violates the Constitution and the rights of the people.]

The Law tells us: [NO IFs ANDs or BUTs...!]

“Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no law making or legislation which would abrogate them.” —*Miranda vs. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 p. 491.

“All laws [rules & practices] which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void.” —*Marbury vs. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 180.

“There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of his Constitutional rights.” —*Sherar vs. Cullen*, 481 F. 2d 946.

“No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law, and no courts are bound to enforce it.” —*Sixteenth American Jurisprudence*, 2nd Ed., Section 177.

[Thus, if no courts are bound to enforce it, if a judge does enforce it, he is committing an act *ex officio* and is without judicial immunity, he has perpetrated an individual act (not an official one) and is liable for damages for his malicious, even conspiratorial actions in violations of the Constitutional rights of citizens, in violation of his oath of office, and has committed treason. Further, judges are not the authority in this land—the people are:

“It is not only his [a juror's] right, but his duty to find the verdict [of a case] according to his own best understanding, judgement and conscience, [even] though [it may be] in direct opposition to the direction of the court.” —John Adams (1771)

“To consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions is a very dangerous doctrine indeed, and one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy.” —Thomas Jefferson

The people and judges need to frequently be reminded of this.

“All human laws which contradict His [God's] Laws [the Bible], we are bound by conscience to disobey.” —George Mason (1725-1792); one of the major framers of the U.S. Constitution, member of the Constitutional Convention 1776, Federal Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia 1787, author of the Declaration of Rights (after which most States drew their respective State Constitutions).

“An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.” —*Norton vs. Shelby County*, U.S. p. 442.

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the *Declaration of Independence*, and a key figure in the writing of the *U.S. Constitution* though *in absentia*, and our 3rd President also declared: “Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God.” Note: This resistance is not “rebellion”—it is resisting those who are themselves in rebellion and guilty of crimes and treason against the people, the true government of these united states.

The Common Law secures our rights, informing us:

“An agreement induced by fraud cannot stand.” (Digest of Justinian 2, 4, 7, s. 9) This defines 99% of all laws passed by Congress and all Executive Orders (whichever of them were in violation of the Constitution and the rights of the people). Edmund Burke said, “The people never give up their liberties but under some delusion. That delusion is deception and fraud on the part of politicians (public servants) and it is criminal. This includes Obamacare being passed without the members of Congress reading it (and it equally applies to Obamacare being passed even if the members of Congress had read it, because it violates the rights of the people who do not give their consent to be a part of it—it is communism).

“Those things which are impossible to be given, or which are not in the nature of things, are regarded as no part of an agreement.” (Digest of Justinian 50, 17, 135)

“The laws help persons who are deceived, not those deceiving;” and “That which is null produces no effect.” (Trayner, Latin Legal Maxims and Phrases 149; 519)

“Out of fraud no action arises; A right of action cannot arise out of fraud.” (Phelps vs. Decker, 10 Mass. 276; Broom, Legal Maxims 349)

“It is a fraud to conceal a fraud.” (1 Story, Equity Jurisprudence s. 389, 390)

“What otherwise is good and just, if it be sought by force and fraud becomes bad and unjust.” (3 Coke, English King's Bench Reports, 78)

“No one can transfer to another a greater right than he himself has.” (Coke on Littleton, 309; Wingate’s Maxims of Law, 56; 2 Kent’s Commentaries on American Law, 324; 35 U.S. 161, 175)

“The derivative power cannot be greater than the original from which it is derived.” Noy’s Maxims; Wingate’s Maxims of Law, 66; Finch, English Chancery Reports tempore Finch b.1, c.3. [that is, the servant (government) cannot be greater than its master (the people).]

“Individual Liberties are antecedent\* to all government.” (Common Law Maxim)

“By virtue of his profession, he [a judge] is presumed to know the Constitutional Rights of citizens, as well as written statutes. He is prohibited from making any decision or applying any rule against any party when that ruling is unconstitutional. When there is a question or any conflict between the two, the Constitution prevails.” (Marbury, Supra)

“Where there is no authority for establishing a rule, there is no necessity of obeying it.” (Black’s Law Dictionary (1910) 2d. 1181; Davie’s Irish Reports K.B. 69)

“Whenever the interpretation of liberty is doubtful, the answer should be on the side of liberty.” (Digest of Justinian 50, 17, 20; Coke on Littleton, 116)

“Due Process is not limited to the settled usage of the past, but may include new methods not known to the Common Law, provided that they are in harmony with the underlying principles of Common Law.” (Corpus Juris Secundum 16 A, 567 Constitutional Law p. 579)

The term “due process of law” is synonymous or interchangeable with or equivalent to “law of the land,” a phrase appearing in many State Constitutions; “due process of law” being said to mean, in brief, “the law of the land,” including unwritten law. Other synonymous or equivalent terms are “due course of law,” “due course of the law of the land,” and “course of common law.” (Corpus Juris Secundum 16 A, 567 Constitutional Law, p. 540) This includes the Bible because the unwritten law of the land, the Common Law, was based on the Bible.

“...due process of law, due course of law, and law of the land (Magna Charta c29) all have the same meaning, that implies conformity with the ancient and customary (common) laws of the English people.” (Bouvier’s Law Dictionary (1839), p. 947)

“The People have given to their Governors no Power to do an unjust thing, such as to make an unjust War, for they never had such a Power themselves.” (Locke, Two Treatises of Government, 2, 16, 179)

“The welfare of the people is the supreme law.” (McInerney vs. Ervin, (Fla.) 46 So. 2d 458, 463; Bacon’s Maxims, reg. 12; 13 Coke’s English King’s Bench Reports, 139) —and it is the people, not some “government” who decide what is best for themselves; it is called totalitarian communism when the “government” decides.

“All political power is inherent in the people by decree of God, thus none can exist except it be derived from them... The main object of government is the protection and preservation of personal rights, private property, and public liberties, and upholding the law of God... A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles, and a firm adherence to justice, justice and original law, are indispensably necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty and good government.” (American Maxim)

“All law has either been derived from the consent of the people, established by necessity, confirmed by custom, or of Divine Providence.” (Digest of Justinian 1, 3, 40; Broom’s Legal Maxims 3d Lond. ed. 616, n.)

“Jus naturale, or natural law, has its foundation in the will of God.” (Sir William Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Law, Vol. 1, 39; James Kent’s Commentaries on American Law, Vol. 1, 2, note; Id 4 note)

“Obedience to [the law] makes the government, not the name by which it is called. The government is subject to the law, for the law makes the government.” (Common Law Maxim)

“It is lawful to repel force by force, provided it be done with the moderation of blameless defense, not for the purpose of taking revenge, but to ward off injury.” (Coke on Littleton, 162a)

“No one is bound to expose himself to misfortune and dangers.” (Coke on Littleton, 253)

“Self-defense is the primary law of nature.” (Common Law Maxim)

“Whatever one does in defense of his person, that he is considered to have done legally.” (Coke’s Institutes, Coke on Magna Charta and Old Acts, 590)

“He is justified who acts in pure defense of his own life or limb, for it is a natural right to do so.” (Common Law Maxim)

“One may destroy a man who makes war upon him, as he may kill a wolf or a lion, because such men are not under the ties of the Common-Law of Reason, and have no other rule, but that of force and violence.” (John Locke, Two Treatises of Government, 2, 3, 16)

“An aggressor, who puts himself into the state of war with another, and unjustly invades another’s Right, can never, by such unjust war, come to have a right over the Conquered.” (Locke Two Treatises of Government, 2, 16, 176)

“Everyone is presumed to be innocent until his guilt is established beyond a reasonable doubt.” (Common Law Maxim)

“Every uncondemned person is held by the law as innocent.” (Lofft’s English King’s Bench Reports, 121)

“There is nothing more sacred, more inviolate, than the house of every citizen.” (Common Law Maxim)

“Every man’s house is his castle; and even though the winds of heaven may blow through it, government officials cannot enter it.” (Common Law Maxim; 5 Coke’s English King’s Bench Reports, 91,92)

“A citizen cannot be taken by force from his house to be conducted before a judge or to prison.” (Digest of Justinian 50, 17, 103)

“Every man’s house should be a perfectly safe refuge.” (Coke’s Institutes, Pleas of the Crown, 162; Clason vs. Shotwell, 12 Johns (N.Y.) 31, 54; 5 Coke’s English King’s Bench Reports, 91b; 11 Id. 82)

“A man’s dwelling house is his castle and fortress, not merely for his own personal protection, but for the protection of his family and property therein.” (5 Coke’s English King’s Bench Reports, 91b; Broom’s Legal Maxims 432; Curtis vs. Hubbard, 4 Hill (N.Y.) 437)

“No 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, free from all restraint or interference of others...” (Union Pack. Ry. vs. Botsford, 141 U.S. 250,251)

“It is not incumbent on the possessor of property to prove his right to his possessions.” (Codex Justinianus 4.9.2; Broom’s Legal Maxims, 3d Lond. ed. 639)

“It is unjust that freemen should not have the free disposal of their own property.” (Coke on Littleton, 223a; 4 Kent’s Commentaries on American Law, 131; Hobart’s English King’s Bench Reports, 87)

“The right of property is that sole and despotic dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in total exclusion of the right of any other individual.” (Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Law, vol. 1, 138; Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Law, vol. 2, 2, 5) [from Maxims of Law, Weisman (?6.00) + P&H]

“No man shall be deprived of his property without being heard in his own defense.” (Kinney vs. Beverly 2 Hen. & M. (VA) 318, 336)

“...nor [shall he] be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” (Amendment 5, U.S. Constitution)

“The rights of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable search and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath and affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.” (Amendment 4, U.S. Constitution)

An act, which is not of a person’s free will, is not his act. (Common Law)

“The Christian Religion is part of the Common Law.” (Lofft’s English King’s Bench Reports, 327)

“That which is against Divine Law [Bible] is repugnant to society and is void.” (Common Law Maxim)

“No Human laws are of any validity, if contrary to the law of God.” (Sir William Blackstone)

Thomas Jefferson penned into the Declaration of Independence itself, “And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance *on the protection of Divine Providence*, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.”

[Jefferson may have been a Deist in his early life, but statements like this which he made later in life, show he believed in the true God. The same goes for Thomas Paine and Benjamin Franklin. Deists do not believe God intervenes in the affairs of men, and thus a Deist would never trust in God’s protection. Jefferson was not a superstitious simpleton, and therefore, that “firm reliance” upon the protection Divine Providence had to have been based on something, not mere assumption. Therefore, it was based upon the Promises of God’s Word.]

Public Law 97-280 states “that renewing our knowledge of and faith in God through the Holy Scriptures can strengthen us as a nation and a people.” Congress further found that the United States has a “national need to study and apply the teachings of the Holy Scriptures.”

Congress established, “the history of our Nation clearly illustrates the value of voluntarily applying the teachings, of the Scriptures in the lives of individuals, families, and societies.” Therefore, disobedience to this Law should be discouraged in our own communities and in the nation at large.

Under Public Law 97-280 any person or organization attempting in any way to prevent American citizens from voluntarily acquiring that “knowledge of and faith in God through the Holy Scriptures” would be attempting to weaken America. They would be guilty of trying to frustrate “our national need to study and apply the teachings of the Holy Scriptures.” Such actions would be in violation of the plain intent of Public Law 97-280 and would probably make the instigators guilty of sedition against the United States of America.

“Christian religion is common law.” Vidal vs. Girard

“Our laws and our institutions must necessarily be based upon and embody the teachings of the Redeemer of mankind [Jesus Christ]. It is impossible that it should be otherwise; and in this sense and to this extent our civilization and our institutions are emphatically Christian.... These and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation.” U.S. Supreme Court, 1892, *Church of the Holy Trinity vs U.S.*

“The people of this country profess the general doctrines of Christianity as the rule of their faith and practice. We are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply engrafted upon Christianity, not upon the doctrines of imposters.” *People vs. Ruggles*

“The Bible is the rock on which this Republic rests.” Andrew Jackson

“The Bible is the source of Liberty.” Thomas Jefferson

“The Bible is the sheet-anchor of our liberties.” Ulysses S. Grant

“No power over the freedom of religion... [is] delegated to the United States by the Constitution.” —Thomas Jefferson

“...religion is a matter which lies solely between a man and his God, that he owes account to none other for faith of his worship...” —Thomas Jefferson

It should be clear from those very few statements that the laws of our nation are founded upon the Bible and that the Constitution preserves all Common Law rights which stem from the Bible, the right of a person to protect his own person, his family, his possessions, and his house and property are inviolable and that any law which contradicts those rights is invalid.

Denying someone the right to work or go to school if he refuses to submit to a vaccine is discrimination and it is illegal. Our right to work is an extension of our very being and is secured for us by the Constitution.

“The right to earn a living is property.” —*Smith v. Decker*, 312 S.W. 2nd. 632, 633; 5th Ct. Texas (1958) quoting 19th Century USSC case.

In the case of *Butchers’ Union Co. v. Crescent City Co.*, 111 U.S. 746 (1883), Justice Field wrote in his concurring opinion at page 757: “It has been well said that, ‘The property which every man has in his own labor, as it is the original foundation of all other property, so it is the most sacred and inviolable.’”

The fact that a person owns his labor and owns his property (an extension of his labor) presupposes that he owns his own body. The U.S. Constitution secures for us the right to life, liberty, and property (or the “pursuit of happiness”); “pursuit of happiness” and “property” are established by law as being identical in their meaning.

“It is unjust that freemen should not have the free disposal of their own property.” (Coke on Littleton, 223a; 4 Kent’s Commentaries on American Law, 131; Hobart’s English King’s Bench Reports, 87)

“The right of property is that sole and despotic dominion which one man claims and exercises over the external things of the world, in total exclusion of the right of any other individual.” (Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Law, vol. 1, 138; Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Law, vol. 2, 2, 5)

[By “despotic” Coke meant that each person is lord over his own property any no one has any right to tell him otherwise. If anyone else can tell him otherwise, then that is slavery and true despotism.]

Philosophers, jurists, and legislators of free society have agreed on this point: The respected libertarian thinker, Frank Chodorov (1887-1966) rightly reasoned that the right of ownership is an extension of each individuals very right to life itself. Therefore, if an individual’s ownership of his person (which by extension includes his labor and his property) is not an absolute right and his alone, if it is not protected from the immoral whim of the majority (or oligarchy), then any person’s very right to life itself may be terminated when those in political power (legitimate or illegitimate) decide that it is “expedient” (i.e. in the “State” or corrupt politicians’ best interest). We saw the fulfillment of this savage injustice carried out in real life in during the Bolshevik Revolution. Is not one enough...?

[This is actually what Obamacare is preparing to do. It is unconstitutional and it is genocide and it is sedition. It is also treason for the politicians to force Obamacare on the people, while they themselves will be exempt from it—having the only best health care provided for them at the peoples’ expense (in addition to their pension which will pay them every year after they retire for doing nothing more than the average American makes in 5 years of dedicated labor). This is treason.]

The demand for vaccination is just one step shy of euthanasia (which, incidentally, is a very real provision of Obamacare). Autism and many other diseases (including cancers which may develop decades later) have been linked to vaccines and there is an overwhelming amount of information and a plethora of professionals to document this. All the honest individual has to do is a simple web search for “dangers of vaccinations” (including you-tube videos) to see the documented evidence from around the world. If someone chooses to believe in vaccines—great. That is his choice. To force vaccines on those who believe them to be harmful, when it also violates



their conscience and religion, their right to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, the right to contract (and not to contract), freedom from slavery, the right of privacy, safety, security of their persons, and life itself, is a hate crime.

The fact that a person would be threatened with the termination of his employment, his very labor, his means of providing life, also violates the Constitutional ruling: “No man shall be deprived of his property without [first] being heard in his own defense.” (Kinney vs. Beverly 2 Hen. & M. (VA) 318, 336)

The law also says,

“The Constitution is to be construed with respect to the law existing at the time of its adoption and as securing to the individual citizen the rights inherited by him under English [Common] Law, and not with reference to new guarantees.” (Mattox vs. U.S. 237, 15 S. Ct. 337, 39 LED 409; see also Bouvier’s Law Dictionary (1839) p. 628) ... and ...

“We find it intolerable that one Constitutional Right should have to be surrendered in order to assert another.” (Simons vs. U.S. 390, US 398 (1968))

Some medical institutions are allowing a waiver of the vaccines if the nonvaccinated health-care worker agrees to wear an operating mask during flu season when around patients. This is truly asinine. Are they afraid that the vaccinated patient is going to “catch health” from the nonvaccinated health care worker? If vaccines truly work, the vaccinated patient has nothing to fear. It is the nonvaccinated health-care worker (if vaccines truly work) who should be afraid, and it should be his option of whether he want to wear a mask or not. Is not breathing considered a God-given right any more...? If anyone should be masked, should it not be those who are sick, to keep them from infecting those who are not...? Cannot a vaccinated person act as a carrier for a disease, even if he himself allegedly is safe from the disease since he has been vaccinated? If a disease can be caught from a vaccinated person, should not all health care workers and all patients wear masks at all times...? This of course is absurd. We do not live in a bubble and unless someone actually has a contractable disease, he cannot legally be forced to live in one.

This regulation of being masked itself, aside from being a punitive insult to the person who refuses to marvel at the Emperor’s invisible suit of clothes and submit to poisoning by vaccines, is a violation of HIPAA laws—the public broadcasting of a person’s health records by institutional mandate. Why not force them to wear a “yellow Jewish star” or “the scarlet letter A”...? This is cruel and unusual punishment without a person having committed any crime. While the average health-care worker may assent to being masked, not all will and it is an affront to demand such of them. Are health-care workers who have AIDS forced to wear a bubble or an astronaut suit or a giant placard that says, “I have AIDS”...? Are non-heterosexual health-care workers forced to wear pink scrubs and a sign that says, “I participate in ‘at-risk’ behavior”...? Why then should health-care workers who refuse vaccines because they are deadly and a violation of their rights, be subjected to such special humiliation as if they are somehow “diseased”...? If they consent to be being masked (waiving their rights), what is to keep the employer from later increasing the burden (even draconianly) placed upon on these masked nonvaccinated workers, who have already been intimidated into waiving their rights in submitting to wearing a mask even though they are not sick...?

God’s Word is clear. Our bodies are the Temple of God and we are not to profane or pollute them in any way:

<sup>15</sup>Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? .... <sup>19</sup>What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? <sup>20</sup>For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.” (I Corinthians 6)

God created our bodies and He created all that exists (and He controlled how all life fell from Grace). God commanded that we not eat certain foods or take into our body certain things in any way, not only because they are not healthy for us, but because they are *abominations*. When a person goes to an allergy doctor or heart doctor, quite often the doctor gives the patient a list of *foods to avoid*, and these foods are quite often the very same foods that God Himself forbade that we should eat: pork, shellfish, etc. See Leviticus 7:23-27; 11 (see also Leviticus 26), Deuteronomy 14 (see also Deuteronomy 28). Whether the majority of so-called “Christians” observe these laws or not is irrelevant. Those majority of “Christians” are the exception, not the rule—because God makes the rules. Time will tell whether they are truly of Christ or not. The exception may be in the majority (as in time most all things undergo corruption), but that does not invalidate the rule. The Standard remains though the majority deviate from it.

Thomas Jefferson said,

“I have sworn upon the Holy Altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.”

“The course of history shows that as government grows, liberty decreases.”

[This statement is not the expression of a fatalistic attitude. The people’s rights shall not be infringed, and if they are, the people’s recourse, in the face of lawlessness, is recorded in the Declaration of Independence (if you can’t recall what this is, look it up, that means you haven’t read the Declaration as you should—yearly—so that you remember what freedom actually is). The people never have to submit to tyranny. Jefferson also said: “Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God.” Again, this is not demonstrative of the mindset of a Deist, because Deists believe God to be an “absentee landlord”; *ergo*, after

abandoning His property and tenants (if the Deist's position is correct) no one is bound to obey God. Jefferson at the time of his greatest influence in our government, was not a Deist. His very words reveal this. Jefferson and Franklin made it quite clear, at this period of time in their lives, that God played an active role in the affairs of men and not only receives the petitions of His people, but makes demands upon them.]

\_\_\_\_\_ has observes God's dietary laws as a matter of conscience and religion. God's Law forbids us to take into our bodies fat, blood, any manner of uncleanness (disease, pus, etc.), any unclean animal (monkey, swine, horse, any animal that dieth of itself, etc.), and any creeping thing. Vaccine are full of such uncleanness and is a violation of \_\_\_\_\_'s conscience, religion, and aforementioned rights to of ones body, life, liberty, property, pursuit of happiness, health, right to contract, freedom from cruel and unusual punishment (without having even committed a crime), freedom from slavery, etc.

In good faith \_\_\_\_\_ desires to follow all valid rules and regulations in the work place and is desirous that the employer not violate these constitutional rights by demanding vaccination. It is not that an "exemption" is sought: for an exemption legally implies obligation. What is sought (no pun intended) is *immunity* from this required vaccination: the recognition of the freedom from this violation of all rights.

Her record of service shows her good faith as a competent and caring nurse who cares about her job and her patients. Please do not violate her rights or demand that she violate her conscience and her religion and grant her the exemption from being forced to take vaccinations which would cause irreparable damage and violate her rights.

This church's position on vaccines is not unique. Other churches and organizations likewise champion the right to choose and also expose the dangers of vaccines. A simple web search will prove this if anyone in good faith has even attempted to verify this fact. A list of signatures of other pastors and churches and experts in the areas of health and law can be obtained if, in bad faith \_\_\_\_\_ refuses to recognize \_\_\_\_\_'s rights in this matter.

Please declare \_\_\_\_\_ immune from the requirement to submit to all vaccinations now and in the future to prevent irreparable damage and resultant litigation. Litigation is not desired, merely the right to work while retaining the integrity of body, mind, and soul and obedience to God. To demand vaccinations would be a violation of all valid law and a a violation of the true Christian faith and religion.

Thanks so much and God bless,

Pastor Robert Alan Balaicius,  
Free Reformed Church of our Ancient Christian Faith and Heritage  
(unincorporated).

P.S. Note: this is merely a form letter for general information. Those who may wish to become members of this church may email with your inquiry and we can begin the mandatory Biblical review process. Only bonafide Christians who qualify will be granted membership. After that, if needed, a personalized copy of this letter with signature can be provided. If you are already a member of a Christian church, those who wish to use this document, may have their pastor affix your church's letter head to it and sign it for you, and he may use it "as is," or adapt it to suit your needs and permission to do so is granted if proper credit is given. It would also be beneficial if churches and pastors would network with me to develop a portfolio of other pastors and churches and other organizations who also agree to the tenets laid out herein, so that our influence grows and the rights of our people are not irreperably violated.

Direct inquiries to: [stm@mounet.com](mailto:stm@mounet.com)

In case the email goes to my spam folder the first time, title the subject of your email (copy and paste) "Inquiry - Church membership."

For more information concerning others who may believe the same way about vaccines and legal support groups. I have no affiliation or history with these groups, I am merely passing this information along since someone recently emailed me these 2 below URLs; see:

<http://www.hcpvc.org/activism.html>

<http://labor-employment-law.lawyers.com/human-resources-law/Forcing-Flu-Shots-Employees-and-Health-at-Work.html>