

# Discussion #4

[Thomas Renz](#) | [Rebecca Messall](#) | [Brad Bergford](#)

Topics include religious liberty, lockdown laws, free speech, and censorship issues.

**Gualberto** OK, welcome to today's call on the legal aspects of the vaccine and the coronavirus mandates. My name is Gualberto García Jones. I am vice president and LifeSite News. I'm also an attorney licensed to practice in the state of Virginia. Today, we're going to be speaking with three guests, all of them attorneys, all of them with recent experience in the cases surrounding Covid. And I'm just going to give you a quick introduction to them, and then we're going to jump right into some of the questions...general questions about what their work has entailed. And then we'll have some time to address some of the questions that you have submitted to us. So without further ado, we have attorney Thomas Renz with us today. He is the lead attorney in three major cases in Ohio, New Mexico and also nationally regarding the unconstitutional Covid lockdowns, mask mandates, and business closures. While Mr. Renz recognizes this fight is controversial, he believes it simply should not be. The Constitution of the United States does not allow for states to disregard the rights of Americans. We also have attorney Rebecca Messall. She is an old friend of mine from Colorado. She's a managing partner at Messall Law Firm and she maintains a litigation practice in state and federal courts. Mrs. Messall has been representing two churches in Colorado while they push back on the governor's Covid restrictions. And we also have Brad, and Brad is co-counsel with Rebecca and has also been trying some of these cases in Colorado regarding the churches and the mask mandates. And so we're just so, so privileged to have them here on the call with us today. And I'd like to start with a quick question here for Rebecca Messall. And Rebecca, you have been a longtime pro-life advocate. I know that you represented personhood and you represented my organization in Colorado when...when we had our run-ins with the law, and with the...with the state. And so you have a very broad perspective on these issues. And I wanted to ask you in particular, you mentioned to me that in one of the litigation...one of the cases that you've been trying, you mentioned the case of Jacobson. Right? Which is that 1905 US Supreme Court case that sort of settled the law that the states have this authority to vaccinate people forcefully now. A very interesting part of your...of your mention of that case is the relationship it bears to the infamous case of Buck versus Bell. And so within that relationship and the the whole link to eugenics. Right? Buck versus Bell being the case, that allowed people to be sterilized against their will. Can you talk a little bit about the vaccination and the law and eugenics?

**Rebecca Messall** Well, thank you. Virtually, yes. It surfaced when I was not even on one of these cases, but I was listening in because I'd been working in the background for some possible clients. And I listened in to oral argument in the Kentucky case, one of the first federal court hearings on the situation in Kentucky. And I was shocked because I heard the state's attorney coming in arguing a 1905 vaccine case. What they were talking about, there was an outdoor congregation of people in their cars who the local officials were trying to say were in violation of the executive order. So that was...that was a shocking piece of authority that I heard them arguing for. But it was then a vaccine case. At that point, I was already concerned about all of the hype for vaccines that didn't exist. And it seemed like a kind of political extortion going on because we had severe, severe, unprecedented lockdowns and a promotion of vaccines using a 1905 case. So I had this background in eugenics because of abortion having sprung from that whole movement, as you know. And it came to my mind. 1905. Well, that's right the year after Galton established his chair in eugenics at the London School of Economics. Well, that's that's a coincidence, isn't it? Just I mean, wise. But I wondered I wonder what that had to do with Buck versus Bell, the sort of epitome of that horrible eugenics movement of disguised as public health. Right? We're just going to forcibly sterilize the unfit. So sure enough, I looked up the horrible Buck versus Bell case and the very citation that everyone knows [indiscernible] it was enunciated in that case, three generations of imbeciles are enough. You know what the direct cite was? It was to the vaccine case of Jacobson versus Massachusetts, in the 1905. Buck versus Bell in 1927. But anyway, so that lit my hair on fire because as you know, I've written about eugenics. I've written about abortions springing from eugenics. I've written about population control coming from

eugenics. And here we go again with the government citing to that 1905 case. And I knew other lawyers. I mean who does this kind of research except for pro-life lawyers? Maybe a few people know, but I was probably the only person that probably knew about this citation. So what springs to mind right after Buck versus Bell is the horrible Korematsu case. That one has been denounced. Korematsu was the relocation of all the Japanese Americans out of their homes and put into camps for four years. No due process. No nothing. It was an executive order. The irony of all of that that I just told you is that Jacobson was not a forcible sterilization...or a forcible vaccination case. The Jacobson was just a state statute. And the man who objected, he brought a poor case. It was thrown out because the claims were not properly stated and also the statute in Massachusetts did not require you to be vaccinated. It was, you paid a five dollar fine. So that's what happened. And yet from that opinion came Buck versus Bell and you know, a horrible history of eugenics.

**Gualberto** Seems to have been interpreted, at least it lives today, under the guise of the state having the power to vaccinate people against their will, doesn't it?

**Rebecca Messall** Well, it's being tempered down in the last few cases that I've seen come through, including the United States Supreme Court, where, as Justice Roberts referred to it obliquely and it was not a binding opinion or anything, but in the first couple of cases that came their way on the United States Supreme Court, they were referring to Jacobson as if it were authority. And in the next few cases that came their way, they didn't do that any more. So I...there was one line by Justice Gorsuch to the effect of...when we just uphold these executive orders blindly, things don't turn out well. And so he, I know, has a background in eugenics because he wrote a book about physician assisted suicide coming out of that same movement. And so I feel I have hope that the courts will stop relying on Jacobson and start thinking about executive orders in the context of World War Two. We already been there, done that. That was Poland. That was Germany, that was the Eastern Bloc. We just don't do these things, although we're suffering through them right now. Hopefully the judges will.

**Gualberto** What is your what is your opinion and your interactions with the judges during these cases? Is there a possibility of Jacobson being overruled? What was the reaction when you when you mentioned some of these cases from the Second World War and before?

**Rebecca Messall** Well, as close as they got to the whole...I really hope the courts will denounce and overrule both of those Buck versus Bell and Jacobson, but Korematsu has been denounced in the past. And I want to say it might have been in the Supreme Court that denounced. So I mean, I hate to have to do that kind of thing, but you basically have to, I think, for history purposes, no, this cannot happen again. So in our case, that was the result, at least as to Korematsu. So that was very refreshing and a hopeful sign.

**Gualberto** Absolutely. Well, I'd like to jump to to you, Mr. Bergford. If you could, would you explain some of the litigation that you have been doing along with with Mrs. Messall on the Covid mandates, on church attendance? Can you explain a little bit of your work and also the the results of those cases?

**Brad Bergford** Well, we are...I'll start with the end in the end, is that we're not over yet, we're not finished and we're still in the throes of litigation. We're happy for that. The the litigation that we are working on together has been on behalf of two churches in each of their pastors with respect to religious free exercise. First Amendment free exercise. And we really have taken an approach that is unusual around the country among lawyers on these sorts of cases, whether they be lawyers from religious organizations or lawyers just from law firms. The common approach has been to say, please treat us no worse than you treat big box stores. And our approach is that, while the First Amendment says that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and so we we look at those...that language and we and we think that, well, that's pretty absolute language. That we understand that there are some there's some case law that has to do with how First Amendment freedoms can be restrictive, whether it's speech or otherwise. But we really look at free exercises. We got to start from this place of the absolute language in that amendment. And so we've essentially said free exercise should not be compared to operating a Wal-Mart or some other store. When we look at how free should free exercise be, what shouldn't be it shouldn't be treated worse than a Wal-Mart. I just don't think

that that's an appropriate or a faithful reading of the First Amendment. And really, Mrs. Messall has had a lot to do with the development of my understanding of all of this. And so a lot of times what the government has said in defense of these shut downs, lockdowns, business restrictions, you know, all the other stuff that they've said with respect to churches has been, well, there's this case, Employment Division vs. Smith from 1990 that says that neutral laws of general applicability have to be followed even if it if they impinge on free exercise of religion. The problem with using that case in this context is that that case had to do with a criminal statute. It did not have to do with the sorts of conduct by the government that we're talking about now. And so, you know, they kind of have got this warm butter approach where they've spread that across all free exercise cases and just said, well, look, the butter is everywhere. And and we're trying to say, you know what? The butter doesn't belong everywhere. It's not that cut and dried. And we really need to look at non-criminal context in a different way than we look at the criminal context. Of course, you know, we would never say that, you know, those people should be able to violate criminal statutes in the course of exercising their religion. You shouldn't be able to rob bakeries in the course of exercising your religion. The other side of that is that the government is saying, well, essentially we're imposing through executive orders criminal liability on churches and other people by way of the threat of fines and imprisonment. In the case of Colorado, fines are up to a thousand dollars, imprisonment up to a year, one or the other. But , you know, they say this is a misdemeanor, that the executive orders and the public health orders treat this as a misdemeanor. And so we've got a very interesting situation setting up. And it's really important that the...that worshipers are willing to say, you know what, we're not going to have the ongoing...ongoing mistreatment of those seeking to just simply exercise their religion and have that mistreatment happen in the name of, you know, kind of going back through Korematsu, Buck versus Bell Jacobson versus Massachusetts. It's got to be a different standard. We can't just look to Employment Division vs. Smith. And Lukumi Babalu Aye is another case that kind of helps to form some of the...some of the basis that I think is actually helpful for us in these cases. But the bottom line is, those people who want to maintain the rights need to stand and fight for them.

**Gualberto** Right. And I noticed in how [indiscernible] the media reported on the cases in Colorado that you were able to get the district court to rule that there was no limit on the attendance, the capacity at the church or the mascheroni. Is that correct?

That did happen and and there is...there is some room for discussion about how all that happened, but the bottom line is that we filed a motion for a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction. In our case, our case involves state defendants, namely the governor of the health department and the executive director of the health department and three federal agencies as well. We said the state can't come into this religious exercise setting and tell these people that they can't do things...like we've said, the capacity limit. You can't tell us that we can't allow parishioners into parishes or you can't allow congregants into the assembly just because you've reached a numerical limit. There's something very arbitrary about that. And especially...you know we don't we don't make the argument this way, but it is instructive to look at, you know, if there's an unlimited number of people who can gather in some other place indoors. And the obvious examples are big box stores. But again, we don't argue legally this way, but it shows that there's some discriminatory action going on on behalf of the state or by the state. We said...

**Rebecca Messall** Could I interject real quickly? So we...we're not really free to discuss our case to any large degree.

**Gualberto** Can you tell us about that? Is the case currently...it's being appealed by the government after the district court ruled in your favor. Is that right?

**Rebecca Messall** It was repealed first by the state, then we had a couple of issues that we have appealed. And the state dismissed its appeal after the New York diocese case came down in favor of the churches. That was the state Supreme Court. So it's on appeal. And that's what limits Brad and myself from discussing much more than just the fringes of the litigation.

**Brad Bergford** Thank you. Thank you, Rebecca, for catching me. I was enthusiastic to talk about this, but yes...

**Rebecca Messall** I'm sorry I barged in, but...

**Brad Bergford** I'm so glad you did.

**Gualberto** Well, I want to bring in Mr. Renz, who has...he has a lot of experience in different states. And one point that I would like to ask you about, Mr. Renz, is, in particular, you, in your cases, challenge the premise that there is an emergency and also the idea of this never ending emergency. Right? Which we said was at first it was a couple of weeks to flatten the curve and now it's a year and without really an end in sight. So can you talk about that aspect of your case and tell us a little bit about your cases as well?

**Thomas Renz** Yes, so we have two types of cases. Naturally, we have the emergency case. We also have a case challenging the data and the information. They're separate questions of law, but they're related. And ultimately it comes down to this whole thing. What's an emergency? I mean, emergency, something that's unexpected. It happens. And it ends. You know, when things don't end, they're no longer an emergency. They're just the way it is. And this isn't a really complicated thing. This is just a reality. So, you know, something like Covid that we know we're going to have with us forever because every single public health expert and doctor out there has said this will never go away. It's not an emergency. It's just the way things are. The emergency powers that are being exercised are there. So if a tornado comes through your town and you need to keep the kids inside so they don't play in a puddle and get electrocuted from downed power lines, you can keep them safe. And that makes sense. Right? But that lasts a few days, not a few years. And this apparently has no end in sight. Another thing that's kind of a byproduct of what we're doing is if we...if the emergency declaration is gone...if the emergency's over under some relevant case law, that would essentially mean we believe that all of the issues, all the regulations, all the edicts promulgated by the various governors of the various states would then be rendered invalid. It'd be void. So ideally, if we get the win, what this will do is take us back to the real normal, not the new normal. If they want to pass regulations and laws related to masks and other such stuff, let them put it through the legislative process of the regulatory process that's laid out in the law, just like they would any other law. And then they can deal with the political fallout for destroying businesses and shutting down the country and at the ballot box. What we can't have, though, is governors who have totally, totally disregarded the separation of powers, has totally disregarded the constitutional rights of all these Americans just issuing these edicts. And worse yet, they're doing it based on a false premise. Not only is it not an emergency, because an emergency doesn't last forever, but it's also not an emergency because the facts don't back up what they're saying. We submitted in court, and so if we lie, we're subject to sanction. You can fact check away. But we cited everything using CDC documents, using documents and other state documents. We cited over and over again the fact that the numbers they're presenting are untrue. We know that the 450,000 deaths that they're talking about right now are with Covid. We also know that it's not and is entirely different from being from Covid. Okay, so everybody thinks when you've got a cause of death that that cause of death caused you to die. Well, that's not the case. Every cause of death out there, every single one is determined the same way except for Covid-19. In March, the CDC issued a rule that changed the way that death counts were done for Covid-19 and no other disease. So the 450,000 numbers are...450,000 death number is truly invalid and useless. It's comparing apples to oranges. Yeah, so that's kind of where we're at these things.

**Gualberto** A quick question on that. On the CDC guidelines for counting the Covid deaths, is that a uniform standard throughout the United States or is there still wiggle room? I know Colorado had some some discussion about this and and the very liberal governor actually curtailed a little bit of the insanity that was happening by the state authorities, that they were counting people that were shot and died. They happened to have Covid. They were Covid deaths. So how much wiggle room is there? I asked this because I...I have a good...a good friend. I was just speaking with him. He's a hospitalist doctor. He's pro-life. He's Catholic and he's very concerned being in the hospital all day and seeing Covid victims. So, you know, when I told them that I thought that the Covid deaths were inflated, he said, well, you know, in his hospital work, they'd make sure that the death is from Covid and not with Covid. So can you talk about that? Sort of the uniformity of that of that standard?

**Thomas Renz** Yeah, it's not uniform. Each state has kind of shifted it. Altered it, and to the extent to which it had an impact, it's unclear. We don't really know because there's not a truly uniform standard, because things are so vague. It's very difficult to know. We really can't. Now we know

that this is a disease. We know it's killing people. No one's denying that. But we also know that it's... the truth, the data about this is not available to the public. We're making policies...we're making decisions based on bad data. And one of the things that I would ask your doctor friend and I asked a number of doctors is, okay, so you're in a bad spot and you are seeing people who are dying. And I've lost loved ones very close to me to this, okay? So I understand that. But how do you know what you're...what you're talking about here? People don't realize this, but within the instruction manuals for just about every PCR test out there, which is one of the major ways that these diseases are diagnosed, is the disclaimer that says this test should not be used to diagnose Covid-19. So if you're going through a drive through and getting a diagnosis of Covid-19 and you have no symptoms, there's literally nothing to back that up. So now, for a doctor who's in a hospital who is diagnosing someone and sees the symptoms and can use that in conjunction with the PCR test, that can be useful. Okay, but the other thing that's occurring is we've seen a number of manufacturers who are giving a single positive or negative result for Covid-19, but the test is testing not only for Covid-19, but also for various strains of influenza. I don't know if everybody's noticed, but there's no influenza deaths anymore. Right? So, you know, the thing is, is there's no transparency in this. We don't know the truth about a lot of this because there's no transparency. There's no standards. And while your doctor is probably a good guy and probably being honest, the reality is, is that there are some that are not. And it's not typically the doctors. It's typically being pushed down from the top.

**Gualberto** So, yeah. So I have I have a question for the three of you. Since you have been representing different different churches and different people that have been pushing back against these mandates, even if it is anecdotal with this, with the number of people that you've been dealing with, have you seen outbreaks of Covid at the churches that you have been representing that have not worn the masks? What has your experience been for the last six months as you follow these cases?

**Thomas Renz** For my part, I can tell you absolutely that. So I've been giving speeches. I've been all over. My doctor experts have me on some prophylactics, ivermectin and vitamin D and things like that. I have shook hands and hugged hundreds of people over and over again. I have not gotten sick. None of...there's been no reports from any of these political... Right? These are free speech rally type things. I've had no reports of any sort of major outbreaks anywhere. That's not to say that people haven't gotten sick, but where I've heard about people getting sick now and then, it's been very similar to what we've seen every other year with the flu. They get sick. They get better. And we know that there's over 99.9% recovery rate from Covid-19. So unless you're in that risk category, it's really not been an issue. And frankly, for the people who are in that risk category, we're asking, you know, be safe, take precautions. Right?

**Gualberto** And Mr. Bergford, how about you with the churches that you've been representing, have they been okay?

**Brad Bergford** I feel like I probably shouldn't talk about them and Rebecca [indiscernible] go into that stuff directly, but in a general sense, I...my experience has been like Tom's.

**Gualberto** Yeah. I mean, I can tell you that in my my role at LifeSite news, I've been covering a lot of mass rallies. I was at the Capitol on January 6th, which is a very interesting thing. But nobody was wearing a mask there. A million people there. And, you know, I'm fine. Everybody that I know that was there is fine. And if there was ever a concentration of people without masks, it was...it was there. So it is very interesting. It's the the role of an emergency in the law, I think is crucial because it allows for a type of chilling effect, where people are willing to to set aside the protections of the Constitution and the rights that the Constitution gives. I know for my part, I...I don't like to cause a ruckus. So when I go into the supermarket, even though I think it's ridiculous, I put the dumb cloth mask on and most people do that. And if you extrapolate that to the law, there is a real trampling of our constitutional rights because of that fear that's been created. So it's it's something where I don't know the exact quote, but they say the Constitution isis most needed during emergencies. We can't toss it during an emergency. So I want to go ahead and ask a couple of questions from that were submitted ahead of time by our audience. I don't know if you have an answer for these. I haven't submitted these to you ahead of time. So if you don't know, that's fine. I'm being asked here by one of our our readers, what is the best legal

leg to stand on, in your opinion, when it comes to fighting back against these mandates, both the mask mandates and what we expect to be a vaccine either coerced or mandated.

**Rebecca Messall** Well, there are so many of us speak up, if you can hear me, we're told there are so many different violations going on. The best one is the winning one. So we have pursued many, but not all. And thank goodness for Tom Renz's case because he was able to put together the expert testimony for challenging the emergency itself that is supported by the Supreme Court. There were emergencies like this. Well, they were mainly statutory, not executive orders, during the Great Depression. And so there is case law that says, no, emergencies don't last forever. There's a difference between an emergency and chronic. And so, well, maybe we have a chronic condition that's different from the emergencies, as Mr. Renz was saying. What's important is these operations at the state level are driven by state statutes that are emergency declaration acts, and they're integrated with the federal system for declaration of emergencies, for purposes of funding, so that that involves now federal congressional money being utilized to prop up these states as they closed down. So they're able to keep going as government workers. Right? But the private people are not. And that's a problem. So in terms of politically, when we're talking to the Congress people and they're giving money to 50 governors who have shut down the economy, that's not okay. So Congress should answer for that. And then as far as what the states are doing to selectively shut down certain sectors while benefiting the Wall Street sectors, that's not okay. So there are so many violations of equal protection, of a procedural due process, of substantive due process, of federalism itself. It's hard to pick just a few to get them all in to a case. But I think that anything, any of them are good.

**Thomas Renz** And I would I would agree with and that's a great characterization of our work. Thank you so much. But I would agree with you. There are so many ways to challenge. It really just depends on on the individual plaintiff and the individual harm. I mean, right now, there are violations of our religious freedoms. There are violations of our free speech, violations of our freedom of assembly violation takings right and left. I mean, we have so many things that we could challenge. It really just depends on what you want to do. As far as the vaccination stuff goes. I really am hoping to see some people challenge this on religious grounds. I think that there absolutely has to be a religious exemption. And that to me is really underlying a lot of this. I think the EUA that was issued for the Covid vaccines should be challenged and a number of ways because there were other treatments available, and that's one of the requirements.

**Gualberto** Can you explain what the EUA is?

**Thomas Renz** That's the Emergency Use Authorization. So the vaccinations, and let me preface this and I know...bout a year and a half ago, I had never heard of medical freedom. My kids are vaccinated. I'm vaccinated. We will not be getting the vaccine and I had no idea about any of these vaccination issues. I've learned a lot about this since then. And one of the things that I think is really telling for anybody that's hearing this that doesn't know is, I think you've got to ask yourself the question. If these medicines are safe and effective and there's no problems, why can't you sue if there's a problem? Why would you need that law, right? Well, that's particularly true with this Covid vaccine. They say that it's gone through all these safety standards. Well, I read the Emergency Use Authorization. I've looked at the studies, I've looked at the stuff. And I can assure you that there are a number of issues. Now, is it a bad vaccine? I don't know. I have no idea. I'm not qualified to make that decision. What I know is that for me and my family, I'm not comfortable with it. I will not be getting it. I would object to it on religious grounds for a number of reasons. And I would object to it on the fact that it was not validly put out there under any way. I would also argue that you can't...force someone to accept a vaccination that was issued under an emergency use authorization that didn't undergo the full testing required for the vaccination. So I think there is in terms of the vaccination, there's a ton of things that could/would/should be done. And frankly, I just don't have the time to take on those cases right now. But I'm hoping to see some people question this, not so much because I'm against vaccines, but because this one was not done honestly. Much like everything else related to this disease, it's all been just misleading and deceptive and about money. Yeah, it's really sick.

**Gualberto** I think. I think a lot of people are in the same place to you are. I know I am. Except for the abortion tainted element of vaccines, that being a pro-life activists have always been very curious about, I...I'm not particularly I was never really particularly interested in vaccines in terms

of a liberty interest because I considered it fine except for that abortion issue. But I think my eyes have been opened certainly in in the the interests that are behind the vaccines and certainly the fact that they've stripped the ability to sue. That is...as an attorney, I think that really worries me because you're you're definitely hiding something. If you don't want to be sued, you're expecting to be sued. And so it's definitely very, very worrisome. And I think it was Dr. Simone Gold who mentioned that there are...there are some international law treaties that prohibit experimental vaccination. And really, at only a couple of months, this is truly an experimental vaccination. And the fact that it's being pushed on potentially billions of people is incredible. It is...it is probably the most reckless experiment that human science has ever undergone. So I want to mention to all of you that we had over 25,000 people sign up for this conference within 48 hours. So the interest is there. This is not a fringe conspiracy movement. This is real Americans that are really worried about the health of their children and themselves and their parents. So thank you for fighting this battle.

**Thomas Renz** If I could interject something I think is a really important question people need to ask themselves. So, if you have a... if you're pregnant, and I know that a lot of your people, followers of your site are pro-life and I, of course, am myself. But if you're pregnant, the odds of your pregnancy coming to fruition and you're giving birth to a live, healthy baby are incredibly high at this point. Almost almost 100%. If you have Covid, the odds of you dying are way, way less than 1%, way less. Okay? So here's my question. The government and the courts have said that you control your body up to the point where you can kill a baby that is almost certain to be born healthy. So explain to me how it is that you don't control your body when it comes to an experimental medicine, when it comes to the determination whether to wear a mask, whether it comes to the determination as to whether to quarantine on a disease that has almost no deaths. And the deaths that they're counting, they're miscounting. And we've proven that. We've proven that. We've used their words. We've shown that. Okay? So, I don't think that you can fact check away. But please tell me how you're going to fact check the CDC document that says that we expect that this new rule will result in Covid-19 being the cause of death, more often than not. I mean, you can't fact check that it's a CDC document. So I want to know how it is that we can...we can choose, you know, how we want to apply this law so randomly when it comes to my body, my choice.

**Gualberto** It seems like any litigation on mandatory vaccination would have to overlook Roe and Casey and the privacy interests there completely. Do some some pretty serious legal gymnastics to get rid of them. Very interesting. So I like to ask Mr. Bergford, could you talk about the the element of religious free exercise and religious freedom in fighting these mandates and related to that question of kind of the best legal leg to stand on? It seems to me, based on the composition of the court and some of the recent rulings, like the free exercise angle would be one of the best ones to take. What's your opinion?

**Brad Bergford** Well, I don't know if I'm qualified to say what is the best thing, but I certainly think going back to what I said before, our religious freedom is...it's recognized in the Constitution, not conferred in the Constitution, but recognized in the Constitution in broad, absolute language. And I think we should stand...stand strong for that for those people who are religious, those people who value the rights that are enshrined in the First Amendment. I'll tell you that...that if we don't stand for any of those rights, if there's any one that we say, well, I don't really feel like really taking a punch over that one. And I don't mean I'm speaking metaphorically. Please understand in every sense when I talk about fighting for your rights, if we're not willing to kind of take those blows and and risk something, I don't think that we really have the right perspective on those rights, because if you're not willing to, you know... It's been said if you're not willing to die for something, you're really not living for anything. And so, I think we need to take a couple of...a kind of a long view of all this. We need to say, okay, as citizens, there's something that we need to defend. And also we need to own and understand the perspective that attorneys exist in this context, kind of as safety cables. But attorneys are not supposed to actually do the protecting of these rights. It's kind of like the last line of defense is what is the way I view it. The first line of defense is the people who are trying to hold on to the rights. And yes, that involves attorneys because in the same way it involves all of us. We can't give this stuff up or we're not going to get it back. I mean, the government...I don't know anything that the government's ever taken that it gave back to people in terms of freedom. And so this is...this is one of those, if you want to be able to speak freely, don't give up your religious liberties. If you want to be able to speak freely, don't give up

your right to assemble. You know, I mean, we could we could talk about the interrelation of all these things and that really the, you know, to use the example of churches, if churches are going to say, you know what, we have these these sacraments that we believe in. We're not going to allow the state to say that you can't engage in sacraments, for instance, communion. It's very difficult to receive communion in many faith traditions without coming within six feet of another person. And it's, you know, to do so would be absurd in the first place. It...the idea defies logic. It defies what so many people believe in. And so you might say, well, there is a way to do it. Well, the question is, how many different ways do you want to find to adjust the way that you do things that are...that are sacred to you? I think that at the point when you start to try and find ways to do it, the government's way, you start to give up quite a bit.

**Gualberto** Yeah, very well put. So one one further question here, this one, maybe it's kind of a curveball for you, because I don't think any of you are specialists in military law. But we do have a lot of readers who are in the military and they have a long history of of litigation and of suffering from experimental vaccines because of the unique position that they're in. And we we have a reader who asked us any any tips on vaccine exemptions for active military families.

**Brad Bergford** Boy, I know. Oh, sorry. I was just going to say, when you sign up to to go into the military, you basically sign you give away your rights. You say that I'm military property is essentially what you do. I've got a son who's a Marine. And so I've considered this idea. And, you know, it's, boy, it's pretty tough. And I understand the reason for all that. I don't know, and, Tom, you look like you're about to say something. I don't know of a basis on which to refuse all of that. My son's been vaccinated every which way because of all the things he's been involved in.

**Thomas Renz** All I was going to say is, well, thank you to your son for his service and thank you to all of those that are serving for their service. And I am very sorry to say that I don't know that there's a great way for them to challenge that I've seen. That said, I would love to have the opportunity at some point to do something with that, because if there's any one which should be taken care of, it's our service member. And it's a shame that they are experimented on in so many ways.

**Rebecca Messall** And I want to chime in because I'm old enough to remember Agent Orange, and it was deployed on our own troops by the fact that they were in the area and our troops came home with it and then their children were born with the impact of the toxicity of the Agent Orange. And then even today, as recently as last few weeks, we have troops saying they've been exposed to toxic chemicals at the bases where they've been assigned to all these far-flung places of the world. And so the rights of the military to humane treatment. They should not be forced to lie on the concrete floor of a garage for days on end for no reason in Washington, D.C. They should not be experimented on and they should not be purposely or recklessly exposed to toxic chemicals at their bases. And some of that, of course, is unavoidable. But what's obviously avoidable should be avoided. And that's on the military to fix. I don't know how we as civilians can fix it.

**Gualberto** Right. I mean, to me, it seems like you have to have a certain level of health to be in active service. And by virtue of that, you would you would be in very, very low risk category for Covid. You probably, I don't...I don't know about for sure, but diabetics and people with obesity, very old people, they're not really the people in active service. And so, you know, why would you vaccinate every single person? I think my perspective on this would be that if I were in the military or had a family member, I think the religious angle would be the closest one. I think you probably lose, as you said, Mr. Bergford, you do give up a lot of your rights when you sign up. But we had some cases earlier in the year, last year where, I think it was in the Navy, they had, using the pandemic as an excuse, they had removed priests from several of the bases and they closed down the religious services. And thankfully, President Trump pushed back on that pretty hard. I don't think it got to... There was actually a case that was litigated. But I think because of the fact that the president pushed back, the litigation wasn't necessary in the end to correct that. But probably, I think other than the religious angle, I would say politically. Right? I mean, people respect the military for the most part, and we don't want to see them treated as guinea pigs. So probably having that political accountability, in my opinion, is the best way to push back. Okay, we are almost at the end, I think there's one... Go ahead, Rebecca.

**Rebecca Messall** Well, sometimes when you're a lawyer, you're privy to how things work politically more than when you're a normal person, and I'd like to say we all know that there are some politicians who seem to have access to cash and information. And I want to point out there's a theory of law called the dead hand theory. And that's hundreds of years old. And it's the power to somehow dictate politics by leaving your trust, your big pots of money to steer the way you want the world to go. And those used to be curtailed by the statute of limitation...I'm sorry...the statute...rule of perpetuity. And a lot of states abolished. That's what we have is the dead hands now of major foundations who are steering our politicians with cash. These ginormous pools of cash and assets. They invest in these same companies and they channel their they make their money and dividends off of using the government as distribution points where you've got large markets like military. Like schools. Like.... And that is...I think lawyers understand that this is a problem. When you're talking about antitrust, thanks to Amy Klobuchar I saw yesterday, maybe somebody is going to actually look at that. But that's more than just these big tech companies. It's these big trusts that go on for hundreds of years, investing in these companies that end up being contractors for the government. And it's a...it's a circle of income at that high level. That's why we feel like, what is going on.

**Gualberto** Well, this was a fascinating conversation on behalf of all of our readers, at LifeSite and the people who signed up for this conference, I want to thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedules to talk about this with us. And we know... God bless you. Keep up the good work and and keep us up to date with your with your cases. We'll be covering it on LifeSite News. And so for all of our viewers and readers, you'll be able to follow all of the...all of this litigation on our pages of LifeSite News and on our YouTube channel and the social media network. So, if Big Brother and Big Tech allow us, we will reach out to you. But the best way to get your information is to come directly to LifeSite News to our website to avoid all of that censorship. So, again, on behalf of all of our readers. Thank you so much to the three of you. And God bless you.

**Thomas Renz** Thank you.

**Brad Bergford** Thanks and God bless.

All right. OK. All right.

Yeah, we still recording and it worked out. No problems.

Yeah. All right. Thank you so much. It really was fascinating to hear your expertise on this and really appreciate it.

Can can I can can we turn off the recording? Yes, absolutely.