

## **A response to the Governor of Nevada and a statement about the mask mandate from No Mask Nevada PAC**

### This is a response to Governor Siosolak of Nevada

Governor Stephen Sisolak issued the following statement directed towards No Mask Nevada PAC during an address on July 27<sup>th</sup> 2020: “to have a protest about wearing masks is ridiculous.”

This is an answer to clarify the position of those who protest and a response to his statement.

The position against masks is not one of being against the invention, implementation, or wearing of masks, but the mandating of them by government – and more specifically by the manner in which they are being mandated.

As of today, July 28<sup>th</sup> 2020, we are all mandated by the signing of a piece of paper to wear a mask or else face the wrath of the government.

We hope that the Governor will understand our position and our reason for protest.

### About the author

Who the author of this publication is, is wholly unnecessary to the public, as the object for attention is the doctrine itself, not the man. Yet it may not be unnecessary to say, that he is unconnected with any party, and under no sort of influence public or private, but the influence of reason and principle.

### The problem

Because you cannot keep both your freedom and a government power so vast it can command others arbitrarily to give up their liberty. One will be lost. There is no avoiding this.

A government employee, or worse yet, an elected official, does not have both the best intention for your health; and; **is the most informed on how to specifically address your health** – this is never the case.

Often, our elected officials have personal agendas or are compensated to mislead and personally benefit.

Do we not agree that this is the case? Have we forgotten that politicians will use their power to manipulate?

We also agree that the government and their elected officials are poor at handling issues of importance, lack trustworthiness, so why hand the power over to them to allow them to make decisions for you as to how you dress, what you put in your body, and when and where you go out of your home?

This power has never been granted before. Why now?

Today we stand at the intersection of two paths; **one** where our safety and protection is governed by our beliefs, desires, and personal choices, and **the other** where we allow government to dictate it to us.

### Why we should not trust the government path

This way in which government has pushed their 'protection' on us recently is deceitful **procedurally**. We have seen pieces of paper signed by a governor, without input from the elected representatives of government in the form of the state legislators (state representatives, assembly, state senate).

If their data is so compelling as to conclude the case should be made for whatever mandate they require, then why not have a vote in the legislature on it?

Law is created by a vote of our elected representatives and signed by our elected executive (governor).

These recent 'protections' are not.

So why are there no laws as of yet? Four months and counting and no laws, just pieces of paper with a single signature on it.

In many cases, these representatives have met and voted on other issues, but not these issues of personal protection and mandating a mask and so forth.

When the issue of trust is the utmost importance, why would government withhold the most basic of fundamental procedure? Why would government not do what they have done with every other law and go through the process?

To mandate something – without input from our elected representatives in the legislative branch – mirrors the kinds of governments of tyranny, where a single man decides how government should behave and offers no limitations or restrictions on government's conduct.

We are, indeed, on a path of government power at the expense of personal freedom.

What is worse is that if we continue down this road of government control, the very safety that we seek so desperately – is dependent on the specific wisdom of the specific government that we allow to make these decisions for us.

Empowering government to dictate terms of our personal safety by a single piece of signed paper by an elected executive will not only mean that we are only as "smart" as those in government (and how smart are they?) but will expose our personal safety to the great possibility of corrupt forces that hope to profit from us, without regard to our care and well-being.

### What happens if we go further down a path of government control?

Should we favor government over personal freedom, we will place the certainty of our safety in the hands of a government that we already do not trust.

We will lose this "government safety" quicker than we consented for it to be created in the first place, and our "government safety" will soon be as effective as any other government program: the war on poverty, the war on drugs, and laws created over the last century to remove racial bias.

Down this path, we lose any freedom to use common sense in battling whatever health or protection issue because we have given that freedom to government to make the decision for us.

No matter how small the act of giving government control 'by piece of signed paper' itself is, the power is enormous: for it grows as the need for 'keeping us safe' grows. Today's minor inconvenience is tomorrow's lifestyle change. And the power of the 'signed piece of paper' knows no limit, for as long as it is in the spirit of safety it is the ultimate law of the land by consent.

If we now decide to govern by the whim of one elected governor or president or other executive by a single piece of signed paper, we will waive our ability to return to governing by our constitution.

This means our constitutional rights will become secondary to an individual ruler's desire to 'protect' us from harm – and the piece of paper that determines how we should react cannot be opposed.

### What it means to be free

The activities we enjoy, the lifestyle we engage, and the very being that we are is a product of our personal freedom.

Should we cast aside this freedom, we stand to lose the things that have been created by it.

Will the government let us attend church? Go to a baseball game? Eat an expensive meal? Quit a job and find a new career? Move to another state?

This will depend on what pieces of paper that have been signed by whatever rulers we have say that we can do.

How far away is a restriction on dangerous speech? Asking a provocative question or providing an unwelcome answer could easily be reclassified as necessary for health, with a simple signing of a piece of paper – should we stay on our current course.

For freedom is not so narrowly defined, and these things that I mention are missing in other nations across the world as a consequence of society either losing freedom or never having it.

Our freedom has always been dangerous. We have always suffered harm at the hand of freedom. This is no different today as it ever was.

Losing a right to drive a car because it is too dangerous or losing the right to fly because of the potential for an air disaster or forbidding one from visiting a sick relative in a hospital; all of these things could easily be determined by a government to be freedoms too dangerous to allow.

As history is being ignored, destroyed around us, censored, and removed from record, we are not reminded of the hardships that previous Americans have endured and the freedoms that have kept us together as a nation.

### Today's threat is tomorrow's tyranny

If we are to live in fear, who decides?

First, we must accept the fact that in order to have a free society there are risks involved.

The question then becomes 'what risks are allowed to be taken?'

Then it must be determined who decides these things.

We have recently allowed, by consent, our government to make these decisions of 'what is best' for us with regard to personal safety.

So what is happening because of it?

We are conditioning our society to take orders from government to segregate a segment of the population (those without masks) and demonize them. This normalizes an attack on people because of their differences, because of their beliefs.

In 1939, the German government insisted that a symbol divide one segment of the population from the other. The yellow Star of David was a way to dehumanize a population and allow it to be thought of as somehow inferior to others.

The yellow Star of David served as a symbol that the one wearing it was unable to conform and therefore deserved to perish.

Today, the mask is a symbol that one who does not wear it is unable to conform and therefore deserves to perish.

The German government used the medical establishment and the 'science' to conform to their political desire to exterminate a segment of the population.

On May 12 2012, the German Medical Association declared an apology for "participation in human rights violations" and said, "... German doctors were guilty of scores of human rights violations... the crimes were simply not the acts of individual doctors, but rather took place with substantial involvement of leading representatives of the medical association... as well as considerable representatives of the university medicine and renowned biomedical research facilities."

Are we so different now that the abuse of the power of the authority of medical officials is impossible today?

Without determining it to be so, we are not calling on this issue to be debated upon the merits of one medical community and another – but rather to frame a new debate on the acceptance of anything said by government using the authority of the medical community it oversees.

At least, should this medical interest be compelling, we deserve to have our legislative body determine a cause of action and not a single decision made by a single person using a pen and a piece of paper.

The only remedy for the disease of abuse of power is the empowerment of the individual as the decision maker, through an organized government that acts with due process.

This is what we thought we had today. But today this due process has taken a backseat to the power of a piece of signed paper.

And now, as a result, our society allows and encourages dehumanization of the individual who fails to conform to government standards, and we are going down a dangerous path of evil that overlooks or sidesteps the rule of law.

Conclusion

You and I must decide if life is too dangerous to allow ourselves to make decisions for ourselves.

We must decide whether to depart from this experiment of self-governing that we have engaged in for hundreds of years and instead hand our power over to a small number of rulers who govern with a pen and a single piece of paper, or insist that our constitution – a document that has no ‘emergency powers’ – remain the ultimate law.

There is little doubt that our government is aware of the consequence of allowing governing ‘by piece of signed paper’ and that this surely will lead to an end of our constitutional protections and an end to our very way of life.

For what good is a process when it can be avoided through the signing of a single piece of paper? And how can a constitution that is ignored by in control of our government?

For years, government has been frustration by our complex and difficult process of governing. It is indeed set up to frustrate the powers of those who govern in an attempt to make tyranny difficult to accomplish.

You and I must reject not just the unlawful procedure of governing, but those very people who would mandate, without the process of law, any depriving of liberty. For this is what America was yesterday, is today, and should be tomorrow.