

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Mark Maykranz <mmaykranz@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 7, 2025 7:36 AM
To: Participate
Cc: Amanda Breen; Courtney Hamilton; Tripp Hutchinson; Spencer Cordovano
Subject: Limelight

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am opposed to the Limelight's proposed conversion of hotel units to lux condominiums. The Limelight was granted two extra stories of height to do a hotel. The building towers over Ketchum, and the mass and scale of the building is overwhelming. The extra stories granted were against public sentiment, as was the penthouse component, but Council allowed the elephant for the hotel component. To add lux units after the fact is a back door approach and will be perceived as deception. As well, there are quite a few penthouse units sitting on the market right now, post Covid, and more planned. I fear that we are incentivizing a glut that could harm real estate values in Ketchum in general.

The owners of the building are worth over 14 billion; let's not worry about enhancing their wealth.

Do the right thing and reject the conversion of 11 hotel rooms to lux units (that will likely sit empty like most of the penthouses in town).

Thank you,
Mark Maykranz
Sent from my iPhone

Dawn Hofheimer

From: James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2025 1:37 AM
To: Neil Bradshaw; Amanda Breen; Spencer Cordovano; Courtney Hamilton; Tripp Hutchinson; Participate
Subject: MOTHERS'S DAY APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE AND COUNTRY/ PUBLIC RECORD FILING. KETCHUM CITY COUNCIL MEETING MAY 19 2025
Attachments: covid Mothers Day appeal 2025 .pdf
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mayor and Councilors -

Please see attached, submitted For the record, general public comment - of the next CC meeting May 19.

For your immediate action, as indicated therein.

Thank you,

Jim

*A Mother's Day Appeal
to Conscience and Country:*

**COVID *Beliefs*, Inalienable Rights
and the Rule of Law**

May 11, 2025

“The enduring hope and prayer of every mother is that her children may grow up in a land where freedom is not some gift granted by the state, but a sacred right secured by principle—protected and cherished by every citizen, in every generation. A nation where civil liberties are honored absolutely, and not surrendered in the face of fear, nor yielded in the face of tyranny.

We must stand resolute against the insidious forces that would impose falsehoods upon us—those who would have us trade truth for comfort or surrender integrity for the illusion of peace. For in doing so, we would not only betray the future of our children, but risk destroying the very soul of humanity itself.

Let us stand, then, not as passive observers, but as active guardians of liberty, so that future generations may inherit a country worthy of their dreams, never doubting that freedom will endure.”

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

Mother's Day

May 12, 1963

PROLOGUE

More than five years after the onset of what came to be known as the COVID-19 pandemic, confusion and uncertainty continue to linger around the world. The recent federal pardon of Dr. Anthony Fauci has only intensified public suspicion and raised serious concerns that the public was subjected to widespread deception regarding all matters related to "COVID," with potentially disastrous consequences for those who endured its sweeping mandates.

Most Americans — and people worldwide — complied with the COVID related directives promoted by government authorities and amplified by mainstream media. Yet, an undercurrent of considerable unease remains, often suppressed or dismissed, with concerns that invasive policies such as widespread masking and vaccination may have caused significant and irreversible harm. Tragically, this chapter in history has also produced profound divisions between people, even within families—fracturing relationships and weakening the nation's collective spirit.

This paper emphasizes the critical distinction between the fundamental right to freely express differing viewpoints, especially regarding health and public policy, and the equally vital necessity of upholding, inviolate and uncompromising, the rule of law in the United States. Our survival as a people and as a nation depends on both: the ability to engage respectfully across differences and the unwavering commitment to lawful governance, which ensures that no single viewpoint can be imposed on others without Due Process of Law.

DISCUSSION

I FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, BELIEF, SPEECH

1 Inalienable Rights

Our inalienable rights are those fundamental entitlements under natural law that every individual possesses simply by virtue of being human. They are not granted by governments, constitutions, or legal systems, and therefore cannot be justly revoked or overridden by any authority. These rights are our natural inheritance—existing prior to and independent of political institutions. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as articulated in the Declaration of Independence, are not privileges bestowed by the state, but expressions of a deeper truth: that human beings are born free, with moral and existential claims to live, to choose, and to seek fulfillment without coercion. These rights form the bedrock of a just society, serving as a moral compass that limits the reach of power and protects the dignity and agency of every person. To honor inalienable rights is to recognize that no law, emergency, or ideology can justly extinguish the sovereign humanity of another.

Freedom of thought is the most fundamental and inviolable of all human rights—it protects the absolute autonomy of the mind to question, imagine, reflect, and reason without interference, coercion, or punishment. It encompasses the private space of intellectual and moral exploration, including the right to question prevailing ideologies, doubt official narratives, or conceive alternative visions of reality. In a real sense, this right forms the foundation of all other liberties, safeguarding individuals from indoctrination, surveillance, or forced conformity. It ensures that, regardless of the external pressures imposed by governments, institutions, or society, each person retains the sovereign right to think freely. In this sense, freedom of thought is the last refuge of human dignity—an untouchable domain where truth, conscience, and imagination cannot be compelled or controlled.

Freedom of belief is a corollary of freedom of thought - the inalienable right of every individual to form, hold, and express such beliefs without coercion or punishment. This right is foundational to human dignity and intellectual freedom and applies regardless of how unconventional or contested those beliefs may be.

Freedom of belief includes the right *not to* believe. In a world increasingly shaped by artificial constructs, synthetic media, and persuasive technologies, withholding belief until evidence is clear is a mark of cognitive maturity. This restraint preserves mental agility, keeps emotional reactions in check, and protects against manipulation. It allows individuals to remain grounded in

discernment rather than swept up in illusion or coercion. In this way, disbelief—not cynicism, but careful suspension of judgment—is not a weakness, but a necessary safeguard of intellectual freedom and personal sovereignty.

2 The Constitutional Protection of Inalienable Rights

Our nation's founders understood that the preservation of inalienable rights is essential to the health of the republic. This understanding is reflected in the Declaration of Independence, which boldly asserts that all men are endowed with certain unalienable rights, and that governments are instituted to secure these rights.

At the heart of our Constitutional democracy lies the fundamental principle of freedom of thought, belief and speech. This freedom ensures that individuals can freely express their views, even if those views are controversial and/or contrary to the prevailing opinion. for the open exchange of ideas.

3 The Importance of Free Exchange of Beliefs

The expression of divergent views is foundational to the health of the individual as well as the society, both in terms of intellectual and social development. When speech and thought are free, individuals are encouraged to engage with a wide range of ideas, refine their perspectives, and develop a more nuanced understanding of the world. This creates an inclusive environment where people are free to disagree, to listen, and to evolve their thinking.

The free interchange of ideas is essential for innovation and critical thinking. When people can express and challenge each other's viewpoints, the resulting dialogue stimulates the evolution of thought, enabling ideas to be refined, tested, and strengthened. Divergence in thought acts as a catalyst for discovery, because each competing perspective can offer fresh insights, alternative solutions, or new ways of approaching problems. This is particularly evident in scientific, philosophical, and cultural advancements, where questions, criticisms, and challenges push boundaries and deepen understanding.

A society where everyone thinks the same is a society that stops thinking, thereby ultimately risking deterioration and collapse.

4 When Beliefs Become Unhealthy

Beliefs are a natural and often healthy part of human cognition. They can help us interpret the world, guide our decisions, shape our values, and give life meaning. Yet beliefs can become dangerous when they grow rigid, disconnect from reality, or are used to justify harm. When held

in absolute terms—immune to reason and evidence—they risk devolving into dogma, prejudice, or fanaticism. Such beliefs can trap individuals in cycles of fear, guilt, or victimhood, especially when rooted in trauma or manipulation. This kind of intellectual inertia can have serious psychological consequences.

When a person's beliefs are never questioned, they may develop an unhealthy attachment to them—perceiving any contradiction as a threat rather than an invitation to grow. This rigidity can erode mental balance and critical thinking, giving way to fear-based reactions, groupthink, and an overreliance on authority over evidence.

When societies close themselves off to competing ideas, they slide into stagnation. The fear of challenge becomes so ingrained that rational dissent is rejected or silenced. Over time, this lack of intellectual diversity breeds mediocrity, as people cling to fixed beliefs without the spark of fresh insight.

By shutting out opposing views, individuals not only stunt their own growth but undermine the human struggle for truth and liberty. Abandoning the responsibility to question and think critically is a betrayal of the very foundations of a free society.

Worse still, when dissenting beliefs are labeled inherently dangerous or evil merely because they challenge the dominant view, society risks demonizing difference itself. This blocks self-correction—vital for progress—and drives polarization. Alienated and silenced, large segments of the population withdraw, and public discourse collapses into echo chambers. The result is a monoculture of thought—brittle, stagnant, and prone to deception.

5 The Power of Challenge and Debate

The key to healthy belief systems is openness—a willingness to question, revise, or even let go of beliefs in light of new information, evidence, or ethical reflection.

Free and open discourse and debate with continuous challenging of beliefs and ideas are not only healthy; they are necessary for a thriving society. Being able to disagree, to argue, to question, and to examine perspectives is part of the growth process. Societies that value debate and allow for competing beliefs are more likely to innovate and advance. Societies that fear diversity of thought are more likely to stagnate and falter.

A robust democracy depends on citizens who are able to evaluate different perspectives, think critically, and participate in civil discourse. The freedom to engage in intellectual competition and express differing views ensures that societies remain vigilant on threats and open to progress.

Benjamin Franklin's warning that "it is the first responsibility of every citizen to question authority" reflects a core principle of a free society: the duty of individuals to think critically, remain vigilant, and hold those in power accountable. He understood that unchecked power—whether held by kings, politicians, or institutions—naturally tends toward abuse unless challenged by an informed and courageous public. Questioning authority ensures that decisions are based on reason and evidence rather than fear, manipulation, or blind obedience. In this way, citizens serve not only as participants in democracy but as its protectors, preserving freedom by demanding accountability and resisting tyranny in all its forms. Challenging authority isn't a threat to freedom—it's how freedom survives. Or, as Thomas Jefferson put it, "Dissent is the highest form of patriotism."

Moreover, the discipline of questioning assumptions and narratives in the search for the truth is a cornerstone of sanity itself. Without it, delusion can easily take root and spread. The ability to think critically—to demand evidence and challenge prevailing claims—is not just a virtue; it is a survival skill. It protects us from the imposition of false, destructive, and even enslaving versions of reality.

6 The Wisdom of Withholding Judgment

A healthy approach to any "reported news event" is to treat it as a claim—one that requires verification. This means neither accepting nor rejecting it outright, but suspending judgment, examining sources, cross-checking facts, and following reason and evidence. Such a mindset reflects intellectual humility and critical thinking—not contrarianism or antisocial behavior.

Actually, the ongoing review of belief systems, especially when guided by evidence, closely mirrors the scientific method in both spirit and process. In science, one begins with a hypothesis—a tentative belief about how something works—then tests it against observable data through experimentation and analysis. If the results support the hypothesis, confidence in it grows; if they contradict it, the hypothesis is revised or discarded. Similarly, a healthy belief system remains open to new information, willing to update or abandon beliefs that no longer align with the evidence. Both processes require critical thinking, skepticism, and a commitment to truth over comfort or tradition. Just as science is iterative—continually refining its models of reality—so too is the pursuit of wisdom through "belief review": an ongoing effort to live in alignment with what is most reliably known.

7 The Vital Role of Evidence in the Search for Truthful Reality

In a society that values free expression and open debate, disagreement is both inevitable and essential to progress. However, when people engage in the free exchange of ideas, especially on controversial topics, they often discover not just differences in opinion—but *deep divisions in*

their perception of reality itself. In some cases, entire belief systems may be founded not on verifiable facts, but on misinformation, assumptions, or even complete fantasy. This creates a profound challenge: how can we resolve disputes or make collective decisions?

The answer lies in returning to fundamental principles—specifically, the common law rules of evidence. These rules, refined over centuries, provide a clear and impartial framework for determining *factual truth*. They emphasize firsthand accounts, verifiable documentation, cross-examination, and the ability to test claims with logic and evidence. By applying these principles, individuals and communities can move beyond emotional appeals or ideological biases, and center discussions around demonstrable facts. In an age of information overload and deep division, the disciplined application of evidence is not just a legal tool—it is the bedrock of civil discourse, mutual understanding, and justice.

Simply because a shared belief system or collective understanding prevails in a society does not validate that belief or its underlying assumptions. Any belief system—whether adopted individually or collectively—that lacks strong evidentiary support should be recognized as prone to delusion: false convictions held with unwavering certainty, resistant to contradictory evidence, alternative viewpoints, or rational scrutiny.

8 Facing the Growing Threat of Fabricated Reality Depictions

In an age of deepfakes, CGI, and artificial intelligence, discerning real from fake is more critical than ever. The rule of law, paired with cognitive integrity, becomes our defense. If society ceases to engage in disciplined thought, we risk a complete break from reality.

Here's why AI presents such a profound threat to truth:

Today's technology can mimic reality so perfectly that deepfake videos, synthetic voiceovers, and AI-generated "news footage" can depict political leaders declaring war or witnesses describing events that never happened. CGI tools can render entire environments—explosions, protests, disasters—that appear real but are completely artificial, 'never occurred—all without any factual basis'. Even journalists can be fooled, unwittingly spreading misinformation from manipulated sources or AI-generated eyewitness accounts. At the same time, AI-generated "social proof" can simulate thousands of online voices all echoing the same narrative, creating the false illusion of widespread agreement that pressures people into belief. to conform to synthetic beliefs.

Worse, these technologies can be used to orchestrate large-scale false narratives—simulating geopolitical events or crises for strategic influence. Entire geopolitical events—wars, pandemics, social unrest—can be simulated or exaggerated to steer public perception and policy. And

because AI operates around the clock, it can flood the information space with plausible lies faster than any human can verify, leaving the public vulnerable to confusion, manipulation, and deception before they even realize what's happening.

Especially on recalling the chilling words of CIA Director William Casey in 1981—"We'll know our disinformation program is complete when everything the American public believes is false"—it becomes clear that blind trust in authority is no longer an option. In today's climate, both sanity and survival require a sober awareness of potential deception and a readiness to question the very fabric of manufactured reality.

The threat of AI and synthetic media is not just technological—it is existential. If unresisted, it may dominate thought, shape perception, and redefine preempt human life. But there is a counterforce: individuals and communities who preserve autonomy, nurture human intelligence, and root themselves in truth. Those who train, think, and build beyond the machine offer hope for a future not determined by code, but by conscience. requiring the full engagement of the physical, mental, and spiritual capabilities in pursuit of truth and the human potential.

II DIVERGING VIEWS ON HEALTH and COVID

9 The Medical-Pharmaceutical Model

On one side is the medical-pharmaceutical model, which centers on diagnosing and treating suspected disease through pharmaceutical drugs, surgical procedures, and advanced technologies. It is a data-driven approach that relies heavily on lab results, imaging, and measurable outcomes. This model tends to view the human body almost as a machine—an assembly of parts that can be repaired, replaced, or enhanced—focusing intervention on the point at which symptoms appear.

For decades, this paradigm has shaped Western medicine and is credited with significant advances in emergency care, trauma treatment, and what it calls "infectious disease" management. Its proponents emphasize science, precision, and technological innovation. Increasingly, however, this model views the human body as inherently flawed—requiring correction or improvement through biotechnology, including genetic modification, brain implants, and bio-digital integration. It envisions a future where human beings are closely fused with machines, both biologically and cognitively.

This framework completely dominated the public narrative throughout the COVID-19 crisis. It was treated as unquestionable truth that viruses—especially this one—were real, highly

contagious, and inherently dangerous. The public was told they could be infected simply by being near others, and that illness, even death, could result. In response, extreme measures were promoted as necessary: isolation, masking, mass vaccination (including infants), and repeated boosters. These interventions were framed as the only way to protect all people, regardless of age or health, and to "stop the spread." The public was led to believe that every symptom attributed to COVID had a single, undeniable cause: the virus itself—leaving no room for alternate explanations or debate.

This model positioned itself as the sole authoritative voice on health throughout the pandemic. Alternative views—those questioning the science, ethics, or legality of the official response—were frequently dismissed as misinformation, ridiculed as anti-science, or censored outright. Public discourse narrowed, and dissent was often treated not as a legitimate part of scientific inquiry, but as a threat to public safety.

10 The Holistic, Natural Health Perspective

In stark contrast is a more "natural" or roots-based perspective on health, one that emphasizes prevention, balance, and alignment with nature. This approach views health as the body's natural state when properly nourished, emotionally grounded, and physically active. It advocates for lifestyle practices such as eating whole, unprocessed foods, connecting with nature (e.g., grounding by going barefoot outdoors), engaging in energy-focused movement like martial arts, managing stress, and nurturing spiritual and emotional well-being. It sees the body as an integrated, self-healing system that flourishes when internal balance and the environment are in harmony. Instead of waiting for dysfunction to occur, this approach aims to cultivate health proactively.

Today, more and more people are embracing this natural approach, often driven by deep dissatisfaction with conventional medicine. Overprescription, profit-driven practices, and the rise of chronic illnesses—despite decades of perceived progress—have led many to believe that institutional medicine fails to address the root causes of health. In contrast, natural methods empower individuals to take charge of their own well-being.

There is also a deeper cultural and spiritual movement underway. Many people are rediscovering ancestral wisdom and traditional healing practices that prioritize harmony with the Earth and respect for the body's innate intelligence. As modern life grows more artificial, fast-paced, and disconnected, the longing for something simpler, more grounded, and more authentic grows stronger. For those drawn to this path, healing is not merely the absence of symptoms—it is the restoration of wholeness. In pursuit of that deeper sense of well-being, an increasing number of individuals are turning away from pills and high-tech interventions and embracing what they consider a more natural, profoundly human approach to health.

Relative to “COVID-19”, the opposing view - which was championed by many independent experts and individuals from the start—maintains that COVID testing and reported incidence rates were entirely fabricated. This perspective argues that every COVID “health measure” was the exact opposite of what a sane people should do in response to this alleged threat: providing absolutely no protection but instead ruining health and perhaps gravely endangering life. This view maintains that isolation, social distancing, and masking are better seen not as measures of health but rather as instruments of illness and oppression, suffocating not only breath but also vital interpersonal connections, hopes, and aspirations. The predictable outcomes, according to this view, are now evident in rising rates of illness, depression, and despair. Even worse, they claim, is the relentless vaccine rollout, which they maintain has introduced a new wave of physical, mental, and emotional harm to countless individuals, young and old alike.

III ANCHOR OF THE IMMUTABLE RULE OF LAW

Beliefs may be diverse and ever-evolving, shaped by culture, experience, and individual conscience, but the rule of law stands firm—altered only through the intentional and lawful processes of a democratic society.

11 The Vital Constitutional Guarantee of Due Process

Due Process of Law is the most treasured inheritance from Mother England, of Magna Carta magnificence; the distinguishing cornerstone of individual liberties and democracy of the United States of America; and the crucial safeguard that protects us from dictatorship. What our Founding Document assures is that nobody gets life, liberty or property deprived unless the government first comes in and makes the overwhelming case by hard evidence, one building block at a time – in court, by the rules, and subject to full challenge by all sought to be deprived.

Freedom of speech, thought, movement, and conscience are inalienable rights—obvious in principle, and recognized as natural to human beings - even self-evident in documents like the Declaration of Independence. By contrast, Due Process had to be built and refined through centuries of law—through English common law, Magna Carta, the U.S. Constitution, and hundreds of court rulings that refined what fairness actually means in practice. It wasn't enough to say “no one shall be deprived of liberty”—courts had to define what *counts* as fair notice, a fair hearing, burden of proof, impartial judgment, and more. Due process is the legal backbone that gives teeth to all other rights, translating ideals into enforceable protections. It is not just a legal formality—it is the foundation of justice and the single most important protection against tyranny and abuse.

12 The Complete Failure of Due Process with COVID Orders

What was the “process” employed and relied upon by authorities to justify the COVID Measures?

- A president barking and wheezing about “China Flu!” heading our way.
- Executive declarations of Emergency – by governors, mayors, councilors.
- Daily broadcasts of Dr. Anthony Fauci on the dangers of the viral threat and the need for people to submit to the many so-called preventative measures, from isolation, to masking, to vaccination.
- Assessments from governmental health bodies like WHO and CDC regarding the nature of the illness and the seriousness of the “spread”.
- Various NGOs, such as the Harvard Global Health Institute, Johns Hopkins, Bloomberg, and others—who had never set foot in Idaho—nonetheless rushed to assess and label the “COVID risk”, pushing for measures that subdued the population.

None of these actions meet the standard of competent evidence required in a U.S. court of law, let alone meet the high constitutional burden of proof necessary to justify extreme measures that seriously infringe upon fundamental rights, such as the right to breathe freely without obstruction (i.e., mask mandates).

As a matter of law, unilateral declarations of a “problem” and “solution” by government authorities and vested interests cannot constitute due process. Yet, during the COVID era, that’s all there was. What should have been rejected as an unsubstantiated narrative was instead accepted without question—and both adults and children were forced to comply.

Moreover, the pardon of Dr. Fauci should not be seen as a resolution but as a further unraveling of a fabricated narrative—one that demanded unquestioning obedience, vilified dissent, and caused immense harm, the full extent of which we are only beginning to understand. The only logical conclusion is to recognize that the COVID lockdown was a monumental fraud, and the measures enacted constituted the most severe and prolonged deprivations of civil liberties in Idaho’s history, imposed on citizens of all ages without any semblance of due process.

Public servants swear an oath to uphold the Constitution and protect the freedoms of those they serve. Yet, during the COVID era, many officials chose to disregard the Constitution and turn against the very people they were supposed to protect. Despite repeated warnings about the illegality of their actions, they doubled down on authoritarian measures, tightening restrictions, increasing mandates, and attacking those who questioned their unconstitutional orders. Even now, they dismiss the harm inflicted—downplaying the lasting effects of suffocating children under masks for years and subjecting them to repeated drug injections.

This disaster could have been avoided if officials had chosen to act justly. They could have modeled for children the importance of standing firm - *Just Say No* - to government-imposed measures that significantly threatened life, liberty, and well-being—measures that lacked any legal foundation in due process.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that the pardon of Dr. Fauci may signal a chilling truth: that COVID-19 was the greatest criminal enterprise in U.S. history, involving collusion among rogue elements in government, industry, and the press, in schemes of fraud and racketeering resulting in widespread human suffering.

13 The Tragedy of the Unchallenged “COVID” Narrative

What occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic was not merely a public health initiative—it was an epistemological coup. One side, backed by government and media, claimed the exclusive authority to define reality. The other, grounded in centuries of human experience with the natural world, was marginalized. This was not simply a disagreement over methods; it was a profound clash of worldviews: one that views human health as a commodity to be controlled by experts, and another that sees it as an inherent, sacred capacity to be nurtured.

While everyone is free to hold their own views on any matter—whether related to public health, politics, or religion—this freedom does not grant anyone the right to impose their beliefs in a way that would strip others of their fundamental human rights.

The failure to engage Blaine County's deep bench of highly trained holistic health professionals during the COVID-19 era was not merely an oversight—it was a serious betrayal of the community's values, wisdom, and right to informed, diverse care. This region is uniquely rich in practitioners of integrative medicine, breathwork, neuromuscular therapy, martial arts, bodywork, yoga, and other mind-body disciplines. These professionals were well-equipped to offer frontline, symptom-specific support—enhancing respiratory capabilities and immune resilience, reducing anxiety, improving respiratory function, and promoting overall wellness—without relying on the more invasive and coercive methods imposed by the dominant medical-pharmaceutical model.

Beyond symptom management, many of these professionals brought critical insight into worrisome environmental and physiological factors that may have contributed to the symptoms labeled as “COVID.” Their perspectives—whether involving the health impacts of 5G radiation, “cloud seeding” and weather manipulation programs, prolonged masking, or “adverse vaccine reactions”—deserved to be heard and examined. Yet their voices were systematically dismissed or silenced as ‘nutcase’ by the tired and worn-out use of the C-word (conspiracy theorist!).

14 No Due Process Means All COVID Orders were *Null and Void*

The collapse of due process during the COVID era meant that every mandate—from governors, mayors, school boards, and city councils—was illegitimate from the start. Orders that shut down livelihoods, isolated the elderly, masked children, and broke apart communities carried no lawful force. They were void the moment they were issued, regardless of how loudly they were proclaimed.

But most people didn't know this. In Idaho, as across the country, they complied—confused, coerced, or afraid. A few who were fully knowledgeable about their rights and the gross illegalities refused compliance on all measures including masking. When confronted by a few “fired up” members of the public who sought to compel compliance by threats of force, a few stood their ground ready to defend. They resisted—not out of rebellion, but out of principle. And without exception, the officious intermeddler cowardly backed down.

15 The Mass Victimization from Unconstitutional COVID Measures

And as is always the case when tyranny rises, the ones who suffered most were those least able to understand their rights and defend themselves: workers, single mothers, minorities, the elderly, the disabled, and above all, children—muzzled, isolated, and betrayed by the very leaders entrusted to protect them.

Any responsible adult should have recognized the truth: the severe COVID-era restrictions devastated public health—but none more so than the health and spirit of our youth. The youngest generation—vulnerable, trusting, and in need of protection—endured the greatest assault on body, mind, and soul ever inflicted on American children.

The greatest betrayal a society can commit against its children is failing to teach them their inalienable rights—and how those rights are protected under the Constitution. Without that foundation, children are left defenseless: unable to assert their freedoms, to challenge authority, or to distinguish truth from propaganda. Instead of fostering critical thinking and teaching rules of evidence and reason, our leaders imposed blind obedience. This was not just negligence—it was a flagrant breach of duty and conscience.

Those inalienable rights that are absolutely essential for health, happiness and survival of children – unobstructed breathing, playing with friends, hugging family members, and refusing drug injections – were abjectly ignored and denied by our local “health authorities” who now pretend sympathy and care for those in distress. In fact, those “leaders” now calling attention to the so-called “mental” or “behavioral” health crisis in youth and others are the same ones who went all in, warp-speed implementing the savagely harsh COVID Measures - from isolation, to

masking that choked out and poisoned every breath for two years, to distancing, and then to the Injections with booster after booster: “Good for you!”, they firmly assured children, parents, and all of us.

Further, to force children to accept depictions of reality that are blatantly false and demand compliance with harsh restrictions on their fundamental freedoms is a sabotage of the human spirit. It goes against the very grain of human nature, subverting instinct, common sense, and logic. This creates an inner conflict—one that festers in the mind, body, psyche, and soul. Children trapped in a web of deception are robbed of their potential, denied the opportunity to pursue their inherent human rights to truth and freedom. As the layers of deception pile on and the distortions of reality grow more massive, the damage becomes even more profound. The more deeply children are ensnared by these falsehoods, the more they—and society as a whole—become twisted and poisoned. They are conditioned to accept confinement, to swallow lies, and to ask no questions. The natural joy of exploration is smothered by a pervasive sense of decay and depression. As *Colonel Slade* (Al Pacino) said in *Scent of a Woman* (1992), while defending young Charlie: “There is nothing like the sight of an amputated spirit.”

What is clear is that local “health authorities” have no understanding or concern as to the nature of the profound existential hurt being experienced by youth today, specifically, what it is like to be a lonely, abandoned and fearful child – isolated, choked out, poisoned, and all shot-up/vaccinated, with hopes and aspirations fading and not knowing why - and without the ability to detect and defend against actual serious threats to health and life.

We have discovered that the modus operandi of the COVID perpetrators and collaborators has been to dictate health “crisis and solutions”, and never to engage, but rather to belittle, condemn, and even threaten anyone who dares question or dissent. By doing so, they lock children into a fabricated reality of terror, in a futile attempt to cover up the crimes and exploding casualties that took place on their watch, at their hand.

16 The Fauci Pardon and the Culpability of the COVID Collaborator

The pardon for Dr. Anthony Fauci only serves to underscore the magnitude of the crimes committed under the guise of public health. Pardons are typically granted when criminal exposure is real and politically sensitive. In this case, it signals that credible allegations exist against Fauci for actions that may include fraud, racketeering, and even wrongful death—particularly if critics' claims about vaccine-related dangers are borne out by the evidence.

However, Fauci had no authority to enter any orders or mandates on the public. The destruction of due process—the core procedural guarantee of the U.S. Constitution—was not effectuated directly by Fauci, but by state governors, public health departments, and local officials who

operationalized the federal narrative into draconian measures lockdowns, mask orders, and coercive vaccination regimes. These officials issued orders that restricted movement, silenced dissent, criminalized natural human interaction, and in some cases denied individuals access to work, education, or even medical treatment.

The issuance of a pardon at the federal level should prompt—not preclude—a wider investigation into the chain of responsibility that enabled an unprecedented collapse of lawful governance. Justice must be pursued not only against those who designed the narrative but also against those who used the machinery of government to force it upon the people, in direct violation of both constitutional limits and medical ethics. In Blaine County, and throughout Idaho, the individuals responsible are known to the public—and they must be held accountable through the rule of law.

17 Founding Flaws/ Enduring Principles: Constitutional Legacy

Some critics argue that the United States' founding documents—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—are fundamentally compromised due to the moral failings of their authors. They highlight that many Founding Fathers were slaveholders, and that the Declaration refers to Native Americans as "merciless Indian savages," suggesting these texts were instruments of exclusion and oppression. From this viewpoint, the documents are seen not as aspirational but as mechanisms designed to protect the interests of a privileged few. Consequently, some advocate for discarding these documents entirely in favor of creating a new foundation centered on equity and inclusion.

However, assessing these founding documents solely through the lens of their authors' imperfections overlooks the revolutionary principles they enshrine—principles that have empowered generations to strive for greater justice and equality. While acknowledging the serious moral failings of the early United States, it's important to recognize that the Declaration and the Constitution introduced radical ideas for their time: that all people possess inalienable rights, that government derives its legitimacy from the consent of the governed, and that power should be limited and accountable to the people. These principles laid the groundwork for movements advocating abolition, civil rights, women's suffrage, due process, and equality under the law.

Prominent reformers like Frederick Douglass and Martin Luther King Jr. did not reject the Constitution; instead, they invoked its promises to demand that the nation fulfill them. Douglass, for instance, described the Constitution as a document with "principles and purposes entirely hostile to the existence of slavery," distinguishing his view from contemporaries who saw it as pro-slavery. Similarly, King drew inspiration from the nation's founding ideals, stating in his "I

Have a Dream" speech that they were "a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir".

Discarding these documents would mean erasing not only their flaws but also the frameworks that have enabled progress through law, reason, and peaceful reform. A more constructive approach is to acknowledge the past honestly, learn from it, and continue striving toward a more perfect union using the very tools of freedom provided by the Constitution, which is the most protective of civil liberties in the history of the world.

Regardless of differing perspectives, it's essential to recognize that the Constitution remains the supreme law of the land, changeable only through the orderly legal process of amendment.

18 There is No Supreme Court Authority for Forced Vaccination

It is seriously concerning that numerous state and local officials in Idaho—including the governor and certain mayors, city council members, and school trustees—have publicly asserted that the 1905 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Jacobson v. Massachusetts* constitutes precedential authority as “supreme law of the land” for the notion that a state can compel universal vaccination. While *Jacobson* did uphold a state's authority to enforce compulsory vaccination laws, the case specifically addressed a situation where noncompliance resulted only in a modest \$5 fine. Henning Jacobson was neither forcibly vaccinated nor subjected to imprisonment; he was not barred from employment or denied access to public spaces. The sole penalty imposed was the \$5 fine which was the maximum penalty allowed by that vaccination law.

In legal terms, when the deprivation of rights is minimal—as in the case of a nominal fine—the government must only demonstrate a "rational basis" for its law to satisfy due process requirements. However, when the government imposes more severe measures, such as prolonged mask mandates that restrict oxygen intake and trap toxicity of carbon dioxide and other substances, or mandates involving injections of medical substances, the situation changes significantly. In such instances, due process demands a much higher level of scrutiny. The government must provide compelling evidence in an independent tribunal, allowing for full opportunity to confront and cross-examine witnesses and to present independent professional evidence challenging the prevailing public health narrative allegedly substantiating the need for such severe measures.

Therefore, the *Jacobsen* decision holds no authority in justifying forcible government vaccinations that lack comprehensive due process. Although the Idaho governor never directly mandated vaccinations, his administration's endorsement of the right to compel led many Idahoans to trust assurances of safety and efficacy and to submit to the injections, for themselves

and their children—a decision that, in hindsight, most would not repeat given increasing public awareness of the erosion of the rule of law and the worrisome data on vaccine-related harm.

19 Inalienable Rights of Self Defense Against Imminent Threat

With shady and punishing claims of authority contravening legal process, it is crucial for every American to recognize that inalienable rights such as life, liberty, and property inherently include the right to defend oneself and others. When these rights are threatened by unlawful acts—such as an attack on one's life or property—individuals are justified in using measured force appropriate to the threat, including deadly force if necessary, to protect those rights.

James Monroe affirmed this principle, declaring, “The right of self-defense never ceases. It is among the most sacred, and alike necessary to nations and individuals.” Similarly, Thomas Jefferson reminded us, “When the people fear the government, there is tyranny. When the government fears the people, there is liberty.” These words underscore a foundational truth: a free people must remain vigilant and empowered, for only when government is held accountable by the governed can liberty be preserved.

To be clear, if someone with or without claim of authority - yet without any due process – attempts to enforce face masking that effectively chokes out and poisons every breath, or intramuscular or intravenous injections of sketchy substances “for your own good”, all people have the absolute right to stand and defend with all force necessary.

CONCLUSION: The Road Ahead

While we may wish others would see the world as we do, it is precisely the presence of differing viewpoints that breathes life into a free society. No matter how deep the disagreements, we must never let them erode our respect for one another—or for the rule of law, the very framework that protects our liberties and ensures justice.

As we attempt to navigate the so-called “recovery” from the COVID era, we must begin with a solemn duty: to face the truth. Grave violations of constitutional rights occurred. A just society does not ignore such breaches—it confronts them. Not out of vengeance, but with the clarity and courage that justice requires. Only through honest reckoning and renewed commitment to the rule of law can we ensure that such abuses never happen again.

What makes the pardon of Dr. Fauci most alarming is not merely what it forgives, but what it symbolizes: the collapse of due process and the elevation of a single, unquestionable narrative.

This narrative—built on manipulated data and state-coerced conformity—functioned as a psychological assault on the nation. To regard the COVID era as anything less than a coordinated mind virus is a dangerous oversight. The only cure for such a contagion is truth—plain, unflinching, and unafraid.

Dr. Fauci may have shaped the messaging, but it was state and local officials who carried out the orders—who enforced lockdowns, silenced dissent, masked children, coerced medical procedures, and violated constitutional protections without legislative debate or judicial review. These were not public health measures; they were acts of administrative tyranny, executed under a fog of fear and propaganda.

In Ketchum, Idaho, the mayor and city council went even further, actively encouraging private businesses to violate equal employment laws, public accommodation rights, and constitutional protections by requiring masks and vaccination for both employees and patrons. Shockingly, they even hosted election debates at one such venue—an establishment that openly defied legal norms and proudly enforced discriminatory, authoritarian policies of subjugation by masking and vaccination on all who would enter their hallowed grounds.

And yet in Ketchum and throughout Blaine County, as in many communities across the country, not one official who participated in illegal COVID mandates has yet acknowledged any error or responsibility. To simply “move on” as so many intend is to compound the betrayal. Officials were repeatedly warned of their constitutional obligations—and chose instead to model cowardice, abandon process, and embed the sickness of deceit and denial into the very institutions meant to protect us. And now in Ketchum, Idaho, all the attention is on matters like affordable housing, urban renewal and comprehensive planning – matters that are insultingly inconsequential in light of the urgent and unaddressed need for COVID accountability that continues to be swept under the rug.

The rising generation deserves more than silence. They deserve truth, and leaders willing to admit wrongdoing and chart a better course. **Any official who enforced unconstitutional COVID mandates must either take responsibility—or step aside.** Until then, the demand for accountability will not subside.

Meanwhile, of late various “mental health” groups have formed - many funded by those elements of the medical-pharmaceutical complex that fueled the crisis – who now dispense grants to local nonprofits, most of whom participated in the very masking, isolation, and coercion that inflicted psychological trauma on children. And still, few if any of them have acknowledged the harm.

Going forward, the only responsible path is to expose the full scope of the COVID deception, to shut down ongoing vaccine injection operations, and to engage the community's best resources to restore health—naturally, honestly, and freely.

Seventeen states including Idaho are currently investigating Dr. Fauci for state crimes not within the scope of his federal pardon. Whether or not the Idaho Attorney General will extend investigations to include culpability of state and local officials remains to be seen. But those who implemented, enforced, or enabled the COVID mandates must answer to the law.

It also remains to be seen whether the beaten-down, wounded child will, upon reaching age of majority, choose to pursue legal recourse against local perpetrators and collaborators of the COVID calamity. The possible causes of action are many - constitutional and tort based - and the damages potentially colossal: What is the value of a choked out and poisoned, lost childhood?

But what is clear is that there is a powerful and rapidly growing movement of youth emerging from these mad and maddening times who will never again blindly trust anything coming from “health” or any other “authorities”. Nor will they be swayed or comforted by a “mental health” industry that refuses to confront its role in the harm. They will carry forward a new standard of “health”, grounded in three unshakable pillars:

- A deep understanding of natural and constitutional rights—inalienable protections that no authority may override without full and lawful due process.
- A commitment to reason, logic, and evidence-based thinking—using every tool, including advanced AI, to pierce falsehoods and discern truth from propaganda.
- Disciplined development of body, mind, and spirit—in harmony with nature, rooted in resilience, clarity, and the courage to defend liberty.

In closing, on this special day, we honor the unwavering fight of all mothers for their children, for truth, for healing, and for a future where no child will ever doubt whether freedom will endure.

Dawn Hofheimer

From: James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2025 2:36 AM
To: James Hungelmann
Subject: Fwd: MOTHERS'S DAY APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE AND COUNTRY/ PUBLIC RECORD FILING. KETCHUM CITY COUNCIL MEETING MAY 19 2025
Attachments: covid Mothers Day appeal 2025 .pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Please see Public filings with all city councils commissioners and school board in Blaine county, copies to Governor Little and AG Labrador - with attached PDF: FYI and public dissemination as you may see fit.

----- Forwarded message -----

De: **James Hungelmann** <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>

Date: lun, 12 may 2025 a las 1:36

Subject: MOTHERS'S DAY APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE AND COUNTRY/ PUBLIC RECORD FILING.
KETCHUM CITY COUNCIL MEETING MAY 19 2025

To: Neil Bradshaw <nbradshaw@ketchumidaho.org>, Amanda Breen <abreen@ketchumidaho.org>, Spencer Cordovano <scordovano@ketchumidaho.org>, Courtney Hamilton <chamilton@ketchumidaho.org>, Tripp Hutchinson <thutchinson@ketchumidaho.org>, Participate <participate@ketchumidaho.org>

Dear Mayor and Councilors -

Please see attached, submitted *For the record*, general public comment - of the next CC meeting May 19.

For your immediate action, as indicated therein.

Thank you,

Jim

*A Mother's Day Appeal
to Conscience and Country:*

**COVID *Beliefs*, Inalienable Rights
and the Rule of Law**

May 11, 2025

“The enduring hope and prayer of every mother is that her children may grow up in a land where freedom is not some gift granted by the state, but a sacred right secured by principle—protected and cherished by every citizen, in every generation. A nation where civil liberties are honored absolutely, and not surrendered in the face of fear, nor yielded in the face of tyranny.

We must stand resolute against the insidious forces that would impose falsehoods upon us—those who would have us trade truth for comfort or surrender integrity for the illusion of peace. For in doing so, we would not only betray the future of our children, but risk destroying the very soul of humanity itself.

Let us stand, then, not as passive observers, but as active guardians of liberty, so that future generations may inherit a country worthy of their dreams, never doubting that freedom will endure.”

John Fitzgerald Kennedy

Mother's Day

May 12, 1963

PROLOGUE

More than five years after the onset of what came to be known as the COVID-19 pandemic, confusion and uncertainty continue to linger around the world. The recent federal pardon of Dr. Anthony Fauci has only intensified public suspicion and raised serious concerns that the public was subjected to widespread deception regarding all matters related to "COVID," with potentially disastrous consequences for those who endured its sweeping mandates.

Most Americans — and people worldwide — complied with the COVID related directives promoted by government authorities and amplified by mainstream media. Yet, an undercurrent of considerable unease remains, often suppressed or dismissed, with concerns that invasive policies such as widespread masking and vaccination may have caused significant and irreversible harm. Tragically, this chapter in history has also produced profound divisions between people, even within families—fracturing relationships and weakening the nation's collective spirit.

This paper emphasizes the critical distinction between the fundamental right to freely express differing viewpoints, especially regarding health and public policy, and the equally vital necessity of upholding, inviolate and uncompromising, the rule of law in the United States. Our survival as a people and as a nation depends on both: the ability to engage respectfully across differences and the unwavering commitment to lawful governance, which ensures that no single viewpoint can be imposed on others without Due Process of Law.

DISCUSSION

I FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, BELIEF, SPEECH

1 Inalienable Rights

Our inalienable rights are those fundamental entitlements under natural law that every individual possesses simply by virtue of being human. They are not granted by governments, constitutions, or legal systems, and therefore cannot be justly revoked or overridden by any authority. These rights are our natural inheritance—existing prior to and independent of political institutions. The right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as articulated in the Declaration of Independence, are not privileges bestowed by the state, but expressions of a deeper truth: that human beings are born free, with moral and existential claims to live, to choose, and to seek fulfillment without coercion. These rights form the bedrock of a just society, serving as a moral compass that limits the reach of power and protects the dignity and agency of every person. To honor inalienable rights is to recognize that no law, emergency, or ideology can justly extinguish the sovereign humanity of another.

Freedom of thought is the most fundamental and inviolable of all human rights—it protects the absolute autonomy of the mind to question, imagine, reflect, and reason without interference, coercion, or punishment. It encompasses the private space of intellectual and moral exploration, including the right to question prevailing ideologies, doubt official narratives, or conceive alternative visions of reality. In a real sense, this right forms the foundation of all other liberties, safeguarding individuals from indoctrination, surveillance, or forced conformity. It ensures that, regardless of the external pressures imposed by governments, institutions, or society, each person retains the sovereign right to think freely. In this sense, freedom of thought is the last refuge of human dignity—an untouchable domain where truth, conscience, and imagination cannot be compelled or controlled.

Freedom of belief is a corollary of freedom of thought - the inalienable right of every individual to form, hold, and express such beliefs without coercion or punishment. This right is foundational to human dignity and intellectual freedom and applies regardless of how unconventional or contested those beliefs may be.

Freedom of belief includes the right *not to* believe. In a world increasingly shaped by artificial constructs, synthetic media, and persuasive technologies, withholding belief until evidence is clear is a mark of cognitive maturity. This restraint preserves mental agility, keeps emotional reactions in check, and protects against manipulation. It allows individuals to remain grounded in

discernment rather than swept up in illusion or coercion. In this way, disbelief—not cynicism, but careful suspension of judgment—is not a weakness, but a necessary safeguard of intellectual freedom and personal sovereignty.

2 The Constitutional Protection of Inalienable Rights

Our nation's founders understood that the preservation of inalienable rights is essential to the health of the republic. This understanding is reflected in the Declaration of Independence, which boldly asserts that all men are endowed with certain unalienable rights, and that governments are instituted to secure these rights.

At the heart of our Constitutional democracy lies the fundamental principle of freedom of thought, belief and speech. This freedom ensures that individuals can freely express their views, even if those views are controversial and/or contrary to the prevailing opinion. for the open exchange of ideas.

3 The Importance of Free Exchange of Beliefs

The expression of divergent views is foundational to the health of the individual as well as the society, both in terms of intellectual and social development. When speech and thought are free, individuals are encouraged to engage with a wide range of ideas, refine their perspectives, and develop a more nuanced understanding of the world. This creates an inclusive environment where people are free to disagree, to listen, and to evolve their thinking.

The free interchange of ideas is essential for innovation and critical thinking. When people can express and challenge each other's viewpoints, the resulting dialogue stimulates the evolution of thought, enabling ideas to be refined, tested, and strengthened. Divergence in thought acts as a catalyst for discovery, because each competing perspective can offer fresh insights, alternative solutions, or new ways of approaching problems. This is particularly evident in scientific, philosophical, and cultural advancements, where questions, criticisms, and challenges push boundaries and deepen understanding.

A society where everyone thinks the same is a society that stops thinking, thereby ultimately risking deterioration and collapse.

4 When Beliefs Become Unhealthy

Beliefs are a natural and often healthy part of human cognition. They can help us interpret the world, guide our decisions, shape our values, and give life meaning. Yet beliefs can become dangerous when they grow rigid, disconnect from reality, or are used to justify harm. When held

in absolute terms—immune to reason and evidence—they risk devolving into dogma, prejudice, or fanaticism. Such beliefs can trap individuals in cycles of fear, guilt, or victimhood, especially when rooted in trauma or manipulation. This kind of intellectual inertia can have serious psychological consequences.

When a person's beliefs are never questioned, they may develop an unhealthy attachment to them—perceiving any contradiction as a threat rather than an invitation to grow. This rigidity can erode mental balance and critical thinking, giving way to fear-based reactions, groupthink, and an overreliance on authority over evidence.

When societies close themselves off to competing ideas, they slide into stagnation. The fear of challenge becomes so ingrained that rational dissent is rejected or silenced. Over time, this lack of intellectual diversity breeds mediocrity, as people cling to fixed beliefs without the spark of fresh insight.

By shutting out opposing views, individuals not only stunt their own growth but undermine the human struggle for truth and liberty. Abandoning the responsibility to question and think critically is a betrayal of the very foundations of a free society.

Worse still, when dissenting beliefs are labeled inherently dangerous or evil merely because they challenge the dominant view, society risks demonizing difference itself. This blocks self-correction—vital for progress—and drives polarization. Alienated and silenced, large segments of the population withdraw, and public discourse collapses into echo chambers. The result is a monoculture of thought—brittle, stagnant, and prone to deception.

5 The Power of Challenge and Debate

The key to healthy belief systems is openness—a willingness to question, revise, or even let go of beliefs in light of new information, evidence, or ethical reflection.

Free and open discourse and debate with continuous challenging of beliefs and ideas are not only healthy; they are necessary for a thriving society. Being able to disagree, to argue, to question, and to examine perspectives is part of the growth process. Societies that value debate and allow for competing beliefs are more likely to innovate and advance. Societies that fear diversity of thought are more likely to stagnate and falter.

A robust democracy depends on citizens who are able to evaluate different perspectives, think critically, and participate in civil discourse. The freedom to engage in intellectual competition and express differing views ensures that societies remain vigilant on threats and open to progress.

Benjamin Franklin's warning that "it is the first responsibility of every citizen to question authority" reflects a core principle of a free society: the duty of individuals to think critically, remain vigilant, and hold those in power accountable. He understood that unchecked power—whether held by kings, politicians, or institutions—naturally tends toward abuse unless challenged by an informed and courageous public. Questioning authority ensures that decisions are based on reason and evidence rather than fear, manipulation, or blind obedience. In this way, citizens serve not only as participants in democracy but as its protectors, preserving freedom by demanding accountability and resisting tyranny in all its forms. Challenging authority isn't a threat to freedom—it's how freedom survives. Or, as Thomas Jefferson put it, "Dissent is the highest form of patriotism."

Moreover, the discipline of questioning assumptions and narratives in the search for the truth is a cornerstone of sanity itself. Without it, delusion can easily take root and spread. The ability to think critically—to demand evidence and challenge prevailing claims—is not just a virtue; it is a survival skill. It protects us from the imposition of false, destructive, and even enslaving versions of reality.

6 The Wisdom of Withholding Judgment

A healthy approach to any "reported news event" is to treat it as a claim—one that requires verification. This means neither accepting nor rejecting it outright, but suspending judgment, examining sources, cross-checking facts, and following reason and evidence. Such a mindset reflects intellectual humility and critical thinking—not contrarianism or antisocial behavior.

Actually, the ongoing review of belief systems, especially when guided by evidence, closely mirrors the scientific method in both spirit and process. In science, one begins with a hypothesis—a tentative belief about how something works—then tests it against observable data through experimentation and analysis. If the results support the hypothesis, confidence in it grows; if they contradict it, the hypothesis is revised or discarded. Similarly, a healthy belief system remains open to new information, willing to update or abandon beliefs that no longer align with the evidence. Both processes require critical thinking, skepticism, and a commitment to truth over comfort or tradition. Just as science is iterative—continually refining its models of reality—so too is the pursuit of wisdom through "belief review": an ongoing effort to live in alignment with what is most reliably known.

7 The Vital Role of Evidence in the Search for Truthful Reality

In a society that values free expression and open debate, disagreement is both inevitable and essential to progress. However, when people engage in the free exchange of ideas, especially on controversial topics, they often discover not just differences in opinion—but *deep divisions in*

their perception of reality itself. In some cases, entire belief systems may be founded not on verifiable facts, but on misinformation, assumptions, or even complete fantasy. This creates a profound challenge: how can we resolve disputes or make collective decisions?

The answer lies in returning to fundamental principles—specifically, the common law rules of evidence. These rules, refined over centuries, provide a clear and impartial framework for determining *factual truth*. They emphasize firsthand accounts, verifiable documentation, cross-examination, and the ability to test claims with logic and evidence. By applying these principles, individuals and communities can move beyond emotional appeals or ideological biases, and center discussions around demonstrable facts. In an age of information overload and deep division, the disciplined application of evidence is not just a legal tool—it is the bedrock of civil discourse, mutual understanding, and justice.

Simply because a shared belief system or collective understanding prevails in a society does not validate that belief or its underlying assumptions. Any belief system—whether adopted individually or collectively—that lacks strong evidentiary support should be recognized as prone to delusion: false convictions held with unwavering certainty, resistant to contradictory evidence, alternative viewpoints, or rational scrutiny.

8 Facing the Growing Threat of Fabricated Reality Depictions

In an age of deepfakes, CGI, and artificial intelligence, discerning real from fake is more critical than ever. The rule of law, paired with cognitive integrity, becomes our defense. If society ceases to engage in disciplined thought, we risk a complete break from reality.

Here's why AI presents such a profound threat to truth:

Today's technology can mimic reality so perfectly that deepfake videos, synthetic voiceovers, and AI-generated "news footage" can depict political leaders declaring war or witnesses describing events that never happened. CGI tools can render entire environments—explosions, protests, disasters—that appear real but are completely artificial, 'never occurred—all without any factual basis'. Even journalists can be fooled, unwittingly spreading misinformation from manipulated sources or AI-generated eyewitness accounts. At the same time, AI-generated "social proof" can simulate thousands of online voices all echoing the same narrative, creating the false illusion of widespread agreement that pressures people into belief. to conform to synthetic beliefs.

Worse, these technologies can be used to orchestrate large-scale false narratives—simulating geopolitical events or crises for strategic influence. Entire geopolitical events—wars, pandemics, social unrest—can be simulated or exaggerated to steer public perception and policy. And

because AI operates around the clock, it can flood the information space with plausible lies faster than any human can verify, leaving the public vulnerable to confusion, manipulation, and deception before they even realize what's happening.

Especially on recalling the chilling words of CIA Director William Casey in 1981—"We'll know our disinformation program is complete when everything the American public believes is false"—it becomes clear that blind trust in authority is no longer an option. In today's climate, both sanity and survival require a sober awareness of potential deception and a readiness to question the very fabric of manufactured reality.

The threat of AI and synthetic media is not just technological—it is existential. If unresisted, it may dominate thought, shape perception, and redefine preempt human life. But there is a counterforce: individuals and communities who preserve autonomy, nurture human intelligence, and root themselves in truth. Those who train, think, and build beyond the machine offer hope for a future not determined by code, but by conscience. requiring the full engagement of the physical, mental, and spiritual capabilities in pursuit of truth and the human potential.

II DIVERGING VIEWS ON HEALTH and COVID

9 The Medical-Pharmaceutical Model

On one side is the medical-pharmaceutical model, which centers on diagnosing and treating suspected disease through pharmaceutical drugs, surgical procedures, and advanced technologies. It is a data-driven approach that relies heavily on lab results, imaging, and measurable outcomes. This model tends to view the human body almost as a machine—an assembly of parts that can be repaired, replaced, or enhanced—focusing intervention on the point at which symptoms appear.

For decades, this paradigm has shaped Western medicine and is credited with significant advances in emergency care, trauma treatment, and what it calls "infectious disease" management. Its proponents emphasize science, precision, and technological innovation. Increasingly, however, this model views the human body as inherently flawed—requiring correction or improvement through biotechnology, including genetic modification, brain implants, and bio-digital integration. It envisions a future where human beings are closely fused with machines, both biologically and cognitively.

This framework completely dominated the public narrative throughout the COVID-19 crisis. It was treated as unquestionable truth that viruses—especially this one—were real, highly

contagious, and inherently dangerous. The public was told they could be infected simply by being near others, and that illness, even death, could result. In response, extreme measures were promoted as necessary: isolation, masking, mass vaccination (including infants), and repeated boosters. These interventions were framed as the only way to protect all people, regardless of age or health, and to "stop the spread." The public was led to believe that every symptom attributed to COVID had a single, undeniable cause: the virus itself—leaving no room for alternate explanations or debate.

This model positioned itself as the sole authoritative voice on health throughout the pandemic. Alternative views—those questioning the science, ethics, or legality of the official response—were frequently dismissed as misinformation, ridiculed as anti-science, or censored outright. Public discourse narrowed, and dissent was often treated not as a legitimate part of scientific inquiry, but as a threat to public safety.

10 The Holistic, Natural Health Perspective

In stark contrast is a more "natural" or roots-based perspective on health, one that emphasizes prevention, balance, and alignment with nature. This approach views health as the body's natural state when properly nourished, emotionally grounded, and physically active. It advocates for lifestyle practices such as eating whole, unprocessed foods, connecting with nature (e.g., grounding by going barefoot outdoors), engaging in energy-focused movement like martial arts, managing stress, and nurturing spiritual and emotional well-being. It sees the body as an integrated, self-healing system that flourishes when internal balance and the environment are in harmony. Instead of waiting for dysfunction to occur, this approach aims to cultivate health proactively.

Today, more and more people are embracing this natural approach, often driven by deep dissatisfaction with conventional medicine. Overprescription, profit-driven practices, and the rise of chronic illnesses—despite decades of perceived progress—have led many to believe that institutional medicine fails to address the root causes of health. In contrast, natural methods empower individuals to take charge of their own well-being.

There is also a deeper cultural and spiritual movement underway. Many people are rediscovering ancestral wisdom and traditional healing practices that prioritize harmony with the Earth and respect for the body's innate intelligence. As modern life grows more artificial, fast-paced, and disconnected, the longing for something simpler, more grounded, and more authentic grows stronger. For those drawn to this path, healing is not merely the absence of symptoms—it is the restoration of wholeness. In pursuit of that deeper sense of well-being, an increasing number of individuals are turning away from pills and high-tech interventions and embracing what they consider a more natural, profoundly human approach to health.

Relative to “COVID-19”, the opposing view - which was championed by many independent experts and individuals from the start—maintains that COVID testing and reported incidence rates were entirely fabricated. This perspective argues that every COVID “health measure” was the exact opposite of what a sane people should do in response to this alleged threat: providing absolutely no protection but instead ruining health and perhaps gravely endangering life. This view maintains that isolation, social distancing, and masking are better seen not as measures of health but rather as instruments of illness and oppression, suffocating not only breath but also vital interpersonal connections, hopes, and aspirations. The predictable outcomes, according to this view, are now evident in rising rates of illness, depression, and despair. Even worse, they claim, is the relentless vaccine rollout, which they maintain has introduced a new wave of physical, mental, and emotional harm to countless individuals, young and old alike.

III ANCHOR OF THE IMMUTABLE RULE OF LAW

Beliefs may be diverse and ever-evolving, shaped by culture, experience, and individual conscience, but the rule of law stands firm—altered only through the intentional and lawful processes of a democratic society.

11 The Vital Constitutional Guarantee of Due Process

Due Process of Law is the most treasured inheritance from Mother England, of Magna Carta magnificence; the distinguishing cornerstone of individual liberties and democracy of the United States of America; and the crucial safeguard that protects us from dictatorship. What our Founding Document assures is that nobody gets life, liberty or property deprived unless the government first comes in and makes the overwhelming case by hard evidence, one building block at a time – in court, by the rules, and subject to full challenge by all sought to be deprived.

Freedom of speech, thought, movement, and conscience are inalienable rights—obvious in principle, and recognized as natural to human beings - even self-evident in documents like the Declaration of Independence. By contrast, Due Process had to be built and refined through centuries of law—through English common law, Magna Carta, the U.S. Constitution, and hundreds of court rulings that refined what fairness actually means in practice. It wasn't enough to say “no one shall be deprived of liberty”—courts had to define what *counts* as fair notice, a fair hearing, burden of proof, impartial judgment, and more. Due process is the legal backbone that gives teeth to all other rights, translating ideals into enforceable protections. It is not just a legal formality—it is the foundation of justice and the single most important protection against tyranny and abuse.

12 The Complete Failure of Due Process with COVID Orders

What was the “process” employed and relied upon by authorities to justify the COVID Measures?

- A president barking and wheezing about “China Flu!” heading our way.
- Executive declarations of Emergency – by governors, mayors, councilors.
- Daily broadcasts of Dr. Anthony Fauci on the dangers of the viral threat and the need for people to submit to the many so-called preventative measures, from isolation, to masking, to vaccination.
- Assessments from governmental health bodies like WHO and CDC regarding the nature of the illness and the seriousness of the “spread”.
- Various NGOs, such as the Harvard Global Health Institute, Johns Hopkins, Bloomberg, and others—who had never set foot in Idaho—nonetheless rushed to assess and label the “COVID risk”, pushing for measures that subdued the population.

None of these actions meet the standard of competent evidence required in a U.S. court of law, let alone meet the high constitutional burden of proof necessary to justify extreme measures that seriously infringe upon fundamental rights, such as the right to breathe freely without obstruction (i.e., mask mandates).

As a matter of law, unilateral declarations of a “problem” and “solution” by government authorities and vested interests cannot constitute due process. Yet, during the COVID era, that’s all there was. What should have been rejected as an unsubstantiated narrative was instead accepted without question—and both adults and children were forced to comply.

Moreover, the pardon of Dr. Fauci should not be seen as a resolution but as a further unraveling of a fabricated narrative—one that demanded unquestioning obedience, vilified dissent, and caused immense harm, the full extent of which we are only beginning to understand. The only logical conclusion is to recognize that the COVID lockdown was a monumental fraud, and the measures enacted constituted the most severe and prolonged deprivations of civil liberties in Idaho’s history, imposed on citizens of all ages without any semblance of due process.

Public servants swear an oath to uphold the Constitution and protect the freedoms of those they serve. Yet, during the COVID era, many officials chose to disregard the Constitution and turn against the very people they were supposed to protect. Despite repeated warnings about the illegality of their actions, they doubled down on authoritarian measures, tightening restrictions, increasing mandates, and attacking those who questioned their unconstitutional orders. Even now, they dismiss the harm inflicted—downplaying the lasting effects of suffocating children under masks for years and subjecting them to repeated drug injections.

This disaster could have been avoided if officials had chosen to act justly. They could have modeled for children the importance of standing firm - *Just Say No* - to government-imposed measures that significantly threatened life, liberty, and well-being—measures that lacked any legal foundation in due process.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that the pardon of Dr. Fauci may signal a chilling truth: that COVID-19 was the greatest criminal enterprise in U.S. history, involving collusion among rogue elements in government, industry, and the press, in schemes of fraud and racketeering resulting in widespread human suffering.

13 The Tragedy of the Unchallenged “COVID” Narrative

What occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic was not merely a public health initiative—it was an epistemological coup. One side, backed by government and media, claimed the exclusive authority to define reality. The other, grounded in centuries of human experience with the natural world, was marginalized. This was not simply a disagreement over methods; it was a profound clash of worldviews: one that views human health as a commodity to be controlled by experts, and another that sees it as an inherent, sacred capacity to be nurtured.

While everyone is free to hold their own views on any matter—whether related to public health, politics, or religion—this freedom does not grant anyone the right to impose their beliefs in a way that would strip others of their fundamental human rights.

The failure to engage Blaine County's deep bench of highly trained holistic health professionals during the COVID-19 era was not merely an oversight—it was a serious betrayal of the community's values, wisdom, and right to informed, diverse care. This region is uniquely rich in practitioners of integrative medicine, breathwork, neuromuscular therapy, martial arts, bodywork, yoga, and other mind-body disciplines. These professionals were well-equipped to offer frontline, symptom-specific support—enhancing respiratory capabilities and immune resilience, reducing anxiety, improving respiratory function, and promoting overall wellness—without relying on the more invasive and coercive methods imposed by the dominant medical-pharmaceutical model.

Beyond symptom management, many of these professionals brought critical insight into worrisome environmental and physiological factors that may have contributed to the symptoms labeled as “COVID.” Their perspectives—whether involving the health impacts of 5G radiation, “cloud seeding” and weather manipulation programs, prolonged masking, or “adverse vaccine reactions”—deserved to be heard and examined. Yet their voices were systematically dismissed or silenced as ‘nutcase’ by the tired and worn-out use of the C-word (conspiracy theorist!).

14 No Due Process Means All COVID Orders were *Null and Void*

The collapse of due process during the COVID era meant that every mandate—from governors, mayors, school boards, and city councils—was illegitimate from the start. Orders that shut down livelihoods, isolated the elderly, masked children, and broke apart communities carried no lawful force. They were void the moment they were issued, regardless of how loudly they were proclaimed.

But most people didn't know this. In Idaho, as across the country, they complied—confused, coerced, or afraid. A few who were fully knowledgeable about their rights and the gross illegalities refused compliance on all measures including masking. When confronted by a few “fired up” members of the public who sought to compel compliance by threats of force, a few stood their ground ready to defend. They resisted—not out of rebellion, but out of principle. And without exception, the officious intermeddler cowardly backed down.

15 The Mass Victimization from Unconstitutional COVID Measures

And as is always the case when tyranny rises, the ones who suffered most were those least able to understand their rights and defend themselves: workers, single mothers, minorities, the elderly, the disabled, and above all, children—muzzled, isolated, and betrayed by the very leaders entrusted to protect them.

Any responsible adult should have recognized the truth: the severe COVID-era restrictions devastated public health—but none more so than the health and spirit of our youth. The youngest generation—vulnerable, trusting, and in need of protection—endured the greatest assault on body, mind, and soul ever inflicted on American children.

The greatest betrayal a society can commit against its children is failing to teach them their inalienable rights—and how those rights are protected under the Constitution. Without that foundation, children are left defenseless: unable to assert their freedoms, to challenge authority, or to distinguish truth from propaganda. Instead of fostering critical thinking and teaching rules of evidence and reason, our leaders imposed blind obedience. This was not just negligence—it was a flagrant breach of duty and conscience.

Those inalienable rights that are absolutely essential for health, happiness and survival of children – unobstructed breathing, playing with friends, hugging family members, and refusing drug injections – were abjectly ignored and denied by our local “health authorities” who now pretend sympathy and care for those in distress. In fact, those “leaders” now calling attention to the so-called “mental” or “behavioral” health crisis in youth and others are the same ones who went all in, warp-speed implementing the savagely harsh COVID Measures - from isolation, to

masking that choked out and poisoned every breath for two years, to distancing, and then to the Injections with booster after booster: “Good for you!”, they firmly assured children, parents, and all of us.

Further, to force children to accept depictions of reality that are blatantly false and demand compliance with harsh restrictions on their fundamental freedoms is a sabotage of the human spirit. It goes against the very grain of human nature, subverting instinct, common sense, and logic. This creates an inner conflict—one that festers in the mind, body, psyche, and soul. Children trapped in a web of deception are robbed of their potential, denied the opportunity to pursue their inherent human rights to truth and freedom. As the layers of deception pile on and the distortions of reality grow more massive, the damage becomes even more profound. The more deeply children are ensnared by these falsehoods, the more they—and society as a whole—become twisted and poisoned. They are conditioned to accept confinement, to swallow lies, and to ask no questions. The natural joy of exploration is smothered by a pervasive sense of decay and depression. As *Colonel Slade* (Al Pacino) said in *Scent of a Woman* (1992), while defending young Charlie: “There is nothing like the sight of an amputated spirit.”

What is clear is that local “health authorities” have no understanding or concern as to the nature of the profound existential hurt being experienced by youth today, specifically, what it is like to be a lonely, abandoned and fearful child – isolated, choked out, poisoned, and all shot-up/vaccinated, with hopes and aspirations fading and not knowing why - and without the ability to detect and defend against actual serious threats to health and life.

We have discovered that the *modus operandi* of the COVID perpetrators and collaborators has been to dictate health “crisis and solutions”, and never to engage, but rather to belittle, condemn, and even threaten anyone who dares question or dissent. By doing so, they lock children into a fabricated reality of terror, in a futile attempt to cover up the crimes and exploding casualties that took place on their watch, at their hand.

16 The Fauci Pardon and the Culpability of the COVID Collaborator

The pardon for Dr. Anthony Fauci only serves to underscore the magnitude of the crimes committed under the guise of public health. Pardons are typically granted when criminal exposure is real and politically sensitive. In this case, it signals that credible allegations exist against Fauci for actions that may include fraud, racketeering, and even wrongful death—particularly if critics' claims about vaccine-related dangers are borne out by the evidence.

However, Fauci had no authority to enter any orders or mandates on the public. The destruction of due process—the core procedural guarantee of the U.S. Constitution—was not effectuated directly by Fauci, but by state governors, public health departments, and local officials who

operationalized the federal narrative into draconian measures lockdowns, mask orders, and coercive vaccination regimes. These officials issued orders that restricted movement, silenced dissent, criminalized natural human interaction, and in some cases denied individuals access to work, education, or even medical treatment.

The issuance of a pardon at the federal level should prompt—not preclude—a wider investigation into the chain of responsibility that enabled an unprecedented collapse of lawful governance. Justice must be pursued not only against those who designed the narrative but also against those who used the machinery of government to force it upon the people, in direct violation of both constitutional limits and medical ethics. In Blaine County, and throughout Idaho, the individuals responsible are known to the public—and they must be held accountable through the rule of law.

17 Founding Flaws/ Enduring Principles: Constitutional Legacy

Some critics argue that the United States' founding documents—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—are fundamentally compromised due to the moral failings of their authors. They highlight that many Founding Fathers were slaveholders, and that the Declaration refers to Native Americans as "merciless Indian savages," suggesting these texts were instruments of exclusion and oppression. From this viewpoint, the documents are seen not as aspirational but as mechanisms designed to protect the interests of a privileged few. Consequently, some advocate for discarding these documents entirely in favor of creating a new foundation centered on equity and inclusion.

However, assessing these founding documents solely through the lens of their authors' imperfections overlooks the revolutionary principles they enshrine—principles that have empowered generations to strive for greater justice and equality. While acknowledging the serious moral failings of the early United States, it's important to recognize that the Declaration and the Constitution introduced radical ideas for their time: that all people possess inalienable rights, that government derives its legitimacy from the consent of the governed, and that power should be limited and accountable to the people. These principles laid the groundwork for movements advocating abolition, civil rights, women's suffrage, due process, and equality under the law.

Prominent reformers like Frederick Douglass and Martin Luther King Jr. did not reject the Constitution; instead, they invoked its promises to demand that the nation fulfill them. Douglass, for instance, described the Constitution as a document with "principles and purposes entirely hostile to the existence of slavery," distinguishing his view from contemporaries who saw it as pro-slavery. Similarly, King drew inspiration from the nation's founding ideals, stating in his "I

Have a Dream" speech that they were "a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir".

Discarding these documents would mean erasing not only their flaws but also the frameworks that have enabled progress through law, reason, and peaceful reform. A more constructive approach is to acknowledge the past honestly, learn from it, and continue striving toward a more perfect union using the very tools of freedom provided by the Constitution, which is the most protective of civil liberties in the history of the world.

Regardless of differing perspectives, it's essential to recognize that the Constitution remains the supreme law of the land, changeable only through the orderly legal process of amendment.

18 There is No Supreme Court Authority for Forced Vaccination

It is seriously concerning that numerous state and local officials in Idaho—including the governor and certain mayors, city council members, and school trustees—have publicly asserted that the 1905 U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Jacobson v. Massachusetts* constitutes precedential authority as “supreme law of the land” for the notion that a state can compel universal vaccination. While *Jacobson* did uphold a state's authority to enforce compulsory vaccination laws, the case specifically addressed a situation where noncompliance resulted only in a modest \$5 fine. Henning Jacobson was neither forcibly vaccinated nor subjected to imprisonment; he was not barred from employment or denied access to public spaces. The sole penalty imposed was the \$5 fine which was the maximum penalty allowed by that vaccination law.

In legal terms, when the deprivation of rights is minimal—as in the case of a nominal fine—the government must only demonstrate a "rational basis" for its law to satisfy due process requirements. However, when the government imposes more severe measures, such as prolonged mask mandates that restrict oxygen intake and trap toxicity of carbon dioxide and other substances, or mandates involving injections of medical substances, the situation changes significantly. In such instances, due process demands a much higher level of scrutiny. The government must provide compelling evidence in an independent tribunal, allowing for full opportunity to confront and cross-examine witnesses and to present independent professional evidence challenging the prevailing public health narrative allegedly substantiating the need for such severe measures.

Therefore, the *Jacobsen* decision holds no authority in justifying forcible government vaccinations that lack comprehensive due process. Although the Idaho governor never directly mandated vaccinations, his administration's endorsement of the right to compel led many Idahoans to trust assurances of safety and efficacy and to submit to the injections, for themselves

and their children—a decision that, in hindsight, most would not repeat given increasing public awareness of the erosion of the rule of law and the worrisome data on vaccine-related harm.

19 Inalienable Rights of Self Defense Against Imminent Threat

With shady and punishing claims of authority contravening legal process, it is crucial for every American to recognize that inalienable rights such as life, liberty, and property inherently include the right to defend oneself and others. When these rights are threatened by unlawful acts—such as an attack on one's life or property—individuals are justified in using measured force appropriate to the threat, including deadly force if necessary, to protect those rights.

James Monroe affirmed this principle, declaring, “The right of self-defense never ceases. It is among the most sacred, and alike necessary to nations and individuals.” Similarly, Thomas Jefferson reminded us, “When the people fear the government, there is tyranny. When the government fears the people, there is liberty.” These words underscore a foundational truth: a free people must remain vigilant and empowered, for only when government is held accountable by the governed can liberty be preserved.

To be clear, if someone with or without claim of authority - yet without any due process – attempts to enforce face masking that effectively chokes out and poisons every breath, or intramuscular or intravenous injections of sketchy substances “for your own good”, all people have the absolute right to stand and defend with all force necessary.

CONCLUSION: The Road Ahead

While we may wish others would see the world as we do, it is precisely the presence of differing viewpoints that breathes life into a free society. No matter how deep the disagreements, we must never let them erode our respect for one another—or for the rule of law, the very framework that protects our liberties and ensures justice.

As we attempt to navigate the so-called “recovery” from the COVID era, we must begin with a solemn duty: to face the truth. Grave violations of constitutional rights occurred. A just society does not ignore such breaches—it confronts them. Not out of vengeance, but with the clarity and courage that justice requires. Only through honest reckoning and renewed commitment to the rule of law can we ensure that such abuses never happen again.

What makes the pardon of Dr. Fauci most alarming is not merely what it forgives, but what it symbolizes: the collapse of due process and the elevation of a single, unquestionable narrative.

This narrative—built on manipulated data and state-coerced conformity—functioned as a psychological assault on the nation. To regard the COVID era as anything less than a coordinated mind virus is a dangerous oversight. The only cure for such a contagion is truth—plain, unflinching, and unafraid.

Dr. Fauci may have shaped the messaging, but it was state and local officials who carried out the orders—who enforced lockdowns, silenced dissent, masked children, coerced medical procedures, and violated constitutional protections without legislative debate or judicial review. These were not public health measures; they were acts of administrative tyranny, executed under a fog of fear and propaganda.

In Ketchum, Idaho, the mayor and city council went even further, actively encouraging private businesses to violate equal employment laws, public accommodation rights, and constitutional protections by requiring masks and vaccination for both employees and patrons. Shockingly, they even hosted election debates at one such venue—an establishment that openly defied legal norms and proudly enforced discriminatory, authoritarian policies of subjugation by masking and vaccination on all who would enter their hallowed grounds.

And yet in Ketchum and throughout Blaine County, as in many communities across the country, not one official who participated in illegal COVID mandates has yet acknowledged any error or responsibility. To simply “move on” as so many intend is to compound the betrayal. Officials were repeatedly warned of their constitutional obligations—and chose instead to model cowardice, abandon process, and embed the sickness of deceit and denial into the very institutions meant to protect us. And now in Ketchum, Idaho, all the attention is on matters like affordable housing, urban renewal and comprehensive planning – matters that are insultingly inconsequential in light of the urgent and unaddressed need for COVID accountability that continues to be swept under the rug.

The rising generation deserves more than silence. They deserve truth, and leaders willing to admit wrongdoing and chart a better course. **Any official who enforced unconstitutional COVID mandates must either take responsibility—or step aside.** Until then, the demand for accountability will not subside.

Meanwhile, of late various “mental health” groups have formed - many funded by those elements of the medical-pharmaceutical complex that fueled the crisis – who now dispense grants to local nonprofits, most of whom participated in the very masking, isolation, and coercion that inflicted psychological trauma on children. And still, few if any of them have acknowledged the harm.

Going forward, the only responsible path is to expose the full scope of the COVID deception, to shut down ongoing vaccine injection operations, and to engage the community's best resources to restore health—naturally, honestly, and freely.

Seventeen states including Idaho are currently investigating Dr. Fauci for state crimes not within the scope of his federal pardon. Whether or not the Idaho Attorney General will extend investigations to include culpability of state and local officials remains to be seen. But those who implemented, enforced, or enabled the COVID mandates must answer to the law.

It also remains to be seen whether the beaten-down, wounded child will, upon reaching age of majority, choose to pursue legal recourse against local perpetrators and collaborators of the COVID calamity. The possible causes of action are many - constitutional and tort based - and the damages potentially colossal: What is the value of a choked out and poisoned, lost childhood?

But what is clear is that there is a powerful and rapidly growing movement of youth emerging from these mad and maddening times who will never again blindly trust anything coming from “health” or any other “authorities”. Nor will they be swayed or comforted by a “mental health” industry that refuses to confront its role in the harm. They will carry forward a new standard of “health”, grounded in three unshakable pillars:

- A deep understanding of natural and constitutional rights—inalienable protections that no authority may override without full and lawful due process.
- A commitment to reason, logic, and evidence-based thinking—using every tool, including advanced AI, to pierce falsehoods and discern truth from propaganda.
- Disciplined development of body, mind, and spirit—in harmony with nature, rooted in resilience, clarity, and the courage to defend liberty.

In closing, on this special day, we honor the unwavering fight of all mothers for their children, for truth, for healing, and for a future where no child will ever doubt whether freedom will endure.