

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Sue Soller <sue@ssaconsulting.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2026 6:15 PM
To: Participate
Subject: Support for conditional use of cultural facility in LI2

Dear Members of the Ketchum City Council,

I am writing to support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District.

Cultural facilities are vital to our community and provide much needed space for gathering and learning. Because this would be a conditional use, the City retains full review of any proposal to ensure it is a good fit for the district. Sun Valley Museum of Art is a valued cultural hub in the Wood River Valley, providing access to art and arts education for our community, and I support allowing for a cultural facility conditional use in the LI2.

They produce so many valuable opportunities for the community to participate in the arts and provide performance and exhibit opportunities for local artists. This keeps Ketchum engaged in the arts in such a meaningful way, especially for a town of it's size!

Sincerely,

Susan Soller
Limelight Condominiums, Warm Springs Road Owner

Sue

Sue Soller
SSA Consulting, Inc.
Andrew Clapham & Assoc., LLC
Project and Construction Management
3200 Alki Avenue SW, #401
Seattle, WA 98116
ph 206.612.3960

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Louise Wilson Noyes <lwn208@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2026 2:39 PM
To: Participate
Subject: SV Museum of Art

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To the Ketchum City Council,

I support the proposed text amendment allowing a cultural facility as a conditional use within the Light Industrial 2 (LI2) District.

The Sun Valley Museum of Art is an exceptional pillar of our community, providing opportunities for culture and education to everyone. I have been a member since 1996 and would love to see them expand into this new space. Please approve this L12 amendment.

Thank you,

--

Louise Wilson Noyes
LWN208@gmail.com

Dawn Hofheimer

From: James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2026 12:16 PM
To: Peter Prekeges; Tripp Hutchinson; Matthew McGraw; Participate; Randy Hall; Spencer Cordovano
Subject: Public Submission: Ketchum Should Exit the Affordable Housing Business: Support Workers, Not Housing Bureaucracies.
Attachments: Ketchum_Exit_Affordable_Housing_June_2026.pdf

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I respectfully submit this document for your consideration and request that it be included in the public record for the next regular City Council meeting.

The essay acknowledges the legitimate workforce housing challenges facing Ketchum while offering an alternative policy perspective regarding the City's present role in affordable housing development and administration. It argues that municipal resources may be more effectively directed toward broader worker-support initiatives, transportation improvements, and other measures that assist a larger segment of the local workforce.

The purpose of this submission is to contribute constructively to the ongoing public discussion concerning housing policy and the long-term allocation of municipal resources.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to the community.

Regards,

James Hungelmann

Ketchum Should Exit the Affordable Housing Business:

Support Workers, Not Housing Bureaucracies

June 2026

The Problem Is Real — But the Current Approach Is Not Working

No one seriously disputes that Ketchum faces workforce housing challenges. Teachers, police officers, firefighters, restaurant employees, healthcare workers, retail workers, and tradesmen all help make this community function.

The question is not whether a problem exists; rather, it is whether the City of Ketchum is the appropriate institution to solve it through an ever-expanding affordable housing bureaucracy.

Increasingly, the evidence suggests that the answer is no.

Ketchum should begin gradually reducing its direct involvement in affordable housing programs and instead redirect public resources toward direct worker support, regional transportation, and cost-of-living assistance that benefits a far broader segment of the workforce.

Housing Is a Specialized and Complex Business

Housing development, finance, and long-term property management are highly specialized disciplines. They require expertise in real estate economics, land acquisition, financing, construction, risk management, and asset management.

Municipal governments, however well intentioned, are not typically designed to function as real estate developers, landlords, or housing investment firms.

This is not a criticism of individual elected officials or staff. Most public servants are dedicated and conscientious. But housing development is extraordinarily difficult, and municipalities across the country often struggle to perform it efficiently.

Government programs are funded through taxes, fees, grants, and dedicated revenue streams. The market disciplines that force efficiency in the private sector are typically weaker or absent altogether.

Affordable housing programs create substantial administrative complexity. These programs require applications, income verification, eligibility standards, deed restrictions, resale formulas, compliance monitoring, audits, consultants, legal review, enforcement procedures, and continuing staff oversight. Every new rule generates additional administration. Every additional program requires more personnel, more procedures, and more expense.

The City is not merely supporting housing. It is creating and maintaining a permanent administrative apparatus devoted to housing programs. Every dollar spent administering the system is a dollar not

going directly to workers. These administrative requirements create substantial overhead while simultaneously increasing the risk of inconsistency, favoritism, and regulatory disputes.

By contrast, direct worker-support programs such as transportation subsidies, commuter assistance, vanpools, and regional transit funding can often be administered with considerably less complexity and overhead.

Ketchum's Historical Performance Should Be Evaluated Honestly

Before expanding any program, the public should ask a simple question: What has been the City's historical performance?

The City has estimated that Ketchum will require roughly 660 to 980 additional housing units over the next decade. The Housing Action Plan established a goal of creating or preserving approximately 660 homes by 2032. Yet City reports indicate that only a fraction of those units have been produced or preserved thus far.

At the same time, the City continues to devote substantial financial and administrative resources to these efforts, raising legitimate questions about cost-effectiveness and institutional capacity. The disparity between stated goals and actual production warrants a careful reassessment of both strategy and institutional capacity.

Good intentions are not enough. Results matter. Public policy should be evaluated by outcomes, not intentions alone. By the City's own measures, current production remains well below projected need, suggesting that existing municipal programs have not materially altered housing markets at the scale originally envisioned.

If a private company spent years attempting to solve a problem, consumed substantial resources, expanded administrative programs, and still fell well short of its objectives, investors would demand a serious performance review before providing additional funding. Public programs should be subject to no less scrutiny.

How many units have actually been produced? What has been the cost per unit? How much money has gone to administration? Have these programs materially improved affordability? Those metrics should be reported annually through a standardized public performance dashboard so taxpayers can evaluate program effectiveness.

Until those questions are answered through an independent performance audit, expanding existing programs risks producing more of the same disappointing results.

Critics correctly note that resort markets often fail to produce sufficient workforce housing without some form of public intervention. That concern deserves serious consideration, and some limited public role may remain appropriate. Yet good intentions cannot become a substitute for measurable success. Programs that repeatedly fail to achieve broad affordability should be reevaluated, not automatically expanded.

The Workforce Is Regional

The Wood River Valley already functions as a regional economy.

Many people who work in Ketchum live in Hailey, Bellevue, Carey, Shoshone, Twin Falls, and elsewhere. That reality is unlikely to change, nor should it necessarily be viewed as a failure.

Regional labor markets are common throughout the United States. Many successful metropolitan and resort economies rely upon daily commuting patterns extending well beyond municipal boundaries.

The public purpose should be to make it feasible for people to work in Ketchum and participate in the regional economy—not to guarantee every employee a Ketchum address.

Ketchum should embrace this reality rather than attempting to reshape it.

Scarce Land Should Be Used Strategically

Ketchum is geographically constrained. Buildable land within the city is limited, and parcels located in or near the downtown core are among the community's most valuable assets.

Every decision to dedicate prime land to a particular use necessarily forecloses alternative uses. Economists call this opportunity cost.

Before subsidizing or reserving scarce property for affordable housing, the City should ask whether it is being put to its highest and best public use—economically, fiscally, and socially. Prime locations within the city core may sometimes produce greater community benefit through commercial activity, mixed-use development, public amenities, or other uses that strengthen the tax base and support the broader economy.

In a resort community with limited land, policymakers should be cautious about allocating scarce, high-value parcels in ways that may not maximize overall community benefit, particularly when such policies produce relatively few housing units at substantial public expense while sacrificing alternative economic opportunities.

A Better Alternative: Support Workers Directly

Rather than continuing to expand municipal housing programs, Ketchum should redirect housing revenues toward direct worker support.

Potential initiatives include expanded regional public transportation, additional support for Mountain Rides, employee commuter subsidies, vanpool programs, park-and-ride facilities, winter commuting assistance, childcare support, and direct workforce grants.

These approaches could assist hundreds of workers at a fraction of the cost of constructing, subsidizing, or managing housing units.

Such programs would also avoid the difficult and often divisive process of determining who receives scarce subsidized housing and who does not.

Worker support should follow workers—not housing units.

A prosperous resort community depends upon economic diversity. Ketchum requires workers at every income level, but it also depends upon visitors, entrepreneurs, retirees, business owners, investors, and residents whose economic activity supports local commerce and generates much of the tax revenue upon which the City relies.

The proper role of government is to foster a prosperous, accessible, and economically vibrant regional economy that benefits everyone.

Conclusion

Ketchum does not need to become a housing developer. Nor does it need to become a landlord, a real estate investment company, or a permanent housing bureaucracy.

To date, the City's efforts have not demonstrated an ability to produce broad affordability at the scale originally envisioned, and simply expanding existing programs is unlikely to produce dramatically different results without substantial reassessment.

The City should recognize its institutional limitations, focus on its core governmental responsibilities, and redirect more resources toward direct worker support, transportation, and regional mobility.

Ketchum does not need to house everyone who works here.

It does, however, need to support the people who make this community work.

Respectfully,

James Hungelmann
The White Room LLC

Dawn Hofheimer

From: James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2026 11:37 AM
To: Peter Prekeges; Tripp Hutchinson; Matthew McGraw; Randy Hall; Spencer Cordovano; Participate
Subject: Fwd: Public Submission: The Sheriff's Constitutional Oath
Attachments: The_Sheriff's_Oath_June_2026.pdf

Dear Mayor and City Council Members,

Attached please find a copy of an opinion essay entitled, "The Sheriff's Constitutional Oath: Technology May Change, but the Oath Does Not" for inclusion in the public record of your next meeting.

This essay was submitted today to the Blaine County Commissioners and Sheriff Ballis for consideration and inclusion in the public record. Because the issues discussed involve constitutional governance, emerging surveillance technologies, transparency, and democratic accountability in local law enforcement, I am providing this copy for your information and consideration as well.

Respectfully submitted,

James Hungelmann
The White Room LLC

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

De: James Hungelmann <jim.hungelmann@gmail.com>
Date: sáb, 27 jun 2026 a las 11:32
Subject: Public Submission: The Sheriff's Constitutional Oath
To: <commissioners@co.blaine.id.us>, <sheriff@co.blaine.id.us>, <mdavis@co.blaine.id.us>, <lmollineaux@co.blaine.id.us>, Angenie McCleary <amccleary@co.blaine.id.us>

Dear County Commissioners and Sheriff Ballis,

Attached please find an opinion essay entitled, "The Sheriff's Constitutional Oath: Technology May Change, but the Oath Does Not" that is hereby submitted for consideration and inclusion in the public record of the next Commissioners' meeting.

The essay offers observations concerning constitutional governance, emerging surveillance technologies, transparency, and democratic accountability in local law enforcement. It is respectfully submitted in the spirit of constructive civic engagement and ongoing public discussion.

Recent public discussions concerning surveillance technologies and interagency cooperation suggest that these issues are of legitimate interest to citizens throughout Blaine County. Because these questions affect both county and municipal governments, I am submitting copies by separate email to the various city councils within Blaine County for their information and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

James Hungelmann

The Sheriff's Constitutional Oath:

Technology May Change, but the Oath Does Not

June 2026

The office of sheriff occupies a unique place in American constitutional government. Unlike many public officials, the sheriff is directly elected by the people and sworn not merely to enforce laws, but to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Idaho.

That distinction matters.

As law-enforcement agencies across the nation acquire increasingly sophisticated technologies—automated license plate readers, networked cameras, drones, data-sharing platforms, predictive analytics, and AI-assisted databases—communities must ask a fundamental question: What is the proper constitutional role of the sheriff in an age of expanding surveillance capabilities?

Regardless of how impressive modern technology may be, and regardless of how often Americans are told that we must keep pace with emerging threats or foreign competitors, the first duty of government is not technological competition. It is constitutional fidelity.

This country was not founded as a laboratory for domestic surveillance. It was founded as a constitutional republic built upon liberty, limited government, and the protection of individual rights. The existence of a technological capability does not, by itself, create either the moral or constitutional authority to employ it.

Technology may change. Threats may change. Public fears may change.

The sheriff's oath does not.

To protect the Constitution does not merely mean enforcing criminal statutes. It also means protecting the structure of liberty itself—due process, privacy, freedom of speech, freedom of association, property rights, and the presumption that citizens are free people rather than subjects to be continuously cataloged, tracked, analyzed, or quietly entered into government databases.

Law enforcement should certainly understand emerging technologies. Public officials should know what tools exist, how they operate, what benefits they may provide, and what risks they may present. But awareness is not synonymous with adoption.

The higher duty is to ensure that governmental power remains subordinate to constitutional principles.

Modern law enforcement increasingly operates within a broader homeland-security and emergency-management culture that emphasizes preparedness, intelligence-sharing, technological capability, and threat response. Those functions may be necessary. But constitutional liberty cannot become merely another operational consideration. The Constitution is not a box to be checked after new powers have been acquired. It is the framework within which all governmental action must exist.

Throughout American history, many sheriffs have asserted an independent obligation to evaluate governmental action in light of constitutional limitations. The most instructive examples are not those in which sheriffs imagine themselves above the law, but those in which they insist that law enforcement itself remain subordinate to constitutional boundaries.

The proper lesson is not sheriff supremacy. It is constitutional subordination: every sheriff, every deputy, every technology, every database, every emergency measure, and every public-safety initiative must remain subordinate to the Constitution.

The concern facing communities today is not limited to one camera system, one vendor, or one sheriff's office. It involves a much larger architecture that is quietly spreading across the nation.

Individually, technologies such as license plate readers, networked cameras, drones, and shared intelligence systems may appear reasonable and useful. Taken together, however, they possess the capacity to create a permanent system capable of monitoring movement, association, political activity, religious participation, and other aspects of the ordinary private lives of citizens.

That is why these decisions should not be treated merely as purchasing decisions. They are constitutional decisions.

The danger is incremental: one camera becomes a network; one network becomes a database; one database becomes an intelligence platform; one emergency becomes a precedent; and one exception becomes a permanent program.

History suggests that once such machinery is in place, pressures to expand its use frequently grow. Systems introduced for one purpose may later be repurposed for entirely different purposes by future officials operating under different circumstances. Constitutional government therefore requires caution before such systems become permanent features of local life.

Recent experience has reminded many Americans that emergency conditions can sometimes produce governmental overreach affecting fundamental civil liberties. Whatever one's views regarding the COVID era, that period demonstrated an enduring principle: constitutional safeguards become more important during emergencies, not less important—and never to be set aside.

Public officials must be able to respond to genuine crises. But emergency authority should always be clearly defined, publicly explained, narrowly exercised, subject to meaningful review, and constrained by constitutional boundaries.

Fear and urgency are often poor substitutes for constitutional process.

Transparency is indispensable.

Citizens are entitled to know what technologies are being used, what problems they are intended to solve, what information is collected, who may access that information, how long it is retained, and what safeguards exist to prevent misuse.

These are not anti-police questions. They are constitutional questions.

The recent public town hall addressing both immigration-related concerns and Flock camera technology demonstrates that these issues are matters of legitimate public concern in Blaine County. Citizens are interested not merely in whether such systems are effective, but in how they operate, who may access collected information, and what safeguards exist to protect constitutional rights. Such inquiry should not be viewed as opposition to law enforcement. It is the ordinary functioning of self-government.

Public confidence cannot rest solely upon official assurances. Trust is strengthened when governmental power is accompanied by transparency, written policies, public participation, independent review, and meaningful accountability.

Because sheriffs are independently elected constitutional officers, ordinary political oversight is often limited. That independence serves important purposes, including insulating criminal investigations from improper influence. But independence does not eliminate the need for public scrutiny, written policies, meaningful civilian oversight, and robust public participation when surveillance technologies and interagency systems are proposed.

Ultimately, this issue is not about any particular officeholder or any specific technology. It is about whether local communities remain capable of protecting themselves from governmental systems that are powerful, opaque, and easily expanded.

For many citizens, the Sheriff's Office represents the last local line of defense against the unchecked growth of governmental power. The sheriff should not become merely the local operator of increasingly sophisticated surveillance systems. He should be the local official most willing to ask whether the technology belongs here at all, and what safeguards are necessary to protect innocent citizens if it does.

The American constitutional system was never intended to depend upon blind trust in public officials. It was designed upon the assumption that power itself requires limits, transparency, and accountability.

Responsible citizens should not be asked to place blind trust in any official, present or future, who possesses the ability to monitor innocent movement without strict limitations, transparency, and accountability.

The issue is not whether one trusts the current sheriff. The issue is whether any sheriff should exercise such authority without clear rules, public reporting, independent oversight, and enforceable consequences for misuse.

The American answer to authoritarianism is not to become a more efficient version of it.

The American answer is to remain America: constitutional, transparent, accountable, and jealous of liberty.

And so we ask the Blaine County Commissioners to discontinue funding for the Flock camera program and to refrain from appropriating any additional taxpayer funds for automated license-plate surveillance. The constitutional duty of local government is not merely to adopt every available technology, but to preserve liberty while providing public safety. Many citizens believe that permanent automated surveillance networks exceed what a free people should accept in ordinary civic life.

Technology may change.

The oath does not.

James Hungelmann
The White Room LLC

Dawn Hofheimer

From: Elise orban <eliseorban@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2026 6:02 AM
To: Participate
Subject: LOT Tax

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Stop taxing locals! Let us see where are taxes are going!
Elise Orban

“Go out in the world and do good”

Celebrating Liberty? Not Without First Reckoning

As Idaho and the nation commemorate the 250th anniversary of the American founding, leaders, dignitaries, and policy experts are gathering in Sun Valley to discuss liberty, self-government, and the American experiment.

One of the featured speakers is Governor Brad Little. The conference is being held at the Argyros Performing Arts Center in Ketchum.

For many Idahoans, particularly in the Wood River Valley, those facts are not merely ironic. They are deeply troubling.

Can institutions and public officials that led, participated in, promoted, or acquiesced in the unprecedented restrictions of the COVID era credibly celebrate American liberty without first confronting what occurred?

Many Idahoans believe the answer is a resounding no.

This is not simply a debate about COVID. It is a constitutional question.

At the 250-year mark of American history, this should be a moment of heightened constitutional awareness, not constitutional forgetfulness.

Instead, during COVID, many Americans witnessed what they regard as one of the most sweeping restrictions of constitutional liberty in modern American history, carried out not by foreign enemies, but by domestic institutions and public officials entrusted with protecting those very liberties.

The American system was designed precisely for times of fear and crisis. The Founders understood that emergencies create enormous pressure for citizens to surrender liberty in exchange for promises of safety. For that reason, constitutional government requires due process, transparency, evidence, public debate, and meaningful limitations on governmental power.

During the COVID period, many of those safeguards appeared to vanish almost overnight.

Executive orders proliferated. Businesses closed. Churches suspended services. Schools shut down. Citizens were excluded from public buildings and private establishments. Employees faced mask requirements, testing requirements, and, in many cases, vaccine requirements as conditions of employment or participation. Children were denied playgrounds, normal interaction with friends, visits with grandparents, and even the ordinary human comfort of hugs and family closeness.

Vaccination campaigns followed. Although Governor Little stated that vaccination should remain voluntary and opposed formal vaccine mandates in some settings, he nevertheless became one of Idaho's leading public advocates for mass vaccination, repeatedly assuring Idahoans that vaccination was safe, effective, and the appropriate course of action.

Critics argue that these assurances relied heavily upon guidance from federal public-health authorities, including the CDC and NIH, institutions whose recommendations remain the subject of continuing public debate.

Many citizens complied not because they freely consented, but because they trusted Governor Little and other authorities, feared consequences, or believed they had no practical alternative.

Citizens who questioned prevailing policies were often marginalized, ridiculed, excluded, or portrayed as threats to public safety rather than participants in legitimate democratic debate.

Beginning in the spring of 2020, Governor Little was repeatedly cautioned by citizens, attorneys, physicians, and others that the emergency response raised profound constitutional concerns.

Governor Little became the public face of Idaho's response, repeatedly extending emergency declarations and exercising enormous influence over the state's pandemic response during a period many Idahoans experienced as fearful, divisive, and deeply disruptive. While he did not personally impose every restriction adopted by employers, schools, hospitals, municipalities, and private businesses, authority does not require a signed order to shape conduct. Governors possess the bully pulpit, and their repeated endorsements of emergency measures, public-health guidance, and vaccination inevitably influence institutions and individual decisions throughout society.

Many critics also challenge the duration of Idaho's COVID emergency itself. Governor Little repeatedly renewed emergency declarations for nearly two years. Critics argue that such successive extensions strained the intent of Idaho's emergency statutes and the constitutional principle of separation of powers.

The result was a society in which many Idahoans experienced exclusion from employment, commerce, worship, education, cultural life, and civic participation—and, for many, the loss of countless ordinary joys, relationships, and experiences that make life worth living.

For many in the Wood River Valley, the venue itself carries symbolic weight. The Argyros was not experienced merely as a neutral cultural space during the COVID period. Citizens remember stringent policies involving masking and other measures for employees and patrons, including proof-of-vaccination requirements for employees, with little apparent consideration for objections grounded in bodily autonomy and civil liberties.

To many, this and other prominent institutions became part of a local regime characterized by masking mandates, vaccination pressure, exclusion, and institutional conformity.

For citizens who experienced that period as coercive and humiliating—particularly those who now regret decisions they felt pressured to make for themselves or their children—hosting a liberty conference at such a venue appears tone-deaf and, for some, an aggravation of what they regard as profound injuries inflicted during the COVID era.

Recent claims and disclosures concerning Anthony Fauci, gain-of-function research, and possible laboratory origins of COVID may deserve investigation. But to many, they must also be regarded

skeptically: as another possible means of controlling the narrative, preserving falsehoods, and avoiding true accountability for the punitive measures imposed during the COVID era.

The restrictions experienced by ordinary citizens were not imposed by Washington alone. They were implemented by governors, mayors, school boards, employers, hospitals, courts, cultural institutions, and local officials.

Perhaps most troubling was the perceived failure of institutional gatekeepers.

Medicine, law, the judiciary, and the press occupy special places in American society. Physicians are entrusted with informed consent and patient autonomy. Lawyers swear to support the Constitution and defend the rule of law. Courts exist to require evidence, protect rights, and test governmental power. Journalists are expected to question power rather than amplify it.

It is especially important to examine the role of the judiciary during the COVID era. Rather than requiring strict constitutional scrutiny, courts often accepted official factual assertions without ordinary evidentiary testing. In effect, they treated contested facts as settled without proof through testimony, discovery, or cross-examination. In Idaho, courts ordered masking for participants, burdening courtroom communication, public access, and free expression, while further embedding in the public mind official narratives carrying significant consequences that had never been properly tested.

Moreover, critics argue that too much of organized medicine aligned itself with centralized public-health authority at the expense of open scientific debate and informed consent.

They also contend that the public conversation became overwhelmingly medicalized and pharmaceuticalized. Virtually no attention was devoted to strengthening and protecting general health and human resilience through nutrition, exercise, movement, adequate sunlight, deep breathing, stress reduction, emotional well-being, and other long-recognized foundations of health. This exclusion carried particular significance in communities such as the Wood River Valley, where many citizens earn their livelihoods helping others build and maintain health through holistic, integrative, functional, naturopathic, preventive, and lifestyle-based approaches.

Likewise, remarkably few members of the legal profession aggressively challenged unprecedented restrictions on constitutional liberty. Many citizens were left to wonder: if fundamental rights are not vigorously defended during periods of crisis, what is the purpose of legal training and the profession itself?

Further, much of the press worked more to reinforce official narratives than to investigate competing perspectives. Dissenting scientific, legal, and constitutional perspectives were often marginalized or ignored.

Whatever history's final judgment may be, many citizens emerged from the COVID period believing that some of society's most important institutions failed precisely when they were needed most.

Attorney General Raúl Labrador has spoken publicly about the COVID era as a period in which liberty was severely curtailed. But if that is so, Idahoans are entitled to ask: where is the official

reckoning? Where are the hearings, investigations, and reforms addressing institutional conduct and constitutional safeguards?

When constitutional liberties have been significantly curtailed, a genuine reckoning must occur at every level of government and civil society. The conduct of governors, mayors, city council members, school boards, employers, hospitals, courts, media institutions, and other entities that implemented, enforced, justified, or normalized restrictive measures must be subjected to honest public examination.

Unless there is meaningful accountability, we risk repeating many of the same mistakes during future emergencies.

The next time officials arrive with emergency orders, the answer must not be blind obedience.

It must be constitutional resistance.

Not violence. Not chaos. But a clear, lawful, public insistence that fundamental rights cannot be suspended indefinitely by emergency decree.

Future crises, whatever form they may take, must meet the Constitution at the door.

Until the difficult questions raised by the COVID era are honestly confronted, celebrations of liberty will ring hollow for many citizens.

Those rights deserve more than ceremonial applause. They deserve remembrance, vigilance, and defense—especially in times of crisis.

A genuine reckoning should not be motivated by vengeance, but by education and prevention. Future generations must better understand constitutional rights, due process, evidentiary standards, and the difference between fear, assertion, and demonstrable fact.

Liberty cannot be authentically celebrated until its restriction has first been honestly examined.

James Hungenmann
The White Room LLC
June 2026