

Ronald F. Avery
1933 Montclair
Seguin, Texas 78155
830.660.6055
taphouse@sbcglobal.net

August 15, 2021

Mayor Eric Garcetti
mayor.helpdesk@lacity.org
Mike Feuer City Attorney
mike.n.feuer@lacity.org
Gil Cedillo Dist 1
Gilbert.Cedillo@lacity.org
Paul Krekorian Dist 2
councilmember.Krekorian@lacity.org
Bob Blumenfield Dist 3
councilmember.blumenfield@lacity.org
Nithya Raman Dist 4
contactCD4@lacity.org
Paul Koretz Dist 5
paul.koretz@lacity.org
Nury Martinez Dist 6
councilmember.martinez@lacity.org
Monica Rodriguez Dist 7
councilmember.rodriguez@lacity.org

Marqueece Harris-Dawson Dist 8
councilmember.harris-dawson@lacity.org
Durren D. Price, Jr. Dist 9
councilmember.price@lacity.org
Mark Ridley-Thomas Dist 10
councilmember.ridley-thomas@lacity.org
Mike Bonin Dist 11
councilmember.bonin@lacity.org
John Lee Dist 12
councilmember.Lee@lacity.org
Mitch O'Farrell Dist 13
councilmember.ofarrell@lacity.org
Kevin de Leon Dist 14
councilmember.kevindeleon@lacity.org
Joe Buscaino Dist 15
councilmember.buscaino@lacity.org

Dear Mayor and City Council of Los Angeles, California,

It was reported by Deadline¹ that the Los Angeles City Council voted unanimously to mandate that all people show proof of vaccination prior to entering indoor spaces in Los Angeles. The justification for such was given by the Mayor, several City Councilmen and the City Attorney. Before you go any further implementing this city ordinance, I would like to address each argument given in support of the "No Shots No Admission" mandate to illustrate that those arguments can be successfully challenged as unsound and worse. Obviously, I can't challenge those arguments and that ordinance in a California court but it won't be long until someone in Los Angeles figures this out.

Want of Authority to Eradicate Disease:

Councilmen O'Farrell reportedly said: "COVID-19 could be eradicated if we had mass vaccinations across the country and across the world," It was also reported he said that the US eradicated small pox and mostly eradicating polio with vaccines. He was further reported as saying: "Why on Earth is it OK in 2021 to have 30 plus people die in the county of Los Angeles from COVID over a three-day period, including an 11-year- old girl, when we have a vaccine that could have prevented all of that, accessible to everyone."

¹ <https://deadline.com/2021/08/los-angeles-city-requires-vaccination-vaccine-indoors-1234813086/>

O'Farrell was also reported as saying: "This is not a vaccine mandate...we're not going to deny anyone the ability to access essentials, food, medicine, etc., regardless of vaccination...but what is immoral is choosing not to get vaccinated, choosing to listen to some delusional rant on Twitter,"

Answer:

The question is; does the state or government have authority to *eradicate* a virus from the face of the earth? All lawful governments are limited to the protection of property consisting of the life, liberty and possessions of each and every citizen. Hence, no lawful government can harm or endanger or deny life, liberty or property to any individual in order to protect the property of any other individual or all citizens or all the people of earth.

The only source of authority for lawful government comes from each individual citizen delegated to government. The citizens may retain and not delegate all their authority to government. But even if they did delegate all their authority to government that authority would still be limited as no individual has unlimited authority. Therefore lawful governments can never be unlimited in authority.

I have authority to protect myself from disease by taking steps and precautions that I think best but I do not have authority to tell or compel my neighbor to take those same steps to protect them or myself or any one else from disease. Also I have authority to eradicate a disease from earth, as long as I can do so without harming others in any way or requiring anyone else to do anything against their will.

Therefore, I cannot delegate an authority I do not have to government. And lawful government cannot tell or compel any one or all citizens to take certain measures to prevent disease of the whole population. Also lawful governments do not possess and cannot acquire lawful authority to eradicate a disease from the state, nation or world by way of making people do anything against their will.

Further O'Farrell defines a mandate as the denial of access to essentials, food, and medicine, etc. Only representatives of Los Demons would consider that a mandate. That is rather mass murder. And since it was admitted that the people outside the council meeting were protesting the "No Shots, No Admission" ordinance, it appears even this ordinance was not popular much less a mandate. And as we now know; that which is not in the people to start with, cannot be lawful. A mandate really means "to give into (someone's) hand." And is not the source of that which is given into your hand all the people of Los Angeles? And this power exercised by the "No Shot, No Admission" ordinance cannot come from an authority held even in one citizen of Los Angeles.

Privileges, Responsibility, Natural Rights, Endangerment:

The Deadline article reported the following concerning the City Attorney:

City Attorney Mike Feuer has already endorsed the idea he calls "No shots, no admission." In an article on Medium this week he wrote, "Those who reject that responsibility should temporarily lose some of society's privileges until their reckless behavior no longer endangers the rest of us."

Answer:

Society does not possess *privileges* that natural men and women do not have. Society is merely the coming together of people from the state of nature to join together in the defense of their property consisting of life, liberty and possessions. It is not a privilege bestowed upon compliant servile individuals by society to go to work indoors, go to the store indoors, or go to a restaurant indoors. Those things are liberties that people have in the state of nature without government and they do not give those things up to society when they come together under a lawful government. We have a right in the state of nature to trade with people where they are located indoors or out. The very purpose of lawful government is to protect those rights and authorities people had in the state of nature before they entered into society. That being the sole purpose of lawful government to protect our natural rights and authorities, it is the greatest absurdity on earth to surrender those very things we come together to protect.

Citizens delegate some of their limited authority to government and with it comes responsibility to protect that authority in each individual. Each individual has a right to protect their property consisting of their life, liberty and possessions. And it becomes the *responsibility of representatives* to protect the same of each and every individual. But that responsibility to protect can never be used or converted into authority to harm any property of another. It is those in office that have responsibility not the individual citizen as the private citizen is not entrusted with delegated authority to protect the property of all in society.

All individuals have a *right to be in a natural condition* as God made them in his own image to live perfectly in a world God created for them. And this natural state of mankind cannot be made a threat to society any more than God is a threat to society. A society that makes natural man a threat is one that should perish from the face of the earth. A person who is not sick can exercise all their natural rights endowed by their creator to assemble, work, socialize, trade and conduct business to the fullest. "No Shots, No Admission" presumes all to be sick unless they can prove otherwise with a government license. To require that the biological image of God be altered with potions injected into ones body before they can be admitted into society is a direct challenge to God and His will for mankind.

Attorney Feuer complains that those who want to remain in their natural state of being without shots should be denied access to society until they change their reckless ways and get a shot so they won't *endanger* the rest of us. This statement is an admission that the "Covid-19 vaccines" do not work. We are lead to believe that he is "vaccinated" and that those who are not endanger him and all others. If he had confidence in the "vaccine" he could not be endangered by the un-injected. If he is worried only for the un-injected he can simply advocate that they get injected but he has no delegated authority to compel them to do so.

Authority to Protect Cannot License a Property Right:

The article reported that several people had called into the council meeting complaining the ordinance was a form of segregation and compared it to the holocaust:

Councilman Bob Blumenfield, who said he was offended by the latter comparison, responded, "When you ask someone for their papers for the purpose of sending them to a death camp, that is the exact opposite of asking for proof of vaccination so we can save lives, it is the opposite."

Answer:

Let's presume just for a moment that the "vaccines" were actually vaccines and completely harmless and that the Covid-19 detection "tests" actually worked and that those who took the shots would never get Covid-19 or any other variant of it; any required proof that someone has taken the "vaccine" to enter any part of society is denial of natural rights and liberty that government was created to protect. The state has no authority to alien those natural rights and license them out only to the servile.

We need not know anything about the holocaust or Nazi papers to know that such a policy is tyrannical as it is the exercise of authority that is not in the individual citizen and therefore cannot be delegated to their representatives in lawful government. The justification for denying natural rights of individuals cannot be to *save lives* any more than to kill.

Citizen Rights vs Government Want of Authority:

Council President Martinez was quoted as saying: "I want to be very clear about something, and I've heard this on social media and people who call in that they have a right to not access the vaccine or not get vaccinated. Unfortunately that argument just doesn't work for me," Martinez said before the vote Wednesday. "You not being vaccinated actually impacts the health of everyone else. So that argument that you have the right to not access the vaccine or get vaccinated just doesn't work anymore."

Answer:

The question of authority to impose injections on the natural person before they are admitted to society is not a matter of *rights* to reject it but the original authority to impose it. I have a right to get a vaccine if I think it will protect me from any disease, but I don't have a right to tell or compel my neighbor to get a vaccine for any purpose. Therefore, I cannot delegate to government an authority to tell or compel any one or all people to get a vaccine.

The problem with the President Martinez argument is the *want of authority* of the council to deny rights to coerce people into taking a vaccine. This is because none of the individual citizens of Los Angeles have authority in themselves to require submission of their neighbor to be vaccinated. Therefore the people cannot give it into the hand of the council to tell or compel any or all citizens to get a vaccine before they can participate in any level of society open to the vaccinated.

No Government Authority from Disease or Pandemics:

Councilman Paul Koretz was quoted as saying: "Frankly I'm tired of our politicization of science and public health. And while people outside this building are protesting that this is a violation of their civil liberties, Angelenos are dying unnecessarily."

Answer:

Councilmen Koretz, even though tired of the *politicization* of science, has repeated the argument used in the Presidential election, and often since, that we should "follow the science" and public health experts in making governmental policy and law. This is not possible as it is unsettled, changes often and denies the most advanced political science our nation and states were founded upon. *Authority* for any policy enacted must come from each individual as they are the creators of lawful government for the protection of all their property consisting of life, liberty and possessions, as said before.

Authority for lawful government policy cannot spring from *emergencies, diseases, or pandemics*, but only from each individual at all times. Emergencies and disease did not create the state and neither have authority in them to delegate to the state. The authority of each individual does not increase upon an emergency or pandemic. We do not live under an *eventocracy* where new expanded authority springs from events, many of which can and may be conjured and manipulated intrigues.

A fact that Angelenos are dying from "Covid-19" does not increase authority of the individual citizen to delegate to government and since they do not have authority to tell or compel their fellow citizens to take a vaccine, the government cannot obtain authority to compel any one or all the people to get a vaccine, regardless of deaths from any disease.

Citizen Obligations vs. Limited Government Authority:

Reportedly, Councilman Paul Krekorian said, "It is beyond me that this emphasis on personal rights and liberties somehow trumps — excuse the pun — every obligation of citizenship and concern about protecting the lives of our fellow Americans."

Answer:

Councilmen Krekorian also *politicizes* his argument that citizens have *obligations* to protect the lives of their fellow Americans for which they should surrender their personal rights and liberties. Apparently he associates citizen hesitancy to alienate their inalienable rights with Trump. There is simply no obligation placed upon citizens to give up their rights and liberties to protect the lives of other citizens. There is no moral law of nature, God, or man that requires citizens to allow government to alien or take their rights and liberties to save others from a disease or pandemic.

The emphasis that must be made and the obligations and responsibilities that must be acknowledged and obeyed is not the rights of the citizen, which is admittedly beyond Krekorian, but rather their want of rights. The citizens do not have a right to tell or compel their fellow citizens to take a vaccine therefore they cannot delegate to their representatives the authority to tell or compel any or all citizens to take a vaccine. If government does compel all to take a vaccine that would be tyranny which is the exercise of power without authority. Tyranny is the worst condition that a society can have and is exceedingly more dangerous and destructive than any pandemic.

The city of Los Angeles should exercise the authority they do have from the people which is to prevent those who would compel a person to refuse a vaccine against their will, and also to prevent those who would compel a person to take a vaccine against their will. The state and its subdivisions have authority to protect the rights of all to do their will in regard to medical treatments for any disease during a pandemic.

Threat of Lockdowns to Alter Public Policy and Law - State Terrorism:

Deadline reported that Councilman Joe Buscaino, was absent from the vote along with Councilman John Lee, but said in a statement last week, "We must do everything in our power to avoid another shutdown. The rapid increase in cases means that we have to use every tool available to protect our neighbors and our economy."

Answer:

The statement made by Councilmen Buscaino is an admission that the shutdown is harmful to society and individuals and the economy. He also says that they must use every tool available to avoid the harm of another shutdown. It is strongly implied by this language that to avoid another government imposed harmful shutdown that they should deny the rights and liberties of citizens until the unvaccinated submit to them. The only tools they have mentioned are harmful denials of rights to assemble, and trade openly in society. This is nothing but the imposition and threat to use harm to alter public policy or law regarding medical treatments. The use of harm to alter public policy or law is terrorism. And when the state uses harm or the threat of harm to alter public policy or law it is properly termed *state terrorism*. Therefore, denying the right of natural man to go indoors to shop, eat, and or assemble unless they submit to vaccines is state terrorism.

Further it must be said that the answers to your arguments above are infinitely more powerful when realized that long term mask wearing is harmful causing hypercapnia and hypoxia, even death, and the best PCR test should not be used to identify "Covid-19" as so stated by its inventor, and the vaccines are not really vaccines. A true vaccine could not be made because the "Covid-19 virus" has never been isolated or reproduced and linked to specific symptoms known in those who have it. As a result there are no antibodies produced from anything associated with "Covid-19" to use in a real vaccine. The "Covid-19" experimental potions should have been cancelled long ago since most trial studies are cancelled with one to six deaths. In America alone there are over 11,000 deaths and over 400,000 harmful side effects reported to VAERS for "Covid-19" many of them horrible. Remember whatever "Covid-19" is, it can be prevented and treated with other harmless means.

Thank you for your time and please give thoughtful consideration to the principles involved.

Sincerely,

Ronald F. Avery

PS This letter may be found online at:

<http://LawfulGovernment.com/los-angeles-mandate.pdf>