

# Tyrannous Covid-19 Restrictions

VS

## American Liberty

A Facebook New American Family Argument about the Law of the Land  
Ron Avery for American Human Liberty From Nature's God

VS

Saaed (Sid) Ghaderi for New World Order Human Rights Come From Man

### **Ron's Original Facebook Post:**

Wow! About time! A federal judge has ruled that Gov. Wolf of Pennsylvania has violated the constitution with his lockdown restrictions. You know "unconstitutional" today is like saying, "impolite," or "unnecessary" but the true term for the exercise of power beyond one's authority is TYRANNY! A federal judge has ruled Gov. Wolf has imposed tyrannous Covid restrictions in Pennsylvania.

I hope our tyrannous Gov. Abbott in Texas will take notice and avoid this ruling against him by opening Texas all the way as soon as possible. Let's STOP TYRANNY IN AMERICA! NO MORE COVID TYRANNY!

<https://www.foxnews.com/politics/pennsylvania-coronavirus-restrictions-deemed-unconstitutional-federal-judge-rules>



### **Sid:**

This judge is 6 years older than my son, has a lot of learning to catch up with. No competent court will agree with this judge's opinion.

He knows that too, he wrote that "his opinion stands alone in Pennsylvania".

His decision is also contrary to rulings by other courts – including the U.S. Supreme Court, other Pennsylvania District Courts, and the Pennsylvania Supreme Court – which have upheld similar state restrictions aimed at curbing the spread of the coronavirus.

He should go back to the late 1700 era and read a few cases.

When the ink was still wet on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights documents, States and Cities were granted ample powers & imposed much harsher mandates than those of nowadays to stop the spread of diseases. Even in Pennsylvania ! The young judge should've done his homework.

Read the 60 page write up. It is not what the headline implies .

His ruling applies only to the shutdown of non-life-sustaining businesses back in March, which is currently suspended & crowd size. He also questions the stay-at-home order .That's it.

His ruling on COVID-19 restrictions does NOT affect regulations put in place still in place by various cities within the state , like social distancing and wearing masks , etc. & the cities are not bound by the judge's decision.

The ruling will be overturned.

This is simply a publicity stunt .

**Ron:**

Saaed Ghaderi I don't care if he went against the whole rule of corrupt overthrown law in the last 50 years he did the right thing according to the right laws the laws of our land you can take all those other rulings and shove them

**Ron:**

The rulings you referred to go against the natural law which is against the law of this land it is time somebody did something about the corrupt rules of precedent in American jurisprudence

**Ron:**

Sid I have already shown you at length the rule of law that should apply in the United States of America

And I'm sure you remember what that is and I'm not going to recover that here

But I'm not going to read that whole case is I'm sure it's not as good as it should be and not completely in conformance with what it should be

If you knew the history of lawyers and judges in this country you wouldn't be hanging your life on their every word

**Sid:**

I did look up the young judge William Stickman IV bio's . That is why I noted , don't rely on his very questionable opinion. His own State's Supreme Court has issues with his poor misplaced reasoning.

Throughout the late 17,18 & 19th century, Northern States and the south were periodically hit with various outbreaks including yellow fever ,etc. usually coming in through ports.

The field of medicine was not prepared anywhere close to where is it now either . How do you think the States handled the frequent outbreaks ?

When the Constitution was ratified, the framers specifically left the power of health, safety and welfare with the states.

Having drafted the Constitution as well as the Bill of

Rights during the times when various states were challenged on how to control the spread of various diseases on a regular basis, they recognized that none of those natural rights are absolute ...

There are times when those can be limited in some way - temporarily - so that the rights of others are not interfered with. but most importantly, to protect the public.

Protection of the public should not even be an argument during the time of an outbreak, how the states or municipalities go about containing it - is a different issue all to itself.

It is simply rational thinking.

The most significant early decision from the U.S. Supreme Court to mention the state power to quarantine is from 1824 ..... by Chief Justice John Marshall - the nation's greatest chief justice.

He understood the Rights and the Laws way back then much better than a young judge in the 2020 pretends to .

**Sid:**

Read the law of the land very carefully. Read about how the courts and the founders treated emergencies and pandemics starting 1770 and onward .

The powers were placed with the STATE . They put people in jail for not following the health officials or the city or that State officials .

They knew far better in the late 1700 and throughout the 1800s what they meant by those laws.

You may not agree with the court positions of the last 50 or 70 years , but arguing with those who much better understood the intent and and applied the laws , is arguing against the Bill of Rights & the Constitution.

How is it that someone in the year 2020 claims to understand the laws and the intent thereof better than those who drafted them and were much much closer to the original authors.

Have you researched how various states handled pandemics , disease outbreaks or emergencies during the very late 1700s and all the way through the early 1900s ??

I have .

**Ron:**

Saaed (Sid) Ghaderi, I find it a bit amusing that you as an Iranian who married my sister into America is now educating me, who's own ancestors died fighting the lobster backs (English Troops) and fought on both sides of the war between the states. I also find it a bit amusing that you are instructing me on the law of the land and the meaning of the federal and state constitutions when I have been to the Supreme Court of Texas 7 times and proven that property taxation in America is unlawful <http://SueIT.org/avgcad.html> and that sovereign immunity for the state to harm its own citizens is unlawful and un-American <http://PostWTC.com/frame-3.html> Yet we have them both. And it is thanks to people like you who do not know the foundation of the constitutions and the law.

Your main presumption is that if we read the constitution or law of the land more carefully instead of carelessly as I, then we would know that the state has power to tell its citizens to stand on their head during a pandemic because power was given to the state to tell the citizens what to do during a pandemic.

First of all, I don't think there is precedent in America for the state to close all or even "all but the most essential" businesses and force healthy people to stay home for months and to wear masks all day long even outside and to prevent the right to assemble in church or other places. But even if it were true I will explain once again why the state does not possess such power and cannot obtain it.

The law in America does not start with a constitution nor does a constitution convey rights and privileges to people. In America all rights and freedom comes from God who creates all people equal. Therefore we are all kings and queens each possessing the same rights and powers. In the condition of nature we all have a right to defend our property consisting of life, liberty and possessions. We know this because Christ Jesus has redeemed all mankind and made them equal in the eyes of God as he died for all that all may live forever in his Kingdom which he has created for man and opened the door to it that all may now go in. This Kingdom covers earth and the galaxies.

Knowing this, we create government for the protection of the property of each individual, consisting of life, liberty and possessions. These properties are unalienable by government for its creation or support. Each of us kings and queens have authority to defend our property against any who would take it or harm it. We can delegate that authority to government to defend our property for us on our behalf. Hence the authority for law enforcement. But that is where our authority stops. We have no authority to prevent our neighbors from exercising their rights and freedoms even during an emergency, therefore we cannot delegate that to government. Hence government has no authority to prevent people from exercising their rights and freedoms even during an emergency.

One of our most basic freedoms is our health or our own medical care for the protection of our own life. That would entail the use of a mask which is known from many studies to cause hypercapnia and hypoxia leading to serious health conditions even death. I have a right to wear one if I think it helpful at a particular time. I do not have authority to tell you when and where to wear a mask or to wear it at all times in public or anywhere else. Hence the government does not have authority to tell all people to wear a mask at all times in public or anywhere else.

Continuing with our defense of our life, consisting of our health, we all have a right to determine what is in the best interest of our health including surgeries, medication and vaccinations. All these pertain to our health and it is our right to determine what is best for us. I have a right to take a vaccine if I feel it is best for me and my condition. But I do not have a right to tell my neighbor to take a vaccination. Hence, the government cannot obtain authority to tell all people to take a vaccination.

One of our most basic freedoms is the right to work to provide for our own needs and the needs of our family. If I am sick I have a right stay home for my own good. And he that would make me work while sick would be harming my property for which the state should protect me. If I am not sick, I have a right to gainfully pursue my vocation and he

who would make me stay home while not sick is harming my property for which the state should protect me. I have no authority to tell my healthy neighbor to stay home instead of exercising their freedom to pursue a livelihood.

One of our most basic freedoms is the right to assemble for we are all gregarious and we all survive best as a group by sharing ideas and immunity. I have a right to refrain from being with other people if I feel threatened in any way. But I do not have authority to prevent other people from gathering for any harmless purpose, church, sports, concerts, conventions, seminars, etc. Hence the government cannot obtain authority to tell people to not congregate for such purposes.

It is indeed unfortunate that our lawyers rise to the level of high court justices who are really not familiar with these basics of American society as put forth by John Locke, Algernon Sidney, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Samuel Adams. This is the power that you say is given to the state and it is not an unlimited power, but rather very limited to only defend the life, liberty and possessions of each individual. Government is not created to make a better world or stamp out disease or eradicate viruses or extinguish fat or ugly but rather for the exclusive defense of property of each individual.

You, Saaed, are working night and day researching to make America a land of elite bureaucrats and technicians who have special authority to regulate all people as a collective whole. You are promoting collectivism which makes that which is "best for all" the command and duty of all to perform at the end of a gun barrel. You demand that I serve the common good which is determined not by my input or even any of my neighbors but by your special doctors you have pleaded for and flattered earlier in other discussions. But collectivism is not the law and it is not based upon any sound thinking but is another form of tyranny or the exercise of power without authority from the people. It is un-natural, un-American and unlawful.

**Sid:**

Those rights you speak off are NOT absolute, nor are natural in a sense you wish to make them. They are man made & indeed profound. Because they are man made, they are NOT absolute.

Proof ?? These very rights did NOT apply to Black people for a very very long time into the 1900s.

Same is true when men wrote that ALL men were created equal. The word ALL did not apply to black people.

Why is this so hard to grasp Ron.

I have argued pro se in Federal court for over 6 years. I won. I know a little about the laws.

I also won a case against KeyBank when they emplyed 7 attorneys, they ended up settling. I know a little about rights & what could stand in a court of law.

You are relying on misinformation to make a case.

You totally rejected the fact that my friend died 2.5 days after being infected with Covid-19. How can you possibly be right about your other claims???

With the rights also come responsibilities. That's my point.

It is very irresponsible to call a virus that has killed close or more than 200k people a hoax.

All the dead had the COVID-19 in them

It not a hoax.

**Sid:**

What you or anyone else for that matter should do when making claims about violations of rights, in any form or fashion in this particular context , is to show that the governor or the mayors , etc. " had other viable options, but failed to consider them".

Then you have to prove that those other options were indeed more viable in protecting the citizen's rights & the economy , or commerce, et. all.

One who raises these objections needs to go back in time, consider what & how much info was available to the State's health dept & elected officials, then prove that in light of what was available, the biz shut downs , or stay at home rules, or wearing a mask was the wrong thing to do.

If you can prove that, then you have a legit case.

Do you know who knew about the dangers of this virus & FAILED to take timely actions? To live up to his oath of office to protect the people?

The very person who said it was the other political part's hoax. That it will just go away.

That's who you need to go after, most mayors & Governors have done what they had to do in times of crisis. That power was given to them over a century & half ago.

**Ron:**

Saaed, you have truly revealed your position for all to see. You claim that man makes rights and determines who has them and when and grants them through a constitution or some decree. Whereas I claim all rights come from God and that lawful government is created to defend those rights which God grants to all men equally.

Your proof of your position is the evolution of recognized rights in constitutions, which has nothing to do with the truth that rights spring from God not man. Yes men and their established rules are slow to catch up with the truth they know because the evil environment in which they must deal with to survive at all. This evolution began thousands of years ago when man thought rights came from God directly to kings. My proof that God grants absolute rights to all men equally is as follows: Life does not spring from man but God makes men and God puts them on the earth that God made for him to live perfectly. In order for man to survive in the world God grants him a right to defend his life. God also grants man the right to possess property for his own sustenance and a right to protect that property. God gave man the right of liberty to move about and interact with others freely so they could cooperate and enjoy mutual friendship, comforts and protections. God granted man a right to defend these properties in order that man would survive and prosper. An attack upon any of the three rights of properties is an attack upon his life.

If rights sprang from man, men could take them away lawfully as you claim they can. This would mean that men do not have any rights at all because all of them can be

lawfully rescinded or repealed by man on his whim or excuse conjured up by kings, popes, priests, presidents, doctors, lawyers, scientists or palm-readers.

Now you seemed to have focused your attention on the right of the individual instead of his corresponding want of authority or want of rights. Individuals do not have rights to make their neighbors do what they think is correct or healthy. They do have a right to prevent their neighbors from harming them and their rights. And our present argument has as much to do with lack of authority as possession of rights. Both operate to allow each individual to enjoy life, liberty and possessions. So my rights come from God and my want of authority to harm the rights of my neighbor prevents the government from obtaining such authority to harm the rights of any individual. All authority of government comes from the delegated authority of each individual as I have said earlier in other facebook chains with you. And that is all contained in Article 1 Section 2 of the Texas Constitution. And anything contrary to this is null and void in Texas under Article 1 Section 29.

You say that "with rights comes responsibilities." But you describe that to mean 'with rights comes obligations and duties.' That is feudalism, bondage and slavery. When you mean with rights comes duties and obligations that must be performed before one can enjoy such rights, the rights have been alienated by another claiming ownership of them or ownership interest in them. Thus the rights are not really yours at all. This is not the American understanding of rights. Our rights are unalienable by anyone or by government and we need not perform anything in order to enjoy them and expect them to be protected by lawful government performing its only role and purpose, the protection of rights or property.

Then you have proven what I said about you regarding collectivism and eventocracy controlled by elite experts. You have placed our rights in the hands of men and you claim the violation of our rights are only in the degree to which some expert or official should not have acted so inefficiently or wastefully. Our rights become mere amorphous bureaucratic exercises in pursuit of what they determine to be the common good. So our rights cannot really be violated or harmed on principle but only in the degree of incompetence of the expert in weighing all the options to impose upon the people. Therefore the only harm that could come would be the difference of one action as opposed to another action not the denial of rights itself. And this difference can only be determined by other expert officials. This is not the American understanding of human liberty and lawful government!

So you have placed my rights in the hands of expert doctors, lawyers and politicians and my only lawful remedy is to argue the merits of their decisions upon the common good based upon facts that are really unknown to just about everyone. We don't really know how many have Covid-19, or how many really died from that. Some doctors say there is no evidence for Covid-19 at all. In other words the medical expert opinion is just that, opinion, and it is entirely unsettled. And therefore my rights are entirely unsettled and dependent upon me proving somehow that experts did not act as beneficially as they could have. This is pure anarchy or lawlessness.

The principle is clear; no one can make me take actions against my judgment as to what is good for my health, or make me stay home when I am healthy, or wear a mask all day long in public, or close my business. This is tyranny and you don't get to call it my obligation or responsibility to you or all others. I have no responsibility to you other than to defend my own property and yours too if I can. But your property is not being harmed as you can do all those things you want me and everyone else to do without anyone stopping you. If someone tries to stop you from wearing a mask give me a call and I will help you. But don't claim I must wear one or anyone else.

So don't tread on me or my fellow citizens who have the same unalienable rights I do that cannot be given or taken by experts or made dependent on government officials. I need not prove a damn thing related to Covid-19 to declare that all the Covid-19 restrictions are absolutely tyrannous. Let the people decide, do they want their rights in the hand of God from whom they cannot be ripped or the hands of corrupt experts who deny them to any and all. Do you want American liberty based upon the absolute principles of property and the natural law of reason? Or do you want eventocracy based upon unsettled science and the whim of experts who determine what you shall do at all times related to any event that comes along? I say take expert eventocracy and shove it!