The Nefarious Experiment On All Us Coronavirus Guinea Pigs!!!

By Andy Caldwell

Is Santa Barbara County’s Public Health Officer, Dr. Henning Ansorg, looking through the wrong end of the microscope, telescope and horoscope?

In a public health briefing on April 15, Dr. Ansorg indicated he believes that “anywhere from 0.5 to 0.7% of the population has been exposed to the virus. That is what our current understanding is from studies done in Europe and China....it is definitely...less than 1 percent of the population. That leaves 99% ready to catch the virus at any time.”

He was citing these statistics in reference to a question about our ability to develop herd immunity, indicating in his opinion, that we are a long ways off from that level of defense against the virus. Yet, Governor Newsom says California is not going to get back to “normal” until we have a vaccine or we have developed herd immunity!

Nevertheless, how on earth could this good doctor believe that less than one percent of the population has been exposed to a virus that has been in our community for nearly four months?

And, what does that say about the transmission rate of the virus?

Dr. Ansorg believes this because less than 1% of the county’s population has had a confirmed case of the virus. He equates a confirmed illness with the infection rate. Hence, Dr. Ansorg and the board of sups who are relying on his guidance are completely dismissing the fact that 80% of the people who do catch the virus will have no symptoms and therefore not seek medical attention!

The reality is, according to Stanford Professor Michael Levitt (Nobel Laureate and Biophysicist), the infection rate of the virus drops naturally over time, even in those countries (e.g., Sweden- more on that below) that have not shut down their economy and forced people to stay in their homes.

Moreover, all the data indicates that upwards of 80% of the population will not “catch” this virus, as it relates to them having symptoms, and the odds are you have to be in close proximity to an infected person to catch it in the first place (shared confined space- which is why staying at home may not have been the best advice!!!).

As it pertains to looking through the wrong end of the lens, using Dr. Ansorg’s very own numbers, the real data indicates no more than 0.5 to 0.7% of the entire population will suffer a fatality once they are infected. The Santa Barbara County death rate, relative to our entire population, is less than 0.001%! Regardless, more than 99% of the populace will not suffer mortality even IF the virus were to spread unabated. As one research pathologist I interviewed (Roger Klein) indicated, “the coronavirus in all actuality is “infrequently severe and rarely fatal”.

Hence, Stanford University epidemiologist and Meta Data analyst, John Ioannidis, believes what we are witnessing is not a once-in-a-century pandemic but a once-in-a-century evidence fiasco.

Dr. Ioannidis, in addition to many others, points to the one closed population segment where an entire population was tested. There were 3,700 people on the Diamond cruise ship. Eighty percent of the people on the ship never suffered morbidity! The fatality rate, of those who did get sick on the ship, did approach 1%, however, the passengers were elderly with underlying conditions so that skewed the fatality rate upwards.

With respect to the economic shutdown and stay-at-home orders, consider the fact that Sweden took an
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Permit Denials For Capitol Protests Earn Gov. Gavin Newsom Another Federal Lawsuit

By Katy Grimes

Newsom and state officials ‘have seized the Coronavirus pandemic to expand their authority by unprecedented lengths’

‘Governor Newsom has reacted to citizen protests not by addressing widespread concern, but simply by shutting down protest at the Capitol altogether…’

A new lawsuit is seeking to vindicate the First and Fourteenth Amendment rights of two California plaintiffs, both who planned different protests at the California State Capitol this week.

The California Constitution says “[t]he people have the right to … assemble freely to consult for the common good.”

“In a gross abuse of their power,” a new lawsuit says California Governor Gavin Newsom, Attorney General Xavier Becerra, Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol Warren Stanley, and State Public Health Officer Sonia Y. Angell, “have seized the Coronavirus pandemic to expand their authority by unprecedented lengths.”

The lawsuit says in addition to a violation of First Amendment rights, “The State Order and Defendants’ enforcement thereof violate the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, both facially and as-applied to Plaintiffs. A regulation is constitutionally void on its face when, as matter of due process, it is so vague that persons “of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application.”

The imposition of the Governor’s Orders “is unreasonable and has a chilling effect on protected speech by outright banning all gatherings for the purpose of demonstrations, rallies, and protests.”

The Center for American Liberty in coordination with the Law Office of D. Gill Sperlein and the Dhillon Law Group, on behalf of clients Ron Givens and Christine “Chris” Bish, sued California Governor Gavin Newsom, AG Becerra, and other state officials for depriving plaintiffs of their First and Fourteenth Amendment rights.

Gov. Newsom issued Executive Order N-33-20 on March 19, 2020, ordering all residents to to stay at home and “heed current State public health directives.”

“Neither the Governor’s Order or state public health directives exempt demonstrations, protests, or other First Amendment-protected activities from enforcement,” Dhillon and Sperlein say in a press statement about the lawsuit. “The Governor has also specifically ordered the California Highway Patrol to deny protest/rally permits at the State Capitol, a core First Amendment speech venue. The Governor’s orders thus deny all California residents the right to exercise their First Amendment rights to free speech, free assembly, and petition.”

The lawsuit calls Gov. Newsom’s order “vague,” because it provides that individuals are ordered to “heed” State public health directives. The word “heed” is defined by Webster’s Dictionary to mean “to give consideration or attention to” —not specifically to adhere to those directives, as Dhillon Law Group Consti...
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Good Will Goes On Spring Break
By Andy Caldwell

Good Will Hunting is a movie about a troubled young man, who is nonetheless a genius, played by Matt Damon, and a down-to-earth psychologist, played by Robin Williams, who is trying to help Damon’s character get on the right track in life. In one prescient scene, Williams delivers a blow to Damon’s glib views on life by informing him that there is no substitute for real life experiences in comparison to Damon’s proclivity for emotional detachment aided and abetted by smug condescension.

The subject matter at hand was the inherent cost of life and love having to do with loss, in this case, having to do with William’s wife, who had died from cancer. Williams’ point was there is only so much you can truly know about a subject by reading a book or by way of distant observations. That is, real relationships require trust and vulnerability because of the risk of losing everything you love.

This is what I was thinking about while I watched a group of UCSB college students engage in a tawdry virtue-signaling therapy session at a hearing conducted by a state agency tasked with regulating onshore oil operations. Specifically, ala Good Will Hunting, the students gave remarks based upon what they “learned in class”. That is, the students were telling the state agency representatives about the inherent dangers of oil and gas operations, of which they have no real knowledge, and none of which were true. Regardless, they believe the planet is going to be destroyed within 10 years due to climate change and that this threat demands immediate action and supreme sacrifice (on the part of others!).

To say these college students can’t relate to life in Santa Maria would be an understatement. You could feel the smug superiority of these students who have the unique background of coming from among the wealthiest families in the state. The cost of housing, food, utilities, and fuel were never a problem in their household. Hence, they could not relate to the oil field workers testifying that their jobs allowed them to earn a good living in the Santa Maria Valley, a locale which otherwise has some of the highest poverty rates in the nation.

Nope, none of that mattered, because of what the students had learned in class. And, oh, by the way, these college students are of the cohort that is now demanding that these blue-collar workers, and the rest of the people living in places such as the Santa Maria valley, dig deeper into their pockets in order to pay off their college loans. That is, in effect, the students would simultaneously and callously hand these oil field workers a job termination notice along with a bill for their student loan, if they had their druthers.

Let us speak even more plainly of the cognitive dissonance and classic narcissism of this generation. A few years ago, these college students were so traumatized by the Trump election that campuses across the country, including Ivy League schools, set up cry rooms! They also encouraged students to play with play-doh and stuffed animals, with one college campus even offering pony rides! Nevertheless, in the midst of the coronavirus crisis, while society at large has been induced to become shut-ins, what did this generation that is convinced “the end is near” do? They left home to go party on spring break! CBS interviewed a couple of representative students. One said "This virus ain't that serious", while another said, “If I get corona, I get corona. At the end of the day, I'm not gonna let it stop me from partying." Enough said.
Economic Ruin Was Our Only Choice?

By Andy Caldwell

The fatalities associated with covid-19 were inaccurately predicted to be so grave that Governor Newsom prohibited so-called “elective surgeries” to make beds available for a surge that never materialized in CA. Newsom is now allowing surgeries dealing with cancers, heart valves, and chronic diseases—how beneficent!

Our response to the coronavirus was based on computer models coming from institutions of so-called higher learning whereby experts warned us that millions of people here in the United States were going to die from exposure to a virus that has a fatality rate orders of magnitude above any normal flu.

In deference to the “experts”, we shut down doctor’s offices and surgery centers, most forms of businesses, schools, churches, entertainment and sporting events, airline routes, parks, beaches, and the like. In the meantime, we were basically forced to stay home, socially distance from one another, and wear a mask that, truth be told, offers little to no protection from the virus.

Meanwhile the government started printing money! Nonetheless, it is entirely impossible for government to replace monies to the public sector when the private sector is the source of government funds! Moreover, the private sector has lost so much business and money that our supply chains are breaking. The debt the government is piling up, along with the depression era catastrophe we have self-inflicted on businesses by government fiat, indicates we may be on the brink of economic collapse.

This should all sound familiar! For the past couple of decades, we have been told that if we don’t completely cease from our reliance upon fossil fuels, we are going to perish as a result of climate change. These dire predictions came from the very same experts at the very same institutions (Imperial College) using the same exact computer models as were used for the virus warnings!

What else do they have in common? In both cases, the prescriptions against the virus and climate change threatened economic catastrophe— but the powers that be said it was worth it and we had no choice!

We now know that this virus was not any more deadly, in terms of fatality rates, than the regular flu. Similarly, government’s ability to stop the transmission of a virus in short order is no more possible and practical than attempting to control our climate via banning the only affordable and ubiquitous fuel and material source known to man.

Moreover, the very things the environmental activists want us to do in order to stave off climate change include the very things that made us most susceptible to the virus. Hence, New York City was the epicenter of the worst outbreak and death toll in the nation. New Yorkers live like the enviros want the rest of us to live and work, in high density neighborhoods that force everyone to use virus-laden mass transit. Hence, saving us from the threat of climate change would set us up for future viral and communicable disease outbreaks in addition to poverty!

The only way out of our current financial crisis is by bringing jobs and industries back to America from China. Ironically, the only way we can do this is by reverse engineering the factors that drove these jobs offshore in the first place. Again, the same staggering correlation applies. Namely, it was overwrought rules and regulations that made doing business in China so attractive in the first place.

We need to bring back a balanced modicum of prudent policies and regulations that will protect our environment and public health without sacrificing our lives and our economy. And, we need to remember that in order to restrict our liberties, government is required to have a compelling reason based on facts, not conjecture!
The Dark Side Of Stimulus

By Jon Coupal

The COVID-19 pandemic has turned the world upside down with massive disruptions in virtually every aspect of human life. With some notable exceptions, humanity has pulled together to vanquish this silent killer. It’s amazing how quickly both the private sector and public health experts have moved to confront this serious threat. For this, we can all be thankful.

But politics is politics and the controversies over government’s response to the crisis are legion and will continue long after the virus disappears. At the international level, China must be held accountable to the rest of the world for both its actions and omissions that led to the spread of the virus.

In the United States, debates swell over whether our response was too slow. Many of the same critics of President Trump’s handling of the crisis by underestimating the severity of the pandemic are the same people who criticized his barring of international flights into the country. In hindsight, both the administration as well as America’s health-care experts failed to respond in a timely manner.

When our political leaders reacted, they did so with a sledge hammer, essentially shutting down the economy with strict shelter-in-place orders. Whether this was an overreaction will only become clear in the future when we know more about this particular virus, but the government-imposed shutdown was based on the best information we had at the time.

Nonetheless, the nationwide shutdown has come with its own huge negative impacts on the economy and employment. And because it was government that ordered society and the economy to come to a screeching halt, it had the obligation to make individuals, businesses and institutions whole — or as close to whole as possible.

And here is where it gets sticky. So far, Congress has passed more than $2.68 trillion in rescue assistance, including the most recent agreement to spend another $484 billion. This is a staggering amount of money. Almost from the outset, the battle over who was going to get this money lined up along the deep political divides in our nation.

The first phase of the federal stimulus response was a relatively non-controversial $8.3 billion for coronavirus vaccine research and development. Phase 2, about $192 billion, focused on providing paid emergency sick leave for some workers, as well as boosting aid for state unemployment insurance and food assistance. Phase 3 is where the fireworks started. At $2 trillion, 10 times what Phases 1 and 2 cost, all semblance of bipartisanship evaporated, with recriminations hurled in both directions.

The fight was over whether the stimulus bill would be used to advance a list of progressive policies having little, if anything, to do with responding to the virus and the economic havoc it was wreaking. Fortunately, the effort to use the stimulus to impose elements of the Green New Deal, restructure corporate boards of directors and implement new voting procedures were quickly dropped in the face of public outrage.

With the stimulus providing direct cash payments to most Americans, some complain that individuals with an AGI of $99,000 or more are denied any relief. That amount of money is a lot in many parts of the country but in some urban areas, a total household income of $90,000 meets HUD’s definition of low income for a
There is a petition circulating throughout the county asking local elected officials to consider deferring their own salaries until the coronavirus shut down is abated. Moreover, the petition requests that all highly paid administrators, who earn between $200,000-350,000 a year, consider taking a 30% reduction in pay. To say this petition floated like a lead balloon would be an understatement.

Nonetheless, the reason citizens are floating this petition is because government in general is not feeling the pain of the private sector in this shutdown, at least not yet! For example, Santa Barbara County, the largest local government entity by orders of magnitude ($1.2 billion annual budget and 4,000 employees) has apparently not deemed one single employee as “non-essential”.

That is not to say, I want government employees to be laid off any more than I want the private sector to suffer a similar fate. After all, I am of the firm opinion that it would have been easier from the start for most of us to social distance at work rather than at home in lieu of crashing our economy! That is, most people have their own work station/cubicle/office wherein they don’t have to share much of anything, meaning it wouldn’t be that difficult or onerous to wipe things down as necessary and distance accordingly. Meanwhile, at home, all bets are off because we are cramming people into a confined space which involves the potential for increased virus transmission via the constant touching and sharing of virtually everything.

Another reason to consider laying off government employees at this time has to do with the huge impending financial loss in tax revenues via the downturn in the economy and subsequent pension losses in the stock market. If we don’t lay off the “non-essential” government employees now, we may be forced to lay off vitally important personnel (police, fire and health) later on.

Here is why we can and must reopen our economy as soon as possible. First and foremost, the real data, versus computer models, indicates that California successfully “flattened the curve” before Governor Newsom ordered businesses to close and us to stay home! What that means in practical terms is that the governor no longer has the legitimate Constitutional authority to keep the state in lock down. Namely, his Constitutional authority is based upon a compelling governmental purpose that must be as narrowly construed as possible.

Now that our hospitals have surge capacity and the trends of the virus have more than flattened, Newsom is constitutionally required to relinquish control back to county health authorities. These local authorities answer to county supervisors who can fine tune their approach to their particular situation. That is, a one-size-fits all shut down of the state is no longer warranted or legally justified.

Furthermore, this shutdown could inflict an economic meltdown exceeding that of the Great Depression! As reported in the Federalist, the US Chamber of Commerce conducted a nationwide survey which revealed that one in four businesses are less than two months away from permanent closure. Furthermore, one in ten businesses reported they were under one month away from closing their doors for good. In other words, we are facing an unmitigated, unprecedented, and unwarranted economic disaster.

Finally, Congress has plans to spend another $2 trillion that they don’t have, on the impact of the coronavirus shutdown, when nothing short of opening our economy will do. Please contact the governor’s office and urge him to relinquish control. In America, the people are the sovereigns, treat us accordingly as adult free citizens. We alone can provide for ourselves and we can only do so sans government’s heavy-handed and completely indiscriminate, destructive, and overwrought control.
It Is Time To Reassess Our Situation

By Andy Caldwell

Do you remember, that the original emergency order to stay home and shut down our economy was issued in order to buy time for our care providers to create surge capacity and enable them to get the equipment they needed, and to flatten the curve? Well, since then, thankfully, our situation has changed and that means it is time to reconsider our response to the virus.

Unfortunately, now that we have met all these goals, Gavin Newsom has moved the goal posts on us. Now that we have adequately prepared to handle the outbreak, he is telling us we can’t have our lives and jobs back unless, and until, we can test and trace everyone, cure the illness, and/or create a vaccine. Any of these conditions could take more than a year! Moreover, there is no such thing as a definitive test for any virus because one can always catch it after they get the test, nor is that such a thing as a fool-proof cure or vaccine because viruses mutate.

Did you know that this shutdown means that the federal reserve is now spending one million dollars a minute and that America is losing one million jobs a day? Furthermore, a shutdown into the month of June will cost San Luis Obispo County $800 million and Santa Barbara County $1.3 billion? And, it will cost the state of CA over $200 billion! How can we afford this? We can’t.

The reality of our situation is that our government has never in our history assumed the power to quarantine healthy people and shut down our economy, nor has it bothered to calculate the cost of the same. In that respect, surely we must come up with a better plan than this, keeping in mind the fact that the coronavirus does not have wings! That is, a modicum of good hygiene and physical distancing will keep it at bay in most all instances and we can apply these measures at work just as easily as at home.

Speaking to the bigger picture, we need a plan that incorporates and restores respect for our bill of rights, one that recognizes the fact that as Americans, we are sovereigns. What that means is that our government, at any and all levels, has no authority over us but that which is authorized by the Constitution. That is, the only moral authority government has over us is to help us secure our rights as a free people.

Hence, government can only impede our freedom, sovereignty and privacy if there is a compelling government interest that warrants the same. We deserve to be treated as free, responsible adults, not as subjects. Most importantly, the truth is, our government has no legitimate authority to limit our freedom if we don’t have the virus. Compare that with their assertion that they can restrict us in order to prevent us from catching it!

For many years, we have witnessed the rise of the nanny state, telling us how we should live, in addition to taking over control of our healthcare system. Well, the powers that government is now asserting over us is the nanny state phenomenon on steroids. Do we cede our freedom for the government’s promise to keep us well and safe? How can they possibly do that? Consider the fact that we will always have new and novel viruses among us, including in recent memory, Sars, Mers, Swine Flu, Zika, Ebola, and HIV/AIDS!

Consider the famous words of Patrick Henry “Give me liberty or give me death”, except for death by covid-19”? Our safety must not come at the expense of our freedom.
Businesses Not Reopening Because They’re Afraid of Being Sued?

By Rachel Alexander

Yes, COVID-19 kills people. But so does a collapsed economy. Finally, states are beginning to let more businesses open. But there’s a problem. A big one, that could keep crucial businesses closed.

Georgia allowed some businesses to open on Friday. Several other states will do that on May 1. But some businesses might not open even when they can. Why? Because an employee or customer might get COVID-19 and sue them.

As long as someone might get sick, businesses might get sued. As long they’re sued, they could lose. They could face and lose dozens or hundreds of law suits. They could lose tens of millions of dollars. That would put the small and medium-sized business under. Why risk it? Why not wait?

A Warning

Lawsuits have already been filed against businesses over COVID-19. Cruise lines were the first businesses to get hit with suits. They’ve already lost almost a billion dollars worth of business. They won’t be sailing for at least another three months. With all the suits they might lose a lot more. (Suits against them have been hard to win in the past, but who knows how the pandemic will change the courts?)

Other businesses look at them as a warning. Small businesses that can’t afford lawyers are going to be very worried.

Small businesses that are less likely to be able to afford lawyers are going to be very worried.

Some industries require close human contact. They include hotels, hair salons, daycares, gyms and restaurants. How are they going to achieve social distancing? They can’t guarantee employees or customers will always be safe. A wrongful death lawsuit was filed against Walmart over the death of an employee.

Some of the businesses that were allowed to open in Georgia aren’t doing so. Others are opening with numerous restrictions.

Businesses Shouldn’t be Liable

What’s the answer, then? Protect businesses from being sued. More people are proposing this. President Trump said on Tuesday that he wants to shield businesses from liability. For example, he is going to order meat processing facilities to stay open, and will sign an executive order shielding them from lawsuits.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and several business groups are asking Congress to set a federal standard that limits liability for employers who follow CDC guidelines. White House economic advisor Larry Kudlow says reopened businesses shouldn’t be liable for coronavirus infections. Lawsuits may put them out of business. A writer at National Review urges state legislatures and Congress to pass laws shielding them. Both see that America needs businesses opening as fast as they can.

Some states are already working on this. The House and Senate in Utah passed a bill last Thursday to protect businesses. It would make business owners “immune from civil liability for damages or an injury”

(Continued on page 13)
The California economy is on the verge of ruin, and our society is on the verge of collapse, because of the abusive power grab of Governor Newsom that has been aided and abetted by local officials who are refusing to challenge the governor in a meaningful and timely manner.

How bad is our situation? Consider the following dire implications of this protracted shutdown on the most vital sectors of our economy which has resulted in the loss of one million U.S. jobs per day:

Small Business: One in four businesses are about to close permanently, meaning the jobs and revenue they represent are not coming back for a very long time.

Supply Chains: Our food supply, including meat, vegetables, eggs, and the like are going to be in short supply because half of our food is eaten outside the home and most of those outlets have been closed. This has forced producers to destroy supply, which threatens them financially. Furthermore, due to financial hardships, people are switching to cheap basics, such as beans, flour, rice, etc... All told, the breakage of the supply chain portends food shortages while also threatening to bankrupt farmers, ranchers, and processors.

Medical Sector: The cancellation of so-called “elective” diagnostics and surgeries, in and of itself, presents a larger health risk than did cv19! 60,000 family practices will close or significantly scale back, and 800,000 of their employees will be laid off, and that does not include more than 200 hospitals across the land that are also laying off thousands of staff members and incurring significant losses.

Public Safety: The release of dangerous prisoners, including serial child molesters and sexual predators.

Government Finances: The federal government is burning through one million dollars a minute with no end in sight. The shutdown is creating a financial death spiral as it relates to the government borrowing money while simultaneously destroying the private sector economy which is the source of its funds. Moreover, neither the federal nor state governments have the money to cover unemployment claims nor the future demands on social services, including the costs of food and rent for millions of people that are suffering impending financial disaster.

Energy: The glut of fuel supplies due to less economic

(Continued on page 12)
I was thinking of heading to the gas station to see how much the local retailer will pay me to fill up my tank. As the Washington Post explained [1] this week, an oil glut caused “sellers holding U.S. crude contracts (to pay) buyers as much as $30 per barrel to take it off their hands.” Unfortunately, I haven’t started up my car for a while — and the tank remains full. And all those assorted taxes still keep gas prices here at around two bucks a gallon.

Nevertheless, the dramatic tanking of oil prices brought to mind one of my favorite doomsday predictions. “Ever since the end of World War II, we’ve embarked on this project to build ourselves a drive-in utopia — an economy based on suburban land development, eight-lane freeways lined with fry pits and hamburger shacks and a national big-box chain retail system,” argued social critic James Howard Kunstler in a 2005 interview [2] with Grist.

In Kunstler [3]’s view, none of that is sustainable because it’s based on overly cheap oil to move us and our stuff around. “We are at or near the peak right now because oil markets are wobbling and prices are volatile, and there is no swing producer,” Kunstler added. He figured that by around 2008 “our lives are going to be noticeably beginning to be disrupted” and by 2015 “you will see the beginning of a major collapse of suburbia.” Instead, oil is less valuable than hand sanitizer. Suburbia might survive a few more years, after all.

The internet is a great way to track past predictions. In 1982, writer and investor Douglas Casey offered [4] his speculative guide for profiting from the coming Greater Depression, which he predicted had already started. The economy had its ups and downs in the ensuing 38 years, but nothing (even in 2008) that looks like a massive depression. In one of his newsletters last month, however, he argued [5] that “Right now, very few people are willing to consider the possibility of tough times — let alone the Greater Depression.”

If we live long enough, some of these dystopias might actually come to pass, but I’d warn against making too many investment decisions based upon other people’s worries. Obviously, we’re living through some catastrophic economic times [6] right now, but it’s not because of any fundamental, underlying weakness in the economy. It’s because of government-imposed, coronavirus-related shutdowns that have artificially ground the economy to a halt.

These sky-is-falling critics often make some accurate points about the government policies that, say, subsidize particular development patterns or prop up banks or real estate. But never underestimate the resilience of our economy — or the ability of governments to kick the can down the road [7] on major problems. Downturns happen, but rarely as expected.

Another favorite prediction: Leftist writers have long been forecasting the destruction of the nation’s workforce caused by technological innovation and automation. “The robots are coming,” wrote [8] Michelle Chen last year in the Nation magazine. “Some studies estimate that up to half of the current workforce will soon see their jobs threatened by automation, and that more than four in five jobs paying less than $20 per hour could be destabilized.”

Unlike the Luddites [9] who destroyed mechanical looms to stop progress, Chen argues for union con-
activity, coupled with the price wars between Saudi Arabia and Iran, have caused energy prices to plummet. What that means is that our energy providers are going to be forced to shut down production and lay off workers creating another future gap in our ability to restart our economy.

The Law: This is perhaps the most dangerous and dire threat to our society and our economy. The governor’s only legitimate power to impose a shutdown depends on a bonafide emergency that creates a compelling government purpose to limit our freedom and liberty, including our ability to make a living. Even then, the governor’s use of this power must be narrowly construed.

The original and legitimate goal of flattening the curve and creating surge capacity has been met. There is no longer a grave threat to public health and safety that warrants the continued shutdown in light of the fact that our care providers have surge capacity. The governor, therefore, no longer has the legitimate authority to continue to impose a form of martial law on the residents of our state.

Furthermore, no second wave of the coronavirus is coming, based on the experience of other countries, and the damage this shutdown is creating exceeds the damage from the virus, which was never as dangerous as they said it was, in two meaningful ways.

First, we did not lose over two million American lives from the virus as predicted because the virus was never that deadly to begin with. These projections were based on computer models, not the real data from throughout the world. These models were off by orders of magnitude.

Second, the actual number of deaths has been grossly distorted, manipulated and exploited. That is, if somebody had coronavirus, they were deemed to have died from coronavirus, including those people who were in hospice before the outbreak began! The actual number of deaths in America, including in New York, have been exaggerated as a result of a directive to assign death by “presumption”, by the thousands! Finally, a significant number of deaths occurred in nursing homes due the fact that several governors, including NY’s Cuomo and CA’s Newsom, forced nursing homes to admit cv19 positive patients with the result of the disease spreading like wildfire in these institutions housing the most vulnerable among us.

These are just a few of the reasons I believe it is time to revolt against Governor Gavin Newsom’s dangerous and illegitimate power grab.

What should local government do? They should officially declare the emergency is over within the boundaries of their jurisdiction and refuse to enforce any of the restrictions or penalties associated with the governor’s rogue use of his authority.

If they don’t unilaterally do so and do it soon, they are going to bear co-responsibility for one of the greatest disasters in our country’s history.

This is not an easy decision to make, but it is the only choice we have.
Businesses Not Reopening Because They’re Afraid of Being Sued?  

when someone has been exposed to COVID-19 while on the premises doing something associated with the business.

A law enacted in March in New York protects health care facilities and volunteer organizations from both civil and criminal liability due to COVID-19. While it shields businesses from negligence, they will still be liable for willful misconduct, recklessly or intentionally inflicting harm.

Protecting Themselves

Businesses can already protect themselves in some ways. But they also remain vulnerable. Employees who contract COVID-19 at work can file a worker’s compensation claim, which removes their right to sue. And they will have to prove they contracted the illness at work, which will not be easy. However, a handful of states have shifted the burden to the employer when it comes to essential employees. The states’ laws presume that the employee caught COVID-19 at work. However, a judge in Illinois issued a temporary restraining order against the rule after business groups filed lawsuits opposing it.

Businesses can protect themselves to some extent by following the CDC guidelines.

Businesses can also protect themselves to some extent by following the CDC guidelines. Only healthcare facilities are required to follow the guidelines, but businesses would be wise to. A court will take that into consideration when deciding a lawsuit. That means using social distancing, providing hand sanitizer, separating sick employees and possibly providing face masks.

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) is allowing employers — for the time being — to take the temperatures of on-site employees, even though this constitutes a medical exam. Businesses should also follow workplace guidelines from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. One lawyer recommends that businesses have employees sign a waiver making them aware of potential COVID-19 exposure.

Of course, there is always a risk. Businesses with immunity might shirk their responsibility to take precautions against the virus. But so far it appears from media reports that the businesses reopening are taking great precautions. They should not be punished. The country needs them open. A sensible law should protect them.

Rachel Alexander is a senior editor of The Stream. Follow her on Twitter at Rach _IC. Follow The Stream at streamdotorg. Send tips to rachel.alexander@stream.org.
tracts that “can place safeguards around the introduction of new technology.” Never mind that companies are incentivized to automate more functions because of inflexible union work rules or state and federal labor codes that were designed around an industrial-era economy of factories and cubicles. Certainly, we should be glad for automation in these stay-at-home times. But the predictions are pretty scary — the elimination of half of current jobs is a biggie.

As a result, some analysts are calling for the nation to embrace Universal Basic Income [10] — a guaranteed, taxpayer-provided income stream so that low-skill workers can have a way to subsist without having to do any actual work. This proposal is problematic for any number of social and economic reasons. Do we really want huge groups of people freed from any expectation of work? How could our debt-clogged governments afford such a thing?

But, like most such “solutions,” this one is based on a future that’s highly unlikely to arrive — at least anytime soon. “A rigorous study of the impact of robots in manufacturing, agriculture, and utilities across 17 countries, for instance, found that robots did reduce the hours of lower-skilled workers — but they didn’t decrease the total hours worked by humans, and they actually boosted wages,” according to a 2017 Wired article [11] by James Surowiecki.

That gets to the heart of the problem with most doomsday predictions. Our economy grows and adapts. It isn’t a zero-sum game. Innovations can obliterate existing industries, but they create new jobs elsewhere. As the saying [12] goes, you can’t have capitalism without failure any more than you can have religion without sin. Often, those new technology-created opportunities are better than the old ones, even if individual workers and companies need to adapt to change.

That’s not to say that we can’t see some trouble signs, but most of them are the result of government policies. I’ve been warning about the coming pension [13] debacle for a decade, given that states have been boosting public pensions to unseemly levels and paying for them with unrealistic investment projections and higher taxes. As a result, the underfunded California Public Employee Retirement System (CalPERS) is going to emerge from the latest crisis in a precarious position.

I’m not predicting a depression, but more of the same [14]: bailouts, higher taxes, cutbacks in public services, layoffs of city workers, and, perhaps, a wave of municipal bankruptcies given that market returns may no longer be able to paper over the Ponzi scheme. This, by the way, is a real numbers problem — not some theoretical futuristic scenario. It’s driven by officials who are more interested in placating public-sector unions than the general public.

Indeed, it’s the growth in government debt and power, rather than quickly evolving markets, that should really scare us. The COVID-19-related crisis should remind us that the real threat to our futures comes not from the oil industry, potential depressions, or job-killing robots. It comes from the usual source: government officials, whose often-illogical edicts [15] can destroy a thriving economy and whose spending addiction imperils us all.

Steven Greenhut is the Resident Senior Fellow and Western Region Director, of State Affairs at R Street
Dear COLAB Members,

Did you know that lessening the burden of government is a bonafide and legitimate function of a charitable endeavor, i.e. a 501c3 tax exempt foundation? Is that not a cause you can believe in and support? Well, thankfully, COLAB now has its own foundation!!!

COLAB can now raise funds from other foundations, as well as, individuals who don’t own their own business! That means that everyone who contributes to the COLAB Foundation can write off their contributions.

The COLAB Foundation is a public charity formed to procure funding for the Santa Barbara County Coalition of Labor, Agriculture and Business (COLAB) and other select non-profit entities to advance education and science, combat community deterioration and lessen the burden of government.

Of course, the donations to the COLAB Foundation can only be used to educate the public about the work that COLAB and others are doing in our community, but we have been educating people all along!

The COLAB Foundation!

Donations are tax-deductible as a charitable contribution!

Please send your contribution to:

The COLAB Foundation
PO Box 7523
Santa Maria, CA 93456

Or online at:


Donations to the COLAB Foundation are deductible IRC 170 as the foundation is an IRS approver 501 C3 charity.

Our EIN is 81-1088586
family of give.

Another brewing controversy is whether banks were allocating the funds intended to assist small businesses to large businesses that were their important clients, leaving small businesses with nothing as the initial payouts were quickly exhausted. Shake Shack was shamed into returning federal dollars. Harvard University, with an endowment of over $40 billion, was excoriated for taking $8.7 million in rescue funds.

Small local government entities are likewise crying foul. In California, federal dollars are being distributed to local jurisdictions under the CARES Act only to those with populations of more than 500,000.

We can also look forward to huge fights between red states and blue states over whether the latter should receive even more federal dollars to bail out failing public employee pension funds. Fiscally prudent states will argue that profligate states should not be rewarded for mismanagement.

Call this “stimulus envy.” Whenever government starts handing out vast amounts of money there will always be inequities — either real or imagined.

But unfairness in the distribution of federal funds isn’t the only problem with a stimulus that exceeds $2.6 trillion. America had a huge debt problem even before the virus came to our shores. Now it is much, much worse and few are raising it as a concern.

We fully understand that our house is on fire and that we have to hose it down with cash. But as Milton Friedman was fond of saying, there’s no such thing as a free lunch, and young Americans and their children will be paying for all this for generations to come.

Moreover, what if the next crisis isn’t as severe as what we are facing now? Will there be an automatic default position of “Well, let’s just spend more money?”

Recall that when he was running for president, Barack Obama called George W. Bush’s $12 trillion national debt “unpatriotic.” But then he himself took the national debt close to $20 trillion. And President Trump has shown no inclination to take the national debt seriously. This is a recurring character flaw that infects elected officials in both parties.

It is my hope, but not my expectation, that once the virus is substantially contained and the economy can begin to recover, we can start a national conversation about moving toward a balanced budget. It won’t happen overnight, but unless it is taken seriously, there is a real threat of worldwide economic collapse. And that would make our current problems with COVID-19 seem puny by comparison.

Jon Coupal is president of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association.
tutional Attorney Mark Meuser explained in a California Globe interview in March:

The public health officer only has authority to quarantine those who they have reasonable or probable cause have been infected. Otherwise they have no authority to deprive someone of their liberty.

The courts have ruled that “A mere suspicion, unsupported by facts giving rise to reasonable or probable cause, will not justify depriving a person of his liberty under an order of quarantine.” That is a court’s order regarding the same statute that the Public Health officials are using to try to get everyone to shelter in place.

The Governor simply asked us to heed what the public health official has ordered.

The Public Health Officials do not have the authority to give a blanket quarantine.

And the governor has simply asked us to heed what the public health officers are saying.

“Based on the State Order, and at the direction of Governor Newsom, the California Highway Patrol has refused to allow any gatherings on the grounds of the state capitol for the purpose of protesting or petitioning the government,” the lawsuit states.

Plaintiff Ron Givens, a firearms instructor at the Sacramento Gun Club, is planning to protest the State’s failure to process background checks for those purchasing firearms as well as employment background checks for gun stores, effectively denying Californians of their Second Amendment rights.

Plaintiff Bish, a candidate for U.S. House in California’s Sixth Congressional District, intends to protest the extent and duration of the State’s shelter-in-place order.

“Both Plaintiffs Givens and Bish intend to hold their protests outside, on State Capitol grounds, in a safe and socially-distant manner. California Highway Patrol denied plaintiffs’ respective applications to use State Capitol grounds for their planned demonstrations depriving them of their First and Fourteenth Amendment rights,” the press statement says.

Health Sanitation Services
(805) 922-2121

The plaintiffs are also seeking a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction.

Notably, the lawsuit describes precedence for challenging the state’s quarantine measures:

California courts have held that Public Health Officials’ authority over the rights of personal liberty is limited.

Before exercising their full powers to quarantine, there must be “reasonable grounds [] to support the belief that the person so held is infected.” Public Health Officials must be able to show “probable cause to believe the person so held has an infectious disease …”

California courts found that Public Health Officials could not quarantine 12 blocks of San Francisco Chinatown because of nine (9) deaths due to bubonic plague.

The court found it “purely arbitrary, unreasonable, unwarranted, wrongful, and oppressive interference with the personal liberty of complainant” who had “never had or contracted said bubonic plague; that he has never been at any time exposed to the danger of contracting it, and has never been in any locality where said bubonic plague, or any germs of bacteria thereof, has or have existed.”

California courts have found that “a mere suspicion [of a contagious disease], un-
entirely different approach than most of the rest of the world. The following quote says it all:

“This is, in fact, the first time we (the world) has quarantined healthy people rather than quarantining the sick and vulnerable. As Fredrik Erixon, the director of the European Centre for International Political Economy in Brussels, wrote in The Spectator (U.K.) last week: “The theory of lock-down, after all, is pretty niche, deeply illiberal — and, until now, untested. It’s not Sweden that’s conducting a mass experiment. It’s everyone else.”

There is another perspective to this crisis that should duly concern Santa Barbara County residents. The board of supervisors have completely deferred to the Governor’s edict on this matter of a shut down along with stay at home orders. They are only beginning to consider a process of reopening our economy and society, a process they estimate will take 4-6 weeks, however, in the meantime, the only thing they have asked the governor to do is send them money!

Compare and contrast this to San Luis Obispo County. They organized a letter signed by county supervisors and mayors requesting the governor cede back local control as it effects managing the crisis and the economy.

In conclusion, we can social distance at home and we didn’t elect public health directors to create policy. Moreover, the governor no longer has the constitutional au-

thority to keep us in lock down because his original impetus to flatten the curve has been accomplished.

Our elected leaders must now turn their attention, post haste, to flattening the curve of economic catastrophe now that our California hospitals and care providers have more than enough surge capacity, by a factor of tenfold!
Supported by facts giving rise to reasonable or probable cause, will afford no justification at all for depriving persons of their liberty and subjecting them to virtual imprisonment under a purported order of quarantine.”

In Jew Ho v. Williamson, 103 F. 10 (C.C. Cal. 1900), and Wong Wai v. Williamson, 103 F. 1 (CC Cal. 1900), the California courts found that there were more than 15,000 people living in the twelve blocks of San Francisco Chinatown who were to be quarantined. The courts found it unreasonable to shut down the ability of over 15,000 people to make a living because of nine deaths. This was one death for every 1,666 inhabitants of Chinatown.

“At a time when Californians are rightfully questioning the duration and extent of the stay at home orders, which are unevenly enforced and which have resulted in other Constitutional challenges, Governor Newsom has reacted to citizen protests not by addressing widespread concern, but simply by shutting down protest at the Capitol altogether, making no reasonable accommodations for this fundamental function in a free society,” said Chief Executive Officer of the Center for American Liberty, Harmeet K. Dhillon, whose law firm, Dhillon Law Group Inc., also represents the plaintiffs.

“Our lawsuit seeks to vindicate several core First Amendment rights — the right to free speech, to assemble, and to petition the government. The government is also violating fundamental equal protection and due process rights.”

“We will be seeking a temporary restraining order in federal court ordering that our clients and other citizens be permitted to protest safely and peacefully again, as is their right under both the California and U.S. Constitutions.”

Katy Grimes, the Editor of the California Globe, is a long-time Investigative Journalist covering the California State Capitol, and the co-author of California’s War Against Donald Trump: Who Wins? Who Loses?