

Dear Esteemed Representatives,

If it please the committee, I would like to take a moment to submit my own view and points of contention of Ohio Governor Mike DeWine's executive orders related to the alleged health emergency.

1) Risk Assessment.

From the first rumors of a worldwide pandemic in early 2020, there have been varying assessments of mortality, novelty, and spread of the SARS-COV2 virus. The estimates provided by Governor's DeWine staff were inflated by many accounts at the time, and proved to be poorly understood and researched. The death toll specific to SARS-COV2 and excluding co-mortalities is orders of magnitude lower than we were lead to believe, and that common sense would dictate from the number of deaths and demographics of the earliest accounts available.

2) Evidence of countermeasure effectiveness, and analysis of alternatives.

Mask and quarantine effectiveness are still being hotly debated, but the evidence is clear that there is enough uncertainty in these methods that a government advisory would have been more appropriate, and more just than a mandate. Countermeasures such as social distancing alone, as well a heightened attention to common human manners such covering one's cough or sneezing, as well as possible liberty preserving substitutes such as simply instruction Ohioans to "not breathe on each other" were not evaluated for relative efficacy, and remain unstudied. Masks present additional health risks including aggravation of respiratory and cardio-pulmonary issues, skin diseases such as staph, and psychological risk factors such as but not limited to increases anxiety and stress response due to work of breathing increase. In light of reduced mortality estimates and mask effectiveness, these decisions turned out to be wrong for Ohio, and this was predictable.

3) Health and economic risks of imposition

Side effects of mandates include significant fiscal losses and health consequences that were poorly understood at the time the mandates were issued, but their risk should have been sufficient to temper the perceived need for mandates, if government processes were appropriately designed.

4) Infringement on religious Liberty.

Due consideration was not made to protect differing opinions and religious persuasions, given the uncertainty of the situation. The governors office obviously failed to give due consideration for opposing views, particularly in light of the lack of efficacy of it's decisions, and the well defended but under-substanciated justification for their actions.

Though this an admittedly brief account, I believe that in the future given a thorough and unbiased analysis of the historical evidence, one would most certainly conclude that while there may be a legitimate time when executive powers would be necessary to curb an extreme risk to human life, this, most certainly was not that time. And this governor, most certainly, did not follow processes sufficient to justify mandatory risk reduction procedures that continue to cost Ohio blood, treasure, and no small amount of happiness.

We're in this together Ohio, but if decisions were made that way, it is clear that Ohio has not shared sufficient information accessible for me to agree.

Instead I see propaganda and a friendly faced incompetent leadership that apparently needs better processes.

Unjustified mandates are unjust mandates. I believe Ohioans have been treated unjustly. Many of us have had our dignity imposed upon, many have lost precious moments with loved ones, and some even their livelihood. Executives should not have the power to do things on a whim without some serious justification. That justification is obviously not present.

Respectfully.

Michael Eaton

[www.linkedin.com/in/mpeaton](http://www.linkedin.com/in/mpeaton)