



Masks Aren't Just Ineffective, They're Dangerous

December 16, 2021 / [Challenge to City of Hailey, ID Mask Mandate II](#), [Health](#), [HFDF Lawsuits](#)

Though many cities have mandated masks at some point or another during the COVID pandemic, forcing American citizens to wear unapproved medical products without their informed consent of the true costs and benefits, is a violation of federal law and our rights under the Constitution, not to mention, incredibly unsafe. California just announced that mask mandates are coming back to the golden state, with more regions sure to follow, sparking renewed debate on the legality, health risks, and questionable merits of such policies.

Well the evidence is in, and it doesn't support the widely held notion that the use of facial coverings to prevent COVID-19 transmission is benign and harmless, let alone effective.

Much to the contrary, animal studies show without a doubt that breathing even low levels of carbon dioxide causes a spectrum of dangerous adverse reactions in the body such as [acidification](#) of the blood and [calcification](#) of organs and arterial walls that can lead to worsening coronary heart disease and other serious problems. The cascade of metabolic changes to the offspring of pregnant mothers exposed to CO2 can also cause permanent [neurological damage, birth defects and stillbirths](#), possibly due to the [calcification](#) of the placenta. Which brings us to ask, are masks partly to blame for the concerning [28% rise](#) in stillbirths worldwide during the pandemic?

Experiments confirm that wearing masks, be they surgical, N95, or community-made cloth, leads to a drastic rise in CO2 in the inhaled air under masks, increasing [six- to seven-fold](#) in five minutes to as much as [sixty-fold](#) in fifteen minutes of measurement. Breathing air with such high CO2 concentrations increases blood CO2, which in turn [acidifies](#) the blood and tissues in the body. Studies show that elevated CO2 levels cause permanent damage to the unborn pups of [pregnant](#) animals exposed to just a fraction of the concentration present in the air under a mask. We also know through studies that [adolescent](#) mice show similar developmental impairment and irreversible neuron death from minimal increases of CO2.

How or why have public officials disregarded this crucial information and forced young children and pregnant mothers to risk their and their unborn babies' health and development?

Mandating masks is an unprecedented human experiment forced upon citizens. If masks were FDA approved, the Emergency Use Authorization would be unnecessary. The reason the FDA issued the EUA specifying that consent is required, that harms be properly described, and that masks must not be labeled to imply they offer antiviral protection, is precisely because they are not FDA approved for this use, and their safety, efficacy and health risks are not properly understood. So the uncomfortable truth is that people wearing masks, either voluntarily or under threat of punishment by their local authorities, are partaking in a grand medical experiment without their consent.

Public officials who mandate masks without mention of their risks, fail in their duty to provide informed consent by not communicating crucial information to citizens that they need to make educated medical decisions affecting their personal health. The reality is that a community is comprised of people with widely varying health status, with each person having a unique history of biological factors and family predispositions. As cardiovascular disease continues to be the #1 killer to this day in the US and worldwide, wouldn't it be of utmost importance to communicate the risk of calcification of arteries from increased CO2 to the millions of people battling this deadly disease? How many other conditions besides heart disease are worsened by breathing high levels of CO2? Knowing what health factors influence the severity of adverse effects from wearing a mask is absolutely essential information for individuals to make the call as to whether this medical intervention is right for them or not. It should always be left up to the individual to decide if the benefits outweigh the risks. Even if masks were effective at significantly reducing transmission of a disease, the "greater good" argument cannot be used to mandate a medical intervention if it comes at the cost of an individual losing their health or their life in sacrifice to a perceived community benefit.

Even the so-called "mild" side effects of mask-wearing should be more deeply scrutinized. What exactly causes the metabolic changes responsible for anxiety, fatigue, headaches, and trouble concentrating and is the damage possibly permanent? What about the fact that

increased CO2 impairs children's ability to learn language and empathy, and masked faces around them harms their emotional development?

In *Jacobsen vs. Massachusetts*, a landmark case on government-mandated medicine, the US Supreme Court unequivocally ruled that there must be clear public health benefit to justify the imposition of a medical mandate. There is little, if any, public health justification in this case as evidence from “gold-standard” mask studies show that facial coverings offer negligible benefit to the wearer or those in their vicinity when it comes to reducing viral transmission among the general population. That evidence even suggests that incorrect or long-term use of masks may increase the risk of transmission, especially with cloth or “community” masks.

When comparing the potential benefit and potential harm of mask mandate policies, it is clear the balance is much more heavily weighted to the harmful side of the equation. Why aren't our officials focusing instead on measures to combat community viral spread that have proven efficacy and safety such as quarantining of the sick and supplying guidance on prevention and early treatment? Why do they seem obsessed with forcing a dangerous intervention on their populace? Whatever the reasons for our public and health officials continuing the false narrative that masks are the best way to protect yourself and others and are harmless ways to “do your part”, it is time for people to review the evidence and make medical decisions based on their own unique health profile and how much risk they are willing to take for what appears to be little or no benefit. At Health Freedom Defense Fund, we support your choice either way, and will continue to fight for your right to choose what is best for your own health.

We hold fast that government does not have the right to interfere in our health decisions, let alone cause suffering and permanent damage to us or our children because of a virus with a 99.7% survival rate. We recently filed our Memorandum of Points in our case against the City of Hailey, Idaho's mask mandate, outlining the multitude of reasons why forcing citizens to wear masks is illegal, unethical, physically, psychologically, developmentally, and socially harmful, and just plain unscientific. Follow our case by subscribing to our newsletter and support our important work by donating and becoming a member so we can continue to defend health freedom for all Americans.