

The Dakotas Against Decrees

[The Dakotas Against Decrees](#)

by [Joseph P. Farrell](#), [Giza Death Star](#)

February 5, 2021

W.G. spotted this article, and it might be considered more pushback from the states against federal overreach in the form of a flood of executive orders:

[Horowitz: North Dakota legislators introduce bill to block Biden's illegal executive edicts Op-ed](#)

As the article notes, there are bills working their way through the legislatures of North and South Dakota that would in effect be a form of state nullification:

Recently, Rep. Tom Kading and eight other Republicans in the North Dakota House [introduced](#) HB 1164, which would task the attorney general with reviewing the constitutionality of the president's executive orders. If any of his orders are deemed to be unlawful, this bill would prohibit any state or county agency or publicly funded organization from enforcing the edict.

The list of issues covered under the bill are:

- 1. Pandemics or other health emergencies.*
- 2. The regulation of natural resources, including coal and oil.*
- 3. The regulation of the agriculture industry.*
- 4. The use of land.*
- 5. The regulation of the financial sector as it relates to environmental, social, or governance standards.*
- 6. The regulation of the constitutional right to keep and*

bear arms.

Thus, an easy first candidate for such legislation is Biden's recent mask mandate, which unconstitutionally prohibits humans breathing without cloths on their mouths and noses inside any public transportation, including in-state ride-shares and taxis. The CDC created an entire criminal offense for something that never passed Congress.

There is a similar bill in South Dakota (and what piqued my interest here was that it is being offered by the representative for Harrisburg, a small town not far from my home town of Sioux Falls):

South Dakota already has a [similar bill](#) to HB 1164 targeting Biden's executive lawmaking. Rep. Aaron Aylward of Harrisburg, South Dakota, introduced [HB 1194](#), which would set up an executive board to review the constitutionality of executive orders pertaining to the six issues laid out in the North Dakota legislation.

What seems to be clear with various state resolutions and bills in the past few years, is that they are beginning to push back. We've seen Missouri pass state bills denying any state law enforcement being used to enforce any federal gun grab, South Carolina considering a bill to recognize any bullion coin as legal tender, Texas – well, where do we begin? – considering all sorts of measures and doing all sorts of things, like creating its own state bullion depository, attempting to woo NASDAQ's data center to Dallas, and even considering a referendum on secession. There are secession movements in California, Oregon, and Washington states, and on and on we could go. Iowa recently passed a bill funding *students* directly, and bypassing schools.

Where all this will end neither I nor anyone else knows. I *do* think that the trend will continue, and grow more acute;

it is a measure of how deeply the distrust in federal institutions goes, and it is a measure of just how deeply divided the country is. That divide, let me reiterate, is cultural, not just political.

That said, there's something suggested by this article that invites a little speculation, namely, that the two bills in the respective Dakotas appear to be *coordinated*, and that means there been a bit of talk back and forth between Bismarck and Pierre (the state capitals of North and South Dakota, respectively). Perhaps there have even been meetings over lunch or breakfast between respective legislators in the two states.

If my guess about coordination is correct, then it won't be long until one sees other American midwestern, plains, and southern states coordinating too.

Or to put it country simple, the fallout continues...

See you on the flip side...