

AFFIDAVIT OF TRUTH REGARDING RELIGIOUS BELIEF AND PRACTICE

and Demand for Discovery for Any Requirement Infringing on the Free Exercise Thereof



The Body of Believers of
ESTABLISHMENT OF RELIGIONSM
Austin, Texas USA
Establishment-of-Religion.world

To Whom It May Concern;

I, *[FULL NAME]*, whose residence is *[ADDRESS, INCLUDING CITY, COUNTY, STATE AND ZIP CODE]*, swear to the following facts under penalty of perjury.

I hereby assert my constitutionally protected right of association with Establishment of Religion; my sincerely held belief in its teachings and practice, moral compass and efficacy; and further, to assert a notice of requirement to any natural or artificial person to submit facts in evidence lawfully justifying infringing the free expression of my sincerely held religious belief through involuntary medical mandates. Such evidence must be submitted through a recognized process of discovery, as an essential part of my due process rights to fully informed consent to such mandates as both a lawful assertion and a religious expression, as detailed below.

Such principles are enshrined in the [Three Tests](#), as offered by Charles King Jr. They are:

1. ***Non-coercion;**
2. ***Fully informed and meaningful consent;**
3. ***The right of voluntary association.**

Together, they form the core of Establishment of Religion teachings, and the reason for its emergence at this critical time in human history. The First Amendment's Free Exercise Clause, the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, and subsequent federal and state religion rights legislation protects individuals from government interference in the practice of their faith, prohibiting government from targeting laws at specific religious practices or placing undue burdens on worship.

ARTICLE THE FIRST

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

***NON-COERCION**

Non-coercion is the principle tenet of Establishment of Religion. Non-coercion is a universal constant within the teachings, is age-old and universally familiar to almost all religious traditions, and is a duty demanded of all those who claim a sincere belief in these teachings.

It is inclusive of both our duty to others as well as their duty to us, and forbids participation in any behavior or action that arises from either party within a coercive exchange, that being an exchange in which one party is disadvantaged by disproportionate influence upon the other.

***CONSENT**

Fully informed and meaningful consent provides the rationale for access to all data substantive in its impact on our, or another person's, decision making. To withhold relevant information makes fully informed consent impossible, and is considered to be coercive in nature within the teachings of Establishment of Religion. Disallowing a Believer the opportunity to inquire, and if necessary to challenge, directives which affect fundamental rights of bodily integrity is a clear violation of the principles of Establishment of Religion, and the rights of those who follow it.

***VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION**

Voluntary association is the freely made choice of an individual natural person to be in relationship to a person, organization, institution, activity or action. Forcing association against the freely given consent of another is coercive and strictly forbidden by Establishment of Religion. While avenues of productive accommodation may be explored and mutually agreeable actions may be arrived at, the assumption a Believer must accept without question any association imposed by coercion is strictly rejected.

OBJECTIONS, DETERMINATIONS AND THE RIGHT OF DISCOVERY

In the **Center for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Pledge to the American People**, the third item states, "Base all public health decisions on the highest quality scientific data that is derived openly and objectively." I assert my due process right to discovery in determining:

1. **Objection: The foremost consideration in applying any attempted mandate is to determine by what authority such power is granted.** In this case, the authority is ephemeral. The White House announced their intention to issue an Executive Order on Sept. 10, but as of October 20, 2021, no such EO has been entered in the Federal Register as required. Additionally, there is no apparent progress at the White House Office of Management and Budget nor evidence the Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) is preparing a standard to apply in workplace enforcement. **To date, we have nothing more than a press release which carries no force of law.**
2. **Objection: Should such details eventually be resolved and the EO cleared for implementation, would it then have the force of law? The answer is no. An EO is an administrative directive issue to Executive Branch agencies; it does not carry the authority of congressional legislation but merely implements the will of Congress.** Absent a congressional declaration of a "grave health concern" or health

emergency, the EO fails to supersede any of the State-issued prohibitions on mandates, numbering 12 states as of the second week of October, 2021.

3. Question: Does the justification for the present mandate rely exclusively on the force of this announced Executive Order, an order which is effectively non-existent as of this date?
4. Question: **Is enforcement in this instance of any mandated medical procedure, including vaccination, relying on the CDC's guidance or conclusions in whole or part** as to the appropriateness and necessity for the procedure? If so, to what extent was enforcement impacted by CDC guidance?
5. Question: If CDC guidance was not determinative in implementing the instanced mandate, **what expertise was relied on to invoke the necessity of the mandate** and how were their qualifications, methods, inferences, tests or results evaluated and by whom?
6. Objection: Affiant hereby objects to the reliance on any proffered medical authority until such time as **Affiant is afforded the right to examine the evidence for the determination of the necessity of the mandate and provide alternate evidence** from reliable and credible sources that do not support the CDC conclusions.
7. Objection: Affiant hereby objects to the vaccination mandate as a violation of "strict scrutiny" settled law set forth in *Sherbert v. Verner* and *Wisconsin v. Yoder* as it fails to show how the compelling government interest in controlling the spread of the SARS2-Covid virus and its variants is accomplished by a process that provides for unequal treatment of vaccinated and non-vaccinated when both may be infected, both may be contagious to others while asymptomatic, both may require hospital or advanced care, and both may succumb to the disease.
8. Objection: The COMIRNATY vaccine that has been approved by the FDA for use in the US has an extensive list of redactions made to the *Summary Basis for Regulatory Action* paper (*attached*) made available to the public. With such a broad withholding of product information from potential users, and no credible alternative sources to explain what the basis of the redactions are, this information does not provide sufficient data for those seeking full disclosure as their right before making a choice, as well as to adhere to the requirements of their beliefs.
9. Objection: Notwithstanding the information in 8. above, the FDA approved COMIRNATY branded formulation is not available in the US and will not be for some time, yet to be announced. The EUA formulated PFIZER-BIONTECH COVID-19 VACCINE currently in use is legally distinct in ways that are not made known to the public and is inadequate for the purpose of full disclosure. An EUA product is, by definition, experimental and cannot be involuntarily administered, nor coercive action used to administer it.
10. Objection: Further, to the extent such mandates ignore, minimize or show a disparity of treatment between those who have been vaccinated and those who have natural immunity, they provide a questionable at best and invalid at worst analysis of the superiority of natural immunity over the limited protection afforded by the mandated

mRNA inoculations. (See the attached list of 91 current studies which come to conclusions at odds with the prevailing CDC orthodoxy.)

11. Objection: The CDC has set for itself a standard in its Pledge to the American People. To the extent it; 1) does not provide an open and honest process of evaluation; 2) accepts inferior science or its politicized imitation and; 3) refuses an open public dialog regarding the science it claims to represent, **it is self-contradictory and betrays its own Pledge to the American People.**

There is no restriction within the teachings of Establishment of ReligionSM for any medical procedure that is lawful under civil authority and engaged in voluntarily. While others may have medical, philosophical or personal objections to vaccines or a particular medical practice, my right of exemption is not based on these reasons.

My individual right of freedom of conscience, as offered first in the enumerated guarantees of the Bill of Rights, takes primacy over all other collective rights that have not been clearly shown to be urgent and necessary as an essential public good. **A narrowly tailored reasonable accommodation to my sincerely held beliefs must be made, reasonable being those actions which treat similar risks of infection, transmission or other deleterious outcomes in vaccinated individuals in comparable ways to any proposed requirements for the unvaccinated.**

I will consider an alternative solution within the context of necessity so long as it meets the [Three Tests](#) of my faith. Further, it is my prayer that both those facing immoral coercion and those implementing policies of coercion find their moral conscience by trusting in, and practicing, the Three Tests. You are hereby noticed of my objection to the infringing on my religious beliefs and practice by the appearance of coercion in this instance, as well as other objections noted above.

By this Affidavit offered herein under penalty of perjury, I therefore respectfully decline to agree to the present directives.

Submitted by:

[FULL NAME] [SIGNATURE] [DATE] {WITNESS #1 } [SIGNATURE] [DATE]

WITNESS #2] [SIGNATURE] [DATE] [OR NOTARY] [SEAL] [DATE]