## 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 RELIGION
Austin,Texas USA
[Establishment-of-Religion.world](http://Establishment-of-Religion.org/)

COMES NOW [FULL NAME] under oath and states that the following information is true and correct within[HIS/HER]personal knowledge and belief. 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 clear and convincing evidence of a "reasonable person" standard to justify the infringing of my religious belief through involuntary medical mandates. Such rebuttable evidence must be submitted through the recognized means of discovery as an essential part of my right to fully informed consent to such mandates, both as a due process assertion and an expression of my religious duty, as detailed below.

The principles of Establishment of Religion are expressed in the [**Three Tests,**](https://app.site123.com/the-nine-principles-1) 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. The First Amendment's Free Exercise Clause, the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related federal and state religious rights legislation protects individuals from government interference in the practice of their faith, prohibiting government from targeting laws at specific religious practices or creating an unlawful disparity of impact based on religious practice.

NON-COERCION
Non-coercion is the principle tenet of Establishment of Religion. Non-coercion reflects the practice of harmlessness in all reciprocal relationships. It is a universal constant within the
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teachings, is 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 express it in simple terms, it is a requirement to be truthful in our dealings with others and to demand truthfulness from others with us, so that a trusting and honest relationship is maintained. To withhold relevant information is dishonest, makes fully informed consent impossible, and is considered to be coercive/harmful in nature within the teachings of Establishment of Religion. Disallowing a believer the opportunity to inquire, and if necessary to challenge, directives makes informed and honest consent impossible. Such denial affecting fundamental rights of bodily integrity is a clear violation of the principles of Establishment of Religion and imposes substantive harm on the practitioner who wishes to observe the duties of his or her religion.

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION
Voluntary association is the freely made choice of an individual natural person to be in relationship to a person, organization, institution, ideal, activity or action. Forcing association against the freely given consent of another is coercive and strictly forbidden by Establishment of Religion. While in its most egregious form, that of human slavery, we see the ultimate perversion of the principle of voluntary association, the assumption a believer must accept without question any association imposed by coercion is strictly rejected. Avenues of productive accommodation may be explored and mutually agreeable solutions always are to be a preferred outcome.

AFFIANT'S CONCLUSIONS

1. The vaccine mandate is an impermissible infringing upon my religious principles from a multiplicity of coercive effects, inadequate and incomplete disclosures and the attempt to force my association with beliefs and practices prohibited to me by Establishment of Religion and odious to my sincerely held religious beliefs.
2. The reliance on guidelines promulgated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and other health authorities following their determinations places the CDC in the role of a de facto "expert witness."
3. As such, their conclusions may be examined as to qualifications, methods, inferences, tests, means, motivation, conflicts of interest, material misrepresentations and inconsistent declarations of either negligent or fraudulent origin as part of my due process right to impeach the credibility of such testimony and offer alternative credible evidence for consideration.
4. While the mandates have been represented as being consistent with requirements of Executive Order (EO) agency directives, in fact the process is incomplete as to one or

 more preconditions necessary for implementation which would make the EO lawful to apply. 2/4

1. Further, the OSHA requirements as published are currently suspended by injunctive relief imposed by a federal court of competent jurisdiction and may not be relied on as to a regulatory directive.
2. 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 utilize a faulty analysis of the inferiority of natural immunity over the limited protection afforded by the mandated mRNA inoculations.
3. The vaccination mandate Is a violation of settled law as 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 persons and non-vaccinated persons due to religious objection 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.
4. The COMIRNATY vaccine's Summary Basis for Regulatory Action paper with its extensive list of redactions does not provide sufficient data for those seeking full disclosure before making a choice as to accepting the immunization.
5. The FDA is currently seeking court approval to provide full public disclosure of all Pfizer Covid injectable documents over a period of 55 years. It took the FDA 108 days to receive the same documents, research, confer and confirm the purported safety of this drug that has been dispensed to untold millions to date.
6. The EUA formulated PFIZER-BIONTECH COVID-19 VACCINE currently in use is legally distinct from the COMIRNATY vaccine 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.

There is no restriction within the teachings of Establishment of Religion 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 enumerated in the Bill of Rights, the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related federal and state legislation, takes primacy over other collective rights that have not been clearly and convincingly shown as urgent and necessary to an essential public good, realizable only through the curtailing of specific practices of my religion. A narrowly tailored reasonable accommodation to my sincerely held beliefs may 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 and do not entail disparity of impact upon me because of my religious beliefs.
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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 ]       [OR NOTARY]      [SEAL]     [DATE]

[SIGNATURE]     [

[DATE]

[WITNESS #2 ]

[SIGNATURE]

[DATE]
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