

Tired of governors having unchecked power during COVID? The Foundation for Moral Law is doing something about it!



Foundation for Moral Law

Mr. John R. Venrick
20561 Wild Horse Ranch Rd, Ranch 10
Rollins MT 59931-9800



October 13, 2020

Dear Mr. John R. Venrick,

In almost every state, Governors have been issuing executive orders dictating how the people must respond to COVID-19.

This process involves no input from the People or their representatives. It also has little regard for constitutional and individual rights.

When COVID-19 hit the United States in March, we were told that we would be taking some precautions to ensure that the virus did not overwhelm our hospitals. The program was titled, “14 days to flatten the curve.”

But today, we are far past the 14 day mark, *and yet the restrictions remain.*

While the Foundation recognizes that COVID-19 is a real virus that can be deadly for some people, it also recognizes that tyranny is a virus that can be just as deadly for a constitutional republic.

That is why today I am announcing that **the Foundation for Moral Law has filed a lawsuit challenging the executive orders that the Governor of Alabama has issued**, which we believe improperly usurps the power of the legislature and trespasses on constitutionally protected rights.

In this letter, I will discuss our case, tell you why it is important, and tell you what you can do to help us protect constitutional rights as the government figures out how to deal with COVID.

1. The Background

In Alabama, the Governor and State Health Officer have been issuing orders telling Alabamians how to deal with COVID-19. Despite the fact that this alleged “emergency” has been ongoing for nearly seven months, *the Governor has not called the legislature back for a special session to deal with the crisis*. Instead, she and the State Health Officer have resorted to issuing orders without checks or balances that purport to bind every person in this State.

Such a situation is not unique to Alabama. Almost every state in this Country has taken similar measures, mandating some form of social distancing or stay-at-home orders of some kind during the outbreak; and many now require people to wear masks. Again, the trend in these cases has been to issue these orders without any input from the people’s representatives.

As a result, healthy people have been quarantined, small business owners have suffered severe economic loss, and the people’s constitutional rights have been infringed—*perhaps none more so than religious freedom*.

After nearly seven months, seven people from Alabama decided *they had had enough!* They asked us to represent them, **and we agreed**.

2. Our Plaintiffs

We have the honor of representing seven people from different backgrounds whose stories illustrate just how destructive these COVID orders could be.

Our lead Plaintiff is a woman who loves God and her country. She has considerable difficulty breathing while wearing a mask. While Alabama’s current order exempts people who have medical difficulties from wearing masks, she has been turned away from many places of business for not wearing a mask. What’s worse, her church shut down during the pandemic **due to the State’s COVID orders**.

We are also representing a public school bus driver. The temperature can reach up to 110 degrees inside the bus on a hot day. Wearing a mask under these



conditions is dangerous, increasing the risk of fogging up the driver's glasses and increasing the chances that she could pass out. The children are being forced to wear masks as well. If one of the children becomes sick, a lack of oxygen could endanger their health. *The mask mandate on buses therefore endangers the lives of the bus driver and the children.*

Two pastors also joined our suit. Because of the state's COVID orders, these pastors were denied their right to assemble their churches and worship together. Even now, it is not clear whether they are exempt from the state's mask mandate or not when they hold church services. **This leaves them guessing as to whether they will suffer retribution for worshiping in accordance with the dictates of their consciences.**

Finally, we are representing three small business owners as well. One is a chiropractor, who helps people with chronic pain. Our other small business owners own a barber shop. These three men have suffered significant economic loss, as well as loss of property rights, because of the COVID orders.

These are *ordinary Americans like you* who have suffered because of the government's COVID orders. When the government ordered small businesses to shut down, many people wondered how they were going to ***feed their families, pay their bills, and keep a roof over their heads.*** Many people like our bus driver are facing new safety risks that the government did not take into account when it ordered these things. Like our lead plaintiff, many people who are exempt from wearing masks for medical reasons are wondering how they will get the goods they need when store owners ***won't even let them enter*** because they are afraid the government will punish them if they do. And like our pastors, every God-fearing American is wondering when churches will have ***the freedom to decide for themselves*** how to deal with COVID.

We can fight for the rights of these people, and in doing so, we can defend the rights of those like them. But as a nonprofit, we can only do this with your help! **In order to support our work, will you please send us a tax-deductible donation of \$35, \$50, \$100, or even \$500 today?**

3. The risk to republican government

We acknowledge that COVID-19 is real and can be deadly. However, we also have to acknowledge that the harms that our plaintiffs have suffered are real as

well. Thus, in order to combat COVID-19 properly, we need to do so in a way that protects civil liberties, respects the rule of law, and minimizes economic hardship.

Unfortunately, the current approach to fighting COVID-19 has failed to do that.

Our Declaration of Independence says that in order to secure our unalienable rights given by our Creator, “Governments are instituted among Men, **deriving their just power from the consent of the governed.**”

To the extent that the government has authority to tell people how to deal with COVID, it can only be done with the consent of the governed. *That means that the people’s representatives need to convene, discuss the different ways to combat the virus, consider the costs, and then pass laws.*

But since that isn’t happening, people like our plaintiffs don’t have anyone in the discussions who can represent their needs! If the legislature was called into a special session, our plaintiffs could have their representatives participate in the debate. But since the legislature is not in session, our plaintiffs have no meaningful voice with the Governor.

A person who has the authority to both make the law and enforce it without meaningful input from the people is not called a governor, but a **dictator**.

Our government is built on the premise that man is naturally sinful, and therefore power should not be consolidated into the hands of one person. But governors across the country are not only deciding how to enforce the law but also what the law shall be, which is exactly what our system is designed to avoid!

If we want our states to continue to be republics instead of dictatorships, *then we must fight back!*

4. The risk to civil liberties

The government’s handling of COVID-19 jeopardizes not only our form of government, but also our civil liberties.

The Declaration of Independence says yet again, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, *that they are endowed by their Creator*



with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”

Our entire society is built on the premise that God gave man certain rights that could never be taken away, even by a majority vote. That’s what “unalienable” means. Many of these unalienable rights are protected by the Constitution. By listing some of these unalienable rights in the Constitution, the framers wanted to ensure that it was extra clear that certain rights were off limits.

The foremost of these unalienable rights is religious liberty. We have the duty to worship God, and what is a duty towards God is a right against man. This includes the right to *assemble for church*, the right to *sing to the Lord*, the right to *preach the Word*, the right to *fellowship with one another*, the right to administer *baptism, communion, and the laying on of hands*. **All of these rights have been jeopardized by unprecedented government orders during this pandemic.**

At some point, someone has to ask whether the government can rightfully do this. Our position is that no, it cannot. These rights are unalienable in nature and enshrined in the Free Exercise Clause of the Constitution of the United States.

Because the Constitution is the supreme law of the land, nobody, including the governor, can issue an order that is contrary to the Constitution. Consequently, it is our honor to argue that the governor’s orders are null and void as applied to our plaintiffs who *simply want to assemble for church*.

The importance of protecting our constitutional rights cannot be overstated. George Washington, the Father of our Country, warned us in his Farewell Address:

If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. **But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.** The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit, which the use can at any time yield.

In other words, if you violate the Constitution—even if it seems that you really need to do so—then you’ve set a precedent that the Constitution means

nothing at all and can be violated whenever the government deems there to be some necessity.

This is not how the rule of law is supposed to work. Indeed, we cannot have the rule of law or the preservation of unalienable rights if we set a precedent saying the government can violate the Constitution if it feels a necessity to do so.

This is why we are fighting back. Religious liberty matters. Constitutional rights matter. Representative government matters. ***Freedom matters!*** We are willing to stand and fight for these principles, but we can only do so with your help! **Will you please support our work today with a tax-deductible donation of \$35, \$50, \$100, or even \$500?**

Thank you for your support! With God's help, we can not only defend the rights of our plaintiffs, but also send a message to the government that it cannot trample on the rights of the people!

Sincerely,



Kayla Moore, President

P.S.: The ancient republic of Rome eventually gave up its power to one man, who could make whatever decisions he deemed necessary. His name was Caesar, and he never gave it back. If our republic is to survive, then we cannot allow America to suffer the same fate. We will fight to preserve it! Will you join us?

Vaccine (NOT a vaccine)

Was it this one:

Statement by Dr. David Martin on Jan 5th 2021

"Let's make sure we are clear... This is not a vaccine. They are using the term "vaccine" to sneak this thing under public health exemptions. This is not a vaccine."

"This is mRNA packaged in a fat envelope that is delivered to a cell. It is a medical device designed to stimulate the human cell into becoming a pathogen creator. It is not a vaccine. Vaccines actually are a legally defined term under public health law; they are a legally defined term under CDC and FDA standards [1]. And the vaccine specifically has to stimulate both the immunity within the person receiving it and it also has to disrupt transmission.

And that is not what this is. They (Moderna and Pfizer) have been abundantly clear in saying that the mRNA strand that is going into the cell is not to stop the transmission, it is a treatment. But if it was discussed as a treatment, it would not get the sympathetic ear of public health authorities because then people would say, "What other treatments are there?"

The use of the term vaccine is unconscionable for both the legal definition and also it is actually the sucker punch to open and free discourse... Moderna was started as a chemotherapy company for cancer, not a vaccine manufacturer for S.A.R.S.CO.V.2. If we said we are going to give people prophylactic chemotherapy for the cancer they don't yet have, we'd be laughed out of the room because it's a stupid idea. That's exactly what this is. This is a mechanical device in the form of a very small package of technology that is being inserted into the human system to activate the cell to become a pathogen manufacturing site.

And I refuse to stipulate in any conversations that this is in fact a vaccine issue. The only reason why the term is being used is to abuse the 1905 Jacobson case that has been misrepresented since it was written. And if we were honest with this, we would actually call it what it is: it is a chemical pathogen device that is actually meant to unleash a chemical pathogen production action within a cell. It is a medical device, not a drug because it meets the CDRH definition of a device. It is not a living system, it is not a biologic system, it is a physical technology - it happens to just come in the size of a molecular package.

So, we need to be really clear on making sure we don't fall for their game. Because their game is if we talk about it as a vaccine then we are going to get into a vaccine conversation but this is not, by their own admission, a vaccine. As a result it must be clear to everyone listening that we will not fall for this failed definition just like we will not fall for their industrial chemical definition of health. Both of them are functionally flawed and are an implicit violation of the legal construct that is being exploited. I get frustrated when I hear activists and lawyers say, "we are going to fight the vaccine". If you stipulate it's a vaccine you've already lost the battle. It's not a vaccine. It is made to make you sick.

Page 7/7