

Exemption Topics

- God Given right to choose, and freedom to choose my medical practices. No one, not even a doctor, court, government, or business has a right to force a medical procedure on an individual. My body, my choice. Even if none of the following applied, it would still be my choice. I need no further reason than I say no.
- My body is a gift from God and a temple, I may not cause it undo harm or mutualization by any means or by carelessness. There is significant evidence that there are unhealthy ingredients in not only this vaccine but in others. Therefore there are many vaccines I will not take as they would poison my body, my temple, causing other complications (future sickness and so loss of quality of life) or even death. The vaccines have not been put through a reasonable or even standard level of testing. Therefore even with FDA approval, they are not approved by me as safe for my body, my temple.
- God created my body to heal and fight diseases. Natural is always the better way to go, including natural immunity. Only when the body fails, do we use medications, surgery or other means to correct the bodies limitations or inabilities. If my body can fight the virus then there is no need to assist it or correct it with medications or vaccines.
- God made the body with the genes designed according to His will. We have no moral right to do gene therapy, correction or manipulation at the DNA or RNA level. This is God's domain alone. The mRNA vaccines are impermissible.
- Murder is always evil and a sin. You may not murder even to save a life. This is different from self-defense where one may kill an unjust aggressor to save life and health. Murder is about killing the innocent, not the guilty. As the vaccines have used murder as a means to bring them about (research, testing, development, manufacturing), I may not morally benefit from them. (see passive material cooperation is remote below for more info)
- Common Good. The idea of the common good is for the individual to freely choose out a sense of loving neighbor as thy self to do what is moral and right for the good of neighbor. The idea of the common good may never ask or demand one to do evil in order promote the good of neighbor. The idea of the common good may ask the individual to do a moral action that they do not want to do or prefer to do for the good of neighbor. But for it to remain for the common good, the individual must still remain free to choose, otherwise it is not for the common good as the common good may never take away that freedom that is basic to human dignity and individual liberty. (i.e. it is not in the best interest of the common good to violate liberty as then all would lose liberty.)
- Doctrine of Double Effect as it pertains to the pandemic (according to the Pope and certain bishops). It has been stated by individuals in the Church that it may be morally permissible to use the murder tainted vaccine in time of a pandemic if there is no other cure available. This violates the Doctrine of Double Effect. This doctrine states that you may do a GOOD that has two effects one good and the other evil IF:
 - The act itself is good, moral, legitimate, prudent and necessary.

- Note that the act itself must be good. The vaccine is tainted with murder and so it fails on the very first test.
 - The good effects must outweigh the evil effects.
 - Note that the goal is to save lives, but at what cost. Many could easily say that the cost (evil effects) is too high to justify that the good outweighs the bad. This is left to an individual judgment call.
 - You intend the good effects and want to avoid the evil effects if it were possible.
 - Assuming that no one wants to kill babies to save their life, there is no argument here.
 - The evil effects must not be the cause of the good effects.
 - Note that the vaccines were made possible by the murder of babies, so the evil is the cause of the good and so impermissible.
 - There must be no other way to achieve the desired good effects.
 - Note that there are other possible cures, so it is impermissible again.
- Passive material cooperation is remote –
 - The role of the Catholic Church as it pertains to medical decisions is only to provide moral guidance on what practices, procedure and medications may or may not be moral, useful, or for the common good. These may be grouped into those that are moral absolutes, moral certitude, questionable, and opinion. The Church, through the CDF (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) has taught that while the vaccine is evil as such due to its participation in murder (abortion) because of the remote passive material cooperation that a person may take the vaccine if there is grave danger. However, they do not define what grave danger means and so this is left to the moral conscience of the individual. The same document also states in no uncertain terms that there is no moral obligation to take the vaccine and therefore, must be voluntary. (Note that this declaration does not change the fact that the vaccine is evil. It only gives a single condition under which one might be able to take it without sin. It is still up to the individual to determine if that condition applies to them.)
 - This document (teaching of the Catholic Church) makes it clear that it is not making any declaration on the safety or efficacy of the vaccine. It is only answering the question as to whether a person may receive the vaccine based on the question of its origin based in murder. The answer is only in grave danger and if there is no other cure available. This teaching would be mute if it is determined that the vaccine is dangerous, not effective, or if other cures are found.
 - It is also true that the Church teaches that a person's informed conscience trumps this documents declaration. Meaning that if a person believes taking the vaccine is immoral and not according to God's will, then they are obliged to follow their conscience. They may make this determination on any number of factors: Scriptural, moral, medical, safety, political, social, and others that impinge on their sincere and firmly held religious convictions.
 - The document pays lip service to the fact that one may not directly will but must oppose the death of murder when taking the vaccine, thereby not giving any

endorsement, permission, credibility or legitimacy to the uses of murdered babies to make vaccines in the future or any other medication or any other uses. The problem is that the people who do this work do not care. By taking the vaccine, we are directly endorsing and legitimizing their work in their minds. As long as we will take their evil and tainted drugs, they will make them. This makes us complicit in any future murders. If not the one, it is said, we are “remote” from.

- **Pandemic:** The word pandemic means a disease prevalent over the whole country or world. An epidemic means a disease prevalent in a community. We note that the words pandemic and epidemic do not mean a dangerous situation in and of themselves. The type of disease and its effects determine that. The word pandemic has been used as a scare tactic, “COVID-19 is spreading throughout the whole world, we are doomed!” If we are real about this for a moment, we recall that most diseases do spread over the whole world. The only thing new about COVID-19 is that it is new. Again, if we are real about this we will recall that there are new diseases all the time. “But COVID-19 is killing people!” Be real, many diseases do. The death rate is less than .5%. That does not qualify as a crisis. It certainly does not qualify as a crisis that would determine that we could murder babies to save lives or force people against their will to take an immoral vaccine.
- **Other Cures:** There is significant evidence that there are other cures available that are moral, safe, and inexpensive. So again, why would I take the path of murder to save my life, if I were to get sick, when I do not have too?
- **Obedience.** As medical decisions are the right of the individual, I own no obedience to the government or to any man to take a vaccine I disagree with.
 - The government has the right to protect the citizen from fraud and harmful practices in the business world, including the medical field. Hence the legitimacy of the FDA. But the government does not have the right to say that I will partake of any medical practices even if not harmful. What legitimate medical procedures or medications an individual uses is up to the individual under the guidance of their personal medical professional.
- **Time to say there is a global crisis of major proportion where we only have one choice, and that is to take the immoral vaccine or humanity is doomed?**
 - How bad does it have to get?
 - We are told in Sacred Scripture that Moses allowed for divorce (an evil) because of their obstinacy. If evil can be allowed because of perversion like obstinacy, surely it can be done for the good and noble cause of saving lives? The point is not that lives are being saved, but how are they being saved. Murder! Are we trying to compare murder with fornication? At least with fornication, there is the chance of new life. With this vaccine a life had to be murdered. Murder is a sin that cries out to heaven for vengeance. Fornication, evil though it is, has never been held to that level.
 - But is there a time? Yes, but only if it remains the choice of the individual. It is up to the individual to pray to God for guidance as to the importance of the situation and if they should take the vaccine or if they should choose the martyr's death.

This could be the end of world scenario and who am I to interfere with that. And if this is the case, do I want to sin and burn in hell to save my life if we are all going to die anyway.

- What percentage would justify this? There is no Church teaching that defines this. Only that there is some mystical number that would justify it. In the end, it would be up to the individual conscience to determine this. With this, no mandate can be imposed as it is up to individual conscience.
- Charity (this section is not fully developed, but you will get the gist). Is it a loving act to receive the vaccine to help your neighbor, especially the ones who cannot take it for medical or other legitimate reasons? No. And for several reasons:
 - It makes no sense to say that I must lose my soul to save your body.
 - Political – embolden governments to take more rights and liberties away from us. And never for our good, but theirs. Is this conspiracy theory or evidenced by history? To embolden the government would be contrary to the common good.
 - Employment – the same as for political. There would be no end to the nightmare as to how far into our private lives they could reach.
 - Social – see common good.
- Death – It is inevitable, as is the end of the world. Our goal is to live it well and to die in the state of sanctifying grace. To preserve life at the cost of salvation is in no one's best interest, so not for the common good. The question here is what does it mean to "live it well?" Certainly it is not about the duration of life, but the moral, faith filled quality of life. It is not about riches, fame, pleasure, possessions, power, property, or anything of the like. It is about, loving God and loving neighbor as self. It is about living the virtues and avoiding the vices and hurting people. It is about family and friendships. It is about contributing to society to the extent that we are able in our labors (services, manufacturing, art, governance...).