

**STATEMENT OF RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION
FROM ALL DRUGS KNOWN AS A COVID-19 VACCINE**

Statement Of Faith

I firmly and resolutely with mind, heart and body believe and affirm all *de fide* teachings of the Roman Catholic Faith given to me through Scripture and Tradition and expounded upon by the Church Fathers, Doctors, councils, and *ex cathedra* pronouncements by the Pope on all matters of faith and morals. Those points on faith and morals that are not *de fide* but considered opinions, theological conclusions or political or theological musings, no matter how sound they may be or from whatever source they may come, I reserve to myself under the Church's teaching on having an informed conscience.

Statement Regarding the Drugs Known as COVID-19 Vaccine:

It is my firm and deeply held religious belief base on the official Teachings of the Roman Catholic Church and my fully informed moral conscience that taking any of the drugs known as a vaccine for the COVID-19 virus is morally and unquestionably contrary to my faith and the will of God. I therefore cannot take them, and I do not give any consent to any person, doctor (any medical personnel), business, institution, or government to administer the drug to me in any manner.

This statement further applies to all my family under my authority and guardianship as husband and Father (Mother) as granted to me by God to fulfill my religious, moral, and civil duties as head of house.

Any act toward me or those under my care that violates this statement will be treated as religious discrimination and charges will be filed.

Attached is my statement of facts, evidence, proofs, and explanations. They show my real, reasonable and prudent belief that I am exempt from all drugs known as a COVID-19 vaccine on religious, moral, medical, and philosophical grounds.

_____ date _____

Supporting Statements of facts, evidence, proofs, and explanations for Religious Exemption to taking all drugs known as a COVID-19 vaccine.

Medical Facts That Need to be Taken Into Account:

The following medical facts guide the reasoning and points that follow:

- The drugs are not approved and as such are experimental.
- Even approved drugs may not be imposed on people.
- The drugs have already had harmful effects on many people.
- There are other safer cures believed to be real and effective. This negates the need for a drug that is experimental and dangerous.
- There are dangerous substances in the drug that could cause harm and even death.
- Some of the drugs were produced using unproven techniques that may have serious life threatening or quality of life issues well into the future.
- Some of the drugs were researched, developed, or produced using the tissue from babies obtained brutally and mercilessly as they were butchered alive. It is well known that the tissue had to be taken from a living fetus. Therefore this tissue was obtained from a live birth (living child) and not from an already murdered (aborted, dead) fetus.
- If a person has already had the virus, then they do not need the vaccine, our body already has the antibodies it needs as designed by God.
- The death rate of the virus is minimal, well under 1%.
- Those who take the so called COVID-19 vaccine are already safe from those who have not.
- Each person is morally responsible to take care of their own health in a way that is congruent to their own religious, moral, medical, and philosophical beliefs.

Supporting Teaching from the Catholic Church:

The Catholic Church teaches:

- We must protect and care for our life, soul, and body
- We may not do unnecessary harm to the body or endanger ourselves (life or limb) unnecessarily.
- Death is not the end. There is life after death. Death is not evil but should be looked forward to by the faithful but not unduly or artificially hastened as life must be lived fruitfully to its natural conclusion.
- We must follow our informed conscience.
- Murder, torture, barbarism, abortion... are all intrinsically evil and may not be practiced or participated in under the pains of Hell.
- Human nature is fallen and so we are subject to concupiscence. This means that we are apt to sin and to cause harm to our neighbor in preference for our own needs, wants and desires, especially for money, power, and sex.
- Other teachings also apply, too numerous to list here.

Supporting Statements from the Constitution of the United States of America and Other Legal Precedents:

Constitution: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Constitution: Right to free Speech

Legal: Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act requires employers to reasonably accommodate an employee's sincerely held religious belief, practice or observance if that accommodation can be made without "undue hardship" on the employer's business. ("Undue hardship" is generally referring to financial hardship.)

Legal: Doctors may not perform medical procedures, including the giving of vaccines, to a person without their expressed permission. Implicit permission is allowed only in cases of emergencies where the person is not lucid, and no proxy can be found. Even here, they may not do unnecessary procedures or administer medications that are not an emergency. Vaccines are not an emergency.

Legal: Nuremberg trials – You may not do experimental practices on a person without their express permission.

Slogan: My body, my choice. While not a law unto itself, it has been a standing principle for making legal decisions. This slogan is used by pro murder (abortion) groups and while they misused the slogan, it still has legitimacy, and it needs to be applied here.

Other Substantial Theories with Religious Overtones

Because our human nature is fallen, we are subject to sin, especially those of greed and power. In this case, because the pandemic is fake (not a real crisis), we cannot morally embolden or justify the role of government, businesses, researchers, or individuals (Like Bill Gates and George Soros) by taking their drugs. There are too many problems with the production of the drug itself and the motives of the above-mentioned groups. If they are allowed to do this, there will be never ending attempts to cause unnecessary fear in order to control, subject, manipulate, and steal from the people. It is my Constitutional right to free speech to protest against my government and to boycott that which I morally, intellectually, or politically disagree with. My God would not have me put others in unnecessary harm's way. I am not only called to protect my own liberty, but that of others as well.

Refutation of Counter Points Surly to Be Made:

Pope Francis, bishops, priests, and theologians are saying that one may morally take the vaccines without violating the faith.

Rebuttal 1: The role of the Clergy is to impart the official teachings of the Faith to the faithful. It is not their role to take political stances as clergy or to impose their personal feelings, opinions, or fears on the faithful. As such, no member of the hierarchy has the right to impose personal, political, or medical opinion on the members of the faithful as it pertains to taking the drugs for COVID-19.

Rebuttal 2: The Clergy are not doctors and so may not force their medical opinions on the faithful any more than a doctor can. This would be as illegal as practicing medicine without a license. Even if a particular member of the clergy is a doctor, they are still not MY doctor.

Rebuttal 3: Theologians do not determine what is of faith and morals. It is their role to give an opinion based on their best sound and reasonable judgment based on the Faith. As in Rebuttal 1, they may not impose their opinion on the faithful. It is also true that members of the clergy and theologians disagree on the morality of the issue. They are not able to agree among themselves and so there is no set and binding teaching from the church on this issue. It is therefore up to the individual to look at the facts and with God in their own spiritual life to determine what God is asking of them (known as having an informed conscience.)

Rebuttal 4: It is the role of each individual (or their parent or guardian) to determine, based on Faith, prayer and guidance by the Church in the understanding of the Faith, what they are going to do. This falls under the teachings that we must follow our informed conscience, even if it disagrees with the majority opinion of theologians.

Jesus teaches that we are to love our neighbor. From this, the Church is currently teaching that taking the drug is an act of loving our neighbor. You therefore have a moral duty.

Rebuttal 5: Jesus says to “Love our neighbor as our self.” We are not called to love neighbor to the exclusion of self-love. Rather, our love of self should guide how we love and treat others. “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” I would not have someone take this drug for me and so I am not obliged to take it for them.

There are people who cannot take the so called COVID-19 vaccine and so if you can, it is your duty to protect them.

Rebuttal 6: It is not my duty to sin in order to help someone. It is not my duty to condemn my soul to hell fire so that some can live. This thinking violates the whole understanding of salvation. We are never called to put our salvation at risk. We note that we are at times to put our physical life at risk to help others (police, fire, military, self-defense of another, especially family), but never is our salvation to be put at risk.

You said earlier that God would not want you to put others in unnecessary harm’s way. By not taking the drug, are you not putting people in harm’s way if you happen to be a carrier.

Rebuttal 7: As mentioned in Rebuttal 6, I cannot morally help someone in an immoral way. Further, I am not the virus. I would not be putting anyone in harm's way; the virus is; nature is. I am not responsible for what nature does. I am not responsible for natural selection (some are more vulnerable to the virus than others). I am responsible for me, not you. I cannot and will not do something immoral to help others. You are responsible for you. If you feel you can take the drug, then take it. That is between you and your God. You will then be safe. Or you may choose to wear a mask if you feel that will help. Or you can socially distance. You have options too. I am not called by God to bear your burdens that are your responsibility. Each of us must care for our OWN health.

Rebuttal 8: We do exercise certain practical social courtesies for each other so as to not UNNECESSARILY spread diseases of any kind. This is part of the "do unto others as you would have them do unto you." I would not want to get you sick if I KNOW I am sick.

- If we have to sneeze, we cover our mouth.
- When we go to the bathroom, we wash our hands.
- If we have hand foot and mouth disease, we refrain from shaking hands.
- If we have something contagious, we stay home.

The key point is that I KNOW I am sick, you KNOW if you are sick. We do not live our life in a constant state of hypersensitivity. This would be akin to the psychological problem of being a hypochondriac. We each live our life. We each move about freely. We each take our own risks. But out of love for neighbor I can (you will) temporarily do that which is moral, just, and practical to momentarily (short period of time) suspend our liberties to be kind and considerate to others and not get them sick. But that is still a personal choice. People go to work with colds all the time.

Rebuttal 9: Sometimes getting sick is the best option. Parents for decades, when a child in the area would get chicken pox, would gather all the children together to play and all get it. This way, they all get it at once and it is done. Also, herd immunity is developed. Again, natural selection. Some are more susceptible to different strains of viruses than others. We just do not know until we know. Until then, I will not place unnecessary burdens on people or on myself.

The bishops say that the abortion happened so long ago that we had no participation in it. The language they use is that it is too remote for us to have had any material participation in the murder of the child and so it may be used under certain circumstances. These circumstances include:

- We are remote enough from the actual murder.
- There is a crisis.
- There is no other recourse (treatment) at this time to avert the crisis and save lives.

Rebuttal 10: While there has been a significant time (temporal) between the actual murder and the reception of the drug, we are not speaking of remote in terms of time, but in participation (act). It is the same flesh of the same baby that was murdered. That same flesh has been kept living (viable) and growing to this day. They use this flesh to do research, development, and production to make the drug. We then receive the results of it. We directly receive the drug that was made possible by murder. That is a direct benefited and so immoral.

Rebuttal 11: If we accept that we can take the immoral drug under these circumstances, we empower and embolden certain groups, organizations, governments to do more of the same practices as we would be giving them their first premise for murder through abortion. It is saying that it is acceptable, even if not morally acceptable according to the faith, to murder so long as we can benefit from it. This is religiously repugnant and violates the sanctity of life.

Rebuttal 12: It can be shown that there is no real crisis. The death rate has been less than 1% of those who contract the virus. While those who were sick and the family and friends of those who died may consider it a crisis, it is simply a personal crisis and not a large scale, international, social, end-of-the-world crisis. People die every day. For those people and their families and friends, they too see those events as a crisis also. Again, even if there were a crisis, we still uphold rebuttals 10 and 11.

Rebuttal 13: There is substantial evidence that there are alternative cures for COVID-19 that are safe, effective, and lower in cost. The government and other forces have made it difficult for the research that has been done to be published and used. They have also made it difficult for further research to be done on these alternative remedies. The fact remains that they have been shown to work and so there are other recourses than the so called COVID-19 vaccines.

Rebuttal 14: It is up to each individual to determine which solution they will use for their own health. Health is a personal issue between them, their God, their family, and their doctor. A person is not obliged to use extraordinary means to save their life. An experimental drug is extraordinary. One is also not always obliged to use ordinary means to save their life at all times especially if those means are immoral, may cause further problems or will simply delay the inevitable leading to further problems or poor quality of life.

Businesses have the right to protect their employees and customers.

Rebuttal 15: It is the right and duty of an employer to provide a safe working environment. This first and foremost means that they are to ensure that the physical plant is safe and that all practical measures are taken that all machinery is safe and that all work practices are safe. As to the employee's personal health, they are only allowed to give advice as to what they think is safe. Remember that the employer is not the

employee's personal physician and those decisions must remain between an individual and their personal physician.

Rebuttal 16: As mentioned above, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act requires employers to reasonably accommodate an employee's sincerely held religious belief, practice or observance if that accommodation can be made without "undue hardship" on the employer's business. My not being vaccinated is not a hardship on the employer's business. The business might say that by not getting the vaccine, one runs the risk of getting sick and taking time off from work. With this thinking, the business would be able to control every aspect of a person's life, at work and away; no stairs, you might trip and break a leg; no exercising, you might strain yourself or hurt yourself, no eating med-rare meat, you might get sick; no drinking, you might get a hangover and not be able to work in the morning; no smoking, you might get lung cancer and not be able to work; no, no, no... The over reach would be endless. Title VII is correct in that it is not the role of business to use their power to employ as a means to dictate religious, moral, medical, philosophical or political agenda on people who are simply trying to make a living and contribute to society in a meaningful and fruitful manor.

Rebuttal 17: Customers, like employees know the risks of life. We all know that there are people walking around every day with contagious diseases of all kinds. If we feel unsafe, we are able to take those measures necessary to protect ourselves (masks, social distancing, vaccines and others). We do not however have the right to make our personal concerns the burden of others.