### **Would you please identify the specific religious tenet that prohibits the COVID-19 vaccination?**

My sincerely held personal religious beliefs exempt me from receiving any Covid-19 vaccinations and their variants. There are multiple reasons for which I take this religious stance, while each of these statements may not apply to every individual vaccine, these statements do comprehensively cover those that have been released and may be released in the future.

1. My beliefs are deeply rooted in God and his teachings revealed in Scripture: ***“Honor the Lord with your bodies.” (1 Cor. 6:20).*** The Bible encourages Christians to abstain from contaminating one’s body with substances that may be threatening to one’s bodily health. Based on the lack of sufficient research surrounding Covid-19 vaccines and the known harmful side effects many individuals have already experienced, including death, it may be harmful and dishonoring to my body to receive the vaccine.
2. I believe the use of any of the vaccinations that contain cell lines from an aborted fetus to be unclean. The Old Testament discusses unclean substances ***(Isaiah 64:6).*** Although the New Testament reveals Christ as the one who cleanses our souls, I have a responsibility to honor the Lord through my body.
3. The use of any vaccination developed or containing cell lines from an aborted fetus violates the sanctity of life. ***“Thou shalt not murder” (Exodus 20:13)***, Human life is sacred because from its beginning it involves the creative action of God and it remains for ever in a special relationship with the Creator, who is its sole end. God alone is the Lord of life from its beginning until its end: no one can under any circumstance claim for himself the right directly to destroy an innocent human being. The deliberate murder of an innocent person is gravely contrary to the dignity of the human being, to the golden rule, and to the holiness of the Creator. The law forbidding it is universally valid: it obliges each and everyone, always and everywhere. The fifth commandment forbids direct and intentional killing as gravely sinful. The murderer and those who cooperate voluntarily in murder commit a sin that cries out to heaven for vengeance.
4. There are concerns of dangerous metals and substances in the vaccine used as adjuvants to increase immune responses, at times these can cause persistent excessive immune responses, and ***“as our bodies are the temple of the Holy Spirit” (1 Cor. 6:19, 1 Cor. 3:16-17)***, we should not do anything that would purposely harm our bodies.
5. There is evidence that the vaccine may have negative consequences related to reproductive health and we believe it would be sinful to put our future children and ourselves at risk in that manner.
6. If at any point a vaccine passport is required to work, shop, sell goods or run a business it would be reminiscent of, and a precursor to the Mark of the Beast. **Rev. 13:16-17** ***“And the second beast required all people small and great, rich and poor, free and slave, to receive a mark on their right hand or on their forehead, so that no one could buy or sell unless he had the mark— the name of the beast or the number of its name.”*** and ***Rev 14:11 “And the smoke of their torment rises forever and ever. Day and night there is no rest for those who worship the beast and its image, or for anyone who receives the mark of its name.”*** The Bible clearly shows that anyone who carries the mark will be damned. As a Christian, I cannot be party to such schemes nor can I comply with what may be the attempt to ‘condition’ the general population to accept a future scheme under any guise. Note this attack on faith will be by **the government and their cronies.**

**What I believe:** The Bible says that God, desired a love relationship with each of us as individuals, so he had to give us the opportunity to rebel against him. For you cannot have a relationship without the option to *not* have a relationship. Sadly, we humans rebelled and continue daily to rebel against God. Now those who repent of their rebellion could restore their relationship with God. But to be just, God still has to punish that rebellion, for a judge who does not punish crime is a bad and unjust Judge. So, God had a dilemma, how does he punish us, yet restore us to Him, since the punishment is eternal separation from Him. So God’s solution was to take the punishment upon Himself. God so loved the world that He gave His only Son, God the Son, Jesus, who willingly accepted our punishment as the substitutionary atonement. Whoever believes in Him shall not perish but have eternal life with Him. So, if you want to spend eternity with God, repent of your sins and accept Jesus as your Lord and Savior, and you will be saved from eternal separation from God. The defense of the archeological, historical, scientific, philosophical, and rational truth of this, i.e. the truth of Christianity is called Apologetics (find out more at <www.NoBlindFaith.com>).

I believe that at many points in man’s history, governments have attempted to supersede and destroy Christianity and faith and as a follower of Christ, I must be watchful and resist such attempts.

### **Please identify the Christian sect or denomination that teaches that the COVID-19 vaccination is prohibited.**

Christ followers/Bible Believers, we don’t’ believe that just the COVID vaccinations are prohibited just certain types of vaccines.

1. **State whether the views expressed in your religious exemption request are part of a shared or comprehensive doctrine and how long the doctrine has existed.**

Since the Bible was written. It has been applied in various ways. The specific reasons are above (see question 1).

### **Do you regularly worship with others sharing your beliefs about the COVID-19 vaccine, if so, how often and where are services generally held?**

  My objection is a declaration of my God Given rights. My association with a church or group if you think it through, is logically not relevant as long as I genuinely hold these Biblically based spiritual values and they do not violate the rights of any other individual. My rights don’t come from the church, they don’t come from the state and they certainly don’t come from mankind. They only come from God and his Word, the Bible. Thus, the only authority I need to cite is the Bible. While a pastor may sign this and a church may support it, that is only a formality. This form would be just as valid without any signature or church behind it, the verses from the Bible and the logical reasoning are sufficient. To refute these reasons, you’d have to refute the Bible. The New Testament is almost 2000 years old and the Old Testament is about 4000 years old.

1. **Is the declaration supporting your religious exemption request from your pastor or religious leader?**

Same answer as above. They are my beliefs based on my reading of the Bible. A pastor named Neil Mammen has helped me understand these issues. He has offered his services at anytime for any government official or employer, you may contact him at neil@vac.org

1. **Did you purchase the letter or pay the person who provided the declaration supporting your religious exemption request?**

No.

1. **Please identify the specific religious tenet, practice or observation used to identify harmful substances and state how you applied this to the COVID-19 vaccine.**

See the answer to #1.

1. **Please identify the specific religious tenet, practice, or observance prohibiting receiving vaccines developed or tested using fetal cell lines.**

See the answer to #1.

1. **You wrote that “The Covid 19 vaccines include aborted fetal cell lines.” However, no COVID-19 vaccines contain aborted fetal cells, and aborted fetal cell lines are not used in the production of the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines. Please identify the specific religious tenet that prohibits COVID-19 vaccines that do not use fetal cell lines in their production.**

[Not sure what form this was, but we don’t say it includes fetal cells, we just say it was tested on aborted fetal lines as a part of their certification. Note if a vaccine did contain aborted fetal cells we’d also consider that to be sinful.]

1. **Fetal cell lines are used in the production of vaccines for rubella, varicella (chickenpox), hepatitis A, and rabies. As a DPH employee, you have been previously required to take or show proof of vaccination, e.g., for rubella upon hire (MMR vaccine) and possibly for influenza annually. If your religious tenet does not prohibit all vaccines, please identify the specific religious tenet that prohibits the COVID-19 vaccine but allows other vaccines you have taken (and in some cases provided proof of to DPH).**

Until this point, I was not aware of that. Thus moving forward, I reject these shots as well. Thank you for this information.

Also the EEOC guidance says: “although prior inconsistent conduct is relevant to the question of sincerity, an individual’s beliefs – or degree of adherence – may change over time, and therefore an employee’s newly adopted or inconsistently observed religious practice may nevertheless be sincerely held.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

1. **If your religion, belief system, or practice requires you to abstain from the COVID-19 vaccination, but not other types of vaccinations, please describe the specific tenet, practice, or observation that expressly conflicts with the COVID-19 vaccination. Please address that, as a DPH employee, you have been required to be vaccinated or provide proof of vaccination when hired (MMR vaccine) and possibly annually (influenza vaccine), for which you did not previously request religious exemption.**

Until this point, I was not aware of that. Thus moving forward, I reject these shots as well. Thank you for this information and I will request a religious exemption for any such shots in the future. Also the EEOC guidance says: “although prior inconsistent conduct is relevant to the question of sincerity, an individual’s beliefs – or degree of adherence – may change over time, and therefore an employee’s newly adopted or inconsistently observed religious practice may nevertheless be sincerely held.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. **Have you taken vaccines for any of the following diseases: rubella (measles), varicella (chickenpox), or hepatitis A? (see question 10)**

If these contain or were primarily tested on fetal cell then, moving forward, I reject these shots as well.

1. **Have you authorized your children to receive vaccines for rubella (measles), varicella (chickenpox), or hepatitis A? (see question 10)**

See the answer to the above question.

1. **If your answer to question #12 and/or #13 is “yes,” why is your position with respect to the COVID-19 vaccine different than for these other vaccines, all of which are also grown in cell lines derived from fetuses?**

See above answers. But you yourself said that COVID vaccines was not grown in Fetal cell lines. Are you changing your statement about COVID vaccines now?

1. **Many common medications were also developed using the same type of technology used in the development of Covid-19 vaccines, including Tylenol, Pepto Bismol, aspirin, Tums, Lipitor, Senokot, Motrin, ibuprofen, Maalox, Ex-Lax, Benadryl, Sudafed, albuterol, Preparation H, Claritin, Zoloft, Prilosec OTC, and azithromycin. Do your beliefs prohibit you from taking and will you in the future abstain from taking these and other similar medications? If not, what tenet or belief prohibits the use of the Covid-19 vaccine, but permits the use of these other medications?”**

This is actually patently false. Have you researched this yourself? Or did someone just tell you this and you repeated it without study?

There’s a big difference if some test was done at some point by some agency and they used fetal cells or if the very existence of the drug is based on the validation of it using fetal cells. For instance, Aspirin has been around since ancient Egypt and was first synthesized in 1899[[3]](#footnote-3). There were no fetal cells in use back then. Tylenol/Acetaminophen was created in the late 19th century as well[[4]](#footnote-4), again no fetal cell lines. Ivermectin was discovered in 1970[[5]](#footnote-5), Abortion wasn’t legal then and nobody even thought of using murdered babies for testing medicines. Ibuprofen[[6]](#footnote-6), 1969. Benadryl 1946[[7]](#footnote-7), Pepto Bismol, around 1910[[8]](#footnote-8). If you procure evidence that show that the very existence of the drug or the FDA approval of any drug was based on fetal cell testing, I will cease using those drugs in the future and look for alternatives.

1. **How consistently do you keep the tenets of their faith and demonstrate those in your daily life? Do you attend services, how do you gather with others to worship?**

It is important to note that case law and the EEOC states a sincere religious believer doesn’t forfeit his religious rights merely because he is not scrupulous in his observance,”[[9]](#footnote-9)

Secondly” Repeating the themes from above: It’s not relevant to keep the tenets of the faith, because Christianity is not a set of rules. It’s a love relationship with Christ who is God. But in line with that there are certain things that we try to do when you are in a relationship. And you are constantly working on that. It’s called Sanctification. It’s a cooperative working of the Holy Spirit with my own will. Since you asked, it’s important you understand what Christianity really is: The Bible says that God, desired a love relationship with each of us as individuals, so he had to give us the opportunity to rebel against him. For you cannot have a relationship without the option to not have a relationship. Sadly, we humans rebelled and continue daily to rebel against God. Now those who repent of their rebellion could restore their relationship with God. But to be just, God still has to punish that rebellion, for a judge who does not punish crime is a bad and unjust Judge. So, God had a dilemma, how does he punish us, yet restore us to Him, since the punishment is eternal separation from Him. So, God’s solution was to take the punishment upon Himself. God so loved the world that He gave His only Son, God the Son, Jesus, who willingly accepted our punishment as the substitutionary atonement. Whoever believes in Him shall not perish but have eternal life with Him. So, if you want to spend eternity with God, repent of your sins and accept Jesus as your Lord and Savior, and you will be saved from eternal separation from God. [[10]](#footnote-10)

1. **What makes this refusal to be vaccinated against COVID-19 such an important part of your religion or your religious beliefs?**

Because rights come from God. And once you start to violate the rights of individuals there is no stopping the downward slope. Our entire Constitution was written to protect our inalienable rights from God. So let me ask you this question in return, what makes you think that violating my inalienable rights is something I need to defend? Shouldn’t you who want to violate my rights explain what justification allows you to violate them. The Constitution does not make any exemptions for vaccines. You can only restrain or quarantine someone who has been proven to be a danger to society. You cannot judge them on their looks or their associations or their lack of any particular action. Thus an unvaccinated person cannot be treated differently than a vaccinated person, unless you can prove that they are a danger to society. The only way to prove this would be to prove that they are sick. And as of this writing the evidene is that the vaccinated are getting sick just like the unvaccinated, you will need to show me why you don’t test the vaccinated as well.

1. **How long have you held your current religious beliefs or been part of your current religious faith?**

To tell the truth it’s actually not relevant how long I’ve been a Christian, only that I am one now, and it’s not relevant how long I’ve had these convictions because even if I came to these conviction days before I walked in the door, the fact that I have these valid Biblical Convictions now are sufficient. I have been advised by those who are more mature in the faith.

1. **For those stating that they are seeking an exemption by quoting 1 Corinthians 6:19-20, what steps are you taking to ensure that other foreign substances are not introduced into the body.**

**ANS**: Please read 1 Cor 6:19-20

**19**Do you not know that your bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit, who is in you, whom you have received from God? You are not your own; **20**you were bought at a price. Therefore honor God with your bodies.

The objection I have has nothing to do with Foreign bodies, it has to do with putting anything into my body that may harm my body. I’m quite happy to put foreign things into my body that may help my body e.g. artificial hips, sutures, pacemakers as none of these are dishonoring to God.

**20. For those members with visible tattoos, how do you reconcile that act with your beliefs.**

I’m sure that you know your Bible, and know that this was an admonition to the Israelites going into Canaan. God was telling them not to copy the habits of the worshipers of Baal who also were known for killing babies by putting them alive on the outstretched arms of an Idol that was heated red hot.

Thus, not having tattoos was a Ceremonial Law to the Jews, not a Moral law. God was asking them not to merge and mingle with the locals so that the line of Judah would not be diluted. This was needed because it allowed the Prophesy of Jesuss birth to be fulfilled (the prophesy that Jesus would come from the Tribe of Judah – if the Tribe of Judah had mingled in with the local Canaanites, there would have been no way to check if the Jesus fulfilled that prophecy). So these Ceremonial laws were given to keep the Jewish people distinct until the birth of Christ.

But like the Ceremonial law known as Kosher, this law is not relevant to Christians today. Now, some may choose to observe it but we are not bound to it.

[If you want to find out more about the 4 kinds of laws and 4 types of groups that God gave the laws to, read this book: [www.J3IP.com](http://www.J3IP.com).]

**References and Notes – this is important to my case so please read this (though some key points maybe repeated):**

1. The Constitution does not give us rights because it cannot. It does not have the authority to do so. Then where do rights come from? Only a Being with authority over all mankind can insist that all mankind, rich and poor, black or white, all treat each other equally. So as the Declaration of Independence states, our rights come from the only authority that can exist over all mankind i.e., the Creator of all mankind. This is self-evident and does not require a Bible to arrive at this conclusion. If there is no Creator, no one has inalienable rights and the only right you’d get are the rights you got by force. In which case we’d have no justification for saying slavery was wrong when it existed, and the only reason the slaves got rights was because of some nice white folk. But this is patently offensive and self-evidentially false. **The truth is that the slaves always had rights, but they were being unjustly violated.** It wasn’t until society & the law recognized this violation that justice was achieved. Thus, rights can’t come from the masses, government, society or by force.
2. The Constitution and the Bill of Rights do not give us rights, they are actually a list of *negative* rights. That is, they restrict the government from infringing on our preexisting Inalienable Rights.[[11]](#footnote-11) See [www.J3IP.com](http://www.J3IP.com) for more information.
3. Rights are individually assigned. We do not get more rights or less rights by virtue of being part of a group of people. That means that I don’t gain any rights by being a part of a church. Nor do I lose rights by *not* being part of one. If a billion people believe one way but I don’t, I still have all my God-Given rights. I also do not need to give up any Inalienable rights by choosing to live in any society. It is a fallacy that one must give up rights to live peacefully. One does not give up the right to steal from others when wanting to live in a community or nation, because God the only giver of rights never gave anyone that right to steal to begin with.
4. Thus, this document is a declaration of my God Given right*s.* ***My association with a church or group is not relevant as long as I genuinely hold these Biblically based spiritual values and they do not violate the rights of any other individual. My rights don’t come from the church, they don’t come from the state and they certainly don’t come from mankind. They only come from God and his Word, the Bible. Thus, the only authority I need to cite is the Bible. While a pastor may sign this and a church may support it, that is only a formality. This form would be just as valid without any signature or church behind it, the verses from the Bible and the logical reasoning are sufficient.***
5. There are numerous studies that show that the vaccine has hurt people. It is not necessary to show that injury is common, just that it is possible. Here are a few examples.
   1. <https://www.abc4.com/news/local-news/woman-suffers-life-altering-injuries-after-covid-vaccine-teams-up-with-utah-senator-to-demand-answers/>
   2. Covid-19 vaccine-induced thrombosis and thrombocytopenia-a commentary on an important and practical clinical dilemma, this publication also indicates that various vaccines have been suspended in Europe <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8130591/>
   3. 85,971 cases where Vaccine was COVID19 <https://www.medalerts.org/vaersdb/findfield.php?TABLE=ON&GROUP1=AGE&EVENTS=ON&VAX=COVID19&SERIOUS=ON>
   4. Reverse-transcribed SARS-CoV-2 RNA can integrate into the genome of cultured human cells and can be expressed in patient-derived tissues <https://www.pnas.org/content/118/21/e2105968118?cct=#sec-1>
6. My exemption does not need to have been applied to previous vaccines to be valid. I was not aware of the presence of these dangerous or objectional elements in past vaccines, so any objection I have stands even if I have taken vaccines in the past.
7. While my beliefs are genuine the EEOC states that you as an employer have the burden of proof to show that you are not discriminating against any religious objection and not if my beliefs are sincere.

https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/section-12-religious-discrimination#h\_9546543277761610748655186

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidance [warns that](https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/section-12-religious-discrimination#h_9546543277761610748655186) “whether or not a religious belief is sincerely held by an applicant or employee is rarely at issue in many types of Title VII religious claims.

“For example,” the guidance said, “with respect to an allegation of discriminatory discharge or harassment, it is the motivation of the discriminating official, not the actual beliefs of the individual alleging discrimination, that is relevant in determining if the discrimination that occurred was because of religion.”

Neither the commission nor the courts should “be in the business of deciding whether a person holds religious beliefs for the ‘proper’ reasons,” the guidance said, but they may examine whether the individual’s motives or reasons for holding the belief.

Like the religious nature of a belief, observance, or practice, the sincerity of an employee’s stated religious belief is usually not in dispute and is “generally presumed or easily established.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

An individual would not be deemed insincere in his belief just because he is not scrupulous in his observance, the guidance notes, but an employee’s credibility could be undermined by behaving “in a manner markedly inconsistent with the professed belief,” if the accommodation the individual is seeking would have a “particularly desirable benefit that is likely to be sought for secular reasons,” if the timing of the religious objection is suspect, or the employer has other reasons to believe the “accommodation is not sought for religious reasons.”

None of these factors are final, however: an individual may inconsistently practice his faith but still hold sincerely held beliefs, or an individual may have “Forgone his or her sincerely held religious practice” out of fear of discrimination, according to the EEOC guidance.

1. S*ee,* *e.g.*, *EEOC v. Ilona of Hungary, Inc*., 108 F.3d 1569, 1575 (7th Cir. 1997) (en banc) (finding that Jewish employee proved her request for leave to observe Yom Kippur was based on a sincerely held religious belief even though she had never in her prior eight-year tenure sought leave from work for a religious observance, and conceded that she generally was not a very religious person, where the evidence showed that certain events in her life, including the birth of her son and the death of her father, had strengthened her religious beliefs over the years); *Cooper v. Oak Rubber Co*., 15 F.3d 1375 (6th Cir. 1994) (holding that employee held sincere religious belief against working on Saturdays, despite having worked the Friday night shift at plant for approximately seven months after her baptism, where seventeen months intervened before employee was next required to work on Saturday and employee’s undisputed testimony was that her faith and commitment to her religion grew during this time); *Cunningham v. City of Shreveport*, 407 F. Supp. 3d 595, 609-10 (W.D. La. 2019) (holding that disputed material facts precluded summary judgment on sincerity where employee who previously grew beard during vacations and extended weekends asserted new religious adherence prompted wearing beard full-time); *EEOC v. IBP, Inc.*, 824 F. Supp. 147, 151 (C.D. Ill. 1993) (holding that Seventh-day Adventist employee’s previous absence of faith and subsequent loss of faith did not prove that his religious beliefs were insincere at the time that he refused to work on the Sabbath); *see also Union Independiente*, 279 F.3d at 57 & n.8 (noting the fact that the alleged conflict between plaintiff’s beliefs and union membership kept changing might call into question the sincerity of the beliefs or “might simply reflect an evolution in plaintiff’s religious views toward a more steadfast opposition to union membership”). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Same as above. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\_of\_aspirin [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.aplususapharma.com/blog/the-history-of-acetaminophen/ [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://pharmaceutical-journal.com/article/infographics/a-brief-history-of-ibuprofen [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://pharmaceutical-journal.com/article/infographics/a-brief-history-of-ibuprofen [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. https://ohiohistorycentral.org/w/Benadryl [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://pepto-bismol.com/en-us/the-pepto-story [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. *Grayson v. Schuler*, 666 F.3d 450, 454-55 (7th Cir. 2012) (finding in RLUIPA case that Nazirite prisoner’s asserted belief in not cutting his hair was sincerely held). Cited in: https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/section-12-religious-discrimination [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The defense of the archeological, historical, scientific, philosophical, and rational truth of this, i.e. the truth of Christianity is called Apologetics (find out more at <www.NoBlindFaith.com>). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The points about rights are a summary taken from the book “Jesus is Involved in Politics! Why aren’t you? Why isn’t your Church?” [www.J3IP.com](http://www.J3IP.com) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Cf. Moussazadeh v. Tx. Dep’t of Crim. Just., 703 F.3d 781, 790 (5th Cir. 2012) (case arising under Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA)). [↑](#footnote-ref-12)