

LETTER REQUESTING EXEMPTION

from COVID-19 Injections for Conscientiously Held Religious Belief

To Whom it May Concern,

I hereby seek to provide this notice and request that you recognize my First Amendment Constitutional Right to a Religious exemption from the COVID-19 injection. I am a Reformed Presbyterian Christian who believes in the sixty-six books of the Bible as the inspired and infallible Word of God. I maintain a Christian worldview and humbly state that while I at times have failed my Lord in many ways, I also endeavor to follow Him to the best of my ability in everything the Bible teaches.¹

This perspective recognizes that faith and conscience compel an individual to submit to the legitimate (Biblically based) exercise of authority, which originates in God Himself as sole authority, and is thereby derivative in all other mediate authorities.² When compelled by a mediate or secondary authority to violate our conscientiously held understanding of the Law of God, we must respectfully submit to the Lord, and not men. This has been known throughout history as the “Right of Private Judgment.” Although I desire to be at peace with all men,³ especially civil leaders, and to maintain the subordinate relationship between employee and employer with respect and uprightness, there may come times when I am duty-bound humbly to obey the Lord Jesus Christ instead. This is a conscientious position derived from a study of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which, according to our Church’s secondary standards, are the only rule of faith and obedience, for all of life.⁴

The Christian’s Body is not His Own

My first objection to receiving this injection is that because I believe in and follow the Triune God of the Bible and the principles laid out in His Word, I have a deeply held belief that these particular COVID-19 injections violate those principles. The Bible teaches that my body is the temple of the Holy Ghost and that I am not my own, but bought with a price, soul, and body, and so I cannot in good conscience take that body, which the Lord has purchased for His own, and subject it to something I believe may be harmful, such as this injection.⁵ The Bible teaches,

*What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? 20 For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.*⁶

¹ 1 Corinthians 10.31

² Acts 5.29; Romans 13.1-7; James 4.12

³ Romans 12.18

⁴ See our Church’s Doctrinal Standards: The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647) Chapter 1.2, and the following Scriptures: Ephesians 2.19-20; 2 Timothy 3.15-16; See also Westminster Larger Catechism Question & Answer, # 3.

⁵ <https://www.openvaers.com/covid-data>

⁶ 1 Co 6:19–20.

I believe that the COVID-19 disease is potentially harmful, but also manageable through early therapeutic treatment. I conscientiously choose, if infected, to seek early therapeutic treatment from my physician, rather than this mRNA, gene-therapy treatment. I believe the therapeutic method of managing the risk associated with this disease is a wiser way of proceeding – as do many others⁷ – and is more obedient to the Lord. I have conscientiously considered both options, studied and weighed them in light of my Christian faith.

I have found the latter (treating the illness, rather than receiving an mRNA, gene-therapy injection which is also lacking in long-term testing to determine its safety) to be more in keeping with the Scriptures and my faith. Therefore, I am conscience-bound in my understanding of the Scriptures that this is the better course for protecting the physical integrity of my body (which is belongs to the Lord) against the greater potential of harm and in support of building up my God-given natural immunity. This better accomplishes my conscientious obedience to the Lord’s commands, especially considering the many reports of injury visited upon those who have received this injection, with its yet unknown long-term effects.

Rights of Individual and Familial Privacy and Responsibility Concerning One’s Household

My second objection is simply this: I also believe whether to receive any treatment or not, like a vaccine, experimental or otherwise, is a matter of individual, personal choice in consultation with my own physician, who knows my medical history, and whom I have chosen as my doctor due in part to shared principles of treatment, recognizing that the right of determining medical treatment belongs finally to the individual patient. I believe this is the best method of protecting one’s health before God.

Also, I believe that the care of minor Christian children is the responsibility of their Christian parents, who are charged in Scripture to care for their children before the Lord, who also claims them as His own. Therefore, it is a perilous procedure, and contrary to the Scriptures, to emancipate minor children out from under the Christian nurture of their parents for the purpose of injecting them with this substance, or any other treatment contrary to our faith.⁸ God has placed the responsibility for the children firmly upon the shoulders of parents and not upon the state.⁹ This principle reveals the high importance and weight of these decisions which Christian fathers and mothers make with and for their households, and serves to heighten our sense of duty before the Lord, which ought not to be overridden.

The Sixth Commandment: Medicine, and Obedience to God

My third objection is as follows: My religion (Biblical Christianity) teaches me that, according to the Sixth Commandment, I am morally required to make use of all careful studies, and lawful endeavors, to preserve my own life, and the life of others, which also includes the protection of health and well-being.¹⁰ Rather than requiring an injection, this commandment requires careful and conscientious study to make the best use of all the information available as we obey the Lord’s command to preserve our own, and others’ lives. This Commandment requires the “sober use of medicine.”

⁷ [https://www.amjmed.com/article/S0002-9343\(20\)30673-2/fulltext](https://www.amjmed.com/article/S0002-9343(20)30673-2/fulltext) (accessed 08/04/2021)

⁸ Genesis 18.19; 30.30; Joshua 24.15; Proverbs 22.6; Isaiah 38.19; Luke 11.11-13; 2 Corinthians 12.14; 1 Timothy 5.8

⁹ Proverbs 1.8; 6.20; Luke 11.11-13; Ephesians 6.1-4; 1 Timothy 5.8; Hebrews 12.9-10

¹⁰ Westminster Larger Catechism, Question & Answer 135

My understanding of this direction is that we must enhance and encourage natural, God-given immunity as the most sober course, rather than a new injection with untested and therefore unseen long-term consequences, used to prevent an illness that is largely survivable through therapeutic treatment. My religious conviction also teaches me that “whatever is not of faith is sin.”¹¹ This means that if I cannot in good conscience participate in any activity if I have doubts about its lawfulness before the Lord, I must refrain from it, or be guilty of sinning against conscience, no matter the pressure to conform that comes from others.

My understanding, given these careful studies required and undertaken, is that I am conscience bound to seek natural immunity and therapeutic treatment should I become infected as the wisest course of treatment for myself and others, rather than to receive an injection that has caused harm to some, whose long-term effects are unknown.

The Sixth Commandment: Participation in Abortion

My fourth objection is that it has been reported that the COVID-19 injections have been manufactured using fetal cell lines from aborted children, either in the materials of the injection, or in the development of those materials, or in their testing.¹²

This is also contrary to the Sixth Commandment. Receiving such medicine would constitute disobedience to the commandment to preserve life, by knowingly making use of the unlawful killing of others, resulting in an injury to my conscience and tacit participation in abortion, which I am decidedly against as nothing short of murder. One of the early founders of Presbyterianism said the following in his commentary on Exodus 21.22:

This passage, at first sight, is ambiguous, for if the word death only applies to the pregnant woman, it would not have been a capital crime to put an end to the foetus, which would be a great absurdity; for the foetus, though enclosed in the womb of its mother, is already a human being, and it is almost a monstrous crime to rob it of the life which it has not yet begun to enjoy. If it seems more horrible to kill a man in his own house than in a field, because a man's house is his place of most secure refuge, it ought surely to be deemed more atrocious to destroy a foetus in the womb before it has come to light. On these grounds, I am led to conclude, without hesitation, that the words, “if death should follow,” must be applied to the foetus as well as to the mother. Besides, it would be by no means reasonable that a father should sell for a set sum the life of his son or daughter. Wherefore this... is the meaning of the law, that it would be a crime punishable with death, not only when the mother died from the effects of the abortion, but also if the infant should be killed; whether it should die from the wound abortively, or soon after its birth.¹³

Historic, faithful Protestantism has not changed its opinion concerning this view of the unborn child, as even a cursory examination of historical theology reveals. So, receiving medicines manufactured from the death of others, especially helpless and non-consenting others, cannot be forced upon those of us who regard abortion as violating the Sixth Commandment without injury to our conscientious obedience before the Lord. This is the position of our Presbyterian denomination, the Reformed Presbyterian Church General Assembly.¹⁴

¹¹ Romans 14.23

¹² <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/>

¹³ John Calvin and Charles William Bingham, *Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses Arranged in the Form of a Harmony*, vol. 3 (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2010), 41–42.

¹⁴ See Reformed Presbyterian Church: General Assembly's Book of Church Order, (<http://www.rpcga.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/RPCGA-BCO-2016.pdf>) p. 4

Weighing Risks Concerning the Foregoing Principles

My fifth objection is that many vaccines, including the injection for COVID-19, contain substances that are otherwise potentially harmful to the body.¹⁵ Various studies have made this known, and one would be wise to receive them only if the risk posed by these objectional substances was lesser than the risk of the disease itself. However, there is a growing body of evidence concerning the treatment of COVID-19 that safe, time-tested, therapeutic options pose less risk than the injection. Again, the Christian is duty-bound to conduct these careful studies in order to come to a wise and Biblical conclusion that comports with conscientious obedience to the Lord, in the principles stated above.

The Free Exercise of Religion

In closing, please understand that I do not intend to be contrary, strident, or insubordinate in this statement of my sincerely and conscientiously held religious beliefs. With humility, I only seek the free exercise of my Christian religion according to the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, as a citizen of this land protected by that venerable document, as a statement of the rights due to all men, being thereby endowed by their Creator. Seeing that those rights are given by our Creator, they are inalienable, as the Declaration of Independence states. My Christianity is forever preserved in its doctrinal and practical statement contained in the Bible and presented in summary form in our Ecclesiastical Standards, drawn from that sacred Word of God.

The above statements are consistent with those Scriptures and our standards as the historic expression of the Christian faith. I seek nothing novel in this petition, only what our Civil Fathers insisted upon: the free exercise of the Christian religion by our citizenry, the right of private judgment and informed consent, and the right to be “secure in my person, papers, and effects.”

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of my request for exemption to the Emergency Use Authorization COVID-19 injections as well as the FDA-approved COVID-19 injection.

Respectfully,

Name (Printed): _____

Name (Signature): _____

Date: _____

¹⁵ <http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/pubs/pinkbook/downloads/appendices/b/excipient-table-2.pdf>.