

It is widely supposed that I, a pastor, would naturally support the idea of the “religious exemption” in the realm of mandatory medical treatment, especially against the advent of possible mandatory vaccination.

Indulge me with regard to the religious exemptions to vaccines and other potentially mandatory medical interventions. I think this is SO important to understand...

What we believe ABOUT freedom... what it is and what it is not, is every bit as important as HAVING freedom... for freedom neither exists nor continues, unless the free know it, recognize it and protect it.

I write specifically regarding the religious exemption (in this case, to vaccine). While I think it is necessary that the government recognizes religion and its place in life, society, culture, etc, I warn freedom loving Americans that this can be a major distraction, and ultimately a tremendous loss.

Freedom Is Not what the government allows me to do. I'll repeat that...

Freedom Is Not what the government allows me to do.

Freedom is the right to do what I want to do, as long as I'm not taking anyone else's freedom and/or rights.

Today, most Americans have allowed themselves to be convinced that freedom is what the government allows you to do. It is not.

We now live in a regulated, administrative state, and we've become accustomed to it as if it's right, constitutional, necessary, and the way things ought to be. The administrative state is none of those.

Last year sometime, while with friends, I suggested that we do something together; something unusual, but certainly not illegal. Bob's wife said, "Oh! Can we do that?" She asked because she immediately wondered whether or not there was an ordinance, local, state, federal, whatever, against it. If not, then in her mind, we "could" do it.

She was a parishioner of mine in another church situation, and she knows that I wouldn't do anything against an other's freedom, and she, a 10 year, freedom protecting, army veteran, God-fearing woman wouldn't either! But she's a good citizen too; and has come to believe that being such, requires her to do only what she is "allowed" to do. Ohh, that's dangerous...

When my goals/desires/intentions are nefarious, yes, she should try to dissuade and/or even stop me.

But when my goals/intentions/desires are neither harmful nor nefarious, but result from my natural wants and desires, while they ought to be weighed against right and wrong... they ought not have to be weighed against administrative regulations. Might I remind you that "administrative regulations" come from regulators. "Regulators of what?", one might ask. Regulators of human behavior, that's what. If we could be certain that the regulators had only pure interest in maintaining what is right and good, we could rest. But as James Madison wrote in Federalist 51,

*"If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be*

*administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself."*

Might I, need I remind you that it does not.

But back to the matter at hand, the religious exemption to any mandatory medical intervention, in this case, vaccine... when I decide that I do not want a particular medical intervention, I decide that I do not want a medical intervention, and that must be the end of it.

When the government says to me, "*You cannot refuse that medical intervention, for yourself or your minor children unless you request and obtain an exemption that we recognize as valid*", then I am acquiescing to the administrative state *as its property*. Be that exemption religious, medical, conscientious or otherwise it matters not. Why I don't want a medical intervention is my business. Whether or not I become in doing so, a "danger", we'll address in a moment. But when I cede my medical decisions to the state, I recognize their role in my life as "*owner*" at worst, or "*medical benefactor*" at best. I do not recognize either of those. The state must recognize *my individual sovereignty* and cede medical decision making to me. Anything else is based upon lies, and no mistake. What has been sold to the population by ours and many other governments, are myriad lies about disease, about nutrition, about medical intervention and treatment, about individual health, about public health and safety, *and* about the government's role in such. Indeed, most governments have developed numerous agencies (regulative bodies), not only to oversee these areas, but to "instruct" people about what are the "rights and wrongs" in all of these areas, while discrediting and largely quelling all opposing thought. You can believe whatever you may want to about "alternative" (the thinking mind must ask, "Alternative to what?") forms of medical treatment, but if want to engage in them, practice them and heaven forbid, propagate them, you cannot, unless it is done on the "down low". The regulators will not allow your thinking, right or wrong, to contradict the "approved narrative" about treatment. In fact, in 2020, we have seen our "information sources" decide to contradict and censor anything that doesn't adhere to the approved narrative about medicine and many various other aspects of our lives and experiences.

At the end, it comes down the tongue-in-cheek sign I stuck on my porch this past Summer. It has now faded from the sun and needs to be replaced (and added to!), but it says,

*"If you do what you're told, we'll let you have your rights".*

In the case of religious or medical exemption, it sounds like this,

*"If you produce the proper religious documents (CT has a list of religious entities that it will recognize... personal religious beliefs are not enough and in some cases, a note from one's "pastor" is required), or a doctor's note (some doctors have bought "western medicine" hook, line and sinker, and other who practice natural/herbal/traditional/native medicine are not recognized and perhaps not "licensed" as doctors) from a recognized, licensed, practicing medical professional, then we will allow an individual, sovereign decision about what you are or are not injected with, and whether or not you will or will not*

*have medical intervention... and this includes for your minor children as well. But if you cannot, we will not allow an exemption from medical intervention, neither for you nor your children."*

Once we acquiesce to the very concept, by demanding that we are "allowed" to keep our religious or medical exemption, we have already lost... and don't think they don't know it. The lower level regulators I'm certain, believe they're doing their jobs as described, having bought the administrative/regulative state concept already. But those advocating such, and those inspiring such, not just locally but globally, already know what I've told you, above, and are quite willing - once they've determined that you've pushed back hard enough to believe you've actually won something when indeed you've lost by even acquiescing the the premises - to allow you a win on these grounds.

I'm convinced that we're smarter than them, and are not going to settle for a loss that looks like a win. At the outset of this, I mentioned distractions that can lead ultimately to tremendous loss. Can you tell that I consider the religious exemption a loss that looks like a win?

While I am a pastor, and one whom believes that the government must recognize each citizen's religious beliefs, this is a loss that looks like a win.

Pastor