

Vaccination Exemption College/School Letter

No authorship claim or copyright asserted. Use at your own discretion. Delete this title and disclaimer and modify letter as needed. <https://theyliedto.us>

Dear University/School,

First, by the laws granted by this state and the constitution of the United States, I request a religious exemption from any vaccine mandates placed upon my persons by your institution. Each of the manufacturers of the Covid vaccines currently available developed and confirmed their vaccines using fetal cell lines, which originated from aborted fetuses. (<https://lozierinstitute.org/an-ethics-assessment-of-covid-19-vaccine-programs/>) For example, each of the currently available Covid vaccines have confirmed their vaccine by protein testing using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. (<https://lozierinstitute.org/an-ethics-assessment-of-covid-19-vaccine-programs/>) Partaking in a vaccine made from aborted fetuses makes me complicit in a highly objectionable action that offends my religious faith. As such, I cannot, in good conscience and in accord with my religious faith, take any such Covid vaccine at this time. In addition, any and all coerced medical treatment goes against my religious faith and the right of conscience to control one's own medical treatment, free of coercion or force. Please provide a reasonable accommodation to my belief, without religious discrimination as I wish to be able to fulfill my academic ambitions and be a good student enrolled in this institution.

Equally, compelling any student to take any current Covid-19 vaccine violates federal and state law, and subjects the educational institution to substantial liability risk, including liability for any injury the student may suffer from the vaccine. Many educational facilities as well as employers have reconsidered issuing such a mandate after more fruitful review with legal counsel, insurance providers, and public opinion advisors of the desires of employees and the consuming public. Even the Kaiser Foundation warned of the legal risk in this respect. (<https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/issue-brief/key-questions-about-covid-19-vaccine-mandates/>)

Three key concerns: first, informed consent is the guiding light of all medicine, in accord with the Nuremberg Code of 1947; second, the Americans with Disabilities Act proscribes, punishes and penalizes organizations who invasively inquire into their students medical status and then treat those students differently based on their perceived medical status, as the many AIDS related cases of decades ago fully attest; and third, international law, Constitutional law, specific statutes and the common law of torts all forbid conditioning access to employment, education or public accommodations upon coerced, invasive medical examinations and treatment, unless the institution can fully provide objective, scientifically validated evidence of the threat from the organization and how no practicable alternative could possibly suffice to mitigate such supposed public health threat and still perform the necessary essentials of employment or educational services. As one federal court just recently held, the availability of reasonable accommodations like accounting for prior infection, antibody testing, temperature checks, remote work, other forms of testing, and the like suffice to meet any institution's needs in lieu of masks, public shaming, and forced injections of foreign and unknown substances (undisclosed by deliberate pharmaceutical concealment) into the body that the FDA openly admits we do have any long term data and do not know the long term effects of such medical treatments.

For instance, the symptomatic can be self-isolated. Hence, requiring vaccinations only addresses one risk: dangerous or deadly transmission, by the asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic employee, in the employment setting. Yet even the government official, Mr. Fauci admits, as scientific studies affirm, asymptomatic transmission is exceedingly and "very rare." Indeed, initial data suggests the vaccinated are just as, or even much more, likely to transmit the virus as the asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic. Hence, the vaccine solves nothing. This evidentiary limitation on any educational institution's decision making, aside from the legal and insurance risks of forcing vaccinations as a term of service without any accommodation or even exception for the previously infected (and thus better protected), is the reason many wisely refuse to mandate the vaccine.

This right to refuse forced injections, such as the Covid-19 vaccine, implements the internationally agreed legal requirement of Informed Consent established in the Nuremberg Code of 1947. (<http://www.cirp.org/library/ethics/nuremberg/>). As the Nuremberg Code established, every person must "be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision" for any medical experimental drug, as the Covid-19 vaccine currently is.

Second, demanding students divulge their personal medical information invades their protected right to privacy, and discriminates against them based on their perceived medical status, in contravention of the Americans with Disabilities Act. (42 USC §12112(a).) Indeed, the ADA prohibits employers or organizations from invasive inquiries about their medical status, and that includes questions about diseases and treatments for those diseases, such as vaccines.

An educational institution that treats an individual student differently based on that student's belief the is discriminating against that student based on perceived medical status disability, in contravention of the ADA. The institution must have proof that it cannot service the student, even with reasonable accommodations, before any adverse action can be taken against the student. If the school/university asserts the student's medical status (such as being unvaccinated against a particular disease) precludes active enrollment then the institution must prove that the student poses a "safety hazard" that cannot be reduced with a reasonable accommodation. The institution must prove, with objective, scientifically validated evidence, that the employee poses a materially enhanced risk of serious harm that no reasonable accommodation could mitigate. This requires the student's medical status cause a substantial risk of serious harm, a risk that cannot be reduced by any another means. This is a high, and difficult burden, for any company or institution to meet. Just look at the all prior cases concerning HIV and AIDS, when employers or institutions discriminated against employees based on their perceived dangerousness, and ended up paying millions in legal fees, damages and fines.

Third, conditioning continued enrollment upon participating in a medical experiment and demanding disclosure of private, personal medical information, may also create liability under other federal and state laws, including HIPAA, FMLA, and applicable state tort law principles, including torts prohibiting and proscribing invasions of privacy and battery. Indeed, any employer or institution mandating a vaccine is liable to their employee for any adverse event suffered by that employee or student. The CDC records reports of the adverse events many have already reported to date concerning the current Covid-19 vaccine. (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/vaers.html>)

Finally, forced vaccines constitute a form of assault and battery upon any persons not only due to all the serious health risks involved, but also by the very mode of delivery and protocol. There is overwhelming evidence that countless deaths, diseases and permanent debilitating injuries have been censored/suppressed as world renown doctors and top Phd scientists have come out in condemnation of the vaccines as found in countless video and written documents found at <https://theyliedto.us>

The Supreme Court has long made it clear that "no right is more sacred than the right of every individual to the control of their own person, free from all restraint or interference of others."
(<https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/141/250>)

With Sincere Regards,

Student of the Year,
Your Well Informed Name Goes Here