



## The question has been asked: Why wouldn't you take the vaccine?

An answer by Rev. Matthew T. Dent

I actually have a problem with the question itself. The question needs first to be answered why get it? It is an intervention - a change in the natural order of things. Why? To what end? "Why not?" is not a legitimate or rational reason.

By **TAKING** the vaccine, are we confessing something? What are we confessing? Is that a universal confession by all taking the vaccine? Or is it a personal confession of select individuals taking the vaccine? Can different people confess different things by taking/not taking the vaccine? Or is not taking the vaccine **ALWAYS** a confession of a certain truth and taking the vaccine **ALWAYS** a confession of against that truth (or vice versa)?

Specifically - what are we confessing about God and science and life and death? What are we confessing about risk? What are we confessing about the reliability of the information we have been fed? What are we confessing about our trust and confidence (and in what?)?

Also - the fact that it is **AUTHORIZED** vs. **APPROVED** is not insignificant. Even the federal government won't "stand behind" the vaccine if something goes wrong and the manufacturer cannot be held liable.

There are still **A LOT** of unknowns - and there's no evidence of long term benefit and lack of long term harm (eg., As I understand, the vaccine targets only one specific aspect of the virus - the spike protein - which is **A PRIMARY** way of getting the virus - but not the only way, again, as

I understand. - And, with variants emerging - it seems to me a more comprehensive immunity may be better - which, it would seem, traditional attenuated or inactivated vaccines would provide. As I understand, the mRNA vaccine is a modified subunit vaccine that coopts the body into manufacturing the subunit that is to be recognized.)

Also - as for "strikes" against vaccination - it's simply the TRUST factor. Considering the fact that in the last 12 months it has been proven beyond a doubt that we have been lied to and manipulated throughout this crisis (not that the crisis itself is not real, but manipulated in the midst of the reaction), on what basis should we trust those who previously lied to us about all the issues related to the vaccine (safety, effectiveness, etc.)?

Now that certain ends seem to have been achieved, we're finding out that HCQ is a legitimate treatment after all, that PCR tests were, in fact, miscalibrated and as a result, false positive numbers were amplified, and a whole host of other things that, if those in charge had been HONEST from the beginning, would have had a SIGNIFICANT impact on our perception of the NEED to take the vaccine in the first place. (Example, if prophylactic and or early intervention HCQ was recognized as a legitimate therapy option [rather than having researchers demonized and the results of their research buried] - would we even be TALKING about universal vaccination? -- IF NOT -- isn't it legitimate to consider the question WHY there was such a push to hide evidence as part of the consideration of whether or not to take the vaccine? Likewise with PCR testing which even the creator of the test [before he died under mysterious circumstances] said was not legitimately used as a diagnostic tool - and now the WHO has said was used improperly in a way to amplify false positive results.)

Also - since all previous treatments were thrust aside because, "There are no double-blind scientifically validated research studies proving their effectiveness," why does the vaccine get a pass? Where are the research studies not only proving effectiveness at short term antibody production, but long term immunity - including T-Cell activation and "programming" - and proof and validity that the historic standard of medical care, "First - do no harm," is upheld through an experimental global vaccination system using a brand new vaccine platform that has never been approved for wide use in humans?

So far, based on the currently available information I have reviewed --- this is the only circumstance under which I will willingly permit the vaccine to be injected into my body: To mitigate the risk to my family and community which I serve, the person urging/mandating me to have the vaccine injected into me simultaneously signs on to take FULL LIABILITY to cover all medical treatment in the event of an adverse reaction (or failure of the vaccine to fully inoculate me) and includes significant disability and death benefits along with a rider that provides for payment of a substitute and helps cover a significant portion of the cost associated with the search for a my replacement in the event of incapacity or death due to the vaccine or ANY complication arising from it -- all with a LOW barrier of proof that the vaccine was the cause - basically - it's up to YOU to prove it WAS NOT the vaccine and that there is another likely cause - otherwise, it will be ASSUMED to be the vaccine - just like the guy who just got a positive test and gets hit by a bus "died of Covid" and is counted in the statistics that are on the news every night. If you're not willing to take responsibility for cleaning up the mess if it causes problems and use the same standard of proof that is used elsewhere - you have no standing to urge/insist that I participate.