

Responses to Some Vaccine Mandate Promoter's Positions

1 - "The COVID-19 Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) "vaccine" is not materially different from other traditional vaccines (e.g., the flu vaccine)."

— This injection is *substantially* different from traditional vaccines in numerous material ways. A more accurate description of the COVID-19 version is that it is an experimental bio-chemical injection.

2 - "The COVID-19 experimental injection is *safe*."

— There are many unknowns about the longterm safety of the COVID-19 experimental injection, as some of the normal clinical trial investigations were eliminated or abbreviated to accelerate getting these to market.

3 - "The COVID-19 experimental injection is *effective*."

— The term "effective" has not been adequately explained to the public. For example, experimental injection recipients are NOT protected from getting infected with COVID-19: *is that "effective"*? For example, injection recipients who then get infected are NOT stopped from transmitting COVID-19 to people they come in contact with: *is that "effective"*?

4 - "This mandate is because we are trying to do everything we can to protect the public from dying from COVID-19."

— If true, then the public would be provided all scientifically documented therapies, from the first indications of a COVID-19 infection. The fact that the Medical Establishment is discouraging doctors from prescribing (and pharmacies from fulfilling prescriptions for) scientifically proven therapies, indicates that the public's health is not the primary concern.

5 - "Those who have had prior COVID-19 infections must also be vaccinated, as the vaccine provides more protection than acquired immunity."

— This has not been scientifically established, as quite a few studies have concluded otherwise.

For more details on these responses see other Reports at C19Science.info.