

Perspectives on Medical Ethics

Preached by Phillip Kayser at DCC on Sunday, April 24th 2022

We are going to deal with a very sensitive topic today – the Covid Vaccine Mandate. Some of our friends in the military could face dire straights for refusing to get vaccinated - even the threat of spending time in a military prison. Some of you may not have realized that, but we need to be very very supportive.

Now, granted, conscience issues are hard to navigate, and today I hope to give you a Biblical tool to help you navigate these and other complicated issues. But even if the issue of the Covid jab is not completely resolved in your minds today (I hope it will be, but even if it is not), I hope this sermon at least results in 1) more support for the consciences of our military friends, 2) sensitivity to other people's conscience issues on this and other medical questions, 3) and a better understanding of Quadperspectivalism as a Biblically based tool for processing tough ethical decisions.

If you've been on Facebook for very long, you know that good Christian men and women are all over the map on the ethics of both the so-called "vaccine" *and* the mandate. And the more you understand the complicated ethics involved (and the way it necessarily intersects with science - and science is not infallible), the more you will sympathize with *why* people differ. Of course, the main reason people differ is that there has not been a lot of good teaching on the subject of medical ethics, and certainly not on the subject of biblical civics.

How much variety of opinion among Christians is there on these "vaccines"? Unfortunately, there is a lot of variety. You all know Dr. Jonathan Sarfati. He is a brilliant man and a godly man, yet he is about as far removed from my position on the Covid-19 vaccines as you could get. He has written one of the best defenses of the vaccine that I have read.¹ I consider him to be a friend, but I do disagree with him very strongly on this subject. At least on Facebook he makes it look like you are in sin if you don't get vaccinated - or at least that you are irresponsible. He thinks that you are not loving your neighbor as yourself; you are not contributing to herd immunity. So he is a representative of one position. And since he is so brilliant, I disagree with him with some trepidation.

A little removed from Sarfati are Matthew Mason² and John Stevens.³ They are two representatives of many Christian leaders who argue that there are no ethical problems whatsoever with receiving the Covid shots, and they strongly encourage others to get it in order to achieve herd immunity, but they are a little more polite about it than Sarfati.

Other Christian leaders are more cautious and simply argue that it is a personal conscience issue that is debatable and not established and we should appreciate the differences of

¹ <https://creation.com/cmi-vaccination#summary>

² <https://pastorsacademy.org/blog/can-christians-get-a-covid-vaccine/>

³ <https://www.affinity.org.uk/news/news-stories/post/917-vaccine-pro-life>

opinion and we shouldn't base ethics on science anyway. And I would actually agree that we shouldn't *base* ethics on science. But the Scripture does indeed address these issues, even though science complicates them.

Others (like myself, Dr. Fugate,⁴ and Dave Brennan) argue that there are enormous ethical issues involved in receiving the Covid shot and another layer of ethical problems with making the shot a civil mandate or even a business mandate.

But I bring up these differences of opinion to caution myself and all of us that this is a complicated issue on which good brothers disagree. But that doesn't mean we ignore the subject. It means we keep going back to the touchstone of Scripture.

So, where do we start? Any time you see respected Christian leaders disagreeing, it is useful to see if people are missing something in the Bible by only looking through one or two of the four windows of ethics. Let's start by assuming that there is no direct rule of Scripture that is being violated. I think there are Scriptural rules that are being violated by the shot, but let's first of all assume that there are no explicit commands being violated. Paul still says that there are other ethical issues that need to be considered. In verse 23 he calls us to teleology or outcomes. It might be lawful, but is it helpful or expedient? If not, there is probably an ethical issue with it. In verses 25-27 he deals with the *situation* that they found themselves in. There is a difference between a person who knowingly violates the law and one who does so out of ignorance. And Paul actually brings up a situation where you are not in sin if you eat something offered to idols and didn't realize that it was offered to idols. But what do you do about it after you find out? That's also an important question. In verses 27-29 he deals with one aspect of personalism (the conscience). So those are the four windows of ethics - rules, outcomes, situations, and the people involved. And the Bible addresses all four.

I. Deontology (v. 23 “All things are lawful” with vv. 1-22)

Let's start by looking at the rules - what theologians call deontology. And I'll spend most of my time on this point and try to occasionally weave the other facets of ethics into it. And I will do that because even though you can distinguish these four sides of ethics, you can't separate them. They are wrapped up in each other.

This first point asks, “Is it lawful?” Everything we do needs to be lawful done. When it came to the ceremonial food laws, Paul said, “All things are lawful for me.” Why? Because food laws were no longer binding on Paul. We shouldn't universalize that statement to mean that stealing, murder, or fornication is lawful. It is not, and Paul himself says so later. It is “all things” in the immediate context. And the context was dealing with ceremonial food laws. He knew that it would be OK for him to eat Gentile food, but there were other issues to consider as well. Now, this morning I am not going to exegete *this* passage. I am only using this passage to illustrate the four sides of ethics. It's going to be more of a topical

⁴ <http://www.lordofthenations.com>

sermon. And I want to start with whether “vaccines” are Biblically lawful. The lawfulness of an action deals with deontology. Are covid-19 vaccinations in violation of any direct commandments of Scripture? I believe they are.

A. Is abortion implicated (Ex. 20:13; 21:22-25; Numb. 35:33; Ex. 17:8-16; Prov. 29:24; Deut. 23:18; see implications of John 10:12-13; Rom. 3:8; Matt. 4:6-7; Prov. 1:10-11,15-16; Ex. 21:12-36)?

And I’ll start with the abortion question since that is the one that is most frequently raised. I’ve given you more verses in your outline, but let me just start by listing three of those laws. Exodus 21:22-25 shows that abortion is murder and needs to be punished. Proverbs 29:24 says that an accomplice to a crime (any crime) is also guilty of that crime and needs to be punished. So a receptionist at a Planned Parenthood abortuary and the nurses who help the doctor murder a baby are both accomplices just like the driver of a getaway car is an accomplice to the bank robbery. One more Scriptural rule that relates is Deuteronomy 23:18. It pronounces guilt upon those who receive gifts from a harlot or a male prostitute or who in other ways profit from their crimes. That’s even one more step removed. We are not even to profit from someone else’s crime. And I will bring in some other Scriptures as well in the process of dealing with those three.

But with just those three Scriptures in mind, it is worth asking if the Covid-19 “vaccines” or any other vaccines are tied in with abortion in any way. Do the Pharmaceuticals buy baby parts from abortionists for any other lines that they are selling? Then, whatever you think about the “vaccine” itself, the *other* abortion-related products make them a criminal organization. Do they use any tissues or cells derived from an aborted baby when they produce and/or when they test the “vaccine?” Or do they in any other way profit from the abortion industry? Do those who get vaccinated profit from the abortion industry in any way? Those are the kinds of questions that the vaccine-opponents raise.

Jonathan Sarfati (who is a very articulate ambassador for the mRNA “vaccines”) realizes that these are valid questions. They are not stupid questions. And he spends several pages trying to show that there is no implication in abortion for at least the current batch of Covid-19 shots. (That’s his position, not mine.)

So let me start off by at least showing the *surface* connection to abortion that made Sarfati realize that he needs to defend himself. Pfizer initially claimed that no fetal cell lines were used, until some whistleblowers from within the company produced irrefutable evidence on October 6, 2021 that fetal cell lines were indeed used for testing.⁵ By the way, this doesn’t settle the debate among Christians because Sarfati and others argue that these cell lines are not the baby itself and are far removed from that baby. I’ll deal with those arguments in a bit, but let me document that *everyone* now agrees that there is at least a

⁵ <https://www.visiontimes.com/2021/10/06/pfizer-executive-emails-aborted-fetal-tissue-covid-vaccine-testing.html>

remote connection of *every single Covid-19 vaccine to abortion*, and then we will analyze the implications of that.

1. As I just mentioned, even though Pfizer tried to hide its use of fetal cells for a long time, it was discovered last year that the Pfizer Vaccine was indeed protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293.⁶ HEK-293 cells were originally taken from the kidney of a baby aborted in the Netherlands in 1973. HEK is an acronym for Human Embryonic Kidney. The number, 293 represents the number of experimental attempts the researchers needed to get the cell line working. For those cell lines (and other cell lines that are currently being developed) to be able to even work, the baby has to be removed alive and (without any anesthesia) the kidneys and other organs have to be cut out. The reason there can't be anesthesia is that it would ruin the "product" they are developing. So the process is torturous. The death of the child came as a direct result of the *procedure*, not the abortion. *It was murder for the purpose of advancing medical research*. I've got detailed footnotes to Pharmaceutical companies' statements and the laboratories they used to prove HEK-293 was used. There is no question on this anymore.

⁶ See <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and the following laboratory documentation <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.08.280818v1.full>

2. And here are some other “vaccines” tested on that same cell line HEK-293: Moderna,⁷ Sputnik V,⁸ AstraZeneca,⁹ Vaxart,¹⁰ Covaxx,¹¹ Medicago,¹² Noravax,¹³ PittCoVacc,¹⁴ the Walter Reed Vaccine,¹⁵ the Sanofi Vaccine,¹⁶ the Inovio Vaccine,¹⁷ the Arcturus

⁷ <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2622-0>

⁸ See <https://sputnikvaccine.com/about-vaccine/human-adenoviral-“vaccines”/> and also <https://actanaturae.ru/2075-8251/article/view/10302/106>

⁹ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and at the UK government website here <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/regulatory-approval-of-covid-19-vaccine-astrazeneca/information-for-healthcare-professionals-on-covid-19-vaccine-astrazeneca-regulation-174>

¹⁰ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.04.283853v1.full>

¹¹ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.30.399154v1.full>

¹² As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.11.04.20226282v1.full>

¹³ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/370/6520/1089>

¹⁴ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/ebiom/article/PIIS2352-3964\(20\)30118-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/ebiom/article/PIIS2352-3964(20)30118-3/fulltext)

¹⁵ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.04.28.441763v1.full>

¹⁶ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41541-021-00324-5>

¹⁷ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-16505-0>

Vaccine,¹⁸ the Imperial College Vaccine,¹⁹ the Providence Vaccine,²⁰ CoronaVac,²¹ CanSino Vaccine,²² the ImmunityBio Vaccine,²³ the Institut Pasteur Vaccine,²⁴ Rega Vaccine,²⁵ the Anhui Zhifei Vaccine,²⁶ and the Clover Biopharmaceuticals Clover Vaccine.²⁷

¹⁸ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.03.280446v1>

¹⁹ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.04.22.055608v1>

²⁰ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.11.443286v1>

²¹ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abc1932>

²² As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biospace.com/article/releases/the-national-research-council-of-canada-and-cansino-biologics-inc-announce-collaboration-to-advance-vaccine-against-covid-19/>

²³ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.29.227595v1.full>

²⁴ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.2014468117>

²⁵ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-3035-9>

²⁶ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here [https://www.cell.com/cell/fulltext/S0092-8674\(20\)30812-6](https://www.cell.com/cell/fulltext/S0092-8674(20)30812-6)

²⁷ As reported here <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/> and here <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.09.24.311027v1.full>

3. Johnson & Johnson publicly admitted that their “vaccine” used a cell line called Per.C6.²⁸ Per.C6 was derived from an 18 week old baby’s retinal cells. It was frozen in liquid nitrogen and thawed in 1995 to derive a new fetal cell line. Another “vaccine” that used that same cell line is Altimmune.²⁹

So, with this clear-cut connection to abortion, how do Sarfati, Mason, and others justify the use of these “vaccines”? I’ll use Sarfati’s arguments verbatim (word-for-word) since his are a bit more rigorous than the others. He says first,

1. “So there are neither fetal cells nor fetal body parts...”

When he says that there are no fetal cells, he means that the cell used to test the “vaccine” was not taken directly from a baby. It is a cell replicated from a previous cell that was replicated from an earlier cell, etc. So the baby was not there in the testing. He points out that when the virus kills the fetal cell, it is not killing a baby. These are not little babies that are being replicated. This cell line has been replicating cells for decades and destroying one cell no more destroys a baby than cutting a baby’s hair or removing a mole kills the baby. But while his statement is technically true, it is missing the link to a crime. These cells would be impossible without the crime of an abortion and the torture involved in removing the kidney from that baby. The Pharmaceuticals are benefiting from a horrific crime.

So his second argument deals with that and says that we are now so far removed from the original crime that the connection is not real. He says,

2. “Any cultures from these original lines are likely to be now removed by tens of thousands of generations.”

He tries to contrast those *old* cell lines with anything *new* that might arise. He says, “It would be a different matter when it comes to proposals to abort babies now, specifically to make “vaccines”, then my colleagues and I agree that we should refuse such “vaccines” and insist on ethical manufacture, such as the new recombinant technology.”

The argument seems to be that since we are profiting from cell lines so far removed from the original crime (in the case of Pfizer, 1973), we should not see it as an issue. But how far removed does a crime have to be before a person becomes an accomplice? Do Pfizer, Moderna, and other Pharmaceuticals *agree* with the *legitimacy* of the original crime? Yes they do. Otherwise they would use recombinant technology. And are they willing to use

²⁸ See <https://www.janssen.com/emea/emea/janssen-vaccine-technologies> and also documented at <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/>

²⁹ Documented with their own clinical trial https://clinicaltrials.gov/ProvidedDocs/67/NCT03232567/Prot_000.pdf and also at <https://lozierinstitute.org/update-covid-19-vaccine-candidates-and-abortion-derived-cell-lines/>

modern babies for *other* medical experiments? And the answer is yes. They are accomplices in 2022. This is not far removed from the companies.

Here's another question to ask: Was David being legalistic when he punished people for violating a Gibeonite treaty made four hundred years earlier? That's pretty far removed. But there are some crimes that are so heinous that God declares generational opposition *precisely because each generation has refused to repent of the original crime*. Murder is one of those sins that brings perpetual guilt and pollution to the land until the guilty are executed. *God does not wipe the guilt away with time and the passing of generations*. Numbers 35:33 says that God's wrath rests upon the land until the blood that cries out from the land is confessed and atoned for. The guilt doesn't eventually wither away with time.

And let me use Amalek as an illustration of that principle. Amalek murdered the stragglers among Israel in Exodus chapter 17. And because of the high-handed nature of the murder and the public involvement of the leaders in that murder, God declared perpetual opposition to all Amalekites and mandated that Israel never be at peace with them - with one condition: if an individual Amalekite repented. Yes, with repentance there is immediate grace. But without repentance, they could not profit from an Amalekite, do business with an Amalekite, or honor an Amalekite. That was why Mordecai could not bow down before (or in any other way honor) Haman the Agagite in the book of Esther - because he was a descendant of Amalek. Mordecai was to have nothing to do with them. Why? Because of the original murders that were never repented of. That was many generations later. Well, in the same way, the blood guilt of the babies murdered in the 1970s and 1980s has not been confessed or atoned for, and those who continue to agree with those murders and to profit from those murders should not be rewarded. Like Mordecai, we should have nothing to do with Haman. That's my perspective.

Sarfati disagrees. But let me point out that Sarfati is not consistent on this argument that he put forth. He said that he would be very opposed to any "vaccines" developed from the recent Walvax-2 cell line and would treat them as sinful. Let me quote him at length. He says,

"There is a relatively new Walvax-2 cell line that dates to 2015, from Wuhan, China. This abortion was obtained very unethically, even by the standards of abortion, by means of the 'water bag' method, illegal in the USA, that removes the entire amniotic sac. There would be real problems with supporting "vaccines" connected to this one, because it is not remote in time like the others. Fortunately, at present there are no "vaccines" that have been developed from the Walvax-2 cell line. Now is the time to insist that any new "vaccines" are not made with this line, but with the many ethical alternatives readily available."³⁰

I'm glad he holds to that position, but I believe it is utterly inconsistent with his being OK with HEK-293 or Per.C6. I would ask, "Why would using the Walvax-2 cell lines be any

³⁰ <https://creation.com/cmi-vaccination#summary>

more sinful?" Those cells are already many many generations removed from the abortion performed seven years ago since they can double every 36 hours. Is there a magical number of generations that suddenly makes it no longer a sin? Distance, whether in time or geography does not diminish the guilt of the original scientists *or of the companies associated with them or buying from them*. They are accomplices.

I think the geographical distance illustrates this well. How far removed geographically do we need to be from the unethical harvester of an organ to receive that organ with a clean conscience? China has been documented to have harvested large numbers of organs from prisoners while they are alive. Is it OK to use those organs simply because the crime happened so far removed geographically? No. I think this whole argument misses the point that we still live in a culture of abortion, Big Pharma that is in bed with Planned Parenthood, and a government that insulates Big Pharma from any liability for its crimes. There has been no covenantal confession or atoning for those past sins, which means that the companies are guilty. So this argument does not hold water.

Sarfati's third argument is:

3. "That deed was unfortunately done, and cannot be undone."

I fail to see how this argument is relevant. The same thing could be said about the organs being harvested from live prisoners in China and sent to organ transplant centers all over the world. It's big business. Using the same logic that Sarati used on the "vaccine" we could say that the crime of harvesting organs from live prisoners is already done, and it can't be reversed, so we might as well use those organs for good. And I will hasten to say that Sarfati argues *against* using such organ transplants because of its proximity and because of the issue of moral hazard. But to simply say, the past abortion can't be undone is not a good enough reason. So he gives more reasons. But while piling on reasons may seem to give weight to his position, hopefully you are seeing that we are systematically removing each one.

His next argument is:

4. "There is also no evidence of any 'moral hazard' - that it would lead to more abortions."

This fourth argument is basically this - unlike receiving organs from China, which *does* incentivize harvesting more organs from live prisoners, he claims the same is not true with "vaccine" research based on old cell lines. A moral hazard refers to people behaving differently (and typically worse) when insulated from the consequences of their decisions or when in some way rewarded for their bad behavior. John 10:12-13 deals with moral hazard, using the illustration that a hireling sacrifices principle and people because he is only doing it for money. So Sarfati thinks there is no risk of moral hazard with these "vaccines". But I believe moral hazard is written all over the "vaccine." Far from being an argument in *favor* of "vaccines", I believe moral hazard is yet another argument *against* these "vaccines". Let me give you five reasons why I think so.

First, by insulating Big Pharma from lawsuits, a huge obstacle to sinful and criminal activity is removed. And more than one Pharmaceutical has been caught lying, falsifying records, and been caught in other scandalous behavior. But there is nothing that can be done. Our laws written *by* Pharmaceuticals and *for* Pharmaceuticals completely *insulate* Pharmaceuticals from liability. These laws *themselves* are a moral hazard since they incentivize bad behavior. So it is my opinion that we need to boycott these vaccines in order to remove incentives for that bad behavior in exactly the same way that Sarfati boycotts organs obtained from China. Let's be consistent.

Second, the Nebraska Coalition for Ethical Research points out that perfectly good and ethical alternatives to fetal cell lines *are* available. They are good and well-developed. By failing to boycott the "vaccine" we *are* incentivizing the continued use of fetal cell lines and de-incentivizing the use of recombinant and other technology. Every time a person takes a Covid shot they are engaged in moral hazard because they are providing financial incentive for the continued use of fetal cell lines.

Third, if abortion had been a crime in the 1970s, the HEK-293 line would not have been developed and the perfectly good alternative methods outlined by NCER would have been used. It is precisely the legality of abortion that incentivizes such research. And abortion is still legal. So that is a moral hazard as well.

Fourth, contrary to Sarfati's statement related to incentive for *more* abortions, new cell lines *are being developed from aborted fetuses right now* - precisely because these immortal lines aren't really immortal. Cell lines do eventually approach the end of their ability to self-replicate reliably, and they can get corrupted in ways that could hurt recipients. The FDA guidelines for testing these cell lines show all kinds of problems that have developed, and need to be screened out - including Karyology, Tumorigenicity (which means the ability of these cells to produce tumors in the recipients), Oncogenicity (which refers to mutations in the cells that could give rise to cancer), and other kinds of problems.³¹ So new lines need to be developed. And they are being developed. I've already mentioned the new fetal cell line developed in 2015, called Walvax-2. It was developed using 9 aborted babies. The Nebraska Coalition for Ethical Research points out that this new cell line replicates much faster than the previous ones, motivating pharmaceuticals to use them.³² It makes financial sense to use them. That motivation is indeed the ethical problem of moral hazard on abortion.

Fifth, Dave Brennan and others have demonstrated that Planned Parenthood makes a massive profit from Big Pharma and medical labs on tissue and organs derived from live babies. *They* are incentivized. The moral hazard of ignoring the abortion connection is found not just in "vaccines", but in many other areas of medical research. Even NPR

³¹ <https://www.fda.gov/media/70868/download>

³² <http://ethicalresearch.net/positions/the-ethics-of-the-walvax-2-cell-strain/>

admits³³ that labs are currently using fetal tissue to find cures and treatments for AIDS, Parkinson's disease, diabetes, cancer, autism, schizophrenia, blindness and various birth defects. (NCER points out that the adult stem cells work much better, but we are in a culture of death.) Anyway, the Cardiff Fetal Tissue Bank, the SWIFT fetal tissue bank, and similar repositories ask women permission to use their aborted babies for new therapies. We can't ignore this. And let me go ahead and quote Dave Brennan on how this relates to the question at hand:

"No new abortion was performed or utilised to develop the [Covid-19]"vaccines"," says John Stevens. But that is beside the point. The cell line developed from the kidney of a baby girl killed in the Netherlands in 1970s is part and parcel of the very same culture of organ harvesting from innocent babies legally killed that continues to this very day. So we are placing ourselves firmly within that ongoing tradition, instead of standing against it. We are opting into it, investing in it, entrenching it, normalising it.³⁴

I agree. So far, not one of Sarfati's arguments stand up. Sarfati's fifth argument is a bit longer. He says,

5. "A similar comparison would be organ donation. Would we refuse a life-saving organ that was from a victim of a drunk driver for example who listed 'organ donor' on the driver's license, because he was killed in a sinful way? Accepting this organ is in no way condoning drunk driving. Another example: it would be totally immoral to murder someone to harvest his organs, even if it would save another person's life. However, if someone you loved was murdered during an armed robbery, would it be immoral to consent to organ donation, so that even though a terrible sin had been committed, something good came from it, one silver lining on a very dark cloud? And would acceptance of such an organ mean condoning the murder? Similarly, should we refuse a life-saving treatment that is the one good thing that came from the abomination of murdering those two babies?"

Let's look at each illustration he uses, because they are not the same ethically. I have issues with most organ donations anyway because organs need to come from a living human and brain death is not a Biblical definition of death, but that is a discussion for another time. Assuming for the sake of argument that organ donations are OK, the first situation of the drunk driver who had donated his organ is fine. It's no problem. And I agree that accepting the organ does not condone drunk driving. But that is hardly analogous. Here is something more analogous: accepting an organ from the Chinese regime that was taken from a live prisoner does indeed condone China's murderous treatment of prisoners and should not be done - even if it is needed to save your life. And it doesn't matter how many intermediaries

³³ <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2015/09/29/444214443/research-on-fetal-tissue-draws-renewed-political-scientific-scrutiny>

³⁴ <https://www.brephos.org/post/john-stevens-matthew-mason-why-do-you-speak-as-though-organ-harvesting-were-a-thing-of-the-past>

the Chinese-originated organ has gone through to make it remote, the issue is still the same. Murder is different than drunkenness. Drunkenness is a sin; murder is a crime, and the social consequences of the two are quite different.

The second illustration he used was of a loved one being murdered. One could receive the organ if the loved one *willed* to have his or her organs given. But *she* didn't kill herself for the purpose of giving that organ, and the *murderer* did not kill her for the purpose of giving an organ. That's an important difference. We will forget about the fact that many life-saving organs can't be donated from a truly dead person (and brain death is not a biblical criteria - they are not dead). But then Sarfati strangely compares that to the tortured murder of two babies in the 1970s and 1980s. Here is why it is strange. *If that argument has any force whatsoever, then he should not object to obtaining cell lines from babies aborted last year - but he does.* Why? He recognizes Paul's repeated admonition in Romans that the good ends do not justify the sinful means - it never does. In Romans 3:8 Paul adamantly disagrees with the statement, "Let us do evil that good may come."

And of course, he will immediately shoot back, "but there is no close proximity." He's trying to tie these things together. We've already dealt with that, but let me quote Helen Watt. She says,

From the perspective of the cell-line creator, it should be noted that the mere use of a go-between – a tissue bank or tissue procurement company – cannot sanitise the close complicity involved in obtaining and using foetal tissue. By analogy, if property is obtained through violent robbery, the fact it is obtained via a 'receiver of stolen goods', not the robber himself, is not enough to legitimate it: the connection is scandalously close even if the transaction is not (as it may be) pre-arranged.³⁵

Sarfati's sixth argument is this:

6. "...there is the Principle of Double Effect. That is, if a contemplated action has both good and bad effects, then it is permissible only if it is not wrong in itself and if it does not require that one directly intend the bad result."

The Principle of Double Effect was invented by Thomas Aquinas and has some legitimate applications, but mostly very bad applications. The way Thomas Aquinas used it, it was legit. He said that though it is murder to kill a person with a weapon, it is not murder to kill a person with a weapon if that killing is done to defend one's own life or the life of another because of the good effect. But I would *not* say that self-defense is legitimized by the principle of Double Effect. You don't need that principle. I would say it is legitimized because the Bible explicitly gives self defense as a proper action.

Unfortunately, this principle of double effect has been used to defend knowingly bombing civilian populations in order to hit a legitimate target. They say, "Our purpose is not to kill civilians; it's to hit the legitimate target." But they know it is going to kill massive numbers

³⁵ <https://www.fli.org.au/covid-19-vaccines-and-use-of-foetal-cell-lines/>

of civilians upfront. They know it. So that would be murder. This same principle is used to justify euthanasia of a person in unbearable pain.

Now, a *good* application of the Principle of Double Effect is that a doctor tells a patient that he *will* die without an operation, but there is a slight risk that he will become permanently comatose if he *does* operate. The operation's intent is to cure, but there could be a negative consequence. It is a risk, and the doctor is not held liable for a negative outcome if the point of the operation was positive. OK - that's legit. But this ethical principle is way too loose for Christians to use it without care.

But let's assume its legitimacy just for the sake of argument. Why does it not support the use of these "vaccines?" Because Big Pharma does not meet the three rules of Double Effect that are always listed by ethics books. Here are the three rules:

1. First, the nature of the act must itself be good, or at least morally neutral. But I have already demonstrated that the act of using fetal cells is not good, and is certainly not morally neutral. And I will later show massive harm that the vaccines are doing.
2. The second rule is that the agent must intend only the good effect and not intend the bad effect, either as a means to the good or as an end in itself. That's all part of the definition. But I have already demonstrated that Big Pharma is totally in agreement with abortion and with using the products of abortion as the means to good - a clear violation of Romans 3:8. I have read the websites of each of the "vaccine" producers, and they have no problems with how the cell lines were produced. Many praise the way the cell lines were produced. They are part of the culture of death.
3. The third rule is that the good effect must outweigh the bad effect in circumstances sufficiently grave to justify causing the bad effect and the agent exercises due diligence to minimize the harm. Again, Big Pharma is not interested in getting rid of abortion. They could easily boycott the abortion industry completely. Nebraska Coalition for Ethical Research has made such a boycott super easy. But the fact of the matter is that Big Pharma is in bed with the death culture of Planned Parenthood. And we cannot weigh the actuality of abortion against possibility of saving life.

So on every level there is no double effect excuse with Big Pharma - even if you bought into the principle of double effect (which I don't). And by the way, the principle of double effect could be used to justify any "vaccine" that comes from the Walvax-2 cell line - something that Sarfati opposes. He's not being consistent here. But you cannot have your cake and eat it too. If Double Effect can be applied to HEK-293, it can be applied to "vaccines" that use fetal cells from Walvax-2. This may seem like overkill, but since you all know Dr. Sarfati, I want to make sure you see the problems in his arguments. If his arguments fail, then we need to avoid the shot just for the commandments related to abortion that are in your outline.

Sarfati gives one more argument as to why there is no negative implication in abortion. He says,

7. "...there is "remote mediate material cooperation", meaning that the moral object of the co-operator (in this case, the one being vaccinated) and that of the wrong-doer (the abortionist who aimed for a dead baby) are distinct. Under this principle, vaccination can be allowed if necessary to prevent severe illness and death (which it does), and if we also clearly condemn both the two abortions from which cell lines were derived and any future abortion to create more cell lines."

There are a number of problems with this line of reasoning. Why is "if necessary to prevent severe illness" even inserted? If it is ethical, it should be ethical even if there *were* alternative means of preventing illness and it wasn't necessary. Why does "necessary" make it suddenly ethical? Scripture indicates that we cannot justify sin in order to save life. We simply cannot.

Second, assuming for the sake of the argument that the "vaccine" really is beneficial rather than harmful, you are still benefiting from a crime. God prohibited the priests from benefiting from the money being tithed by a homosexual or heterosexual prostitute. Deuteronomy 23:18 says,

You shall not bring the wages of a harlot or the price of a dog to the house of the LORD your God for any vowed offering, for both of these are an abomination to the LORD your God.

Now, the priests might have argued that they were personally not involved in the prostitution, and that the money is neutral and could be used for good purposes. But God prohibited them from profiting from a criminal act - even though it would be used for much good in the temple. And it didn't caveat that it would be OK so long as it was 40 years later. And by the way, as bad as the temple priests were in Christ's day, they still recognized this principle. That's why they wouldn't take Judas' blood money.

And for all of these reasons, I think that just this first point under Deontology is all you need to completely rule out the use of *any* of the Covid-19 "vaccines". Nor is it simply a personal choice. I'm a believer in free market. But where murder is involved, businesses should not have the right to impose vaccines on employees. There are more and more medical practitioners who were previously vaccinated themselves, but who have repented of it and regret it. So even if you question the next two issues under deontology, I hope this one is sufficient to make each of us eagerly support the cause of members in the military who are resisting this. They do indeed have a legitimate conscience basis for objecting to the "vaccine," and it is very important that Christians like Sarfati not undermine their case.

B. Does it harm the body - and if so, is the risk of harm greater than that of the disease? (Eph. 5:28-29; 1 Cor. 6:15,18-20; Acts 16:28; Lev. 19:28; Prov. 14:30; 17:22; 25:16,27)

But let me give you a second ethical issue under deontology. If it can be proved that the vaccine harms the body, then there are a number of Scriptures I have placed in your outlines that would say it might be a sin. Of course, Sarfati and others argue the opposite - that it does not harm the body, and the science is divided on the question. Sarfati and

others also point out that even if it does harm the body, “don’t harm your body” is not an absolute rule since we can lay down our lives for the good of others, and Paul’s preaching resulted in him being stoned. And it is true that our bodies can handle some poisons. But I would point out that Paul didn’t willingly cause harm to his body. While science can’t dictate ethics, if you are convinced that the ingredients will do harm to your body, that needs to be seriously considered before taking the shot. And the more I study the body of literature that has been emerging on “vaccine” injuries, the more scared I would be about being vaccinated - even if you were not convinced by the abortion connection.

Because this sermon was motivated to encourage us to support our friends in the military, I won’t deal with the rise in the civilian population.³⁶ I am just going to give *military* statistics from the last seven years to demonstrate *massive* increases in various injuries that have taken place since the military mandated the shot. Thomas Renz, an attorney who works with America’s Frontline Doctors, did an analysis of medical conditions reported by military doctors and recorded in the Defense Medical Epidemiology Database.³⁷ His statistical analysis of the government’s own database³⁸ shows that,

1. There was a 1048% increase in reports of diseases of the nervous system in 2021 over the average of the previous five years. 1,048% increase!
2. There was a 487% spike in Breast Cancer
3. 350% spike in infertility
4. 369% spike in testicular cancer
5. 2,181% spike in hypertension. That can’t be explained away as a statistical glitch. That’s a 2,181% spike in officially reported cases of hypertension in the military. The previous years are relatively flat.
6. 664% spike in malignant neoplasms
7. 680% spike in multiple sclerosis

³⁶ These can be found at the government website called VAERS <https://vaers.hhs.gov> An easy to navigate site that summarizes the government statistics can be found here: <https://openvaers.com/index.php>

³⁷ <https://www.health.mil/Military-Health-Topics/Combat-Support/Armed-Forces-Health-Surveillance-Division/Data-Management-and-Technical-Support/Defense-Medical-Epidemiology-Database>

³⁸ <https://renz-law.com/attorney-tom-renz-whistleblowers-dmed-defense-medical-epidemiology-database-reveals-incredibly-disturbing-spikes-in-diseases-infertility-injuries-across-the-board-after-the-military-was-forced-to>

8. 551% spike in Guillain-Barre Syndrome
9. 468% spike in Pulmonary embolism
10. 302% spike in Tachycardia
11. 452% spike in Migraines
12. 471% spike in female infertility
13. 437% spike in ovarian dysfunction
14. 269% spike in Myocardial infarction
15. 291% spike in Bell's palsy

On the basis of how contrary the government's own database was to the official figures given to the media by the DOD, Thomas Renz and America's Frontline Doctors sued the Federal government. And while the Department of Defense admits that these statistics drawn from the database reflect the database accurately, they *now* claim that the *database* was not correct and they have taken down the database. Instead, they claim that a computer glitch produced massive under-reporting of diseases in the years 2016-2020, and that's why 2021 (which is accurate) looks so much higher.³⁹ But which is more likely in the military - unusually high incidents of each of those diseases in the military year after year or to believe the statistics given and say that the military is generally a healthy population and that there were unusually high incidents of these disease after the Covid-19 vaccination? Either way they choose to go, the Department of Defense has been caught in lies. Their statistics are blatant lies either direction that they go. Like other agencies, you cannot trust government statistics completely. It will be interesting to see where this lawsuit ends up. But while it is being contested, I would encourage you to read about testimonies of the *actual people* who have reported "vaccine" injuries. They are horrible. There are thousands of such testimonies. The massive numbers of testimonials seem to corroborate that the original government database from 2016-2021 was correct, and it is only after the lawsuit that they claim it wasn't.

But even aside from those incredibly scary statistics, there are plenty of other things that can be researched to see if it violates the Biblical laws about not willfully damaging our bodies. What about the mRNA in the "vaccines?" mRNA is nucleoside-modified messenger RNA, and it acts like a set of instructions that tell the body to make its own spike proteins (that normally only viruses would produce). And they do so in order to stimulate the immune system to prevent or fight the actual virus. The idea seems brilliant on the surface,

³⁹ See <https://leadstories.com/hoax-alert/2022/02/fact-check-dod-whistleblowers-mind-blowing-covid-vaccine-injury-numbers-were-not-based-on-accurate-data.html>

but many questions remain. For example, when does the body *stop* producing those spike proteins? And does mRNA disappear like they anticipated it would? Numerous studies have shown the body producing them long after recovery. Why? And how bad are those spike proteins for our bodies? And does mRNA actually change our DNA? Of course, they hotly deny that. Nobody wants their DNA changed by who-knows-who. But a study published by the National Institutes of Health⁴⁰ said that it *did* change the DNA. Now, that study was hotly criticized for not being peer-reviewed yet. But other studies have come to the same conclusion since then. For example, earlier this year a Swedish study⁴¹ demonstrated that the mRNA in the Pfizer “vaccine” goes into liver cells and converts to DNA, completely challenging the establishment’s claim that it does not change or interact with the DNA in any way. Dr. Peter McCullough, an internist, cardiologist and epidemiologist says that the new findings have “enormous implications of permanent chromosomal change” that could drive a “whole new genre of chronic disease.” Whichever side of the science question you land on (and science is not infallible), the situation (and science can only address the situation - the situational side of this equation) would say to use the utmost caution before getting the jab or you might be in violation of several commands of God for stewarding our bodies. And if these statistics are even remotely true, that would be a second reason why businesses should not be allowed to mandate vaccines - unless they are willing to face the medical liability for all their employees. If they mandated it, then they are complicit in the damage to your body. This is not a free market issue. This is a criminal issue.

Sarfati’s essay came out before these studies were done, so we can’t fault him for not knowing about them. But it puts in question his claim that if the potential harm caused by the “vaccine” is outweighed by the harm of the disease itself, then it is the best trade-off in this fallen world. Here’s the problem - we won’t know for quite some time what the results of permanent change to DNA will produce. Science is a moving target because it is impossible to get an absolutely certain conclusion from induction - either way - for my side or the other side. But anyway, by now you are seeing how all four perspectives have to be dealt with at the same time.

C. Do the quarantine laws (Lev. 13-17; Numb. 2) justify mask mandates and forced vaccinations?

The third topic that is often raised under deontology are the quarantine laws of Leviticus 13-17 and Numbers 2. Some people try to use those laws to justify the state getting involved in shutting down churches, businesses, and airlines in order to protect people. And by analogy they use those laws to justify mask mandates and forced vaccinations (for the good of the people, of course). I won’t get into whether those laws are ceremonial laws that have passed away (as Dr. Fugate believes) or moral laws that continue. But assuming

⁴⁰ <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7743078/>

⁴¹ <https://www.mdpi.com/1467-3045/44/3/73/htm>

that they continue, there are four reasons why that absolutely will not work to support civil mandates.

First, both Leviticus chapters 13-17 and Numbers 2 show that it was the *infected* person who was quarantined, not the healthy. To force healthy people to wear masks or to force healthy people to get “vaccines” is completely contrary to the spirit of those laws. Those very laws argue against mask mandates and vaccine mandates.

Second, the quarantine was based on symptoms, not assumptions - as Leviticus 13-17 clearly shows.

Third, the infected people *were only quarantined after* alternative explanations had definitively been ruled out. Well, the military is not allowing Christians to use any alternative means of protecting their neighbor - such as weekly testing, wearing masks (which I don't think work), or something else.

And fourth, no leper was forced to seek a cure or even seek treatment.

Thus, those passages prove the exact opposite of forced mandates for medical treatment - whether of the healthy or the diseased.

There are other questions possible under deontology, but I need to move on. As you can see, the subject is huge and I can't resolve every question, but I do think it is worthwhile asking these and other questions under each window of ethics. If we do so in a thorough manner, one can achieve clarity.

II. Teleology - consequences, goals, trajectory, outcome (v. 23 with 1 Cor. 6:15,19-20; see verses under Larger Catechism's exposition of the sixth commandment)

Obviously I've already covered teleology, person, and situation to some extent while examining deontology. But I will spend a few more minutes on each of the other three windows of ethics just to fill things out a bit.

Verse 23 addresses teleology. Paul says, “All things are lawful for me, but not all things are helpful; all things are lawful for me, but not all things edify.” In context we saw that Paul was talking about the ceremonial food laws. God had opened the door wide open for eating Gentile foods. But just because he it was lawful to eat Gentile food did not mean that it would be beneficial to do so. We need to ask if it is helpful for us and secondly if it builds up others.

How could eating Gentile non-kosher food be bad for us? In the previous two verses he points out that if the food is eaten in a sacramental context, it will usher us into fellowship with demons. That's not good even if the food itself was good. But even if it is simply purchased from the market place, it doesn't mean that the food is healthy for you. Some lawful food might have parasites. It is my personal belief that the food laws given in the Old Testament are the best foods for the body and other foods are allowable, but probably not

as good in all situations. So our family follows the 80-20 rule - 80% or more on the good foods and 20% or less on foods that may not be the best. God calls us to care for the temple of our body by being good stewards of it. 1 Corinthians 6:15 says,

Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them members of a harlot? Certainly not!

Honoring our bodies honors Jesus. Verses 19-20 continue the thought, saying,

19 Or do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you, whom you have from God, and you are not your own? 20 For you were bought at a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's.

So the point is that our bodies don't belong to us. They belong to God and are temples of the Holy Spirit. So we should care for them as if they were God's property.

Applied to "vaccines", you could land either way on this, depending on which science you are convinced of. Some emphasize that our normal diet introduces more of the same toxins that are in "vaccines" than the "vaccines" themselves do. Sarfati has some pretty interesting statistics on that. That may be true of some of the ingredients, but certainly not of mRNA. Other's emphasize statistics on "vaccine" injuries and come to different conclusions. There are risks with many things that are lawful to do, but those risks need to be carefully weighed. Are the risks of "vaccine" injuries greater than the benefits? You might be convinced differently than I am on this. And again, it is because science is a moving target.

Paul's second consideration under teleology here is, "but not all things are edifying." If eating would hurt a fellow brother, I might abstain even if I felt it was lawful to eat. Applied to medicine, some people have gotten shots out of love for their neighbor - hoping to not spread COVID-19. That's admirable, though it is only one window into the issue. Others have abstained because they want to have a consistent testimony against abortion. It's sometimes hard to read what would edify or build up others when it comes to something we believe might be beneficial or harmful to us.

And there are many other teleological questions that Paul does not address in this chapter that could be posed to try to tease apart the ethical issues. For example, moral hazard really is a teleological question that we have already addressed. Does a failure to boycott the "vaccines" encourage the continued use of fetal cells? Does it encourage abortion? Not all agree, but I think that it does.

III. Situation (vv. 25-27; see verses under Larger Catechism's exposition of the sixth commandment)

The situational window related to foods is mentioned in verses 25-27:

1Cor. 10:25 Eat whatever is sold in the meat market, asking no questions for conscience' sake; 26 for "the earth is the LORD'S, and all its fullness." 27 If any of

those who do not believe invites you to dinner, and you desire to go, eat whatever is set before you, asking no question for conscience' sake.

This is a situation of eating out of ignorance. Meat sold at the market place is obviously a different *situation* than meat served at a pagan temple. Likewise, meat eaten without knowledge that it had been dedicated to a demon is different than knowingly and deliberately eating meat offered to an idol - something that the law clearly forbade and that the church council in Acts 15 said is still binding. So knowing the *situation* can make a huge difference on whether we are guilty or not. So - just as there are a number of Biblical principles that apply to the situation related to foods, there are a number of principles applied to the situation of "vaccines".

First, should we trust the mainstream media that has been known to be in collaboration with anti-American and anti-God ideals? No. It is naive to blindly accept the data that comes from the media - whether fact-checking-Facebook, Twitter, Time magazine, the World Herald, CBS, MSNBC, etc., etc.

And people reply, "But the media is simply presenting objective data that can be checked out at the CDC." That's what I keep getting when Facebook blocks my posts. It says that the CDC provides more reliable information on Covid-19. It *used* to be that the CDC and FDA were trusted, but more and more people aren't sure what to trust. And I can certainly respect people who have gotten the "vaccine" out of a sincere trust of the CDC. But there is strong evidence that their absolute denials of any change or interaction with DNA were false. They have claimed that their own database on diseases in the military was false - or is it their new claim that is false? What else are they wrong on? My studies have shown that they are wrong on a lot. And more and more doctors and high level medical researchers are beginning to recognize that the CDC, FDA, and other agencies have been caught being used as political tools. Imagine that! Trust in these agencies is fast eroding - thankfully. Numerous doctors are now realizing that the CDC is *not* an objective organ. It is one of many tools of the political left.

And by the way, I am not being cynic when I ask the question, "How do we even know the truth?" I am just realizing the demonic nature of the situation we are in in modern America. I talked to one doctor a month ago and asked him some questions about medical research. He loves medical research, and still follows it. But when it came to the CDC and FDA, he had nothing but disdain. He said that he used to pretty much trust everything put out by the CDC, FDA, and the Pharmaceutical representatives that came to his office. He has since seen so much evidence of corruption, politicization, graft, legal bribery from the big corporations, and outright lies that he has come to the conclusion that the CDC is a criminal organization and that the FDA is not far behind. Is that an exaggeration? Perhaps. I don't think so. But I would say that given recent events it is utterly naive to blindly accept what *any* government agency claims. They are mostly led by people hostile to the constitution, Christianity, and traditional values. We need to understand our American *situation* to rightly interpret things.

It is important that *trusted* sources for news and medical information be sought out. The mainstream media for sure cannot be trusted to tell the whole truth. They have become

propaganda tools for the establishment left. While I will certainly agree that the Bible is the only source that can be *infallibly* trusted, there are sources of information and news out there that are more reliable than others. Check with Dr Fugate and others about the best sources of information.

IV. Personalism (vv. 27-29; see verses under Larger Catechism's exposition of the sixth commandment)

The last window of ethics that is worthwhile asking questions about is personalism - who are the people feeding us the news? Are they believers or unbelievers? Have they been known to lie in the past? But personalism also deals with my *own* motives. Am I approaching this subject out of fear or in faith? Is my personal conscience being violated by the mandate? Am I rationalizing in order to avoid shame? In the case of many military people, their personal consciences are not being honored at all. While thousands of administrative and medical exemptions have been granted to military people on the Covid-19 shot, so far, zero religious exemptions to the Covid jab have been granted. Zero. That shows prejudice. In 1 Corinthians 10 Paul says that our own consciences and the consciences of others need to be clear before God. On the issue of food, Paul's conscience was more clear than some others, and he sought to be sensitive to the others - even if they were wrong. Verses 27-29

1Cor. 10:27 If any of those who do not believe invites you to dinner, and you desire to go, eat whatever is set before you, asking no question for conscience' sake. 28 But if anyone says to you, "This was offered to idols," do not eat it for the sake of the one who told you, and for conscience' sake; for "the earth is the LORD'S, and all its fullness." 29 "Conscience," I say, not your own, but that of the other. For why is my liberty judged by another man's conscience? 30 But if I partake with thanks, why am I evil spoken of for the food over which I give thanks?

Paul was very sensitive to the consciences of others. And there are Christians today who literally stand in opposite places on the "vaccine" debate - and they stand there from a conscience perspective. Sarfati is no dummy. His article is a rather well-reasoned article in some places - though I find fault with it at places. I also respect his right to live by his conscience. And Paul says much the same in verses 31-33. He sought in everything to please God, but he also sought to the best of his ability to accommodate the consciences of others and to not bind their consciences. It didn't mean that he didn't instruct their conscience- like I am doing today, but he let them be Bereans.

But that whole subject of honoring the consciences of others is also another argument against any kind of mandate - whether by the military, the Federal government, city councils, or businesses. And certainly within the church this should be true. We don't advocate the Roman Catholic idea of implicit faith - where you have to believe things because I preach them. We advocate you being Bereans who study the Scriptures to see if I am right or wrong. You know you can disagree with me and debate with me. We give you that freedom. But if you value that freedom, don't be telling military people that they have

no right to object getting vaccinated. They have every right. And people object, “But what if they get everyone sick while on duty?” Well, if the vaccine works, and if everyone else is vaccinated, why are they worrying? By worrying they are acting as if the vaccines don’t work. When you realize the trillions of dollars vaccines will generate for the establishment, this is no longer an objective debate. Verses 31-33 say,

1Cor. 10:31 Therefore, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God. 32 Give no offense, either to the Jews or to the Greeks or to the church of God, 33 just as I also please all men in all things, not seeking my own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved.

And though this sermon has left more unanswered than it has answered, I would urge all of you to give grace to each other on this subject. It’s OK to have strongly held beliefs. I do. You already know that I’m solidly against the Covid-19 “vaccines.” And I have not even remotely given all my reasons for why. But Sarfati’s article has some pretty convincing stuff for the opposite perspective. Because of the limits of science we should not be dogmatic on the ethics of things that are dependent on facts taken from science - either way. You will notice in this sermon that the “facts” I am using dogmatically are facts everyone agrees on (the use of fetal cells), and therefore I can be more dogmatic in applying the Bible to those facts. Other “facts” I am less dogmatic on, though I obviously have an opinion.

But I do want to end by being absolutely dogmatic on one more thing (as Sarfati himself is, thankfully), and that is that there is not a shred of Biblical evidence to justify *state* mandates on the Covid-19 “vaccine.” Why can the state today mandate something that was not even available in Christ’s day? Scripture is crystal clear that the civil government only has authority to mandate what Scripture gives them authority to mandate. And even if you weren’t a Christian, you should be able to point out that the powers delegated to the federal government by the states in our constitution do not include mandates on masks, covid-19 “vaccines,” or any of a host of other things that the federal government has intruded itself into in recent years. We should be dogmatic on that.

But for us the Scripture is clear. If you look at my book, *The Divine Right of Resistance*,⁴² you will see that there are only a handful of enumerated, specified, and delegated powers given to the civil government by the Bible. They have no authority to go beyond those ten powers. The Bible does not authorize the CDC, the FDA, or most of the other agencies. Nor does the American constitution - article I, section 1 - those powers are vested in Congress and can’t be delegated; it is quite clear. And if neither bible nor constitution gives the civil government the authority to mandate “vaccines” on military people, we should stand behind these military men and women who are refusing the “vaccine.” Their resistance is a lawful and godly resistance to tyranny that deserves our prayers, support, letters, encouragement, calls to government officials, and any other help we can give to end this tyranny. Paul stood up for the consciences of others and so should we. May the Lord give you wisdom to make good decisions before God. Amen.

⁴² <https://kayserscommentary.com/booklets.md>