

Are COVID-19 vaccines made from aborted babies? What is HEK293?

<https://www.patheos.com/blogs/adrianwarnock/2021/01/are-covid-19-vaccines-made-from-aborted-babies-what-is-hek293/>

1. Ingredients of COVID-19 vaccines

Some are claiming that if you inject the COVID-19 vaccine into you then you are injecting aborted babies. **Please cite your sources so that I can make sure you are not holding up straw man arguments.** There are even videos and links circulating on social media that claim to show ingredients of the vaccines and that one of them is fetal tissue. **Please cite your source so I can review your claim.** Some of these reports are falsified. *The idea that the vaccines contain as an ingredient aborted body parts of babies is simply and completely untrue.*

We have discussed the fact that the AZ vaccine would have fetal remains in it as it is made in the traditional method. I know of no method of completely removing such remains, and you have provided no evidence that one exists.

American vaccines list the biological remains of the aborted fetal cell lines used in production. We see on the packaging for the US [Merck MMR II](#) that “human albumin,” the residual blood products of the aborted fetal cell lines used, is listed on the insert.

“Each dose is calculated to contain sorbitol (14.5 mg), sucrose (1.9 mg), hydrolyzed gelatin (14.5mg), recombinant HUMAN ALBUMIN ($\leq 0.3\text{mg}$), fetal bovine serum ($< 1\text{ppm}$), approximately 25 mcg of neomycin and other buffer and media ingredients.”

Yet the UK [Merck M-M-RVAXPRO](#), the same product made with the same cell line, only says that it MAY contain remains.

“The vaccine MAY contain traces of recombinant human albumin (rHA).”

The UK does not seem to have the same standards of disclosure than the US. The [GSK MMR vaccine Priorix](#), although also made with the aborted fetal cell line MRC 5, makes no such admission in its vaccine information.

p. 3

“PRIORIX is a lyophilized mixed preparation of the attenuated Schwarz measles, RIT 4385 mumps (derived from Jeryl Lynn strain) and Wistar RA 27/3 rubella strains of viruses, separately obtained by propagation either in chick embryo tissue cultures (mumps and measles) or MRC5 human diploid cells (rubella).”

p.15

“Composition”

After reconstitution, 1 dose (0.5 mL) contains:

Live attenuated measles virus¹ (Schwarz strain) not less than $10^{3.0}$ CCID₅₀³

Live attenuated mumps virus¹ (RIT 4385 strain, derived from Jeryl Lynn strain) not less than $10^{3.7}$ CCID₅₀³

Live attenuated rubella virus² (Wistar RA 27/3 strain) not less than $10^{3.0}$ CCID₅₀³

1 produced in chick embryo cells

2 produced in human diploid (MRC-5) cells

3 Cell Culture Infective Dose 50%

Excipients

Vaccine: Amino acids, lactose, mannitol and sorbitol.

Diluent: Water for injection.

Residue

Neomycin sulphate

PRIORIX meets the World Health Organization requirements for manufacture of biological substances and for measles, mumps and rubella vaccines and combined vaccines (live).”

(as an aside, all these vaccines are made with the Wistar RA27/3 strain of Rubella, taken from [aborted fetal tissue](#).)

No disclosure of aborted fetal remains on the product information on the UK Electronic Medicine Compendium (emc) for [Priorix](#):

“6.1 List of excipients

Powder:

Amino acids

Lactose (anhydrous)

Mannitol

Sorbitol

Solvent:

Water for injections”

Further, an [analysis by Corvelva](#) of [Priorix Tetra](#) found that the entire genome of [Michael Richard Christian](#), the child from whose lungs MRC 5 was made, was found in the product.

“Results

The human reference genome was found to be matched by 99.76% reads from vaccine DNA, which means nearly in all its entirety. The human fetal DNA presented in this vaccine is a single entire genome, that means the vaccine contains genomic DNA with all the chromosomes of a male individual (in fact MRC-5 originates from a male fetus).”

I cannot find any statement from AZ stating there are no fetal cell remains in their ChAdOx1 product. In fact the UK Medicines & Health care products Regulatory Agency does not seem to admit to, or require the disclosure of, fetal cell remains in UK vaccines.

In their “[Vaccine Knowledge Project](#)” with The Oxford Vaccine group (partners with AZ in ChAdOx1), which claims “Authoritative Information for All,” the strange claim is made that it is UNLIKELY that any human material remains in the final vaccine, as if they did not have

the power to simply test to see if it does.

“Human Cell Lines

For some vaccines, the active ingredient is grown in laboratories on cultures that contain human cells. Some viruses, such as chickenpox (varicella), grow much better in human cells. After they are grown, the viruses are purified several times to remove the cell culture material. This makes it unlikely that any human material remains in the final vaccine.”

Of course they can know for sure, but all this suggests is that there is no requirement for vaccine makers to disclose this unsavory information to British Citizens. And given that such a disclosure increases vaccine rejection for these products by some individuals and groups, it is in the interest of the UK and the companies making the vaccines, to simply leave that information out.

We discussed the need for you to check your regulatory rules in the UK to see if AZ is has a mandate to report fetal DNA fragments or blood proteins in the final product, and the need to contact AZ directly to ask the question. Have you asked the direct question to AstraZeneca: “Are there DNA fragments, residual human albumin in ChAdOx1?”

If you have not, why not?

“The idea that the vaccines contain as an ingredient aborted body parts of babies is simply and completely untrue.”

You have not met the burden of proof upon you to make this claim, and from everything I can tell, it is a false claim.

Additionally, the use of the clumsy term “body parts of babies” instead of using the correct medical terminology is deceptive, suggesting that the assertion is an absurdist one, when in fact, it is an uncontested medical fact in the US that aborted fetal cell remains are contained in vaccines whose antigens are grown in aborted fetal cell lines.

Lev 19:11

“You shall not steal; you shall not deal falsely; you shall not lie to one another.”

You can confirm the ingredients for yourself by looking at sections 2 and 6.1 of the following UK official documents for the three vaccines being rolled out: [Pfizer](#), [Moderna](#), and [Astra-Zeneca](#). Note that none of the ingredients listed in 6.1 are made from aborted baby parts. In the case of Astra-Zeneca there is a note in section 2 that HEK293 cells are involved in the manufacture of the vaccine itself, and more of that later in the article. But even that does not mean that those cells are contained in the actual vaccine. There is an extensive purification process which:

“...consists of lysis of the production bioreactor cell culture, nuclease digestion of the host cell DNA, clarification and further processing through a series of purification/concentration steps to remove process-related impurities and then formulation with excipients and aseptic filtration.” [Section II.2 UK PAR](#)

No aborted babies are contained in our COVID-19 vaccines and no babies have been aborted for the purpose of developing or manufacturing COVID-19 vaccines.

You have failed to meet the burden of proof upon you to make this claim, and you have not responded to the questions I had asked about this in January.

Nowhere in the section above have you exonerated the AZ vaccine from containing fetal DNA or albumin. You have merely demonstrated that AZ **does not say** that the vaccine contains these. They do not make the claim that “no aborted babies are contained in our COVID-19 vaccines.” You have made that leap. It may be there and simply not reported, as they may not be mandated to do so.

Further, please cite the place where it has been espoused that an individual child was aborted for the purpose of “developing or manufacturing COVID-19 vaccines.” so that I can be assured that you are not offering a straw man deception.

Exod 23:1

“You shall not spread a false report. You shall not join hands with a wicked man to be a malicious witness.”

Many might not need to go any further, but some might be interested to understand the detail of the use of certain cell lines in the development, testing, and in some cases manufacturing process and their origins. Some people who believe abortion is morally wrong will have valid concerns about this. If you have heard of HEK293 and that is an issue for you ethically, then continue reading and I will try and explain the situation and why, on balance, I personally do not have an objection to the use of these vaccines.

The “on balance” is the beginning of the theological problems here. This article balances the word of God against the ethics of man. The ethics of man should not hold any weight in an article to Christians on decision making.

I certainly do not want to raise any unnecessary concerns, and so if these complex ethical questions are not important to you then feel free to simply leave the article here knowing that the vaccines do not include the parts of aborted babies.

You repeatedly use language that makes the claim that aborted fetal cell remains being in some vaccine solutions seem absurd. There is no language in the medical lexicon that discusses “parts of aborted babies” being in a vaccine. This is the language used ([Janssen](#)):

“Each 0.5mL dose of Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine is formulated to contain 5×10^{10} virus particles (VP) and the following inactive ingredients: citric acid monohydrate (0.14mg), trisodium citrate dehydrate (2.02mg), ethanol(2.04mg), 2-hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin (HBCD) (25.50mg), polysorbate-80(0.16mg), sodium chloride(2.19mg). Each dose may also contain residual amounts of **host cell proteins ($\leq 0.15\text{mcg}$) and/or host cell DNA ($\leq 3\text{ng}$).**” [emphasis added]

No babies were aborted in order to make COVID-19 vaccines

Dr [Albert Mohler](#) points out:

“there is no activity related to abortion in the present that is in any way associated with the use of these vaccines.” [READ MORE](#)

It is strange to me that theologians with no medical training, or depth of understanding of vaccine issues, are taken as authorities on this to be trusted.

Why is a pastor with no medical training commenting on medicine authoritatively? Why is a

doctor with no theological training commenting on theology authoritatively?

Al Mohler's assertions about medical facts are not trustworthy. It is clear he has not even applied basic market forces to this discussion. When people buy things, it drives the market for these things. When aborted fetal cell vaccines are profitable, it drives the market for more aborted fetal cell lines. It does NOT discourage corporations to make human cell line free vaccines.

And again, is this a straw man? Where has anyone asked if babies were aborted JUST for this specific vaccine? That is not how vaccines are developed.

2. Vaccination itself is not anti-christian

In another article [Mohler points out the long history of vaccination within Christian circles](#), and recognizes that sometimes vaccines can cause harm to some people. One of the leading heroes of Western Evangelicalism is Jonathan Edwards. In 1758 he took an early form of vaccination (which pre-dated [Edward Jenner's discovery](#)), thereby showing that he ethically approved of the concept. We sometimes forget how old the idea of using vaccines to prevent disease is.

Sadly Edwards also died a few days later of side effects caused by this vaccination. Thus also proving that vaccinations can sometimes have side effects. This story therefore reminds us that we should certainly not assume that vaccines will never cause harm. In particular we should always show compassion to the family members of people who have had life altering medical issues that they believe are caused by vaccination. **This goes to the question Kristi Wees asked you... because there is some subtle gaslighting here with the word "believe."** Sometimes these events may have been a co-incidence and it is often impossible to prove causality. But some parents who have experienced a healthy child develop severe illness after a vaccination have often found the medical community and others simply dismiss their concerns. We should show understanding to these families and not be judgmental, labeling them as "anti-vaxers". Let's not heap insults onto the pain of these families whose suffering is very real, and who often feel alone.

The fact that this paragraph is even in this piece puts it in a different category than almost all other Christian vaccine articles. Usually, there is no recognition that vaccine injury exists, that there are real families suffering because of it, and that they are brothers and sisters dealing with it who are deserving of dignity and love.

Sadly all medical interventions have risks and benefits attached. Fortunately the modern vaccines are carefully studied in tens of thousands of patients, and the risk of serious side effects do seem very low indeed. But the risks can never be absent entirely. All doctors know that even common medicines that you can buy over the counter can sadly sometimes cause serious complications.

We should not be overly alarmed, however, by milder side effects such as a swollen arm, fever, feeling unwell as these are to be expected and suggest that the body is responding to the vaccine as we want it to. Remember the whole idea of vaccines is to trick the body into thinking it is sick. No wonder we sometimes feel unwell after a vaccine.

What is the proper amount of alarm for this? External reactions in our community are followed by questions like, "well if there is swelling at the injection site, the body is having an inflammatory response, and what other organs or systems might also be having that response?" The whole idea is tricking the body into thinking it is sick, by injecting things into it that make it sick, which actually makes it sick. Live vaccines make the body sick.

Adjuvants poison the body to make it sick by poisoning the body, so the immune system will react and then stumble up on the antigen while it is looking for the poison and address both. It is not “tricking” the body. It is activating the immune system in a very real process by attacking the body with antigens and adjuvants.

This is just more deceptive language.

3. Does God promise to protect Christians from COVID-19?

Some Christians refuse all vaccines on the basis that vaccinations are somehow not natural or on the basis that they believe God will protect them from diseases. **Please cite your sources #straw man.** Some argue that God determines how long we should live so we cannot “save” our lives.

I am the source for this sentence, but my argument was that I don't do things to extend my life, but to be responsible to God, to behave wisely and remain as healthy as I can.

But we do things all the time to try and reduce our risk of disease or death.

“We do these things all the time to...” it doesn't matter how you end that sentence, it is not a Christian argument. We sin ALL THE TIME.

“We do these things all the time to...” satisfy our carnal lust.

“We do these things all the time to...” justify giving into our sinful desires.

“We do these things all the time to...” insert sinful motive here.

So you have conjoined two different goals, 1. Trying to stay healthy 2. Trying to live longer.

One can use the “a little wine” verse below to encourage staying healthy, but I know of no verse that tells us that we are to try to live longer. Any such verse would surely indict Christ, as he did nothing to prevent his own arrest, conviction, and murder. So, by his example, we are not to try to extend our lives. Do you know of any Scripture that in any way encourages us to try to extend our lives?

Quite the opposite. God says he has numbered our days:

Psalm 139:16

**“Your eyes saw my unformed substance;
in your book were written, every one of them,
the days that were formed for me,
when as yet there was none of them.”**

Job 14:5

**“Since his days are determined, and the number of his months is with you, and
you have appointed his limits that he cannot pass”**

There is the promise that obedience to parents will lead to long life, but the command is to obey parents, not to live a long life.

On the other hand, there is ample Scripture to teach us to be wise and discerning.

1 Kings 3:9

“So give your servant a discerning heart to govern your people and to distinguish between right and wrong. For who is able to govern this great people of yours?”

A favourite passage which sometimes gets cited by Christians about the current pandemic is Psalm 91

He who dwells in the shelter of the Most High
will abide in the shadow of the Almighty.
I will say to the LORD, “My refuge and my fortress,
my God, in whom I trust.”

**For he will deliver you from the snare of the fowler
and from the deadly pestilence.**

He will cover you with his pinions,
and under his wings you will find refuge;
his faithfulness is a shield and buckler.
You will not fear the terror of the night,
nor the arrow that flies by day,
nor the pestilence that stalks in darkness,
nor the destruction that wastes at noonday.

A thousand may fall at your side,
ten thousand at your right hand,
but **it will not come near you.**
You will only look with your eyes
and see the recompense of the wicked.

Because you have made the LORD your dwelling place—
the Most High, who is my refuge
no evil shall be allowed to befall you,
no plague come near your tent.

For he will command his angels concerning you
to guard you in all your ways.
On their hands they will bear you up,
lest you strike your foot against a stone.
You will tread on the lion and the adder;
the young lion and the serpent you will trample underfoot.

“Because he holds fast to me in love, I will deliver him;
I will protect him, because he knows my name.
When he calls to me, I will answer him;
I will be with him in trouble;
I will rescue him and honor him.
With long life I will satisfy him
and show him my salvation.”

This beautiful psalm is intended as a comfort to us that we do not face our problems alone. We should take care not to misuse or misinterpret it:

The psalm itself poses a danger. Because its assurance of security is so comprehensive and confident, it is especially subject to the misuse . . . of turning faith into superstition.

Mays, J. L. (1994). *Psalms* (p. 297). Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.

Correct. But again, quote someone.

Where has it been used to say that this protection covers disease, or specifically COVID-19?

Are they saying that or are YOU making the leap that they think that means protection from disease and death? There were times I posted things with no interpretation at all, and you decided I was offering an interpretation or application, and then chided me for a position I never held.

This psalm is not a magical promise that in this world no Christian will suffer from infectious diseases any more than it is a promise that the believer who falls off a cliff or throws himself off a building will always be held up by angels so that he is protected. The devil quotes verses from this Psalm to Jesus in the wilderness, tempting him to demonstrate the protection these verses speak of. Jesus reply was curt:

Jesus said to him, “Again it is written, ‘You shall not put the Lord your God to the test.’” (Matthew 4:7)

We also should not presume upon the protection of God and use it as an excuse not to take steps to protect ourselves. To do so could be to test God in the exact same way Satan urged Jesus to do.

The protection offered in this psalm is not absolute. It is a spiritual and mental protection that is on offer, and an ultimate spiritual and eternal protection. The true concept is similar to one of the most famous verses in the Bible which appears at first glance to promise we will not ever die. The truth is rather that even the end of our earthly life is not final death for us as we have eternal life:

“For God loved the world so much that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not die but have eternal life” (John 3:16, Good News Bible)

Christians do die. It’s just that when we do our death is not permanent.

Psalm 91 rightly used gives great comfort and hope but our hope is not for our a trouble and sickness free today but for a glorious eternity to come. As Jesus himself promised

“I have told you these things, so that in me you may have peace. In this world you will have trouble. But take heart! I have overcome the world.” (John 16:33)

Yet again, true. But who is this who believes that becoming a Christian protects you from dying? I have not even come across this in the worst of prosperity gospels. If someone is espousing this false teaching, should they not be called out by name? This is the lowest of low hanging fruit.

The promises of God’s protection does not remove from us the need to act responsibly, such as by wearing a seat belt when we go in a car. The use of medical science would fall under a similar category.

And no. Full stop.

Car Seat/Medical Products cannot be compared, and they do not fall under a similar

category.

The seat belt/car seat to vaccine comparison has been used everywhere, and they are not analogous. Seat belts and car seats don't harm and maim on their own. Getting into them in a non-running car parked in the driveway poses no risk. They don't kill. They are inactive entities. They have no active parts to cause harm. They are inert.

Car accidents kill. Not seat belts or car seats.

Vaccines can kill. ALL medical products, used as directed will harm someone. On their own. With no outside disaster like car accidents.

Further, car seats are not liability free. When a badly designed car seat or seat belt results in the needless death of a passenger, the company is liable for damages, and the apparatus is taken out of use.

These two product lines, one inert and one active, have nothing to do with one another.

One is reasonably mandated by law and is subject to regular liability law when designed improperly, and the other, you and I have already agreed should never be mandated by law and is not subject to regular liability when designed improperly.

We should not presume that God will shield us from the consequences of living in a fallen broken world. In the time of the New Testament there was a lot of miraculous healing power at work but even the Apostles were not immune to sickness, nor were they able to heal everyone. Paul not only traveled with a personal Physician, Luke, but advocated the use of basic medical remedies to improve his friend's health:

No longer drink only water, but use a little wine for the sake of your stomach and your frequent ailments. (1 Timothy 5:23)

A recommendation for “a little wine” (organic fermented grapes) cannot be compared to mRNA gene manipulation.

Does Paul traveling with Luke mean all physicians should be blindly obeyed?

The idea that God will protect all true faith-filled Christians from COVID-19 could be called an [over-realised eschatology](#) for those who like theological terms. It is more typically an error seen among [Charismatics](#). Since my theological roots dig deep into that stream I am familiar with its errors, but also with the errors of the other theological stream I have been as much influenced by- [the Reformed](#). As a [reformed charismatic](#) I have to try to avoid the excesses and weakness of both perspectives!

On the Reformed side there can be an over-emphasis on the sovereignty of God that leads to passivity and may be an alternative reason some turn down vaccines or other medical help. Mohler critiques that perspective as follows:

“Some might say, “I believe in the sovereignty of God, and if God wants me to have this virus then he will give me the virus. I don't need medical intervention because I trust God.” That kind of logic, if pressed to its logical conclusion, however, is untenable—we wouldn't treat any sickness, cancer, or injury. Medical treatment is an extension of God's common grace and Christians have always understood this. That is why, throughout history, where you found Christians you found hospitals and the church treating the sick. Thus, it is not wrong for Christians to take measures to avoid getting sick or coming down with the virus. It is not wrong to take the vaccine against COVID-19.” [Read More](#)

First, Mohler has the same citation problem that you do. “Some might say.” Who says that, can I interview them, and will they tell me that Mohler is properly representing their position?

Next, Mohler is conflating medical treatment with a prophylactic vaccine. Vaccination is not medical treatment. It is not given to the ill to treat their illness.

He assumes that those not taking the vaccine are without the ability to reason, and that not taking one medical prophylactic equates to rejecting all medical treatment.

“Medical treatment is an extension of God’s common grace and Christians have always understood this.”

ALL medical treatment is an extension of God's common grace? [Tuskegee](#) was God's common grace? Knowingly [giving HIV contaminated blood to hemophiliacs](#)? [Harvard giving radioactive isotopes to disabled children](#)? [Johnson & Johnson/Janssen's opioids](#)? [AstraZeneca's Seroquel](#)? [Pfizer's Bextra](#)?

In the 21st century, the medical industry has been the [third leading cause of death](#) in the US.

I include these arguments for completeness and to ensure that every Christian realizes at the outset of this discussion that **vaccination is a life or death issue for believers too**. Even if you believe that you yourself are not in a high risk group for death, others around you are. I am one such person since my blood cancer and its treatment has severely damaged my immune system so that I cannot make sufficient antibodies to fight off infection or in response to a vaccine. If you take a vaccine you might save my life by not giving me COVID-19.

And here is where we need to stop and address the fraud that is at the heart of what you have done here, and what almost every Christian article on this is doing. It is WRONG, and it is a LIE.

THE COVID VACCINES DO NOT PREVENT INFECTION.

THE COVID VACCINES DO NOT PREVENT TRANSMISSION.

They are designed to do neither!

They are designed to reduce the severity of symptoms WHEN one becomes infected with SARS-Cov-2 virus. That is it.

I am going to say it again.

THE COVID VACCINES DO NOT PREVENT INFECTION.

THE COVID VACCINES DO NOT PREVENT TRANSMISSION.

Vaccination is NOT AN ACT OF LOVE TOWARD OUR NEIGHBORS AND DOES THEM NO GOOD.

If I get a vaccine, it will, at best, impact the severity of my infection WHEN I become infected. A substance that cannot prevent my infection, certainly can't prevent my transmission to you.

[Pfizer](#) and [Moderna](#) have the same statement on their shot's impact on transmission, word for word:

“Vaccine effectiveness against transmission of SARS-CoV-2

Data are limited to assess the effect of the vaccine against transmission of SARS-CoV-2 from individuals who are infected despite vaccination. Demonstrated high efficacy against symptomatic COVID-19 may translate to overall prevention of transmission in populations with high enough vaccine uptake, though it is possible that if efficacy against asymptomatic infection were lower than efficacy against symptomatic infection, asymptomatic cases in combination with reduced mask-wearing and social distancing could result in significant continued transmission. Additional evaluations including data from clinical trials and from vaccine use post-authorization will be needed to assess the effect of the vaccine in preventing virus shedding and transmission, in particular in individuals with asymptomatic infection.”

This is written by a marketing team, not scientists. It admits that it has no data on transmissibility (because again, it is not designed to prevent infection or transmission) and then concocts a fantasy scenario why it MIGHT impact transmission. I can go on for a very long time breaking this fantasy scenario down, or come up with several on my own, but bottom line, there is no reason to believe it will impact transmission.

If I lived next door to you and took the vaccine, it would not help you avoid the virus. In fact, it could simply make me asymptomatic and let me think it is perfectly fine to bring you a plate of biscuits when infected, resulting in your death.

And if it cannot prevent a single infection, or a single transmission, how exactly does it protect “neighbors” and end a pandemic even if 90% of people get it?

I have been struggling for a way to frame the pure deception and absurdity of the effort to end a pandemic with a vaccine that cannot prevent infection or transmission. This morning, I remembered the SNL skits for City Wide Bank: the bank that only makes change.

“All the time our customers ask us, how do you make money doing this? The answer is simple. [Volume](#).”

We are not “all in this together.” Each of our individual immune systems is in it by themselves. My immune system cannot help your immune system. The only thing I can do for you is to get myself out of the way while my immune system is doing its work, to stay home when I am sick. Which is the rule my community has always followed.

This entire next section that you write is a lie. We deal with this lie all the time. Yet it goes on and on. There is actually [an ad campaign](#) to get grandparents to get the pertussis vaccine, so they don't kill their newborn grandchildren. Yet the pertussis vaccine simply removes the tell tale cough that would prevent a loving and infected grandmother from going to see her newborn grand-bundle of joy.

The pertussis vaccine does not reduce transmission, it increases transmission by creating asymptomatic carriers who unknowingly spread the bacteria. It is insidious.

Exodus 23:1

“You shall not spread a false report. You shall not join hands with a wicked man to be a malicious witness.”

Vaccination is not just an act of self preservation. It is an act of love towards our neighbours to do them good.

This is fraud, and it is fraud that is partially directed at Christian leaders and pastors. This is what God has to say about the consequences of leaders believing lies:

Proverbs 29:12

“If a ruler pays attention to falsehood, All his ministers become wicked.”

To fail to act in order to protect those who are more vulnerable than ourselves could itself constitute a sin of omission as we might be the direct cause of harm that is preventable.

Receiving the vaccine does NOT prevent direct harm to anyone else, and failing to receive this vaccine is NOT sin!

No one can “protect” anyone else by receiving the vaccine because it does not prevent infection or transmission.

This is a very serious fraud that you have engaged in, and it must be repented of.

Lev 19:11

“Do not steal. Do not lie. Do not deceive one another.”

This is the same argument for social distancing and wearing masks of course. By taking steps to prevent ourselves getting and transmitting COVID-19 we are saving the lives of others less fortunate.

One can plausibly make this argument for masking, distancing, or avoiding contact all together, but you cannot plausibly make this argument for vaccinating. The vaccine will work (or not) on my body and my body alone. My seroconversion (or not) has no impact on yours, just as my uptake of birth control will not prevent your wife from getting pregnant.

What Pfizer and Moderna only suggest *might* happen under its fantasy scenario involving a vague high uptake that will never happen (approaching 100%? What?), you present as fact.

I cannot find any research from AZ on impacts on transmission. And reports that their vaccine may lower transmission because of lower PCR tests, can be explained by the WHO putting out a notice on high false positives for high cycles for the PCR tests, and that cycle thresholds should be adjusted, right as the vaccine was coming out.

<https://web.archive.org/web/20210102051357/https://www.who.int/news/item/14-12-2020-who-information-notice-for-ivd-users>

<https://www.medpagetoday.com/infectiousdisease/covid19/90508>

“The World Health Organization issued a notice last week telling the labs “the cut-off should be manually adjusted to ensure that specimens with high Ct values are not incorrectly assigned SARS-CoV-2 detected due to background noise.” Could this be a reason why many people test positive but remain asymptomatic? In that same memo, WHO said all labs should report the cycle threshold value to treating physicians.”

Taking a vaccine is an act of love to others. Precious people made in the image of God are dying from COVID-19. YOU can help stop this.

NO! I CANNOT!

But if anyone has the world’s goods and sees his brother in need, yet closes his heart

against him, how does God's love abide in him? Little children, let us not love in word or talk but in deed and in truth. (1 John 3:17-18)

When I urged you twice to look into the EVMS protocol to protect you months ago, was that closing my heart? That approach has the same impact of the intentions of the vaccine: can't prevent infection, or impact transmission, but can reduce severity of symptoms and make infections symptom free.

But that approach has no life threatening side effects.

How can you equate loving our neighbor with unnecessarily putting ourselves at risk to achieve nothing for our neighbor as the vaccines cannot prevent infection or transmission?

This is manipulation and deception. This is not how Scripture is to be used. This is dangerous for you!

James 3:1

“Do not become teachers in large numbers, my brothers, since you know that we who are teachers will incur a stricter judgment.”

Most Christians do not reject medicines and medical help in general. There is no reason to reject vaccination wholesale as a non-Christian concept.

I reject vaccines outright because all vaccines in my country are liability free. I reject the entire US vaccine program because it is corrupt, and we are warned against being involved with corruption. I have sent you [my secular Hopkins paper](#) on why I reject vaccines, but I don't know if you have reviewed it. These are arguments outside of the abortion issue. I feel that I make the case very well because of the corruption in the program. I believe it is unwise to participate in the program at all.

Refusing to partner with darkness is a Christian concept.

Ephesians 5:6-17

6 Let no one deceive you with empty words, for because of these things the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience. 7 Therefore do not become partners with them; 8 for at one time you were darkness, but now you are light in the Lord. Walk as children of light 9 (for the fruit of light is found in all that is good and right and true), 10 and try to discern what is pleasing to the Lord. 11 Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them. 12 For it is shameful even to speak of the things that they do in secret. 13 But when anything is exposed by the light, it becomes visible, 14 for anything that becomes visible is light. Therefore it says,

**“Awake, O sleeper,
and arise from the dead,
and Christ will shine on you.”**

15 Look carefully then how you walk, not as unwise but as wise, 16 making the best use of the time, because the days are evil. 17 Therefore do not be foolish, but understand what the will of the Lord is.

2 Corinthians 6:14-17

14 Do not be unequally yoked with unbelievers. For what partnership has righteousness with lawlessness? Or what fellowship has light with darkness? 15 What accord has Christ with Belial?[\[b\]](#) Or what portion does a believer share with an unbeliever? 16 What agreement has the temple of God with idols? For we are the temple of the living God; as God said,

“I will make my dwelling among them and walk among them,
and I will be their God,
and they shall be my people.

17 Therefore go out from their midst,
and be separate from them, says the Lord,
and touch no unclean thing;
then I will welcome you,

18 and I will be a father to you,
and you shall be sons and daughters to me,
says the Lord Almighty.”

God has given humans wisdom to create medicines and vaccines and we can accept them as coming from the common grace that he lavishes on all of us whether we follow him or not.

No, God gives humans **minds** to process **knowledge** that creates medicines and vaccines. Wisdom is judging if and when to use them well, or at all, and there is a systematic lack of wisdom in vaccine programs. There is an outright rejection of wisdom in most places in the pharmaceutical industry, because they are profit driven.

We cannot confuse knowledge and wisdom. Knowledge is figuring out how to make Thalidomide. Wisdom is not giving it to pregnant women.

And we have already established that a large portion of “medicines and vaccines” are not “coming from common grace”, but profit driven corruption.

Some Christians do not reject the concept of vaccination altogether but instead reject certain vaccines for a more specific reason that we will now turn to.

4. What are human cell lines?

Having said all this, some people have legitimate concerns about human cell lines that have been growing in laboratories for decades. If this is not an issue for you there is no need to keep reading... **well done for making it this far!**

This section explains the science, but you can also skip this bit to read [how Christians view the use of these cell lines](#).

Scientifically it is crucial for a number of stages in research, development, testing, and in some cases even the manufacture of certain types of vaccine for human-like cells to be used.

The only vaccine that I know of that needs human cells to be made is Rubella. And even then, non fetal cells can be used. There is no vaccine where it is “crucial” for aborted fetal cell use. Please cite a source if you wish to defend this position.

Historically it was actually very difficult to get human cells to grow in a laboratory setting, in effect to

be immortal, or to keep multiplying for decades. Many attempts were made to genetically engineer human cells to change them so that they can be reliably grown and used for all sorts of experiments.

The use of the word “immortal” is deception. Immortal means “exempt from death.” All aborted human fetal cell lines are subject to the [Hayflick Limit](#). Cells divide approximately 40 times, and as they do, they begin to “age” as their ability to methylate degrades.

This is the opposite of the word “immortal.”

Either a cell can be “immortal” or it can “keep multiplying for decades.”

Matthew 5:37

“Let what you say be simply ‘Yes’ or ‘No’; anything more than this comes from evil.”

The use of the word “immortal” suggests that no new abortions are required to sustain future scientific work using aborted fetal cell lines. More Deception.

Fluorescent HEK293 cells by Iznewton – Own work, [CC BY-SA 4.0](#), [Link](#)

Two main sources of the human cells they attempted to transform in this way were cancer cells (which obviously behave in a not fully human way), and human embryos. Importantly this is not the same as embryo research as the idea was not to grow human embryos in a lab but rather to create a sample of cell tissue that could be grown in a laboratory for decades and used in research.

This process does not “create a sample of cell tissue.” This is deception. It harvests the organs of children forced out of the uterus to their death, dissolves the connective tissue between the cells of the organ, and then uses those cells. The cells are not created, they are harvested from a living baby.

Because it has been so hard to produce such cell lines historically there are relatively few efforts today to recreate similar cell lines to those which have worked well for decades.

This sentence is not just deception, it is nonsense to me. How does one “recreate” the child we have named **Winifred Isaksson**, aborted in 1962 in Sweden, harvest her lungs anew, dissolved the connective tissue between her lung cells, and “develop” the WI-38 cell line afresh?

You have gone beyond deception by the sanitizing language of the child organ trafficking that we are participating in when buying these products, to painting a picture where there are no children involved at all... and that science is “creating” what God actually created.

WI-38 are the lung cells that **Winnie** was supposed to be breathing with. They are not “created” in a lab.

HEK 293 are the kidney cells that cleaned **Helen Emma Kristiansen's** blood in her short lifetime.

Your words do not simply dehumanize these children, it suggests that no human was involved in the process at all.

Science flourishes on predictability and when thousands of experiments have been done using the same cells it makes a lot of sense to keep using them.

Did it make sense to God? He prescribed death for anyone that accidentally killed an unborn child.

Exodus 21:22-25

“When men strive together and hit a pregnant woman, so that her children come out, but there is no harm, the one who hit her shall surely be fined, as the woman's husband shall impose on him, and he shall pay as the judges determine. But if there is harm, then you shall pay life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, stripe for stripe.”

You are justifying the use of the organs of murdered children by explaining that it makes work *easier* for unregenerate scientists to do research. At what point do we throw out Scripture and the directives of God for any worldly process or outcome? Much less the increased simplicity of the work itself. God did not say, “don't sin, unless it makes things easier.”

It will be hard to persuade scientists to re-create cell lines that work and are the foundation for so many medical developments.

A loss of product sales, uptake, and funding would easily persuade scientists.

This is unfortunate because in theory it would be possible to attempt to create new cell lines from entirely ethical sources such as umbilical chord stem cells.

And here you make my point for me. Unregenerate, unrepentant, ambitious men will NEVER even attempt to make what is described as an “ethical vaccine” free of the blood of unborn children, unless they can no longer make a profit using aborted fetal cell lines.

Thus, when one partners with darkness by purchasing and using vaccines that began with a child's murder, they will continue the profitability of the murder of children. “Science” has no conscience. It is not a human. It is a process practiced by people who may or may not have any conscience on where their work comes from, or goes to.

Your “this is unfortunate” claim rings empty, as you are doing nothing to discourage the practice, and everything to encourage the profitability of this grave sin.

The cell lines used today were created a long time ago

Please lay out what you believe the statute of limitations on the blood guilt of these killings?

This question has been asked a hundred times, and I have never seen an answer.

The statute of limitations on murder in the US is never. The statute of limitations on sin in Scripture is never.

The Jewish concept of “Bloodguilt” and the scripture it is built on instructs us here.

The Jewish Virtual Library:

“Bloodguilt refers to the liability for punishment for shedding blood. The biblical concept of bloodguilt derives from the belief that deeds generate consequences and that sin, in particular, is a danger to the sinner. The most vivid examples of this belief appear in connection with unlawful homicide, where innocent blood (*dam naki* (*naqi*); Jonah 1:14) cries out for vengeance (Gen. 4:10), is rejected by the earth (Isa.

26:21; [Ezek. 24:7](#)), and pollutes it ([Num. 35:33-34](#)). Bloodguilt attaches to the slayer and his family ([II Sam. 3:28ff.](#)) for generations ([II Kings 9:26](#)), and even to his city ([Jer. 26:5](#)), nation ([Deut. 21:8](#)), and land ([Deut. 24:4](#)). The technical term for bearing bloodguilt *damo bo*, or *damo bero'sho*, meant originally "his blood [remains] in him/in his head" ([Josh. 2:19](#); [Ezek. 33:5](#)), and the legal formula *mot yumat damav bo* ([Lev. 20:9-16](#)) means that in the case of lawful execution, the blood of the guilty victim remains on his own person and does not attach itself to his executioners.

The concept of bloodguilt in the Bible pervades all sources, legal, narrative, and cultic, and entails the following system of graded punishments for homicide."

And this is what you are promoting involvement with:

"Deliberate Homicide

The penalty is death by man ([Gen. 9:6](#)), or failing that, by God ([Gen. 9:5](#); cf. [Lev. 20:4-5](#)). A man can be either the direct cause ([Num. 35:16-21](#)) or the indirect cause, e.g., a watchman ([II Kings 10:24](#); [Ezek. 33:6](#)), priests ([Num. 18:1, 3](#)), homeowner ([Deut. 22:8](#)), or subordinate ([I Kings 2:31-35](#)). The punishment of the murderer is primarily the responsibility of the *blood-avenger (after court conviction, [Num. 35:19](#); [Deut. 19:12](#)), but God is the final guarantor that homicide is ultimately punished. His personal intervention is expressed by the verbs פָּקַד (*pakad (paqad)*, "attend to," [Hos. 1:4](#)); נָקַם (*nakam (naqam)*, "avenge," [II Kings 9:7](#)); דָּרַשׁ (*darash*, "exact punishment," [Ezek. 33:6](#)); and שׁוּב (חַיִּים) (*heshiv*, "return") in the idiom *heshiv damim 'al ro'sh* ([II Sam. 16:18](#); [I Kings 2:33](#)), which indicates that God will turn back to the head of the slayer the blood of the slain, the punishment the murderer believed he had averted. In the Bible, it should be noted, these idioms have become technical terms: the original phrase remains, but without the crudity of its more primitive implications in other ancient sources. God may postpone punishment to a later generation ([II Sam. 12: 13-14](#); [I Kings 21:21](#)). Man, however, does not have this option ([Deut. 24:16](#); [II Kings 14:6](#)) unless divinely authorized ([II Kings 9:7, 26](#)).

There is no commutation of the death penalty. The notion that deliberate homicide cannot be commuted is the foundation stone of criminal law in the Bible: human life is invaluable, hence incommutable. This concept is not found in any other body of law in the ancient Near East."

This is what Christ paid for us with his life for us. That he put himself beneath us so that we could escape. How cheap is our grace if we, who have all "benefited" from abortion, continue to participate in these evil practices and support this market that market which has earned the incommutable death penalty?

Philippians 2:5-11

"Have this attitude in yourselves which was also in Christ Jesus, 6who, as He *already* existed in the form of God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, 7but emptied Himself *by* taking the form of a bond-servant *and* being born in the likeness of men. 8And being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death: death on a cross.

9For this reason also God highly exalted Him, and bestowed on Him the name which is above every name, 10so that at the name of Jesus EVERY KNEE WILL BOW, of those who are in heaven and on earth and under the earth, 11and *that* every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

What is the year that is the cut off for “a long time ago?”

Mikey was killed in 1966 to make MRC-5. ***Little Dani*** was murdered in 2015 develop WALVAX-2. Can I use the former and not the latter? What is your criteria for determining which can be used and which cannot?

Children are being aborted now to develop future medical products. Biblically speaking, how long must one wait after a child is aborted to use their organs for medical purposes?

Please cite Scripture in your answer.

One of the most widespread cell lines used in one way or another with almost all medical developments whether they be vaccines or medicines is a cell line called [HEK293 or FreeStyle293F](#).

This cell line has been used at least in the development or testing phase of almost all COVID-19 vaccines. Here is a summary of how the various vaccines have used these cells.

- [The COVID-19 spike protein gene was grafted into HEK293 cells](#) allowing them to produce copies of this protein allowing it to be further studied. The knowledge led directly to vaccine development and these cell lines were used in developing and testing all the vaccines.
- The Pfizer and Moderna vaccines do not use the HEK293 cells as part of their production process
- In the case of the AstraZeneca / Oxford vaccine as noted in their official information, HEK293 cells are used to grow the vector virus that is inactivated and ultimately becomes the vaccine. Thus the cells are not in the vaccine but are part of the production process.

You have not established that the cellular remains are not in the vaccine.

Some Christians make a moral distinction between those vaccines (Pfizer and Moderna) where the testing or development requires HEK293 and those where the manufacture process requires them. [Jonathan Imbody explains this position](#) in a piece for the Christian Medical and Dental Associations. [Randy Alcorn](#) also outlines the reasoning why some pro-lifers would accept the Pfizer or Moderna vaccines but not the Oxford-AstraZeneca one.

Since the cell lines are used in both cases to me it seems like splitting hairs or straining at gnats to make such a distinction. The moral equivalence of both types of vaccine is [well argued with references to scientific papers outlining the use of HEK293 cell lines in COVID vaccines by Stacy Trasancos](#).

The professor who made the original HEK293 cell line, from which all the cells used today are directly descended, [cannot remember where this originating embryo came from](#). The reason the cell line is called 293 is because that was his 293rd experiment. Some of these experiments apparently used cells from miscarriages and some from abortions. Crucially the decision to carry out the abortion (if indeed HEK293 came from an abortion) was entirely separate from the decision to attempt to make a tissue culture out of the cells.

Please cite your source for this last claim.

If the woman choosing the abortion did not carry out the abortion to attempt to make a culture out of those cells, clearly someone in the chain of custody did, as the child's remains made their way into the hands of the professor making the cell line.

Abortions were not carried out in order to create cell lines. Cell tissues were created via genetic engineering after the abortion had occurred.

Cell tissues were created by God, not the genetic engineering of any man. God made the child, man harvested the tissue, and man adulterated the tissue.

Cite your source for this claim. To develop the WI-38 cell line, Leonard Hayflick at the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia literally ordered a female pair of lungs with specific traits from Sven Gard in Sweden, then Gard and his abortionist, Eva Ernholm screened mothers to find the right child.

The mother was never notified of how her child's body would be used, but Hayflick, Gard, and Ernholm, who carried out the killing, certainly did perform the abortion to develop the cell line.

It is not as if scientists are trolling the back alley's of abortion clinics to see what remains in a trash dumpster at the end of the day.

Again, you have placed a burden of proof on yourself that you cannot live up to, because you cannot know that abortions are not being performed to harvest specific organs with specific traits. Hayflick did so with his first widespread viable line before I was even born. To assume that no one is doing it now is at best naive.

And indeed it is also false.

Just last week a lawsuit in the US Federal Court confirmed that [the US Department of Health and Human Services was illegally purchasing aborted fetal organs for research.](#)

“Both the FDA and NIH purchased the organs from California-based Advanced Biosciences Resources (ABR) to create “[humanized mice](#)” for use in HIV research. ABR partners with Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers to dismember fetuses and sell their parts for research. The [decision](#) notes that ABR: sold second-trimester livers and thymi for hundreds of dollars apiece. The same for brains, eyes, and lungs. After tacking on fees for services like shipping and cleaning, ABR could collect over \$2,000 on a single fetus it purchased from Planned Parenthood for \$60. The federal government participated in this potentially illicit trade for years.”

In order to make the cells essentially immortal genetic engineering was involved, and so the resultant cell culture line is no longer a pure human tissue.

A murdered child's cells were contaminated and manipulated to become “frankencells,” Frankenstein's Monster, refined, sanitized, and made seemingly moral because “science” has advanced.

But it is the same thing. We have had that story at the bedrock of our medical cautionary tales for 200 years. Yet you explain the process of desecrating a child's body as if it is something wonderful, desirable, and a miracle of modern science, and like there are no unintended consequences.

Use of the cell line is not considered embryo research. The cells could never grow to become a human being.

... because the babies were murdered. Mutilated remains of a human can never grow to become a human being.

Because these cells are so predictable and amenable to further genetic alterations they have been used in huge numbers of experiments. A recent [moral report on vaccines](#) explains the impact of these cells:

“58,094 scientific papers have already been published that are associated with HEK293 alone—and they were instrumental in the development of numerous drugs and medical treatments. For example, HEK293 cells were used to study the human dopamine receptor, and many of the antipsychotic drugs used to treat mental illnesses like schizophrenia and bipolar disorder would not have been discovered without them” [Read More](#)

The impact of the cells don't matter to God. The life of **Helen Emma Kristiansen** mattered to God. Do we want our will, or his will?

Exodus 20:13

“You shall not murder.”

These products are fruits of a poison tree.

The scientific knowledge that has come about through the use of these cells is therefore everywhere. It would be almost impossible to avoid taking any vaccine or medicine that had been tested on this cell line, or whose development was contributed to by knowledge obtained from using them.

“Look, everyone is doing it, and the sin is everywhere, so we should just join in.”

You seem to think that you have made the case that since it is ubiquitous, that Christians should embrace it. You are actually making the case that Christians should be pulling farther and farther back from the pharmaceutical industry and mainstream medicine.

That when we are taught to be separate, we have VASTLY underestimated what that actually means.

Romans 12:2

“Do not conform to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind. Then you will be able to test and approve what God’s will is—his good, pleasing and perfect will.”

We all benefit from an abortion which happened decades ago in which we had no part.

I DON'T WANT TO “BENEFIT” FROM ABORTION!

I WANT TO REPENT THAT I HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH IT, EVER, IN ANY WAY!

AND WHO SAID WE HAVE BENEFITED! HAVE WE NOT HEAPED JUDGEMENT UPON OURSELVES?

AND HOW CAN YOU MAKE THE STATEMENT THAT WE DO “BENEFIT” FROM IT, BUT WE HAD NO PART IN IT!?!?

If we “benefited” from it, then that was our part in it.

This quote summaries the position clearly and explains why hoping that scientists will begin using alternatives are currently unrealistic:

“HEK293 is an established cell line. What this means is that these cells have been used and studied by biologists for nearly half a century. They are well characterized, and they have

been validated for their safety. I point this out because it helps explain why it is unheard of for a vaccine manufacturer to seek out new human fetal cells from a recent abortion. Such novel fetal cells would be uncharacterized, unvalidated, and unapproved by regulatory agencies like the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for human vaccine production. Why waste time, effort, and money to obtain, characterize, and validate new human fetal cells when the classic fetal cell lines obtained decades ago like HEK293 are readily and cheaply available?” [Read More](#)

Because it is murder of innocents, and it is the greatest wrong. But the evil do not care, and no one pleads the case of their murders.

Isaiah 59

**“Surely the arm of the LORD is not too short to save,
nor his ear too dull to hear.**

**2 But your iniquities have separated
you from your God;
your sins have hidden his face from you,
so that he will not hear.**

**3 For your hands are stained with blood,
your fingers with guilt.
Your lips have spoken falsely,
and your tongue mutters wicked things.**

**4 No one calls for justice;
no one pleads a case with integrity.
They rely on empty arguments, they utter lies;
they conceive trouble and give birth to evil.**

**5 They hatch the eggs of vipers
and spin a spider’s web.
Whoever eats their eggs will die,
and when one is broken, an adder is hatched.**

**6 Their cobwebs are useless for clothing;
they cannot cover themselves with what they make.
Their deeds are evil deeds,
and acts of violence are in their hands.**

**7 Their feet rush into sin;
they are swift to shed innocent blood.
They pursue evil schemes;
acts of violence mark their ways.**

**8 The way of peace they do not know;
there is no justice in their paths.
They have turned them into crooked roads;
no one who walks along them will know peace.**

**9 So justice is far from us,
and righteousness does not reach us.
We look for light, but all is darkness;
for brightness, but we walk in deep shadows.**

**10 Like the blind we grope along the wall,
feeling our way like people without eyes.**

At midday we stumble as if it were twilight;
among the strong, we are like the dead.

11 We all growl like bears;
we moan mournfully like doves.

We look for justice, but find none;
for deliverance, but it is far away.

12 For our offenses are many in your sight,
and our sins testify against us.

Our offenses are ever with us,
and we acknowledge our iniquities:

13 rebellion and treachery against the LORD,
turning our backs on our God,
inciting revolt and oppression,
uttering lies our hearts have conceived.

14 So justice is driven back,
and righteousness stands at a distance;
truth has stumbled in the streets,
honesty cannot enter.

15 Truth is nowhere to be found,
and whoever shuns evil becomes a prey.

The LORD looked and was displeased
that there was no justice.

16 He saw that there was no one,
he was appalled that there was no one to intervene;
so his own arm achieved salvation for him,
and his own righteousness sustained him.

17 He put on righteousness as his breastplate,
and the helmet of salvation on his head;
he put on the garments of vengeance
and wrapped himself in zeal as in a cloak.

18 According to what they have done,
so will he repay
wrath to his enemies
and retribution to his foes;
he will repay the islands their due.

19 From the west, people will fear the name of the LORD,
and from the rising of the sun, they will revere his glory.

For he will come like a pent-up flood
that the breath of the LORD drives along.[\[a\]](#)

20 “The Redeemer will come to Zion,
to those in Jacob who repent of their sins,”
declares the LORD.

21 “As for me, this is my covenant with them,” says the LORD. “My Spirit, who is on you, will not depart from you, and my words that I have put in your mouth will always be on your lips, on the lips of your children and on the lips of their descendants—from this time on and forever,” says the LORD.”

Adrian, come out from among them.

It should be noted that a new cell line was created in 2015 in China, presumably so they didn't have to rely on imports. But this is very much the exception. New embryos taken from abortions are not required for vaccine development or testing.

We cannot go back into history and undo the creation of HEK293 or its adoption as perhaps the best understood and standardised tissue culture in use in science.

Nor do you seem to even want to.

It is important to stress that now this cell line exists it is not necessary for other abortions to be undertaken to create such cell lines.

And yet they are ongoing: Planned Parenthood Admits in Court That It Sold Body Parts From Aborted Babies

Many Christians are opposed to ongoing embryonic research. And in response to ethical objections a ban was instituted in the USA by the Trump administration. It is interesting to note that the [ongoing use of tissue like HEK293 was specifically excluded from that ban](#). This is due to the fact that the tissue has been around for so long, and the fact that the modifications to the tissue mean that it should not be considered fully human.

Human law is not relevant here. God's law is relevant here.

Roman Catholic theologians typically take a firm anti-abortion stance. In 2017 [an official Vatican statement](#) argues

“the cell lines currently in use are very distant from the original abortions and no longer imply that bond of moral cooperation”.

[The National Catholic Bioethics Center explains:](#)

“Any product grown in these or other cell lines derived from abortions, therefore, has a distant association with abortion. The cells in these lines have gone through multiple divisions before they are used in vaccine manufacture. After manufacture, the vaccines are removed from the cell lines and purified. One cannot accurately say that the vaccines contain any of the cells from the original abortion.”

Yes, they are associated with abortion, but it is distant, and remote, and the cells have divided, and they are a little bit purified, and the package insert doesn't outright say they are in it, and if it is, the whole cells are not in it, and, and, and.

OR

Yes, “Any product grown in these or other cell lines derived from abortions, therefore, has an association with abortion.”

Full stop.

It doesn't matter how many modifiers you tack on. These products would not exist if a child was not murdered in the first place.

Matthew 5:37 “Let what you say be simply ‘Yes’ or ‘No’; anything more than this comes from evil.”

5. How do Christians view human cell lines?

This question is irrelevant. The only question is, how does God view human cell lines.

Many Christians will believe that [abortion](#) is wrong. One of the most widely used passages to support the view that human life exists before birth and should therefore be preserved as precious is from Psalm 139:

**For you created my inmost being;
you knit me together in my mother's womb.
I praise you because I am fearfully and wonderfully made;
your works are wonderful,
I know that full well. . .
Your eyes saw my unformed body;
all the days ordained for me were written in your book
before one of them came to be. (Psalm 139:13-16)**

But if you disagree with abortion this does not automatically mean that it is wrong to use vaccines that have a remote link to cells taken from what may have been an aborted baby. The cells are not part of the baby's "remains" as some have emotively described them.

I emotively call them remains, because they are human remains.

I will now emotively be frank about what they are. The Priorix vaccine contains Michael Richard Christian's remains.

If you kill a boy, and remove his lungs, the lungs is his remains. If you cut the lungs into small pieces, those pieces are his remains. If you put those pieces in a blender, they are still his remains. If you then put the liquid in a jar and pour an enzyme solution into the jar to dissolve some of the remains, and only the cells are left, those cells are his remains. If you infect those cells with Rubella, those cells are still his remains. If you put that solution in a blender again to shred the cells, those cells are still his remains. If you alter the make up and the behavior of the cells, they are still his remains. Mikey's DNA is Mikey's remains.

There is nothing you can do to his remains to stop making them still his remains.

If you could, you would not need his organs in the first place.

This is the process that both Mikey and Winnie went through to develop the MRC 5 and WI-38 respectively.

If you believe I am in error, and that they are no longer Winnie or Mikey's remains, please point out at what point in the process they cease to be the children's remains.

Please cite both science and Scripture in your answer.

The link is not "remote." It is present. It is so present, that Michael Richard Christian's DNA and blood proteins are in the MMR. The cells ARE the baby's remains. The DNA and blood proteins ARE the baby's remains. You are lying to your audience.

The cells are altered genetically to behave in a different way, and there is no way that these decades old cells could ever produce an embryo.

Yes... in much the same way that when an arm is amputated it can't grow a new human.

This is a completely irrelevant discussion, and it's inclusion in this article is deception with

empty words.

These cells are stolen and mutilated. Using lofty language like “altered” does not change the fact that these were children's body parts, and again... if DNA and their blood proteins are in the final product, and Paul Offit of CHOP and the US Department of Health and Human Services confirms that they are, then you cannot claim that they are not part of the baby's remains. They literally have Mikey's genetic signature in them!

God is not fooled by your word games. This is just plain lying.

Proverbs 12:22

**Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord,
But those who deal faithfully are His delight.**

Reiterating:

If you truly believe this, then tell me at what point in the process the cells STOP being a child's remains. When Winnie's lungs were removed, were those a part of her remains? When they were placed in an enzyme solution to dissolve the connective tissue between the cells, were those cells still not hers? When the cells were frozen, were they not hers? When they were unfrozen and replicated, were they not her remains, simply doubled? When cells are infected or “genetically altered” are they still not hers? When do they suddenly cease being human remains? What can you even do to human remains, to make them stop being human remains?

Nothing. What you take from a human, has been taken from a human. The cells, and blood proteins, and DNA came from a child, and do not cease being the child's, no matter what you do to it.

Your fancy explanation defies basic logic.

We cannot undo the past. And there are many other ways we benefit from dubious decisions made by others in the past. We walk on roads that perhaps hundreds of years ago may have been built by slaves or wealth from the slave trade. Certainly the rich status of Western countries today is directly related to their exploitation of other nationalities via enslavement, empire, invading and displacing indigenous peoples. Am I therefore sinning by simply walking down the street and enjoying the many benefits of living in the UK?

Great question. How culpable are we for the crimes our countries commit? As an American, I deal with this question in my daily life. Should I belong to a political party, since they are all corrupt? Should I buy any pharmaceuticals because the sector is so corrupt? Should I use public services that I know came from corrupt sources? These are real questions. Your answer seems to be: yes, we should fully participate. Is this not left up to the logic and conscience of each individual Believer?

Christy Hemphill, one of the moderators of [the Biologos Forum](#) expands on this point:

The ethical arguments calling for avoiding the fetal cell vaccines are similar in some ways to arguments for reparations for slavery, though you would never hear the people who are so concerned about the fetal cell lines saying that White people should be denied anything that benefits them in the present because sins were committed in the past and their wealth is birthed from injustice.

Basically something immoral happened in the past and we have an opportunity in the

present to benefit from a long causal chain that could be traced back to that immoral event. Does that make benefiting wrong? We benefit from land that was violently stolen from indigenous people. We benefit from companies and industries and social systems that were built on the backs of slave labor and colonial imperialism and oppression. Heck, we benefit from manufacturing practices that currently enslave children and pollute the world to the point of killing poor people who have to live in the degraded environments. [Read More](#)

We have the Henrietta Lacks exploitation case to examine here. A black woman whose cells were stolen, without permission, untold amounts of money made by the thieves, and her family didn't get a dime.

And we can certainly agree that the use of these cells was wrong, can't we? And she was not even murdered to get them. I would argue that if we want to please God, to whom we say "not my will, but Thy will" we eschew every "benefit" from known suspect sources.

Are we not cautioned to be in this world, and not of it? To set our affections on things above, not on things upon the earth?

Colossians 3:1-11

"If then you have been raised with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God. 2 Set your minds on things that are above, not on things that are on earth. 3 For you have died, and your life is hidden with Christ in God. 4 When Christ who is your life appears, then you also will appear with him in glory.

5 Put to death therefore what is earthly in you: sexual immorality, impurity, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry. 6 On account of these the wrath of God is coming. 7 In these you too once walked, when you were living in them. 8 But now you must put them all away: anger, wrath, malice, slander, and obscene talk from your mouth. 9 Do not lie to one another, seeing that you have put off the old self with its practices 10 and have put on the new self, which is being renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator. 11 Here there is not Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free; but Christ is all, and in all."

If we are dead to ourselves, why are we so concerned with "benefiting?"

You and Ms. Hemphill seem to be having a secular ethics discussion. But not one based on the Gospel, that we are ALL dead in our trespasses and sin, that we have been freed from the consequences of our sin by Christ's works, and that in our gratitude we live a life of constant obedience and repentance.

Where is the discussion on finding wisdom, discerning obedience as closely as we can, and repenting constantly as we learn more of Christ and the world?

This discussion is focused on how we can get away with justifying whatever "benefit" we want for ourselves. That is anathema to the Gospel.

1 John 2:15-17

15 Do not love the world or the things in the world. If anyone loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him. 16 For all that is in the world—the desires of the flesh and the desires of the eyes and pride of life—is not from the Father but

is from the world. 17 And the world is passing away along with its desires, but whoever does the will of God abides forever.

It can be very hard to untangle the extent to which we benefit personally and individually from the undoubtedly sinful acts of those who have gone before us. We should be mindful of such things, and there is a moral duty on us to act in ways that [demonstrate repentance for such historical corporate sins such as racism](#).

But it is not hard to untangle the murder of an innocent baby, the trafficking of their organs, and such being used for a specific medical product. It is laid out plainly in research that can be pulled up on any computer in any home in 2 minutes. Your attempts to muddle the details of a murder in 2015 and pretend it is as hard to discern as the products of the slave trade in 1700 is deception.

Colossians 2:1-5

For I want you to know how great a struggle I have for you and for those at Laodicea and for all who have not seen me face to face, 2that their hearts may be encouraged, being knit together in love, to reach all the riches of full assurance of understanding and the knowledge of God's mystery, which is Christ, 3in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. 4I say this in order that no one may delude you with plausible arguments. 5For though I am absent in body, yet I am with you in spirit, rejoicing to see your good order and the firmness of your faith in Christ.

And yes... we should want to know if things that we are doing stem from corruption. Yes, yes, yes. And we should especially want to know if anything we are doing drives further corruption that leads to suffering.

If you are walking down a road that was built by slaves, and it is driving the more slavery, stop wading down that road and start picketing that road.

If you are offered blood diamonds or products that use aluminum or nickel or chocolate harvested by children in the third world, don't buy them. This is why we have a market for "free trade" products.

Galatians 6:9

"And let us not grow weary of doing good, for in due season we will reap, if we do not give up."

We certainly should not celebrate historical sinful acts.

And yet you have spent this article celebrating the outcomes of the sinful acts.

But it is impossible for us to somehow avoid the benefits that have come to us by the unjust actions that occurred in the past, and in many cases such injustices do persist today.

But it isn't in this case. It is completely possible for us to avoid the "benefits" of aborted fetal cell use. Find out what products used them, and reject those products.

A similar position surely exists in the case of HEK293. We can grieve the fact that events happened in the past that we morally disapprove of, yet graciously and gratefully take part in the benefits which are huge and which we do not deserve.

And here is another very upsetting aspect of talking with you on these issues for months. You DON'T GRIEVE over them. Further, nowhere in any of the articles that I have ever read from aborted fetal cell vaccine promoting professing Believers show any discernible grief at

all that these children were murdered and had their organs harvested, some by live vivisection.

In this respect, your article, and every one like it that I have read are just like secular discussions, except that they will have one sentence of feigned “grief,” followed by a position entirely bereft of grief for these children's torture and murder.

As in this article, they are talked about as “cell lines” and completely dehumanized.

After two years of discussing cell lines like WI-38 and MRC-5, I began to feel disgusted by it. I realized that I was just playing along with the lies that the world has told about these children. These people. These children whom God loved.

So we named them.

Winifred Isaksson from Sweden

Michael Richard Christian from England

Danielle Wong from China

Helen Emma Kristiansen from The Netherlands

Refraan Angelus from the United States

Where is your grief for these children? When God looks at your heart, does he see your grief for these children? Or your excitement over their utilitarianism? What I see is that to you, they are just products to be used for your benefit.

Read back over your own words. Is this a man grieving a child, or a man pushing a product line regardless of the fact that it was made from children?

If you could snap your fingers, and these five children would come back to life, and all the products and research made from their bodies would disappear, would you do it?

If you had the power to end aborted fetal cell line research, or abortion itself, would you do it?

A [non-religious Patheos blogger](#) explained this perspective well when they imagined how pro-lifers might instead of not talking about this, instead actually acknowledge the fact that the lives of aborted babies have benefited society. They suggested pro-lifers use it as a trigger to campaign not for more abortion but to abolish abortion and even suggested a slogan:

“Two murdered children have saved millions of lives across the globe. Isn't it time we stood up for them, too? #abolishabortion”. [Read More](#)

It is difficult for me to understand why you are using the unbiblical argument of a non-believer to teach Christians. His is a grotesque statement. Standing up for murdered children by justifying their murder?

Exod 20:13

“YOU SHALL NOT MURDER.”

I don't know how he could have made it more simple. Yet you torture logic and Scriptures to justify The Sixth Commandment.

You not only have no Biblical justification for greater good arguments, but Paul ended all greater good arguments by declaring in Romans 6:1

“What shall we say then? Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound? 2 By no means! How can we who died to sin still live in it? 3 Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? 4 We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, in order that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life.”

Ours is simply to obey. If we love him.

John 14:18-24

18 “I will not leave you as orphans; I am coming to you. 19 After a little while, the world no longer *is going to see Me*, but you *are going to see Me*; because I live, you also will live. 20 On that day you will know that I *am* in My Father, and you *are* in Me, and I in you. 21 The one who has My commandments and keeps them is the one who loves Me; and the one who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and will reveal Myself to him.” 22 Judas (not Iscariot) **said to Him*, “Lord, what has happened that You are going to reveal Yourself to us and not to the world?” 23 Jesus answered and said to him, “If anyone loves Me, he will follow My word; and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make *Our* dwelling with him. 24 The one who does not love Me does not follow My words; and the word which you hear is not Mine, but the Father’s who sent Me.

[Albert Mohler](#) explains his own position with regards to COVID-19 vaccines as follows:

- . “We must condemn in the strongest of terms the use of any tissues from aborted human babies. That is a nonnegotiable issue for Christians as we consider medical advances and treatments.

This should be the end of his article if he believes what he just wrote. But now he ignores what he just wrote and does a 180.

There are, however, complexities involved as Christians contemplate these incredibly serious moral questions.

Specifically, with the issue of the COVID-19 vaccine, Christians need to understand that no step in producing these vaccines had any direct involvement in an abortion of a single child.

Here, I question whether or not Mohler knows the mechanics of how these shots were made, or if he is just repeating something he was told.

There is also the issue of proximity. The further you go in history, the harder it is to keep a clear line of culpability in morally significant events . . .

This is deception. We know, in detail, from the medical literature, exactly what is the line of moral culpability.

I can follow the line of moral culpability for the murder of Winifred Issakson and trafficking of her body parts from Eva Ernholm, to Sven Gard, to Leonard Hayflick, to the Wistar Institute, to Stanford University, to the US Department of Health and

Human Services, to Merck, to their injection into my body and the bodies of my children.

One needs simply follow the reams of paperwork, and watch the [videos of interviews of the notably proud Hayflick himself](#), readily available to anyone with an internet connection.

And God is clear that we are not to get involved with those who do evil deeds.

Proverbs 1:8-19

- 8 “Listen, my son, to your father’s instruction
and do not forsake your mother’s teaching.
9 They are a garland to grace your head
and a chain to adorn your neck.
10 My son, if sinful men entice you,
do not give in to them.
11 If they say, “Come along with us;
let’s lie in wait for innocent blood,
let’s ambush some harmless soul;
12 let’s swallow them alive, like the grave,
and whole, like those who go down to the pit;
13 we will get all sorts of valuable things
and fill our houses with plunder;
14 cast lots with us;
we will all share the loot”—
15 my son, do not go along with them,
do not set foot on their paths;
16 for their feet rush into evil,
they are swift to shed blood.
17 How useless to spread a net
where every bird can see it!
18 These men lie in wait for their own blood;
they ambush only themselves!
19 Such are the paths of all who go after ill-gotten gain;
it takes away the life of those who get it.”

The vaccine’s structure relied upon the cell line of HEK-293, which originated with an aborted fetus . . . This is a tragedy of history. A horrifying wrong was done—but that does not mean that good cannot come from that harm, even as it is a good tainted by the realities of a sinful world. This idea is expressed, for Christians, as the doctrine of double effect . . .
” [Read More](#)

Whether or not good can come from that harm is God’s domain, not ours. We are not to disobey him. Our domain is obedience and repentance.

Romans 6:16

“Do you not know that when you present yourselves to someone as slaves for obedience, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin resulting in

death, or of obedience resulting in righteousness?”

I have decided to write a separate critique on Mohler's piece, but I have addressed everything he has said in that passage elsewhere here.

Double effect is defined as follows:

The theory that a moral agent is not to be held morally accountable for unintended and perhaps unavoidable ill side effects of an action or series of actions that is otherwise morally legitimate. Some ethicists add that the principle of double effect can only be invoked in situations in which the good intended in the action or series of acts is so significant that it outweighs the unintended evil side effect.

Grenz, S. J., & Smith, J. T. (2003). In [*Pocket Dictionary of Ethics*](#) (p. 29). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

“Some ethicists” believe something... that is nice. This is not even remotely a Biblical ethic. What does God say? Again, why do you promote the ethical positions of unbelievers who make no attempt to please God?

God says, obey him. Man says, sin with good intentions.

God also said our intentions are evil. Man says I am not responsible for my sin if I have good reasons.

God says that we are born into bad intentions and sin.

Genesis 6:12

“God looked on the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth.”

Man says, “I have a theory that I am not morally accountable for unintended and perhaps unavoidable ill of actions that is otherwise morally legitimate. And I deem abortion for my purposes morally legitimate.”

God says:

Revelation 21:8

“But as for the cowardly, the faithless, the detestable, as for murderers, the sexually immoral, sorcerers, idolaters, and all liars, their portion will be in the lake that burns with fire and sulfur, which is the second death.”

Do you want to please God, or please man? Do you want to encourage Believers to conform to Christ, or conform to the World?

Where is your Scripture to support this ethic? I again refer you to Romans 6:1 that this ethic falls under **“may it never be!”**

Obedience to God is Biblical and should be the only standard in this discussion.

“Double effect” is an unbiblical, worldly “theory.” It should have no impact on decision making.

Yet at the end of this piece, you raise it above obedience to God!

It is not inconsistent to still take life saving vaccines that used these cell lines in order to rescue society

from all the effects of the pandemic (the good effect) and believe the the initial abortion was wrong (the bad effect). We can't undo the actions of the person who aborted that child, nor the scientists who made use of the tissues.

It is **absolutely** inconsistent to believe an initial abortion was wrong, and then to purchase and INJECT the products of that abortion.

And where in Scripture am I directed to “undo the actions of the person that aborted a child?”

In Scripture, I am directed to obey, and repent quickly and completely, when I sin.

Numbers 5:5-7

5Then the LORD spoke to Moses, saying, 6“Speak to the sons of Israel: ‘When a man or woman commits any of the sins of mankind, acting unfaithfully against the LORD, and that person is guilty, 7 then he shall confess his sin which he has committed, and he shall make restitution in full for his wrong and add to it a fifth of it, and give it to him whom he has wronged.

This letter that you are reading now is part of my repentance for partnering with darkness in aborted fetal cell vaccines. I bought them and put them into my children, and my son paid the price. I am repentant of that sin.

Where in Scripture am I directed to “rescue society from all the effects of the pandemic?”

Neither of these are even possible, must less my burden to try to do.

Scripture has directed me:

Exod 20:13

“Do not murder.”

Ephesians 5:6-17

Let no one deceive you with empty words, for because of these things the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience. ⁷ Therefore *do not become partners with them*; ⁸ for at one time you were darkness, but now you are light in the Lord. Walk as children of light ⁹ (for the fruit of light is found in all that is good and right and true), ¹⁰ and try to discern what is pleasing to the Lord. ¹¹ Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them. ¹² For it is shameful even to speak of the things that they do in secret. ¹³ But when anything is exposed by the light, it becomes visible, ¹⁴ for anything that becomes visible is light. Therefore it says,

“Awake, O sleeper,
and arise from the dead,
and Christ will shine on you.”

¹⁵ Look carefully then how you walk, not as unwise but as wise, ¹⁶ making the best use of the time, because the days are evil. ¹⁷ Therefore do not be foolish, but understand what the will of the Lord is.

We can argue that the act of abortion was wrong, we can call for alternative cell lines to be created so that we do not need to remain dependent on lines that were made so long ago from a questionable moral source.

Do you argue that? Where can I find you arguing that?

The vaccines have now been made, and we have no alternative course of action if we want to get COVID-19 under control than to take them. This does not need to imply we agree with that long-ago act.

This is just a flat out lie. I have repeatedly sent you the Eastern Virginia Medical School's COVID prevention and treatment protocol out of concern for YOUR health. There are several pharmaceuticals that turn COVID into an easily vanquished illness when used quickly. But you pretend that the ONLY choice that Believers have is to partner with darkness in aborted fetal cell vaccines?

Proverbs 14:25

**“A truthful witness saves lives,
But he who utters lies is treacherous.”**

This obviously touches on the whole notion of corporate guilt. Do I become guilty by association or by my own action? Is there a moral difference between the researchers using the product of an abortion and those involved in the abortion itself, the decision for which was taken separately? Do I really share any guilt by taking the vaccine at such a removed distance?

You are guilty because you were born in sin.

Jeremiah 17:9

“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?”

You are guilty because your heart, like mine, is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, we can't even know how sinful it is. But if you have been freed from the consequences of your sin, been granted the gift of repentance, and made a co-heir with Christ, then in your gratitude for your newness of life you would RUN from sin and partnering with murderers in their sin!

2 Cor 6:14

Do not be unequally yoked with unbelievers. For what partnership has righteousness with lawlessness? Or what fellowship has light with darkness?

But you practice sin by partaking in darkness via uptake of the products derived from these murders, and made by corrupt corporations.

And this is not simply a financial partnership. You are not just buying their product, you are putting it INTO YOUR BODY. God's temple that you have given to him. You are partnering with them for your life, and for a life time. Is owning a thing with someone, or sharing money, a greater partnership than partnering with a corporation in your body? In God's temple?

Mind you, these are heathen markets full of unrepentant, worldly men. The corporations we are talking about doing business with are not playing in good faith, they are the unrepentant bad guys. They are convicted criminals. Money and power is their aim. They

constantly lie about the safety and efficacy of their products. It is a part of their business model. They are the men we are told to avoid through the Psalms and Proverbs. They are the enemies of God. <https://youtu.be/7ehUWAsvFw>

You are partnering with people who are antithetical to Biblical values. Their decisions are almost entirely on what will make them money even when their customers are harmed or killed. They are blatant liars. (I just sent you a 22 page record of their lies, which followed the NIB piece which documented more lies and fraud.)

Why do you trust them with your life? Why do you encourage other people to trust them? Pfizer is literally a criminal operation. It has illegally promoted more than a dozen drugs and paid the largest criminal fine in history, which is "just the cost of doing business" for them.

Their overarching lie is, "You need us: you will die without us." They use it to justify all their sins, and we give them permission to abuse their power because we have been cowed into the lie that we literally cannot live without them. Does God choose the day you leave this mortal realm or not?

They are just a mafia with good marketing. Pfizer is criminal elsewhere, but suddenly with trillions in global sales on the table, they are going to become honest? Why do you give them the benefit of the doubt? They didn't have a Biblical conscience when they decided to use aborted fetal cell lines. Why are they treated as trustworthy?

The aborted fetal cell issue is just the tip of the iceberg. Pfizer is demonstrable darkness. AstraZeneca, [same](#). Johnson & Johnson, [same](#) and [same](#). Moderna has no history at all, but as there is no jail time for anyone criminally convicted, and fines are baked into their cost of doing business, why should they not lie in their research?

Psalm 146:3

**Put not your trust in princes,
in a son of man, in whom there is no salvation.
4When his breath departs, he returns to the earth;
on that very day his plans perish.**

What fellowship does darkness have with light?

[Joe Carter](#) makes a similar argument about separating the consequences of a sinful action from the action itself, using the question of whether organ transplant from a murder victim would be acceptable:

If a doctor were to offer to transplant a kidney or heart from the murder victim into a Christian, we would likely not object . . . no one would say the Christian who received the organ was morally responsible in any way for the murder. [Read More](#)

I responded to you previously on this on why his comparison does not work:

“Organ donation is done with the consent of the donor, or of his legitimate next of kin.

The child does not give consent to be murdered and dismembered. Parents or doctors who murder the child lose their right to exercise the rights of the child in his best interest (parental rights) when they murder the child.

There is no one to give consent for a child to be delivered, be subject to live vivisection,

and used in any way.

This has no parallel to organ donation here. No one DONATED. Winnie didn't "donate" her lungs, they were stolen from her. Her mother didn't even consent. The child's lungs were used without the family's knowledge or consent. The mother only learned decades later, after most of the planet had been injected with her child's genetic material."

This was my response directly to Carter last year, he did not respond to me, nor to any of the other 3k people who tried to correct him in his writing.

"Neither the child nor the mother gave consent for the WI-38 tissue to be used for medical purposes of any kind. A Christian who consents to receiving illegally harvested organs is in sin, whether or not we decide it makes one an accessory to murder. Yes, we should be overly concerned with the "slippery slope" of people being murdered to expand the number of organs and fetal cell lines to be used for profit. Such IS happening, as Planned Parenthood's secondary market for aborted fetal remains to research institutions has been exposed."

The Bible is full of examples of where sin was turned around to lead to good outcomes. [Rahab lied to protect the Israeli spies](#) (see [Joshua 2](#)), yet was commended for being a woman of faith in Hebrews 11 and is included in the genealogy of Jesus. This has led to an interesting ethical dilemma of whether it is OK to lie for good motives.

It has not lead to an ethical dilemma for anyone who seeks to obey Christ, because they love Christ.

Rahab was not saved because of her lie, she was saved in spite of her lie, because she had faith in the Hebrew God. This passage is constantly being abused to justify sin. You do that here.

I return you again to Romans 6:1.

Romans 6:1-2

What shall we say then? Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound? 2By no means! How can we who died to sin still live in it?

A commonly referenced hypothetical example is of someone hiding Jews from Nazis in occupied Europe. If they knocked on the door and asked "do you have any Jews here?" is the sin of giving up your refugees to probable death greater than the sin of lying? Would lying even be a sin at all in such a situation?

Yes. Lying is still a sin. God hates it.

Proverbs 6:16-19

**There are six things which the Lord hates,
Yes, seven which are an abomination to Him:
Haughty eyes, a lying tongue,
And hands that shed innocent blood,
A heart that devises wicked plans,
Feet that run rapidly to evil,
A false witness who utters lies,**

And one who spreads strife among brothers.

No matter how good the intentions you have at the time, lying is a sin. No matter how greater the good you believe may take place by sinning, lying is a sin. No matter what terrible situation you construct, lying is still a sin.

And not taking the vaccine is not even remotely analogous to murdering jews, so the inclusion in this article is unjustified.

There are no Nazis at the door.

When facing two bad choices should we weigh them both up and choose the least bad option?

No. We should obey the commandments of Christ, no matter what we believe the outcome might be.

When thinking of this moral decision we must remember that the only alternative to taking the vaccine is Society continuing to suffer the economic effects of attempts to stem the tide of severe sickness and death caused by COVID-19.

Again, a lie.

You are presenting a false dichotomy. We don't have two bad choices. We have dozens of choices. Hundreds of choices. One size does not fit all.

We have the choice to read the research for ourselves and make choices that best suit our individual biology and conscience.

One choice would be to follow the Eastern Virginia Medical School COVID protocol.

We also have the choice to go about our daily lives like we always have. Eat right, wash our hands, get plenty of sunshine, exercise regularly, and stay home when we are sick. These are wise things no matter what age we are living in.

We should not comfort ourselves by thinking other people will take the vaccine for us and we will benefit from their actions.

Especially because other people "taking the vaccine for us" will not benefit us, as the vaccine does not prevent infection or transmission.

That is just side-stepping our responsibility, and if we benefit from what we say is another's moral error, how is that any different from us actually taking the vaccine to so benefit?

Again, you seem to have put a "responsibility" on me that I do not have. What is that responsibility exactly? I am responsible to obey God's commandments. What commandment here are you calling me to obey?

Or is this the made up responsibility of "rescuing society from all the effects of the pandemic" you mentioned earlier?

I have already discussed with you, repeatedly and redundantly, that the COVID vaccines DO NOT prevent infection or transmission. So me getting the vaccine benefits no one but me, if there is a benefit. So how is getting the vaccine a responsibility to... whom? Society? You?

Can you state this more plainly so that I can be clear to whom and for what I am responsible.

Sometimes the Bible is very clear that a sin was a sin but nonetheless God turns it around for his

purposes. Bathsheba was also included in the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew 1 despite the fact that David committed adultery with her before murdering her husband. Despite his sin God called King David a man after his own heart.

Bathsheba's inclusion in the genealogy is a fact-based account of Christ's line. It was not commentary on her holiness. Her son Solomon was also included, and he died an unrepentant worshiper of Baal.

David was called by God a man after his own heart, and he was **repentant** of his sin against Bathsheba and her husband.

Neither you nor any of those promoting the use of this vaccine are repentant of any of the falsehoods and partnering with sin that you are practicing and encouraging.

You are preaching the opposite of Romans 6, that sin should abound so that grace might more abound. God needs us to sin so that he can turn things around for good?

Scripture says that for him who knows what the right thing to do is, and doesn't do it, for him it is sin.

James 4:17

“So whoever knows the right thing to do and fails to do it, for him it is sin.”

So if I know that the right thing to do is to not participate in deeds of darkness by buying aborted fetal cell products, I should buy them anyway because even though I am sinning against God, he can turn it around for “good?”

Can he do “good” if I simply obey God not to associate with nots and eschew the vaccine? Or have I condemned an impotent god to allow corruption into the world because he has no power over a virus if his children obey him?

God needs my sin to be able to do “good?”

Joseph understood how great good could come out of an evil act. His brothers left him for dead then sold him as a slave. And yet at the end of his life he said to them

You intended to harm me, but God intended it for good to accomplish what is now being done, the saving of many lives (Gen 50:20, NIV)

Here we see the sovereignty of God and not just a double affect but a double intention. The sinful intention remains sinful and the brothers are guilty of it. But somehow in the mystery of the way God in his providence restrains certain sins but allows others to happen, God was in some way working behind the scenes with a different intention altogether.

Joseph endured persecution and remained faithful to God. God blessed his faithfulness in persecution. But you have made God's blessing to him about the sin his brother's committed against him. Should siblings abuse the weakest among them so that God may use it for good? Should I allow my older son to punch my younger disabled son because God can do good with it?

Can I have a full list of things that are a good idea for me to disobey God on so that he can do good? Since Bathsheba, cheated on her husband, should I do the same since God can do good with that? David murdered his sexual rival, and from him The Christ was born. Can I do the same so God can do good with it?

Just how far does this greater good exemption go?

And what if God chooses NOT to do good with my sin? What are the consequences then?

Without the actions of the brothers there would have been no saving of lives, the good deed which God was all along ordaining.

God HAD to have the sin of the brothers to get Jacob in service to the King? His father who loved him so could not have simply had Jacob with his great math mind apply for an internship in the King's court? God cannot do good unless we sin?

In a similar way without the abortion of the baby which led to the formation of HEK293 cells we would not have COVID-19 vaccines which will save the lives of many.

So you do believe that without the serious sin of murder, God cannot save lives? Or he will not choose to save lives?

And the vaccine will DEFINITELY save many? There is not a chance that incompletely tested vaccines and never before used mRNA gene therapy could backfire, cause antibody-dependant enhancement, and take more lives next cold and flu season than it did over the past year? We are not going to see autoimmune conditions soar?

James 4:13-15

Come now, you who say, "Today or tomorrow we will go into such and such a town and spend a year there and trade and make a profit"— 14yet you do not know what tomorrow will bring. What is your life? For you are a mist that appears for a little time and then vanishes. 15Instead you ought to say, "If the Lord wills, we will live and do this or that." 16As it is, you boast in your arrogance. All such boasting is evil.

God turns events that are morally wrong around to save the lives of others. We are not guilty of that abortion because our lives are saved by vaccines in just the same way that the Egyptians, who were saved by the wise planning of Joseph, were not responsible for the sin committed by his brothers, even though they directly benefited from the results of that sin.

When there is no didactic teaching, and ministers want to justify sin, they go to the stories of the Old Testament and twist Scripture to meet their ends.

I once had a distant relative, who played the role of a devout Believer, tell me that I should allow myself to be subject to verbal abuse by another family member, because when Hagar ran away from home because of Sarah's mistreatment, God told her to return to Abraham's house. I pointed out that such was probably the case because she was in the process of kidnapping Abraham's unborn child, and asked him for some teaching on why I should continue in an abusive relationship. He had nothing to offer me.

Unless you have teaching were God teaches us to sin sometimes if we believe a greater good will be the outcome, I am going to assume that you are using stories where God did a good work, because you have no other instruction that we are to second guess God if we decide we know better than him.

God has simply said that we are to obey him.

John 14:21-24

He who has My commandments and keeps them, it is he who loves Me. And he who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and manifest Myself to him.”

Judas (not Iscariot) said to Him, “Lord, how is it that You will manifest Yourself to us, and not to the world?”

Jesus answered and said to him, “If anyone loves Me, he will keep My word; and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make Our home with him.

He who does not love Me does not keep My words; and the word which you hear is not Mine but the Father’s who sent Me.

Romans 8:28 states that “in all things God works for the good of those who love him, who have been called according to his purpose” (NIV). The story of Joseph shows us that all things includes all sins.

The operable words are “for those who love him, and are called according to his purpose.”

We see in John 14 that those who love him, obey him. Being called according to his purpose means those who obey him.

And he has told us not to participate in works of darkness. So in getting a vaccine derived from darkness, in partnering with those who murder the innocent, do we not prove to him that we do NOT love him because we do not keep his word?

John 14: 24

“He who does not love Me does not keep My words; and the word which you hear is not Mine but the Father’s who sent Me.”

Romans 8:28 does not apply to individuals who are disobedient to Christ and unrepentant of that disobedience.

Joseph’s brothers were only saved because hardship drove them to repentance, then went humbly, and hat in hand, to their brother. He forgave them, and they were saved.

Now let’s go right to the heart of the Christian message. The gospel tells us that the death and resurrection of Jesus has obtained for us not a temporary saving of our earthly lives from a virus, but an eternal salvation of our souls from sin. Yet that very salvation simply could not have happened without the sin of those who betrayed Jesus and murdered him on the Cross. Jesus was sinned against, and yet also “gave himself for our sins to deliver us” (Galatians 1:4).

Those who sinned against Christ were doomed for eternity unless they repented. Are you calling for Believers to knowingly sin, and then repent of the sin? Is God fooled by this?

Adrian, this is false teaching. You are telling Believers to sin. You are in jeopardy.

Because of his cruel death Jesus has vaccinated us against the power and penalty of the disease of sin. We are not contaminated with the sin of those who sent Jesus to his death simply by receiving His offer of salvation.

Without the greatest sin of all time, we could never have been saved.

I hope you have been convinced that great good can come from great sin.

I am not convinced because God says otherwise:

Rom 6:23a

“FOR THE WAGES OF SIN IS DEATH”

And terrible and eternal destruction DOES come from great sin. Because you can twist a few Scriptures to show where God was glorified despite sin, you try to convince Believers to sin? Where is the promise that God WILL use their sin for good? God “CAN” do anything, but he said sin was the path to death.

He “can” bring good from sin, but he “can” also condemn men to hell due to sin. Where is your guarantee that he WILL do good with their willful sin? Because he flat out says that the wages of sin is death. If they take your advice, and sin for the “greater good” are YOU going to take on the consequences of their sin?

Again, God has plainly said, "The wages of sin is death." and even if God does grant the "good" worldly outcome you are looking for, such does not prevent spiritual death from sin.

Can you guarantee that the wages of this sin that you are promoting will not bring about spiritual death? That separation from God will not arise from that sin (or that the willful sin is not evidence of spiritual death)? That sin committed for “the greater good” will simply profit a man to gain something in the world, and lose his soul?

Matthew 16:14-27

24 Then Jesus told his disciples, “If anyone would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. 25 For whoever would save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for my sake will find it. 26 For what will it profit a man if he gains the whole world and forfeits his soul? Or what shall a man give in return for his soul? 27 For the Son of Man is going to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will repay each person according to what he has done.

That on that Day, God will not say to those who were more concerned with “worldly good” than obedience to Christ, depart from me, I never knew you?

Matthew 7:15-23

15“Watch out for false prophets. They come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ferocious wolves. 16By their fruit you will recognize them. Do

people pick grapes from thornbushes, or figs from thistles? 17Likewise, every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit. 18A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, and a bad tree cannot bear good fruit. 19Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. 20Thus, by their fruit you will recognize them.

21“Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. 22Many will say to me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name and in your name drive out demons and in your name perform many miracles?’ 23Then I will tell them plainly, ‘I never knew you. Away from me, you evildoers!’

Christ did not come to offer political or medical solution so save the world from it's worldly problems. He came to save men's souls.

None of this means that we should be unconcerned about the moral peril of abortion. We should welcome those Christians such as [Theresa Deisher](#) who are trying to create vaccines from an alternative source.

But we live in an imperfect world, and the possible implication that we are approving of in some way a long-time ago moral act is surely vastly outweighed by the huge moral good in terms of lives saved and economic ruin reversed that accompany taking the vaccine.

No, it surely is not, and you have not made that Biblical case here. You have argued from man's logic, and this entire piece is anathema to God, whom we obey, because he loved us and saved us.

Does God not set our first and our last day? Does God not own the cattle on a thousand hills? Is he not Jehovah Jireh, our provider?

Is the vaccine a false god to you? An idol imbued with powers that you have stolen from God himself?

The vaccine, according to the makers and all the regulatory authorities, does not prevent infection, or impact transmission in any way, yet you promote it as able to do both, and able to “protect society.” Can God do that without a vaccine? Without us sinning against him?

God himself cannot “save lives” or prevent “economic ruin,” but the vaccine will? Again, a vaccine that can ONLY impact the health of the person receiving the vaccine, simply lessening the severity of the illness WHEN someone gets infected, not even preventing the infection and having no impact on transmission?

Is this not the definition of an idol? Worshiping the created thing over the Creator of all things? Giving an object the credit for having powers to achieve things that it cannot?

In this “double effect” equation if we decide not to vaccinate we cannot undo the previous abortion and will not be preventing any new abortions, so will not be accomplishing anything. But if we instead choose to take COVID-19 vaccines we would be contributing to a much greater good.

There is no good greater than love and obedience to Jesus Christ.

In 2015 the Southern Baptists ethical commission addressed the use of vaccines that had been

developed using cell lines that originated in embryos:

Clearly, the process by which these vaccines are made is not ethically ideal.

Therefore, we should continue to advocate for use of alternatives when available and for the development of future vaccines to be carried out by other means. . .

If the abortion was conducted in order to harvest tissues that were to be used for the vaccine, then it would clearly be immoral. But . . . the abortion was carried out for other reasons and the tissue was acquired post-mortem for the purpose medical research . . .

We believe the use of the vaccines is justifiable based on the fact that we cannot change the way the cell cultures were obtained, there are no available alternatives, and the effectiveness of the vaccines as a means of preserving life and preventing suffering is clear.

We certainly respect the opinion of Christians who would disagree with our reasoning on this issue. However, we would add that a parent who refused to have their child vaccinated in order to avoid the connection—however remote—to the cooperation with abortion, is morally responsible for the outcome of that choice. If their child were to get sick and/or die because of the rejection of the vaccine, they would be morally responsible. [Read More](#)

The SBC is not God, and is not speaking for God here. The SBC is nowhere to be found on this issue. I have tried to contact the SBC on sin in their denomination on this issue, and there is actually no way to contact them. They are embroiled in harassment scandals that they will not properly address. They use the same ignorant views and bad logic that most of those writing anti-biblical arguments for this use. They mock Believers who do not agree with them. They twist Scripture to their ends. They issue “drive-by” articles and opinions, and when people are adversely impacted by their position, they are nowhere to be found.

Jer 6:14

**They have healed the wound of my people lightly,
saying, ‘Peace, peace,’
when there is no peace.**

This last point raises the issue of the dilemma we face when there is no alternative vaccines available which have no involvement whatsoever with these human cell lines. We have two choices: we can take the vaccine accepting all that we know about them and hopefully save lives, protect others, and help end the pandemic. Or we can refuse the vaccine, and put ourselves and family at ongoing risk of this deadly disease and by our refusal to take the vaccine possibly contribute to a state of affairs where insufficient people take the vaccine and the COVID-19 pandemic is not eradicated.

More false dichotomy that ignores the research, and simply promotes the worldly narrative.

This is a lie. We have many choices.

Again, to be as redundant about the fact that the vaccine cannot stop transmission as you are about asserting that the vaccine will “end the pandemic,” the vaccine cannot impact infection or transmission, simply severity of symptoms; therefore, it cannot “end the pandemic,” and even if everyone takes it, it cannot eradicate COVID-19.

Some might argue that no sin is greater than another and so this concept of weighing the consequences

of a morally difficult decision is not valid.

I have never seen this argument used. Please cite someone arguing this, so I can be sure that this is not another straw man.

Jesus confirms that there are weightier and lighter matters in God's law when he accuses the Pharisees of being more concerned about less important matters than the more important. Could we argue that vaccine refusers risk making the same mistake?

No, primarily because no one is using any kind of argument about greater and lesser sin's in their vaccine choices. Please cite such a discussion.

In the discussion on sin, we are arguing that partnering with the world, associating with murders, getting involved with corruption, and other sin, are sins. And we do not want to sin. Where do you see a greater and lesser sin here? What is the greater and lesser sin's that you are suggesting that we are balancing?

Second, you cannot argue that vaccine refusers are making the same mistake that the scribes and Pharisees were making in Matthew 23, because first of all, they are not spiritual leaders charged with shepherding the flock, and devouring them instead. They are individuals making individual medical choices for themselves and their families. YOU are the minister in this instance.

“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you tithe mint and dill and cumin, and have neglected the weightier matters of the law: justice and mercy and faithfulness.
(Matthew 23:23)

I would direct this passage back to you. The most important matter to be concerned about, as is brutally emphasized in Matthew 23, is love for God, and new life in Christ, that results in joyful obedience to the Holy Spirit, and the justice, mercy and faithfulness that spring from the full worship of the Holy God, AND NOT, as outlined in the chapter, worldly matters of the flesh, like mint and dill and cumin, and money and power, which the false shepherds were consumed with.

Christ did not come to save the body, he came to save the soul.

These ministers were more concerned with the things of the world, than the souls of those to whom they were supposed to be ministering.

This entire article is about saving the body at the expense of the soul, and ignoring God's stark warning that the wages of sin is death.

Are you not tying up heavy burdens, hard to bear, and laying them on people's shoulders? You have put the burden to end the epidemic on my shoulders, although God himself gives me no such charge. Additionally, your assessment of how I do that is an invalid one, as the vaccine does not prevent transmission, thus I can never end the pandemic with uptake of the vaccine.

**Not taking the vaccine has the potential to do far more harm,
and to cost many lives**

Please cite the cost/benefit analysis that supports this claim.

The claim of the COVID vaccine is that it may lessen the severity of symptoms.

The claim of the EVMS prophylactic protocol is that it may lessen the severity of symptoms.

The claim of Ivermectin is that it may lessen the severity of symptoms.

The claim of Hydroxychloroquine is that it may lessen the severity of symptoms.

Show me the comparative research between these approaches.

Taking COVID-19 vaccines in 2021 are very much an act of social good.

Choosing the vaccine over the EVMS protocol may do more social harm than good, as the vaccines have severe side effects up to and including death, draining medical resources. Vitamin protocols have no side effects that drain medical resources. Both are intended to do the same thing, prevent severe symptoms. Neither prevent infection or transmission.

It is an act of seeking the welfare not just of ourselves but others since vaccines will only protect society when the vast majority of people take them.

The vaccines will not and cannot “protect society.” At best, they can only protect those who receive them. At worst, they can kill those who receive them, even those who were not at risk for serious complications from the virus in the first place.

As already mentioned some of us require other people to take vaccines in order for us to be protected because we cannot make antibodies of our own.

Please explain to me from science and Scripture, how taking a vaccine that does not prevent infection or transmission achieves a social good.

The Bible is clear that although we are “in the world but not of it” (John 17:14–16) we should play our civic duty:

Seek the welfare of the city where I have sent you into exile, and pray to the LORD on its behalf, for in its welfare you will find your welfare (Jer 29:7-8)

But we are not to sin in doing so.

We must move now to those who hold a different viewpoint. And in doing so we must treat them with respect despite the challenge vaccine refusal presents to community safety.

Please explain to me from science and Scripture how refusing a vaccine that cannot prevent infection or transmission presents a threat to community safety. Here you have indicted me without making a case against me.

Further, I have taken a prophylactic supplement protocol, had a mild case of COVID-19, and, thus, have likely permanent, natural immunity to the virus. It has been long established that natural immunity is superior to vaccine immunity in almost all cases. Thus, it is silly for me to get a vaccine that cannot help me, can only confer risk to me, and cannot help you in any way.

And I have stayed on most of the protocol. I am likely safer for you to be around than your vaccinated friends.

Yet you slander me here as someone whose vaccine refusal presents a “challenge” to community safety. Those of us who began Zinc, Vitamin D, Vitamin C, and Quercetin within days or weeks of the pandemic announcement have, in my estimation, been the most responsible members of society, proactively working not to burden the medical system with

serious infections when the chief concern was hospital bed space.

“Whether or not we in healthcare have personal concerns about the origins of these cell cultures, we must regard the concerns of those patients who do. Moreover, within reasonable boundaries, we have an obligation to allow patients, and parents of patients, the autonomy to make informed decisions based on their understanding of what is known, filtered through their convictions. But while we most often defer to this autonomy, this dilemma regarding vaccination is made more difficult by its implications on public safety. Should our concern for the common good (immunization) trump individual autonomy?”

[Gene Rudd, MD](#)

No.

First, and primarily, the “greater good” is a Utilitarian idea, and we are not Utilitarians. We are Christians. We do not believe in “the greatest good for the greatest number of people.” We believe in Christ crucified. We believe in submission to God even if it does not seem to do the “greatest good for the greatest number of people.”

Second, vaccination does not meet the greater good ideal. The greater good is, at its heart, a math equation, and we have never done the math equation, “does vaccination do the greatest good for the most people.” True risk/benefit analysis of vaccinations have never been done; vaccine injuries are blanketly denied, and almost all vaccine adverse events go unrecorded. Vaccine Safety activists have demanded such research for decades, even proposing bills before the US Congress year after year to force the US National Institutes of Health to do vaccinated v. unvaccinated studies. They do not exist outside of small, independent pilot studies that find that vaccinated children are far sicker than unvaccinated children. Health authorities simply ignore them, and refuse to follow them up with large scale studies, and declare that vaccines are the “greater good.”

“Without proof that compulsory vaccination is, in fact, what brings the greatest good to the greatest number, there is no utilitarian justification for us to sacrifice our individual rights to do what we discern is best for ourselves and our children.” Allen Tate, Vaccine Epidemic, “The Greater Good.”

Further, the control groups for the COVID vaccines are now contaminated, as they have been opened up to receiving the vaccine; thus, we will have fewer and weaker long term controlled studies of adverse vaccine outcomes.

And we are watching, in real time, deaths and injuries being reported by the public to the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System, and on social media, be denied and ignored in real time. Facebook groups of individuals simply reporting if they had a reaction or no reaction after the COVID vaccines are being shut down. There were several, now I know of only one.

In the real world and with vaccines, any standard of a “greater good” is simply a subjective standard set by the medical establishment to advance its own agenda, who never bothers

to even attempt to meet any burden of proof that their pronouncements even meet such a standard. They will not even get in a room with those who question them and their absence of risk assessments.

And again, we do not practice Utilitarianism. God nowhere calls us to do a greater good. He calls us to obey him.

Deuteronomy 27:10

You shall therefore obey the Lord your God, and do His commandments and His statutes which I command you today.”

Luke 11:28

“But he said, “Blessed rather are those who hear the word of God and keep it!”

2 John 1:6

“And this is love, that we walk according to His commandments. This is the commandment, just as you have heard from the beginning, that you should walk in it.”

Jeremiah 42:6

“Whether it is pleasant or unpleasant, we will listen to the voice of the Lord our God to whom we are sending you, so that it may go well with us when we listen to the voice of the Lord our God.”

Acts 5:29

“But Peter and the apostles answered, “We must obey God rather than men.”

Ecclesiastes 12:13

“The conclusion, when all has been heard, is: fear God and keep His commandments, because this applies to every person.”

6. An alternative perspective

Some other Christians may legitimately take a different view point. John Piper’s recent podcast episode [Can I Take a Vaccine Made from Aborted Babies?](#) at first read or listen seems to be suggesting that Christian’s may well have a moral objection to COVID-19 vaccines. It implies that not taking such vaccines may be a way to demonstrate your disapproval of abortion.

The introduction, however, seems to make the distinction between vaccines actually made using human cell cultures which originated in abortion and those where only the testing or development may have involved the cell lines. The podcast editor explains the episode was:

“recorded way back in October, back when it was widely reported that a major ethical dilemma was looming for pro-life Christians related to COVID vaccines made from aborted tissue cell lines. As the weeks passed, however, vaccines rose to the forefront that do not pose this ethical dilemma, particularly those from Pfizer and Moderna.” [Read More](#)

I want to outline some of the arguments used by Christian brothers and sisters who take a different

viewpoint. I am not talking about those who reflexly reject vaccines because they are “antivax” or “conspiracy theorists”.

There are people who might decide due to carefully thought through biblical reasoning that they do not agree with the position I have outlined so far in this article. And they are willing to take the consequences. This has a similar emotional context to that we see when Jehovah’s Witnesses refuse blood products not only for themselves but for their children. We are talking about a serious decision with potentially serious consequences for those who reject vaccines and those who their rejection of vaccines might also affect.

And right off the bat you have attempted to bias your audience by comparing refusing a lifesaving medical TREATMENT for a a seriously ill child, with the refusal of a potentially harmful PROPHYLACTIC product for a healthy child. This is deception. It is also slander.

Ephesians 4:31

“Let all bitterness and wrath and anger and clamor and slander be put away from you, along with all malice.”

Leviticus 19:16

“You shall not go about as a slanderer among your people, and you are not to act against the life of your neighbor; I am the Lord.”

Titus 3:2

“to malign no one, to be peaceable, gentle, showing every consideration for all men.”

Yours is an argument that unbeliever's use to argue that Christians of conscience should have their children removed from their care and placed with the state.

We owe it to these Christians to faithfully explain their viewpoint rather than create and demolish a straw man. So for the rest of this article I will try and outline the alternative viewpoint as fairly as I can whilst showing why I do not agree.

[John Piper](#) quotes [Romans 3:8](#) as key to formulating a position of opposition to at least some of the COVID-19 vaccines:

“Paul’s adversaries accused him of “do[ing] evil that good may come.” Paul responded to this, that it was a slanderous charge. In other words, he distanced himself from that kind of ethical stance. And I think we should too. We shouldn’t do evil that good may come. God alone has the infinite wisdom to manage an entire world of sin in which he can turn horrible things for wise and good purposes . . . If we really believe that the killing of unborn children is abhorrent to God and falls into the category of the shedding of innocent blood, for which God’s judgment fell, we should not think of turning this wickedness into a wonder drug to save our lives.” [READ MORE](#)

With respect to Piper who knows more about theology than I ever will this passage is not talking about moral actions where we weigh both good and evil consequences using the doctrine of double effect outlined earlier. It is referring to those who go on sinning deliberately so that God can show more grace by forgiving them.

The doctrine of double effect, a theory made by man that cites no objective moral standard, is meaningless when compared to the doctrine of obedience to God. You have replaced the true issue, obedience to God, with a creation of Man “double effect,” which

errantly assumes that man can even have good intentions in the first place.

Job 15:14

“What is man, that he should be pure,

Or he who is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?”

How is Piper's citation, and your interpretation of the passage, any different from what you have argued? Repeatedly you have urged Believers to knowingly sin, to sin by partnering with darkness in receiving the first aborted fetal cell vaccine dose, to not repent of the sin, and then to repeat the sin by getting the second dose of the aborted fetal cell vaccine, and not even to repent of *that* sin once it has been accomplished. You are indicted by *your own* interpretation of Romans 3:8. This is evidence of an unregenerate heart.

1 John 5:3

For this is the love of God, that we keep His commandments; and His commandments are not burdensome.

Such trampling over the grace of God is justly condemned by Paul. But for thousands of years Christians have argued in the doctrine of a “just war” that acts of incredible violence can be justified by the intention of dealing with a bigger problem.

No Christian has ever argued from scripture that child sacrifice and the trafficking of body parts were justified in a “Just War.” Please cite such an argument.

And do not be deceived, this is child sacrifice... “for the greater good.” If we want to find a biblical foothold for a discussion on God's perspective of the abortion of innocent children and their use in science and medicine, it is this:

Leviticus 20:1-5

“Then the LORD spoke to Moses, saying, 2 “You shall also say to the sons of Israel: ‘Anyone from the sons of Israel or from the strangers residing in Israel who gives any of his children to Molech, shall certainly be put to death; the people of the land shall stone him with stones. 3 I will also set My face against that man and will cut him off from among his people, because he has given some of his children to Molech, so as to defile My sanctuary and to profane My holy name. 4 If the people of the land, however, should ever disregard that man when he gives any of his children to Molech, so as not to put him to death, 5 then I Myself will set My face against that man and against his family, and I will cut off from among their people both him and all those who play the prostitute with him, by playing the prostitute with Molech.”

Deuteronomy 12:29-32

“29“When the LORD your God cuts off from you the nations which you are going in to dispossess, and you dispossess them and live in their land, 30be careful that you are not ensnared to follow them, after they are destroyed from your presence, and that you do not inquire about their gods, saying, ‘How do these nations serve their gods, that I also may do likewise?’ 31You shall not behave this way toward the LORD your God, because every abominable act which the LORD hates, they have done for their gods; for they even burn their sons and daughters in the fire for their gods.

32“Whatever I command you, you shall be careful to do; you shall not add to nor take *anything* away from it.”

Psalm 106:34-39

“They did not destroy the peoples,
As the LORD had commanded them,
35But they got involved with the nations
And learned their practices,
36And served their idols,
Which became a snare to them.
37They even sacrificed their sons and their daughters to the demons,
38And shed innocent blood,
The blood of their sons and their daughters
Whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan;
And the land was defiled with the blood.
39So they became unclean in their practices,
And were unfaithful in their deeds.”

Piper argues only God can turn evil around for good, which is ultimately of course true. But that didn't stop Joseph using his own situation, which was brought about directly because of the sin of his brothers, in order to work for the good of the Egyptians.

JOSEPH DID NOT SIN!

Piper is right. What he says is not “ultimately true,” it is just true.

God brought the good, and yet you claim that Joseph did it? By obeying God? Did God do it or did Joseph do it?

And your metaphors are a mess here. If I am the vaccine taker, the sinner, am I Joseph or the brothers? I can't be Joseph, because he didn't sin. I can't be the brothers, because they sinned but then they repented.

Genesis 42:21

21 “They said to one another, “Surely we are being punished because of our brother. We saw how distressed he was when he pleaded with us for his life, but we would not listen; that's why this distress has come on us.”

The unrepentant vaccine recipient is not represented anywhere in this story that ended in good.

YOU cannot bring good from sin, and Joseph didn't sin in the first place, his brothers did, and he responded to it with love and forgiveness. His brothers' repented before he even offered them forgiveness by humbling approaching him in the first place. It is a story of obedience and repentance, and God thus used this family's story for good.

It teaches the lesson that God brought about good in a time of famine where obedience and repentance of sin was practiced.

But you are using it to encourage sin, and non-repentance of sin!

This is false and deceptive teaching.

2 Timothy 4:3-4

“For the time will come when people will not put up with sound doctrine. Instead, to suit their own desires, they will gather around them a great number of teachers to say what their itching ears want to hear. 4 They will turn their ears away from the truth and turn aside to myths.”

So if Piper was right, ONLY God can bring good from sin, why have you not repented of any of the pages of words you have used to manipulate Believers into knowingly sin and remain unrepentant? Why does most of this article still exist in light of your admission that Piper is right, and your own interpretation of Romans 3:8?

Surely Christians are called to attempt to turn every situation they find themselves in around to good.

Yes... through obedience and repentance. Not sin.

2 John 1:6

“And this is love, that we walk according to His commandments. This is the commandment, just as you have heard from the beginning, that you should walk in it.”

Such as the mother who was raped but decides to somehow raise the conceived child as an demonstration of great love. Does she not, with God’s help turn the sin committed against her into great good, and even the joy of seeing her child mature?

And here we have to stop, examine this with a level head, and ask some serious questions about why you wrote this.

Because in the scenario where the vaccine recipient is the sinner, but should sin for the greater good, you justify the rape of an innocent woman, because it ends in the greater good of a new life.

It is difficult to even address this because it is so abhorrent, and I have had to stop and rewrite this section several times so that I do not sin in my response to you.

In your “double effect” justification of sin, the rapist, as long as he believes he has “good intentions” is not morally culpable for the evil, remembering that we have no objective standard here for what is and is not “otherwise morally legitimate” as this is squishy, heathen, subjectivity “theory.”

Men can rape women for the greater good. And what is a greater good than the creation of a new life? Subjectively speaking, of course.

I wrote to you in our previous communication that “there is no evil that cannot be justified with a “greater good” argument. Here you, yourself have made my point for me, by justifying the violent rape of an innocent woman with a greater good argument.

The rest of Piper’s article addresses the sanctity of life and the huge value of every human being. He even makes a parallel with martyrdoms, suggesting that the believer may decide to refuse this vaccine even at peril of their own lives. What Piper doesn’t address is the sanctity not just of the life of the baby that was aborted decades ago, and of the person deciding to take or decline the vaccine, but also of the many other lives that each individual who takes a vaccine might save.

And he didn't need to address that, because that number, according to the vaccine makers

and the government agencies regulating them, is Zero.

Which means Piper may have read the documents submitted to the FDA for Emergency Use Authorization that say that there is no data on how the vaccines impact transmission. Because the vaccines are not designed to prevent transmission, which is a feature that the media, and yourself, have granted to the shots by fiat.

To me if we weigh a theoretical risk that we are perceived as approving of an ancient (if it happened in my lifetime, is it ancient?) abortion against the very real risk of this pandemic being allowed to continue to destroy lives and our way of life, the result of that equation is very clear.

You have reversed the math equation. The risk of disobeying God and telling him that we so approve of abortion that we are willing to inject the products of those abortions into our body is not theoretical, it is certain, and is evidence that we do not share his values, and may have never known him.

And the risk of “this pandemic being allowed to continue” is also certain, of course, you cannot end a pandemic with a product that does not prevent infection or transmission. At best, you can only reduce the severity of the symptoms when the infection takes place.

If we weigh up only our own potential death the decision might seem very different to some:

“Absence from the body is presence with the Lord. I am not afraid of dying. I am not going to knowingly participate in the torture, mutilation, and murder of an innocent to avoid meeting Christ for a few years”.

Ginger Taylor, vaccine activist, personal communication.

I am Ginger Taylor, and I approve this message.

We might question whether merely taking a vaccine is to knowingly participate in a decades old abortion, if we are vaccinated are we really by doing so having “fellowship with darkness” (2 Cor 6:14)? We might also ask if this equation was still valid if we added to the comments above “and to prevent the deaths of many others”.

You may ask the question, because all questions can be asked. The answer is that the vaccines will not “prevent the deaths of many others,” if vaccine makers and regulators are to be believed. As the vaccines will not, and are not designed to, “prevent the deaths of many others.”

You have allowed yourself to believe the things you want to believe, that are not claimed in the companies’ own paperwork: that these vaccines are magic, and that despite the fact that all old school aborted fetal cell vaccines have human remains in them, the AstraZeneca COVID vaccine doesn’t, because it doesn’t say so on the AZ paperwork.

You have had your ears tickled.

James 1:13-16

13 “When tempted, no one should say, “God is tempting me.” For God cannot be tempted by evil, nor does he tempt anyone; **14** but each person is tempted when they are dragged away by their own evil desire and enticed. **15** Then, after desire has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and sin, when it is full-grown, gives birth to death.

16 Don’t be deceived, my dear brothers and sisters.”

A [sermon by Jason Garwood](#) is often referred to as an example for the view of Christians who oppose the use of vaccines which involved human cell lines. This cites two main Scriptures in addition to Romans 3:8 which Piper quoted above.

Do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead expose them. ([Ephesians 5:11](#))

“Who can make the clean out of the unclean? No one! ([Job 14:4](#))

Garwood urges Christians not to ignore moral questions associated with vaccines stating

“We are not to simply ignore the darkness as we retreat to our safe pulpits and churches; we’re to reveal it, and uncover it, which requires activity. Activism is a thoroughly biblical concept.”

If there was an ongoing production line dependent on modern day abortions to make vaccines then I agree that we should be exposing such behaviour. And yet there is no such activity.

Adrian, abortions ARE ongoing, and their use in medical research IS ongoing. We have the Planned Parenthood fetal parts sale scandal to demonstrate that to us clearly. Did you not understand that this is what is happening daily? Watch the videos and see the insane prices that PP is charging tissue procurement companies for aborted fetal parts.

Planned Parenthood was just forced to admit in court to harvesting aborted fetal parts

“In a [recent preliminary](#) hearing in the court case against the Center for Medical Progress, a Planned Parenthood official admitted to harvesting aborted fetal parts for the purpose of selling them to human tissue procurement companies.”

AND

Reposting from earlier:

Just this week a lawsuit in the US Federal Court confirmed that [the US Department of Health and Human Services was illegally purchasing aborted fetal organs for research](#).

“Both the FDA and NIH purchased the organs from California-based Advanced Biosciences Resources (ABR) to create “[humanized mice](#)” for use in HIV research. ABR partners with Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers to dismember fetuses and sell their parts for research. The [decision](#) notes that ABR:

sold second-trimester livers and thymi for hundreds of dollars apiece. The same for brains, eyes, and lungs. After tacking on fees for services like shipping and cleaning, ABR could collect over \$2,000 on a single fetus it purchased from Planned Parenthood for \$60. The federal government participated in this potentially illicit trade for years.”

The prices for aborted fetal parts have been published:

The Retail Value of Fetal Organs Harvested by Planned Parenthood

But circling back to that verse itself, which is the mantra of NoDeception.org that Garwood and myself publish on:

Ephesians 5:11

Do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness, but instead expose them.

That verse has two parts. The second, you agreed with, and said that if this is still continuing, then you believe it is our duty to expose them. But you did not comment on the first part. The most important part. The part that makes us morally culpable and binds us to evil men and their practices.

“Do not participate in the unfruitful deeds of darkness...”

I have quoted this verse to you repeatedly in the last three months since we started this discussion. What is your response? Do you agree with this? Do you agree that the murders of these children, their organ trafficking, and their use in medicine are deeds of darkness? Do you believe that buying them or using them is participating in those deeds of darkness?

I do think it is important for Christians not to just ignore the issues we have discussed in this article, however.

Whilst Job does support the idea that no human can turn evil around to good, as Jesus' hands and feet in this world we are surely commissioned to join him in his work of demonstrating his love by healing and preventing suffering.

Which these vaccines cannot do.

7. Conclusion

We live in a real world which has been contaminated by sin. It is impossible for us to ever completely avoid the effects of this fallen broken world. Whilst we like to pretend we are entirely separate from the unbelieving World around us the truth is we are not. We are called to play our part in the impossible miracle of salvation that Jesus came to Earth to perform. Turning sickness into health, sorrow into joy, suffering into patience, fear into peace.

And at the beginning of 2021 is there a better practical way to bring physical and healing to this World than to fully play our part in banishing COVID-19 by being vaccinated, encouraging our friends and family to be vaccinated, countering the lies that many are spreading, and campaigning for the vaccine to be made available to every nation in the World?

Yes: simply by obeying the commandments of God, and to stop spreading the lie that COVID vaccines can prevent infection and transmission, upon which this entire article is based.

Without vaccinating the entire World's population we risk new variants of the virus arising and further waves of misery.

New variants will come with or without a vaccine, because viruses mutate. It's what they do. Some mutations will likely arise because of the vaccine. Vaccines can cause viral mutation. You have made another inaccurate and deceptive statement.

Since Western countries are better equipped in many cases to track the emergence of any unexpected side effects, and confirm efficacy in the real world, I understand that it is good that their millions are the first being vaccinated. But we must not hoard the vaccine but rather share it with the developing

world. To that end the actions of the Oxford and Astra-Zeneca group in licensing a manufacturer in India to produce huge quantities of their vaccine at a further reduced price for the developing world is surely to be welcomed.

And the AZ vaccine was halted in more than 17 countries following millions of reports of blood clots. When all is said and done, what will history show the ChAdOx1 really did to people?

This was the vaccine you said that you believed would turn out to be the relied upon shot.

James 4:13-15

Come now, you who say, “Today or tomorrow we will go into such and such a town and spend a year there and trade and make a profit”— 14yet you do not know what tomorrow will bring. What is your life? For you are a mist that appears for a little time and then vanishes. 15Instead you ought to say, “If the Lord wills, we will live and do this or that.” 16As it is, you boast in your arrogance. All such boasting is evil.

Justice demands that we offer these life saving COVID-19 vaccines to everyone in the World. Love for our neighbours urges us all to take it

Your article is a house of cards, and this summation is a lie.

Justice does not demand anything. It is an abstract concept.

Love for neighbors does not urge any of us to take it.

Our most urgent dilemma is that the Holy God demands Holiness of sinful Believers. And because we cannot give it to him, we are lost in sin.

Because Christ has died in sinlessness for us, he offers us his holiness, if we repent of our sin and live a life of love and obedience to him. When we do, we are given the gift of the Holy Spirit to live within us, convicting and encouraging us, and blessing us with the gift of repentance.

The fruit of this is a lifelong ability to be convicted of sin, and to repent of it, to never be able to escape the conviction of a Holy God, or God's irresistible grace.

This is the gospel of Jesus Christ.

One who is able to resist conviction of sin, call to repentance, and the urging of the Holy Spirit to come away from worldly philosophies, does not know Christ.

So this response to your article is not merely a theological discussion, it is a call from me to you to repent of your sin.

You have been deceived, and you are deceiving others. The vision you present is so appealing, and I understand its hold on you, but it just isn't real.

I have been praying that God would be convicting you about your false beliefs and false teaching, that he would call you to repentance, and that you would joyfully do so, being unable to resist his Grace.

I will leave you with the words of Christ from Matthew 7.

15 “Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves. 16 You will recognize them by their fruits. Are grapes gathered from thornbushes, or figs from thistles? 17 So, every healthy tree bears good fruit, but the diseased tree bears bad fruit. 18 A healthy tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a diseased tree bear good fruit. 19 Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. 20 Thus you will recognize them by their fruits.

I Never Knew You

21 “Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven. 22 On that day many will say to me, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many mighty works in your name?’ 23 And then will I declare to them, ‘I never knew you; depart from me, you workers of lawlessness.’

Build Your House on the Rock

24 “Everyone then who hears these words of mine and does them will be like a wise man who built his house on the rock. 25 And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house, but it did not fall, because it had been founded on the rock. 26 And everyone who hears these words of mine and does not do them will be like a foolish man who built his house on the sand. 27 And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it.”

Ginger