

The Greater Good

In my previous career as a financial services professional, I was bound by industry ethics and standards to conduct a "risk profile" on each client, in order to ascertain their personal "risk tolerance". Should I, after having conducted such an assessment, recommend and sell to them an investment vehicle or security that was "unsuitable" for them based upon that assessment, I would face fines, censure, business suspension and possible loss of license... and that was just for putting their *financial assets* at risk.

You see, people have a right to not be exposed to risks beyond their personal/individual risk tolerance. What about when we extend those risk preferences beyond finances and into the world of health, and even life and death?

Let's talk about that...

Just last week I saw a news story with photos where a woman was embracing her child saying, "*Mommy's going to hug you now*", as a nurse injected the child with a "vaccination" on her opposite side. As the child winced and looked at the injection site where she'd just experienced pain, the mother said, "*Oh, what a brave girl!*"

Couple'a things...

- There was nothing brave in what the child did. It was involuntary, coerced and sneaky.
- There was nothing brave in what the mother did. It was trickery, guile, "betrayal with a kiss", and an actual child sacrifice. Make no mistake.
- There was nothing brave in what the medical professional did. It was forced experimental medical intervention on a helpless child, and complicity in a war crime.
Hmm... didn't we outlaw that and say "never again" in the 40's?

And I warn you, do not succumb to the temptation to believe that there is no "war crime" unless and until a judge and/or jury say so. God determines right and wrong, what is crime and what is not, by His standards. They are not determined by any human court or judge. Moral relativism will say differently, but God has spoken, and we do not, dare not sacrifice children.

To do so is a war crime. Period.

Follow me...

Regarding the gigantic push to get at least 70% of the American population injected with the "vaccines" from the major pharmaceutical manufacturers, we hear things like "The benefits outweigh the risks." Those who think the risks outweigh the benefits are referred to as "vaccine hesitant" at best, and "a danger to the rest of the society" at worst.

And when confronted with the *actual* adverse events, deaths, injuries, etc, the 70% *proponents* respond with the idea that the brave among us ought to make the "sacrifice for the greater good". Many do not know, many deny, and many refute that the "sacrifice" of which they speak, is the recognition of the reality that all of these current "vaccine" injections **are in phase 3 clinical trial, and the recipients are in fact, the test subjects.**

- None of the injections have approval.
- None have undergone animal trials/testing.
- None can be legally mandated as, all are only being administered under Emergency Use Authorization... a designation reserved for that which has been *neither* properly/sufficiently tested *nor* approved.
- None of the manufacturers can be held accountable for injury or death as of 1986 US law.
- None of the administrators can be held accountable for injury or death as of the signing of the Prep Act of 2005.

Under these circumstances, parents are being encouraged to submit their minor children, babies included, as experimental test subjects, and then call the children – and the parents – brave.

Barbara Loe Fisher, the founder of the National Vaccine Information Center, herself having a child irreparably damaged from a DPT vaccination in the early 80's, spoke to this issue of bravery and sacrifice by taking "vaccination for the greater good". I refer to her story, below.

But about the dates and the laws I mentioned... fyi...

The US government decided that vaccination was something that ought to be done for "the greater good" when it authorized and passed into law the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986.

In the early 80's, vaccine manufacturers were getting sued like crazy and threatened to end vaccine research, production and sale as, that they could not handle the cost of litigation. The government said that vaccine, something that was being demonstrated to be dangerous by myriad lawsuits, was something necessary for "the greater good" of society, and therefore passed the Vaccine Act of 1986, thoroughly insulating vaccine manufacturers from any liability for vaccine injury and/or death. A fund has been and is being accrued from a tax on each and every vaccine dose, which pays for damages from vaccine through the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (VICP), which was established as part of the Vaccine Act. Vaccine injury is sometimes recognized and compensated for, but never by the manufacturers; rather by the taxpayers, who fund the compensation fund with the tax on the vaccine doses, through insurance premiums and doctors' fees.

But vaccine research and development continues... for “the greater good”, and those whom take the *current injections* are participating in a gigantic, medical experiment, with known and recognized (albeit usually denied) risks, for “the greater good”.

It's one thing when a drug is “approved” and the maker has no liability, what about when there has been no approval nor testing?

Don'tcha think it ought to be voluntary and neither mandated nor coerced... by those with a legal monopoly on the use of force... namely the government? Hmm?

Now bring it back to the children...

Barbara Loe Fisher, having a 4 year old permanently damaged from a DPT vaccine, tells about a press conference she attended at the American Academy of Neurology. At the conference, a pediatrician released the findings of his study. The study demonstrated that two thirds of babies that had died from Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS), had died within three weeks of having received a DPT vaccine. After unveiling the results of his study and recommending that more research be done on the DPT vaccine, the pediatrician was assaulted by other “pro-vaccine” doctors and scientists at the conference, and was reduced, as Fisher recalls, to cowering and trembling in a corner.

Ms. Fisher having observed this, asked one of the “attacking” scientists about the study and its findings. She said, “*I want to know more about DPT vaccine*”.

She says that the scientist got a “...a quizzical look on his face and said something to the effect that, 'it only happens once in a million kids'. And instinctively I said, but if a vaccine kills even one, how can all children be legally required to get it? He looked surprised, uncomfortable, and walked away mumbling something about '... vaccine benefits far outweigh the risks, and sometimes we have to make sacrifices for the greater good'. And I thought to myself, 'but the benefits didn't outweigh the risk for my child, and maybe they didn't for the babies who suddenly died after DPT shots in the study that that young doctor tried to talk about before he was figuratively lynched for suggesting more research should be done, to find out. And why was my child's health sacrificed without my knowledge or permission? And what is the good that is made greater by child sacrifice?’”

Did you read that last question, Christian? What is the good that is made greater by child sacrifice?

No one... No one sacrifices their children outside of the influence of the enemy of God, the enemy of your soul.

Please stand against any and all who would attempt to mandate these medical interventions for children, whether this current intervention, “vaccine”, injection , or any other.

These current interventions, having been called vaccines – which they are not – all fall under that category that exempts the researchers and manufacturers from *ANY liability at all*, since the 1980's!

In the first decade of this 21st century, someone tried to once again to sue a pharmaceutical manufacturer for vaccine injury, bringing the case on the grounds that the manufacturer *could have* and therefore *should have* made the vaccinations “safer”. The case made it to the Supreme Court in 2011. The majority ruling on the case was in favor of the pharmaceutical manufacturer and not the plaintiff. What is significant about the ruling is, the reasoning for it.

The case having been brought, heard and decided on the grounds of “safety”, the final ruling was a ruling on “vaccine safety”, and whether or not the manufacturers *coulda/shoulda* made the damaging vaccine safer.

It was determined by the high court and written in the ruling by now deceased Justice Antonin Scalia, that vaccines, their research, development, technology... everything about them, is “unavoidably unsafe”, and therefore the manufacturers were not required to compensate anyone for not having made them “safer”.

Did you hear that Christian? Unavoidably Unsafe and therefore no liability for anyone with regard to injury or death... and *that* finding is about vaccines that have been, supposedly, thoroughly tested and approved!!

Now think about a “vaccine” that *has not* been tested and approved, but *is being* tested upon us and upon our children.

The “thoroughly tested and approved” ones are unavoidably unsafe! What of the ones that are now being administered only under Emergency Use Authorization, because *They Have Not Been Tested And Approved?*

And either way, tested or not, approved or not... no liability for injury or death. At all. By law. Since the 1980's.

I prefer not to be a guinea pig for “the greater good” nor for any other reason, and I will fight and die that these things are not mandated by law, edict, order, and neither judicial nor executive fiat upon my friends, loved ones and the children of my friends and loved ones.

Please expose what these fiends and mad-men are trying to do with and to our children.

“And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, rather expose them”. Eph 5:11

Pastor