

# The Great Controversy and COVID

written by Tim Jennings, M.D. | August 5, 2021



## **Preparing Your Mind to Be Beastly**

In July 2021, I received the following email:

*Dear Dr. Jennings and C&R Team,*

*Our family has been so blessed by your ministry, books, seminars, and weekly Bible studies. We were particularly touched by the latest study which focused on today's events and your loving response to a troubling email you received.*

*I write to you today with a heavy heart requesting prayer for my current situation at work. You see, I am a federal employee at a medical clinic and have just received notice of the national mandate that we must receive the COVID vaccine within 8 weeks or face unemployment. I knew this day may come, but I am still concerned nonetheless as I have a health condition that I feel would worsen if I were to take this experimental shot. I had hoped to use my talents in this job and retire with benefits, but it looks like that may not be an option. Pray for me and my family as we seek His wisdom and guidance in these uncertain times. Thank you, and God bless you and your team for what God is doing through you at this critical time in earth's history!*

What is your reaction to this email?

Do you see only the medical problem, employment problem, political problem? Or do you also see the issues of the Great Controversy at play?

Today, we are all being placed in the position to make decisions about what we will do in governance of ourselves—to take an experimental injection or not, wear a mask or not, attend church or not, visit family or not.

But upon what are we to base such decisions? Each of us is trying to decide what is best, what is right, what is truth. But which rationales, ideas, beliefs, conclusions, or options are we ourselves able to directly validate or confirm? In other words, isn't it the case that we are being asked to make decisions based on whom we trust?

- Do you trust the government—the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)?
- Do you trust politicians, either those on the left or the right?
- Do you trust media personalities, either those on the left or the right?
- Do you trust popular opinion?
- Do you trust your doctor?

How many doctors do you know who have personally done research on viruses, and specifically on COVID-19, and have themselves confirmed what they are reading in the various medical outlets? (Full disclosure: I have not.) Are doctors ever wrong—even when the majority agree?

- What about on the majority view when Pasteur presented germ theory?
- What about 100 years ago when doctors prescribed tobacco as a treatment for lung disease?

How did doctors come to leave the wrong ideas behind? What method was used to lead them out of wrong conclusions and into right ones?

These questions take us to the heart of the Great Controversy, the war between Christ and Satan that began in heaven.

## **In Doubt? Examine the Methods**

When Lucifer started his rebellion in heaven, were the angels able to do primary research and uncover evidence to confirm whether he was telling the truth? Did the angels need to decide who they would trust?

We face the same battle for our minds today, a question of whom we can trust.

But what decision do you make when you can't do primary research and uncover the evidence for yourself?

One way is to examine the methods of the various sides.

If people genuinely want the truth, what attitude do they have and what methods do they employ when questions arise, when data come up that question the accepted narrative?

Historically, medicines get approval for use in America by doing double-blind, placebo-controlled studies that demonstrate effectiveness and reveal various side effects, risks, or negative outcomes. But it is also understood that their study populations are always narrow; these study populations don't represent the wide range of genetic and physiological differences found in the population as a whole. Thus, it is understood that once a product enters the market, new side effects or problems may emerge that were not seen in the studies.

Also historically, medical standards encouraged the reporting of complications or harm suspected to be caused by various treatments. Standard medical practice has been scientific, loving and pursuing truth, evidence, and facts. When such reports were made, they were recorded and actively investigated to confirm or refute, by evidence, the concern. This is a healthy and mature approach to any question; truth loses nothing by investigation.

Over the years, multiple medical products have come to market only later to be either removed because of unknown serious problems, like death, or receive new black-box warnings about risks that were not initially understood.

Doesn't the approach of being open to the evidence and following it where it leads sound reasonable? Doesn't it give you greater confidence when concerns are met with a willingness to investigate and uncover what is actually true?

Who would not be willing to do this? Wouldn't it be those who know their position is false, that their product has a problem, and that the truth would expose them?

Take, for instance, Zyprexa. Known by the manufacturer to increase Diabetes Mellitus Type II (DMII) and obesity, the company purposely misrepresented the data and worked to obstruct investigation, even lying about the signals doctors were seeing in their patient populations and resisting research to determine the facts—because they already knew the facts. When you either know there is a problem, or suspect there is a problem, or have it good now and believe any investigation will only expose problems, then you really don't want the facts to come to light, then you don't encourage investigation and inquiry. Eventually, the manufacturer pled guilty to a criminal charge and paid a \$1.42 billion settlement.

## **Troubling Behavior by Those We're Asked to Trust**

And, sadly, we see the same methods of refusal to investigate evidence when it comes to the COVID vaccine.

- Research and evidence have come out indicating that the COVID-19 spike protein, which the injections stimulate the body to produce, bind to heparin-binding proteins, which in the brain increases the accumulation of beta-amyloid proteins (a risk factor for Alzheimer's disease), Tau proteins (a risk factor for Alzheimer's disease), alpha-synuclein (a risk factor for Parkinson's and Lewy Body disease), and prions (a risk factor for spongiform disease).

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0006291X2100499X>

This research suggests that the vaccines could lead to neurodegenerative changes and dementias. What would be the godlike, ethical, moral response? Would it be to actively investigate? Would it be to inform the public and give them the option of waiting for more information on this—or is the godlike response to suppress this information and not inform people before they get an experimental injection? Perhaps

this will turn out to be a false signal and the vaccines don't contribute to increased neurodegenerative changes, but until we know, shouldn't people be informed and given the option to choose for themselves, without coercion—threats of job loss and social isolation? Why withhold the evidence and coercively push the vaccine?

- More than 12,000 deaths from the vaccine have been reported in the VAERS database in just seven months, which calculates to approximately a 1 in 13,000 risk of dying from the vaccine, assuming those numbers are not depressed.

Should people be informed of these numbers and given the option to take the vaccine or not? What is the godlike approach? What about for children who have essentially no risk from the disease itself—should they be required to take the shot in which 1 in 13,000 may die from it?

- When pathologists who have spent the last 16 months examining blood samples of COVID-recovered people report that:

*"A natural infection induces hundreds upon hundreds of antibodies against all proteins of the virus, including the envelope, the membrane, the nucleocapsid, and the spike. Dozens upon dozens of these antibodies neutralize the virus when encountered again. Additionally, because of the immune system exposure to these numerous proteins (epitomes), our T cells mount a robust memory, as well. Our T cells are the 'marines' of the immune system and the first line of defense against pathogens. T cell memory to those infected with SARSCOV1 is at 17 years and running still."*

On the other hand, this vaccine triggers the body to make the spike protein and the immune system to only create antibodies to the spike protein.

What would be an honest, ethical, and truth-loving response? Should we actively investigate? If this is true, wouldn't it be easily verifiable? And if it is verified and true, wouldn't it give millions of recovered individuals comfort, reassurance, and reduce their fear? And would recovered individuals need to worry about re-exposure and mask wearing or getting vaccinated?

<https://www.dailyveracity.com/2021/07/19/cdc-vaccine-deaths-pass-10000-as-efficacy-of-the-jab-plummetts-data-suggests-those-naturally-infected-do-better-than-the-vaccinated/>

New research out July 28, 2021, suggests that this is, in fact, true. According to JAMA Network, in an article entitled "Überantibodies From Recovered COVID-19 Patients Could Spur New Therapeutics and Vaccines," recovered individuals had developed multiple different antibodies to COVID-19 and that "two of the antibodies were 'ultrapotent' at tiny concentrations across all 23 of the variants the scientists tested, including the highly transmissible B.1.1.7 (alpha), B.1.351 (beta), and B.1.617.2 (delta) versions."

[https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2782673?guestAccessKey=f93a08a1-db6e-428d-86d7-3935e87bd31d&utm\\_source=silverchair&utm\\_campaign=jama\\_network&utm\\_content=covid\\_weekly\\_highlights&utm\\_medium=email](https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2782673?guestAccessKey=f93a08a1-db6e-428d-86d7-3935e87bd31d&utm_source=silverchair&utm_campaign=jama_network&utm_content=covid_weekly_highlights&utm_medium=email)

- Other physicians have seen increased vascular problems in their vaccinated patients. With the concern that the spike proteins produced from the mRNA vaccines were binding to the body's smallest blood vessels and triggering micro-clots with subsequent vascular and cardiac problems. One physician began doing d-dimer blood studies and found that 62 percent of his patients who had taken the vaccines experienced this micro-clotting problem.

<https://principia-scientific.com/doctor-heart-failure-from-mrna-jabs-will-kill-most-people/>

What is the ethical, truth-seeking approach to these and other findings? Wouldn't it be to actively investigate the claims to see if they have merit—to see whether these findings are reproducible, documentable, or whether they are some artifact, something unrelated? Why isn't it being openly investigated? Why aren't people being told about these potential risks?

What does it mean when officials suppress such medical data and don't actively investigate it and, instead, attack those who present these points?

Again, I am not saying any of these reports are proven. What I am demonstrating is that normal medical ethics and godly principles of investigation and truth-seeking are not being followed by the pro-vaccinators. *Why?*

## **What Character Reveals in the Age of COVID**

So, while I can't do primary research myself to determine the truth, I can spot the methods being employed by pro-COVID vaccinators and contrast them with those voicing caution at this time.

And the methods of the pro-vaccinators are not the methods of standard medical ethics, nor the methods of truth and liberty.

Let's be specific. Satan has no truth on his side, so he cannot appeal to evidence and truth. He must use other methods. Of course, he uses lies. But more than just falsehood, he depends on the authority of office, position, proclamations, claims, declarations, and trust to get others to believe and follow without investigation or evidence.

In religion, this methodology manifests with statements like "just believe," "have faith," "If you have faith, you don't need evidence," "feelings are reliable and trustworthy," "the Bible said it, I believe it," and "he's the pastor, priest, rabbi, mullah, or pope—who are you to question him?"

In society today, it manifests as "the CDC says," "Dr. so and so says," "the NIH says," "the New England Journal says."

But if the position is not based on truth and truth is not actually desired, then those who advance their position by mere claim, declaration, and authority of office will use [Satan's next method](#) when truth-speakers arise to challenge their view. They will next seek to silence the voices of opposition—shout them down, label them heretics, fire them, retract their articles (not rebut the article with evidence-based scholarly evidence), cancel their engagements, deplatform them, imprison them, and even kill them. This is what happened to God's prophets in the Bible, to the Reformers, and it is what is happening today to anyone who seeks to merely bring the truth to light. If the vaccines are truly safe and effective, asking questions and pursuing evidence will only confirm that. But the fact that Satan's methods are being employed by pro-vaccinators suggests they have something to hide.

Satan also uses the methods of inducement, bribes, payoffs, or giving you some reward for wrongdoing, but if you don't take the payoff, you are then threatened with something painful. It's the classic *Godfather* approach: Take the bribe or have your legs broken.

Satan used all these methods on Christ:

- He tempted Jesus by lying: presenting himself as an angel from heaven when he was not and by misquoting Scripture in order to deceive
- He offered Jesus a bribe—all the kingdoms of the world
- He inspired the religious authorities to denounce Jesus and allege His miracles were done by Satan's power—seeking to “deplatform” Him
- And, ultimately, he used coercion, threat, and violence at the crucifixion

God's methods, in contrast, are truth, presented in love, leaving people free. These are the methods of God's people.

In contrast, what methods do you see being practiced by the proponents of the experimental injection?

- Do they want honest and open investigation of the evidence?
- Do they want to leave people free?
- Do they seek to censor people, to restrict information, to silence?
- Do they use incentives to bribe people to get the injection—gift cards, free meals, bonuses, etc.?
- When that fails, do they use threats—lose your job, can't go to school, can't travel, can't shop, can't worship, can't visit family, lose your license, lose your business?

Some will protest my view. They will say the government simply wants to save lives. They will ask how I can be so insensitive; they will ask if I want to kill people.

But this is a false argument.

Doctors who asked questions about Zyprexa or any other treatment, voicing concern that it may be causing harm, are not seeking to harm but to protect their patients. My questions are not designed to kill people; just the opposite, my questions are designed to save people—and this includes saving people from both temporal illness and death, but even more important, to save them eternally, to save their minds from being corrupted by destructive practices.

The methods being employed by the pro-vaccinators are not the methods of God. They are not actively pursuing the truth.

And to be clear, you can be pro-vaccine and still be godly, because you use godly methods to advance it. You present your understanding, rationale, and reasons in love but leave others free. You don't coerce or bribe others to do what you want them to do. The specific action isn't the primary concern; it is the methods. And I am warning against the prevailing mainstream culture, which is not grounded in the scientific method or the principles of the Bible. How many Christians are falling into this Satanic spirit—and are willing to practice beastly methods to get people injected?

I am neither for nor against the vaccine—you must make that decision for yourself. But I am for truth, love, and freedom, for applying the methods of God in every activity of life, including how we address the COVID crisis.

The methods being employed—notice again, I'm not saying the experimental injection itself; I'm saying the methods being employed—the deceit, authority, bribery, coercion, and threats to get people to take this treatment is beastly. If you go along with these methods now and support them being used on individuals, you are embracing the methods of the beast and are actively preparing your mind to accept them again when the next issue comes along that is presented as necessary to save lives.

Jesus does not work this way.

Only those who have developed the ability to discern, to think for themselves, to examine evidence, to practice God's methods, and have not surrendered their minds and thinking to others will be able to handle the final deception soon coming upon the world.