

RENÉ BALÁK

NEVERENDING HISTORY OF THE USE OF VACCINES DERIVED
FROM ABORTED INFANTS.
PART TWO: MORAL EVALUATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRINCIPLE
OF DOUBLE EFFECT AND ENCYCLICALS *VERITATIS SPLENDOR*
AND *EVANGELIUM VITAE*

A b s t r a c t. Repeated moral reevaluation of mandatory vaccination with vaccines derived from aborted children from a theological angle of view is necessary considering the increasing timeliness of the issue. The principle of double effect, along with the Thomist concept of moral analysis of human action, is an adequate way of moral evaluation of this bioethical dilemma facing Catholic parents. The papal Magisterium of the chosen encyclicals provides a complementary methodological and meritory basis for respecting the unborn human life as well as the doctrinal key for moral evaluation of concerned subjects' behavior.

Key words: moral evaluation; mandatory vaccination; papal magisterium; bonum; abortion; vaccines.

INTRODUCTION

Parentes et medici, nascituri morituri vos salutant! Greeting from a few dozen of unborn children murdered through utilitarianism, who were inhumanly sacrificed on the altar of biomedical science and progress in the production of new cell lines from aborted infants,¹ is addressed to all the people

Dr RENÉ BALÁK, PhD Department of Philosophy and Center for Bioethics Faculty of Arts, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius; address for correspondence: ul. Javorová 15 Piešťany 892101, Slovak Republic; e-mail: info@theologiamoralis.info

¹ Cf. RENÉ LEIVA, "A Brief History of Human Diploid Cell Strains", in *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* (Autumn, 2006), 443-451. A new evidence of the continuing

of good will, who realize that every human person from his conception to natural death pertains dignity of human being.²

It is necessary to repeat the decisive words of the papal *Ecclesiae magisterium ordinarium* unquestionably appeals that “[...] the deliberate decision to deprive an innocent human being of his life is always morally evil and can never be licit either as an end in itself or as a means to a good end. It is in fact a grave act of disobedience to the moral law, and indeed to God himself, the author and guarantor of that law; it contradicts the fundamental virtues of justice and charity. Furthermore, no one is permitted to ask for the act of killing, either for himself or herself or for another person entrusted to his or her care, nor can he or she consent to it, either explicitly or implicitly. Nor can any authority legitimately recommend or permit such an action.”³

1. MORAL EVALUATION THROUGH THE PRINCIPLE OF DOUBLE EFFECT

Moral evaluation of mandatory vaccinations with vaccines produced on the basis of dozens of abortions according to the principle of double effect – *principium duplicitis effectus* delicately regulates human behavior (biomedical intervention, biotherapy), especially in the case when the one of the achieved effects of human act (medical intervention) is in conflict with ethical principles (e.g. intoxication of patient’s body with toxic adjuvants). This bioethical principle contains principles of practical moral (ethical) reasoning when applying unethical vaccines for proper moral decision making of doctors and parents according to the moral law in cases where achieving the desired good effect in order to protect and promote the basic good of a person is accompanied by undesirable (negative adverse) effects.⁴

history of the development and production of new vaccines from aborted infants is the last cell line Walvax – 2. Cf. BO MA ET AL, Characteristics and viral propagation properties of a new human diploid cell line, walvax-2, and its suitability as a candidate cell substrate for vaccine production, in *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* 11(2015), 4: 998-1009. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2015.1009811.

² Cf. CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, *Dignitas personae* (Rome, 2008), n. 1.

³ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Evangelium vitae* (Rome, 1995), n. 57.

⁴ Cf. GUIDO M. MIGLIETTA, GIOVANNI RUSSO, Duplice effetto, in: *Enciclopedia di bioetica e scienza giuridica IV*, direzione di E. Sgreccia, A. Tarantino (Napoli, 2011), 915.

Such action (e.g. mandatory vaccination) can only be carried out when the following conditions are met, without which it is not ethically permissible to do so. In this context, it is appropriate to note that there are several interpretations of the act according to the principle of double effect, not only regarding conditions but also applications in biomedical practice, whether in the context of biotherapy or research.⁵

The act itself must be ethically good (or morally indifferent), meaning that the object, purpose, intention, and circumstances are ethically good according to general ethical principles, but this can not be met in the case of unethical vaccines, since the actual subject of the vaccination act is not morally good due to the origin of unethical vaccines as well as their toxicity.⁶

The aim and intention of the acting subject must be good (dignified) in the act of mandatory vaccination, which means that the acting subject wants to deliberately achieve only an ethically good effect, with no bad effect being wanted (e.g. undesirable toxic negative adverse effects on patient's health) but only tolerated (even when acting healthcare personnel beforehand knows that bad consequence – effect will occur).

The good effect (declared protection against infectious diseases) can never be achieved through the bad effect (organism intoxication that occurs immediately after vaccination or the use of unethical vaccines), thus both effects either occur simultaneously or the bad effect is a subsequent consequence of

⁵ Cf. MARCIANO VIDAL, *Manuale di etica teologica 1. Morale fondamentale* (Assisi, 1994), 421; SALVATORE PRIVITERA, "Duplice effetto", in *Dizionario di Bioetica*, a cura di S. Leone, S. Privitera (Palermo, 1994), 308-309; W.E. MAY, "Double Effect", in *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*. I, ed. W.T. Reich (New York-London, 1978), 316; ELIO SGRECCIA, *Manuale di bioetica*, vol. I. *Fondamenti ed etica biomedica* (Milano, 2007), 236-238; RAIMONDO FRATTALONE, Persona e atto umano, in *Nuovo Dizionario di teologia morale*, a cura di F. Compagnoni, G. Piana, S. Privitera (Milano, 1994), 947-948.

⁶ Cf. MATTHEW MOLD, DORCAS UMAR, CHRISTOPHER EXLEY, "Aluminium in brain tissue in autism," *Journal of Trace Elements in Medicine and Biology* 46(2018), 76-82, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtemb.2017.11.012>; ANTONIETTA GATTI, STEFANO MONTANARI, "New Quality-Control Investigations on Vaccines: Micro and Nanocontamination," *International Journal of Vaccines and Vaccination* 4(2017), 1: DOI: 10.15406/ijvv.2017.04.00072; LUCIJA TOMLJENOVIC, CHRISTOPHER A. SHAW, "Aluminium vaccine adjuvants: are they save?" *Curr Med Chem* 18(2011), 17:2630-7; NANCY AGMON-LEVIN, GRAHAM R.V. HUGHES, YEHUDA SHOENFELD, "The spectrum of ASIA: 'Autoimmune (Auto-inflammatory) Syndrome induced by Adjuvants'", *Lupus* 21(2012), 118-120; ZAKIR KHAN et al., "Slow CCL2-dependent translocation of biopersistent particles from muscle to brain," *BMC Medicine* 2013 (April), 11:99, PMID: 23557144; JEAN-DANIEL MASSON et al., "Critical analysis of reference studies on the toxicokinetics of aluminumbased adjuvants," *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry* (December) 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinorgbio> (15.12.2017).

the good effect. However, the vaccination act with unethical and toxic vaccines obviously fails to meet this criterion.⁷

In doing so with vaccines, sufficiently serious reason must be present to justify such an act (the protection of child's health⁸ or the protection of public health have been stated, but not scientifically reliably proven by any scientist), so such an act can only be applied for very serious reasons as saving of life or health of the human subject, excluding another possibility of solving the borderline situation, in which the patient is present (however, the vaccination is not a borderline situation). As it can be seen from mandatory vaccination with unethical and toxic vaccines, the basic conditions of the principle of double effect can not be met.

⁷ A major problem in the biomedical, legal and moral sphere is the absence of important toxicological-pharmacological and clinical tests of safety of unethical and other vaccines under the European Directive EMA CPMP / SWP / 465/95, which show that the vaccines are not tested for synergistic toxicity, carcinogenicity, genotoxicity, pharmacokinetics, reproductive toxicity, embryofetal toxicity, secondary pharmacodynamics, whereby the consequences of dangerous adjuvants on the patient's health are not tested. In spite of this fact, even in expert circles, there is a widespread claim that vaccines are safe although in vaccine testing there is no placebo-controlled group being used, but the tested vaccines are compared with other vaccines.

⁸ This reason is also declared particularly those texts in the special documents of the Catholic Church: Cf. CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. *Dignitas personae*, n. 35: "[...] Thus, for example, danger to the health of children could permit parents to use a vaccine which was developed using cell lines of illicit origin, while keeping in mind that everyone has the duty to make known their disagreement and to ask that their healthcare system make other types of vaccines available [...]" and opinion of the PAPAL ACADEMY PRO VITA. Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti. "[...] To summarize, it must be confirmed that: – there is a grave responsibility to use alternative vaccines and to make a conscientious objection with regard to those which have moral problems; – as regards the vaccines without an alternative, the need to contest so that others may be prepared must be reaffirmed, as should be the lawfulness of using the former in the meantime inasmuch as is necessary in order to avoid a serious risk not only for one's own children but also, and perhaps more specifically, for the health conditions of the population as a whole – especially for pregnant women; – the lawfulness of the use of these vaccines should not be misinterpreted as a declaration of the lawfulness of their production, marketing and use, but is to be understood as being a passive material cooperation and, in its mildest and remotest sense, also active, morally justified as an *extrema ratio* due to the necessity to provide for the good of one's children and of the people who come in contact with the children (pregnant women); – such cooperation occurs in a context of moral coercion of the conscience of parents, who are forced to choose to act against their conscience or otherwise, to put the health of their children and of the population as a whole at risk. This is an unjust alternative choice, which must be eliminated as soon as possible."

2. MORAL AND THEOLOGICAL EVALUATION

Moral qualification of the human action in the perspective of the thomistic patrimony is officially recognized by the Church, regarding its immanent conformity with the Church's teachings in the field of ethics. *Ecclesiae magisterium ordinarium* clearly denies any involvement in the abortion and mentions the moral duty to avoid any cooperation on the crime of abortion.

The mentioned exclusion of ethical permission of any form of cooperation on the crime of abortion logically results that it is not enough to separate the subjects in space and time, who directly performed abortion, from those, who directly or indirectly take an advantage of that crime for the good of another. Like the argument *in persona propria*, intentional abortion is a morally illicit act of the killing of a legally innocent human being.⁹ Believers (Catholics) in their conscience can never accept the killing of unborn [...], neither respect such a right, which violates the principle of justice [...], whereby cannot justify any action against human life.¹⁰

This means that they have to refrain any form of cooperation¹¹ in the proceeding, that will end the life of an innocent human being, which is evil in its essence (*ex toto genere suo*). In moral theology one should keep in mind the general rule, that there is truth, there is only one truth and our spirit is subjected to the truth, not greater from it; is obliged not only to talk about it, but also honor it, what however can be unpleasant with compulsory vaccination, because it can distract a person (bioethicists, doctors, parents) from its shallow automatic acceptance of hypocritically hidden *intrinsece malum* in the subject (use of vaccine-derived tissues from aborted fetuses) of procedure, which is the act of vaccination.

From the perspective of logic there is a serious moral question: how can an explicit condemnation of abortion of unborn children in *Evangelium vitae*

⁹ Cf. ALEXANDER R. PRUSS, "Cooperation with paste vil and use of cell-lines derived from aborted fetuses," in *Cooperation, Complicity & Conscience*, ed. H. Watt (London, 2005), 91-93. Causal link of previous abortions with the act of vaccination cannot be denied and cannot ignore the danger of the beginning scandal (nuisance) from the fact, that such acceptance of the use might give the impression, that it also agrees to all that proceeds it. The severity of nuisance from evil act is often undervalued, but it is again necessary to emphasize possible impact on ethical climate in society. This is so called scandall argument, which is sometimes used in discussions. A.R. PRUSS, Cooperation with paste vil and use of cell-lines derived from aborted fetuses, 91.

¹⁰ Cf. JANUSZ NAGÓRNY, *Wartość życia ludzkiego* (Lublin, 2009), 143.

¹¹ Cf. CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, *Donum vitae* (Rome, 1987), I, 4.

(performed as an end in itself, used as a means to achieve a good end¹²) be in accordance with the conditional and temporary allowance of the use of unethical vaccines by parents (which is indirect use of abortion) for the good of another human subject (a child)? Thus, if a person disagrees with the crime of intentional serial and industrially planned abortions, organized and logically performed with the goal of progress and production of some vaccines, how can a parent then use it for the good of another subject (own child) without the vaccine being at the same time an implicit acceptance of how some vaccines have been manufactured and produced?

Indeed, moral duty to avoid cooperation with evil act results from the imperative of the natural moral law, inscribed in human nature, obliging to do good and avoid evil, whereas on this principle base all other principles of natural law,¹³ that is located both in *natura humana*, but especially in *lex aeterna*, whereby there is transcendent authority of legislator is undisputable. From this moral obligation (to avoid cooperation with evil act) parents (and others, for inst. doctors) are not freed and actually there is no authority, which would accord permission from respecting what God created and established by His Divine authority.

Moral duty to do good and avoid evil, which is rationally reflected in human being, is deeply rooted in human nature, having the seal of *Imago Dei*. Namely, “the natural moral law expresses and lays down the purposes, rights and duties which are based upon the bodily and spiritual nature of the human person [...], rather it must be defined as the rational order whereby man is called by the Creator to direct and regulate his life and actions [...]”¹⁴ because “[...] inasmuch as it is inscribed in the rational nature of the person, it makes itself felt to all beings endowed with reason and living in history. In order to perfect himself in his specific order, the person must do good and avoid evil, be concerned for the transmission and preservation of life [...]”¹⁵

Ecclesiae magisterium ordinarium further teaches, that „the negative precepts of the natural law are universally valid. They oblige each and every individual, always and in every circumstance. It is a matter of prohibitions which forbid a given action semper et pro semper, without exception, because the choice of this kind of behaviour is in no case compatible with the goodness of the will of

¹² Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Evangelium vitae*, n. 57 and 62.

¹³ Cf. INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION, *Alla ricerca di un'etica universale: Nuovo sguardo sulla legge naturale* (Vatican, 2009), n. 39.

¹⁴ Cf. CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, *Donum vitae*, Intro, n. 3.

¹⁵ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, n. 51.

the acting person, with his vocation to life with God and to communion with his neighbour. It is prohibited – to everyone and in every case – to violate these precepts. They oblige everyone, regardless of the cost, never to offend in anyone, beginning with oneself, the personal dignity common to all.”¹⁶

Papal *Magisterium* so clearly accepts universal valid imperatives and interdictions, because a person “can never be hindered from not doing certain actions, especially if he is prepared to die rather than to do evil”¹⁷ acts, which is (formal or material) cooperation on evil act, which is the crime of unborn children. Herein, there is a clear denial of theological ethics, which is in conflict with western Catholic tradition *lex naturalis* and is the fruit of experimentation of global and systematic questioning of patrimony of the Catholic moral doctrine *Magisterii ecclesiae*, primarily based on the Revelation and Catholic anthropology.

Catholic ethics or moral theology (theology of life) is not theological ethics (theology) of explicitly good acts, or explicitly good intentions or good circumstances, but primarily and methodologically is ethics (theology) of good act, that is an act, that with the power of its own intrinsic capacity (subject) corresponds to the fullness of the moral law and human nature (dignity). It is intrinsically incoherent and inconsistent, but especially illogical on one side to condemn the moral evil of dozens of abortions, that were performed due to the development and production of some vaccines, but on the other side use them for their own good or for the good of their children.

In such attitude there is an internal logical disagreement, because expressed “no” to abortion (crime) of unborn children and following “yes” to vaccines (developed and produced through abortions) immanently contradicts itself. Jesus also points out at the principal and logical disagreement, occurring in human behaviour, when He said: “Let your ‘Yes’ mean ‘Yes’, and your ‘No’ mean ‘No’. Anything more is from the evil one.”¹⁸ It can reasonably be inferred that any justification of the use of final effect (product) of crime of unborn children, performed in the past, which is vaccine, for the good of other children, is intrinsically inconsistent and incoherent not only in relation to *Ecclesiae magisterium ordinarium*, but especially to what Jesus Christ himself said.

Substantial and therefore crucial significance for moral qualification of human act (mandatory vaccination) has an object (objective end – vaccination

¹⁶ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, n. 52.

¹⁷ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, n. 52.

¹⁸ Cf. Mt 5:37.

from aborted human fetuses) to which the act is directed, (specifically to which the object itself directs, that is consciously realized on the basis of intention), and circumstances, that is to simplify: an object, an end, connected with intention and circumstances, which reflect the connection between a person and an act, in the perspective of transcendence and integration of a person in the act.¹⁹

Referring to the tradition of thomistic concept of human act (*actus humanus*) in moral and theological evaluation it primarily morally evaluates an objective (objective end, intention, *finis operantis*, *finis extrinsecus*) and in the end circumstances (*circumstantiae*), that however (likewise objective end, intention) cannot significantly change the moral quality of *actus humanus*. Papal *Magisterium ecclesiae* strongly emphasizes especially the object of human act,²⁰ because the moral nature of human act of vaccination is primarily and essentially situated in the object of the act (in the applied unethical vaccine, causally related to the crime of abortion), that is in the object end of vaccination, ontologically determining its moral quality. Only after that comes analysis of moral quality of subjective end and circumstances.

In the case of active application and the use of these vaccines by parents for their living children, parents are found in the chain of moral responsibility in position of somewhat bigger separation in space and time from intentional crime of serial murder of unborn infants, as to other people (active performers of abortion, developers, producers of vaccines...). Anyhow the last crime is distant in space and time, it is this way outrageous considering the moral matter of such a crime, where it is not morally right or morally allowed in anyway to take share in co-responsibility on such a crime. Criteria of separation and independence is not enough neither in the case of parents who accept vaccination of their own children with such vaccines, but at the same time disagree with abortions, on the basis of which those vaccines were developed and produced.

Herein it is appropriate to refer to biblical guidance of Jesus Christ, as well as papal *Magisterium ecclesiae*, that introduce the teachings about certified ways of moral evaluation *actus humanus*. By the act of the free use of such vaccines a parent (who disagrees with abortions) actually enters into minimal indirect relationship with the crime of abortion, and therefore under

¹⁹ Cf. K. WOJTYŁA. *Osoba i czyn oraz inne studia antropologiczne* (Lublin, 1994), 73-99, 151-191, 229-300. Summarization of these substantial facts are presented in the encyclical *Veritatis splendor*.

²⁰ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, n. 76-79.

any circumstances cannot ignore the fact that there is a direct result of such crimes: vaccine that is applied with their consent. The use of vaccine is (at least) an indirect acceptance of perverse structures and practices of pharmaceutical industry, as well as (at least) an indirect hypocritical form of approbation of the crime of abortion, what is in contradiction with moral duty to encourage the culture of life.

However the fact, that they are final users of the product of serial murder of unborn infants, does not mean that there is no any form of cooperation in the act, that is intrinsically evil in itself – in its essence. Certainly, there are parents who in their conscience disagree with ethically illicit procedural process (development and production of mentioned vaccines through abortions) and condemn it as evil, but still freely accept application of in this way produced vaccines. In this case it can concern distant indirect material cooperation²¹ on the act of murder of unborn infants, which is however also evil *ex genere suo*, because when a person (a parent) accepts the use of such a vaccine, this way indirectly participates in the evil act of murder of unborn infants, that preceded the vaccination of their children.

Nevertheless, this immoral procedure of the use of such vaccines leads to silent acceptance of deeply unjust act, what causes increase of carelessness, if not directly to the encouragement of such an act, with what we can encounter in some medical and political circles.²² It created the impression that Jesus' biblical condemnation of ambiguous and pharisaic moral positions in fundamental moral questions,²³ which clearly requires intrinsically coherent and consistent "no" to the phenomenon, are not always valid anymore, but only when it fits into currently widespread and accepted by society relativistic moral practice. However, the logic of evil is and always will be evident and relentless, because moral evil breeds only evil, that is an evil act of murder of unborn infants, logically breeds immoral and evil result (subject – means), which is vaccine, whereby the logical chain of evil will not be interrupted if such a vaccine is applied on the basis of good will and end.

By the use of morally evil means (vaccine) it is never possible to obtain true good of a child, that is, by the use of moral evil it is not possible to achieve morally good end, therefore end does not justify the means, if they

²¹ As it is properly defined by PAPAL ACADEMY PRO VITA. *Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti* (Roma, 2005).

²² Cf. CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, *Dignitas personae*, n. 35.

²³ Cf. Mt 5:37.

are evil in themselves. *Magisterium ecclesiae* states, “[...] some sins are intrinsically grave and mortal by reason of their matter. That is, there exist acts which, per se and in themselves, independently of circumstances, are always seriously wrong by reason of their object. These acts, if carried out with sufficient awareness and freedom, are always gravely sinful.”²⁴

The murder of unborn infants is such kind of sin (even actively and directly performed by others in the past) and therefore distant material cooperation on this crime cannot be morally allowed especially when taking into account the facts associated with current development and manufacturing practices of pharmaceutical companies, where human life is reductionally regarded as utilitarian instrument for achieving any ends of vaccination. Therefore the use of unethical vaccination cannot be considered to be a moral duty, it is in fact extremely morally evil means, which declares achievement of good end, which however with closer examination of medical facts is not so explicitly good, as it is generally pretentiously claimed.

It is theologically correct to take into account position of *Magisterium Ecclesiae*, that “if acts are intrinsically evil, a good intention or particular circumstances can diminish their evil, but they cannot remove it. They remain ‘irremediably’ evil acts; per se and in themselves they are not capable of being ordered to God to the good of the person. [...] Consequently, circumstances or intentions can never transform and act intrinsically evil by virtue of its object into an act ‘subjectively’ good or defensible as a choice.”²⁵

Therefore material cooperation on the extreme evil act of serial crime of unborn infants will not change the fact, that active application of direct result of such a crime, which is the use of vaccine, will be in its essence evil in itself and cannot be justified by those reasons, and it certainly cannot be declared as a moral duty considering outrageous moral quality of the act, causally objectively and at least partially subjectively related to the act of the use of vaccine.

Non-application of such vaccines and its decisive rejection in the conscious of Christian parents²⁶ is a morally correct theological position of unconditional respect of the gift of human life, and from the position of the Catholic faith its rejection is an unquestionable moral duty, because “the opinion must be rejected as erroneous which maintains that it is impossible to qualify as morally evil

²⁴ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Reconciliatio et paenitentia*, n. 17.

²⁵ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, n. 81.

²⁶ Cf. RENÉ BALÁK, Mandatory vaccination and conscience clause, *Forum Teologiczne* 15(2014), 67-82.

according to its species the deliberate choice of certain kinds of behaviour or specific acts, without taking into account the intention for which the choice was made or the totality of the foreseeable consequences of that act for all persons concerned. Without the rational determination of the morality of human acting as stated above, it would be impossible to affirm the existence of an 'objective moral order' and to establish any particular norm the content of which would be binding without exception."²⁷

True seeking of means to achieve a good end is only realized on the level of a person's worth (especially a Catholic parent), when the subject of act, its end, as well as means used for its achievement correspond to its rational nature (*bonum honestum*), thus the means must also be valuable (*honestus*) in themselves in order to be classified as *bonum utile* (useful good) in moral terms. In moral perspective it is not enough when means is reduced to only utilitarian instrument or is understood *in sensu stricto* only as a useful good (*bonum utile*) in itself, regardless of its intrinsic moral essence, which in this case originates in extreme crime of innocent aborted infants.

Intrinsece malum is a principled moral category of the act (mandatory! vaccination) that morally characterizes vaccine in itself, as well as vaccination process, and logically there is an absence of any ontological moral reason for justifying its application (even if speculatively conditional and temporal) for the good of another human subject. This is (at least) a distant indirect passive material cooperation, to which however we should build resistance, because it concerns a relation to extremely outrageous crime of murder of dozens of infants for the purpose of ensuring the product (means), the goal of which is to proclaim protection of the health of other children.

Since it is not possible to deny a causal relationship between the subject of the act in the past (crime) and intention with the end of the act (development and production of vaccination), as well as relationship with contemporary procedure of vaccination (direct use of the product in a form of a vaccine, causally originated from serial crime), it is hard to find any eligible moral reason, that theoretically could justify the procedure of contemporary vaccination with the help of vaccine, which is the final result of crime of such serial murder.

In addition, an indirect material cooperation (when a person does not participate in the evil act, but only in what is prepared by such activity) is a sinful act, that can be allowed if an act in itself is good and indifferent (in

²⁷ Cf. JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, n. 82.

terms of moral matter) or when there is a proportional great reason.²⁸ However, vaccination procedure with unethical vaccines does not meet this criteria, because the object of the act (vaccine used as a direct means) is already evil, forasmuch as in itself it is the result *sub grave* of the evil act and its chemical composition (means-vaccine) is toxic, whereby the life of aborted infants is not possible to compare with the protection of the health of contemporary children.

Ecclesiae magisterium ordinarium generally and categorically prohibits such an act (*Evangelium vitae* and *Veritatis splendor*), it results in moral prohibition of any form of cooperation on such an act,²⁹ since it morally concerns the most serious moral object of the human act, which is the use of malicious instrumentalization and termination of innocent human life for the wanted good of another human life.

If the object (precisely speaking, objective end – means of the human act of mandatory vaccination) is evil *ex toto genere suo*, thus it is evil always, everywhere and under any circumstances, and no circumstance can justify its application. If the act of crime of an innocent human being (performed in the past) is used nowadays for proclaiming a good end, which is for the declared good of another person, thus a person becomes at least indirectly an accessory to the crime of the serial murder, depending on his personal (dis)agreement with the murder. A direct or indirect use of the serial crime of unborn infants for proclaiming of good (protection against selected diseases) for others (living children) is unquestionably immoral.

Circumstances (mentioned as reasons in declaration or instruction) in fact cannot change moral quality of an evil human act of vaccination, primarily in regard to its object – *finis operis* (vaccine), an act which would have been good from its essence. For that reason there is no proclaimed noble intention and goal of mandatory vaccination (objective end – *finis operantis*), as well as the use of such vaccines, justifying previously performed murder of a child, neither for moral effect of this murder (vaccine) nor for intended declared good of vaccination (protection of the health).

The end of the act (mandatory vaccination) does not justify immoral means (neither close or direct, which is vaccine, nor distant and indirect, which is murder of infants) to achieve this end. Because a person actively uses the product of such murder (vaccine) as an object means, this way he partakes in an indirect

²⁸ Cf. ADAM KOKOSZKA, *Teologia moralna fundamentalna* (Tarnów, 1996), 145-146.

²⁹ Cf. CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, *Donum vitae*, I.4.

distant material cooperation and circumstances of the act (the murder was committed in the past and by another subject) are not strong enough to anyhow change not only ethical quality of such evil act (crime), but also ethical evaluation (at least) of material cooperation in the act of vaccination.

Circumstances of contemporary act (which is mandatory vaccination with unethical vaccines) through which there is a danger of spread of pathologic disease, in any case is not possible to put on a higher level of importance and significance, as to an evil object of vaccination, which is vaccine from aborted human fetuses. Indeed, the object is essential means, that in this case cannot be classified as *bonum utile* in the true meaning of the word, because it is a causal direct effect of evil act and the logic of evil bears testimony of faith about this problem: evil always bears only evil. Subject in itself as a means – which is vaccine – is evil *ex genere suo*, that logically is not neither *bonum utile* nor *honestum*.

Explanation in the broader philosophical or theological perspective and in accordance with metaphysical principle *ens et bonum convertuntur* is such that the end of natural desire is good, existing in the matter itself, whereas the end of voluntary desire is known well. Herein arises a metaphysical ethical question: what good exists in the matter (object), which is unethical vaccine derived from aborted human fetuses? What existentially represents the matter (vaccine) is evil from its essence, because in the matter (vaccine) there is hypocritically hidden crime of abortion of unborn innocent human beings (*intrinsece malum*), whereas the matter – evil in itself – becomes the means to achieve declared end of vaccination.

Surely, the act of vaccination nowadays is separated in time and space from the mentioned murder of unborn children, however there is still presence of intrinsic connection with long before performed evil act of murder. That is, the act of vaccination actively makes use of direct effect of the crime, which is vaccine, as a direct objective means to achieve declared good subjective end for living children.

CONCLUSION

Taking into consideration Revelation,³⁰ Tradition and papal teachings *Ecclesiae Magisterium ordinarium*, that is, its objective moral perspective of

³⁰ Cf. Ex 20:13; Dt 5:17; Mt 5:21.

differentiation (concerning especially methodological optics of ethical reflection upon respect of the gift of life), anthropological and ontological reasons (dignity of each human person and fundamental rights of human being³¹), as well as the principle *ens bonum convertuntur*, or ethical analysis of human act in perspective of immanent bonding with *lex naturalis* and *lex aeterna*, personalistic norm *persona est affirmanda propter se ipsam*, it is possible to state the existence of grave ethical reasons against mandatory vaccination with unethical vaccines:

1. Immoral use of some vaccines, prepared from the cells derived from aborted human fetuses and evident prohibition to directly or indirectly demand the death of a person to achieve the good of another innocent person;

2. an object of the act of human will (vaccine derived from abortion) cannot be taken as an object, what in its moral essence destroys the ethical order;

3. it is not possible to directly perform moral evil (intoxication of the child's organism by aluminum or thimerosal or other toxic adjuvans and nanocontamination), nor indirectly or directly agree with the previous (causally related to moral evil of murder), nor intentionally demand it or use it so that the good will causally come out of it for another human subject;

4. presence of clear denial of freedom of conscience and religious freedom of the catholic parents³², and denial of patient's rights for personal integrity, autonomy and inviolability; for which it is necessary to morally evaluate mandatory vaccination with unethical vaccines as an evident evil act *ex toto genere suo*.

What kind of witness of the Catholic Church and unquestionable respect to *donum vitae* is it, if Catholic parents and doctors, on one hand, publicly fight the culture of death and reject therapeutic use of embryonic stem cells, abortion, artificial insemination, contraception [...] as well as other attacks against life, but on the other hand, without protests peacefully and cannibalistically make use of the products of multiple murder, which are mentioned vaccines, whereby will proportionalistically justify it with wanted good for their children?

Within situational ethics and moral relativism will it be arbitrary and selective to decide in which case the position of parents' faith or other mem-

³¹ Entity of a person in perspective of *Imago Dei*, which is the gift of freedom and conscience, their inviolability and irreducibility, transcendent sanctity of the gift of life, incomparableness of the gift of life with other goods, inalienable right for life of every existing human being in the context of maintaining its integrity.

³² R. BALÁK, "Mandatory vaccination and conscience clause," 67-82.

bers of the Catholic Church will be in accordance with Revelation, Tradition and the teachings of Magisterium, and in which cases it is no more proportionally and consequentially necessary, coherent and unquestionable to hold position of respect to the gift of human life? Will Catholic parental and doctoral “yes” to human life be truly unconditional (unexceptional) “yes”, and parental and doctoral “no” to murder of unborn be truly unconditional (unexceptional) “no”? *Parentes et medici, nascituri morituri vos salutant!*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- JOHN PAUL II. *Evangelium vitae*. Rome, 1995.
- JOHN PAUL II. *Veritatis splendor*. Rome, 1993.
- JOHN PAUL II. *Reconciliatio et paenitentia*. Rome 1984.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. *Dignitas personae*. Rome, 2008.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. *Donum vitae*, Rome, 1987.
- PAPAL ACADEMY PRO VITA. *Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti*. Roma, 2005.
- INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION. *Alla ricerca di un'etica universale: Nuovo sguardo sulla legge naturale*. Vatican, 2009.
- AGMON-LEVIN, NANCY, HUGHES GRAHAM R.V., SHOENFELD, YEHUDA. “The spectrum of ASIA: ‘Autoimmune (Auto-inflammatory) Syndrome induced by Adjuvants,’” *Lupus* 21(2012), 118-120.
- BALÁK, RENÉ. “Mandatory vaccination and conscience clause.” *Forum Teologiczne* 15(2014), 67-82.
- BO MA et al. “Characteristics and viral propagation properties of a new human diploid cell line, walvax-2, and its suitability as a candidate cell substrate for vaccine production.” *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* 11(2015), 4: 998-1009; DOI: 10.1080/21645515.2015.1009811.
- FRATTALLONE, RAIMONDO. “Persona e atto umano.” In *Nuovo Dizionario di teologia morale*. A cura di, F. Compagnoni, G. Piana, S. Privitera, 932-952. Cinisello Balsamo, Milano, 1994.
- GATTI, ANTONIETTA M., MONTANARI, STEFANO. “New Quality-Control Investigations on Vaccines: Micro and Nanocontamination.” *International Journal of Vaccines and Vaccination* 4(2017), 1; DOI: 10.15406/ijvv.2017.04.00072.
- KHAN, ZAKIR et al. “Slow CCL2-dependent translocation of biopersistent particles from muscle to brain.” *BMC Medicine* 2013 (April), 11:99, PMID: 23557144.
- KOKOSZKA, ADAM. *Teologia moralna fundamentalna*. Tarnów: BIBLOS, 1996.
- LEIVA, RENÉ. “A Brief History of Human Diploid Cell Strains.” *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* (Autumn 2006), 443-451.
- PRIVITERA, SALVATORE. “Duplice effetto.” In *Dizionario di Bioetica*. A cura di S. Leone, S. Privitera, 30-309. Palermo: EDB-ISB 1994.
- MASSON, JEAN-DANIEL et al. “Critical analysis of reference studies on the toxicokinetics of aluminum-based adjuvants.” *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry* (December) 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinorgbio> (15.12.2017).

- MAY W.E. "Double Effect." In *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*. I. Ed. W.T. Reich. New York-London 1978.
- MIGLIETTA, GUIDO M., RUSSO, GIOVANNI. "Duplice effetto." In *Enciclopedia di bioetica e scienza giuridica* IV. Direzione di E. Sgreccia, A. Tarantino. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2011.
- MOLD, MATTHEW, UMAR, DORCAS, KING, ANDREW, EXLEY, CHRISTOPHER. "Aluminium in brain tissue in autism." *Journal of Trace Elements in Medicine and Biology* 46(2018), 76-82, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtemb> (12.11.2017).
- NAGÓRNY, JANUSZ. *Wartość życia ludzkiego*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2009.
- PRUSS, ALEXANDER R. "Cooperation with paste evil and use of cell-lines derived from aborted fetuses." In *Cooperation, Complicity & Conscience*. Ed. H. Watt, 89-104. London: The Linacre Centre, 2005.
- SGRECCIA, ELIO. *Manuale di bioetica*. Vol. I. *Fondamenti ed etica biomedica*, 236-238. Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 2007.
- TOMLJENOVIC, LUCIJA, SHAW, CHRISTOPHER. "Aluminium vaccine adjuvants: are they save?" *Curr Med Chem* 18(2011), 17:2630-7.
- VIDAL, MARCIANO. *Manuale di etica teologica* 1. *Morale fondamentale*. Assisi: Cittadella Editrice, 1994.
- WOJTYŁA, KAROL. *Osoba i czyn oraz inne studia antropologiczne*. Lublin: TN KUL, 1994.

NIEKOŃCZĄCA SIĘ HISTORIA O UŻYCIU SZCZEPIONEK
POCHODZĄCYCH Z ABORTOWANYCH PŁODÓW LUDZKICH.

. CZ. II: OCENA MORALNA W ŚWIELE ZASADY DZIAŁANIA O PODWÓJNYM SKUTKU
ORAZ ENCYKLIK *VERITATIS SPLENDOR* I *EVANGELIUM VITAE*

S t r e s z c z e n i e

Ponowna ocena moralna obowiązkowych szczepień szczepionkami pochodzącymi od abortowanych płodów ludzkich z punktu widzenia teologicznomoralnego jest konieczna ze względu na rosnącą skalę problemu. Zasada o podwójnym skutku wraz z tomistyczną koncepcją moralnej analizy ludzkiego działania są adekwatnymi sposobami oceny moralnej zbadanego bioetycznego dylematu, przed którym stają katolicy rodzice. Papieskie magisterium wybranych encyklik stanowi komplementarną podstawę metodologiczną i merytoryczną dla poszanowania nienarodzonego życia ludzkiego i także doktrynalny klucz dla moralnej oceny zachowania zainteresowanych ludzkich podmiotów.

Słowa kluczowe: ewaluacja moralna; nakazane szczepienia; magisterium papieskie; *bonum*; poronienie; szczepionki.