

RENÉ BALÁK

NEVER-ENDING STORY OF THE USE OF VACCINES DERIVED
FROM ABORTED INFANTS.
PART I: CRITIQUE OF TELEOLOGICAL PROPORTIONALISM
AND CONSEQUENTIALISM FROM THE PERSPECTIVE
OF MORAL THEOLOGY

Abstract. The standard obligatory use of unethical vaccines derived from aborted human foetuses is currently a significant moral theological problem. It forms a serious dilemma of conscience especially when people become aware of the connection between their own actions and the morally wrong act committed by another person. However, a few years after the release of the declaration of Pontifical Academy for Life Moral Reflections on Vaccines Prepared from Cells Derived from Aborted Human Foetuses (5th May 2005), this serious problem was pushed into oblivion. Moral assessment is still dominated by consequentialism and proportionalism which reject papal *Magisterium ordinarius*.

Key words: papal teaching; vaccines; proportionalism; consequentialism; teleological methodology.

INTRODUCTION

Parentes et medici, “nascituri morituri vos salutant!”¹ The greeting from a few dozen of unborn infants murdered through utilitarianism and inhumanly sacrificed on the altar of biomedical science and progress, is addressed to all the people of good will who realize that every human

René BALÁK, PhD—Department of Philosophy and Center for Bioethics Faculty of Arts, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius Nám. J. Herdu 2, 917 01 Trnava, Slovak Republic; e-mail: info@theologiamoralis.info

¹ This variation of ancient Roman greeting was inspired by professor Tadeusz Styczeń. T. STYCZEŃ, “Objawienie zakłada doświadczenie...” *Jan Paweł II, Evangelium vitae. Tekst i komentarze*, ed. Tadeusz Styczeń, Janusz Nagórny (Lublin: RW KUL, 1997), 128.

person from his conception to natural death pertains the dignity of human being.²

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

The following bioethical questions (in the field of theology and philosophy) then arise: Is the fifth commandment of the Decalogue, “Thou shall not kill,” not ignored by the application of unethical vaccines? Is it not the same for the reality in which “the person has a value in himself, and for that reason he cannot be used for any other end,”⁴ and for the personalistic norm *persona est affirmanda propter se ipsam*, that is, “a person is such a good, that is not possible to use as a subject or means to an end”?⁵

1. IMPOSTATIO OF THE PROBLEM

Ethical reflections on mandatory vaccination are less visible than the legal side of the issue, or the side of financial interests. However, these ethical reflections will have greater importance in the future than they have today,⁶ because if biomedical science does not serve a person, then it is without a soul and becomes inhuman.⁷ The proof of it is monstrous and inhuman

² CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, *Dignitas personae* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2008), No. 1.

³ JOHN PAUL II, *Evangelium vitae* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1995), No. 57.

⁴ H. HREHOVÁ, “Nové racionálne pochopenia života—bioetika a metafyzika.” *Folia universitatis tyrnaviensis* 15 (2008), 41.

⁵ M. MRÁZ, *Problém utrpenia a jeho riešenie v medicínskej etike* (Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2000), 73.

⁶ J.L. SCHWARTZ, A.L. CAPLAN, “Ethics of vaccination programs,” *Current Opinion in Virology* 1 (2011): 1–5.

⁷ BENEDICT XVI, “Speech to the Participants in the 25th International Congress of Catholic Pharmacists” (October 29, 2007).

biomedical practice of the development, production⁸ and the use of vaccines⁹ which cannot be named other than medical cannibalism, that is, a procedure

⁸ L. Hayflick from the Wistar Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, S. Gard from Karolinska Institute in Stockholm, S. Plotkin and A. Girardi from Merck Research Institute participated in the development of vaccines. More than forty intentionally wanted abortions were performed while creating the first cell lines, which was directly connected with the process of isolation of living rubella virus at that time. Some of the vaccines undoubtedly were and are nowadays developed in connection to intentionally performed abortions, seeing that there is a continual immoral practice of killing of unborn infants, whose the evidence is the cell culture IMR-90 developed in Coriell Institute for Medical Research, as well as the cell culture PER.C6 (cooperation of the University of Leiden) developed in the company Crucell in Holland, or MRC-9. See: Jeffrey P. JACOBS et al., "Characteristics of a Human Diploid Cell Designated MRC-5", *Nature* 227 (1970), 168; Leonard HAYFLICK, PAUL S. MOORHEAD, "The Serial Cultivation of Human Diploid Cell Strains," *Experimental Cell Research* 25 (1961) (December), 591n; Leonard HAYFLICK, Stanley A. PLOTKIN, Roger E. STEVENSON, "History of the Acceptance of Human Diploid Cell Strains as Substrates for Human Virus Vaccine Manufacture," *Developments in Biological Standardization* 68 (1987), 9-17; Leonard HAYFLICK, "History of Cell Substrates Used for Human Biologicals," *Developments in Biological Standardization* 70 (1989), 11-26; Leonard HAYFLICK, Paul S. MOORHEAD, "The Serial Cultivation of Human Diploid Cell Strains," 618; W. NICHOLS et al., "Characterization of a New Human Diploid Cell Strain, IMR-90" *Science* (April 1) 196.4285 (1977), 60; Jeffrey P. JACOBS, A.J. GARRETT, Rosemary MERTON, "Characteristics of a serially propagated human diploid cell designated MRC-9," *Journal of Biological Standardization* 7 (1979), 2:113-122.

⁹ These are vaccines used worldwide, like Varivax, Poliovax, Vivaxim, G-CSF, MMR, Priorix, Xigris, Meruvax II, ProQuad/MMR-V, Avaxim, Epaxal, DT PolAds, Varilrix, Zostavax, Pentacel, Imovax, Quadracel, Pulmozyme, Vaqta, Havrix, Twinrix, MR Vax, Eolarix, Infarix, Biavax II, Enbrel, Acambis 1000. Most of these vaccines are sold in various countries under a different trade name. In Slovakia, the following unethical vaccines are used: ProQuad, Ambirix, Varivax, MMR VaxPro, Vaqta 25 and 50U, TwinRix, Avaxim 160U, MMR II, Havrix, Piorix, Priorix Tetra. All mentioned vaccines are developed and made using various cell strains (WI-26 VA4, Hamster, WI38, HEK-293, MRC-5, rubella virus culture RA-273). All cell strains originate from intentionally aborted human foetuses. In the context of the use of MMR vaccines (but also other unethical ones) some scientists observed significantly increased occurrence of autistic spectrum disorders, and the world of science discussed if gradual prevalence of autism is causally related with the use of vaccines containing chain fragments of human DNA derived from aborted human fetuses murdered during the development of the vaccines (for the cause of creation substrates from cell cultures and isolation of living viruses) or with the chemical composition of vaccines, or contamination of vaccines. Some scientific data raises justified bioethical doubts and moral objections against the use of unethical vaccines, even though the cause of an alarming increase of autism can be the effect of correlative intersection of several factors. See: Theresa DEISHER et al., "Impact of environmental factors on the prevalence of autistic disorder after 1979," *Journal of Public Health and Epidemiology* 6 (2014), 9: 271-284; Brian S. HOOKER, "Measles-mumps-rubella vaccination timing and autism among young African American boys: a reanalysis of CDC data," *Translational Neurodegeneration* 3 (2014), 16; David A. GEIER, Mark R. GEIER, "Pediatric MMR Vaccination Safety," *International Pediatrics* 18 (2003), 2: 203-208; Janet K. KERN et al., "Evidence of neurodegeneration in autism spectrum disorder," *Translational Neurodegeneration* 2 (2013), 17; Helen V. RATAJCZAK, "Theoretical aspects of autism: Causes—

responsible for dozens of abortions of unborn infants, which, in a utilitarian way, uses cell lines from intentionally aborted human foetuses.¹⁰

This is a particularly repulsive and inhuman reality in which the whole process of a vast number of abortions was scientifically planned and intended as well as logistically and professionally managed,¹¹ not only on the medical level, but also in terms of international institutional cooperation on the realization of the whole series of abortions of unborn infants. The development and production of vaccines was a common denominator of all performed abortions. Scientifically and logistically, the process has improved in such a way that it has created and fixed an inhuman structure of the sin, which so far seems to be immune to the moral appeal of official Catholic religious doctrine concerning classical theological analysis of the human act.¹²

Pharmaceutical companies continue the legalized conspiracy against the life of unborn children who are the victims of the primarily individual or group evil of abortion that has gradually transformed into a standard

A review,” *Journal of Immunotoxicology* 8 (2011), 1: 68–79; David A. GEIER, Mark R. GEIER, “A comparative evaluation of the effects of MMR immunization and mercury doses from thimerosal-containing childhood vaccines on the population prevalence of autism”, *Med Sci Monit* 10 (2004), 133–139.

¹⁰ D.L. VINEDGE, “Aborted Fetal Cell Line Vaccines and the Catholic Family a Moral and Historical Perspective. Original Appeal Filed with the National Catholic Bioethics Center and the US Conference of Catholic Bishops,” October 2005.

¹¹ Some authors (and scientists who developed vaccines) point to the fact (in the long term hidden from the public), that more than forty abortions were intentionally performed in the development and production of the vaccine against rubella. See: Stanley A. PLOTKIN, “The History of Rubella and Rubella Vaccination Leading to Elimination,” *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 43 (2006) (Supplement 3), 164–168; Leonard HAYFLICK et al., “Preparation of Poliovirus Vaccines in a Human Fetal Diploid Cell Strain,” *American Journal of Hygiene* 75 (1962) (March), 240–258; Stanley A. PLOTKIN, John D. FARQUHAR, Michael KATZ, Fritz BUSER, “Attenuation of RA27/3 rubella virus in WI 38 human diploid cells,” *American Journal of Diseases of Children* 118 (1968), 178–85; Timothy COLLINS, “The Vaccination Question,” *The Angelus. Journal of Catholic Roman Tradition* 2006 (February), 3–13. Several authors point to a planned and managed process of the development and production. See: Christine BEISWANGER, “A Brief History of IMR–90,” *Cell Collections* 2003/2004, 5–6, http://ccr.coriell.org/ccr/newsletter/CCRNews.pdf_4.pdf; Rene LEIVA, “A Brief History of Human Diploid Cell Strains,” *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* (Autumn, 2006), 443–451; Alvin WONG, “The Ethics of HEK 293,” *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* (Autumn, 2006), 473–495; W. NICHOLS et al., “Characterization of a New Human Diploid Cell Strain, IMR–90,” *Science* (April 1) 196.4285, 1977, 60; Arunee SABCHAREON, “A New Vero Cell Rabies Vaccine: Results of a Comparative Trial with Human Diploid Cell Rabies Vaccine in Children,” *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 29 (1999), 141–149; Jeffrey P. JACOBS et al., “Characteristics of a Human Diploid Cell Designated MRC–5,” *Nature* 227 (1970), 168–170.

¹² *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1992), No. 1750–1761.

structure of evil: accepted by the contemporary culture of death and often glorified as a great medical progress.

According to official statements, great progress in the fight against many infectious diseases has been achieved through the use of global vaccination. However, although the word 'progress' is kept on the lips and in the minds, in reality we can see loss, defeat and destruction in the form of horrible reality in which medicine that should primarily serve life and health, kills unborn infants in order to develop and produce preventive products (vaccines), declaring that they protect the health and life of living children. Medicine in the service of life must not make a difference between the life of an unborn person and the life of a born person. However, is such biomedical practice (namely the cannibalistic application of vaccines derived from aborted human foetuses) a truly authentic service to life?

Global application of unethical vaccines directly supports global abortion industry of pharmaceutical companies and biomedicine, as well as inhuman methods and practices in the field of contemporary scientific research, development and new vaccines, which is immoral in itself, because it encourages moral evil, sinful structures and the culture of death. However it is hard to understand the present situation without naming the source of evil which is plaguing a person.¹³ Catholic religious doctrine emphasizes that a person bears responsibility for the sins committed by others when they cooperate in them by direct and voluntary participation, by instruction and approval, by failure to prevent, as well as by protecting those, who do evil,¹⁴ all of which, however, is often hypocritically ignored in ethical evaluation.

The danger that the ethical conceptions of utilitarianism, consequentialism, proportionalism and teleological methodology of moral differentiation will become the decisive criteria for moral differentiation of the issue, is apparent. It is shocking how characteristic features of contemporary civilization are expressed in most ethical evaluations that lack standards of absolute good and evil, for instance, in materialism, where person is treated as a thing, or in moral subjectivism, where there is nothing but individuality, and finally in utilitarianism, where others are used for one's own benefit and according to their utility.¹⁵

¹³ JOHN PAUL II, *Sollicitudo rei socialis* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1987), No. 36. Such evil is a murder against humanity. It is intentionally wanted and legalized biomedical genocide of unborn infants, in the form of abortions of innocent human beings.

¹⁴ *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, No. 1868.

¹⁵ J.M. MATLARY, *Eudské práva ohrozené mocou a relativizmom* (Prešov: Vadavatel'stvo Michala Vaška, 2007), 40.

The effect is an amazing teleological equilibrium which designs as good something that is an extremely heinous crime against humanity, namely, the development and production, as well as the use of vaccines derived from aborted human foetuses whose developed cell lines can be used only temporarily and for a shorter period of time—the fact which was originally assumed and has been known for decades.¹⁶

2. TELEOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY OF CONSEQUENTIALISM AND PROPORTIONALISM IN MORAL EVALUATION

Nowadays, teleologism (consequentialism and proportionalism) is the most frequently applied methodological way of moral and theological evaluation of vaccination. Traditionally certificated by *Magisterii ecclesiae*, the concept of intrinsically evil acts that people are neither allowed to do nor to use as a means for later good, and that do not transform neither intention nor goal into good, has been artfully abandoned.

It is precisely teleologism that is a fruit of earlier philosophical divergent division, which it represents in itself, and that suggests a conflict between human nature and freedom. The result is a consequentially apparent solution to all emerging bioethical issues, stating that there is only one object of responsibility: the world as a whole. Such approach ignores the fact that every person is a spiritual and physical compositum: a whole in himself, having the seal of *Imago Dei*. It is difficult to come to a deeper understanding of this complicated bioethical dilemma without naming the source of evil, that is, the crime of abortion, as well as its cannibalistic use for others.

¹⁶ Refusal to use such vaccines is an act of protection of life of the unborn infants that are killed nowadays due to the development of new vaccines. New cell cultures are necessary because the old cell cultures cannot be used over and over again, as it is unscientifically stated by the supporters of vaccination with such vaccines. This is also confirmed by the following authors of vaccines developed this way: Leonard HAYFLICK, *Mortality and Immortality at the Cellular Level. A review* (August) (San Francisco: University of California, 1997); Leonard HAYFLICK, “The Limited in Vitro Lifetime of Human Diploid Cell Strains”, *Experimental Cell Research* 37 (1965), 611–636. However, this had already generally been known long before Hayflick stated it, because natural cell aging, in which telomeres at the end of chromosomes provide protection of chromosome DNA against destruction and at the same time indicate the cell age, is a known medical fact. During the biological life of the cells there is a gradual loss of the part of nucleotides in biological processes taking place in a cell (its chromosomes). Telomere shortening has its significance in the fact that it leads to knowledge of biological process of aging, where telomeres, which are constantly reducing, indicate cell age and its approaching end of biological life.

Extended use of the strategy of vaccination's optimal effect, in which the balance of good and evil effects of the acts (the ratio between positive and negative effects of vaccination) determines if the act (the act of vaccination clearly connected with the murders of unborn infants) is morally good or evil, wrongly leads to a false belief that there is no act which is not worthy of human being (the use of vaccines from aborted human foetuses), and that the fear of such proceeding must be eliminated by the praxeological rationality of the universal strategy of optimalization (achievement of a desired state of vaccinated children population). According to this theory, having one's own uncrossable boundaries in the very order of human beings, a person can no longer build any barriers, the result of which is a false concept that it is determining which method to use and if this method is in accordance with ontological and true anthropological order of the act of creation.

The use of such vaccines is connected with the real risk of insulting God and God's biblical command 'Thou shalt not kill,'¹⁷ so it is not possible to consider the application of such vaccines as morally good, since it concerns minimal distant material cooperation on an evidently evil act. Indeed "it can happen that carrying out certain actions, which are provided for by legislation that overall is unjust, but which in themselves are indifferent, or even positive, can serve to protect human lives under threat. There may be reason to fear that willingness to carry out such actions will not only cause scandal and weaken the necessary opposition to attacks on life, but will gradually lead to further capitulation to a mentality of permissiveness."¹⁸

The above quote relates to the social dimension of evil and sin, which is reflected in the establishment of pharmaceutical structures of evil, that is, the source of evil and sin of abortion of innocent children whereby such evil infects other members of society, especially doctors and parents. Some scientists, developers, producers, vaccine distributors, theologians, doctors or bioethicists permissively present moral evil of abortion as accepted by society and as a necessary way of achieving intended consequences of vaccination, which, according to such logic, is meritoriously more important than previous acts directly launched against the lives of unborn children. Finally, the problem also concerns a social dimension of sin, where every sin

¹⁷ Already in the book of Genesis there is an expressed God's will regarding respect of human life, and later a murder of human being is condemned. See: Gn 4:8-15; 9:6. Clear condemnation of a murder is contained in the Decalogue (Ex 20:13) or in other places killing is also condemned (Ex 21:12-17).

¹⁸ JOHN PAUL II, *Evangelium vitae*, No. 74.

against the justice of the rights of another person, beginning with the right to life, the right to physical integrity, or against the freedom of another, is all the more serious social sin.¹⁹

In teleologism, the proposed account of good as a method to settle a particular moral duty worries, because the mistake of these theories lies in ignoring the existence of absolutely prohibited ways of acts,²⁰ for the universal standard of ethical evaluation, as well as a natural moral order have already been denied. The result of this theory is that it evaluates human acts explicitly on the basis of the intention of an agent (subjective end) in which it is enough that the final account of the achieved profits and the suffered losses will prove that positive effects outweigh the negative ones (both kinds of effects will be evaluated aside the moral category), maximizing “good” and minimizing “evil.” Afterwards, everything will supposedly be the way it should be, for it is absolutely enough that in agreement with the intentions of an agent, dishonorable acts are means to a greater positive end,²¹ which is also declared about vaccination.

It is striking that relatively broad spectrum of authors in theology proportionalistically and consequentially evaluates the act of vaccination in a way that “evaluation depends on proportion between good and evil acts, whereas evaluation of acts in categories of good and evil (profits and losses) has an outside moral character, and therefore allows the choice of evil means for the purpose of achieving proportionally greater good (profit) and the least possible evil”,²² which is in conflict with the Catholic Tradition, as well as papal teaching of *Magisterii ecclesiae*.

“Ethics” of utilitarian consequentialism evaluates proceedings in such way that whether an act is good or evil entirely depends on its real and likely effects. According to this concept, an act is good at the time and only then, when it causes at least as much good as any other possible act which an agent can perform, or when an action is necessary at the time and only then, when it causes more good than any other possible action which an agent can perform.

¹⁹ JOHN PAUL II, *Reconciliatio et paenitentia* (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1984), No. 16.

²⁰ A. SZOSTEK, “Encyklika o «rozeznawaniu duchów, czy są one z Boga.»” In *Wokół encykliki “Veritatis splendor,”* Ed. Jarosław Merecki („Biblioteka Niedzieli”, vol. 3. Częstochowa, 1994), 47–48.

²¹ R. BUTTIGLIONE, “Jak czytać encyklikę?” *Wokół encykliki “Veritatis splendor,”* 12–13.

²² R. PLICH, “Proporcjonalizm,” *Encyklopedia katolicka*, vol. 16 (Lublin: TN KUL, 2012), col. 493.

However, the good and values to which consequentialism refers do not belong to the moral order, but to the out-of-the-moral order, non-moral or pre-moral order,²³ while the value of an act according to utilitarian ethics of consequentialism is directly dependent on its effects.²⁴ The result is the acceptance of the only criterion of usefulness which is manifested, for instance, in the property of a subject that leads to the benefit, profit, pleasure, good or happiness of an interested party or (sometimes) of the greatest number of people. Therefore, we cannot identify with utilitarianism,²⁵ which in the context of understanding human nature excludes the concept of morally good or evil acts in themselves, proclaiming by this consequential teleologism.²⁶

Different kinds of moral evil (abortions) and good (protection of life) in the dominant teleologism are considered as methodologically wrong, that is, approached proportionalistically and consequentially. Dozens of intentionally murdered infants, used for the development and the production of some vaccines, are compared to the potential threat to the health of the living children (which may not even happen), from the diseases against which vaccination exists.

Absurd consideration of the value of life of unborn children, who have been murdered because of the development and production of preventive means (vaccines) in order to protect the health of other children, is in conflict with papal teaching of *Magisterii ecclesiae* in *Veritatis splendor*²⁷ as well as in *Evangelium vitae*.²⁸ From the theological point of view, it is not possible to identify with this mistaken evaluation (with teleological methodology) without a radical departure from the fundamentals of the moral teachings of the Catholic Church, as well as from the normative fundamentals in *lex naturalis* based on *lex aeterna*.

²³ JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, no. 75.

²⁴ A. ROGALSKI, "Konsekwencja," *Encyklopedia katolicka*, vol. 9 (Lublin: TN KUL, 2002), col. 678–679.

²⁵ From the Catholic perspective, K. Wojtyła also criticized utilitarianism, emphasizing relatedness of human being. Cf. Karol WOJTYŁA, *Miłość i odpowiedzialność* (Lublin: TN KUL, 1986), 36–41.

²⁶ I. MROCZKOWSKI, *Natura osoby ludzkiej* (Płock: Pocki Instytut Wydawniczy, 2012), 65.

²⁷ JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, No. 28–81.

²⁸ JOHN PAUL II, *Evangelium vitae*, No. 58–63.

3. PARADOX IN SLOVAKIA: THE MORAL OBLIGATION?

In Catholic professional circles, there is a general consensus that the way in which some vaccines are developed and produced is explicitly immoral. The problem cannot be considered to be morally neutral and parents must not use these vaccines, because it is not possible to use evil in order to make good out of it.²⁹ As regards the application of the result of such monstrous and immoral development and production of specific vaccines, it is possible to observe divergent ethical evaluations.³⁰

Some ethicists, including several Catholic bishops in the USA (generally considered as orthodox), generally accept the fact that the use of cell lines from the period between 1960 and 1970 in connection with the production of vaccines is considered to be morally acceptable.³¹ These individual theological opinions or stances, constituted by certain individuals within the Catholic Church³² cannot be understood as definitely normative, or as morally binding, since the comparison of benefits which is brought by the development (research) or a vaccine is based on an incorrect proportionalistic and consequentialistic principle.

Nevertheless, these opinions raise justified apprehension about the future of a true moral differentiation in the field of bioethics and moral theology. Is it a justified question to ask on the basis of what generally this moral belief

²⁹ R. VASA, "Lives are saved, but some vaccine aren't morally neutral," *Catholic Sentinel* 19 (2009), February.

³⁰ P.H. KIENIEWICZ, "Gdy nie ma innego wyjścia... Wobec stosowania szczepionek opracowanych przy wykorzystaniu linii komórkowych uzyskanych z abortowanych płodów ludzkich," *Roczniki Teologiczne* 53 (2006), 3: 141–151. René BALÁK, "Mandatory vaccination and conscientious objection," *Forum Teologiczne* 15 (2014), 67–82; René BALÁK, *Mysterium vitae—Život člověka v rukách člověka, II*. Kraków 2014 (chapter 4: mandatory vaccination); Daniel MAHER, "Vaccines, Abortion, and Moral Coherence," *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* 2.1 (Spring 2002), 51–67; Edward J. FURTON, "Vaccines and the Right of Conscience," *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* 4.1 (Spring 2004), 53–62; John D. GRABENSTEIN, "Moral Considerations with Certain Viral Vaccines," *Christianity & Pharmacy* 2 (1999), 2: 3–6.

³¹ The author presents paradoxical situation in which subjects (for example, the Catholic Church), proclaiming unconditional respect for human life, in some rare cases (it concerns individuals from the number of bishops and theologians, ethicists) create an appearance of moral allowance or acceptability of the use of such vaccines. See: Alexander R. PRUSS, "Cooperation with paste evil and use of cell-lines derived from aborted fetuses," in *Cooperation, Complicity & Conscience*, ed. H. Watt (London, 2005), 89.

³² Statement of Bioethics Subcommittee of the Theological committee of the Episcopal Conference of Slovakia towards some ethical aspects of mandatory vaccination (Štrbské Pleso, October 26, 2013).

of certain individuals presents that mentioned action was accredited by (some) Catholic bishops and that it is theologically correct? There is a moral paradox originating in applied moral proportionalism and consequentialism, as this methodological approach of teleological moral evaluation of human acts in the spirit of proportionalism and consequentialism was condemned by pope John Paul II in the encyclical *Veritatis splendor*.³³

The Pope highlights that the subject of human act is decisive and determining. It is an immediate end of a conscious choice which is the cause of the will of an agent. The circumstances or intentions will not be able to ethically change an intrinsically wrong act into a good act. Applying papal words to the act of vaccination, it is clear that the circumstances of the procedure of vaccination will not be able to remove evil from the evil act (the murder of unborn infants) which is subjectively and causally connected with the current application of vaccines (that are direct effect of serial murder), which, in turn, would not be possible without that heinous crime.

Some individuals incomprehensibly hold even more divergent moral position, which is even more in conflict with the teachings of the encyclical *Veritatis splendor* (in principle, the encyclical does not allow cooperation with an evil act) and *Evangelium vitae* (that prohibits any cooperation in the crime of murder), because they proclaimed an ethically evil act, i.e. (at least) a direct material distant cooperation in the dozens of abortions, as a moral duty of parents, which is a unique theological position within the Catholic Church. It has been declared, that “on the other side, as long as the vaccine substance is unavailable, which would be prepared with the use of cell or tissue culture prepared in an ethical appropriate way, parents are morally justified, even obliged—in regard to serious reasons of protection of life and the health of their own child—to vaccinate their children with an existing vaccination substance.”³⁴

This is explicitly in moral conflict with papal *Ecclesiae magisterium ordinarium*. Basically, this claim teleologically focuses on consensus of human acts with intentions, which an agent achieves, and with the values, that he himself wants to achieve. Standards for proper analysis of morality of the act emerge from judgement of non-moral or pre-moral goods, which

³³ JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, No. 71–82.

³⁴ Statement of Bioethics Subcommittee of the Theological committee of the Episcopal Conference of Slovakia towards some ethical aspects of mandatory vaccination. No. 4 (Štrbské Pleso, October 26, 2013).

should be achieved, or its non-moral or pre-moral values, which should be maintained.

However, alternative vaccines exist (in the case of rubella there is an alternative medical procedure of protection of the health of pregnant woman and her unborn child), thus eliminating one of the mentioned proportionalistic conditions of the conditional and temporary use of unethical vaccines.³⁵ The use of unethical vaccines carries out the support of a complex and professionally managed structure of evil, which includes pharmaceutical companies and institutions performing monstrous development practices that deprive unborn children of life.

According to the judgement of some individuals, particular method of action is either correct or wrong, based on whether it can or cannot improve factual situation with regard to all interested parties. As correct should be considered such proceeding which would “maximize” goods, and evil would be the one that “minimizes” them.³⁶ It means that a direct use of serial crime of abortions for the declared good end of vaccination, which is an implicit acceptance of evil of the murder of unborn infants, is a morally allowed (in this case, an instructed) means to achieve declared medical good for another subject—a child. It also means utilitarian use of instrumentalization of human life of unborn infants (development and production of vaccines by means of somatic tissues derived from intentionally aborted infants); existential denial of imperative of natural moral law—to do good and avoid evil; and deprivation of the right of conscience (which is defended by the church in the teachings of Magisterium). All the above have been proclaimed as acceptable, even (sic!) as a moral duty.

No other subject within the Catholic Church (as far as it is known to the author) derived so expressively from the teachings of *Magisterii ecclesiae*, which is to say that no other subject announced carrying out morally evil act of a distant material cooperation on the crime of dozen of unborn children as a moral duty!³⁷ Papal *Magisterium ordinarium* clearly teaches that “Though

³⁵ A.R. LUÑO, “Riflessioni etiche sui vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti,” *Medicina e Morale* 55 (2005), 3: 521–530. The author mentions alternative Japanese vaccines against rubella and type A hepatitis. He considers their sale and distribution to be ethically wrong, as well as the fact that their use contributes to the demand for such vaccines or support of social climate in its approbation and for maintaining abuse and injustice.

³⁶ JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, No. 74.

³⁷ Statement of Bioethics Subcommittee of the Theological committee of the Episcopal Conference of Slovakia towards some ethical aspects of mandatory vaccination, No. 3 and 4 (Štrbské Pleso, 26.10.2013).

it is true that sometimes it is lawful to tolerate a lesser moral evil in order to avoid a greater evil or in order to promote a greater good, it is never lawful, even for the gravest reasons, to do evil that good may come of it—in other words, to intend directly something which of its very nature contradicts the moral order, and which must therefore be judged unworthy of man, even though the intention is to protect or promote the welfare of an individual, of a family or of society in general.”³⁸

Even if the Magisterium was to agree to the methodology of proportionalism and consequentialism, by thus in the past planned and serially performed abortions, causally connected with a final end, which is with concrete unethical vaccines, definitely these acts are not lesser moral evil than hypothetical occurrence of certain diseases nowadays. It is impossible to theologically agree with what is stated about moral duty of parents’ participation in vaccination program, because it correlates with situational ethics (a long while ago condemned in the statements of *Magisterii Ecclesiae*),³⁹ in which the moral order (law) has absolutely not been applied, and in which the apparently traditional concept of human nature is not enough anymore, but what is crucial is specific (variable) ethical situation, together with its subjective individualistic interpretation, where the end is superior to the objective moral order and human nature. As a result, everything is relativized by the internal intuition of a human person.

It is necessary to point out to a dangerous fact that not only valid legislative desires to positivistically withdraw God’s given right from parents to freely and responsibly decide on the basis of the judgement of their conscience,⁴⁰ but also to mention the position of the institution that is an integral part of the Catholic Church. In contrast to this, papal *Ecclesiae magisterium ordinarium* adequately explains the relation of conscience and truth that accentuates not only irreplaceable meaning of individual conscience of human

³⁸ PAUL VI, *Humanae vitae*, No. 14. Papal teachings (expressed in a different context), referring to one of his predecessors (Pius XII), point to reality in which it is impossible to do evil in order to achieve a good end.

³⁹ SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII (SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE), “Instructio ad ordinarios omnes necnon ad magistros in seminariis, in athenaeis, vel in studiorum universitatibus docentes et adlectores in studiorum domibus religiosorum: De «Ethica situatio- nis,»” *AAS—Commentarium officiale* 48 (1956), 144–145.

⁴⁰ John Paul II defended the freedom of conscience in different contexts and on many occasions. See: Message for the World Peace Day XXIV: “If You want Peace, respect the Conscience of every person”, No. I (Vatican (January 1), 1991). Likewise, he defended religious freedom. See: La libertà religiosa condizione per la pacifica convivenza. Messaggio per la giornata mondiale per la pace (December 8) 1987.

being, but also the necessity to respect God's law and objective truth in the conscience of human being in the context of the gift of freedom.⁴¹

The statements of the subcommittee evidently correlate with teleological methodology of moral evaluation of human act in the spirit of consequentialism and proportionalism, which was condemned in papal *Magisterium Ecclesiae* in *Veritatis splendor* as wrong,⁴² and which at the same time oppose the words of papal *Magisterii Ecclesiae* in *Evangelium vitae*, where the pope, referring to the document of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith *Iura et bona*, clearly teaches that “[...] furthermore, no one is permitted to ask for this 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.”⁴³

This means that nobody can use abortion directly or indirectly for him or herself or for their own children, and nobody can force or allow it, whereby cannibalistic intramuscular (or subcutaneous) application of such vaccines is in logically active use and requests serial crime of abortions of innocent unborn infants for another human being, that is, for children living nowadays. Crucial is believed to be the consensus of a human act (mandatory vaccination with unethical vaccines) with the intention to fulfill legislative regulation to absolve global program of vaccination that the agent (a parent, a doctor) achieves, and with the values that he wants to gain (protection of children against infectious diseases).

The “standard” for evaluation of a particular procedure (legislatively forced vaccination with vaccines from aborted human foetuses) is whether it can or not improve factual situation with regard to all interests (wanted absence of occurrence of infectious diseases, wanted protection against infectious diseases), whereas such a procedure should be considered as correct (forced use of unethical vaccines) that would maximize goods (protection against infectious diseases), and minimize evil (non-use of unethical vaccines).

Methodology of this perverse moral evaluation was clearly and unmistakably condemned by papal *Magisterium ecclesiae*⁴⁴ that explained the connection with so called “autonomous morality” and with the immanent bond of

⁴¹ JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, No. 54–64.

⁴² JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, No. 74–77.

⁴³ JOHN PAUL II, *Evangelium vitae*, No. 57.

⁴⁴ JOHN PAUL II, *Veritatis splendor*, No. 71–75.

human will with human freedom in relation to human act. Teleological ethics leads to ignorance of absolutely forbidden choice of certain procedures. On the basis of such reasoning about moral value of human act there is a conception of human freedom in which moral evaluation of an act is dependent on the realization of individual freedom of a person. His human nature is merely seen as a set of conditions serving freedom, and goods, belonging to human nature, are called pre-moral or non-moral, so they do not influence the final criteria for choice. "Therefore, it is not surprising, that contemporary theologians do not see the reason, on behalf of which in every situation it would be appropriate to negatively evaluate [...] abortion, because there can always be found circumstances which justify such acts on the ground of unlimited freedom of a person."⁴⁵

*

When applying such vaccines, a person (a parent), however indirectly, instrumentalizes the life of the murdered unborn children, making a cannibalistic object out of them, which serves his own interests or interests of persons who are entrusted to his responsibility, i.e. his own children. By the act of free use of such vaccines a person (a parent) implicitly and automatically requests the death of other unborn children who are sacrificed on the altar of scientific research in the name of medical progress, for their own living children.

In the moral essence of such a procedure, even teleological methodology and permissive equilibristics of moral consequentialism and proportionalism can change nothing, which calculates the expected consequences of vaccination and compares values of the health of living children to the ones that were unjustly deprived of life in the past in order to produce, develop and use vaccines for other persons living today. The ethics of consequentialism and proportionalism, on behalf of science, compares the good of a human life of the murdered innocent children to the good of the health and its protection in living children, reducing the life of murdered children to acceptable proportion of good and evil consequences, or in other words, to a greater good or lesser evil.

Translated by Dominika Bugno-Narecka

⁴⁵ I. MROCZKOWSKI, *Zło i grzech. Studium filozoficzno-teologiczne* (Lublin: RW KUL, 2000), 310.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BENEDICT XVI. Speech to the Participants in the 25th International Congress of Catholic Pharmacists (October, 29, 2007).
- JOHN PAUL II. *Evangelium vitae*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1995.
- JOHN PAUL II. *Reconciliatio et paenitentia*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1984.
- JOHN PAUL II. *Veritatis splendor*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1993.
- JOHN PAUL II. *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1987.
- JOHN PAUL II. Message for the World Peace Day XXIV: "If You want Peace, respect the Conscience of every person" (January, 1), 1991.
- JOHN PAUL II. La libertà religiosa condizione per la pacifica convivenza. Messaggio per la giornata mondiale per la pace. (December, 8) 1987.
- PAUL VI. *Humanae vitae*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1968.
- CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. *Dignitas personae*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2008.
- SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII (SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE). Instructio ad ordinarios omnes necnon ad magistros in seminariis, in athenaeis, vel in studiorum universitatibus docentes et adlectores in studiorum domibus religiosorum: De "Ethica situationis." *AAS—Commentarium officiale* 48 (1956): 144–145.
- Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1992.
- Statement of Bioethics Subcommittee of the Theological committee in the Episcopal Conference of Slovakia towards some ethical aspects of mandatory vaccination. Štrbské Pleso (26.10.2013).
- BALÁK, René. "Mandatory vaccination and conscientious objection". *Forum Teologiczne* 15 (2014): 67–82.
- BALÁK, René. *Mysterium vitae—Život člověka v rukách člověka*. II. Kraków: TSP, 2014.
- BEISWANGER, Christine. A Brief History of IMR–90. *Cell Collections* 2003/2004: 5–6, (http://ccr.coriell.org/ccr/newsletter/CCRNews.pdf_4.pdf).
- BUTTIGLIONE, Rocco. "Jak czytać encyklikę?" In *Wokół encykliki "Veritatis splendor"*. Ed. Jarosław Merecki, 12–13. Częstochowa, 1994.
- COLLINS, Timothy. "The Vaccination Question." *The Angelus. Journal of Catholic Roman Tradition* (February, 2006): 3–13.
- DEISHER, Theresa et al. "Impact of environmental factors on the prevalence of autistic disorder after 1979." *Journal of Public Health and Epidemiology* 6 (2014), 9: 271–284.
- FURTON, Edward J. "Vaccines and the Right of Conscience." *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* 4.1 (Spring 2004): 53–62.
- GEIER, David A., GEIER, Mark R. "Pediatric MMR Vaccination Safety." *International Pediatrics* 18 (2003), 2: 203–208.
- GEIER, David A., GEIER, Mark R. "A comparative evaluation of the effects of MMR immunization and mercury doses from thimerosal-containing childhood vaccines on the population prevalence of autism." *Med Sci Monit* 10 (2004): 133–139.
- GRABENSTEIN, John D. "Moral Considerations with Certain Viral Vaccines." *Christianity & Pharmacy* 2 (1999), 2: 3–6.

- HAYFLICK, Leonard et al. "Preparation of Poliovirus Vaccines in a Human Fetal Diploid Cell Strain." *American Journal of Hygiene* 75 (1962) (March): 240–258.
- HAYFLICK, Leonard. *Mortality and Immortality at the Cellular Level. A review.* (August). San Francisco: University of California, 1997.
- HAYFLICK, Leonard. "The Limited in Vitro Lifetime of Human Diploid Cell Strains." *Experimental Cell Research* 37 (1965): 611–636.
- HAYFLICK, Leonard, MOORHEAD, Paul S. "The Serial Cultivation of Human Diploid Cell Strains." *Experimental Cell Research* 25 (1961) (December): 585–621.
- HAYFLICK, Leonard, PLOTKIN, Stanley, STEVENSON, Roger E. "History of the Acceptance of Human Diploid Cell Strains as Substrates for Human Virus Vaccine Manufacture." *Development in Biological Standardization* 68 (1987): 9–17.
- HAYFLICK, Leonard. "History of Cell Substrates Used for Human Biologicals." *Developments in Biological Standardization* 70 (1989): 11–26.
- HOOKE, Brian S. "Measles–mumps–rubella vaccination timing and autism among young African American boys: a reanalysis of CDC data." *Translational Neurodegeneration* (2014), 3: 16.
- HREHOVÁ, Helena, "Nové racionálne pochopenia života—bioetika a metafyzika." *Folia universitatis tyrnaviensis* 15 (2008): 38–42.
- JACOBS, Jeffrey P. et al. "Characteristics of a Human Diploid Cell Designated MRC–5." *Nature* 227 (1970): 168–170.
- JACOBS, Jeffrey P., GARRETT, A.J., MERTON, Rosemary. "Characteristics of a serially propagated human diploid cell designated MRC–9." *Journal of Biological Standardization* 7 (1979), 2: 113–122.
- KERN, Janet K. et al. "Evidence of neurodegeneration in autism spectrum disorder." *Translational Neurodegeneration* 2 (2013): 17.
- KIENIEWICZ, Piotr H. "Gdy nie ma innego wyjścia... Wobec stosowania szczepionek opracowanych przy wykorzystaniu linii komórkowych uzyskanych z abortowanych płodów ludzkich." *Roczniki Teologiczne* 53 (2006), 3: 141–151.
- LEIVA, René. "A Brief History of Human Diploid Cell Strains." *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* (Autumn, 2006): 443–451.
- LUÑO, Angel Rodriguez. "Riflessioni etiche sui vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti." *Medicina e Morale* 55 (2005), 3: 521–530.
- MAHER, Daniel. "Vaccines, Abortion, and Moral Coherence." *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* 2.1 (Spring, 2002): 51–67.
- MATLARY, Janne H. *Ludské práva ohrozené mocou a relativizmom.* Prešov: Vadavateľstvo Michala Vaška, 2007.
- MRÁZ, Marián. *Problém utrpenia a jeho riešenie v medicínskej etike.* Trnava: Dobrá kniha, 2000.
- MROCKOWSKI, Ireneusz. *Natura osoby ludzkiej.* Płock: Płocki Instytut Wydawniczy, 2012.
- MROCKOWSKI, Ireneusz. *Zło i grzech. Studium filozoficzno–teologiczne.* Lublin: RW KUL, 2000.
- NICHOLS W. et al. "Characterization of a New Human Diploid Cell Strain," IMR–90. *Science* (April, 1) 196.4285, 1977, 60.
- PLICH, Robert. "Proporcjonalizm." In *Encyklopedia katolicka*, vol. 16, Lublin: TN KUL, 2012, col. 493.

- PLOTKIN, Stanley A. "The History of Rubella and Rubella Vaccination Leading to Elimination." *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 43 (2006) (Supplement 3): 164–168.
- PLOTKIN, Stanley A. FARQUHAR, John D., KATZ, Michael, BUSER, Fritz. "Attenuation of RA27/3 rubella virus in WI 38 human diploid cells." *American Journal of Diseases of Children* 118 (1968): 178–185.
- PRUSS, Alexander R. "Cooperation with paste evil and use of cell-lines derived from aborted fetuses." In *Cooperation, Complicity & Conscience*. Ed. Helen Watt. London: The Linacre Centre, 2005: 89–104.
- RATAJCZAK, Helen V. "Theoretical aspects of autism: Causes—A review". *Journal of Immunotoxicology* 8 (2011), 1: 68–79.
- ROGALSKI, Andrzej. "Konsekwencja." In *Encyklopedia katolicka*. Vol. 9. Col. 678–679.
- SCHWARTZ, Jason L., CAPLAN, Arthur L. "Ethics of vaccination programs." *Current Opinion in Virology* 1 (2011): 1–5.
- SABCHAREON, Arunee. "A New Vero Cell Rabies Vaccine: Results of a Comparative Trial with Human Diploid Cell Rabies Vaccine in Children." *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 29 (1999): 141–149.
- STYCZEŃ, Tadeusz. "Objawienie zakładu doświadczenie..." In *Jan Paweł II. "Evangelium vitae". Tekst i komentarze*. Ed. Tadeusz Styczeń, Janusz Nagórny, 115–133. Lublin: RW KUL, 1997.
- SZOSTEK, Andrzej. "Encyklika o «rozeznawaniu duchów, czy są one z Boga»." In *Wokół encykliki „Veritatis splendor” („Biblioteka Niedzieli”, vol. 3)*. Ed. Jarosław Merecki, 47–48. Częstochowa, 1994.
- VASA, Robert. "Lives are saved, but some vaccine aren't morally neutral." *Catholic Sentinel* 19 (February, 2009).
- VINEDGE, Debra L. *Aborted Fetal Cell Line Vaccines and the Catholic Family a Moral and Historical Perspective. Original Appeal Filed with the National Catholic Bioethics Center and the US Conference of Catholic Bishops*. October 2005.
- WOJTYŁA, Karol. *Miłość i odpowiedzialność*. Lublin: TN KUL, 1986.
- WONG, Alvin. "The Ethics of HEK 293." *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* (Autumn, 2006): 473–495.



The preparation of the English version of *Roczniki Teologiczne* (Annals of Theology) no. 3 and its publication in electronic databases was financed under contract no. 753/P-DUN/2017 from the resources of the Minister of Science and Higher Education for the popularization of science.