

Mandatory vaccination and conscience clause

René Balák

Over the last few decades the problematic of mandatory vaccination has become a profound bioethical issue that has stirred controversy in moral, medical and law spheres, especially in catholic families. This relates to the question of applying conscience clause, as well as an adequate judgment of reasons¹ when it is possible to claim this natural human right. It turns out that it is necessary to analyze reasons on a moral and theological base, which would justify a person to use conscience clause. Within moral and theological research of mandatory vaccination is it vital to consider medical facts about vaccination (primary, in terms of individual and, secondary, in terms of social dimension) as well as legal sphere of the issue that has to express respect towards human being and its dignity in relationships among particular members of society, as well as within relationship between an individual and society². Some of the solutions of these moral and theological reflections are represented only schematically or just in a form of references to particular documents of Magisterium without explanation of its specific meaning in the first part of the reflection.

1. Solutions and fundamentals in the context of contemporary situation

Starting with a biblical concept of creation process of a person in God's image³, which is possible to consider as the theological fundament of human dignity, it is exactly biblical concept that is a corner stone for inviolability of life of a human being in the context of Christian

¹ THE MOST SIGNIFICANT ARGUMENTS FOR APPLYING CONSCIENCE CLAUSE ARE, PRIMARILY, VACCINATIONS, DEVELOPED AND MADE ON THE BASIS OF VAST NUMBER OF ARTIFICIAL TERMINATIONS OF PREGNANCY (ABORTIONS), AND SECONDARILY, INTOXICATION OF CHILDREN WITH POISONOUS ADJUVANTS IN VACCINES AND NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS OF VACCINATION. THIS STUDY WANTS TO INITIATE MORE INTENSE MORAL AND THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION ABOUT THIS SERIOUS ISSUE OF BIOETHICS. SOME OF THE MEDICAL FACTS ARE REPRESENTED SCHEMATICALLY, WHICH ACCORDING TO THE AUTHOR, IS A SIGNIFICANT REASON FOR REFUSING MANDATORY VACCINATION.

² BASIC NEEDED INFORMATION ABOUT THE DISCUSSION TOWARDS THIS ISSUE IS POSSIBLE TO OBTAIN FROM THE FOLLOWING ARTICLES: T. TOMLJENOVIC. *The vaccination policy and the Code of Practice of Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JVC): are the at odds?* IN: *BSM March 2011 The Health Hazards of Disease Prevention.*, 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, R. LEIVA. *A Brief History of Human Diploid Cell Strains.* IN: *The National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* AUTUMN 2006, 443 - 451.

³ Cf. GN 1, 26.

personalism⁴. The fundament of dignity is Imago Dei, which is a constitutive and transcendent essence of human nature⁵. We can consider human dignity as a real category that defines person's acts and relationships in society, provided that it belongs to every human being explicitly on the basis of its relevancy to human kind, namely from the beginning of its existence⁶. Basically, we deal with ontological and anthropological view of a person in bioethical sphere⁷, which is an important basis for moral reflection about conscience clause in mandatory vaccination. In theological sphere it is not possible to omit documents of Magisterium in its particularity and mutual connection, thereby shaping completion of Christian heritage of the person in various dimensions of his existence⁸.

In connection to mandatory vaccination it is precisely human dignity that demands from parents to express their free, voluntary and informed consent with this legislatively enforced act. Therefore, within the issue of mandatory vaccination free and informed consent⁹ in practice is a serious medical, ethical, but also legal issue, forasmuch as pediatricians seldom instruct parents

4 Cf. J. Wróbel. *Čłowiek i medycyna. Teologicznomoralne podstawy ingerencji medycznych*. Kraków 1999, 33 – 67.

5 This schematic statement is explained in a broader sense in the fifth chapter of publication *Mysterium Vitae*. Kraków 2012, 99 – 111.

6 Cf. E. Schockenhoff. *O nebezpečí antropologických kroků spět*. In: *Bioetika nová zývá za politiku a společnost*. Praha 2002, 7.

7 Cf. R. Lucas Lucas. *Antropologia e problemi bioetici*. San Paolo Edizioni. 2001. Significance and universality of anthropological concept appear in the course of all bioethical issues (4th and 5th chapters partially are especially helpful for this reflection), forasmuch as it mentions ontological unchangeability of status of innocent human life, that cannot be used as means to achieve goal, because it is inviolable, sacred, possessing transcendental finality and can be disposed as means to achieve goal, because it is inviolable, sacred, possessing transcendental finality and can be disposed by God only. Cf. Gn 2,7, Ws 2, 23, Ps 103,14, Ws 1, 13 – 14, Dt 32,39.

8 Cf. John Paul II. *Redemptor hominis* (anthropology), *Veritatis splendor* (truth and morality of human act), *Fides et ratio* (complementarity of knowledge in natural and transcendental sphere) and mainly *Evangelium vitae* (sacredness and inviolability of human life). Based on the teachings of these documents of papal Magisterium we can accurately apply specific documents of Academy Pro Vita *Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti*. Roma 2005 and Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith *Dignitas Personae* Roma 2008 (nr.34 a 35) to the issue of mandatory vaccination. The teachings of the Magisterium in this way inspire moral theological attitude of the author towards mandatory vaccination, however theological and ethical analysis of the issue in the light of these documents is not a primary theme of this reflection.

in an adequate way as it is stated by the law. Professional and competent disposition of information about mandatory vaccination for children must contain entire truth about the essence of an actual medical intervention in the body as well as composition of vaccines or risks, combined with vaccination in the form of negative side effects¹⁰. Instructions should not be presented in a way that would initiate presumptions or factual pressure on freedom of child's parent's decision, whereby in this way partially or utterly obtained consent would not be possible to consider as a free and responsible act. Pediatrician is obliged without appeal to truthfully and completely inform a patient about composition of a vaccine, its possible risks and consequences in medical sphere for the health of patient, as well as about possibility of an alternative procedure. It also relates to the question of vaccine effectiveness, which was often discredited in some of the cases by scientific proves that inspire to the question, if risks and negatives effects¹¹, connected with vaccination, are at all proportional to the good that is declared as a vaccination goal? Instructions about risks, negative side effects and possible long term impact on person's health, and in particular child patient, are from an ethical point of view inevitable.

If a person (child's parent, patient) is not informed by a doctor in this way, in that case not only his fundamental human rights are broken, but also valid legislation, obliging a doctor to give precise information, but in particular human dignity. On this reason such practice of a pediatrician is possible to consider as an adequate argument for parents to apply conscience clause. Indeed, a person cannot consciously agree with medical act, effects of which he is not adequately familiar with, whereby the act does not even sustain therapeutic character but only preventive. Arguments for not giving an informed consent and applying the right of conscience can also preferentially carry religious and ethical character¹², which means that they also concern religious freedom and freedom of conscience, when a person refuses something, what in case of

⁹ Cf. PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR HEALTH CARE WORKERS. *Charter for Health Care Workers*. NR. 72 – 74.

¹⁰ VACCINATION BROCHURES INFORM ABOUT NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS OF EVERY VACCINE. HEREIN IT IS IMPORTANT TO MENTION THE FACT THAT A PERSON IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS, EVEN IF FORESEEN. BECAUSE EVIL SHOULD BE TAXATIVELY (UNDER OBLIGATION) AVOIDED, THEREFORE PERSON HAS A MORAL OBLIGATION TO PREVENT EVIL ACTS BY NOT COMMITTING THEM. Cf. A. GÜNTHER. *Moral theology. 1/b. General moral theology*. ROME 1989, 72. (NOTE: ORIGINAL TITLE: *Chiamata e risposta. Una nuova teologia morale. Vol. I: Morale generale*. Alba 1974.)

¹¹ FOR EXAMPLE, THIMEROSAL, AS A POISONOUS COMPONENT OF MANY VACCINES, HAS SERIOUS NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES ON HEALTH, WHAT WAS REPEATEDLY SCIENTIFICALLY PROVEN. Cf. FOR EX. A. KHAN – Z.L. Sulkowski – T. CHEN ET AL. *Sex-dependent Changes in cerebellar thyroid Hormone-dependent Gene Expression following perinatal Exposure to Tthimerosal in Rats*. IN: *Journal of Physiology and Pharmacology*. 63:2012 NR.3, 277-283, H.A. YOUNG – D. A. GEIER – M.R. GEIER. *Thimerosal exposure in infants and neurodevelopmental disorders: An assessment of computerized medical records in the Vaccine Safety Datalink*. IN: *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*. April 2008 doi.10.1016/j.jns.2008.04.002.

various used and at the same time enforced by law vaccines in many countries¹³, is a big moral evil.

Secondarily, there are also medical arguments (negatives side effects with significant characteristics¹⁴) and legal arguments, on behalf of which a person can refuse vaccination program, forasmuch as this program on the basis of medical facts represents a big moral evil and disproportionate health risks for children and adults. Pediatricians or parents can come to such responsible approach in particular by systematic studies of ethical, medical and legal aspects of bioethics as well as scientific medical facts connected with vaccination, realizing their moral obligation before God and people, their own health and life, as well as health and life of people (children), which are entrusted to them as a gift.

Considering that state is for the good of a person and considering a natural primacy of human being before society (which is before state), a patient person is always more important than solitary society or state with its legislation¹⁵. These realities result in a fact that the issue of

¹² Cf. for ex. biblical commandment Thou shalt not kill! (Ex 20 – 2 – 17) as well as the teachings of the pope John Paul II in the encyclical *Evangelium vitae* (in particular articles 57 – 63), Papal Academy Pro Vita. *Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti*. Roma 2005, CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH. *Dignitas Personae*. WHEN IT CONCERNS VACCINES, WHICH ARE DEVELOPED AND MADE ON THE BASIS OF VAST NUMBER OF ABORTIONS, IT IS EVIDENT THAT FROM THE POINT OF FAITH AND ETHICS A PERSON HAS A RIGHT AND OBLIGATION TO REFUSE THIS KIND OF VACCINES.

¹³ VARIVAX, POLIOVAX, VIVAXIM, G-CSF, MMR, PRIORIX, MERUVAX II, PROQUAD/MMR-V, AVAXIM, EPAXAL, DT POLADS, VARILRIX, ZOSTAVAX, PENTACEL, IMOVAX, QUADRACEL, PULMOZYME, VAQTA, HAVRIX, TWINRIX, MR VAX, EOLARIX, BIIVAX II, ENBREL, ACAMBIS 1000. MOST OF THESE VACCINES CAN BE SOLD IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES UNDER A DIFFERENT TRADE NAME. IN SLOVAKIA FOLLOWING UNETHICAL VACCINES ARE BEING USED: MMR VAXPRO, VAQTA 50U, AVAXIM, MMR II, HAVRIX, PRIORIX, PRIORIX – TETRA. HOWEVER ALL MENTIONED VACCINES ARE DEVELOPED AND MADE WITH THE USE OF VARIOUS CELL STRAINS (WI-26 VA4, HAMSTER, WI38, HEK – 293, MRC – 5, RA – 273), ORIGINATED FROM ABORTED HUMAN FETUSES. ACCORDING TO PRODUCERS, DNA FROM ABORTED HUMAN FETUSES IS PRESENT IN THE VACCINES. PRODUCERS CONTINUE PRACTICING FURTHERMORE, THE PROOF OF WHICH IS CELL CULTURE IMR-90, DEVELOPED IN CORIELL INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH, AND ALSO PER.C6, DEVELOPED IN CRUCCELL COMPANY IN HOLLAND.

¹⁴ Cf. for ex. N. AGMON-LEVIN – G.R.V. HUGHES – Y. SHOENFELD. *The spectrum of ASIA: 'Autoimmune (Auto-inflammatory) Syndrome induced by Adjuvants'*. *Lupus* 21:2012, 118–120, L. TOMIJEVIC – C.A. SHAW: *Aluminium vaccine adjuvants: are they safe?* IN: *Curr Med Chem* 18 (17):201, 2630-7, R. J. MIRKUS – M. A. HESS – S. L. SCHWARTZ: *Pharmacokinetic modeling as an approach to assessing the safety of residual formaldehyde in infant vaccines*. IN: *Vaccine* Vol. 31, ISSUE 25, (2013), 2738–2743, R.L. BLAYLOCK: *The danger of excessive vaccination during brain development: The case for a link to autism spectrum disorders (ASD)*. IN: *Medical Veritas* 5:2008, 1727 – 1741.

¹⁵ ATHEISTIC OR MATERIALIST CONCEPTIONS OF ETHICS AND PHILOSOPHY HAVE ALWAYS DENIED NATURAL PRIMACY OF A HUMAN BEING BEFORE SOCIETY AND STATE, THIS WAY BRINGING FORTH THE DESTRUCTION OF TRUTHFUL UNDERSTANDING OF THIS RELATIONSHIP. BUT EXACTLY HUMAN BEING IS THE SUBJECT, WHO CREATES AND ESTABLISHES SOCIETY OR GOVERNMENT, SO THAT THEY CAN SERVE HIM IN THOSE SPHERES OF HUMAN LIFE, WHERE A PERSON AS AN INDIVIDUAL, IS NOT ABLE TO PROVIDE PARTICULAR GOOD, WHICH NATURALLY BELONG TO HIM ON ACCOUNT OF BEING A PERSON. THAT IS, ALREADY FROM THE POINT OF SOLITARY GENESIS OF SOCIETY AND STATE, A HUMAN PERSON HAS A PRIMACY BEFORE SOCIETY.

mandatory vaccination concerns, besides general ethical and special bioethical principles, also social and ethical principles of solidarity and subsidiarity, as well as an important aspect of respecting freedom of conscience of every patient, who are children parents. It is adequate to appeal to various international documents (declarations, conventions), which are relevant in relationships between patient and state from a legal aspect¹⁶, although the last one is not the most important.

Certainly, society or a state, which does not accept conscience clause of parents, automatically becomes totalitarian, forasmuch as it denies one of the constitutive elements of human nature and human dignity, which is freedom of human being that is freedom of his conscience and religious freedom. Formulated concretely, it concerns such aspect of human freedom, which externally is expressed as a natural and by nobody limited parents right to act in accordance with their own conscience in the course of vaccination, which is to act in agreement with conscience and beliefs, resulted from religious¹⁷, philosophical or world-wide background of a concrete human person. That is why, it is only the totalitarian state that does not respect the fact, that its citizen (doctor or patient) can at any time freely and responsibly use conscience clause, and that after all anybody can freely and responsibly choose not to participate in the act that represents destruction of the nature of human dignity or human freedom (which is the greatest gift of God) or destruction of human life or patient's health.

The child's parent (known as a patient), who uses conscience clause on the base of justified arguments, must be unconditionally protected against not only criminal actions, but also against any legal, discipline or economic harm¹⁸, which could be caused by some legislative regulations, resulting in some penalty, bringing those kind of consequences to a doctor or a patient. In case if parents are considered guilty in legal sphere and are penalized in the form of financial fine because of their religious and ethical attitude in terms of mandatory vaccination

16 Cf. UNESCO: *Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights*, OSN: *Universal declaration of Human Rights, Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine, European convention on Human rights 1950, Basic Agreement between Slovak Republic and Holy See (ART.7, valid for the territories, where the agreement applies only) and etc.*

17 HEREIN IT IS APPROPRIATE TO MENTION THE CONTENTS OF THE DOCUMENT *Dignitatis humanae*, WHICH IS A CLEAR MESSAGE OF IMMANENT BOND BETWEEN THE DIGNITY OF HUMAN PERSON AND HIS RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, PRACTICALLY EXPRESSED IN THE FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE.

18 Cf. EV. NR. 69, 73 AND IN PARTICULAR 74. THESE ARTICLES EXPLAIN CONTEXT AND SOME GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE ISSUE, WHICH HAVE ESSENCIAL IMPACT ON AUTHOR'S ATTITUDE IN THIS REFLECTION.

(where they refuse vaccination applying to conscience clause, forasmuch as they are aware of precise and serious health risks in the form of vaccination side effects, or because of religious and ethical causes, regarding the way of development and production of various vaccines), in that case the state is a totalitarian institution, where it legislatively raises state of injustice¹⁹.

Society and state has to always unconditionally respect religious freedom of a person, as well as his freedom of conscience, whereby unrespect of this principle is a serious danger for existence of society and person alone. Because moral character of a democratic society is not automatically present in itself, but always depends on agreement of such society with a moral law, which it is obliged to conform with as any other human activity²⁰.

2. Conscience clause

Religious freedom and freedom of conscience or freedom of religion are inseparable part of basic human rights conception, which form principal basis for arranging interpersonal relationships in society. Nowadays in the spirit of legal positivism, also in medical law there is a created myth that individual expression of conscience clause is not an inalienable and unlimited basic human right of every human person. There is an origin of a false concept that expression of conscience clause automatically leads to a conflict with other human rights of third parties. Ideologically, there is a claim, that it should be regulated, so that expression of conscience clause would not threaten basic individual human rights and freedoms of other individuals²¹. According to this, suggestively the right to express conscience clause (as one of basic human rights, and this way implicitly all basic human rights) can be in the course of its individual realization a denial of basic human rights of other individuals. That would mean, that if a person consciously wants to live in essential harmony with his nature and dignity (which are keystones for basic human rights), in this way he automatically denies and ruins individual dignity of another person.

This cardinal mistake results from misunderstanding of ontological and anthropological essence of fundamental human rights (especially its transcendent dimension and origin), as well as from Marxist

¹⁹ REGARDLESS THE FACT, THAT IF THE RIGHT OF CONSCIENCE CLAUSE OCCURS OR NOT IN CONSTITUTIONS WORLD-WIDE AND THAT STATE MUST RESPECT IT WITHOUT ANY KIND OF THREAT, PRESSURE OR DISCRIMINATION.

²⁰ Cf. EV NR. 70.

²¹ Cf. E.U. NETWORK OF INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ON FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS: *The right to conscientious objection and the conclusion by EU member states of concordats with the Holy See*. CFR-CDF. OPINION 4-2005, BRUSSELS, 2005.

collectivism conception of these rights, which in its essence carry an individual, not a group character – referring to an individual, not a group. Natural limits of fundamental human rights (which is also a conscience clause right) are given by human nature and dignity, which are an image of the Creator in a person. Conscience clause right in its essence covers a person – individual and particular person, because with regard to his reciprocal relationship towards other people, it protects him from destruction of human dignity from the side of third parties.

In connection with mandatory vaccination it is necessary to point out general wide-spread error that fundamental human rights in the sphere of medicine are granted to a person by absolutist society or a state in a form of its legislative fixations in declarations and constitutions or in medical law. It creates the impression, that society or a state (often understood as earthly guarantee of rights) has a right to restrict or to completely take away rights of anybody, provided, that all statutory requirements have been met. However, fundamental human rights, as an expression of human dignity within interpersonal relationships of a person in society, do not originate in society or a state, but in a person himself. This means, in his *natura humana* in the context of *dignitatis humanae*, whereby both base on transcendent *Imago Dei*, which is a primary source. Thus, right of conscience belongs to a person, because he is created in the image of God and concerns his private and public life, where he expresses his religious beliefs.

For an adequate understanding of the issue it is necessary to point out, that a right of conscience clause (primary in moral and secondary in legal sphere) is a realization of protection of one's personal religious freedom and freedom of conscience in every sphere of human life, which is in every life situation. In the sphere of medical care this religious freedom and freedom of conscience means that every person has a right to freely and responsibly choose and act, so that one's religious beliefs and conscience were in accordance with his acting. So, all people must be protected against pressure from the side of individuals or social groups and from any human force at all, so that in religious sphere nobody would be forced to act against one's own conscience and would not be restrained from acting in proper limits according to his own conscience privately and publicly, individually or in connection with others²².

Parents conscience warns them against committing an evil act²³, to which a state forces parents with legislations, and since, what a parent or a doctor in this way is forced to, is for him ethically unacceptable (wrong), inconvenient or even life threatening²⁴, this way a person (a parent, representing his child, or a doctor) has a natural right, but also a moral obligation, to refuse that kind of acting, for a person is asked to commit an immoral act. There is a straight conflict between law and morality, as well

22 Cf. SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL. *Dignitatis humanae* 2.

23 THE EVIL OF THIS ACT CONSISTS IN A DISTANT MATERIAL COOPERATION (Cf. PAPAL ACADEMY PRO VITA. *Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti*. ROMA 2005) ON A HORRIBLE CRIME OF SERIAL AND INTENTIONALLY PERFORMED VAST NUMBER OF MURDERS OF UNBORN CHILDREN. THE EVIL CONSISTS IN INDIRECT USE OF SUCH MURDERS OF UNBORN CHILDREN (ABORTIONS) AS MEANS TO ACHIEVE DECLARATIVE GOOD GOAL (WHICH YET IN PRACTICE DOES NOT MEAN THAT THE GOAL IS GOOD IN REALITY). THE EVIL OF THAT ACT LAYS ALSO IN NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS, WHICH WERE SCIENTIFICALLY DISCOVERED AND THEREFORE ARE FORESEEN.

as conflict between person's freedom (doctor, patient, child's parent) and a state, which is legislatively obliging to medical acts that are medically and morally questionable at least.

Conscience clause or freedom of conscience²⁵ in such cases means that a person (a doctor, patient or a parent, representing a child) is obliged to obey the voice of his conscience, even though society or state expect and legislatively demand something different. A person can and always must act according with his conscience, because it immanently results in his attitude of faith (if he is a believer) and in his dignity – a gift of freedom that he received from God. However, it is necessary to bear in mind that if a person (doctor, patient or a parent, representing a child) acts according to his conscience and this way respects his own religious (and philosophical) beliefs, he breaks a law or regulations of a state, where he lives, and he can be penalized from the side of state.

It is a natural condition of every fair society that a person will not get into such a position, which is accordingly to the legislature of every state, would be in accordance with natural moral law. The laws of the state should be consistent to objective ethical principles, so that it would be possible to implement just and right formulations of mutual interpersonal relationships in society – specifically between a doctor and a patient, that is in the case of children and their parents. Society (state) or some majority in society does not have a right to dictate or legislatively order or command committing an act, which is refused by conscience of a doctor or a patient by serious religious, ethical or medical reasons. Religious people (Catholics) in their conscience can never accept killing of unborn (...), neither respect such a law that violates the principle of justice (...), and at the same time cannot at any level justify any kind of acting, aimed against human life²⁶, which means that they have to refrain from any kind of cooperation²⁷ in acting, which is an evil in its essence (*ex toto genere sue*). Discussion about ethical dimensions has been going on for a longer period of time, and although while some forums are ignoring ethical dimensions of the issue, it does not mean that some people are exempt from the requirements of natural moral law. In the

²⁴ ACCORDING TO OFICIAL STATISTICS THE USE OF MULTIVALENT VACCINES, TOGETHER WITH INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF VACCINES, PARTAKE IN RADICAL INCREASE OF CHILD MORTALITY AFTER VACCINATION. Cf. G. S. GOLDMAN – N. Z. MILLER. *Relative trends in hospitalizations and mortality among infants by the number of Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) , 1990 – 2010*. IN: *Human Experimental Toxicology*. 31(10): 2012, 1012 – 1021.

²⁵ WHICH IS GUARANTEED BY THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SLOVAK REPUBLIC AND HOLY SEE (ART.7)

²⁶ Cf. J. NAGÓRNY. *Wartość życia ludzkiego*. Lublin 2009, 143.

²⁷ Cf. PAPAL ACADEMY PRO VITA. *Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti*. ROMA 2005 PARTI: *Il principio della lecita cooperazione al male, where there is a schematic description of ethical fundamentals and distinction between basic methods of cooperation with evil*.

Catholic Church there has been an agreement that ethical dimension is essential, however, the documents of Magisterium handle this bioethics issue on a general base and concrete statements about the issue apparently are not formulated on the basis of all available medical facts, leading to different statements of bishops all over the world.

The way how some vaccines are developed and produced is clearly immoral and it is impossible to consider the issue of use of such vaccines as morally neutral, so parents are not obliged to use those vaccines, because we cannot commit evil for the good that comes out of it²⁸. This is exactly why it is necessary and just that, what is called conscience clause, would be defined and accepted by the law, because only in this way it is possible to respect human person (doctor and patient), what consequently

28 Cf. R. VASA. *Lives are saved, but some vaccines aren't morally neutral*. In: *Catholic Sentinel*. Vol. 19 FEBRUARY 2009. THERE IS A MORAL PARADOX, WHERE BIOETHICS SUBCOMMITTEE (A PART OF THE THEOLOGICAL COMMITTEE IN THE EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE OF SLOVAKIA) IN ITS STATEMENT TO A GIVEN ISSUE DECLARED THAT „ON THE OTHER SIDE, AS LONG AS THERE IS NO AVAILABLE VACCINE, WHICH WOULD BE PREPARED WITH THE HELP OF CELL OR TISSUE CULTURE MADE IN AN ETHICALLY APPROPRIATE WAY, PARENTS ARE MORALLY JUSTIFIED, EVEN OBLIGED – CONSIDERING SERIOUS REASONS FOR PROTECTION OF LIFE AND HEALTH OF THEIR CHILD – TO VACCINATE THEIR CHILD WITH EXISTING VACCINE.“, WHICH IS IN DIRECT CONTRADICTION TO THE PAPAL TEACHINGS OF MAGISTERIUM. Cf. *Statement of Bioethics Subcommittee of the Theological committee in the Episcopal Conference of Slovakia towards some ethical aspects of mandatory vaccination*. Nr. 4. (Štrbské Pleso 26. OCTOBER 2013) <http://www.kbs.sk/obsah/sekcia/h/dokumenty-a-vyhlasenia/p/dokumenty-komisii-a-rad-konferencie-biskupov-slovenska/c/stanovisko-k-niektorym-eticky-m-aspekto-m-povinneho-ockovania>. ON THE CONTRARY, THERE IS A STRICT TEACHING OF PAPAL MAGISTERIUM (Cf. JOHN PAUL II. *Evangelium vitae*. 57-63). IN THIS WAY SUBCOMMITTEE DECLARED ETHICALLY EVIL ACT OF INDIRECT MATERIAL DISTANT COOPERATION IN VAST AMOUNT OF ABORTIONS AS A MORAL OBLIGATION. ACCORDINGLY, INDIRECT USE OF ABORTIONS FOR A GOOD GOAL (IN DIFFERENT WORDS, IMPLICITLY ACCEPTING EVIL AS MEANS TO ACHIEVE GOOD), USE OF INSTRUMENTALISM OF HUMAN LIFE OF ABORTED CHILDREN (DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION OF VACCINES, USING THE TISSUES OF ABORTED CHILDREN), IMPERATIVE DENIAL OF NATURAL MORAL LAW – DOING GOOD AND NOT COMMITTING EVIL, DENIAL OF THE FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE (WHICH IS PROTECTED BY THE CHURCH IN THE TEACHINGS OF MAGISTERIUM), IS DECLARED AS ACCEPTABLE, AND EVEN AS A MORAL OBLIGATION. PARADOXICALLY, BOTH DOCUMENTS (*Dignitas personae* AND *Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti*) EMPHATICALLY URGE FAITHFUL PARENTS TO RESIST, AND ON THE OTHER SIDE IN TWO SENTENCES (*Dignitas personae* NR.35: „OF COURSE, WITHIN THIS GENERAL PICTURE THERE EXIST *differing degrees of responsibility*. GRAVE REASONS MAY BE MORALLY PROPORTIONATE TO JUSTIFY THE USE OF SUCH “BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL”. THUS, FOR EXAMPLE, DANGER TO THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN COULD PERMIT PARENTS TO USE A VACCINE WHICH WAS DEVELOPED USING CELL LINES OF ILICIT 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“, BUT *Dichiarazione: Riflessioni morali circa i vaccini preparati a partire da cellule provenienti da feti umani abortiti*: „MA SE QUESTI FOSSERO ESPOSTI A PERICOLI DI SALUTE NOTEVOLI, POSSONO ESSERE USATI PROVVISORIAMENTE ANCHE I VACCINI CON PROBLEMI MORALI. LA RAGIONE MORALE È CHE IL DOVERE DI EVITARE LA COOPERAZIONE MATERIALE PASSIVA NON OBBLIGA SE C'È GRAVE INCOMODO. IN PIÙ, CI TROVIAMO, IN TALE CASO, UNA RAGIONE PROPORZIONATA PER ACCETTARE L'USO DI QUESTI VACCINI IN PRESENZA DEL PERICOLO DI FAVORIRE LA DIFFUSIONE DELL'AGENTE PATOLOGICO, A CAUSA DELL'ASSENZA DI VACCINAZIONE DEI BAMBINI.“ -“HOWEVER, IF THE LATTER ARE EXPOSED TO CONSIDERABLE DANGERS TO THEIR HEALTH, VACCINES WITH MORAL PROBLEMS PERTAINING TO THEM MAY ALSO BE USED ON A TEMPORARY BASIS. THE MORAL REASON IS THAT THE DUTY TO AVOID *passive material cooperation* IS NOT OBLIGATORY IF THERE IS GRAVE INCONVENIENCE. MOREOVER, WE FIND, IN SUCH A CASE, *a proportional reason*, IN ORDER TO ACCEPT THE USE OF THESE VACCINES IN THE PRESENCE OF THE DANGER OF FAVORING THE SPREAD OF THE PATHOLOGICAL AGENT, DUE TO THE LACK OF VACCINATION OF CHILDREN“ CAREFULLY AND CONDITIONALLY ALLOW TEMPORARY USE OF SUCH VACCINES. FROM THE POINT OF LOGIC: HOW CAN EXPLICIT CONDEMNATION OF ABORTIONS (EX. IN *EVANGELIUM VITAE*) BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CONDITIONAL AND TEMPORARY APPROVAL OF USE OF UNETHICAL VACCINES (WHICH MEANS INDIRECT USE OF ABORTIONS) FOR THE GOOD OF ANOTHER? THUS, IF A PERSON DOES NOT AGREE WITH THE CRIME OF ABORTION, HOW CAN HE USE IT FOR THE GOOD OF ANOTHER SUBJECT WITHOUT THE FACT THAT SUCH USE OF THE VACCINE WOULD NOT BE AT THE SAME TIME AN IMPLICIT APPROVAL OF HOW SOME VACCINES WERE DEVELOPED AND MADE (INTENTIONALLY WANTED ABORTIONS)? REFUSAL OF SUCH VACCINES IS EVIDENTLY MORALLY RIGHT AND AT THE SAME TIME A PROTECTION OF LIVES OF THOSE CHILDREN, WHICH ARE BEING KILLED NOWADAYS ON THE GROUND OF NEW VACCINES DEVELOPMENT (NEW CELL CULTURES, FOR THE REASON THAT OLD CELL CULTURES CANNOT BE USED ENDLESSLY). HOWEVER, IT IS NECESSARY TO SAY, THAT ALTERNATIVE VACCINES DO EXIST, AND THIS WAY ONE OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR CONDITIONAL AND TEMPORARY USE OF UNETHICAL VACCINES CAN BE DROPPED OUT. IN THE STATEMENT OF BIOETHICS SUBCOMMITTEE OF EPISCOPAL CONFERENCE OF SLOVAKIA THERE IS NO CLEAR AND DISTINCT CONDEMNATION OF DEVELOPMENT METHOD AND PRODUCTION, AS WELL AS USE OF UNETHICAL VACCINES, TO WHICH BOTH VATICAN DOCUMENTS CLEARLY AND EMPHATICALLY APPEAL. DEEP THEOLOGICAL AND MORAL REFLECTION OF THIS ISSUE WOULD BE A SUBJECT TO A DIFFERENT STUDY.

brings benefits and good not only for them, but also for a state itself, because if a state accepts the freedom of conscience of human person, reciprocally a person (doctor and patient) would also respect a state. Every worker in a medical sphere has a right and an obligation to express protest (clause) of conscience against immoral acting towards cooperation in immoral acting²⁹, which is a true implementation of freedom and responsibility of human being. In fact, a person received conscience as a constitutive gift within its nature and his religious beliefs are expressed as a significant source, from which emanate generally valid moral norms that adequately and reasonably standardize, and also form his maturing. It is valid all the more if it concerns human life and patient health in pediatrics specialization of medical care.

Nowadays, constitutions of every state, as well as international legal norms, regulations, ethical codes and biomedical agreements (either about patient rights or of general character) declare too much (frequently and unisonous) respect of freedom of thought, conscience, religious beliefs and faith, and on the other hand with the help of legal positivism relativize declared person's freedom by means of secondary limits, when such freedom is allegedly possible to restrict or take away from any subject, if they meet statutory requirements. The fact that all personal freedoms, given by God, are mutually related as combined pots, where they cannot exist without each other (freedom of conscience, freedom of religious, freedom of speech, freedom of conscience or religious freedom) is ignored. Conscience clause and its legislative implementation into the legal system about mandatory vaccination ought to protect every parent or child patient in defined fields, respecting his religious beliefs and resulting from them moral attitudes, or social status and worldwide opinion. It is inevitable to eliminate permanent attacks of some doctors or a state in the field of mandatory vaccination and thereby respect conscience clause by adequate and precise formulating of spheres in legislation, where expression of conscience clause considered from the point of ethics and its principles³⁰ to be natural and unlimited.

3. Selected medical arguments for expressing a right conscience

Several medical studies point out not only uncertainty and ineffectiveness³¹ of some generally spread and plenary applied vaccines, but even point out serious negative side effects³² of these vaccines to human life and health, especially child patients (who even in reality are not patients, because do not suffer from any illness, against which they are being vaccinated), or

²⁹ Cf. A. BARTOSZEK. *Obrona klauzuli sumienia*. In: *Roczniki teologii moralnej. (Annales de théologie morale)*. Vol 2 (57) 2010, 125.

³⁰ MORAL PRINCIPLES NATURALLY STAND ABOVE LEGISLATIVE NORMS, WHAT CONCERNS ITS VALIDITY AND MORAL OBLIGATION WITHIN CONSCIENCE.

adult patients, what cannot be ignored by no means³³. It is necessary to point out at least several scientifically recorded serious autoimmune systemic disorders, which were caused by unnatural repetitive stimulation of immunity³⁴, which is possible to reflect also in child patients in present times. It is inevitable to have serious scientific discussions and research about these discoveries, because it is a profound scientific, as well as a moral issue, which is, however, doubted by other authors, especially in medical sphere, who deny negative side effects of poisonous components in vaccines on the human body³⁵.

In the sphere of medicine and bioethics are starting very sharp, but nevertheless sometimes open professional discussions about moral dilemmas³⁶, which logically result from empirical evidence, proposed by many scientists from general professional³⁷, but also lay public. The fundamental background of these debates ought to be sincere openness of every participant

³¹ IN THIS CASE SCIENTIFIC TEAM ADMITS INEFFECTIVENESS OF VACCINATION AGAINST MUMPS, WHERE IN SPITE OF HIGH VACCINATION RATE THERE ARE EPIDEMIC OUTBREAKS OF THIS ILLNESS. Cf. A. E. BARSKEY - C. SCHULTE - J. B. ROSEN ET AL. *Mumps Outbreak in Orthodox Jewish Communities in the United States*. IN: *The New England Journal of Medicine* 2012; 367:1704-1713 NOVEMBER 1, 2012 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMOa1202865.

³² Cf. E. MILLER - L. STELLITANO - CH. VERITY ET AL. *Risk of narcolepsy in children and young people receiving AS03 adjuvanted pandemic A/H1N1 2009 influenza vaccine: retrospective analysis*. IN: *British Medical Journal* 2012 (26.2) 346 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.f794>, KHAN Z ET AL. SLOW CCL2-DEPENDENT TRANSLOCATION OF BIOPERSISTENT PARTICLES FROM MUSCLE TO BRAIN. IN: *BMC Med.* 2013 Apr 4;11:99. PMID:23557144, J. G. DÓREA - R. C. MARQUES - C. ISEJIMA. *Neurodevelopment of Amazonian Infants: Antenatal and Postnatal Exposure to Methyl- and Ethylmercury*. IN: *Journal of Biomedicine and Biotechnology*. Vol. 2012 Article ID 132876, doi:10.1155/2012/132876. THE LIST OF DETECTED NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS CAN BE FOUND IN THE VACCINATION BROCHURE, AND MOST OF THEM ARE EXTREMELY SERIOUS.

³³ Cf. EX. G. BUCHWALD. *Impfen - Das Geschäft mit der Angst*. (?) 1994, T. O' SHEA. *Vaccination is not Immunization*. (?) 2013, T. OBUKHANICH. *Vaccine Illusion*. (?) 2012, A. MORITZ. *Vaccine-Nation. Poisoning the Population one shot at the Time*. SMASHWORDS 2011.

³⁴ Cf. K. TSUMIYAMA - Y. MIYAZAKI - S. SHIOZAWA. *Self-Organized Criticality Theory of Autoimmunity*. IN: *PLoS ONE* 4 (12): 2009 e8382. doi:10.1371.

³⁵ Cf. P. OFFIT - R. K. JEW. *Addressing Parents' Concerns: Do Vaccines Contain Harmful Preservatives, Adjuvants, Additives, or Residuals?* IN: *Pediatrics* Vol. 112. 6: 2003, 1394 - 1401. IT IS ADEQUATE TO MENTION THAT CLAIMS IN THE ABOVE-MENTIONED ARTICLE CANNOT BE CONSIDERED AS OBJECTIVE ON ACCOUNT OF FACT THAT GIVEN COMPONENTS ARE CLEARLY SCIENTIFICALLY CLASSIFIED WORLD-WIDE AS POISONOUS AND HARMFUL BY MEDICAL INSTITUTIONS THEMSELVES, NAMELY ON THE BASIS OF EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE.

to the objective truth, and the goal of these debates should naturally be what are an essence and a deep meaning of medicine and a doctor: *Salus aegrotis suprema lex esto*.

Paradox is that vaccines contain such chemical compounds and elements or components³⁸ that not only are subjectively harmful for person's and child's health, but many of them even cause a serious threat to psychosomatic well-being of a person in short and long terms. Many of these compounds have provable serious negative impact on neurological development of child's brain, because they contain neurotoxic poisoning that causes autism³⁹, as well as carcinogenic effects, forasmuch as it contains substances that cause cancer. These characteristics of adjuvants and additives in vaccines are also admitted by official medical institutions in different countries, but at the same time they avoid any legal or moral responsibility for negative side effects on health of child patients. What can ethically justify application of these chemical compounds, possessing negative medical consequences on the human body? For somebody the answer (in the spirit of classic *contra factum non datur argumentum*) is clear, however not for everyone, especially not for those, who lack the courage to find truth.

³⁶ Cf. N. Scolding, *Cooperation problems in science: use of embryonic/fetal material*. In: *Cooperation, Complicity & Conscience. Problems in healthcare, science, law and public policy*. Ed. H. WATT. LONDON 2005, 105 – 117. THE AUTHOR POINTS OUT PRESSURE TOWARDS SCIENTISTS IN THIS FIELD. (pp. 107 – 108). ON THE OTHER SIDE, OTHER AUTHORS IN THE SPIRIT OF ETHICAL PROPORTIONALISM AND RELATIVISM FIND SEVERAL VACCINES AS HELPFUL. P. REFOLO – I. CARRASCO DE PAULA – A.G. SPAGNOLO. *Analisi etica un proceso di HTA del vaccino pneumococcico 13-valente coniugato (Prevenar 13) per l'impiego in pazienti in età pediatrica*. In: *Italian Journal of Public Health* Vol. 7, Nr. 2 Suppl. 1. 2010, 61 – 67. INTRODUCED VACCINE WAS AWARDED BY GALIEN FOUNDATION AS THE BEST MEDICATION IN 2011.

³⁷ Cf. FOR EX. M. HIRTE. *Očkování – pro a proti*. BRNO 2010.

³⁸ IN *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention* IN THE DOCUMENT *Vaccine Excipient & Media Summary Excipients Included in U.S. Vaccines*, by Vaccine, it is possible to see relatively long list of components that are consistent in vaccines. Cf. <http://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/pubs/pinkbook/downloads/appendices/B/EXCIPIENT-TABLE-2.pdf>. EVERY PERSON CAN BE INFORMED ABOUT NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS NOT ONLY WITH THE HELP OF VACCINATION BROCHURES FROM VACCINE MANUFACTURERES, WHERE HOWEVER NOT ALL SCIENTIFICALLY RECORDED CONTRADICTIONS ARE LISTED. FOR THAT REASON, IT IS PROPER TO RECOMMEND SCIENTIFIC AND SPECIALISTIC LITERATURE, SCIENTIFIC STUDIES, PUBLISHED MAINLY IN REPUTABLE SPECIALIZED MAGAZINES IN THE SPHERE OF BIOMEDICINE. Cf. JD. GRABENSTEIN. *ImmunoFacts: Vaccines and Immunologic Drugs* – 2012 (37th REVISION). ST LOUIS MO: WOLTERS KLUWER HEALTH 2011.

³⁹ Cf. J. K. KERN – D. A. GEIER – T. AUDHYA ET AL. *Evidence of parallels between mercury intoxication and brain pathology in autism*. In: *Acta Neurologiae Experimentalis* 72: 2012, 113 – 153, Z.L. Sulkowski – T. CHEN – S. MIDHA ET AL. *Maternal Thimerosal Exposure Results in Aberrant Cerebellar Oxidative Stress, Thyroid Hormone Metabolism, and Motor Behavior in Rats; Sex- and Strain-Dependent Effects*. In: *Cerebellum* 12:2012 ISSUE 2, 575.

The reason of applying conscience clause is also presence of components that effect not only biological functionality of the human body, but sometimes selectively some of its basic biological functions. Presence of components in vaccines that reduce human capacity to pass life onto the next generations⁴⁰ that is a direct cause of infertility (partial or total, temporary or permanent) cannot be denied. It must not be concealed what vaccines can cause directly or indirectly, when it concerns negative consequences for patient's health in the future, or negative effects on some essential biological functions of the human body, to which is reproduction⁴¹. Such medical consequence from an ethical point of view is unacceptable, and vaccination program in this way becomes a part of social engineering program of demographic development regulation of population without patient's awareness, that is without obtaining his free informed consent. From an ethical point of view such intervention is unacceptable, because it does not relate to the situation when such acting can be ethically justified, as it is in case of direct prompt and immediate rescue of human life, which is regarded as a good of measureless value.

Ethically controversial moments are such vaccines, which contain present genetic modifications (recombination) of human and non-human DNA, which through vaccination get into the body of child patient, and that is even without obtaining informed consent of parents. Every person has an unlimited natural right to preserve integrity of his body, which means even from such ingredients that can cause genetic interaction between his own DNA and DNA of xenogenetic origin. Many of genetically modified substances, which get into the human body through artificial and unnatural process of vaccination, considering ordinary circumstances would never get into the human body on the ground of its somatic structure that sufficiently protects it from such dangers. In every phase of human life (embryonic or prenatal, as well as postnatal) a person cannot be a subject to experiments inescapably aimed at his destruction in face of unavoidable damage, (...) whereby genetic heritage is a treasure, belonging to a particular being, who has a right to life and full development (...) ⁴², what implicitly points out immoral practice of pharmaceutical companies in the course of vaccine development. At the same time it

40 It concerns chemical compound as Octoxynol 10, squalene or Polysorbate 80. In this connection it is impossible to ignore the fact that infertility, which until lately was a rare case (diagnosis), in the course of last five decades has become one of the serious medical issues in contemporary society.

41 Cf. J. MENCZER ET AL. *Possible role of mumps virus in the etiology of ovarian cancer*. IN: *Cancer* 43: 1979, 1375 - 1379. Y. CHEN ET AL. *Risk Factors for Epithelial Ovarian Cancer in Beijing, China*. IN: *International Journal of Epidemiology* 21:1992 ISSUE 1, 23 - 29. D. W. CRAMMER ET AL. *Mumps and ovarian cancer: modern interpretation of an historic association*. IN: *Cancer Causes Control*. 21: 2010 Nr.8., 1193 - 1201. THEREFROM it is logically possible to derive higher risk of development of OVARIAN CANCER, PROVIDED THAT A PERSON OVERCAME THIS ILLNESS IN HIS CHILDHOOD THANKS TO VACCINATION, IF IT HAS THIS KIND OF EFFECT. AN OUTCOME CAN BE WOMAN'S INFERTILITY, AND THEREFORE, IF MUMPS HAS SUCH AN IMPACT THAT OVERCOMING OF THIS ILLNESS IN CHILDHOOD BUILDS UP IMMUNITY TO GENERATE ANOTHER ILLNESS IN ADULTHOOD, WHERE SIGNIFICANCE OF MATTER IS A LOT HIGHER, IT IS QUESTIONABLE WHAT IS A GOAL OF SUCH VACCINATION?

also points out immorality of legislative pressure of a state in the field of pediatric medical care, where there is no respect of patient's integrity, as well as patient's right not to harm his health.

These evidence raise reasonable doubt about ethical quality of such acting, which is in addition forced by state, thus violating one of the most basic norms in the sphere of medicine, which is a free and voluntary informed consent, as well as a refusal of such procedures on the basis of religious beliefs through expression of conscience clause or religious freedom. The ethical issue of use of genetically modified DNA (recombination) is all the more important as scientists are not able to even foresee possible medical consequences in human body and human life, and here is one serious argument of precaution. It is an unreasonable interference with biological dimension of human nature, mainly if it relates unexplored risks in a long term. It pertains to mutual interaction of substances, contained in vaccines, with proteins and DNA of vaccinated person, where there is a risk of incorporation of genetically modified nucleic acids into the personal genome at the cellular level. This is why interventions that do not carry healing character (...), deforming genetic code of an individual and human kind, oppose personal dignity of human existence, its integrity and identity, and therefore in any case cannot be justified by eventual good effects for future generations⁴³.

Likewise, there is an ethical issue of declared presence of nanotechnological components in some vaccines, about which various companies⁴⁴ are carefully and rarely starting to inform, whereby it is not possible to ignore potential health risks on a person and his life. The fact is that up to nowadays there are no any (independent from vaccine producers) scientific studies, double-blinded by placebo⁴⁵ effect, which could empirically prove vaccination effectiveness, as well as

⁴² Cf. JOHN PAUL II. AL GRUPPO DI LAVORO SUL GENOMA UMANO PROMOSSO DALLA PONTIFICIA ACCADEMIA DELLE SCIENZE (SABAT, 20. NOVEMBRE 1993) NR.7.

⁴³ Cf. PONTIFICAL COUNCIL FOR HEALTH CARE WORKERS. *Charter for Health Care Workers*. NR. 13.

⁴⁴ ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE FÉDÉRALE DE LAUSANNE IS ONE OF THE FEW SPECIALIZED WORKPLACES, WHICH INFORMED ABOUT DEVELOPMENT AND PRESENCE OF NANOPARTICLES, WHICH EFFECTIVELY TRANSFER VACCINATION SUBSTANCE TO A DESIRED APPLICATION PLACE, AND AT THE SAME POINTED OUT POTENTIAL RISKS OF ATTACKING HEALTHY CELLS AND DEATHS, WHICH HAVE ALREADY OCCURRED. Cf. S. T REDDY - A. VAN DER VLIET - E. SIMEONI ET. AL. *Exploiting lymphatic transport and complement activation in nanoparticle vaccines*. IN: *Nature Biotechnology* 25: 2007, 1159 – 1164. A RESEARCH ABOUT NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF NANOPARTICLES BESIDES VACCINATION PROGRAM HAS TAKEN PLACE THAT CONFIRMED NEGATIVE IMPACT ON PERSON'S HEALTH. Y. SONG - X. LI - X. DU. *Exposure to nanoparticles is related to pleural effusion, pulmonary fibrosis and granuloma*. IN: *European Respiratory Journal* 34:2009, 559 – 567.

⁴⁵ THIS DISCOVERY HAS AN INDIVIDUAL CHARACTER, FOR IT WAS NOT POSSIBLE TO FIND ANY SCIENTIFIC STUDY IN SCIENCE AND SPECIALIST JOURNALS (*Double blind placebo clinical studies*) THAT WOULD FULFILL MENTIONED ABOVE SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA. THEREFORE, WE CANNOT EXCLUDE

its safety or absence of negative impact on health of (mainly) children patients. Pharmaceutical lobby is a reality in relation to politicians and lawmakers, who together with other facts (circumstances) provoke in a person, experiencing the reality of life, reasonable and justified doubts about good intention of those organizations towards (child) patient⁴⁶.

One of the reasons for claiming conscience clause is a real synergetic effect on human life of a child and his health after participation in a complete vaccination program. Was or is this effect explored in long term effects on human life of a child? If the synergetic effect is not yet scientifically known, it is not possible to claim, that vaccines are safe or even beneficial to human health. This fact by itself is a reason to doubt an existing that is a real synergetic effect of vaccination, and also a reason to its implementation.

Conclusion

From an ethical point of view, forasmuch as a person cannot act, if his conscience doubts, he also can express free and informed consent with vaccination only after removing all doubts in his conscience. However, how can a person freely and responsibly decide in his conscience about participation in vaccination program (which in some countries is even mandatory), if scientifically it is not known what is a synergetic effect of participation in entire vaccination program, not only in light of declared goals, but also negative side effects, which are proclaimed as unwanted or proportionally acceptable?

More and more scientists and specialists, but also lay people, see vaccination as an ethical and medical issue, and at the same time start to look upon this matter from the visual angle of critical consideration and investigation of medical facts. Everything in the context of free and responsible attitude to one's own health or health of children population. It is a certain paradox that ethical reflections about vaccination programs are less visible than legal or political field of problematic, or a sphere of financial interests, however, these ethical reflections would carry a bigger significance in the future than nowadays⁴⁷, whereby ethical conclusions about the issue must respect objective ethical criteria. There seems to be a need of mobilization and union of

THEORITAl possIbIlITy of ITS exISTENCE, WHAT, HOWEVER, THE AUTHOR CONSIDERS AS IMPROBABLE.

46 Cf. S.D. Wells. *25 Amazing (and disturbing) Facts about the hidden History of Medicine*. TRUTH Publishing. 2012. SIGNIFICANCE OF AUTHOR'S MESSAGE IS EVIDENT, HOWEVER IT IS NECESSARY TO CRITICALLY EXAMINE AUTHOR'S ARGUMENTS IN A SCIENTIFIC FIELD TO AVOID FAULTY RESULTS IN PRACTICE.

catholic health care professionals in order to enhance their education not only in medical field, but also in the sphere of bioethics, because if biomedical sciences do not serve a person, they are soulless and inhuman⁴⁸. In light of these facts, it appears that a need of theological and moral analyses and discussions is urgent, because human life is inviolable and is a sacred gift of the Creator, which cannot be exploited, abused and terminated even in order to achieve good for another person – child.

In: Theological Forum (Forum Teologiczne) vol 15 2014 s.67-82. ISSN 1641-1196

47 Cf. J. SCHWARTZ . A. L. CAPLAN. *Ethics of vaccination programs*. In: *Current Opinion in Virology*. 1:2011, 1 – 5.

48 Cf. BENEDIKT XVI. SPEECH [TO THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE 25TH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF CATHOLIC PHARMACISTS \(OCTOBER 29, 2007\)](#).