CONSCIENCE AND VACCINES

Ethical considerations surrounding vaccines have been debated for some time. It is a hot subject today, as many of the COVID-19 vaccines use stem cells from aborted babies. Father Ambrose answers essential questions on this important topic.

Q. ***Is it true that COVID-19 vaccines are created using organs of aborted infants?***

A. When we first heard about the experimentation on human embryos and foetuses many years ago, most of us were incredulous. Some still are. It is difficult to imagine the perversion of the human heart which justifies the use of vital organs of infants, even if the intention is to help others. To *use* another human being is nothing less than to instrumentalise that person, to turn them into an object to be *used* and discarded like a dirty rag. This is a grave thing to do to anyone, but the sin is compounded and increases in gravity when that person is innocent and defenceless. Even if we had *used* the body of only one infant that was spontaneously aborted, it would be a grave injustice.

The Eugenics movement which dawned in the 1920s oversaw the forced institutionalisation and sterilisation of the 'feebleminded' and made medical experimentation on human beings 'acceptable'.[1] Following this and well into the 1970s, organ harvesting on live foetuses of gestational ages of 3-4 months was not uncommon.[2]

To grasp the gravity of the use of aborted foetal cells in the medical field, it is necessary to be aware of the steps required to arrive at a 'successful' outcome. The sanitised idea that the development of the cells came from one female infant in 1973 in a wholly isolated incident is misleading, for the very nature of the scientific method involves performing experiments repeatedly until a successful outcome is achieved.

The currently available COVID-19 vaccines utilise foetal stem cells (a parent cell that can keep reproducing) in either their production (by using them as a container to culture the viruses) and/or in their testing (the vaccines are then tested on these cells to elicit safety and response on a cellular level). The majority of foetal stem cells are of the HEK-293 cell line (HEK stands for Human Embryonic Kidney, and 293 indicates the number of experiments required prior to the successful isolation of the cell line). The workbook of the scientist for HEK-293 is not public, so the true number of foetuses used has not been confirmed. It is thought to be likely to be over 100 when compared to similar cell lines. For example, there were numerous foetuses used in the extraction of the cell line denoted by the number -38

(WI-38)[3] and 9 foetuses in the lead-up to the development of a cell line denoted by the number -2 (walvax-2).

Another misconception is that organs are salvaged after the abortion. Although this is in itself a heinous crime, the harvesting of organs for medical research is far more premeditated. The following is an excerpt from a 2015 publication in a medical journal regarding the development of a new foetal cell line (walvax-2): 'The fetal material was provided by the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology of Yunnan Hospital, with legal and ethical agreements from the donator. Before the study, we made strict and comprehensive inclusion criteria in order to guarantee a high-quality cell strain: 1) gestational age 2 to 4 months; 2) induction of labor with the water bag method; 3) the parent's career should not involve contact with chemicals and radiation; 4) both parents are in good health without neoplastic and genetic diseases, and with no history of human tissue or organ transplantation in the families traced for 3 generations; and 5) no infectious diseases. The tissues from the freshly aborted fetuses were immediately sent to the laboratory for the preparation of the cells.'[4]

In simple language: several infants of a gestational age of 2-4 months were screened, picked for their gender, race and pristine medical history. The date of the abortion is chosen, labour is induced, organs are extracted while the child is alive (denoted by the word 'fresh'), then transported. The cause of death is the removal of the organs by vivisection. The method described above in 2015 is virtually unchanged from the method of organ harvesting in 1952.[5]

In a university application for $2.3 million funding for foetal harvesting in 2016, the method used to guarantee the 'freshness' of foetal kidneys is described: 'Labour induction will be used to obtain the tissue. We record the warm ischemic time on our samples and take steps to keep it at a minimum to ensure the highest quality biological specimens. We get feedback from our users and utilize this feedback to tailor our collection processes on a case-by-case basis to maximize the needs of investigators.'[6] The expression 'warm ischaemia time' refers to the time that the organ remains at body temperature after its blood supply has been cut.[7] In simple language, this refers to the foetus being delivered alive, and the organs extracted *with no anaesthesia* while the heart is still beating and blood is circulating. This part is crucial to ensure viability of the organs.

In any court of law, a crime that used such methods would be called pre-meditated mass murder and torture. It cries to Heaven for vengeance. It is so grave that no reason whatsoever can ever justify it. Up to here, it is to be hoped that all those who bear the name of Christian will be in agreement. It is a clear violation of the Fifth Commandment, *Thou shalt not kill.*

What's more, Church teaching has consistently and systematically condemned abortion, in all its forms - whether therapeutic or for science. Pope Pius XII, in his famous address to midwives, left no doubt about the matter: 'The life of an innocent person is sacrosanct, and any direct attempt or aggression against it is a violation of one of the fundamental laws without which secure human society is impossible. … Never forget this: there rises above every human law and above every "indication" the faultless law of God'[8].

Q. Agreed, but the baby was going to be aborted anyway. Once it's dead, can't we use its body?

There is only one moral thing to do with all these body remains, and that is to bury them with dignity and honour as having been the body of an immortal soul. Any *use* of these remains, for any reason whatsoever, is a grave violation of the moral law. It is not permissible to perform any kind of experiment on these remains, even under the pretext of saving other lives. It is grievously offensive to God to allow the performance of any such experiment, for such a sin is comparable to cannibalism, which is the *use* of human flesh for the purpose of nourishing other human flesh.

Pope John Paul II made it clear that experimentation on human beings is wrong: 'No circumstance, no purpose, no law whatsoever can ever make licit an act which is intrinsically illicit, since it is contrary to the Law of God which is written in every human heart, knowable by reason itself, and proclaimed by the Church. This evaluation of the morality of abortion is to be applied also to the recent forms of intervention on human embryos which, although carried out for purposes legitimate in themselves, inevitably involve the killing of those embryos. This is the case with experimentation on embryos, which is becoming increasingly widespread in the field of biomedical research and is legally permitted in some countries.... [T]he use of human embryos or foetuses as an object of experimentation constitutes a crime against their dignity as human beings who have a right to the same respect owed to a child once born, just as to every person. This moral condemnation also regards procedures that exploit living human embryos and foetuses – sometimes specifically "produced" for this purpose by in vitro fertilisation - either to be used as "biological material" or as providers of organs or tissue for transplants in the treatment of certain diseases. The killing of innocent human creatures, even if carried out to help others, constitutes an absolutely unacceptable act'.[9]

Q. ***But isn't the situation different with the medicines and vaccines that have already been produced from those stem cells, after the fact?***

The Holy See has addressed this question on a number of occasions, the most recent being in December 2020, when the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith published a 'Note on the morality of using some anti-COVID-19 vaccines' (hereafter referred to simply as 'Note').[10] Basing itself on the principle that such an action would not be a participation in the sin of abortion, but only a form of cooperation that is passive, material and remote, the Note declares such cooperation to be licit, on certain conditions. These conditions, as we shall see, have been largely overlooked if not completely ignored.

Q. ***What are the conditions required to make the use of COVID-19 vaccines (and other abortion tainted products) morally permissible?***

A. A careful reading of the Note reveals no less than seven conditions for the licit use of the COVID-19 vaccines:

1) there must be a grave danger that requires recourse to the vaccines;

2) there must be no other effective means of dealing with the virus;

3) there must be no ethical vaccines available;

4) the vaccines must be safe;

5) the vaccines must be effective;

6) one must voice one's opposition to the procedure by which the vaccine was made possible;

7) vaccination must be voluntary, without coercion.

Let us examine these conditions, keeping in mind that if any one of these conditions is absent, then the recourse to these vaccines (or products) is illicit.

Condition 1 - Grave Danger - It is not hard to prove that the gravity of COVID-19 has been overstated on every continent, and lockdowns have been excessive, harmful and with little scientific basis.[11] The initial fears and repressive measures have given many the impression that we were dealing with a true pandemic with the potential to wipe out all of humanity. This was a major factor in the Holy See's decision to allow the use of the vaccines. However, it is a matter of public record that the situation is not and has never been as serious as it is made out to be. As a matter of fact, the consistent median infection fatality rate (IFR) has been a mere 0.05% in the general population globally.[12]

Condition 2 - Lack of Alternatives – There are many highly effective treatment protocols of COVID-19,[13] backed up by robust data, published by leading professors, doctors and scientists around the world.[14] If these treatments had not been suppressed, there would have been virtually no deaths at all from the virus as evidenced by the state of Uttar Pradesh in northern India (20 million people) which has a vaccination rate of 5% and only 100 cases in total,[15] compared to first world countries such as Israel with a vaccination rate of 85% and an estimated daily count of 5000 cases and 30 deaths. Medical professionals globally are decrying the suppression of highly effective treatments in Western countries as a violation of human rights and are highlighting that the driving force behind the vaccine mandates is the profit of pharmaceutical companies.[16]

Condition 3 - Lack of Ethical Vaccines - A number of ethically produced vaccines are being developed. Unfortunately, almost all governments have favoured the development of those which use foetal cell lines. There are no doubt some major financial interests here. We must ask, however, whether a disease that has a global median survival rate of 99.95% requires a vaccine at all, particularly when much of the evidence points to excellent treatment outcomes with existing medication.

Condition 4 - Safety - Up to now, the vaccines have been demonstrably unsafe with a disproportionate risk of death from the vaccine itself. In the US alone in a period of 11 months there have been over 18,000 reported deaths and 1.6 million adverse events.[17] In Australia, the deaths in 2021 attributed to vaccines have virtually equalled the deaths by COVID-19.[18] In the same country, the rollout among young adults is notably causing pericarditis/myocarditis, (inflammation of the heart that can potentially lead to heart failure and life-long dependence on medication or death) with a total of 1100 cases in 10 months.[19] Previous vaccines have been withdrawn after a total of 50 deaths worldwide.

Condition 5 - Efficacy of Vaccines - It is impossible to ascertain concretely at this stage the effectiveness of the vaccines given they remain entirely experimental and constitute an active clinical trial.[20] However, data that has been gathered from countries

like Israel shows unimpressive efficacy of the vaccines, often veiled in misleading ways when communicated to the public.[21] Most recently, a study across 68 countries concludes that present vaccination is not effective in reducing COVID-19 cases and that public health measures need to be reviewed.[22]

Condition 6 - Public Opposition - It is a sad fact that one almost never hears of any such voice being raised, especially from the Holy See and the Bishops' Conferences. Given the enormity of the crime involved in harvesting and exploiting organs from infants, even if all the other conditions had been fulfilled, we have every right to expect from our Bishops a united, consistent and strong demand that ethical alternatives be promptly made available, and that an end be put to the trafficking of human lives. Regarding this duty, the Pontifical Academy for Life states: 'Doctors and fathers of families have a duty to take recourse to alternative vaccines (if they exist), putting pressure on the political authorities and health systems so that other vaccines without moral problems become available. They should take recourse, if necessary, to the use of conscientious objection with regard to the use of vaccines produced by means of cell lines of aborted human foetal origin. Equally, they should oppose by all means (in writing, through the various associations, mass media, etc.) the vaccines which do not yet have morally acceptable alternatives, creating pressure so that alternative vaccines are prepared, which are not connected with the abortion of a human foetus, and requesting rigorous legal control of the pharmaceutical industry producers... In any case, there remains a moral duty to continue to fight and to employ every lawful means in order to make life difficult for the pharmaceutical industries which act unscrupulously and unethically.'

Some have also argued, quite convincingly, that the Holy See's permission to use these vaccines has actually increased world-wide the demand for more experimentation on foetal tissue, thereby encouraging the ongoing industrialisation of human remains. This demand is demonstrably visible in medical journals advocating the use of testing of new COVID-19 vaccines, not just on the HEK-293 cell lines, but also on 'humanised mice' and 'lung only mice'.[23] This term refers to laboratory mice which have organs grafted onto them from foetuses aged 2-5 months (according to the method of extraction described above). These 'humanised mice' have already been extensively funded and official documents state that the foetuses, some up to 6 months gestation, were bought for $12,000 per box. Most of the purchases (for grafting onto mice) were for intact thymuses and livers which were promptly shipped - 'fresh; on wet ice'.[24]

When we imagine what effect an adamant 'No' from the Holy See and the Bishops could have had, we are led to ask some very troubling questions about who was really behind this decision and why our hierarchy has been so culpably cowardly.

Condition 7 - No Mandates or Coercion – The draconian measures by governments globally to mandate vaccines that are still in a clinical trial are in direct contravention of international agreements and indeed of the most fundamental principles of the Natural Law. Unfortunately, many doctors themselves seem to have set aside the requirement of guaranteeing their patients the right to informed consent and the right to refuse. There are however

thousands of doctors who are protesting this and are publicly calling out the current events in the medical field as 'crimes against humanity'[25]. These voices are being categorically censored.

On this topic, the Nuremberg Code (1947) stipulates that for human experimentation 'the voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision'. Any coercion to receive a vaccine not fully tested violates this code. This is something that all health care professionals should consider very carefully, for during the Nuremberg trials, it was made clear that no one may refer a decision of conscience to any superior. When human life is at stake, each person has the grave obligation to find out the facts for himself and to obey the Natural Law at all times. It is to be feared that many of our present-day leaders, both in the state and in the Church, are guilty of complicity that may be condemned in the not-too-distant future. History never forgets nor does it pardon this sort of crime.

Given all this, we can safely conclude that the conditions laid out by the Congregation in its Note having not been met, it is not licit to receive the presently available COVID-19 vaccines.

Q. Is then the Holy See's position, correct?

The principle of material, passive, remote cooperation is well-known in moral theology and stands up to scrutiny. It is very debatable whether or not it applies in this case. One can certainly argue, without prejudice to the prerogatives of the Holy See, that the Note does not properly apply the principle in this case for the following five reasons: 1) it presupposes that the vaccines actually give immunity from the virus, but we know now that this is not the case;[26,27] 2) it does not take into account the proportionality between presumed benefits and adverse side-effects;[28] 3) it fails to take into consideration the exceptional gravity of the matter: the absolute inviolability of an innocent human body and the necessary, even if remote, connection with the gravely immoral *use* of another human to create the vaccine; 4) by giving its blessing to the use of the vaccine in certain cases, it has opened the door to the proliferation of foetal experimentation; 5) finally, it argues on original analysis that this was to be a pandemic of catastrophic proportions with no effective treatment - both of which have been categorically refuted. The very least one can say is that the Note requires revision.

Q. *Does this mean that those who have received the vaccine have committed a mortal sin?*

Anyone who has received a vaccine that was made possible thanks to the abuse of an innocent infant is marked in their flesh by the abuse of that infant, regardless of their intentions. This being said, even if in itself it is gravely immoral to have recourse to such vaccines, due to the social pressure and the encouragements of the hierarchy, it would seem that in most cases, moral culpability for the average lay person is diminished if not removed altogether. Those who have

received the vaccine should, however, examine their conscience and ask themselves what exactly they knew at the time. If they knew nothing about the ethical issues, was this for lack of having taking the trouble to find out? Ignorance is sometimes culpable. However in those who have a duty to know (priests, doctors, government officials, judges…), it is *always* culpable. In any case, those who have already received one or more doses need to refrain from receiving any 'boosters'.

Q. *So we must stand by our conscience and refuse, even if our superiors, priests or doctors encourage us to get vaccinated?*

On the duty to obey conscience there is ample matter in the Church's tradition. St John Henry Newman has been, in modern times, the best-known defender of the rights and duties of conscience: 'Conscience,' he writes 'is not a long-sighted selfishness, nor a desire to be consistent with oneself; but it is a messenger from Him, who, both in nature and in grace, speaks to us behind a veil, and teaches and rules us by His representatives. Conscience is the aboriginal Vicar of Christ, a prophet in its informations, a monarch in its peremptoriness, a priest in its blessings and anathemas, and, even though the eternal priesthood throughout the Church could cease to be, in it the sacerdotal principle would remain and would have a sway'.[29] The reason for this, St Bonaventure teaches, is that 'conscience is like God's herald and messenger; it does not command things on its own authority, but commands them as coming from God's authority, like a herald when he proclaims the edict of the king. This is why conscience has binding force'.[30]

This point is of such great importance that I believe it my duty to exhort everyone, especially bishops, priests, politicians and doctors, to be mindful that they are in grave spiritual danger if they use any kind of moral persuasion to encourage the reception of these vaccines, for in doing so, not only are they running the terrible risk of having deaths and injuries on their conscience, but they are also abusing the consciences of those whose rights they should be defending. It remains gravely scandalous that to this day, very few pastors have taken the public defence of the rights of conscience in this matter, and I call upon them today to do so. "A human being must always obey the certain judgment of his conscience. If he were deliberately to act against it, he would condemn himself" (*Catechism of the Catholic Church,* 1790).

A final word to my confrere priests and moral theologians: In the days of Paul VI and John Paul II, many in our ranks rejected their teachings on abortion and contraception in the name of a false notion of the autonomy of conscience. Today, some of them are telling us that we cannot put conscience forwards as a valid reason for refusing vaccines, but we must 'embrace the vision of Pope Francis'. We should not be surprised that so many Catholics will have nothing to do with such rhetoric, and instead choose to follow their reason, their conscience and their *sensus fidei.* Many Catholics feel betrayed when they see so many of the clergy appearing to side with the agenda of a force that is actively promoting the industrialisation of the human body through desecration and murder of the innocent – either through direct complicity, wilful blindness or cowardly silence.

Let the brave Bishops of Kazakhstan have the final word: 'More than ever, we need the spirit of the confessors and martyrs who avoided the slightest suspicion of collaboration with the evil of their own age. Some churchmen in our day reassure the faithful by affirming that receiving a COVID-19 vaccine derived from the cell lines of an aborted child is morally licit if an alternative is not available. They justify their assertion on the basis of "material and remote cooperation" with evil. Such affirmations are extremely anti-pastoral and counterproductive, especially when one considers the increasingly apocalyptic character of the abortion industry, and the inhuman nature of some biomedical research and embryonic technology. Now more than ever, Catholics categorically cannot encourage and promote the sin of abortion, even in the slightest, by accepting these vaccines. Therefore, as Successors of the Apostles and Shepherds responsible for the eternal salvation of souls, we consider it impossible to be silent and maintain an ambiguous attitude regarding our duty to resist with "maximum of determination" (Pope John Paul II) against the "unspeakable crime" (II Vatican Council, *Gaudium et Spes,* 51*)* of abortion'.[31]

Father Ambrose
10 November 2021

PRUDENCE AND 'VACCINES'

Prudence is the mother of all the other virtues. We all need it, but none more than priests, doctors and politicians, especially when it comes to moral questions linked to the COVID-19 'vaccines'. Father Ambrose explains.

All important decisions in life should be guided by prudence. With it we resolve on a course of action in accordance with our rational nature. Without it we can make some very big, even fatal, mistakes. This is true in questions concerning our state in life, our career, our family, and also our health. At the moment, there is a very serious question concerning whether or not to get vaccinated.

Q. *Doesn't prudence demand we do what our government says is the right thing?*

The general narrative created by our governments, thanks to the all-powerful media, goes something like this:

1) SARS-CoV-2 is a virus that causes a highly transmissible deadly disease known as COVID-19 which has created a state of pandemic throughout the world and already killed millions of people.

2) Vaccination is the only way of preventing spread of the virus and keeping us all safe.

3) If we care about saving lives, we have a moral obligation to receive experimental 'vaccines' which our governments assure us are safe and effective.

4) Anyone who rejects or alters these premises is deemed to be dangerous to society, and is liable to prosecution.

Q. *Is this narrative substantiated by the facts?*

Article 1 in this series "Conscience and vaccines"[32] explores the evidence disputing the three key points above which fuel the vaccination drive, namely the median global infection fatality rate (IFR) of 0.05%[33] and the lack of efficacy or safety of current 'vaccines'.[34]

The fourth point however remains the most concerning aspect of the 'pandemic' with its censorship of debate, even that coming from the most highly qualified in the relevant science, and the swift silencing of any dissenting voices or opposition. This is evidenced by the constant 'fact checking' on web browsers/social media, the removal of medical journal articles[35] and the character assassination and 'cancelling' of prominent medical voices[36] who are critics of the COVID-19 vaccine narrative.

This unprecedented censorship has led thousands of doctors to urgently form global networks[37] which call into question the ethics and the science behind the 'vaccinations'[38], and condemn pharmaceutical influence over politics, the medical profession and good health care. They are also calling out the suppression of highly safe and effective treatments in Western countries. These networks have proclaimed in unison that 'these policies may actually constitute crimes against humanity'[39].

The particular aspects of the gene therapy[40] vaccines that are of concern for high level experts in the fields of virology, immunology and vaccine development are their ability to facilitate:

1) the spread of disease by highly virulent escape mutant variants causing an increase of cases, and likely leading to ADE (Antibody Dependent Enhancement)[41], demonstrated in every past animal study of coronavirus 'vaccines'[42].

2) general immune suppression[43] leading to an increase of auto-immune diseases and cancers[44];

3) an increase in vascular system disorders

(heart attacks, strokes, clots) caused by the biologically active spike protein[45] lodging in the lining of the blood vessels causing micro-clots (endothelial damage[46]). This is demonstrable with the sharp increase of myocarditis and pericarditis cases in young adults. In older adults, it may manifest as heart attacks, strokes, kidney and heart failure (caused by accumulation of spike proteins).[47]

4) the weaponising of the virus for the realisation of plausible ulterior motives. [48]

The notion of ulterior motives shall be dealt with in a future article. For the moment, let's limit ourselves to exploring prudence and its integral parts in relation to the medical aspects of a vaccination with an unknown potential.

Q. ***What is the virtue of prudence and its relevance to this situation?***

A. Prudence is the cardinal virtue by which we discern which things are to be done and which are to be omitted. Three different but complementary acts go into making up a prudential act:

1) Take counsel and deliberate;

2) Come to a decision;

3) Act upon it.

When we know something needs to be done, prudence also helps us discern how and when to do it. In the deliberative stage, the virtue of prudence is helped by what we call its 'integral parts', which are good habits that allow the virtue to exercise its full potential. The integral parts of prudence are: memory, foresight, caution, circumspection, understanding, shrewdness, docility, reason. Let's have a look at them one by one. This will help us come to a prudential decision about vaccination.

Memory (*Memoria*) brings to our mind the right things pertaining to the action we have to perform and its circumstances. Experience of the past allows us to judge with sufficient probability what we need to do now, and consequently a good memory is a most powerful auxiliary to the virtue of prudence. People with lots of experience tend to be more prudent, for they have seen and heard many things.

For medical treatment to be deemed prudential, it is necessary that it be tested over a long period of time to ensure its safety and efficacy. This allows the memory to dig deep into that experience and make judgments that will help do the right thing. A practical exercise in memory would be to recall the infamous Thalidomide Scandal of the 1950s and early 1960s, familiar to medical professionals. Thalidomide was a drug that was hastily rolled out following incomplete observations. It was deemed safe for all to take, including pregnant women, although there were no studies done on the latter, nor even any long-term data on humans. The drug was initially marketed in Germany under the trade name Contergan, and then allowed in 46 countries under many different trade names. It would be five years and 10,000 affected babies later (half of whom died, and the other born severely disabled) that the link was finally made between birth defects and the ingestion of thalidomide. Finally, the drug was withdrawn from distribution.[49]

This grave error caused a global scandal that forced both government and medical bodies to change the ways drugs were tested, approved and marketed, and gave rise to many of the pharmacovigilance strategies in place to this day. The Yellow Card system (for adverse events) was set up in the UK and any drug that was marketed to pregnant women had to provide robust evidence of its safety during pregnancy. The FDA pharmacologist, Frances Oldham Kelsey, was awarded a Presidential award in the USA for blocking the sale of thalidomide in that country – she did so after hearing of a handful of cases of severe adverse events.

Seventy years later, on a far wider scale, following the reports of 18,500 deaths in the US[50], 13,000 deaths in the UK[51] and 27 European union countries[52] and with a combined 3 million adverse effects in the UK, EU and US, over a period of only 11 months – we still have the 'emergency use' and even mandating of gene therapy 'vaccines' marketed to prevent COVID-19 that are still part of an active clinical trial not due to end for another three years, with no demonstrable

safety data on the general population, let alone on children and pregnant women. It is worth noting that the above numbers are extremely conservative estimates, as it is well known in the field of pharmacovigilance that only 1-10% of adverse reactions (including deaths) are reported due to the tedious process involved for families and physicians.[53]

Furthermore, we have the active censoring and character assassination of many eminent professionals across all continents who are flagging the safety concerns and calling for the immediate cessation of the vaccine rollout. One such expert, Dr Tess Lawrie, founder of the BIRD (British Ivermectin Recommendation Development) group in the UK and a former consultant to the WHO, concludes in a letter to the UK Medicines board: 'Urgent independent expert evaluation and discussion is required to assess whether the novel vaccines may be causing gene mutations among recipients, as suggested by the occurrence of usually extremely rare genetic disorders. The MHRA (Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency) now has more than enough evidence on the Yellow Card system to declare the COVID-19 'vaccines' unsafe for use in humans. Preparation should be made to scale up humanitarian efforts to assist those harmed by the COVID-19 'vaccines' and to anticipate and ameliorate medium to longer term effects'.[54]

Foresight (*Providentia*) is the ability to visualise future outcomes of actions based upon past experience: one cannot be provident for the future unless one has learned from the past. We can thus see how foresight is linked with memory.

Anyone aware of the thalidomide scandal cannot fail to see the parallel dangers and risks – indeed in this case on a much larger scale – of the unbridled use of experimental drugs, particularly gene therapies. The knowledge of what happened then helps us chart a course that would avoid similar or even more serious calamities in the future. Unfortunately, the number of deaths and injuries already recorded proves that there is little foresight in those who are making the decisions for us. Even if the majority of people vaccinated do not have immediate adverse effects, we must ask the question of what possible and unknown outcomes we will be seeing in the future with the application of untested genetic technology on all age groups, including pregnant women and children during their neurologically and hormonally sensitive developmental years.

For example, when we consider females both young and old experiencing severe menstrual bleeding post vaccination[55], it is of little wonder why scientists and doctors are warning against epigenetic reproductive effects that may not manifest immediately or in the first generation.[56] In a legal challenge to the European Medicines Agency, Dr Michael Yeadon, former chief scientist of Pfizer, admonishes: 'The mRNA vaccine triggers the body to produce antibodies against the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, and spike proteins in turn contain syncytin-homologous proteins that are essential for the formation of placenta. If a woman's immune system starts reacting against syncytin-1, then there is the possibility she could become infertile. This is an issue that none of the vaccine studies is looking at specifically. Mass vaccinating women of childbearing age against COVID-19 could potentially have the devastating consequence of causing mass infertility if the vaccine triggers an immune reaction against syncytin-1".[57]

Furthermore, an understanding of epigenetic – the influence of external factors on the expression of our genes – is critical and currently lacking. The possibility that the injected mRNA (which has the instructions to create spike proteins) via an enzymatic process can penetrate the nucleus of the cells where the DNA is located and can ultimately insert itself into the DNA, cannot be definitively excluded. There is already evidence that this very process, which researchers did not anticipate, is occurring with the spike protein.[58] What this means, in simple language, if this insertion occurs to the egg and sperm, there is a real potential for these vaccines to alter the human genome, forever.

Caution (*Cautio*) makes use of past knowledge to avoid impediments and evils in the future. The cautious person is very careful so that no exterior obstacles come to vitiate or hinder an act of virtue, for example, by causing unwanted damage of any kind. This is a part of prudence that is most particularly important for doctors. Having people's lives in their hands, they must be very cautious in the means they propose to heal or prevent illness. It is not enough to take action that *might* work. Indeed, the very first principle in medicine is: *Primum non nocere – first of all, do no harm.* Caution helps do just that. This might also entail renouncing what one thought was a safe course of action when it becomes obvious that it was not.

In our present situation, caution reminds us of the apparent lack of scientific method involved in the development of the current 'vaccines', or the quasi-religious zeal involved in promoting them; both of these should set off alarm bells. In the following quote, Dr Robert Malone, co-inventor of mRNA technology, industrial scientist, medical doctor and clinical immunologist with extensive experience at high-level government and pharmaceutical regulatory bodies, describes how caution has been conspicuously absent:

'The regulatory agencies of the world allowed Pfizer to proceed with human trials and then EUA (Emergency Use Authorization) with a set of data that is grossly incomplete that didn't even meet the minimum standards of what is normally required for safety toxicology and genotoxicity and reproductive toxicity testing. The appearance is that they were allowed to cobble together information that they had obtained from other RNAs and other vaccines in lieu of doing other studies. They were allowed to proceed on the basis of inadequate information. It is profoundly demoralising and it is profoundly corrupt. I can't explain it any other way. The norms I have been trained for years of my professional life.... and then none of the rules matter. The rules of bioethics, they've completely disregarded. These rules go back to the Nuremberg trials. What I see is so profoundly disturbing to me. I'm now to the point where my point of view is that the FDA and the CDC are essentially acting outside any judicial restraint. They don't care what their standard rules are. They will do whatever they want to do. A lot [of] it seems to be driven by what Dr Fauci's personal beliefs are. And because of the legislation that was put in place at the start of the outbreak – I don't know whether they can be held accountable – as they may be ex-judicial now'.[59]

Dr Malone's concerns regarding Pfizer in particular have been echoed by Dr Michael Yeadon as well as by current Pfizer researchers who recently revealed the 'unprecedented serious lack of data integrity' within the trials.[60] Pfizer is the main vaccine of choice for those under 50 and has been approved for and rolled out for use in children as young as five.

In addition, there is another, even more important consideration, which forbids us from dismissing serious evidence against the 'vaccinations', namely that *the complete ingredient list is not disclosed.*[61] This is partly due to the drugs being experimental, but also due to the patents. This is unprecedented in medical history – the administration of a drug whose ingredients are not completely known even to the doctors and nurses administering them, which then of course obliterates the notion of informed consent.

Circumspection (*Circumspectio)* is closely connected with caution. It is the disposition to keep track of the circumstances surrounding the situation under consideration. It is the capacity to look around oneself, not to be overly absorbed in one's own research and findings, but attentive to those of others, to current events, to demonstrable facts. A given course of action might be good in itself, but not in these particular circumstances. A given piece of information might be at odds with my research, but I must consider it, for I may have been wrong.

Being circumspect connects the dots and obliges us to ask some more hard questions: Why is a dubious chemical immunity that is brief – lasting only up to 200 days and then even going into negative immunity with the

possibility of a pseudo-AIDs syndrome –, being preferred to natural immunity which is by far superior?[62] Why have the pharmaceutical companies been indemnified from all liability? Why are so many medical professionals ready to lose their jobs and livelihood, or even die for the cause, rather than get vaccinated? Why are medical journals censoring and retracting studies which demonstrate the harm of the 'vaccines'?[63] Why the rush to get *everyone in the world* vaccinated with experimental 'vaccines' against a disease with a survival rate of 99.95%? Why are children, who are not at risk, being forced to get vaccinated[64]? Why are pregnant women, who have always been excluded from such experiments, being encouraged to get the jab? Why do we have young, elite athletes dying suddenly shortly after receiving a 'vaccine'?[65] What is going on here?

When we look back at the last forced human experimentation partnered with manipulated social order in a Western Country – the Nazi-controlled period in Germany – we should feel inclined to be more circumspect. Although many are quick to blast such comparisons as 'conspiracy theory', we really cannot write this off too quickly as a theory when there are ample warning signs that it is much more fact than theory. The fear campaigns[66], segregation and a two-tiered society based on 'health' traits, the building of quarantine camps[67], the demonising of the objectors, particularly experts, as 'antivaxxers', and in many countries the denial of healthcare to certain groups (in this case the unvaccinated), all have their equivalent in that dark period of history. As Dr Vladimir Zelenko, creator of the highly successful hydroxychloroquine protocol for COVID-19, stated: 'When it started to rain, Noah was no longer a theorist'. Furthermore, there is a misconception that the program implemented by the Nazis was an isolated delirium of an Austrian born madman. In fact, human experimentation and eugenics was truly perfected in the United States (particularly California) with the Rockefeller Institute funding many of the early Eugenics programs which were then adopted and implemented in Nazi Germany.[68]

Understanding (*Intellectus*) is the ability to grasp practical principles and the nature of various situations – it's what we call common sense. It is a fact of experience that people who hold degrees are not necessarily gifted with this kind of understanding. They might be capable of reciting facts learned from books, but when it comes to understanding the basics of a given situation, they can easily be deluded and fail to see the forest for the trees, especially when the passion of their own theories can easily blind them. Often, all it takes to see through deceitful propaganda is good common sense. One practical point which understanding resolves quickly is the use of demonstrably safe and effective treatments of COVID-19, such as ivermectin,[69] hydroxychloroquine,[70] Vitamin C, D,[71] Zinc, Quercetin etc. Why this rush for 'vaccines' generated via use of aborted foetal cells when practical results documented by numerous physicians demonstrate there are effective and inexpensive treatments?[72] There is a lack of common sense in all this.

Shrewdness (*Solertia*) is what we would call quickness at discerning the means to an end. Some people are shrewd by nature; they quickly find the right answer or course of action in a given situation. Others pick up the habit by lots of practical exercise, trial and error. By gathering the congruent pieces of information, a shrewd person would not fail to grasp that the vaccination drive strongly suggests the 'pandemic' is being hijacked for purposes other than health. Upon reading of the 'Lockstep Scenario'[73] in the 2010 Rockefeller Foundation convention documents – the same Rockefeller foundation that was the primary financier[74] of the eugenics drive in Germany and the USA – titled *Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development*, which spells out in perfect precision the events of the last 20 months, including the implementation of biometric passes – a shrewd person would ask quite rightly: has this scenario been planned as a means to another end?

Docility (*Docilitas*) is the ability to take counsel from others and allow oneself to be

led by their better judgment. This interior disposition of promptitude in learning is most necessary for acquiring the virtue of prudence, the reason being that prudence concerns actions in particular situations which are so diversified as to be nearly infinite, such that no one man can know them all. Conversely, the lack of capacity to listen is a sign of imprudence. Who could deny that we see an astounding lack of docility today when governments, media and the public health medical bureaucrats ignore and censor the pleas of pioneering scientists and doctors, particularly experts in the treatment of COVID-19[75] or scientists/virologists/immunologists[76] whose specialty lies in the field of novel gene technology and vaccine development, who are risking their livelihoods and reputations to warn us daily about the number of injuries and deaths, and the facilitation of more virulent disease?

Finally, **Reason** (*Ratio*) refers here to the ability to reflect about practical matters, sometimes in depth, and to apply universal practical principles in order to come to a judgment on a given situation. In-depth reflection brings up a lot of unanswered questions: is it rational to continue to oppress the world's population while ignoring proven medical and long-standing pandemic preparedness principles in favour of novel and unscientific ideas such as mask-wearing, social distancing and lockdown of the healthy[77]? The most vaccinated nations are those which continue to have escalating cases and deaths from COVID-19.[78] Yet, developing and Third World nations with vaccination rates as low as 5%, but open availability of ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine, have dropped their cases to a mere 100[79].

How can we, without a serious lack of prudence, continue pushing the 'vaccines' when we know these results? These are the questions a prudent person must ask. Nor is it an option to reply that our governments could not possibly want to harm us. Numerous governments have done just that in the course of the last century.[80] We must continue to ask the hard questions, at whatever personal risk to ourselves. The future of humanity may depend upon our having the courage to do so. Human beings are endowed universally with an intrinsic right to life and liberty. They are not guinea pigs. When a man no longer has any say over what is done with his body, he is by definition a slave. And when freedom is taken away, it is rarely recovered in a peaceful manner.

Q. *What conclusion can we draw from all this?*

If we summarise what we know from the cardinal virtue of prudence, we can point out the following: Since these 'vaccines' have been put onto the market after only superficial testings, there is no *memory* available to which we can refer. *Foresight* is not possible except with adequate long-term safety and toxicity data. Hasty marketing denotes a serious lack of *caution,* and the oppressive mandates beg the question of ulterior motives. Practical common sense (*reason* and *understanding*) makes it clear that the mandating of experimental drugs is a grave mistake. The whole process, combined with the suppression of highly effective treatment options which then allow the 'vaccines' to be used under 'Emergency Use Authorisation', reveals a frightening lack of *docility* towards the numerous brilliant members of the medical profession who are speaking out about the dangers of the 'vaccines'. *Shrewdness* and *circumspection* both tell us that in this case due diligence has not been done, and hint at a darker agenda at play.

In light of the above one can safely conclude that receiving any of the COVID-19 'vaccines' presently available is an imprudent decision.

Q. *Is this imprudence a serious sin?*

Every rational adult person has the duty to gather information and to make the right decisions that affect his/her life and those of others. There are several ways of sinning through lack of prudence:

1) by acting precipitately, without taking the time to consider the situation and ask the right questions;

2) by acting rashly and with too much confidence in one's own vision;

3) by thoughtlessness, not really caring enough to go through the labour of making an

informed decision;
4) by inconstancy, by not following through with what one perceived was the right course of action.
These actions against prudence are, in principle, venial sins, but if they result in grave harm to ourselves or others, they could be mortal sins. For example, if someone clearly perceives that the consequences could be serious, and nevertheless were to make a quick decision just to get it over with, they would be committing a mortal sin, because they would be accepting what they clearly see as possible grave consequences. Like the reckless driver overtaking with no visibility, they accept by their grave imprudence the real possibility of death. Or, the man playing Russian roulette: even if the shot is a blank, he has committed a mortal sin because he took his life into his own hands out of thoughtlessness or peer pressure.

Q. *But what about our livelihoods? Would it not be more prudent to take the jab, hope that we won't be adversely affected, and continue to provide for our families?*

The vaccination mandates pose a real problem of conscience for those whose livelihood depends on their profession, especially for those with large families. The decision will be a difficult one, and must be guided by prudence. Taking into consideration:
1) the conclusion of Article 1 in this series, which demonstrated that accepting these 'vaccines' in most cases is gravely sinful due to the derivation of the 'vaccines' from aborted foetuses and the lack of serious reasons that would justify material cooperation in that evil;[81]
2) the very real danger of death, serious injury, or total dependence on future boosters whose effects could be nothing short of disastrous;[82]
3) the high risk of various immunological phenomena[83] (such as ADE) or even a pseudo-AIDs syndrome, according to many serious virologists and doctors;
it would seem that even to maintain one's livelihood, it is gravely imprudent to take the jab.

Indeed, of what use is a dead or incapacitated father to his family? The risk seems to be disproportionate. While it is certainly permissible at times to take a risky course of action simply because otherwise we will die (like a surgeon who will attempt an extreme procedure when it is a matter of life or death), this hardly seems to be the case here. There are other ways of providing for basic needs, even though our quality of life might make us think that we cannot live without a thousand commodities. It is certainly not justifiable to take the jab just to keep the extra car or house, the paid holidays or the social and professional prestige…

The prudential course of action seems rather to plan for the future to sustain oneself by other means or in another profession. This may involve moving to another place, out in the country, where it is possible to actually grow and hunt food. This tactic has been consistently employed in times of impending persecution as far back as the Maccabees. This is all the more advisable today when life is dependent upon the very fragile provision of food imported from elsewhere. Prudent parents will ask themselves what a large city would be like if, for example, a lack of fuel were to make it impossible for the trucks to reach the stores. Imagine a single week without the thousands of trucks providing food? Wide scale famine is a very serious possibility today, and the only people who would survive are those living in the country.

The gravity of the situation requires a spirit of generosity and sacrifice which every Christian soul has a duty to pray and work for. More importantly still, a God-fearing person will place total trust in the Lord and His Blessed Mother. When one chooses to obey the voice of conscience and resist pressure, the Lord provides. *My children, behold the generations of men: and know ye that no one hath hoped in the Lord, and hath been confounded* (Eccli 2:11).

Father Ambrose
26 November 2021

The author is deeply grateful to the panel of medical professionals, particularly Dr E, Dr T, and Professor X, for their assistance in writing, editing and proofreading the technical medical aspects of this article in order to ensure the accuracy and veracity of medical statements and supporting literature.

CHARITY AND VACCINES

Having established that both conscience and prudence forbid the reception of COVID-19 vaccines, Father Ambrose now explains, especially for priests, why getting vaccinated is not the "loving thing to do".

If there is one adjective the common sentiment identifies with a good Christian, it is no doubt "loving". A good Christian, in imitation of Christ, seeks to love all, especially those in need. This objective notion of charity however, particularly in the current climate, is easily contorted into a subjective notion based on emotions and feelings. Over the last two years a number of attitudes that contravene basic medical principles and human rights have been promoted under the guise of a false charity – from wearing masks, to the lockdown of the healthy, the isolating of the sick at home until they deteriorate, and the abandonment of the elderly in order to 'protect them' – the list of 'loving things to do' grows longer. More recently the 'loving thing to do' is to get vaccinated – the rationale being that by doing so we are protecting the lives of others.

A number of prelates have exploited this noble Christian sentiment by ignoring objective moral and medical facts. If we truly love our neighbour, they tell us, we must leave behind our preferences, accept any disadvantages, and take the jab. Then we will be showing that we really care about others, for then we will be protecting them from a deadly virus. Some of these prelates even refer to a 'moral obligation' to take the vaccine. Conversely, the refusal to do so would would be proof of egotism and self-love, turning the other way and exposing others to risk. What are we to make of this? At face value, if one accepts the current narrative, it seems to make perfect sense.

However, St Paul tells us that it is not permissible to do evil so that good may come of it (cf Rm 3:8). This is a very important concept with vast consequences for the present question. In Article 1 of this series *Conscience and Vaccines*[84], we learned that all vaccines presently available have been developed from cell lines obtained by the vivisection and murder of a human foetus. The conclusion was that, even though a case can be made in certain extreme situations for an ethical use of such vaccines by what the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has called remote, material cooperation, the grave conditions required for this do not ordinarily exist and therefore one cannot in good conscience receive these vaccines.

In the second article of this series *Prudence and Vaccines*[85], we considered a number of other medical issues such as the startling lack of safety or efficacy of these vaccines – which in reality are properly termed gene therapies – and also their potential to facilitate and spread disease as well as permanently alter the human immune system (and other parts of the human

genome) at the genetic level. We also considered ethical issues around the grave violation of the Natural Law and the Nuremberg Code, and social issues around the creation of a two-tiered system of 'medical apartheid' which evokes comparisons with dark periods of history such as the segregation of Jews in Nazi Germany. The conclusion was that it is gravely imprudent to take the risk of receiving the vaccine.

We now arrive at considerations on the virtue of Charity which, in order to be authentic, must be based on objective truth. St Maximilian Kolbe, who died a victim of the Nazi ideology which began with methods of control very similar to those being enforced today, wrote: 'No one in the world can change Truth. What we can do and and should do is to seek truth and to serve it when we have found it. The real conflict is the inner conflict. Beyond armies of occupation and the hecatombs of extermination camps, there are two irreconcilable enemies in the depth of every soul: good and evil, sin and love. And what use are the victories on the battlefield if we ourselves are defeated in our innermost personal selves?' Keeping this background in mind, let us now turn to the queen of virtues, charity.

Q. First of all, what is charity, and is there an order to be observed in its practice?

A. As an infused virtue, charity inclines us to love God above all things in the same way as He loves Himself and to love all things that God loves in the same way that He loves them. God is to be loved first, above all things, and His commandments always take precedence over any other considerations, however urgent they might be: *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with thy whole mind. This is the greatest and the first commandment* (Mt 22:37-38). Committing a sin against God can never be tolerated in any circumstances, for to commit sin is to offend God and therefore it is to fail to love Him. *If you love me, keep my commandments,* Our Lord tells His apostles (Jn 14:15).

Second, one must love one's neighbour as one's self, which implies that love for oneself precedes love for neighbour. And the second is like to this: *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself* (Mt 22:39). To love neighbour is to love him as God loves him, and to want what is really good for him, namely what makes him a virtuous person and helps him save his soul.

Two very important consequences follow from this. The first is that to do for our neighbour anything that is sinful cannot be a true manifestation of love. The second is that it's not about doing things that make me feel good about myself, but things that really are of benefit to my neighbour. Since the notion of charity can be easily influenced by subjective feelings, it is essential to be attentive to the objective order of the good in order to ascertain whether or not an action is truly charitable. For example, Catholic parents whose baptised child intends to marry in a civil ceremony outside the Church may want to support their child's decision and attend the ceremony in order to 'keep the peace'. Objective charity, however, demands that these parents inform their child that they cannot attend the ceremony due to the demands of the moral law. This would of course cause emotional discomfort for both child and parents, but objectively speaking the parents are doing the loving thing because their action is putting the spiritual

welfare of their child first, sowing the seeds for their conversion and salvation.

The order of charity is always: God first, the salvation of my own soul, then the salvation of my neighbour's soul, and finally my own physical welfare and that of my neighbour. Since the needs of the soul take precedence, we should be prepared to sacrifice physical welfare for spiritual benefits, both for ourself and for our neighbour. This is precisely why we must never do anything that would lead our neighbour to sin, for if we truly love someone, then we will be concerned with helping them attain their supernatural end for which purely natural means are insufficient. Speaking the truth to souls tactfully and at the right moment is loving them in truth. It is truth that leads to freedom, and we should want for true freedom and love of God to be shared by those we love. In other words, one cannot show authentic love to someone and at the same time approve of what is objectively wrong.

Our life in this world is brief, lasting only a few years. Our soul will live forever, either eternally happy with God in heaven or eternally wretched in hell. There are no considerations of health of the body that are of any consequence when the soul is at stake. This is why, for example, a mother cannot abort her child even to preserve her own life, or a person cannot consent to euthanise their parent in order to put an end to their sufferings. To violate God's commandments would be a proof of a misguided love that puts ephemeral survival and comfort above eternal salvation.

Q. Why does taking the vaccine violate charity?

Given the mounting medical evidence and the knowledge of the moral issues surrounding the foetal cells, taking the jab and encouraging others to take it, far from being an act of love, clearly and objectively violates the most fundamental precept of charity. It violates love for God who said: *Thou shalt not kill.* It violates love for the baby whose organs made the vaccine possible. It violates love for one's own soul by sinning against conscience and against one's body. It violates the right of others to see in us a good example and not to be scandalised by us.

Q. In the article on Conscience, you explored the fact that the vaccines were generated and/or tested on cells procured from an aborted foetus. It was my understanding that receiving them only involved remote, material cooperation. Are you not contradicting the Holy See?

A. The aim of this article is not to contradict the Holy See, who is the supreme authority on this question, but to offer further reflection in order to demonstrate that the instructions given to date form only a partial view of the matter.[86] The confusion comes from not sufficiently considering what, in moral theology, we call the 'moral object' of the action which here is the taking of the vaccine. It is not so much about the original abortions, or the research performed on the dead foetuses, or the marketing of the medicines derived therefrom. All these actions are extremely grave, and we must make every effort to unmask the magnitude of the machine of evil we are involved in. This is why the horror of it was stressed in the first article. Too many people, even among priests and bishops, have grown accustomed to abortion that they need to have their consciences pricked.

The real problem from a strictly moral point of view lies precisely in the fact that, *however remote* the original abortion, or the laboratory research or the pharmaceutical marketing, might be in time and space, there is a *proximate link* between the recipient of the vaccine and the dead baby, that link being the residual components of the cell lines that belong to the baby and which the recipient is benefitting from in his own body thanks to the vaccine.[87]

In other terms, the moral object of taking a vaccine to protect one's health (this is a good moral object in itself) is vitiated by the circumstance that the vaccine came directly from the immoral abuse of an innocent person and includes something of that person. That is the precise problem which the Holy See has yet to address. In its note of 20 December 2020 it refers to 'formal cooperation with the abortion from which the cells used in production of the vaccines derive'. It does not consider the specific problem of the stolen matter that is in some way still present in the vaccine, and for which some form of restitution must be made.

Of course, one might bring up examples from manuals of moral theology concerning remote material cooperation. However, it can be argued that they do not apply, for the simple reason that this is an entirely new problem which demands a new answer. Never before have we been able to steal from a baby such vital elements that, due to their living efficaciousness, are used to (purportedly) furnish billions of people with the means of fighting a virus, and this for decades. Never before has it been possible to exploit a human being in this way. Institutional slavery is far behind. Even cannibalism is less grave than this, for when human flesh is consumed, it nourishes for but a short time. Here we have human remains that, after being abused in a laboratory, are now used – against the will of their owner – to serve indefinitely someone else's life. Such is the crux of the matter.

It is also important to consider that the reception of these gene therapy vaccines is an offence against charity for the other foetuses who will be murdered because of the vaccine industry which is being pushed forward by the present vaccines. This was explored in more detail in Article 1. It is not an assumption, but a reality proven by studies in contemporary medical journals, which affirm that drugs such as molnupiravir have been tested on 'Lung only mice' and calls for the testing of future COVID-19 vaccines on these same mice grafted with human foetal organs (who die from the vivisection and organ harvesting method). In other words, the very fact that the presently available vaccines are manufactured and/or tested through aborted foetal cells increases the demand for even more vaccines and medications of the kind. So not only is taking the jab a sin against the original infant who was murdered, but it also endangers many other babies who will die, offered like victims to Moloch, the bloodthirsty Canaanite god to whom were sacrificed human babies.[88]

The evil of using stem cells from aborted babies is much graver and vast in its implications than many wish to admit. Even though each person who receives the vaccine is not actively a part of them, nevertheless it is hard to think that they are entirely guiltless, since *de facto* they benefit from them. For priests, in particular, this is an extremely important consideration. How many sins are committed in the production and marketing of these vaccines? And who

benefits from these crimes? Let's enumerate them:

Past sins: Original abortions, vivisection on human beings, deprivation of both lives natural and supernatural (the baby cannot be baptised, which deprives it of eternal life and the vision of God[89]), torture, theft and usurpation of stolen organs, manipulation of body parts, desecration and violation of the child. **Present sins:** cooperation in the industrialisation of the human body, including marketing of pharmaceutical products. **Future sins** which will be committed because of the growing industry: encouraging the vicious circle of creating new foetal cell lines as well as the harvesting of foetal organs to graft onto laboratory mice ('Lung Only Mice' and 'Human Immune System' Mice), and thereby encouraging new and countless abortions. This might even reach the stage (if it has not already done so) of creating embryos in a lab just to be able to exploit them.

Q. Right, so taking the vaccine goes against conscience, prudence and charity. But many people are taking it in order to continue working to support others. Don't you think they are showing a lofty degree of love?

A. It is imperative in this situation, for priests and doctors in particular, to be aware of the objective truth versus subjective feelings. *Subjectively* many may feel they are showing love by accepting the vaccine in order to do noble things such as continuing to work and support others. *Objectively* speaking, such an action does not meet the requirements of the virtue of charity. It would be false charity, for true charity requires that we always obey God's sovereign law (in this case the 5th commandment) and be guided by prudence as demonstrated in Article 2. *If you love me, you will keep my commandments*, says Our Lord (Jn 14:15).

When we mention God's commandments, some might be inclined to recriminate against God, as if His demands were arbitrary. In reality, the commandments are not arbitrary. They correspond with our nature created in the image of God and are therefore a recipe for happiness. That is why St Thomas was able to write: 'Sin is nothing else than to stray from what is according to our nature'.[90] In other words, sin makes us miserable precisely because it is contrary to our nature created by God. This is remarkably summarised by the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (# 2059): 'The ten words (Ten Commandments)… belong to God's revelation of Himself and His glory. The gift of the Commandments is the gift of God Himself and His holy will. In making His will known, God reveals Himself to His people'.

Q. What about the principle of double effect which allows for doing something that could have a good and bad effect?

A. In the principle of double effect, the first requirement is that the action performed be, in itself, good or at least indifferent. As we have demonstrated, having recourse to tainted vaccines is in itself wrong, and therefore the principle does not apply here. One can never do something that is positively wrong so that good may come from it. For example, a priest cannot give Holy Communion to a public sinner who is a millionaire in order to get the donation he needs to build a school.

Q. Surely a priest who refuses the jab is just being self-centred and delicate with regard to his own health, especially if it involves him not being

able to directly perform certain duties?

A. This might be the case if there were no ethical objections to the vaccine itself and if only minor disadvantages were to be expected from the jab. However, objectively speaking it is not the case when we know the origin of the vaccine and the real danger it poses to health and even to life.

A priest cannot be reproached for refusing a treatment whose evil derivation he is aware of, and which is known to have caused many deaths and injuries. This is not being delicate, but prudent and having a proper love of self and others, for were something bad to happen to this priest because of the vaccine, others would suffer the loss. Besides, it would be tempting God to expect Him to protect us if we took a drug we knew to be disadvantageous to our health.

Up to now, a number of priests have been unaware of the extent of the depravity of what is currently occurring. However, given all the progress of harm done by the vaccines and the growing tyranny, it seems no longer possible for a priest to ignore what is really going on. If he is ignorant, it might be because he is so busy he hasn't even considered it. But if it's because he doesn't want to or is too afraid because of the social and hierarchical consequences, then it is a serious problem.

Q. Should not a priest, who knows the physical dangers of the vaccines, lay down his life for his faithful like a military chaplain at war and take the jab anyway with the hope of serving for some time the needs of souls?

A. A priest must sometimes take risks for his faithful and must even be prepared to expose his physical health for the souls of those in his charge. For example, if a parish priest happens to go by the burning house of one of his parishioners, he has a duty to risk his life in order to administer the sacraments to those who are trapped inside, assuming he has a chance of success. If we apply this principle here, it would seem that if the priest is going to lose his ministry for not being vaccinated, thus leaving many souls without the sacraments, he should take the risk and get the jab, hoping that it will do him no harm, either in the short or the long term. He might even recall the word of the Lord: *If they shall drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them* (Mk 16:18).

However, the comparison is not a valid one, for two reasons. Firstly, the objective evil origin of the vaccine remains, and as we have seen, one may never do something evil to obtain a good. Secondly, in the scenario of the burning house there is no other way for the faithful to receive the sacraments; this is not so with the administration of the sacraments in a parish. The principle reason for this is that there are other ways of making the ministry possible. Let's suppose a bishop removes a priest from his parish or even suspends him from ministry for refusal to get vaccinated and there is no one to replace him. The decision being contrary to both the Natural Law and the Divine Law, is unjust, and therefore without effect. The highest law in the Church is the salvation of souls, and compared to it everything else fades into the background. Canonical decisions that contradict the Natural and Divine Law are null and utterly void. This priest, therefore, can and must continue to serve the needs of the faithful, even if it has to be in their homes and without his bishop's approval.

The comparison with the war scenario where a priest risks his life to administer the sacraments to dying soldiers on the

battlefield also fails, because the chaplain is putting the spiritual needs of men above his physical health without involving himself in an illicit action. What's more, a soldier or military chaplain need not risk his life all the time. There are times and there are ways. Even soldiers hide and camouflage, and avoid going straight into danger.

This priest may think that he is acting heroically by putting his life on the line to be able to serve his people and save souls, and he may indeed be performing a meritorious action. He would however be doing something objectively wrong, and this could jeopardise his eternal salvation. Furthermore, a priest has a second point to consider, namely that his reception of the vaccine passively counsels others to follow his example.

Q. Didn't you say spiritual welfare trumps physical welfare? On that logic, shouldn't priests get vaccinated to at least give the last rites and sacraments?

A. This is a very tough call for priests. Being shut out of the hospital or the nursing home because he is not vaccinated is a grave injustice, one that will deeply pain the heart of a good priest. It is not surprising at all that many priests resolve this question in favour of undergoing the injustice and taking the jab. Again, if it were only a question of minor risks or inconvenience, the decision would be easy. However, again we are faced with two problems.

The first is that a priest cannot do something that is objectively wrong (take an abortion-tainted vaccine) in order to perform a charitable act. This is false charity. Furthermore, on a medical and prudential level, the growing evidence and the ever-greater number of doctors and scientists pleading for the immediate cessation of the vaccine rollout proves of itself that we are not dealing here with minor inconveniences. Many have died and many others have been gravely injured. The long-term effects are still unknown. In this context, no one can blindly trust our politicians and pharmaceutical companies, the priest less than anyone else. It's not in the short term but in the long term that we need to consider the importance of the presence of the priest.

Q. So are you saying they just have to sit there and allow the faithful to die like animals without the sacraments? Isn't that uncharitable?

A. A good priest will never 'sit there' when someone is in need. If the priest has faith, he will see miracles happen, doors open. Even if he does not, there is still much he can do. He should, first of all, forewarn all parishioners that he may be denied entrance into the hospital or nursing home. This will give the faithful greater incentive to be prepared at all times. If someone does require hospitalisation, they need to be told to *ring the priest first* before the ambulance so that they can receive the sacraments *before* going to the hospital. For nursing homes, it is a matter of being astute. Most elderly persons can be taken out for a few hours, and during this time the family can organise the visit of a priest. It is sad that we have to have recourse to these tactics, but it is no different than at times when the priests were forced underground or had to disguise themselves as laymen in various periods of Church history.

This brings up another important point. God never asks us to do the impossible. Sometimes we find ourselves in a situation where there is no ideal solution. In those cases, we must take the path of objective good and abandon ourselves to God's providence.

He will bless us and take care of the rest, for then we will truly be doing the loving thing.

Q. Some bishops have actually mandated vaccination for their priests. Aren't they showing love for their people by doing this, so that the priests don't infect the laity?

A. The fullness of the priesthood has been given to Bishops in order to lead souls to Heaven, not to dictate personal opinions about medical questions. They have no right whatsoever to mandate vaccination. Even if the vaccinations were safe, effective and stopped the spread (none of which is true), this would still be wrong. Those who have done so are acting as if the Church were a corporation. They are submitting the Holy Catholic Church to coercion, effectively making Christ's Church a puppet of the State. They are allowing the Bride of Christ to be violated and abused by a quasi-omnipotent bureaucracy. Sadly, this is an egregious crime for which they will one day have to give an account.

Such bishops are acting contrary to the *Natural Law*, because any person in possession of his intellectual faculties has an inalienable right, within the limits of the moral law, to make individual medical decisions. No human authority, including the supreme religious authority, may legitimately usurp that right. They are acting contrary to *positive human law*, in particular against the Nuremberg Code (1947) which stipulates that for human experimentation 'the voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision'. Finally, they are acting against *Church Law*, for they are abusing their spiritual power to force medical procedures on their priests. It is an awful form of clericalism. Such abuse is comparable to egregious crimes such as pedophilia, and may very well one day be recognised and punished as such.

Q. What if a priest is under pressure to get vaccinated, and thinks he would thereby be giving a good, loving example to others?

A. A priest in this situation must pray for an increase in the virtue of prudence and an abundant supply of the Gifts of Counsel and Fortitude. He may have a big heart and want to show love by taking the jab, but the virtue of prudence commands even the virtue of charity. If, which is to be hoped, after due diligence in studying this matter, he comes to the conclusion that taking the vaccine is neither prudent nor charitable, then his duty is to stand firm, come what may, and trust ultimately in the intervention of Divine Providence.

If he went ahead and took the jab, sadly, he would be scandalising the souls who witness him cave in to pressure and take a drug he should know is not only unsafe, but worse, a form of cooperation in the gravest form of child abuse. Scandal, leading another into sin, is one of the gravest sins against charity. This is why Our Lord said: *He that shall scandalise one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth*

of the sea (Mt 18:6). He also runs the risk of depriving his faithful of the sacraments in the event that it would cause him serious harm. Of what use is a dead or incapacitated priest?

He would be harming those who think he's safe when he's not. This is one of the most glaring problems with the present government narrative. The mandates are forcing vaccination with full knowledge that the protection it is supposed to provide is not being given. Why do the protected require the unprotected to have the same level of protection that has caused the protected to be so afraid of the unprotected? In other words, the vaccinated are a real danger of contagion (and even breeding more aggressive variants) because they think they are protected when they are not, and that leaves them open to contracting and spreading the virus. This absurdity reaches mind-boggling proportions when we have governments celebrating the 'opening of borders to the vaccinated' and at the same time warning that this will increase the number of 'cases' and then locking down venues reserved to fully vaccinated patrons due to a 'Covid outbreak'! The unvaccinated, on the other hand, are often more cautious, and what's more, when they are well-informed, they take vitamins and minerals to fortify their immune system against the virus.

Finally, such a priest would also be harming the bishops and politicians who encourage the jab, and who will have to answer to God for it. It is an act of charity to resist any bishop, priest or politician who encourages vaccination, for when the day of reckoning comes for them, it is hard to imagine how they will be exempt of responsibility. The Nuremberg trials are a sober reminder that crimes will be severely punished – already in this world – on anyone who had authority and did nothing to oppose the crimes.

Q. What about the vaccination of children, particularly if the mandates extend to schooling? Isn't getting an education an important act of charity so that a child may be able to make a contribution to society?

A. The same objective principles as above need to be applied to children. But there is more. Dr Robert Malone, the inventor of mRNA vaccine gene technology, has delivered a chilling warning and an excellent summary of the medical dangers of experimental gene therapies to parents not to allow the vaccination of children due to the changes it will cause in their immune system:

'Before you inject your child – a decision that is irreversible – I wanted to let you know the scientific facts about this genetic vaccine, which is based on the mRNA vaccine technology I created. There are three issues parents need to understand. The first is that a viral gene will be injected into your child's cells. This gene forces your child's body to make toxic spike proteins. These proteins often cause permanent damage in children's critical organs, including their brain and nervous system, their heart and blood vessels, including blood clots, their reproductive system, and this vaccine can trigger fundamental changes to their immune system. The most alarming point about this is that once these damages have occurred, they are irreparable. You can't fix the lesions within their brain. You can't repair heart tissue scarring. You can't repair a genetically reset immune system, and this vaccine can cause reproductive damage that could affect future generations of your family. The second thing you need to know about is the fact that this novel technology has not been

adequately tested. We need at least 5 years of testing/research before we can really understand the risks. Harms and risks from new medicines often become revealed many years later. Ask yourself if you want your own child to be part of the most radical medical experiment in human history. One final point: the reason they're giving you to vaccinate your child is a lie. Your children represent no danger to their parents or grandparents. It's actually the opposite. Their immunity, after getting COVID, is critical to saving your family, if not the world, from this disease. In summary: there is no benefit for your children or your family to be vaccinating your children against the small risks of the virus, given the known health risks of the vaccine that as a parent, you and your children may have to live with for the rest of their lives. The risk/benefit analysis isn't even close'.[91]

Dr Malone's remarks make us wonder if this manipulation of the genetic heritage is not an even more serious crime that the theft and abuse of human cells. When we consider the irreversible transformation it will cause in the next generation, this may very well be the case.

Q. I understand now where you are coming from and that the narrative being pushed upon us is not the truth. However, with the polarising nature of this topic and the government mandates, aren't the so-called 'truth tellers' like yourself sinning against charity by sowing contention, discord, quarrelling and even encouraging sedition? Should we not seek to speak with one voice?

A. There can be no charity without truth. If our concern for others is based on a falsehood, then it is not charity, but misguided philanthropy. In every age, brave souls have had to stand up against errors and lies, precisely out of love for their fellow man. It is never fun being the party spoiler or having to point out the elephant in the room or to say that the emperor has no clothes. But those who have the courage to do so are the ones who truly love.

When St Catherine of Siena went to Avignon to plead with the pope to return to Italy, it took a lot of courage, but she did so because she loved. She loved Christ and she loved His Vicar, whom she called the 'sweet Christ on earth'. Out of love, she even went so far as to call the schismatic cardinals 'incarnate devils'. Such language makes one think of St John the Baptist who called the Pharisees a 'brood of vipers' (Lk 3:7) or Our Lord who called them 'whited sepulchres' (Mt 23:27).

What's more, never in history has a true reform been achieved without rowing against the current. It has been one of the disastrous policies of the Catholic Church in recent decades to not oppose evil, but to pretend that by being nice to everyone, somehow things will work out. Nowhere is it written that Christ was 'nice'. He was actually quite harsh with those who needed it, as with the Pharisees, because He loved them and wanted to try to convert them. This is something we have lost. Our prelates and priests are afraid of saying anything that will upset people. But that is not Christian at all. The true Christian wants what is truly good for people and what is truly good means first off all eliminating the evil. We need to read again what Paul VI wrote in *Humane Vitae*: 'To diminish in no way the saving teaching of Christ constitutes an eminent form of charity for souls.'

In a situation such as the one we find ourselves in, anyone who has any kind of moral authority and who sees the evil of the narrative has a duty to speak out. Failure to do so means certain victory for the forces of evil. There are numerous examples in history of this. Pope St Felix III affirmed: 'Not to oppose error is to approve it; and not to defend truth is to suppress it, and, indeed, to neglect to confound evil men—when we can do it—is no less a sin than to encourage them'. Of course, for this we need courage, but if we can muster enough of it, we can be influential in making things change. Ronald Reagan once said: 'Evil is powerless if the good are unafraid'.

Q. Does this mean that we must take on a more activist role in opposing the narrative?

A. Activism need not take the form of protests in the streets. All have the duty to pray and do penance, speak the truth, resist evil, never cooperate with error and sin. For some, however, the duty is more pressing. It is clear that priests and doctors must take the lead.

Priests may be terribly burdened with the demands of ministry, but this does not diminish, rather it enhances, their duty to refresh what they learned in seminary and to remain abreast of current issues. Moral theology does not exist in a vacuum. It has practical applications and consequences. The priest cannot claim ignorance when this can be overcome by diligent study. The articles on *Conscience* and *Prudence* offered abundant references to reputable sources, precisely to enable the busy priest to find the right answers quickly and undertake further study in this matter. A priest cannot turn a blind eye to the issues at hand, for he must guide the faithful who turn to him for moral advice. This is a huge challenge, especially when under pressure from superiors, but he cannot continue to play the ostrich, and just pull the trigger, hoping it will work out and nobody else will be killed. Priests will be required to give an account, and sooner than we think.

Doctors too, in order to be able to advise patients truthfully, have the grave duty to undertake due diligence in regard to the true nature of the virus, any prophylactic supplements and measures, viable ethical treatments, as well as study of vaccines in general.[92] Many patients are likely to follow their doctor's advice blindly, which only increases their responsibility. Doctors will not be allowed to say, 'I didn't know' or 'I was following orders and guidelines'. The doctor's duty is to know. If he cannot help, he must at least do no harm and refer to someone who can help. At the moment, doctors are under scrutiny and they risk their profession by going against the narrative. In the end, however, their solace will be that they truly loved their patients, and did the right thing, even if it was to their own temporal loss. *Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends* (Jn 15:13).

In His discourse on the end of time, Our Blessed Lord Himself warned us that, *because iniquity hath abounded, the charity of many shall grow cold* (Mt 24:12). It would appear that this time has come. Many of our choices to 'do the loving thing' are tainted with self-love, as St Paul warned his disciple Timothy: *Know also this, that in the last days shall come dangerous times. Men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, haughty,... lovers of pleasure more than of God* (2 Tm 3:1-4). In that context, priests and laity alike can easily be led astray, caught up in the ways of the world, and fail to see their duty and

follow through with it. We are all good at making good excuses to avoid the hard decisions.

Let us ask the Lord, through the Mother of Fair Love (cf. Eccli. 24:24), for the grace to love the truth, to love in truth, and to do the truth in love (cf. Eph 4:15). Even though the hour is late, it is never too late to love. *Charity beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things* (1 Cor 13:5-7).

Father Ambrose
3 January 2022

.

THE COMMON GOOD

In his third article on "Charity and Vaccines," Father Ambrose debunked the claim that getting vaccinated was "the loving thing to do". In this fourth instalment he shows how the concept of the Common Good, which is part of Catholic social doctrine, has been unduly exploited to justify mass vaccination and other extreme measures taken during the so-called pandemic.[93]

The last three years witnessed unprecedented collaboration of governments around the world to coerce their citizens into accepting behaviours and procedures at odds with the normal ways of social interaction. We were told this was to be "the new normal". Simultaneously, the notion of "the Common Good" was adopted by many academics[94] and healthcare professionals as a justification for lockdowns and mandates that essentially superseded several fundamental human rights. Academic journal articles were advocating for experimental gene therapies to be declared a global "Common Good."[95] A worldwide initiative titled *Declare Covid-19 Vaccines a Global Common Good* saw numerous heads of state, financial stakeholders and Nobel laureates act as signatories to advocate so that the "prevention and immunisation against Covid-19 and its variants should be recognised as a global Common Good, with equal access, regardless of religious beliefs and socioeconomic status."[96] How does all this fit in with the Common Good as the Catholic Church understands it?

What is the Common Good?

The Common Good is the sum total of social conditions which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfilment more fully and more easily.[97] The more immediate ends that make life possible and are required so that the Common Good may be achieved are food, clothing, shelter, a job, safety from violence, etc. All this is good and necessary, which is why the Catholic Church, following the Lord's command, has always taken great care to provide such basics to those in need. We all know by experience, however, that more is required to be a happy and fulfilled human being. Among other things: friends, education, public services, any number of organisations that allow human beings to develop their talents and flourish in a way that is rational, for it is by his reason that man is distinguished from other animals.

What role exactly does reason play in determining the Common Good?

Reason guides every human being, even those without faith, to know that there are certain norms they must live by, certain laws they must obey. A man's conscience tells him there are things he must do and others he must avoid. This universal voice of conscience points to the existence of what Catholic theology refers to as the Natural Law. The Natural Law could be called the universal moral compass that every human being has in his mind and heart and which he knows he must follow in order to live a good life. For example, every individual, no matter whether he has faith or not and what his cultural background is, knows that he should not lie, kill, steal, commit adultery or disrespect his parents. All civilisations throughout history recognise these actions as not being conducive to life in common. The golden rule: *Do unto others as you would have them do unto you*, does not require any particular faith. All it requires is the use of reason.

It is now easy to see that the Common Good is based on the Natural Law, and Natural Law is based on reason. It is through the exercise of his God-given reason that man pursues good – both temporal and spiritual. We can also see why the Common Good serves as the basis for civil laws. If these were not based on the Common Good anchored in the Natural Law, such laws would contradict what every human being instinctively knows through reason. The result would be that instead of the Common Good we would have an earthly coexistence determined by a State that would lose its moorings to the Natural Law and thereby to God. Such a State would end up usurping the powers and prerogatives of God, which ultimately leads to the exploitation and abuse of man, and this is precisely what we see happening at the present moment.

But was it not precisely in the interests of reason that governments implemented restrictive measures to prevent the spread of Covid-19 and save lives?

Since the Common Good can only be achieved by the exercise of right reason, the measures taken during the pandemic would have had to be based on truth and result in the preservation of a higher good. If they were irrational and based on falsehoods, they could not be for the Common Good. So, upon what rationality were the pandemic restrictions based?

We know that medical strategies for dealing with infectious diseases have always focused on treating unwell individuals, and this would include early nutraceutical and pharmacological treatment of the disease and isolation at home or hospital room if warranted. This is based on true evidence, it is therefore rational, the measures being beneficial for the sick individual as well as for the greater majority who are well.

However, over the last three years, not only longstanding medical and pandemic preparedness principles,[98] but also logical reasoning were suppressed in favour of bureaucratic public health initiatives based on fear, campaigns of misinformation[99] and computer algorithms.[100] The irrational measures included isolation of the healthy majority, abandonment of the sick with many not being able to see a doctor face to face due to fear from clinicians, and suppression of highly effective early treatments.[101] The measures adopted were detrimental to the individual, the minority who were sick and the majority who were well, by ignoring the wider bio-psychosocial

needs of human beings such as: the ability to earn a living, social interaction, familial and psychological support and most importantly, spiritual well-being.

Let's have a closer look now and apply the rational criteria mentioned above to the restrictions seen worldwide over the last three years.

Masks: The use of personal protective equipment (PPE), such as masks and gowns, has been accepted in medical protocols for decades. Their use, however, has been limited to specific situations for short durations, e.g. operating theatre, examining a patient with an infectious disease. These protocols were based on scientific evidence and were reserved to trained healthcare professionals. Each mask was used for interaction with a single patient. Public health initiatives in nearly all western countries abandoned these long-standing principles and introduced indiscriminate mask mandates in both healthcare and public settings, despite the evidence that showed spread was happening through aerosolised particles rather than respiratory droplets.[102] Due to this last finding, the public health intervention should have been focused on improvement of ventilation systems and air purifiers in closed spaces. Regardless, these mandates were forcibly applied, particularly in nations such as Canada and Australia, even in absurd situations such as patients who had difficulty breathing and mothers in labour.[103]

There are over 100 scholarly studies,[104] including robust randomised controlled trials[105] that demonstrated that masks used outside of the usual healthcare settings demonstrate little to no benefit.[106] Furthermore, it was also demonstrated that long-term mask wearing is potentially damaging to health[107] due to: the decrease in oxygenation and the increase in inhaled carbon dioxide;[108] inhalation of micro-plastics[109] that could lead to conditions similar to asbestosis;[110] the increased risk of respiratory tract infections, with the mask acting as a reservoir for pathogenic bacteria and fungi, particularly in immuno-compromised patients[111] and those with a respiratory disease;[112] as well as a documented increase in other diseases such as dermatological or ocular infections.[113]

Astonishingly, even the medical community which supported the false narrative and was strongly in favour of mask mandates agreed that masks were only pandering to fear mongering and were not based on any logic[114] as demonstrated by the following quote from the prestigious *New England Journal of Medicine* which was promoting the use of masks: "We know that wearing a mask outside healthcare facilities offers little, if any, protection from infection. Focusing on universal masking alone may, paradoxically, lead to more transmission of Covid-19 if it diverts attention from implementing more fundamental infection-control measures. Masks are not only tools, they are also talismans that may help increase healthcare workers' perceived sense of safety, well-being, and trust in their hospitals. Although such reactions may not be strictly logical, we are all subject to fear and anxiety, especially during times of crisis. One might argue that fear and anxiety are better countered with data and education than with a marginally beneficial mask, particularly in light of the worldwide mask shortage, but it is difficult to get clinicians to hear this message in the heat of the current crisis."[115]

In short, the case for mandatory mask wearing did not satisfy any criteria of the Common Good; the mandates were not

based on reasonable scientific data; furthermore, there were no positive outcomes, nor was there preservation of any higher goods, medically or socially.

Lockdowns, social distancing and restrictions of movement: In Western nations over the last three years – particularly in Australia, Canada and Austria – social distancing, household limits and quarantine, curfews and mandatory hotel quarantines without acute illness were widespread and prolonged, and yet were not based on any logic or evidence. Most of these measures by public health bureaucrats were based on false assertions – with no solid evidence from medical journals – that the virus could be spread between two asymptomatic healthy individuals. As early as 2020 it was already demonstrated that spread by asymptomatic individuals was negligible.[116] A study in Wuhan, China that saw testing of 10 million residents, demonstrated zero cases of transmission between asymptomatic individuals.[117] Another systematic review and meta-analysis of 54 studies with a total of 77,758 patients, demonstrated only a possible 0.7% chance of asymptomatic transmission.[118] Despite this evidence, governments and bureaucrats continued to enforce irrational, inhumane and even illegal measures on free movement for a further two years.[119] This was demonstrated particularly in Australia which saw unjustifiable state border closures and even the non-sensical quarantine in a non-medical hotel facility of high-risk elderly patients recovering from brain surgery[120] or a 2-year-old child recovering from heart surgery, on the absurd grounds that they had travelled a few minutes over the interstate border.[121]

These irrational measures have had wide-ranging negative impact, particularly in children. Among these are: A) a decrease in herd immunity due to lack of exposure, which has favoured rampant increases in other illnesses such as RSV, influenza,[122] group A streptococcus[123] and Adenovirus 41 hepatitis.[124] B) A severe decline in early childhood cognition with one study revealing "a striking decline in cognitive performance since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, with infants born since mid-2020 showing an average decrease of 27-37 points".[125] C) A huge increase in mental health diagnoses, particularly depression and suicide attempts.[126] Suicide attempts by children rose by 77% in the UK[127] and 184% in Australia.[128] We must also add that the restrictions on freedom of movement likely *caused* many deaths, in nursing homes in particular[129] where elderly people were quarantined from family and died of grief and neglect due to isolation[130] and lack of care due to staff shortages[131] and fear.[132]

It should now be obvious that the lockdowns and restrictions of movement did not satisfy *any* of the criteria for the Common Good. Furthermore they cannot be compared with dire situations that justifiably restricted movement for the good of the individual and the Common Good such as wartime bombardments or genuine historic pandemics where people were dying in the streets.

Forced vaccination: On multiple accounts this was irrational as was extensively documented in the first three articles of this series. Firstly, even if proven effective, forced vaccination – and it *was* forced by government officials with the grave complicity of most bishops and pastors – violates the principle of informed consent; secondly, de facto, the vaccines that were imposed were not fully tested[133] and there was a high likelihood that the

pharmaceutical companies were covering up risks and harms in preclinical trials[134] which later caused – and are still causing – a great number of grave injuries and even deaths[135]; finally, they are not effective, as at least one of the major pharmaceutical companies has since acknowledged.[136]

The undisputed statistics clearly demonstrate that the countries with the highest rates of Covid-related infections, complications, hospitalisations and deaths continue to be those nations where most citizens have received one or more vaccinations such as: Japan, Singapore, United Kingdom, USA, Canada, Germany, Austria, Australia and New Zealand.[137] There is serious evidence to support the case for the vaccinations *causing* new waves of infections (escape variants)[138] and increasing immuno-suppression[139] as well as the risk of sudden death with each additional vaccination due to cardiovascular compromise and spike protein damage.[140]

A case in point is Australia which enforced some of the harshest vaccination mandates. The latest statistics from this nation are very sobering. Data released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics[141] in December 2022 found that nationally the number deaths for that year was 17% higher than the historical average.[142] In New South Wales, Australia's most populous state, the weekly report for Covid hospitalisations and deaths was consistently demonstrating that the overwhelming majority of those who died or were hospitalised with Covid were in fact vaccinated.[143] The final weekly report of 2022 revealed that out of 1770 patients who were hospitalised, 74% were fully vaccinated and 0% were unvaccinated. Out of the 95 deaths in that week 81% were fully vaccinated (2 doses), 55% had received 4 or more doses and 7% were unvaccinated.[144] What was the response to this glaringly obvious data by Australian state health officials? "The following changes will be implemented for the weekly report in 2023: Vaccination status of cases admitted to hospital, admitted to ICU and those who die will no longer be reported."[145]

In conclusion, the forced restrictions, coercive medical mandates and curtailing of basic rights and freedoms were unwarranted, unjustified, and illegal, given they were not based on any sound logic or reason and suppressed essential human goods. It is clear that they were not good for anyone and did not serve the Common Good. The assumptions they were based on were demonstrably false, and therefore the measures were against right reason; none of them resulted in the preservation of a higher good. Most glaringly, all contradicted well established medical principles, including pandemic preparedness principles.

Pope Francis, and with him a lot of bishops and priests, were nevertheless talking about the importance of all these restrictions for the Common Good. Weren't they relaying the teaching of the Church?

Let's take a closer look now at what the Church actually teaches on the Common Good. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* explains that "the Common Good resides in the conditions for the exercise of the natural freedoms indispensable for the development of the human vocation, such as the right to act according to a sound norm of conscience and to safeguard . . . privacy, and rightful freedom also in matters of religion."[146] Furthermore, "respect for the human person entails respect for the rights that flow from his dignity as a creature. These rights are prior to society and must be recognised by it. They are the basis of the moral legitimacy of

every authority: by flouting them, or refusing to recognise them in its positive legislation, a society undermines its own moral legitimacy. If it does not respect them, authority can rely only on force or violence to obtain obedience from its subjects. It is the Church's role to remind men of good will of these rights and to distinguish them from unwarranted or false claims."[147]

This remarkable text underlines a number of very important points that have been overlooked during the pandemic. In particular, the norm of conscience must always and everywhere be respected. Yet, it was gravely violated by pressure, either on priests or teachers and other staff, to receive vaccination against their conscience. This point is particularly grave when the pressure came from bishops whose first duty it is to guarantee the rights of a well-informed Catholic conscience and not allow them to be impinged upon by the State. In the same way, the right to privacy was violated when it was required to make known to just about anybody one's vaccination status.

The *Catechism* also tells us another essential point that we have intentionally left for now, namely, that part of the Common Good is to orient us towards the fulfilment of our vocation, which is to see God in eternity. It is because human beings are created in the image and likeness of God and destined to a supernatural life with God, that they have certain inalienable rights. Rights are grounded on and oriented towards true goods, be they natural or supernatural, which is why they must be respected by others, including by the public authority. The State does not give them; nor can it take them away. To attempt to do so would endanger the Common Good and the eternal salvation of persons.

Here we encounter another most serious consequence of the unjust pandemic measures, namely the closing of churches, which prevented people from fulfilling their religious duties to God and obtaining the spiritual help they need. It was exactly as if we were but animals being herded into separate pens because earthly life is all that matters. It is very odd that the same clergy who were parroting cliché ideas on the Common Good were unable to see that the right to worship God and receive the Sacraments is an essential part – the most noble part – of the Common Good. We even had the incomprehensible scandal of priests hiding in their presbyteries and refusing to hear confessions for fear of contagion. Such priests would do well to meditate on the example of St Charles Borromeo who lived through a real pandemic when people were dying on the streets. This holy bishop ministered to the sick himself and encouraged his clergy to do the same. For him, it was an opportunity to save souls, and even if it meant losing his own bodily life, he considered it to be a privilege to sacrifice it for others.

It makes sense that the Common Good should consider spiritual goods as well, but nevertheless, is it not sometimes necessary to renounce the individual good in order to safeguard the Common Good?

It is essential to understand that the Common Good would not exist without the individual good, nor vice versa. It is not possible to promote the Common Good while refusing fundamental, individual goods that are intimately a part of being human. The Catholic Church in modern times, especially in the first phases of the industrial revolution during the 19th century, in which people were treated like animals to

maintain and develop the production lines, and again during the Nazi and Soviet eras when individual rights were denied for the profit of the State, has insisted that this dichotomy is false which creates a conflict between the good of the individual and the good of the group.

The situation is not unlike that of a pregnant woman whose life is in danger because of her pregnancy. Modern medical practice, ignoring the human dignity of the child in utero, states that we must sacrifice the child to save the mother. The Church says we must make every effort to save both, and we can never positively take away the fundamental right to life of either mother or child. So, coming back to our question, when we protect the rights of the individual, we are protecting the Common Good. When we protect the Common Good, we are protecting the rights of the individual. It is not one or the other.

Coming down to lessons to be learned for the future: It is gravely immoral for the State to impose medical treatment that the individual conscience refuses; it is gravely immoral to force people to stay in their homes when they are a risk to no one and their livelihood depends on their getting about and doing their job. When we are told that these things were done in the name of the Common Good, what we are dealing with, quite simply, is the abuse of a truth in the service of error and exploitation.

It sounds like your definition of the Common Good is a Christian one. Aren't there good civilisations outside of Christianity, and therefore is not the Common Good possible even without reference to God and Christ?

In principle, it should be possible for a civilisation to follow the Natural Moral Law even without knowing of the true religion. This, however, is a utopian perspective, because it ignores the ravages caused by Original Sin. This is what prompted Pope St Pius X to state with great lucidity that "there is no true civilisation without a moral civilisation, and no true moral civilisation without the true religion: this is a proven truth, a historical fact."[148] What he meant by that was that human reason, due to its having been wounded by Original Sin, requires the supernatural guidance of the true religion revealed by God in order to not go astray. All religions other than the Christian religion are only human attempts at finding God. Since human reason has been weakened and obscured by Original Sin, it cannot find God on its own. This is why false religions propose solutions which, while being in part true, are fatally flawed. This also explains why the present-day attempt by the Church to find common ground with other religions can only weaken her own position, and in so doing, weaken the power of the Natural Law to guide our life in this world.

The only hope for humanity is a return to Jesus Christ and the religion He founded, that is to say, the Roman Catholic Church. The enemies of the Church know this very well. They know that the Church is the only force capable of resisting the godless New World Order, and that is precisely why so much effort is put into the corrupting the one true Catholic Church, confusing her clear and true teachings and portraying her as being on the side of the globalists.[149]

I thought we were supposed to "believe the science." Why do Catholics ignore science when it conflicts with the Natural Law and the Common Good?

In the minds of many, science is in opposition to faith. By faith you believe things you cannot see, but by science you know how things happen. There are two major problems with this view. Firstly, God created both the natural and supernatural orders, and therefore any authentically proved scientific fact can never be in opposition with the true faith. This is why the greatest promoter of science in the history of the world is the Catholic Church who has never seen any opposition between faith and science.[150]

The second is that if, in the name of science, one accepts a universe without God, then one must blindly trust science to find a meaning to reality, in which case one ends up transferring one's faith to science. So what began as a way to reject faith has actually ended up replacing it with another faith. Instead of believing in God, we lose our common sense and believe in man. As G. K. Chesterton famously wrote: "It's part of something I've noticed more and more in the modern world, appearing in all sorts of newspaper rumors and conversational catch-words; something that's arbitrary without being authoritative. People readily swallow the untested claims of this, that, or the other. It's drowning all your old rationalism and scepticism, it's coming in like a sea; and the name of it is superstition... It's the first effect of not believing in God that you lose your common sense, and can't see things as they are".[151]

A case in point is that in the context of the Covid pandemic, as was shown above, the true science clearly demonstrated the ineffectiveness of wearing masks and social distancing as well as the real dangers of the vaccinations that were proposed, but all this was ignored in favour of "faith in the science".[152] In this case, it was clear that scientism was becoming a new religion, based not on facts and data, but on blind faith in the science, in other words in those who invent it.

So, either you believe in God and in His Son Jesus Christ, or you "believe" in science. You cannot do both. But if you are a true Christian, you are more free to pursue true science without the oppressive influence of a State turned god and dictating to you its conclusions.

If you are in a pagan society without reference to God, you still have to obey the local authorities. Did not Christ say to 'render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's'? So Christians should obey government mandates, right?

And to God the things that are God's (Cf. Matt 22:21). By these words, Our Blessed Lord clearly set limits to the authority of Caesar. All things belong to God, including Caesar. The State exists to serve the interests of God and God's creatures; it's not the other way around. Since the whole universe exists only for God and to lead to eternal salvation the souls of human beings, then the State must acknowledge that fact and do nothing to impede it. On the contrary, it must protect the rights of the true religion and foster everything that can help souls achieve their salvation, banning all that would turn them away from it.

This is why the collaboration of the Church with the State, important though it is, has its limits. The laws of the State are valid before God only if they do not contradict the Divine Law manifested in the Natural Law. To quote the *Catechism* again: "Authority does not derive its moral legitimacy from itself. It must not behave in a despotic manner... A human law has the character of law to the extent that it accords

with right reason, and thus derives from the eternal law. Insofar as it falls short of right reason it is said to be an unjust law, and thus has not so much the nature of law as of a kind of violence. Authority is exercised legitimately only when it seeks the Common Good of the group concerned and if it employs morally licit means to attain it. If rulers were to enact unjust laws or take measures contrary to the moral order, such arrangements would not be binding in conscience. In such a case, authority breaks down completely and results in shameful abuse."[153]

The Common Good of society cannot trump the rights of God, nor does it override the Ten Commandments, nor does it take precedence over the innate rights of individuals. Rejecting God leads to rejecting man. This is the tragic story of humanity ever since the atheistic philosophers from the French Revolution on have persuaded us to try and build a world without God. At first, it's about promoting man instead of God, but when God has been eliminated, there is no longer anyone to safeguard the dignity of man. Just think of how the atheistic regime of Soviet Russia unscrupulously killed millions of people in order to promote the "rights of the proletariat".

When looking at it from this angle, the last three years, although a shock to many, were in fact a little foretaste of the logical next step that is to come in a society that has turned away from objective truth. When objective truth, reason and the Natural Law are replaced by moral relativism dictated by the passions and vices of human nature, it is only natural that man and his selfish desires will take the place of God, goodness and truth. The propaganda, the draconian laws, the medical terrorism and the lockdowns were the prelude to an openly totalitarian system – which is the only logical outcome of a society that has replaced God with "science".

What can we do to truly promote the Common Good?

Whoever we are, it is imperative to realise that our present predicament is first and foremost a spiritual problem and therefore, without neglecting social and political means, the answer lies in the spiritual realm. Now, winning the spiritual battle boils down to two things: avoiding sin and practicing virtue.

The first step then to winning this spiritual battle is quite simply to keep the Ten Commandments. We find there the way to please God as well as the most fundamental requirements for the peaceful coexistence of rational creatures. Keeping the Commandments is just the start however; one must also practice virtue, namely the theological virtues of faith, hope and charity and the cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance. Practicing virtue involves of course avoiding the vices opposed to them, among which two need to be pointed out in this context, because many allow themselves to fall into them without even realising how potentially devastating they can be for the spiritual life and how detrimental to the Common Good:

- *curiosity* leads a lot of people to overindulge in social media, obsessing over the state of the world, as if their entire trust were in a human solution – so much time is lost that could be devoted to prayer, serious study and good works;

- *cowardice* can cause others to run for cover and play the ostrich because of the fear of the struggles facing us. Correcting evils in Church and society does not come about

without strong souls who accept to put their necks out to fight evil. Evil prospers when good people do nothing.

The second step is to faithfully fulfil the duties of our state in life, whatever that may be. *Parents* must ensure that Christ reigns supreme in the home, and to that end, that the family pray and practice the faith together. For a Catholic family, this means daily prayer together and at least weekly attendance at Holy Mass (Sundays and Holy Days). These are the essential foundation stones for a solid Christian home which will shape the societal norm and can then be reordered to the true Common Good. *Priests* must be clear and consistent in preaching the truth, and fear no one but God; they must not cooperate with unjust directives, such as refusing Communion on the tongue or otherwise refusing access to the church or to the sacraments for fear of contagion. *Doctors* must be aware of their duties to human life in all its stages; in particular, they must not cooperate with the making or administering of unethical products or procedures, even if it means losing their position, nor can a doctor refuse to administer care to a patient for fear of contagion. *Teachers, professors and lawyers* must cultivate love for truth and justice at any cost. The civilisation of tomorrow rests on the handing down of truth and the refusal to compromise with it at any level. *Law enforcement officers* must respect inalienable human rights and always treat persons with dignity. *Politicians* must promote laws that respect God's commandments; never may they support legislation that is contrary to them, nor may they allow themselves to be swayed by purely monetary considerations.

A final point, but not the least: we Catholics know that Our Lady has consistently given, in numerous apparitions over the past five centuries, a message of penance and prayer. She has asked again and again that we recite the daily Rosary.[154] This is a simple means that is within the reach of everyone. It is not asking much. Let us heed the voice of our heavenly Mother.

The Rosary is such a powerful prayer because it uses the very words of God in Holy Scripture to focus our attention on the mysteries of the life of Our Lord Jesus Christ. It allows us to contemplate the life of Jesus through the eyes of His Mother Mary. By humbly respecting our Mother's wishes, we will be working to make reparation for our own sins, for the public sins of our nations which have turned their back on Christ, for the scandals given by the Church either through moral corruption of its members or through confusing teachings of the hierarchy, and for the blasphemies and offences against her Immaculate Heart. As St Bernard of Clairvaux wrote: "It is the will of God that all things come to us through Mary." It is His will, therefore, that through the Immaculate Heart of Mary the enemies of Christ be conquered and a restoration of a Catholic civil order commence which will ultimately restore the true concept of the Common Good. May that day come quickly!

Father Ambrose
21 January 2023

The author is deeply grateful to the panel of medical professionals, particularly Dr E, Dr T, Dr C and Professor X, for their assistance in writing, editing and proofreading the technical medical aspects of this article in order to ensure the accuracy and veracity of medical statements and supporting literature.

Father Ambrose is a Catholic priest who holds a doctorate in theology from a pontifical university and has many years of experience teaching moral theology. Due to the highly politicised nature of discussions surrounding the Covid-19 Pandemic, he regrettably feels it necessary to write these articles under a pseudonym in order to protect the souls he serves in his priestly ministry. He will happily receive any correspondence at ambroseastor@protonmail.com. This article and all the other articles in this series may be reproduced and shared in any way without special permission.

Endnotes

[1] Cf. Adam Cohen, *Imbeciles: The Supreme Court, American Eugenics, and the Sterilization of Carrie Buck,* Penguin Books, 2017.

[2] For example, Dr. Robert Schwartz, chief of pediatrics at Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital, tells how he went to Finland. After a fetus is delivered, while it is still linked to its mother by the umbilical cord, he takes a blood sample. Then, after the cord is severed, he 'as quickly as possible,' operates on this aborted being to remove other tissues and organs.' *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 19, 1973, entitled "Operations on Live Fetuses".

[3] 'One my duties in the laboratory in Stockholm was to dissect human fetuses from legal abortions and send organs to the Wistar Institute. Such material was the source of many important studies of cell lines at the Institute, such as Hayflick's study of WI-38 cells.' Erling Norrby, Perspectives in Biology and Medicine 44.2 (Spring 2001): 304–306.

[4] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4526020/

[5] 'Human embryos of two and one-half to five months gestation were placed in a sterile container and promptly transported to the virus laboratory of the adjacent Hospital for Sick Children. No macerated specimens were used and in many of the embryos the heart was still beating at the time of receipt in the virus laboratory.' 1952-06; Thicke et al; Cultivation of Poliomyelitis Virus in Tissue Culture; Growth of the Lansing Strain in Human Embryonic Tissue, Canadian Journal of Medical Science, Vol. 30, p231-245 . https://cdnsciencepub.com/doi/10.1139/cjms52-031.

[6] Grant Number 1U24DK11079-1 awarded by NIH to University of Pittsburgh, p62, p73 – accessible at https://www.centerformedicalprogress.org/2021/08/aborted-infants-continued-blood-flow-advertised-in-racist-university-of-pittsburgh-grant-application-to-nih/

[7] https://www.cancer.gov/publications/dictionaries/cancer-terms/def/warm-ischemia-time

[8] Pope Pius XII, *Allocution to Midwives*, October 29, 1951.

[9] Pope John Paul II, Encyclical *Evangelium vitae,* 25 March 1995, no. 62-63.

[10] Previous declarations include:"Moral Reflections on vaccines prepared from cells derived from aborted human foetuses" from the Pontifical Academy for Life (2005), the Instruction *Dignitas Personae* from the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (2008), and finally another declaration from the PAL in 2017.

[11] https://gbdeclaration.org/

[12] https://www.who.int/bulletin/online_first/BLT.20.265892.pdf

[13] https://covid19criticalcare.com/covid-19-protocols/i-mask-plus-protocol/

[14] www.hcqmeta.com, www.ivmmeta.com

[15] https://covid19criticalcare.com/ivermectin-in-covid-19/epidemiologic-analyses-on-covid19-and-ivermectin/

[16] https://www.oraclefilms.com/tesslawrie Dr. Tess Lawrie (Former WHO advisor and founder of https://bird-group.org/)

[17] www.openvaers.com

[18] https://apps.tga.gov.au/PROD/DAEN/daen-report.aspx

[19] https://www.tga.gov.au/periodic/covid-19-vaccine-weekly-safety-report-04-11-2021#section-1147

[20] https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04368728.
The Australian Health Minister Greg Hunt actually went on record as saying, at the very time the vaccines were being rolled out: "The world is engaged in the largest clinical trial, the largest global vaccination trial ever" (Interview with David Speers, 21 February 2021).

[21] https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanmic/article/PIIS2666-5247(21)00069-0/fulltext

[22] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8481107

[23] https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7250318/

[24] https://thefederalist.com/2021/04/15/federal-government-caught-buying-fresh-flesh-of-aborted-babies-who-could-have-survived-as-preemies/

[25] https://doctorsandscientistsdeclaration.org/original/

[26] Public Health England Data: 63% of all deaths with the Delta variant have now been in the 'fully vaccinated' i.e. 14 days post the second dose. Table 5 pg 19-20: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1018547/Technical_Briefing_23_21_09_16.pdf

[27] https://www.thelancet.com/journals/laninf/article/PIIS1473-3099(21)00648-4/fulltext#seccestitle160

[28] https://quadrant.org.au/opinion/public-health/2021/10/we-cant-vaccinate-this-pandemic-away/

[29] St John Henry Newman, Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.

[30] St Bonaventure, On the Second Book of Sentences, dist. 39, a. 1, q. 3.

[31] Declaration of 12 December 2020 signed by Cardinal Janis Pujats, Archbishop Tomash Peta, Archbishop Jan Pawel Lenga, Bishop Athanasius Schneider and Bishop Joseph Strickland.

[32] https://www.lumenfidei.ie/conscience-vaccines/

[33] https://www.who.int/bulletin/online_first/BLT.20.265892.pdf, 33PIC-COVID-19-Disease-Information-Statement-DIS-August-2021.pdf

[34] https://physiciansforinformedconsent.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Pfizer-COVID-19-Vaccine-Risk-Statement-PDF.pdf

[35] ps://twitter.com/RWMaloneMD/status/1449142757335863297, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8483988/

36 Dr Malone, inventor of mRNA technology, was blocked from the New England Journal of Medicine https://twitter.com/RWMaloneMD/status/1446064487988146180

37E g : w w w . c o v i d c a r e a l l i a n c e . c o m , w w w . n z d s o s . c o m , w w w . b i r d - group.org,www.canadianphysicians.org,www.covid19criticalcare.com,www.doctors4covidethics.org, www.worlddoctorsalliance.com, www.covidmedicalnetwork.com, www.covid19assembly.org/doctors-open-letter/, www.physiciansforinformedconsent.org, www.hartgroup.org

38 https://www.pandata.org/letter-to-british-society-of-immunology/

39 https://doctorsandscientistsdclaration.org/

40 Dr Malone explains the nature of gene therapy vaccines and risks https://www.bitchute.com/video/ukx8L3lh5CA7/

41 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7943455/; 'It's becoming increasingly difficult to imagine how the consequences of the extensive and erroneous human intervention in this pandemic are not going to wipe out large parts of our human population. One could only think of very few other strategies to achieve the same level of efficiency in turning a relatively harmless virus into a bioweapon of mass destruction.' Dr Geert Van Den Bossche: Virologist & former Vaccine Scientist for The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. https://www.geertvandenbossche.org/; https://dailyexpose.uk/2021/05/24/nobel-prize-winner-says-covid-vaccines-are-an-unacceptable-mistake/, Dr Luc Montagnier- Nobel Laureate in Medicine

42 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22536382/; https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17194199/; https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18941225/

43 https://europepmc.org/article/PPR/PPR334978

44 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC8538446/; https://swprs.org/covid-vaccines-and-cancer/

45 https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.121.318902

46 https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/circ.144.suppl_1.10712

47 Spike of 10-15% of excess mortality (even when factoring for Covid-19 deaths, or lockdown effects) in highly vaccinated countries. https://www.unz.com/mwhitney/excess-deaths-point-to-depopulation-agenda/

48 'There's no possible benign interpretation of this other than a serious attempt at mass depopulation. This will provide the tools to do it, and plausible deniability. They'll create another story about some sort of biological threat and you'll line up and get your top-up vaccines, and a few months or a year or so later, you'll die of some peculiar inexplicable syndrome. And they won't be able to associate it with the vaccines.' Interview with Dr Michael Yeadon, Former Chief Scientist of Pfizer for 16 years and total 30 years experience in immunology science and vaccine development. http://totalhealthmatters.co.uk/a-massive-fraud-has-been-perpetrated-by-dr-michael-yeadon-phd/?

49 www.sciencemuseum.org.uk/objects-and-stories/medicine/thalidomide

50 www.openvaers.com

51 www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-vaccine-adverse-reactions

52 www.ema.europa.eu/en/human-regulatory/overview/public-health-threats/coronavirus-disease-covid-19/treatments-vaccines/vaccines-covid-19/safety-covid-19-vaccines

53 https://digital.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/docs/publication/r18hs017045-lazarus-final-report-2011.pdf, https://www.gov.uk/drug-safety-update/yellow-card-please-help-to-reverse-the-decline-in-reporting-of-suspected-adverse-drug-reactions

54 https://ukfreedomproject.org/resources/open-letter-to-dr-june-raine-chief-executive-mhra/

55 In Australia according to TGA DAEN: 445 cases of heavy menstrual bleeding, 97 cases of miscarriage, 7 cases of stillbirth, 85 cases of uterine haemorrhage in post-menopausal women. In the USA: 2996 miscarriages.

56 https://cienciaysaludnatural.com/estudio/why-covid-19-vaccines-might-affect-fertility/

57w w w . 2 0 2 0 n e w s . d e / w p - c o n t e n t / u p l o a d s / 2 0 2 0 / 1 2 / Wodarg_Yeadon_EMA_Petition_Pfizer_Trial_FINAL_01DEC2020_EN_unsigned_with_Exhibits.pdf

58 https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4915/13/10/2056/htm

59 https://rumble.com/vnpbdv-jim-hale-interview-with-dr-robert-malone.html

60 https://www.bmj.com/content/375/bmj.n2635

61 https://www.icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/IR0558-FDA-Ingredients-in-Pfizer-Vaccine_FINAL.pdf

62 https://quadrant.org.au/opinion/public-health/2021/10/we-cant-vaccinate-this-pandemic-away/; https://wwwnc.cdc.gov/eid/article/27/10/21-1427_article; https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-01557-z

63 ps://twitter.com/RWMaloneMD/status/1449142757335863297; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC848398

64 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S221475002100161X

65 https://www.notonthebeeb.co.uk/post/surge-of-sports-people-worldwide-suffering-unexpected-ill-health

66 www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(21)02243-1/fulltext

67 https://summit.news/2021/10/12/australia-building-quarantine-camps-for-ongoing-operations/

68 'Upon returning from Germany in 1934, where more than 5,000 people per month were being forcibly sterilized, the California eugenics leader C. M. Goethe bragged to a colleague: You will be interested to know that your work has played a powerful part in shaping the opinions of the group of intellectuals who are behind Hitler in this epoch-making program. Everywhere I sensed that their opinions have been tremendously stimulated by American thought ... I want you, my dear friend, to carry this thought with you for the rest of your life, that you have really jolted into action a great government of 60 million people'. Edwin Black, *War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race*.
See also Carola Sachse, *What research, to What End? The Rockefeller Foundation and the Max Planck Gesellschaft in the Early Cold War*, Central European History, Cambridge University Press (Mar., 2009), Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 97-141.

69 www.ivmmeta.com

70 www.hcqmeta.com

71 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7826030/

72 https://covid19criticalcare.com/covid-19-protocols/i-mask-plus-protocol/

73 'The pandemic that the world had been anticipating for years finally hit...However, a few countries did fare better—China in particular. The Chinese government's quick imposition and enforcement of mandatory quarantine for all citizens, as well as its instant and near-hermetic sealing off of all borders, saved millions of lives, stopping the spread of the virus far earlier than in other countries and enabling a swifter post pandemic recovery. China's government was not the only one that took extreme measures to protect its citizens from risk and exposure. During the pandemic, national leaders around the world flexed their authority and imposed airtight rules and restrictions, from the mandatory wearing of face masks to body-temperature checks at the entries to communal spaces like train stations and supermarkets. Even after the pandemic faded, this more authoritarian control and oversight of citizens and their activities stuck and even intensified. In order to protect themselves from the spread of increasingly global problems—from pandemics and transnational terrorism to environmental crises and rising poverty—leaders around the world took a firmer grip on power. At first, the notion of a more controlled world gained wide acceptance and approval. Citizens willingly gave up some of their sovereignty—and their privacy—to more paternalistic states in exchange for greater safety and stability. In developed countries, this heightened oversight took many forms: biometric IDs for all citizens, for example, and tighter regulation of key industries whose stability was deemed vital to national interests.' The Rockefeller Foundation, *Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development*, Report of May 2010, pp. 18-19.

74 See Gretchen Schafft, *From Racism to Genocide: Anthropology in the Third Reich*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press (2004) pp. 47–58; Jan A. Witkowski, 'Charles Benedict Davenport, 1866–1944,' in Jan A. Witkowski and John R. Inglis, eds., Davenport's Dream: 21st Century Reflections on Heredity and Eugenics, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press (2008) p. 52.

75 E.g. Drs Pierre Kory, Vladimir Zelenko, Shankara Chetty, Joseph Varon, Jose Inglesias and Professors. Paul Marik, Peter McCullough, Thomas Borody

76 Drs Robert Malone (inventor of mRNA technology, virologist), Luc Montagnier (Nobel Laureate), Mike Yeadon (Former Chief Scientist of Pfizer, 30 years vaccine development), Geert Van Den Boscche, Sucharit Bahkti , Prof. Dolores Cahill etc

77 https://evidencenotfear.com/

78 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8481107

79 https://covid19criticalcare.com/ivermectin-in-covid-19/epidemiologic-analyses-on-covid19-and-ivermectin/

80 To name only the most well-known: the Soviet Gulag, the Nazi, Chinese, Cambodian, Turkish, Pakistani and Rumanian genocides. Cf. R. J. Rummel, Death by Government, Transaction Publishers, 2008.

81 https://www.lumenfidei.ie/conscience-vaccines/

82 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S221475002100161X

83 https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4915/13/10/2056/htm

84 https://www.lumenfidei.ie/conscience-vaccines/

85 https://www.lumenfidei.ie/prudence-and-vaccines/

86 My conclusions are shared at least in part by other authors, among whom special mention should be made of:
Bishop Athanasius Schneider (https://www.crisismagazine.com/2020/covid-vaccines-the-ends-cannot-justify-the-means, https://www.crisismagazine.com/2021/resisting-abortion-tainted-vaccines-and-the-culture-of-death, https://www.lifesitenews.com/opinion/bp-schneider-theres-a-basic-error-in-vatican-documents-on-material-cooperation-with-abortion-tainted-vaccines/),
Fr Regis de Cacqueray, https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/former-sspx-district-superior-covid-vaccines-are-immoral-should-be-opposed/, https://www.medias-presse.info/non-possumus-etude-par-le-rp-joseph-de-la-question-de-la-moralite-des-vaccins-contre-la-covid/141286/), Fr Phil Wolfe (https://cogforlife.org/fr-phil-wolfe/), Fr Chad Ripperger (https://www.bitchute.com/video/a4eJhjenkjaY/).

[87] The vaccines do not contain cell lines of aborted foetuses, but they do contain residual components of those cell lines. Without them, the vaccine would not exist, and that is enough to prove that there is a proximate link. Cf. https://cogforlife.org/2021/05/12/lets-get-a-few-things-cleared-up-testing-cell-lines-and-fetal-tissue/.
A number of pharmaceutical products, including vaccines, use aborted foetal cells in the testing stage of production only. The question is often asked whether or not that changes the morality of these products. In principle it does not, *inasmuch as* that testing is an essential part of its production. If a new product is marketed using and abusing foetal cell lines for testing, it is in the same category as the other products in which the foetal matter is actually used to create it, and having recourse to such products constitutes material cooperation in a very grave evil, which is permissible only in extreme cases. As argued in both the *Conscience* and the *Prudence* articles, this extreme situation does not ordinarily exist today, and therefore we must oppose any abuse of human foetuses with, to borrow Pope John Paul II's expression, 'maximum determination'. The same judgment does not apply to medicines that existed before foetal testing was possible, but which have since been tested on foetuses. Subsequent research does not disqualify such products from a morally licit use, contrary to some confusion created by articles such as this one: https://www.patheos.com/blogs/throughcatholiclenses/2021/01/if-any-drug-tested-on-hek-293-is-immoral-goodbye-modern-medicine/

[88] See for example Deuteronomy 12:31, 18:10, 2 Kings 16:3; 17:17; 17:31; 21:6, 2 Chronicles 28:3; 33:6, Jeremiah 7:31, 19:5 and Ezekiel 16:21; 20:26, 31; 23:37.

[89] In spite of the wishful thinking of some theologians today, there is no foundation in the Church's authentic teaching for considering unbaptised babies to be in Heaven. This is why at least one author considers this deprivation of supernatural life for the baby to be the height of abomination. It would also explain why Satan wants child sacrifice and why some Satanists perform ritual abortions. This in turn explains the real nature of the push for abortion on demand: it is ultimately a form of Satan worship.

[90] *Summa Theologiae*, Ia-IIae, q. 109, a. 8, corpus.

[91] https://globalcovidsummit.org/news/live-stream-event-physicians-alerting-parents

[92] A good place for doctors to start is here: https://doctors4covidethics.org/gold-standard-covid-science-in-practice-interdisciplinary-symposium-ii-december-10-2021/

[93] The first three articles are available here: https://www.truedevotions.ie/author/fr-ambrose-astor/

[94] Cf. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9396745/

[95] Cf. and https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40926-020-00154-w

[96] Cf. https://www.ohchr.org/en/2021/06/vaccines-against-covid-19-must-be-considered-global-public-good-high-commissioner-human.

[97] Cf. *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, 164-170.

[98] Cf. https://gbdeclaration.org/

[99] Cf. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9557944/, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9557939/

[100] Cf. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0169207020301199, https://www.hartgroup.org/nhs-cites-a-computer-modelling-study-to-justify-ongoing-mask-requirements/

[101] Cf. https://covid19criticalcare.com/senate-testimony/, https://bird-group.org/

[102] Cf. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7151430/

[103] Cf. www.health.act.gov.au/sites/default/files/2021-02/COVID-19%20Information%20for%20pregnant%20women%2006052020.pdf, https://www.bbc.com/news/health-57021736

[104] Cf.brownstone.org/articles/studies-and-articles-on-mask-ineffectiveness-and-harms/, https://brownstone.org/articles/time-to-unmask-the-truth/

[105] Cf. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33205991/, https://www.bmj.com/content/371/bmj.m4586

[106] Cf. https://www.hartgroup.org/masks-do-more-harm-than-good/

107 Cf. https://www.bmj.com/content/369/bmj.m2003

108 Cf. https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/bmjopen/11/2/e044364.full.pdf

109 Cf. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969722020009#!

[110] Cf. https://www.investmentwatchblog.com/bombshell-disposable-blue-face-masks-found-to-contain-toxic-asbestos-like-substance-that-destroys-lungs/, https://childrenshealthdefense.org/wp-content/uploads/Masks-false-safety-and-real-dangers-Part-1-Friable-mask-particulate-and-lung-vulnerability.pdf

[111] Cf. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-022-15409-x

[112] Cf. https://rc.rcjournal.com/content/65/5/658

[113] https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36577463/, https://journals.lww.com/retinajournal/Fulltext/2021/11000/FACE_MASK_CONTAMINATION_DURING_COVID_19_PANDEMIA_.3.aspx

[114] Cf. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7884659/

[115] Cf. https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp2006372

[116] Cf. https://www.hartgroup.org/asymptomatic-spread/

[117] Cf. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-19802-w

[118] Cf. https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2774102

[119] Cf. https://www.hartgroup.org/variants-of-sars-cov-2-and-the-futility-of-border-closures/

[120] Cf. https://9now.nine.com.au/a-current-affair/queensland-premier-annastacia-palaszczuk-is-blasted-in-emotional-interview-with-a-current-affair-host-tracy-grimshaw/47bc95ff-1268-43c2-a41d-0d341dd69273

[121] Cf. https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-08-22/qld-gov-denies-toddler-home-isolation-heart-surgery-coronavirus/12584354

[122] Cf. https://www.bostonglobe.com/2022/12/15/opinion/unintended-consequence-covid-control-measures-kids-without-immunity/

[123] Cf. https://www.spectator.co.uk/article/we-cant-ignore-group-a-strep/

[124] Cf. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langas/article/PIIS2468-1253(22)00166-2/fulltext

[125] Cf. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.08.10.21261846v2, https://www.theguardian.com/society/2022/apr/04/pandemic-has-delayed-social-skills-of-young-children-says-ofsted-chief

[126] Cf. https://www.covidmedicalnetwork.com/coronavirus-facts/lockdowns-and-mental-health/overview.aspx

[127] Cf. https://www.bbc.com/news/education-60197150

[128] Cf. https://www.news.com.au/lifestyle/health/mental-health/attempted-suicide-rates-among-victorian-teenagers-soar-by-184-per-cent-in-past-six-months-kids-helpline-reveals/news-story/db9d5136075a7c7edf4750a0391b0653,

[129] Cf. https://www.hartgroup.org/covid-policies-in-care-homes-doing-more-harm-than-good/

[130] Cf. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25910392/

[131] Cf. https://www.hartgroup.org/care-home-isolation-and-neglect-an-urgent-crisis/

[132] Cf. https://www.hartgroup.org/care-homes/

[133] Cf. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36055877/

[134] Cf. https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/judge-evidence-pfizer-whistleblower-lawsuit/

[135] Cf. Openvaers.com, https://www.vacsafety.org/

[136] Cf. https://www.news.com.au/technology/science/human-body/pfizer-did-not-know-whether-covid-vaccine-stopped-transmission-before-rollout-executive-admits/news-story/f307f28f794e173ac017a62784fec414

[137] Cf. https://www.conservativereview.com/horowitz-possibly-the-most-important-study-on-covid-shots-might-explain-why-covid-never-seems-to-end-2659039644.html

[138] Cf. https://rumble.com/v23tmxi-geert-vanden-bossche-we-are-turning-vaccine-recipients-into-asymptomatic-sp.html

[139] Cf. https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciimmunol.ade2798

[140] Cf. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9557944/, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9557939/, https://www.stewpeters.com/video/2022/11/live-world-premiere-died-suddenly/

[141] Cf. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/health/causes-death/provisional-mortality-statistics/latest-release

[142] Cf. https://www.news.com.au/lifestyle/health/health-problems/excess-deaths-in-2022-incredibly-high-at-13-per-cent/news-story/2a33dfeeb7476765da4e237c59f59bf7

[143] Cf. https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/covid-19/Pages/weekly-reports.aspx

[144] Cf. https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/covid-19/Documents/weekly-covid-overview-20221231.pdf (page 4)

[145] Cf. https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/covid-19/Documents/weekly-covid-overview-20221231.pdf (page 1)

[146] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1907.

[147] *Ibid.*, 1930.

[148] St Pius X, Apostolic Letter, *Our apostolic mandate,* 25 August 1910.

[149] Cf. for example https: //https://www.vaticannews.va/en/pope/news/2019-03/pope-development-goals-rooted-in-ethics-not-economics.html

[150] There are many excellent books on this subject. An easy and comprehensive read is: Thomas Woods, *How the Catholic Church Built Western Civilisation*, Regency, 2012.

[151] G. K. Chesterton, *The Oracle of the Dog*.

[152] This was extensively examined in the first two articles of this series *Conscience* and *Prudence*. However, the question of science as a whole and the trajectory on which we find ourselves on at this stage shall be properly examined in a future article.

[153] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1902-1903.

[154] Among the most significant apparitions, I would like to mention those in Quito, Ecuador (1594-1632), La Salette, France (1846), Lourdes, France (1858), Fatima, Portugal (1917), and Akita, Japan (1973).