

CHURCH AND PANDEMIC

'Vaccines did not stop Covid': increases bishops' moral guilt

ECCLESIA

20_08_2024



**Luisella
Scrosati**



The recent admission by the Italian Medicines Agency (AIFA) puts the moral issue of vaccines back on the table. In its response to the Arbitrium PSG Association, AIFA candidly wrote in black on white that 'no approved Covid-19 vaccine has the indication "

prevention of transmission of infection by the Sars agent cov-2". No prevention of infection.

If one pays attention to the statement, it is evident that it is not the result of a posthumous discovery, as if to say, the manufacturers had confirmed that these preparations would stop the contagion, but then realised that this was not the case. Not at all. Instead, AIFA stated that it was never acknowledged that these mRNA serums were capable of stopping the transmission of Sars cov-2. Several months earlier, in October 2023, the outcome of a question by a number of MEPs - including Francesca Donato from Italy - to the European Medicines Agency (EMA), had led to the same conclusion (see here): 'You are right to point out that COVID-19 vaccines have not been authorised to prevent person-to-person transmission. The indications are for the protection of vaccinated individuals'.

On the protection of vaccinated individuals it would be better to ask the countless victims, whether recognised or not, what they think of this protection. And also to those who, after having been vaccinated, have repeatedly fallen ill with Covid. But, the main point of interest is that it was known from the outset that these preparations did not serve to block the transmission of Sars cov-2.

In the Note on the Morality of the Use of Certain Anti-Covid-19 Vaccines of 21 December 2020, published by the then Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith(now the Dicastery), it was stated that, since all available preparations were made using cell lines from aborted fetuses, certain circumstances had to be fulfilled in order to use them lawfully. This is how [the Note summarises it, at No. 3](#): 'The moral duty to avoid such passive material cooperation is not obligatory if there is a grave danger, such as the otherwise uncontrollable spread of a serious pathogenic agent'.

The reasoning is as follows. Since the moral problem of using cell lines from aborted foetuses exists - whatever the 2017 Note of the Pontifical Academy for Life may say about this (on this, see *The Idolatry of Vaccines, Faith & Culture*, 2022) -, it is necessary to oppose this scourge first and foremost by condemning this production; formal cooperation, i.e. the approval of the permissibility of using tissue taken from aborted babies, is always gravely culpable, at any level. As for their concrete use, on the other hand, it is normally binding to reject those drugs made from these cell lines; since the person who simply makes use of these drugs cooperates with those who performed the abortion and produced these lines only remotely, materially (i.e. does not approve) and passively, there are, however, situations in which such recourse is morally licit. The Note speaks precisely of 'grave danger', such as the transmission of a serious pathogen.

Now, AIFA's admission officially states that these vaccines were not authorised by virtue of the fact that they were able to contain contagion. And this statement charges the behaviour of the bishops and the Pope himself, who pushed for the vaccination, with an additional moral gravity. Additional, because it cannot and must not be forgotten that the famous 'act of love', which had burdened the consciences of the faithful with a sort of sense of obligation to go to the vaccination HUBs and which had in fact turned into a concrete blackmail, especially against priests, religious, catechists, pushed thousands of people to be inoculated with a preparation of which they knew practically nothing. On the contrary, it was clearly known that the fundamental studies on toxicokinetics, genotoxicity and carcinogenicity had not been carried out. In essence, people were encouraged to offer themselves as guinea pigs, in the name of an 'act of love', which was already known not to be at all, since the vaccine did not stop contagion.

So, to this enormous moral responsibility of our pastors, who have thousands of injured people on their consciences, we must add another, that of having advised people to perform a morally reprehensible act, since vaccination was by no means a means to stop the transmission of a serious pathogen.

It could be argued that things were not so clear at the time. In reality, it would have been sufficient to do some research and ask the relevant bodies, such as AIFA and the EMA, the appropriate questions to clarify many shady aspects of the vaccines. Episcopal conferences and individual bishops, not to mention the Holy See, had a duty to document themselves in order to have sufficient elements for a moral evaluation of the vaccination. Instead, this has not been done, and this constitutes a grave fault on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities, who have betrayed the trust of the people and zeroed in on the resistance against this illicit market in the foetal tissue of aborted

children, preferring to appear in perfect harmony with the prevailing line.

The devastating outcome is that the Catholic Church has not appeared - and continues not to appear - to be a bastion of resistance against the powers of this world, full of lies and thirsty for power and control, for whom people are worth less than ants. The shepherds have failed in their duty of vigilance, protection and resistance against the techno-scientific delirium that is reaping victims at will, upstream and downstream of these preparations. They must realise this before judgement comes. And not of this world.