



RIGHT TO LIFE ACTION COALITION OF OHIO POLICY DOCUMENT – VACCINE ETHICS

The Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio (RTLACO) sees increasing trends toward mandated vaccines with little to no exemptions for moral or religious objection. We stand against these Constitutional violations. The Christian conscience, bodily integrity, and personhood of the human being must be protected.

The Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio presents 10 points as the foundation of our position on vaccine ethics.

WHEREAS

1. Many vaccines are still produced and tested¹ using human diploid cell cultures originally harvested from aborted human beings (hereby referenced as unethical vaccines),^{2,3,4,5} which in turn, has had an impact on families' access to common, ethically produced vaccines at present; researchers have developed several new fetal cell lines from aborted human beings to supplement or replace the original fetal cell lines.^{6,7,8,9}
2. Remnants of the DNA of aborted human beings are present in unethical vaccines¹⁰ and researchers are currently studying the level of risk to patients receiving these vaccines and the manufacturing protocols necessary to reduce this risk,¹¹ with guidance from the FDA.¹²
3. Some pharmaceutical companies are moving away from unethical production and testing of vaccines because of public pressure,¹³ but more must be done to produce ethical vaccines—that is, derived from animal, plant, synthetic, or human cells from consenting adults—and demand ethical alternatives of more companies, particularly when taxpayer funding is involved.¹⁴
4. Interdenominational church positions on the use of unethical vaccines may differ,^{15,16,17,18,19,20} but our common goal of ethical production and testing of vaccines remains; the Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio seeks to find unity among various positions, where biblical personhood and the Word of God can be our foundation and where the

rights of persons remain intact—the rights of born persons not to be forced to violate their own bodily integrity and/or moral conscience and the rights of pre-born persons not to be trafficked, commodified, and/or experimented upon without their consent.

5. There are religious arguments that permit and sometimes encourage participation in vaccinations that use the originally aborted fetal cell lines; these arguments include, but are not limited to, the amount of time that has passed since the original abortions and the intent of the original abortions not being for vaccine production.^{21,22} We find these arguments to be in error. Christians must demand an end to the trafficking and commodification of human beings at all stages of life and must not participate or accept practices that perpetuate and encourage the relationship between abortion, biomedical science, and human trafficking, regardless of when that connection was initiated or how long a practice has been socially accepted.

6. The production and testing of vaccines using the remains of aborted human beings, regardless of manner of conception and without their consent, is morally unacceptable and must be opposed. The Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio strongly urges the rejection of such vaccines.

7. The right of bodily integrity and the right to refuse medical treatments for moral, religious, health, or other reasons,²³ must remain intact and protected by law when an individual considers whether to vaccinate or not. Bodily integrity emphasizes the importance of self-ownership and self-determination of human beings over their own physical bodies. The Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio regards the violation of bodily integrity as unethical and intrusive.

8. Humans are made in the image and likeness of Almighty God (Genesis 1:26-27); We have a duty to honor and care for the body God has given us as a temple of the Holy Spirit (Romans 12:1, 1 Corinthians 3:16, 1 Corinthians 6:20, 1 Corinthians 10:31) and therefore, to force or coerce a person to administer a substance into their body against their will is a violation of their biblical personhood. Such mandates and coercions are also a violation of the dignity of the human person, because freedom of religion and freedom of conscience are fundamental to human dignity.²⁴

9. Parental decisions regarding vaccinations of children must be determined by the family and not by the State, according to biblical mandate (Romans 13:1-7) and legal precedent;^{25,26} the family and the Church are legitimate authorities distinct from the civil magistrate and as such, the Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio rejects the subordination of the family and Church to the State in these matters.

10. Threats to religious freedom, as well as compelled speech,^{27,28} in relation to forced or coerced vaccinations,^{29,30} are already a reality in several states.^{31,32,33,34,35,36,37}

BE IT RESOLVED

The production of a vaccine or any medical therapy derived from the remains of a human being intentionally killed is wholly unethical and should be made unlawful. The Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio affirms the inalienable right to life of pre-born human beings, and thus, their right not to be trafficked, commodified, and/or experimented upon. The Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio also affirms the rights of all people to refuse medical treatment and to reject violations of their and their family members' bodily integrity, moral conscience, and Constitutional protections through forced or coerced vaccines.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

The Right to Life Action Coalition of Ohio affirms that, while the family, the Church, and the State have distinct spheres of authority, the State is subordinate to the family and the Church in matters of vaccination. Therefore, we acknowledge that Christians of all stations have a duty to reject unethical vaccines, to inform others of the connection between abortion, human trafficking, and biomedical science, and to publicly demand that ethical alternatives be produced, tested, and brought to market by pharmaceutical companies and public health officials.

REFERENCES

¹ Charlotte Lozier Institute. (2020, June). A visual aid to viral infection and vaccine production. *On Science*, 1. Retrieved from https://s27589.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Viral-Infection-and-Vaccine-Production-On-Science_1_FINAL1.pdf

² Children of God for Life. (2020). Aborted fetal cell line products for USA and Canada. Retrieved from <https://cogforlife.org/wp-content/uploads/vaccineListOrigFormat.pdf>

³ Sherley, J. L., MD, PhD, & Prentice, D., PhD. (2020, May). An ethics assessment of COVID-19 vaccine programs. *On Point*, 46. Retrieved from <https://lozierinstitute.org/an-ethics-assessment-of-covid-19-vaccine-programs/>

⁴ Moy, A., MD. (2020). How can one tell whether a COVID-19 vaccine was derived from an aborted fetal cell line? Retrieved from <https://www.jp2mri.org/how-can-one-tell-whether-covid19>

REFERENCES

- ⁵ Moy, A., MD. (2020). Are there current vaccines in development that are using cell lines from aborted fetal cells? Retrieved from <https://www.ip2mri.org/are-there-current-vaccines>
- ⁶ Nichols, W.W., & Murphy, D.G., et al. (1977, April 1). Characterization of a new human diploid cell strain. *Science*, 196(4285):60-3. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/841339/>
- ⁷ Nichols, W.W., Cristofalo, V.J., Toji, L.H. et al. (1983). Characterization of a new human diploid cell line—IMR-91. *In Vitro*, 19:797–804. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02618099>
- ⁸ Pau, M.G., & Ophorst, C., et al. (2001, March 21). The human cell line PER.C6 provides a new manufacturing system for the production of influenza vaccines. *Vaccine*, 19(17-19):2716-21. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-410X\(00\)00508-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0264-410X(00)00508-9)
- ⁹ Bo, M., & Li-Fang, H., et al. (2015). Characteristics and viral propagation properties of a new human diploid cell line, walvax-2, and its suitability as a candidate cell substrate for vaccine production. *Human Vaccines and Immunotherapeutics*, 11(4):998-1009. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2015.1009811>
- ¹⁰ SoundChoice Pharmaceuticals. (2020). DNA fragments research. Retrieved from <https://www.soundchoice.org/research/dna-fragments-research/>
- ¹¹ Yang, H. (2013, Mar-Apr). Establishing acceptable limits of residual DNA. *PDA Journal of Pharmaceutical Science and Technology*, 67(2):155-63. Retrieved from <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23569076/>
- ¹² U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research. (2010, February). Guidance for industry: Characterization and qualification of cell substrates and other biological materials used in the production of viral vaccines for infectious disease indications. Retrieved from <https://www.fda.gov/media/78428/download>
- ¹³ Children of God for Life. (2020, June). Sanofi Pasteur discontinues aborted fetal polio vaccine – Using moral cell lines instead. Retrieved from <https://cogforlife.org/2020/06/04/sanofi-pasteur-discontinues-aborted-fetal-polio-vaccine-using-moral-cell-lines-instead/>
- ¹⁴ U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2020, June 16). Fact sheet: Explaining Operation Warp Speed. [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.hhs.gov/about/news/2020/06/16/fact-sheet-explaining-operation-warp-speed.html>
- ¹⁵ Pontifical Academy for Life. (2006, Autumn). Moral reflections on vaccines prepared from cells derived from aborted human fetuses. *National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly*, 6(3):541-37. Copy of text available at <https://www.immunize.org/talking-about-vaccines/vaticandocument.htm>
- ¹⁶ Pontifical Academy for Life: National Office for Health Pastoral Care, Association of Italian Catholic Doctors (2017, July). Note on Italian vaccine issue. Retrieved from <http://www.academyforlife.va/content/pav/en/the-academy/activity-academy/note-vaccini.html>
- ¹⁷ Southern Baptist Convention. (2000). Resolution: On human fetal tissue trafficking. Retrieved from <https://www.sbc.net/resource-library/resolutions/on-human-fetal-tissue-trafficking/>
- ¹⁸ Grobien, G., Dr., Rev. (2020). As long as vaccines are tied to abortions, Christians need exemptions. Retrieved from <https://thefederalist.com/2020/05/06/as-long-as-vaccines-are-tied-to-abortion-christians-need-exemptions/>
- ¹⁹ Olasky, M. (2015). Applying a Christian worldview to the vaccination issue. Retrieved from https://world.wng.org/2015/03/applying_a_christian_worldview_to_the_vaccination_issue
- ²⁰ Mohler, A. (2019). The briefing: Part 1 - The complicated controversy over vaccines: Balancing public health, parental rights, and religious liberty. Retrieved from <https://albertmohler.com/2019/06/17/briefing-6-17-19>
- ²¹ Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission. (2015). Vaccination and the Christian worldview. Retrieved from <https://erlc.com/resource-library/articles/vaccination-and-the-christian-worldview/>
- ²² Randall, R. (2019). Not worth a shot: Why some Christians refuse vaccinations on moral grounds. Retrieved from <https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2019/april-web-only/why-christians-refuse-measles-vaccinations-moral-grounds.html>

REFERENCES

- ²³ Grzybowski, A., Rafal, P.K., Sak, J., & Zagaja, A. (2017, June). Vaccination refusal. Autonomy and permitted coercion. *Pathology and Global Health*, 111(4):200-5. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5498765/citedby/>
- ²⁴ Witherspoon Institute. (2018). Five pillars. Retrieved from <https://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/five-pillars/>
- ²⁵ McCall, S.P. (2008). Vaccination and religious exemptions. Retrieved from <https://www.freedomforuminstitute.org/first-amendment-center/topics/freedom-of-religion/free-exercise-clause-overview/vaccination-religious-exemptions/>
- ²⁶ National Conference of State Legislatures. (2020). States with religious and philosophical exemptions from school immunization requirements. Retrieved from <https://www.ncsl.org/research/health/school-immunization-exemption-state-laws.aspx>
- ²⁷ Utah State Legislature. (2017). HB308: Public health and schools. Retrieved from <https://le.utah.gov/~2017/bills/static/HB0308.html>
- ²⁸ State of Connecticut. (2015). HB6949. Retrieved from <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2015/ACT/pa/pdf/2015PA-00174-R00HB-06949-PA.pdf>
- ²⁹ McCall, Ibid.
- ³⁰ National Conference of State Legislatures, Ibid.
- ³¹ Medical Autonomy Colorado. (2020). Facts about SB20-163. Retrieved from <https://medicalautonomy.co/2020/02/15/the-most-important-things-you-need-to-know-about-sb20-163-and-how-it-will-affect-you/>
- ³² Aguilera, E. (2019). Five things to know now about California’s new vaccine law. Retrieved from <https://calmatters.org/health/2019/09/california-new-law-vaccination-medical-exemption/>
- ³³ MPR News (2020). Vaccine exemptions defeated in Maine, a new law dividing parents is upheld. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2020/03/03/811284575/vaccine-requirements-are-on-the-ballot-in-maine-after-a-new-law-divided-parents>
- ³⁴ Mississippi State Department of Health. (2020). Medical exemption policy. Retrieved from https://msdh.ms.gov/msdhsite/_static/14,0,71,688.html
- ³⁵ New York State Senate. (2020). Senate bill S2994. Retrieved from <https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/bills/2019/s2994/amendment/original>
- ³⁶ Washington State Legislature. (2020). HB1638. Retrieved from <https://app.leg.wa.gov/billsummary?BillNumber=1638&Initiative=false&Year=2019>
- ³⁷ Stilt, D. (2020). Vaccines in Colorado: Informed choice or forced mandate? Retrieved from <https://personhood.org/2020/07/15/vaccines-in-colorado-informed-choice-or-forced-mandate/>