

**Opinion on the ethics of the participation of medical staff and investigators in the administration of the anti-Covid vaccine**

With the Opinion on the compulsory nature of the anti-Covid vaccine, made on the initiative on 20 December 2021, the CIEB drew the attention of the public opinion to the fact that the marketing of the so-called anti-Covid "vaccine" took place according to a "conditional" procedure, applicable in an expedited or urgent way exclusively to "medicinal products" for which "complete clinical data on safety and efficacy have not been provided" (Article 2, and Article 4, no. 1, of European Commission Regulation No. 507/2006 of 29 March 2006).

This normative evidence demonstrates, beyond any debate on relevant scientific data, the experimental nature of the anti-Covid "vaccine" and the experimental purpose of the vaccination campaign in progress, to the extent that recipients are exposed to an unknown risk for Health.

Since the "vaccine" in question is an experimental medicine, it is clear that its use must be in accordance with the principles and rules that constitute the ethical and legal acquis that has been consolidated since the Second World War in the field of biology and medicine. The scientific community itself contributed to the formation of this acquis, through interdisciplinary debates and comparisons that led, among other things, to the proposal of specific moratoriums, such as the one on the use of recombinant DNA discussed in 1975 by the Asilomar Conference. Today this acquis constitutes the source of inspiration for the systems of liberal and democratic states, the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the body of law constituted by the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and the Dignity of the Human Being towards the applications of biology and medicine, signed in Oviedo in 1997, and its Additional Protocols, as well as some declaratory instruments of universal scope, such as the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO I November 11, 1997 and the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights adopted by the UNESCO General Conference on October 19, 2005.

The principles and rules in question are aimed at safeguarding the fundamental rights and freedoms of man with regard to the applications of biomedicine, with particular reference to the need to protect the subjects participating in experimental activities from the risks connected or consequent to the performance of the activity in question. Specifically, the principle of the primacy of the human being over the interests of science and society, as well as the principles of precaution, charity, non-maleficence and equal access to medical care are relevant.

In the perspective indicated above, the duty of the doctor / investigator to respect the professional obligations inspired by rigor, prudence, professionalism, intellectual honesty and moral integrity, not only in the transparency of the decisions taken and in the use of the best knowledge, takes on special importance. available, but also in the presentation of the scientific results achieved (art. 4 of the Oviedo Convention, art. 13 of the UNESCO Universal Declaration of 1997, art. 18 of the UNESCO Universal Declaration of 2005).

Compliance with these professional obligations - which results primarily in the declaration of any conflicts of interest of the doctor / investigator - is essential in order to ensure the safeguarding of another general principle: the principle of informed consent. According to this principle, in fact, an intervention of a medical and biomedical nature can only take place when the persons concerned

have been previously informed by the doctor / investigator about, among other things, the risks of the intervention in question, risks of which the doctor / The investigator must obviously have specific knowledge (art.7 of the 1966 International Pact, art.5 of the Oviedo Convention, art.5 of the 1997 UNESCO Universal Declaration, art.6 of the 2005 UNESCO Universal Declaration) .

The need to periodically promote, in this matter, an interdisciplinary, pluralistic and well-founded public debate, involving the directly interested parties and society as a whole, is also of particular importance, in order to allow the free expression of all relevant opinions, including minority ones (art. 28 of the Oviedo Convention, art. 21 of the UNESCO Universal Declaration of 1997, art. 18 of the UNESCO Universal Declaration of 2005).

As a corollary to the general principles referred to up to now, there are the rules which recognize the right to obtain fair compensation for the damages suffered by subjects unjustly damaged by an intervention of a medical and biomedical nature, according to the applicable legislation (Article 24 of the Oviedo Convention, art.8 of the Universal Declaration of UNESCO of 1997).

On the basis of these considerations, and taking up the conclusions of the Opinion of 20 December 2021, the CIEB first of all reiterates the need for the Government to promote, including through the media, a transparent and objective public debate on the risks and effectiveness of the so-called Anti-Covid "vaccine". The CIEB also reiterates the need for the government to withdraw from its policy aimed at extending the vaccination obligation to targeted categories of workers, surreptitiously forcing even larger portions of citizens to vaccinate.

With specific reference to the ethical conditions of the participation of medical / investigator personnel in the administration of the anti-Covid vaccine, the CIEB recommends that the Government, universities, research bodies and health facilities solicit the personnel in question to knowledge and observance of the principles and rules referred to in this Opinion, also to protect the staff themselves in view of the dispute that the vaccination campaign will inevitably open up.

Rome-Paris, December 27, 2021

The original text of the Opinion is published on the website: [www.ecsel.org/cieb](http://www.ecsel.org/cieb)