

ON THE LEGALITY OF AN ANTI-COVID VACCINE OBLIGATION

Article (<http://www.revuedlf.com/type-chronique/article/>) by Philippe Ségur (<http://www.revuedlf.com/auteurs/philippe-segur/>)

Chronique classée dans Droit administratif (<http://www.revuedlf.com/chroniques/droit-administratif/>)

RDLF 2021 chron. n°20

Keyword (s): consent (<http://www.revuedlf.com/tag/consentement/>), medical experimentation (<http://www.revuedlf.com/tag/experimentation-medicale/>), vaccination obligation (<http://www.revuedlf.com/tag/obligation-vaccinale/>), public health (<http://www.revuedlf.com/tag/sante-publique/>)

Is it legally possible to make anti-covid vaccination compulsory? Considering the marketing authorizations issued for vaccines and the applicable positive law, the answer seems negative. Indeed, the issue of compulsory vaccination, although often mentioned, is rarely mentioned from the angle that should be its own: that of medical experimentation on which the rules of European Union law such as those of French law are clearly established.

By Philippe Ségur, Professor of public law at the University of Perpignan Via Domitia



Four anti-covid vaccines are currently authorized in France: the Moderna vaccine, the Pfizer & BioNTech vaccine (brand name: Comirnaty), the Astrazeneca vaccine (brand name: Vaxzevria) and the Johnson & Johnson vaccine (brand name : Janssen). The **vaccine** - medical technique of inoculating a substance capable of providing immunity against infectious disease - is the answer primarily chosen by the French authorities in response to the pandemic Covid-19. Faced with resistance from part of the population, the question of whether it should not be made compulsory for caregivers, or even for all French people, has entered the public debate [1] .

In general, the vaccination obligation finds its basis in several international and national texts. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of December 16, 1966 provides that in order to guarantee the right to individual health, States must take the necessary measures to ensure

"the prophylaxis and treatment of epidemic diseases" (art. 12). In France, it is the Minister in charge of health who draws up the vaccination policy and the law which determines which vaccines are compulsory. Eleven of them are today for children (art. L3111-2 CSP) [2]. Health professionals and embalming workers are also subject to certain vaccination obligations, as are travelers who wish to go to Guyana. It is, moreover, admitted that "when a small number of deaths occur within the framework of a vaccination program whose sole purpose is to protect the health of society by eliminating infectious diseases", this does not constitute a infringement of the right to life protected by the European Convention on Human Rights of 4 November 1950 [3] . The benefits of vaccination, in fact, are no longer to be demonstrated: it has enabled the eradication of smallpox, a 99% reduction in polio cases between 1988 and 2016, a considerable reduction in cases of tetanus, measles and diphtheria, , whooping cough, etc [4]. Conversely, the resurgence of certain lethal infectious diseases is linked to the reduction in vaccination coverage, which may justify making vaccines compulsory [5] .

In a recent case, the European Court of Human Rights appeared to give pledges to states wishing to impose this obligation in the fight against covid-19. In the *Vavřička* judgment (<https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#%7B%22itemid%22:%5B%22001-209377%22%7D>) of April 8, 2021, it considered that while compulsory vaccination of children was an interference with privacy, it was necessary in a democratic society in the name of social solidarity [6] . This judgment, together with the fact that the French government had intervened in the proceedings, was interpreted as an additional argument in favor of the obligation. This especially since the Constitutional Council (<https://www.conseil-constitutionnel.fr/decision/2015/2015458QPC.htm>) had already refused in 2015 to declare contrary to the Constitution the obligation of childhood vaccination against polio, diphtheria and tetanus [7] .

The health crisis resulting from the covid-19 pandemic could therefore justify making vaccination compulsory by law for public health reasons. The exceptional nature of the circumstances should not, however, obscure that of the medical means used to put an end to it, namely the novel nature of the vaccine procedures used. Thus, the marketing authorization given to manufacturers under the accelerated procedure by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) is conditional. According to the EMA (<https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/glossary/conditional-marketing-authorisation>), this type of authorization is issued "on the basis of less complete data than is normally required" and assumes that the manufacturer undertakes to "provide complete clinical data in the future". The European public assessment reports (EPAR) submitted within the European Medicines Agency for Pfizer (https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/overview/comirnaty-epar-medicine-overview_en.pdf) [8] and Moderna (https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/overview/covid-19-vaccine-moderna-epar-medicine-overview_en.pdf) [9] indicate that pharmaceutical companies have yet to "provide the results of the main trial, which continues for two years." The marketing authorization was granted to Pfizer on December 21, 2020 until December 2022. The "final report of the clinical study" will be submitted in December 2023. For Moderna, the authorization was given on the 6 January 2021 until January 2023. The "final report of the clinical study" will be submitted in December 2022. The fact that this is a vaccination in the experimental phase can therefore not be in doubt.

For the other two vaccines, the marketing authorization is also conditional. The AstraZeneca vaccine was authorized on January 29, 2021 and the Johnson & Johnson vaccine on March 11, 2021. Companies that market them will have to continue to "provide the results of clinical trials, which are ongoing," as the reports indicate. evaluation of the first (https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/overview/vaxzevria-previously-covid-19-vaccine-astrazeneca-epar-medicine-overview_en.pdf) and second (https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/overview/covid-19-vaccine-janssen-epar-medicine-overview_en.pdf) [10] . For AstraZeneca, the "final clinical study reports" are expected on May 31, 2022 [11] . Those for the Johnson & Johnson vaccine are expected on December 31, 2023 [12] . The "clinical trial" formula used by the European Agency is unequivocal. This concept is defined by Directive 2001/20 / EC (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/FR/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32001L0020&from=fr>) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 April 2001 [13] . According to this text, a clinical trial is an "investigation carried out in humans, in order to determine or confirm the clinical, pharmacological and / or other pharmacodynamic effects of one or more experimental drugs (...) with the aim of ensure their safety and / or efficacy". It should be noted, for example, that, apart from the uncertainties relating to their specific technique - mRNA or recombinant DNA [14], "no

carcinogenicity study has been carried out" for the Moderna (<https://www.vidal.fr/medicaments/covid-19-vaccine-moderna-dispers-inj-220325.html>) vaccine and "no genotoxicity study or carcinogenicity has not been achieved" for the Pfizer (<https://www.vidal.fr/medicaments/comirnaty-dispers-diluer-p-sol-inj-219946.html>) , AstraZeneca (<https://www.vidal.fr/medicaments/vaxzevria-susp-inj-224260.html>) and Johnson & Johnson (https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/covid-19-vaccine-janssen-epar-product-information_fr.pdf) vaccines (https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/covid-19-vaccine-janssen-epar-product-information_fr.pdf).

All of this information is enough to convince that the covid-19 pandemic has led health authorities to authorize a large-scale vaccine experiment unprecedented in the history of medicine. In times of emergency, nothing seems legally to oppose it, both in terms of individual health in order to protect vulnerable people and in terms of public health to avoid the saturation of hospital structures. On the other hand, the experimental nature of vaccination invites the jurist to recontextualize its use, because in this matter, both domestic law and international law have historically constructed the notion of the subject's consent as a safeguard to prevent any drift (I). Since then,

I- FREE CONSENT, A BRAKE TO MEDICAL EXPERIMENTATION

A- The historical conflict between ethics and medical experimentation

From the 16th century, advances in medicine prompted experimentation [15]. It is also one of them that allowed the invention of the vaccine. In 1796, Doctor Edward Jenner inoculated an eight-year-old child with pus taken from a milker of cows suffering from an infectious disease of bovines, the vaccine. By then exposing it to a contagious patient, he demonstrates that the injection immunized the child against smallpox. Faith in progress and the exaltation of scientific discoveries then incites to experiment on "vile bodies", considered of little value: the prisoners, the internees, the slaves, the natives, the prostitutes. In the 18th century, doctors carried out experiments on black slaves in the European colonies of the West Indies and North America [16]. Preventive inoculation of diseases such as smallpox is used on entire populations to attempt immunization in the context of mass experimentation.

In the 19th century, experiences multiplied. Some doctors show a high ethical conscience. This is the case, in 1833, of an American military surgeon, William Beaumont (<https://archive.org/details/2543009R.nlm.nih.gov/page/n21/mode/2up>), who carried out experiments on a patient suffering from a fistula in the stomach, but only after having sought his agreement and having committed him to this end [17]. In 1856, Claude Bernard (https://www.irphe.fr/~clanet/otherpaperfile/articles/Bernard/bernard_introduction_etude_medecine_experimentale.pdf), in laying down the principles of the experimental method, recommended "never to practice on a man an experiment which could only be harmful to him to any degree" [18]. However on December 15, 1859, the criminal court of Lyon condemns for willful injury two hospital doctors who voluntarily inoculated syphilis (<https://www.biusante.parisdescartes.fr/sfhd/ecrits/histoire-de-la-dermatologie-lyonnaise/>) to a ten-year-old boy who came to consult for a ringworm [19]. In 1884, Louis Pasteur himself wrote to the Emperor of Brazil asking him for permission to infect death row inmates with cholera in order to try treatments on them [20]. The requirements of experimentation are therefore far from being immediately synonymous with ethics. In 1892, in Germany, a physician director of a clinic was convicted of having injected syphilis into prostitutes and minors without their knowledge. Following this affair, the German health services adopted on December 29, 1900 an instruction (<http://www.landtag.ltsh.de/infothek/wahl19/umdrucke/05100/umdruck-19-05160.pdf>) to the directors of clinics, polyclinics and hospitals which imposed on them in terms of experimentation "the clear consent" of the person concerned [21].

It was a French doctor, Pierre-Charles Bongrand, who was the first to express the modern idea according to which the human subject - and not the doctor - is at the center of the experimental device. In 1905, in his thesis for the doctorate in medicine (https://philippeamiel.fr/Bongrand_Experimentation.pdf), he observed that, while being indispensable to medical progress, experiments on human beings were immoral, because they sacrificed the individual for the community. This is why he proposes to establish an agreement between the experimenter and the subject based on "prior consent" [22]. This conception will not immediately translate into law [23]. The principle of the informed consent of the patient will first be enshrined for the only therapeutic relationship by the Court of Cassation on January 28, 1942 [24]. As for medical research, we will continue to assume that it is humanist simply because it aims to improve the lot of the community. "The labor of men of genius, even when directed in the wrong direction, almost always ends up working to the full advantage of mankind," wrote Mary Shelley in *Frankenstein* in 1818.

The twentieth century has, however, largely denied the presupposition of the humanist aims of all medical research. Thus Unit 731 (<https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2001/06/05/commentary/world-commentary/the-trial-of-unit-731/>), created by Imperial Japan in 1932 would have killed more than ten thousand prisoners serving as human guinea pigs in the laboratory [25]. In August 1944, the chief medical officer of the Japanese army, Nakamura Hirosato, caused the death of nine hundred Indonesians after ordering the experimental injection of a vaccine (<https://apjff.org/2016/01/4-Baird.html#sthash.PxNOhevq.dpuf>) containing chemically modified tetanus toxin [26]. In Germany, neither the Hippocratic Oath, nor the government directives on new therapeutics and scientific experimentation of February 28, 1931 which provided that experimentation was prohibited "in all cases where consent is lacking" will have been sufficient to prevent the most tragic medical abuses. The Third Reich carried out large-scale experiments on deported Jews. In Auschwitz, Buchenwald, Dachau, Natzweiler, Nazi doctors used human guinea pigs that had been inoculated with pathogens such as typhus, yellow fever, smallpox, typhoid, cholera and diphtheria to search for vaccines or to develop treatments for immunity [27].

B- The consecration of informed consent after 1947

In the aftermath of World War II, twenty doctors and three Nazi officials were accused of war crimes and crimes against humanity and tried in Nuremberg from December 9, 1946 to August 20, 1947. The judgment of the American Military Tribunal of 19 and 20 August 1947 [28] establishes a list of ten criteria used to assess the experiments with which the accused are accused and known today as the "Nuremberg Code" (<https://philippeamiel.fr/DocsCobayes/NurembergTrad.pdf>) [29]. Among them is the principle of informed consent of the subject. In their defense, the defendants claimed that in times of war, the Hippocratic oath no longer held and that the State could decide to make the interests of science take precedence over that of the individual for the benefit of the Nation. In response to this argument, the Nuremberg judges defined principles which

should not depend on a specific legal consecration - that is to say on the law of such and such a State - but on universal medical ethics and even on the international law [30]. This is why the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 16, 1966, in turn provides that "it is forbidden to subject a person without their free consent to an experiment. medical or scientific" (art. 7).

Because of their atrocity, the crimes of the Nazi doctors led to believe that it was a monstrous accident of history, thus making us forget what Hannah Arendt calls "the banality of evil". However, throughout the XXth century, other tragedies resulted from medical experiments without the agreement of the people [31]. The history of the United States, where they are well documented, is instructive: feeding retarded children with radioactive cereals by MIT researchers at Fernald State School (<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/americas-deep-dark-secret/>) (Massachusetts) in the 1940s and 1950s [32], false treatments administered to blacks with syphilis by the Tuskegee (<https://www.cdc.gov/tuskegee/timeline.htm>), Alabama, Public Health Department from 1932 to 1972 [33], contamination of mentally handicapped children with hepatitis by two university doctors at Willowbrook State School in New York from 1956 to 1972 [34], trial on 20,000 Americans of thalidomide - a sedative responsible for serious fetal malformations - on simple prescription by general practitioners in the late 1950s and until 1961 [35], injection of cancer cells into elderly and destitute patients at the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital in Brooklyn in 1963 [36], etc.

These examples show that for some, the end can always justify the means. This is why the World Medical Association, a non-governmental organization of physicians created in 1947, saw fit to adopt the Declaration of Helsinki in June 1964. It is the first post-Nuremberg international text which returns to questions of ethics in experimentation. This text affirms that "the participation of capable persons in medical research must be a voluntary act" (art. 25). In France, the principles of the Nuremberg Code largely inspire the guarantees provided by law. They were taken up by the National Consultative Ethics Committee in an opinion delivered in 1984 (<https://www.ccne-ethique.fr/fr/publications/avis-sur-les-essais-de-nouveaux-traitements-chez-lhomme>) [37] and by the Council of State's report on life sciences, ethics and law in 1988. [38]. However, it is the law of December 20, 1988, known as the Huriet-Sérusclat law (<https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT00000508831/>), which for the first time provided for specific permission for medical tests on healthy volunteers - until then prohibited - while recalling the need of "free, informed and express consent" [39]. recalling the need for "free, informed and express consent" [39].

II- FREE CONSENT, AN OBSTACLE TO THE OBLIGATION TO VACCINE

A- The legal framework of the experiments

Medical research, including when it has a therapeutic purpose, is currently governed by the law of March 5, 2012, known as the Jardé law (<https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000025441587/>) [40]. According to the Public Health Code, no intervention research involving the human person can be carried out "without their free and informed consent obtained in writing, after having been given the information provided" (article 1122-1-1). Interventional research is that which "includes an intervention on the person not justified by his usual care" (article 1121-1), that is to say an intervention not without risk for the people who participate in it. This includes research on drugs, but also cell therapies or gene therapies as recalled by INSERM (<https://www.inserm.fr/recherche-inserm/recherche-clinique/comprendre-recherche-clinique>). Both by their nature and by their experimental methodology, the four anti-covid vaccines appear to fall into this category. As for prior information, it must include in particular "foreseeable risks" and "possible medical alternatives" (article 1122-1).

This intervention research assumes a favorable opinion from a regional body, the Committee for the Protection of Persons (CPP), which depends on the Regional Health Agency (ARS), followed by authorization by the National Security Agency of the Medicines and health products (ANSM). In principle, failure to obtain this consent is punishable by three years in prison and a fine of 45,000 euros by the Penal Code (art. 223-8). Nevertheless, the issue of the anti-covid vaccine led to the relinquishment of the French health authorities in favor of the European Medicines Agency (EMA) on the basis of Regulation (EC) n ° 726/2004 (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2004/726/oj>) of March 31, 2004. **With regard to concerns** les "medicinal products for human use containing a new active substance", in particular for the treatment of viral diseases, this regulation **in fact provides for a centralized authorization procedure at European level. In other words, these medicines** must receive an authorization from the European Medicines Agency (EMA) valid for all Member States of the European Union. This relinquishment then precludes a possible action before the French judge for non-compliance with the opinion and authorization procedure in domestic law, since under the pressure of the circumstances, this has been replaced by a European procedure. On the other hand, it does not in any way dispense with the obligation to obtain the consent of the persons.

Within the Council of Europe, Recommendation No.R (90) 3 (<https://philippeamiel.fr/DocsCobayes/041-recR90.pdf>) of the Committee of Ministers on medical research on human beings, adopted on 6 February 1990, sets out a number of principles. According to the third, "no medical research can be carried out without the informed, free, express and specific consent of the person who lends itself to it" and, according to the thirteenth, "persons likely to be the subject of medical research cannot be carried out. should not be induced to submit to them in a way that compromises their free consent". This text, if it represents a political and ethical commitment, has no binding legal value. On the other hand, the regulation (EC) of March 31, 2004 provides in a binding way within the European Union the respect of certain ethical requirements during the conduct of clinical trials of medicinal products authorized at European level (point 16). Directive 2001/20 / EC (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/FR/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32001L0020&from=fr>) of 4 April 2001 which explicitly refers to the Declaration of Helsinki and which also provides for informed consent (art. 3). Finally, the European Court of Human Rights had the opportunity to rule in 2002 that the imposition of treatment without the patient's consent is "an attack on the physical integrity of the person concerned" [41] and that "compulsory vaccinations as involuntary medical treatment constitute an interference with the right to respect for private life" [42].

One question remains: does this principle apply when the experiment consists of a vaccine? The answer is yes, because the directive of April 4, 2001 covers medicinal products as they are defined by another text, Directive 65/65 / EEC (<https://op.europa.eu/fr/publication-detail/-/publication/a761f2b9-d398-4fc5-a2fe-f1f7bebdb9b4/language-fr>) of January 26, 1965. According to this directive (<https://op.europa.eu/fr/publication-detail/-/publication/a761f2b9-d398-4fc5-a2fe-f1f7bebdb9b4/language-fr>), a medicinal product is "any substance or composition presented as having curative or preventive properties with regard to human or animal diseases. Any substance or composition which can be administered to humans or animals with a view to establishing a medical diagnosis or to restoring, correcting or modifying organic functions in

humans or animals is also considered to be medicinal "(art. . 1st). Anti-covid vaccines undoubtedly meet this definition. Insofar as they are still in the experimental phase, they are subject to the ethical principles imposed by the 2004 regulation. The rule of free and informed consent to an experiment is therefore well established in French law as well as in European Union law.

B- Inviolability of the human body and dignity of the person

While the *Vavříčka* judgment rendered by the European Court on April 8, 2021 does not preclude the anti-covid vaccination obligation, it does not make it plausible or legally acceptable. In this case, it was about vaccines long tested which only arouse marginal disputes among radical opponents of any vaccination. It is quite different with anti-covid vaccines. As these are, by the European Medicines Agency's own admission, in the clinical trial phase, it seems difficult to impose them given the existing legal guarantees. An obligation to vaccinate in a context of experimentation would run the risk of encountering the sanction of the judge, especially since French law is based on the principle of the inviolability of the human body. This prohibition is expressed in the adage *Noli me tangere*, "do not touch me", taken from the words of the Risen Christ to Mary Magdalene [43] and reflecting the sacred character of the body. If this principle of inviolability has not received constitutional consecration, it nevertheless crosses our entire legal system and is covered by the "safeguard of the dignity of the person", a broader concept that the Constitutional Council has elevated to the rank of principle. constitutional in its decision of July 27, 1994 (https://www.conseil-constitutionnel.fr/decision/1994/94343_344DC.htm) on the law relating to respect for the human body [44].

It is common to say that medical experimentation benefits the entire human species although it may be exercised to the possible detriment of those who expose themselves to its risks. In other words, the benefit expected by the greatest number would be well worth the danger incurred by a few. However, medical experimentation on human beings cannot be reduced to an equation which would make it as obvious as a benefit / disadvantage calculation. Indeed, such reasoning postulates its disinterested purpose while avoiding its economic, political and social determinants. In the *Vavříčka* case, Judge Wojtyczek observed in a dissenting opinion ([https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#%22itemid%22:\[%22001-209377%22\]](https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng#%22itemid%22:[%22001-209377%22])) published following the judgment "that no evidence has been submitted to the Court to show that the States which have implemented the vaccination obligation obtain better results in terms of public health than the States which do not 'have not introduced this obligation' ". The remark is crucial and fraught with implications.

We must in fact beware of an idealized vision of scientific rationality which would lead to disregarding the issues of power, financial interests and the institutional strategies which condition it. Medical research has its own logic of deployment which is not necessarily humanist and which can be subject to the quest for profit, as the Mediator case recently recalled [45]. It is a fact, moreover, that pure rationality escapes all moral norms and threatens to turn against itself, as Max Horkheimer has shown [46]. A marker of civilization can then be transformed into "regressive progress" according to Theodor Adorno's formula [47].

If the idea of scientific neutrality is an illusion [48], the mere use of the term "ethics" in legal texts is not sufficient to guarantee its harmlessness. Even when research is strictly framed by law, the principle of free consent often seems fragile in the asymmetrical relationship between medical authority and the subject. It is difficult to see, moreover, how consent could be completely "informed" in the presence of an unknown risk and a complex vaccination technique. As Yannick Bardie (<https://www.nouvelobs.com/sante/20160115.OBS2866/l-essai-clinique-est-un-exercice-tres-dangereux.html>) recalled in 2016, a clinical trial is by nature "a very dangerous and unethical exercise" [49]. Given the many uncertainties that will weigh until the end of the trials on anti-covid vaccines, if it is legitimate to leave volunteers, in particular vulnerable people, the possibility of receiving them in full knowledge of the facts, it would appear contrary to the law in force and to the principles on which our liberal system is based to want to impose them on all citizens.

[1] National Academy of Medicine, "Vaccination of caregivers against Covid-19 must become compulsory," Press release from the National Academy of Medicine, March 9, 2021.

[2] Law n° 2017-1836 of 30 December 2017 on the financing of social security for 2018, *JORF*, 31 Dec. 2017.

[3] Commission EDH, 12 July. 1978, *Association X. Against the United Kingdom*, n° 7154/75.

[4] D. Lévy-Bruhl. "Vaccine policy", in F. Bourdillon (ed.), *Treaty of public health*. Lavoisier, 2016, pp. 311-322.

[5] Ph. Sansonetti, "Distrust of vaccines, a luxury for those who are protected by others? », *The day after tomorrow*, vol. n° 42, n° 2, 2017, pp. 9-11.

[6] ECHR, April 8, 2021, *Vavříčka v. Czech Republic*, No. 46621/13.

[7] CC, dec. n° 2015-458 QPC, March 20, 2015, Husband L.

[8] *Comirnaty. An overview of Comirnaty and why it is authorised in the EU*, EMA/215190/2021, p. 4.

[9] *Covid-19 Vaccine Moderna. An overview of COVID-19 Vaccine Moderna and why it is authorised in the EU*, EMA/704373/2020, p. 4.

[10] *COVID-19 Vaccine Janssen. An overview of COVID-19 Vaccine Janssen and why it is authorised in the EU*, EMA/229490/2021; *Vaxzevria. An overview of Xaxzevria and why it is authorised in the EU*, EMA/213411/2021.

[11] Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use, *Covid-19 Vaccine AstraZeneca, Assessment report*, EMA/94907, 20 January 2021, p. 176.

[12] Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use, *Covid-19 Vaccine Janssen, Assessment report*, EMA/158424, 11 March 2021, p. 209.

[13] Directive 2001/20 / EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 April 2001 on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to the application of good clinical practice in the conduct of clinical trials on medicinal products for human use, *OJ No. L121, 1st May 2001, p. 34-44*.

[14] Janssen Vaccines & Prevention B.V., *Summary Notification Information Format for the Release of Genetically Modified Organisms Other Than Higher Plants in Accordance with Article 11 of Directive 2001/18/EC, Ad26COVS1*, 6 July 2020.

[15] Ph. Amiel, "Experimentation on the human being", in C. Bonah, J.-M. Mouillie et al., *Medicine, health and human sciences*, Les Belles Lettres, pp. 554-576, 2014.

- [16] G. Chamayou, *Les corps vils. Experimenting on human beings in the 18th and 19th centuries*, La Découverte, 2014, pp. 341-384.
- [17] W. Beaumont, *Experiments and Observations on the Gastric Juice*, Plattsburgh, P. P. Allen, 1833, p. 20.
- [18] C. Bernard, *Introduction to experimental medicine*, JB Baillière & Fils ed., 1865, II, chap. 2, § 3.
- [19] A. Claudy, *Histoire de la dermatologie lyonnaise*, French Society for the History of Dermatology.
- [20] L. Pasteur, *Letter addressed to Pedro II, Emperor of Brazil*, Sept. 22, 1884, National Archives, AB / XIX / 3332.
- [21] Schleswig-Holstein Ministry for Social Affairs, Health, Youth, Family and Seniors, *Scientific investigation of the practice of drug trials in Schleswig-Holstein facilities for the disabled as well as in adult, child and youth psychiatry in the years 1949 to 1975*, January 12 2021, p. 35.
- [22] P.-C. Bongrand, *Experimentation on man. Its scientific value and its legitimacy*, 1905, Presses de Institut Gustave Roussy / IGR Press.fr, 2011, p. 122.
- [23] Ph. Amiel, *Guinea pigs and men; experimentation on human beings and justice*, Les Belles Lettres, 2011.
- [24] Cass, Jan. 28, 1942, *Teyssier*, Gaz. Pal. 1942, 1, p. 177; B. Hoerni and J.-P. Bouscharain, "Teyssier judgment of the Cour de Cassation, January 28, 1942: some remarks on a forgotten "decision", *Histoire des sciences médicinales*, t. XXXV, No. 3, 2001.
- [25] R. Working, « *The Trial of the Unit 731* », *The Japan Times*, 5 June 2005.
- [26] J. K. Baird, « *War Crimes in Japan-Occupied Indonesia: Unraveling the Persecution of Achmad Mochtar* », *The Asia-Pacific Journal Japan Focus*, Jan. 1, 2016, vol. 14, issue 1, n° 4.
- [27] J. Graven, "The trial of the Nazi doctors and the pseudo-medical experiments. Outline of a comprehensive study, *Annales de droit international médical*, n° 8, June 1962, p. 5.
- [28] Ph. Amiel, "Medical experiments: Nazi doctors before their judges", in F. Violla, *Les grandes décisions du droit médical*, LGDJ, 2009, pp. 431-444.
- [29] Ph. Amiel, "Code de Nuremberg": translations and adaptations in French", in *Des cobayes et des hommes, op. cit.*
- [30] Ph. Amiel, F. Violla, "The Nuremberg code", an inaugural criminal case law international place of health", in E. Cadeau, É. Mondielli, F. Violla (dir.), *Mélanges in honor of Michel Bédaride: modernity of health law*, Les éditions hospitalières, 2015, pp. 573-585.
- [31] A. M. Salam, A. S. Carr, « *Racing for Covid-19 Vaccine and Cure: Lessons and Tragedies in Human Subject Research* », *Heart Views*, 2020 Jul-Sep, 21(3), p. 229-234.
- [32] R. Leung, « *America's Deep, Dark Secret* », *CBS News*, Apr. 29, 2004.
- [33] Center for Disease Control and Prevention, *The Tuskegee Timeline*.
- [34] S. Krugman, « *The Willowbrook Hepatitis Studies Revisited: Ethical Aspects* », *Reviews of infectious diseases*, vol. 8, n°1, Jan.-Febr. 1986, 157-162.
- [35] B. Fintel, A. T. Samaras, E. Carias, « *The Thalidomide Tragedy: Lessons for Drug Safety and Regulation* », *Helix*, Jul. 28, 2009.
- [36] « *Hospital Accused on Cancer Study* », *The New York Times*, Jan. 21, 1964.
- [37] CCNE, *Opinion on trials of new treatments in humans. Reflections and Proposals*, No. 2, Oct. 9, 1984.
- [38] *Life sciences: from ethics to law*, Report G. Braibant, La Documentation française, 1988.
- [39] Law n° 88-1138 of 20 Dec. 1988 relating to the protection of persons who lend themselves to biomedical research, *JORF*, 22 Dec. 1988.
- [40] Law n° 2012-300 of March 5, 2012 relating to research involving the human person, *JORF*, March 6, 2012. See: J. Ducruet, "Protection of persons who lend themselves to biomedical research", *Laennec*, vol. 56, n° 3, 2008, pp. 6-24.
- [41] ECHR, April 29, 2002, *Pretty v. United Kingdom*, n° 2346/02.
- [42] CEDH, 9 July. 2002, *Salveti C. Italy*, n° 42197/98.
- [43] *Jean*, 20, 17.
- [44] CC, dec. n° 94-343 / 344 DC, July 27, 1994, Law relating to respect for the human body and law relating to the donation and use of elements and products of the human body, to medically assisted procreation and prenatal diagnosis, *JORF*, July 29. 1994, p. 11024.
- [45] CAA Paris, 8ème ch., August 4, 2017, 16PA00157 and 16PA03634.
- [46] M. Horkheimer, *Eclipse of reason*, 1947, Payot, 1974.
- [47] Th. W. Adorno, *Minima Moralia. Reflections on mutilated life*, 1951, Payot, 2016.
- [48] K. Abbasi, "Covid-19: politicization, corruption, and suppression of science", *The British Medical Journal*, 2020, 371. Online: <<https://www.bmj.com/content/371/bmj.m4425>> (accessed May 7, 2021).
- [49] *L'Obs*, Jan. 15, 2016. See also Y. Bardie, *Clinical trial: from the patient to the object of science*, Ed. Sauramps Medical, 2013.

◀ Previous article (<http://www.revuedlf.com/cedh/le-reploiement-de-la-dignite/>)

Next article ▶ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/cedh/cedh-gc-georgie-c-russie-ii-21-janvier-2021-la-jurisprudence-chaotique-de-la-cour-europeenne-sur-la-jurisdiction-extraterritoriale-dans-les-conflits-armes/>)

103 REVIEWS

1. ARNOUX Christophe the July 1, 2021 at 23 h 52 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-11856>)

tnis:

Thanks for this article.

How to assert your fundamental rights?

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73856#respond>)

2. Véronique the2 July 2021 at 2 h 17 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73857>) this: Thank you very much for this really interesting and complete article! You really have to understand that we are still in the clinical testing phase.

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73857#respond>)

3. Christmas the2 July 2021 at 7 h 17 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73859>) this: "Noli me tangere"... Thank you very much for this clear and precise article.

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73859#respond>)

4. Duchesne the2 July 2021 at 8 h 11 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73863>) this: How complicated medical legal is !!! and how much effort it will take us to be enlightened in what looks like a great pharmaceutical manipulation !!!

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73863#respond>)

5. Charlotte the2 July 2021 at 9 h 38 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73864>) this: Thank you for your very informative and very useful article in the event of compulsory vaccination to argue the illegitimacy of such a measure during vaccine experimentation.

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73864#respond>)

6. Marie France MAZENOD the2 July 2021 at 9 h 53 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73865>) this:

Can we have all this by email. ???????

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73865#respond>)

- Suzy R le July 3, 2021 at 0 h 19 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73882>) this: Here you can send it by email <https://www.printfriendly.com/p/g/Ty8ULd> (<https://www.printfriendly.com/p/g/Ty8ULd>)

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73882#respond>)

7. Chollet Magali the2 July 2021 at 9 h 53 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73866>) this: Thank you!

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73866#respond>)

8. Jean Louis the2 July 2021 at 10 h 02 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73867>) this: Thank you very much for this article.

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73867#respond>)

9. Noémi GUYON le2 July 2021 at 10 h 17 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73868>) this: An essential focus.

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73868#respond>)

10. ADAM chantal on2 July 2021 at 11 h 24 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73869>) this: Thank you so much. I had my morale at zero with the government announcements, I regain some hope thanks to you.

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73869#respond>)

11. Nicole Foulquier the2 July 2021 at 12 h 05 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73870>) this: Very interesting
Thank you

Reply ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73870#respond>)

12. Ecclesia Elodie le 2 juillet 2021 at 12 h 25 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73871>) dit: Bravo et merci pour cet article complet, parfaitement argumenté et qui nous conforte dans nos libertés de choix et de refus de ce produit !

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73871#respond>)

13. Pederiva le 2 juillet 2021 at 12 h 27 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73872>) dit: Un grand merci pour cet article qui remet le droit humain en avant face à toutes ces dérives pharmaceutiques.

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73872#respond>)

14. Françoise Jacotin-Soueix le 2 juillet 2021 at 15 h 00 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73873>) dit:

A lire absolument , en entier et à conserver .

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73873#respond>)



High

15. Citoyenne alarmée le 2 juillet 2021 at 15 h 30 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73874>) dit:
 Merci beaucoup. Peuvent ils changer le droit? Par exemple, le projet de loi interdisant l'école à la maison a été adopté hier par 56 votes et 28 oppositions ([https://www2.assemblee-nationale.fr/scrutins/detail/\(legislature\)/15/\(num\)/3865](https://www2.assemblee-nationale.fr/scrutins/detail/(legislature)/15/(num)/3865) ([https://www2.assemblee-nationale.fr/scrutins/detail/\(legislature\)/15/\(num\)/3865](https://www2.assemblee-nationale.fr/scrutins/detail/(legislature)/15/(num)/3865))), cād en séance parlementaire très réduite. Peuvent ils s'y prendre de la même façon pour modifier le droit français?
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73874#respond>)
16. Sprikritik le 2 juillet 2021 at 17 h 31 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73875>) dit:
 Il est peu utile et pertinent de parler de licéité quand on vit depuis 1958 en godillotcratie et en prime en eurocratie.
 La question est : était/est-il intelligent d'imposer à tous sans discernement quelle que soit le degré de risque individuel d'être moyennement agressé pendant une durée indéterminée par un des plus de mille virus de la « famille » des Sars coronavirus des injections génomiques expérimentales qui ont déjà fait un nombre de morts (officiel et non caché) et d'abîmées supérieur à ce qui est généralement accepté, hélas, dans les cas antérieurs pour des nouveaux « vaccins » totalement autorisés.
 Il est absolument impossible que le réseau international opportunément constitué de médecins sans conflits d'intérêts et expérimentés, parfois vieux vaccinomanes comme Perronne et Raoult et d'autres, qui conseillent d'attendre se trompent. Quand, t à l'opposé, beaucoup de leur confrères ont fait pas mal d'argent avec cette syndémie plandémique.
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73875#respond>)
17. Aurore Sanchez le 2 juillet 2021 at 17 h 40 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73876>) dit:
 Merci infiniment pour cet article édifiant qui remet les choses en perspectives. Ne nous laissons pas abuser par la folie ambiante.
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73876#respond>)
18. Lamendour André le 2 juillet 2021 at 18 h 04 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73877>) dit:
 Merci à Philippe Segur, pour cette étude
 Juridique, documentée, sur la liceite d'une obligation vaccinale contre le
 Cov 19..les arguments d'opposition, reposent, sur le consentement éclairé,
 qui ne peut exister aujourd'hui, les dits
 vaccins étant encore en phase expérimentale.. sans résultats probants, et sans garantie de maîtrise des effets secondaires induits...
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73877#respond>)
19. Goncalves le 2 juillet 2021 at 18 h 23 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73878>) dit:
 Marre d'être pris pour des ignorants au cerveau vide ! Merci pour cet éclaircissement historique !
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73878#respond>)
20. Ferreira le 2 juillet 2021 at 21 h 44 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73879>) dit:
 Merci pour cet article très intéressant et qui va sûrement m'aider car je suis soignante.
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73879#respond>)
- o Johann le 8 juillet 2021 at 12 h 28 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73966>) dit:
 Bonjour,
 Je suis soignant également et même si cet article est très intéressant, cela ne change malheureusement rien.
 Il ne peuvent légalement pas nous imposer une vaccination, soit !
 Mais il peuvent parfaitement rompre le contrat de travail des récalcitrants.
 Ils peuvent imposer les cours à distance pour les étudiants non-vaccinés et en présentiel pour les vaccinés, ils peuvent empêcher l'accès aux transports en commun aux non vaccinés...
 Ils sont capables de tout, surtout du pire.
 Donc si la vaccination ne peut légalement être obligatoire, ils peuvent faire de notre vie un véritable chemin de croix.
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73966#respond>)
 - Melissandre le 12 juillet 2021 at 16 h 41 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73989>) dit:
 Alors en fait si, la jurisprudence est très claire, on peut imposer une obligation vaccinale pour certaines catégories de population. Les arguments développés par cet article sont claqués au sol, il n'y a pas d'univers où ils sont entendables. Vous serez vaccinés si vous êtes soignants et vous irez très bien derrière.
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73989#respond>)
21. Danielle marc le 2 juillet 2021 at 21 h 59 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73880>) dit:
 Merci pour cet article clair et complet ! Pour nous permettre la réponse à cet acharnement à rendre la vaccination obligatoire
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73880#respond>)
22. Utkovic nathalie le 3 juillet 2021 at 0 h 59 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73883>) dit:
 Esque ont n'a le droit de vaccinez de force une personne qui ne veut pas???
 Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73883#respond>)



Merci beaucoup pour cet article très complet qui remet les pendules à l'heure et qui relative des directives qui sont pour le moins liberticides et je pense dangereuses sinon très dangereuses. Merci encore.

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73884#respond>)

24. Jfr le 3 juillet 2021 at 8 h 10 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73888>) dit:

Merci pour votre excellent travail.

« primum non nocere » voilà l'action prioritaire. Ne pas oublier que le médecin soigne et que la nature guérit...

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73888#respond>)

25. tourvie le 3 juillet 2021 at 9 h 31 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73890>) dit:

Bonjour

Il suffit de faire un copier coller du lien de l'article

<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#respond> (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#respond>)

Et de le coller dans le texte d'un mail

Bonne reception

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73890#respond>)

26. Jean MUR le 3 juillet 2021 at 9 h 48 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73891>) dit:

Il y a malheureusement (pour eux) énormément de gens sensibles à la propagandastaffel

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73891#respond>)

27. Stéphanie le 3 juillet 2021 at 10 h 20 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73892>) dit:

Je préfère la mesure à l'espoir. Si cet article donne un certain espoir. Il n'explique pas l'obligation vaccinale des nouveaux nés en 2018. Car le libre consentement éclairé ne s'y trouve pas. Quel parent, connaît le contenu de ces 11 vaccins ?

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73892#respond>)

28. Clara le 3 juillet 2021 at 10 h 30 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73893>) dit:

Un grand Merci pour ce dossier complet, travail de fourmi indispensable, que devraient faire les vrais journalistes. ... on a vraiment compris le vrai visage des médias dominants depuis cette crise. Mais avez vous essayé d'envoyer votre dossier à Élise Lucet, qui se réclame de révéler les affaires de corruption etc... ? ou bien est ce peine perdue d'avance?

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73893#respond>)

29. Jean MUR le 3 juillet 2021 at 14 h 00 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73894>) dit:

Un commentaire posté ce matin.

Et, visiblement censuré.

Pour quelle raison ?

Vous avez mon adresse courriel et la moindre des corrections aurait été de me contacter.

Peut-être ne savez vous pas ce qu'est la politesse!!!

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73894#respond>)

30. Camille le 3 juillet 2021 at 14 h 20 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73895>) dit:

Merci beaucoup pour cet article. L'obligation vaccinale dans ces conditions est une aberration. Le « vaccin » est en réalité de la thérapie génique expérimentale.

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73895#respond>)

31. Jacques Poirier le 3 juillet 2021 at 16 h 56 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73897>) dit:

Merci pour cet éclairage juridique. En revanche, je ne suis pas optimiste. Pour avoir passé une grande partie de mon existence professionnelle dans l'industrie pharmaceutique avec – comme principaux interlocuteurs – les Autorités d'Enregistrements françaises et européennes (EMA), je sais que ces dernières sont prêtes à beaucoup d'arrangements. Il suffit que les firmes pharmaceutiques concernées se concertent avec les Autorités d'Enregistrements pour rendre leur copie plus tôt... Et le tour est joué !... C'est donc MAINTENANT qu'il faut réagir.

Le sujet est trop grave pour qu'on l'élide. Je me mets à la disposition des juristes qui souhaiteraient recueillir mes commentaires (et éventuellement mes recommandations) concernant la préparation d'une possible action en justice à l'encontre des Autorités françaises de santé et de l'EMA. Il existe à Bruxelles des cabinets d'avocats (j'en ai pratiqué certains) qui passent leur temps à ferrailler contre les initiatives et certaines clauses léonines des différentes DG.

Le vieil adage « mieux vaut prévenir que guérir n'a jamais été autant d'actualité.

Jacques POIRIER

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73897#respond>)

32. Françoise Donant le 3 juillet 2021 at 20 h 59 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73898>) dit:

Texte fouillé détaillé essentiel pour défendre notre intégrité psychique et physique.

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73898#respond>)

33. Marie-Angèle HERNÁNDEZ le 3 juillet 2021 at 23 h 16 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73900>) dit:

Vous oubliez la Résolution 2361 adoptée le 28/01 parle Conseil de l'Europe qui stipule en Article 7.3.1 et 7.3.2 que « la vaccination ne devra pas être obligatoire et que

personne ne devra subir de pressions politiques, sociales ou autres, pour se faire vacciner, si il ou elle ne souhaite pas le faire personnellement, etc...

ceci ne concerne que l'Europe et il serait important que les SOIGNANTS soient au courant de ce document juridique en raison des pressions politiques et médiatiques qui sont opérés à leur encontre actuellement en les menaçant de Vaccination Obligatoire

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73900#respond>)

- fabthefab le 5 juillet 2021 at 23 h 53 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73955>) dit:
Il s'agit d'une résolution exprimant la position politique du conseil de l'Europe sur un sujet donné. Malheureusement, les résolutions du conseil n'ont aucun effet contraignant sur les états. Ce sont des vœux, rien de plus.
<https://www.consilium.europa.eu/fr/council-eu/conclusions-resolutions/> (<https://www.consilium.europa.eu/fr/council-eu/conclusions-resolutions/>)

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73955#respond>)

- fab_thefab le 7 juillet 2021 at 22 h 02 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73964>) dit:
Non contraignante hélas... Allez faire un tour sur cette page et vous verrez par vous-même
<https://www.consilium.europa.eu/fr/council-eu/conclusions-resolutions/> (<https://www.consilium.europa.eu/fr/council-eu/conclusions-resolutions/>)

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73964#respond>)

34. Zouar Samia le 4 juillet 2021 at 2 h 01 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73901>) dit:
Merci j'imprime direct, merci d'informer avec des preuves factuelle

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73901#respond>)

35. Romano le 4 juillet 2021 at 12 h 26 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73906>) dit:
Ma fille est infirmière et ne désire pas être vaccinée. Est ce que l'hôpital peut l'écarter sans salaire ou la licencier ? Quel sont ses droit ?

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73906#respond>)

36. Doudet le 4 juillet 2021 at 14 h 24 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73907>) dit:
Un grand merci pour cet exposé limpide et qui vient me renforcer dans ma décision de ne pas me laisser imposer de la thérapie génique dont personne à ce jour ne peut prédire les effets moyen et long terme .

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73907#respond>)

37. Jib le 4 juillet 2021 at 15 h 40 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73908>) dit:

Je vous signale un angle mort de votre démonstration:

L'octroi de l'AMM conditionnelle d'un vaccin repose sur la présomption de l'absence de traitement médicamenteux ou autre.

Or ces traitements existent : à l'hôpital le taux de mortalité de la réanimation a été grandement amélioré par l'administration d'oxygène à haut débit et d'anticoagulants (héparine) associés à des corticoïdes.

En médecine de ville, de multiples traitements précoces sont apparus (plaquénil, ivermectine, antibiotiques macrolides),

En prévention ou en soutien de nombreuses propositions ont été avancées (vitamine D3, C et zinc). Toutes ces avancées en France ou à l'étranger ont fait largement réduire le taux de létalité de cette maladie.

Les médecins ont également distingué des populations à risques aggravés (obésité, HTA, diabète, immunodéficiences).

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73908#respond>)

38. Séverine le 4 juillet 2021 at 16 h 04 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73909>) dit:
Merci pour cet excellent article. Il serait judicieux que Monsieur Véran et les sénateurs prennent connaissance de cet article.

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73909#respond>)

39. Vincent le 4 juillet 2021 at 16 h 38 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73911>) dit:
Je suis un homme libre ... de gérer ma vie , ma santé, mon corps n'appartient qu'à moi et je refuse de servir de cobaye pour la medecine ... les chercheurs qui sont meilleurs apôtres que moi n'ont qu'à faire les essais sur eux-mêmes pour prouver leur crédibilité et leur investissement dans leur travail qui est la recherche .

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73911#respond>)

40. Nathalie Henry le 4 juillet 2021 at 17 h 49 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73912>) dit:
Éclairer notre conscience

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73912#respond>)

41. Noland le 4 juillet 2021 at 21 h 33 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73914>) dit:
Très intéressant que j'ai eu le bonheur de recevoir d'une amie juriste. Nous sommes quand même en danger quand les lois sont arrachées de nuit par une minorité inconsciente seulement préoccupée par la reconduction de son mandat et qui a abandonné ses prérogatives de surveillance du gouvernement sous un faux prétexte d'état de guerre.

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73914#respond>)

42. Remy Vaissiere le 5 juillet 2021 at 0 h 22 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73915>) dit:
Merci de cette informarion très complète.

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73915#respond>)

43. Cellini Helene le 5 juillet 2021 at 9 h 50 min (<http://www.revuedf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73941>) dit:
Merci pour votre article complet et éclairé. Je suis soignante et résolument contre la vaccination obligatoire. J'ai maintenant des arguments à apporter pour ne pas protéger de cette vaccination , en tout cas jusqu'en 2023.



High

Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73941#respond>)

44. Tarquis le 5 juillet 2021 at 16 h 28 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73946>) dit:
Pourriez-vous contacter et envoyer votre article aux présidents respectifs des commissions des affaires sociales du sénat et de l'assemblée?
Il faut les éclairer
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73946#respond>)
45. Portier le 5 juillet 2021 at 16 h 46 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73947>) dit:
Informations très instructives
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73947#respond>)
46. Portier le 5 juillet 2021 at 16 h 51 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73948>) dit:
Un suger très intéressant et instructif
Merci pour l'information
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73948#respond>)
47. Portier le 5 juillet 2021 at 16 h 54 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73949>) dit:
Un documentaire très complet et très intéressant
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73949#respond>)
48. Portier le 5 juillet 2021 at 17 h 12 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73950>) dit:
Merci pour ces informations très intéressantes
Olivier Veyran devrait consulter ces documents
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73950#respond>)
49. Yoly le 5 juillet 2021 at 17 h 41 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73951>) dit:
Merci pour cet article très intéressant avec rappel des faits historiques et l'évolution des textes dans le temps.
Merci à Jib d'avoir évoquer les traitements pour la prise en charge du COVID et les moyens de prévention en renforçant son système immunitaire.
J'écoutais ce matin Olivier Bogillot sur France Inter et je n'ai pas tout compris (si quelqu'un peut m'éclairer) notamment lorsqu'il a dit :
- Vacciné, vous pouvez contaminer une personne. Sans vaccin, vous en contaminez six => est ce possible ? si oui pourquoi , pas compris.
- la grippe est quelque chose de très particulier auquel l'ARN messenger peut apporter des réponses. Le temps de recherche « se comptera en années » => pourquoi en années, n'est ce pas la même technique que pour le COVID ? pas compris non plus
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73951#respond>)
50. Nicolas le 5 juillet 2021 at 19 h 48 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73952>) dit:
Très clair et instructif.
Merci
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73952#respond>)
51. Roux le 5 juillet 2021 at 21 h 24 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73953>) dit:
Merci pour cet éclairage très documenté et très accessible, cela donne du baume au cœur en cette période où on nous amène à nous affronter entre nous : les pour et les contre, alors que la loi est là.....
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73953#respond>)
52. Vallot le 5 juillet 2021 at 22 h 55 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73954>) dit:
Tres bon documentaire, mais le danger est réel ! N'avons nous pas de fous furieux au gouvernement pour vouloir commettre de telles ignominies , leur guerre pas la nôtre devra prendre fin au plus vite ...
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73954#respond>)
53. Franck Buda le 6 juillet 2021 at 7 h 44 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73956>) dit:
Merci pour votre article très éclairant. J'ai deux questions :
- Vous n'évoquez pas la Convention d'Oviedo, ni la loi Kouchner. Que faut-il penser de ces textes ?
- La distribution de ces vaccins se fait alors que nous somme encore en phase d'essai (phase III), cela voudrait-il dire que 50% des vaccinés ne reçoivent pas un vaccin, mais un placebo ? Dans l'affirmative, que penser de l'obligation d'administrer un placebo à d'une population ?
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73956#respond>)
54. j-michel et nicole le 8 juillet 2021 at 13 h 17 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73967>) dit:
bonjour , très bon article qui confirme ce que j'ai déjà dit a des amis(es) , ILS ne nous obligeront pas ,
c'est contraire aux droit de l'homme . et sans consentement écrit de la part d'un individu nul ne peu exigé et encore moins obligé a faire ce que l'on ne veut pas .
s'agissant là évidemment de traitement ou vaccin contre le covid 19 . donc cobaye pour notre part = NON .
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73967#respond>)
55. François le 8 juillet 2021 at 13 h 30 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73968>) dit:
Merci pour cet excellent travail mais il faut aussi aborder la question sous un angle pragmatique . Bon nombre lois ont été votées mais nombreux sont les décrets qui n'ont jamais été appliqués ; Les soignants sont en bun-out .Nombre d'établissements n'arrivent pas à recruter. Des lits continuent a à fermer faute de personnel.
Vous croyez qu'ils vont faciliter les choses en stigmatisant le personnel soignant ? voir à ce sujet 1 excellent article dans l'express
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replytocom=73968#respond>)

56. jef le 8 juillet 2021 at 23 h 29 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73971>) dit:
Merci infiniment pour cet éclairage parfaitement bien documenté, qui permet de respirer dans cette ambiance anxiogène qui dure depuis trop longtemps .
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replyto=73971#respond>)

57. Pierre Dominique BENEDETTI le 9 juillet 2021 at 14 h 01 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73972>) dit:
Très intéressant et instructif À partager
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replyto=73972#respond>)

58. VIVIER Solange le 10 juillet 2021 at 20 h 16 min (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/#comment-73977>) dit:
Merci Monsieur Segur pour cette mise au point claire et précise.
Question : Au cas où de nouvelles lois seraient « arrachées » (dixit Noland) en catimini pour faire passer en force l'obligation de vaccination généralisée à l'ensemble de la population, ne peut-on envisager une/des actions juridiques de groupes, régionales ou autres, pour nous défendre ?
Et le plus vite possible, car les « bruits de bottes » se rapprochent , quoi qu'on en dise...
Répondre ↓ (<http://www.revuedlf.com/droit-administratif/sur-la-liceite-dune-obligation-vaccinale-anti-covid/?replyto=73977#respond>)

POUR CITER CET ARTICLE :

Philippe Ségur (<http://www.revuedlf.com/auteurs/philippe-segur/>), «Sur la licéité d'une obligation vaccinale anti-Covid»
RDLF 2021 chron. n°20 (www.revuedlf.com) (<http://www.revuedlf.com/>)

DU MÊME AUTEUR ([HTTP://WWW.REVUEDLF.COM/AUTEURS/PHILIPPE-SEGUR/](http://www.revuedlf.com/auteurs/philippe-segur/))

PARTAGER f (<https://www.facebook.com/Revue-des-Droits-et-Libert%C3%A9s-fondamentales/>)

LAISSER UN COMMENTAIRE

Nom (required)

Email (required) (will not be published)

To send

Copyright © 2011-
Warning : Use of undefined constant Y - assumed 'Y' (this will throw an Error in a future version of PHP) in [/homepages/2/d533696188/htdocs/wp-content/themes/RDLF_theme/footer.php](#) on line 22
2021 Review of fundamental rights and freedoms (<http://www.revuedlf.com/>) | All rights reserved | Legal Notice (<http://www.revuedlf.com/mentions-legales/>)



High