

Chairman Lipps, Vice Chair Holmes, Ranking member Russo and Honorable Members of the House Health Committee,

My name is Kelly and I am mother of three and an Ohio citizen. Thank you for the opportunity to provide proponent testimony regarding Sub House Bill 248.

It should go without saying, that individuals have an inherent right to make health decisions for themselves; as well as parents for their children. We should be able to decide for ourselves what is or isn't injected or consumed into our bodies without fear of job-loss, discrimination, or loss of freedom of movement in society. Since body autonomy is a constitutive condition of our existence as conscious and rational human beings and is also a necessary condition of a life worth living, it is as valuable as life. Therefore, every permanent violation of body autonomy or self-constitution is destructive of individual agency and life. Our country was founded upon protecting those inherent rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Mandating or coercing vaccination amounts to discrimination, segregation and the loss of those natural rights which not only violates body autonomy and self-constitution but is unethical and moves our country away from its founding principles.

Coercive tactics are no doubt being used to promote these new experimental vaccines. Universally accepted Codes of Medical Ethics, including the Nuremberg Code and the Declaration of Helsinki absolutely prohibit any form of coercion to participate in a medical experiment. "The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion;"(from the Nuremberg Code of 1947). Individuals have a right to choose or refuse this medical injection well as all others. Individuals may have valid moral or religious objections or medical contraindications to vaccination. Moreover, vaccination is an irreversible medical procedure that intends to augment the natural state of our immune systems in the interest of public health. The natural state of our immune system is an innate and healthy biological characteristic of every human. Mandatory or coercive vaccination discriminates against those innate healthy biological characteristics, making our own natural state of being unlawful or unworthy of free movement which is absolutely unethical. All persons reserve the right, at all times, to determine what is in their own best medical interest without threat to their livelihood, schooling, or freedom of movement. Vaccine passports, digital health IDs, and other such required documentation pose substantial risks to personal privacy and equal treatment under the law. Private businesses have no legal authority to require, mandate or coerce medication or experimental medication for any persons and all public and private entities and persons must abide federal medical privacy laws(HIPPA) which protect patients' privacy. Vaccine passports violate the Americans with Disabilities Act and would be a step backward, opening a door for discrimination, segregation and an authoritarian-type surveillance state.

Considering that vaccination is not risk-free, the alleged moral "obligation to vaccinate" implies that we have an obligation to reduce the risk to the health of others by accepting an increased or unknown health risk to ourselves. This is contradicting and absurd. Most arguments in favor of vaccine mandates assume that vaccines are safe and effective, and therefore a public good that cannot be refused. This assumption is at best unproven and sometimes contrary to the evidence.

*"Critically, the safety of the vaccines currently used for mass immunization was not established via saline placebo controlled randomized trials in previously unvaccinated individuals. The difficulty of establishing a clear causative link between vaccines and any late-onset health conditions, and the fact that vaccine manufacturers are typically not liable for the adverse effects of their products, allows the industry to give absolute priority to profits over consumer safety: this moral hazard constitutes an indirect health risk." (1)*

The current COVID vaccines are not FDA approved, therefore experimental, and cannot be compelled. They are approved for Emergency Use only and the trials are still ongoing (*completion dates are: Moderna October 27, 2022 and Pfizer January 31, 2023*). Emergency use products are specifically prohibited by federal law (21 U.S.C. §360bbb-3) from being mandated: “Authorization for medical products for use in emergencies ... require ...the option to accept or refuse administration of the product” (2). According to VAERS data as of May 14, there are 4,021 deaths and 12,625 hospitalizations reported after the COVID vaccines. The public health approach to coercive vaccination is not ethical if it involves unfair treatment and a mandatory “sacrifice” from the unlucky few for the sake of public good. Why should one risk be valued over another and decided for us? A prospective benefit to public health does not of itself give a reasonable necessity to infringe on personal body autonomy which is one of the necessary conditions of a life worth living.

All vaccines come with risks. Even so, if vaccines were hypothetically risk free, personal body autonomy would still be priority by virtue of the intrinsic value of human agency. This cannot be defeated by circumstances such as emergencies and pandemics or even an unproven “greater good”. “Preserving the constitutive conditions of agency trumps the obligation to eliminate or minimize any associated risks to life.”(1) No vaccine (experimental or otherwise) should ever be forced, incentivized or used as a discriminatory tool that coerces one into complying in order to be a free citizen. Let’s not let an hysterical fog blind us to a human rights threat that echos having to “show your papers” of past authoritarian countries. History demands that we pay attention.

I am asking you to please vote in support of Sub HB 248. I truly believe that we are witnessing history in this hearing and all the past year’s events leading up to it. We have an opportunity and a moral obligation to be on the right side of history for the future of our children and our country. We have been pushed up against the precipice - we have the choice to push back or be pushed off into medical tyranny.

*“The Constitution of this Republic should make special provision for medical freedom. To restrict the art of healing to one class will constitute the Bastille of medical science. All such laws are unAmerican and despotic. ... Unless we put medical freedom into the constitution the time will come when medicine will organize into an undercover dictatorship and force people who wish doctors and treatment of their own choice to submit to only what the dictating outfit offers.”*  
*Attributed to Dr. Benjamin Rush – Founding Father, signer of the Declaration of Independence and personal physician to George Washington.*

There is neither a moral obligation to vaccinate nor a sound ethical basis to discriminate against or restrict the unvaccinated. It’s time to put medical freedom into law before the undercover dictatorship tightens their grip. Now is the time to push back and be on the right side of history

Thank you,

1. Kowalik, M. Ethics of Vaccine Refusal. J Med Ethics Epub. 5 February, 2021. Dog:10.1136/medethics-2020-107026
2. <https://www.americasfrontlinedoctors.org/take-action/vaccine-bill-of-rights/vaccine-bill-of-rights>
3. <https://www.openvaers.com/covid-data>