

Etica pubblica e contesa vaccinale. Una mappa critica delle ragioni (e dei torti)

FEDERICO ZUOLO

Public Ethics and the Conflict about Vaccinations. A Critical Map

Abstract: Although compulsory vaccinations have sparked protests since their institutions long time ago, recently there has been a surge in this debate because of the diffusion of fake news in our communication environment characterized by “bubbles” and epistemic niches. In this paper I reconstruct the main positions about vaccinations as a measure to pursue public health. The main positions (coercive vaccinations, compulsory vaccinations, compulsory vaccinations with the possibility of being exempted for non-medical reasons, nudging and recommended vaccinations) will be ranged from the most restrictive of people’s liberties to the least. I will not argue in favor of any of them as the best one. Rather, I will point at the strengths and weaknesses of each, thus underlying the conditions under which each approach can be mostly effective. In sum, I will outline the kinds of arguments that can support these approaches and the circumstances that make a strategy preferable over the others. Finally, I briefly discuss two kinds of approaches (ban on vaccinations and cherry picking in vaccinations) that are frequently appealed to in the public debate but that cannot be supported by any publicly acceptable reason.

Keywords: Vaccinations, Pluralism, Rule and exemption approach.

notizie di POLITEIA, XXXIV, 130, 2018. ISSN 1128-2401 pp. 38-47