

## ORGANIZATION OF PLANNED IMMUNIZATION OF THE POPULATION IN CRISIS SITUATIONS

Asadova Gulnara Akmalovna

Associate Professor of the Department of Public Health, Healthcare Management, Tashkent  
Pediatric medical institute

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7824433>

**Abstract.** *Humanitarian emergencies can lead to disruption of normal health services, including routine vaccination programs. Displaced populations, including refugees and internally displaced persons, are particularly susceptible to outbreaks of infectious diseases, such as vaccine-preventable diseases (HEI). Common UIs encountered in humanitarian emergencies include measles, polio and, depending on geographical location, meningococcal meningitis, yellow fever, hepatitis A and cholera. We conducted a review of 50 published articles from 2000 to 2015 concerning MI in humanitarian emergencies. This article provides updated information on the available literature on vaccination among this extremely vulnerable population group and describes the unique problems associated with MI during humanitarian emergencies. Humanitarian emergencies expose the affected population to the risk of increased morbidity and mortality from MI due to the creation or aggravation of factors associated with the transmission of the disease, such as mass population movements, overpopulation, malnutrition and poor water and sanitation conditions. Vaccination is one of the most basic and most important medical measures to protect vulnerable groups of the population during emergencies. Growing insecurity, as evidenced by the increase in targeted attacks on health workers in recent years, as well as the destruction of the cold chain and the infrastructure for transporting materials, create new challenges in providing life-saving vaccines in conflict conditions. Population displacement could also jeopardize global efforts to eradicate and eliminate MI.*

**Keywords:** *civil conflicts, displacement, humanitarian emergency, immunization, internally displaced persons, outbreaks, refugees, vaccines.*

**Introduction.** At the end of 2019, the world faced an unprecedented crisis, which is based on a global health emergency. It cannot be compared in scale with any other emergency situation that has arisen over the past century, therefore it requires a global response. In view of the exceptional situation and in order to save people's lives, countries have no choice but to take emergency measures: to introduce universal isolation regimes, restricting freedom of movement and the enjoyment of other human rights. But people and their rights should be in the foreground and in the center of attention. It is necessary to ensure that all emergency measures, including the introduction of a state of emergency, are lawful, proportionate, necessary and non-discriminatory, have a specific purpose and duration. International human rights norms allow for the suspension of certain rights in an emergency situation threatening the life of a nation. This can be done only in cases where an emergency situation has been officially declared, and the adoption of emergency measures is caused by an urgent need in the current situation, does not contradict other obligations under international law, is limited in time and does not lead to discrimination. Indeed, both in Russian and in foreign literature, the authors express concerns that restrictive measures are a violation of the constitutional rights and freedoms of citizens, and may also create conditions for abuse of authority in the application of norms regulating the emergency regime. The Constitution

of the Russian Federation provides for a number of provisions that are peculiar criteria, the observance of which is mandatory when restrictions are imposed on human and civil rights and freedoms. According to N.V. Vitruk, such criteria are necessary so that "there are no unjustified restrictions, arbitrariness, the possibility of abuse by the authorities and officials." However, in the Russian Federation, a state of emergency or an emergency situation has not been introduced. The state limited itself to the introduction of a self-isolation regime that has no legal regulation in the legislation, which created legal uncertainty and made it possible for the state to "manually" regulate this situation. Rights such as the right to life, the right to health and the right to freedom of movement have been at the forefront of the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic. The issues of the implementation of these rights during the pandemic, as well as the issues of possible restrictions of rights and compliance of the imposed restrictions of rights with national legislation and international law will be considered in this article.

### **Right to life**

The right to life is the basis and foundation of all human rights. The spread of coronavirus has shown States and their populations how valuable and fragile life is, its protection has become a real challenge both at the international and national levels. Deprivation of life or violation of the right to life in the absence of proper provision by the State of medical care, medicines and equipment is a serious problem during a pandemic. The right to life directly depends on the volume of health resources, its ability to monitor diseases, the ability to build up the health system and access to medical facilities. International law establishes a special mechanism for the realization and enforcement of the right to life, which occupies a special place. As V.V. correctly notes. Gavrilov, "the main purpose of treaties and other international legal acts on human rights is not to replace national legislation, but to establish clear common standards of State behavior, to ensure their universal recognition and uniform application." Thus, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Article 3 proclaims: "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."<sup>1</sup> The content of the right to life is also enshrined in article 6 of the International Covenant of December 16, 1966. "On Civil and Political Rights" (hereinafter – the Covenant): "The right to life is an inalienable right of every person. This right is protected by law. No one may be arbitrarily deprived of life."<sup>2</sup> It is these two documents that establish a universal international standard for the entire international community for legal regulation and ensuring the right to life. The positions of the UN Human Rights Committee, an organization responsible for overseeing the implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights in the countries participating in the Covenant, which are formulated in general comments (hereinafter referred to as the ZOP), are of great importance for the modern understanding of the concept of the right to life. These comments summarize the accumulated practice regarding the articles of the Covenant. Of interest is ZOP No. 6 (1982)<sup>3</sup>, in which the UN Human Rights Committee outlined its understanding of the necessary measures that States should take in order to comply with this right. In paragraph 2, the right to life is proclaimed as a fundamental right, from which no derogation is allowed even during

<sup>1</sup> The Universal Declaration of Human Rights: adopted and proclaimed by the UN General Assembly on December 10, 1948 // Rossiyskaya Gazeta. 1998. 10 Dec. p. 4. <sup>2</sup> International Covenant of December 16, 1966 "On Civil and Political Rights" (entered into force on March 23, 1976) // Bulletin of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation. 1994. No. 12. a state of emergency in a State in which the existence of a nation is under threat. It is argued that the right to life is a right that cannot be interpreted narrowly. The UN Human Rights Committee also pointed out that the

protection of the right to life obliges states to take all possible measures to preserve life, for example, measures to reduce child mortality, overcome the problems of malnutrition, and stop epidemics. Thus, the comments do not contain detailed instructions on the protection of the right to life in a pandemic, nor do they indicate any specific measures that States should take to preserve the lives of its population. It is necessary to agree with M.F. Kosolapov that "the ZOP currently in force under Article 6 of the Covenant are of a fairly general nature. The Committee, while emphasizing that the right to life cannot be interpreted narrowly, at the same time did not even define approximate guidelines for the correct interpretation." At present, when the mortality rate of people from coronavirus remains at a fairly high level, the question arises of compliance by States with international legal obligations to protect the right to life.

**Conclusion.** Unfortunately, the pandemic has shown that the regulatory framework for the regulation of emergency situations, as well as health care, was not fully ready for the conditions of the spread of coronavirus. The state was forced to hastily make changes to numerous regulations. The reaction of States to COVID-19 has shown that the lack of planning and preparedness for such emergencies is a systemic problem that covers almost all sectors of society. Therefore, any interference in the exercise of human rights, the establishment of restrictions and prohibitions must have a substantial legal justification and remain under the close control of independent judicial bodies and, above all, the State itself.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Vorontsov S. A. On the correlation of human rights and freedoms with the level of security of the individual, society, and the state during the pandemic / S. A. Vorontsov // Science and education: economy and economics; entrepreneurship; law and management. – 2020. – № 5 (120). – Pp. 50-53.
2. Semyanov E. V. Constitutional and legal characteristics of "pandemic" lawmaking (economic and legal analysis) / E. V. Semyanov // Education and Law. - 2020. - No. 4. – pp. 484-487. – DOI: 10.24411/2076-1503-2020-10477.
3. Spadaro A. COVID-19: Testing the Limits of Human Rights // European Journal of Risk Regulation. – 2020. – Vol. 11, iss. 2. – P. 317-325. – DOI: 10.1017/err.2020.27.
4. Vitruk N. V. General theory of the legal status of the individual / N. V. Vitruk. – M. : Norma, 2008. – 448 p.
4. Matuzov N. I. The right to life in the light of Russian and international standards / N. I. Matuzov // News of higher educational institutions. Jurisprudence. – 1998. – № 1 (220). – Pp. 198-212.
5. Gavrilov V. V. The European Convention on Human Rights and the legal system of Russia: Some problems of interaction / V. V. Gavrilov // Russia and the Council of Europe: prospects of interaction : sat. dokl. – M. : Institute of Law and Public Policy, 2001. – pp. 54-56.
6. Gomien D. The European Convention on Human Rights and the European Social Charter: law and practice: translated from English / D. Gomien, L. Zwaak, D. Harris ; under the scientific editorship of L. B. Arkhipov. – M. : MNIMP Publishing House, 1998. – 600 p.
7. Kosolapov M. F. Law for life: the evolution of a universal international standard / M. F. Kosolapov // Legal Bulletin of Samara University. – 2018. – Vol. 4, No. 4. – pp. 48-56. – DOI: 10.18287/2542-047X-2018-4-4-48-56.

8. Belousova A. A. The right to health in international law: the history of formation / A. A. Belousova // Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Legal Sciences. - 2013. – No. 3. – pp. 270-278.
9. Morozova K. P. Constitutional and legal foundations of ensuring the right of citizens to health protection in the Russian Federation / K. P. Morozova // Nauka.