

60 Minutes: Getting to the Point (10.06.11)

To the 60 minute team,

I would like to publicize some of the myths that you presented in your program – Getting to the Point (10.6.11). This program did not provide a balanced presentation of the vaccination issue. It also did not allow for discussion or debate of the issues presented. It relied on the program Directors selecting the script for the program and selecting the comments they wanted from the interviewees.

There was also no blog for this program posted on the website which does not allow viewers to provide feedback and discussion. You will also note that there is no forum for the public to discuss the topic of immunization in a two-way flow of information. This amounts to propaganda not a presentation of scientific evidence.

Myths presented in this program:

1. Vaccines are a victim of their own success.
Untrue: Infectious diseases became a low risk in Australia in 1950 after improvements in sanitation, hygiene, nutrition and family sizes (1) (2)
2. There is a bottomless pit of misinformation on the internet.
True: Whilst this is true, there are also a large number of websites that are now promoting the risks of vaccines as described in medical journals. Visit: The International Medical Council on Vaccination www.vaccinationcouncil.org
3. Research the history books to observe the benefits of vaccines.
Untrue: History books inform us that infectious diseases were reduced before most vaccines were introduced and many outbreaks of infectious diseases have been caused by vaccines (3).
4. Not vaccinating a child is playing Russian roulette with your child's life.
Untrue: Morbidity (chronic illness and disability) is as much an indicator of children's health as mortality (death). Mainstream science states chemicals have toxic effects on human health and vaccines inject many chemicals into the bloodstream of developing infants. This correlates with a significant increase in chronic illness in this generation of children.
5. Mainstream science says there is no risk from the mercury (in vaccines).
Untrue: The dangers of mercury have been known for a long time and it has been removed from all other medical products.
6. Individuals who question vaccines believe in conspiracy theories.
Untrue: The influence of industry in the medical profession is widely known. The fact that industry makes large profits from drugs and vaccines is not a secret. Industry funds the majority of research and promotion of vaccines. In addition, many researchers and government ministers have conflicts of interests. Industry representatives are sitting on government advisory boards. This situation results in an institutional bias which is a political situation not a conspiracy theory.
7. Individuals speaking against vaccines are not medical doctors.
It is not necessary to have medical qualifications to assess the risks associated with environmental health problems. E.g. infectious diseases and toxins in vaccines. In addition,

there are many individuals who are not scientists or medical doctors promoting vaccines. Consumers are stakeholders in this issue and entitled to participate in discussions and decisions about preventative health.

8. Andrew Wakefield was discredited for falsifying his results.
Untrue: Ethical arguments were used to discredit Wakefield because the government has not done the science he is attempting to do. He is one of the few scientists that have attempted to investigate the effects of combining the children's schedule of vaccines (13 vaccines) in infant monkey's to determine the effects. Governments are currently experimenting on children without systematically monitoring the effects of vaccines in children (4).
9. Professor Peter McIntyre (Co –Director of the NCIRS) states "If we were concerned about something causing harm we would be the first to put up our hands to stop it".
Untrue: The NCIRS has not funded an investigation into the correlation between the increased use of vaccines and the increase in chronic illness in children because they state it is "a coincidence".
10. Anecdotal evidence of two babies who have died of whooping cough was used in this program to support the case for vaccines.
This type of evidence should not be used to promote vaccines and if it is used for this purpose, the programmers have a duty to provide two babies who have been damaged by vaccines (as many were by the influenza vaccine in 2010) to provide a balanced representation of risks.
11. Serious adverse events from vaccines are rare.
Untrue: The health department cannot make this claim because they have never actively and systematically monitored the effects of vaccines in children over a long time period E.g. 5 – 10 years (4) (5).

I am copying this information to many of my contacts and the Human Rights Department because it is time for the public, as consumers of vaccines, to be involved in a proper debate on this topic.

The community expects that you will be able to provide discussion on these comments or provide a proper public forum for a two way flow of information on these issues.

Kind regards,

Judy Wilyman

References:

1. Commonwealth Department of Health, 1945 – 1986, Official Yearbook of the Commonwealth of Australia, (Com.Year) No. 37 – 72.
2. Obomsawin R, 2009, Immunisation Graphs: Natural Infectious Disease Declines; Immunisation Effectiveness; and Immunisation Dangers. Published on the Gaia website www.gaia.health.com/articles101/000123-InfectiousDiseaseVaccines
3. Allen A, 2007, Vaccine: The Controversial Story of Medicines Greatest Lifesaver.

4. Stokes B, Government of Western Australia, Department of Health, August 2010, Ministerial Review into the Public Health Response into the Adverse Events to the seasonal Influenza Vaccine, www.health.wa.gov.au
5. Collignon P, Doshi P, Jefferson T, 2010, Adverse events following influenza vaccination in Australia – should we be surprised? BMJ Rapid Responses Published 7 May 2010