

Newsletter 43 MMR Court Decision Not in the Child's Best Interest

22nd November 2013

I believe this court case is a very good example of the ethics involved in court decisions that are recommending vaccination by claiming it is in the 'best interests of the child'. This is a case that recently occurred in the UK (a country where vaccination is not compulsory) and the case was a result of parents who disagreed over whether the children should receive the MMR vaccine or not: one child was 15 and the other 11. Please note that a court can recommend that vaccination is in the 'best interests' but they cannot compel a child to have the vaccine against their wishes in a country where vaccination is not compulsory. Bodily integrity is protected in Criminal Law.

The court ruled that it was in the best interests of both children - even the 15 year old who had chosen not to get the vaccine. An officer appointed by the court ruled that "the children didn't have a rounded opinion of the pros and cons of the vaccine". However, this point is also valid for the court decision and for the public who are debating this topic. This is because the community is only being presented with one side of the debate. The medical profession is informing the media that 'there is no other side of this debate' (Jonathon Holmes, MediaWatch, October 2012). The evidence for the other side of this debate is provided by many health professionals, doctors and parents on the internet and in books, and also on the publications page of my website that is associated with my university research.

Despite the fact that the medical literature is full of articles linking vaccines (not just the MMR vaccine) as a cause of autism and the fact that there is no empirical evidence that has disproved this possibility, the government continues to ignore this research and to de-fund this area of science so that empirical evidence cannot be provided.

Here is the link to the article on the Conversation website so you can enter the debate and see what evidence has been used in this court case to suggest that 'vaccinating is in the best interests of these children'.

<https://theconversation.com/court-decision-to-force-mmr-wasnt-in-childs-best-interest->

[20383#](#) =

Here is my reply to a comment that was made on the website. I leave it with you as food for thought. The information I am providing has been researched at the university.

Comment:

Did you know that scientific methodology to prove the efficacy of drugs was not improved until the 1950's and most drugs were not tested in controlled clinical trials before 1960 (Cochrane 1989). Even today the integrity of many clinical trials is being disputed - and the public does not see the design of the trials to validate the claims made by the manufacturers of the vaccines – who are funding the clinical trials and many of the researchers involved in these trials.

Smallpox vaccine was never tested for efficacy or safety using scientific methodology and its eradication came after the improvements in public health. This is empirical evidence. The environmental context of infectious diseases is important to their control. In addition, the adverse events of smallpox vaccine are well documented.

The court appointed officer in this vaccination case has stated that "the children didn't have a rounded opinion of the pros- and cons- of the vaccine". And this statement is true of the court decision and the comments on the Conversation website to this article.

It is not possible for the community to have a 'rounded opinion' on this issue when only one side of the debate is ever presented to the public - and this is with spin and not evidence.

The public is entitled to see and debate the empirical evidence that was used in the court case for this decision. I would also like someone to provide the empirical evidence "that vaccine-induced herd immunity is necessary to control infectious diseases". Herd immunity after natural exposure to infectious agents is a proven theory but 'vaccine-created' herd

immunity has not been proven with scientific-evidence. If anyone has evidence for this theory please send it to me for publication on my website.

Vaccines for measles and whooping cough were introduced in Australia after 1950 - these diseases had already been removed from the National Notifiable Disease list at this time. This is because the deaths and illness to these diseases had significantly declined by 1950 (Comm Yearbook 1953).

It is time for the public to challenge the government on this policy to ensure that we are not believing in the theory of vaccination without proper scrutiny. We must see the evidence for this policy.

Judy Wilyman MSc

PhD Candidate