

Newsletter 21: Government Research and the Vaccination Schedule

19 May 2013

Vaccine ingredients:

Aluminium hydroxide, Aluminium hydroxide/phosphate, Aluminium phosphate, Borax, Egg Protein, Formaldehyde, Gelatin, Gentamicin (antibiotic), Kanamycin (antibiotic), Monosodium Glutamate (MSG), Neomycin (Antibiotic), Phenol, Phenoxyethanol, Polymyxin (antibiotic), Thiomersal (49% ethyl mercury compound), Yeast (Australian Government, March 2013)

Here is a list of the lack of evidence for the safety of the Australian Government's schedule of childhood vaccines:

1. There is NO study that has compared the health of fully vaccinated children and fully unvaccinated children – either in humans or animals.
2. In 2009 the Telethon Institute for Children's Health Research (TICHR) was provided with government funding to carry out a long term health study of thousands of children to investigate the effects of social and environmental factors on the health of children. This was being done to try and understand the significant increase in chronic illness that is occurring in children. When the researchers for this study were asked if *vaccines* were included as one of the environmental factors to be investigated (a universal environmental exposure of toxins for all children) the answer was NO.

The head of the study, Dr. Peter Franklin stated "It is not the aim of our study to correlate vaccination with health and development outcomes...." yet he also stated "We are looking at the effect of family, community, biological and environmental factors on various foetal and child health outcomes."

In other words, although governments are recommending that parents inject a combination of ingredients into newborn infants in the first year of life, we will not be investigating these ingredients (environmental toxins) in this million dollar government funded study of children's health to see if they are causing harm to

children. How valid will the findings of this study be if all the possible environmental causes of chronic illness in children are not included?

3. Professor Fiona Stanley has been promoting the risks to the foetus of pregnant women drinking alcohol. This is because the health effects of toxins in infants and children are many times greater than in adults. Yet the TICHR has not investigated the effects of injecting the ingredients of vaccines into developing infants. This would be considered unethical.
4. In the words of Professor Fiona Stanley “*Infectious deaths fell before widespread vaccination was implemented*” and “*The rates of infectious diseases in Australia were very low from 1950 to 2000 and the majority of the fall in the under 5 mortality rates (80%) had occurred by 1960.*” This was prior to the introduction and widespread use of the majority of childhood vaccines (Australian Yearbook 2001 ‘Child Health Since Federation’).
5. It is now recognised that many of the wealthy areas in Australian communities have the lowest vaccination rates in the country and Professor Fiona Stanley has stated “...a child’s chance of survival improves with higher levels of parental education....with maternal educational level being the strongest.” (Stanley, 2001, ABS Child Health Since Federation).
Please note that the most ‘wealthy’ areas of town have the highest levels of education.
6. Parents are not informed of the ingredients of vaccines before they vaccinate and they are not freely available on the government’s Immunise Australia website. They are listed in the Appendix of the *Australian Immunisation Handbook* under “components of vaccines”.
7. Australia’s Health Minister, Tanya Plibersek, has stated in the mainstream media that the link between vaccines and autism has been disproved. She says it is “100 per cent not true that vaccines are a cause of autism”. The health minister has not provided evidence to support this claim. In addition, she has recently signed a pledge on a lobby group’s website (The *Mamamia* website run by Mia Freedman allows subscribers and supporters of the Australian Skeptics lobby group to promote vaccines – many of whom do not have qualifications in health or health policy) to

increase the vaccination rates of the population. This is not how public health policy should be formed.

Public health policy is required to be based on non-biased information yet journalists are framing discussions about the risks of vaccines as a 'conspiracy theory'. They are also stating that 'there is no other side to this issue'. The journalists who have presented these statements include Janet Albrechtsen (The Australian Newspaper), Jonathon Holmes (ABC MediaWatch), Sarrah Le Maurquand (The Telegraph) and Caroline Marcus (The Telegraph).

Journalists are also misinforming the public by claiming that everyone questioning vaccines is 'anti-vaccination.' Dismissing scientific evidence by labelling it as anti-vaccination is not evidence-based practice. All the science must be included in an academic debate on scientific issues not selective science chosen for pre-determined outcomes.

It is essential that the community maintains a choice in this medical intervention and this is difficult when the media is not accurately informing the public of the risks and benefits of vaccines. If you would like to support your right to maintain choice in the vaccines that are recommended to healthy people please sign the 2 petitions below to take a stand on this issue.

http://www.avaaz.org/en/petition/Stop_the_vilification_of_parents_whose_children_have_been_injured_or_killed_by_vaccines/?korZGeb

http://www.avaaz.org/en/petition/My_Body_My_Choice/?cDZEidb

Judy Wilyman MSc (Population Health)

PhD Candidate

www.vaccinationdecisions.net