

Newsletter 163 The Australian Government is Protecting Corporate Interests in Government Vaccination Policies

23 June 2017

Currently the Australian government is discussing extending its coercive and mandatory '*No Jab No Pay*' welfare policy to ban all healthy unvaccinated children from pre-schools and childcare centres. For anyone who does not have young children this means children will be expected to have the 'full' schedule of 16+ vaccines or approx 45 doses of vaccine to be accepted into pre-schools and childcare facilities. The Australian government has removed religious and philosophical exemptions to vaccination in this policy and also reduced the medical exemptions that are allowable. Most of these 16+ vaccines have been added since 1990 - when infectious diseases were not a serious risk to the majority of children in Australia and the vaccines have serious health risks associated with them. This is why Sweden has recently stated it will not adopt any coercive or mandatory vaccination policies. It is stated in the medical literature that waccines did not control infectious diseases so vaccine-created herd immunity is not a reason to mandate vaccines for the entire community (as Sweden has demonstrated).

Yet *all of these 16 vaccines* have now been mandated in coercive and mandatory social welfare policies in Australia. In addition, doctors and nurses are not required to inform parents of the many toxic ingredients in these vaccines. Nor are they required to inform parents of the serious adverse health outcomes described on the package inserts and in the medical literature. Also hidden in this policy is the influence of <u>pharmaceutical funding</u> on the education of doctors, in the media, and on politicians. Our Ministers of Health in general do not have qualifications in health and they are dependent upon the information and donations provided by the dominant pro-vaccine lobby groups. In Australia the politicans are relying on the non-independent vaccine research that is supported by the Australian Medical Association (AMA). The AMA and the Australian Academy of Science are providing <u>false information on vaccines</u> because they are promoting pharamceutically funded and interpreted studies on vaccine safety and efficacy.

In fact, nurses and doctors in Australia are being actively prevented from discussing the risks of vaccines to the public by their <u>professional registration boards</u>. Doctors and nurses are being

instructed that any material that is considered 'anti-vaccination' must not be presented to the public or they risk de-registration and/or prosecution by the regulatory board. My PhD thesis provides the medical literature that describes the serious risks of vaccination that outweigh any claimed benefits from the current schedule of vaccines. Does this mean that doctors and nurses can be prosecuted for describing the medical literature on the risks of vaccines as described in my PhD thesis? Evidence-based policies are about scientific debate and the evidence must stand up to scrutiny. If doctors and nurses are being threatened with prosecution for debating the medical literature then these policies are endangering human health. The debate is not about pro- or anti-vaccination, it is about the rigour of the evidence supporting this medical intervention for healthy people.

Coercive and mandatory vaccination policies are a breach of the **Nuremburg Code** that was designed to prevent experimentation on the human population. Australians no longer have the right to *informed consent without coercion for vaccination* in social welfare policies (and many employment situations) and this dangerous legislation is being extended further with the '**No Jab No Play'** policy.

Mandatory medications in genetically diverse populations are harmful to the population yet the Australian government is bringing in *mandatory vaccination policies for healthy people*. A policy that includes mandatory medication is not in the public's best interest if the science cannot be <u>openly debated</u>. Vaccination has *always been voluntary* in Australia and mandatory policies were not needed to control infectious diseases. So why are they now being mandated globally in developed countries when infectious diseases are not a serious threat to the majority of the population? There are no studies proving that vaccines are not causing the escalating autism in children or the 5-fold increase in chronic illness that directly correlates to the expanding vaccination schedule. So why are vaccines being claimed to be 'safe and effective' by governments?

Until this <u>proof</u> is provided governments are endangering public health with coercive and mandatory vaccination policies that only benefit a \$30 billion vaccination industry that is supported by <u>politicians with conflicts of interest</u> who provide advice to the Minister of Health. This political system is allowing biased industry information to be used as the foundation of government vaccination policies that are stated to protect the 'public interest'. It is noted that our Prime Minister's wife, Lucy Turnbull, as the <u>chairman of Prima Biomed</u>, also has a conflict of interest in the push for coercive and mandatory vaccination policies by the Turnbull government in Australia.

Dr. Judy Wilyman PhD


Bachelor of Science, University of NSW

Diploma of Education (Science), University of Wollongong

Master of Science (Population Health), Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Wollongong.

PhD in <u>The Science and Politics of the Australian Government's Vaccination Program</u>, UOW School of Social Science, Media and Communication (re-named the School of Humanities and Social Inquiry in 2014).











Facebook

Website

<u>Email Judy Wilyman</u> | http://us8.forward-to-friend.com/forward? u=f20605fde3732e41929f4a3f2&id=9758f72a12&e=fec8337d3c

Copyright © 2017 Judy Wilyman, All rights reserved. For pre-view