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A SUMMARY OF THE MAIN ARGUMENTS IN MY PHD THESIS THAT INVESTIGATED THE CONTROL OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES IN AUSTRALIA

Contrary to the Australian government and media’s assertions, my PhD thesis does not ‘oppose immunisation’.

My PhD thesis provides the evidence that opposes mandatory vaccination for any infectious disease.

Here is a summary of the four main critical points regarding the Australian government’s vaccination policies that I presented in my PhD thesis [1]:

01
The significant decline in deaths and illnesses from infectious diseases in Australia occurred before the introduction of vaccines in mass vaccination programs. It is recognised by all the prominent public health officials of the twentieth century that the risk from infectious diseases was reduced significantly before the majority of vaccines were developed [2]. This indicates that mass vaccination was not the main factor in controlling infectious diseases.

02
Australia’s vaccination policies have been designed from the recommendations provided by the World Health Organisation (WHO) under Global Health Policies. The WHO receives these recommendations from an advisory group called the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI). This alliance includes the Federation of Pharmaceutical Companies, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation and many more private and public organisations, all with equal input into global health policies.

The GAVI alliance cannot provide objective advice about disease control because many of these private organisations profit from the vaccines they recommend to the WHO.

Specifically, the GAVI alliance’s recommendations to the WHO do not consider the diversity of genetics in the population or the special ecological conditions that vary between all the WHO member countries - two important factors in the causality of disease.

The WHO recommendations for vaccines are a one-size fits all and this fact means that these policies will increase diseases in all populations. They cannot be described as ‘protective health policies’ because they contradict the science of epigenetics; the science showing that individuals are pre-disposed to diseases due to their genetic make-up and the interaction with chemicals in the vaccines.

03
The majority of the research on vaccine safety and efficacy that is used by government regulators and advisory boards is carried out or sponsored by pharmaceutical companies. These are the companies that profit from selling vaccines. In addition most representatives on vaccine advisory boards have financial conflicts of interests with pharmaceutical companies.

Research has shown that conflicts of interest in vaccine research and on vaccine advisory boards can lead to bias in the design of clinical trials and the conclusions drawn from these studies [3]. It has also been proven that much of the industry-funded science is fraudulent [4].

There are important areas of research relevant to vaccination policy that have not been performed but are necessary to make claims of safety and efficacy about vaccines.

The undone science includes safety studies using a true inert placebo in the unvaccinated group for an appropriate time-period – either for single vaccines or for the combined vaccination schedule.

The safety of vaccines cannot be verified without this study and yet this study has never been done. There is no justification for mandating any vaccine in government policies without this scientific evidence. Australians need to demand a truly independent government vaccine advisory board (free of COI) to assess the vaccine-industry funded research before vaccines are recommended to the community in government policies.

04
Contrary to the Australian government and media’s assertions, my PhD thesis does not ‘oppose immunisation’.

My PhD thesis provides the evidence that opposes mandatory vaccination for any infectious disease.