



## Newsletter 200 The Sydney Morning Herald Corrects Itself: 'Flu Vaccines "Do Little"'

6 June 2018

**Please note:**

**The 2018 Sydney Vaccination Conference: The Censorship of the Vaccination Debate in Australia will be held on Saturday 30 June from 1-5 pm**

If you are concerned about mandatory, coercive and discriminatory vaccination policies that the Australian government is implementing in the NJNP/P legislation (with ~16 vaccines or 52 doses required by children) then please take the time to come to the "[2018 Vaccination Conference: the Censorship of the Vaccination Debate in Australia](#)". This conference is being held on Saturday June 30 in Sydney and it is time for the public to take a stand to protect our human right to bodily integrity and to challenge the Australian government and the Medical Board of Australia for the evidence for these extreme vaccination policies.

**The False and Misleading Information Provided on Vaccines by the Mainstream Media**

On the 25th May 2018 I wrote Newsletter 199 titled '[The Sydney Morning Herald Providing False and Misleading Information about Flu Vaccines](#)'. This was sent to the SMH editor for a response and on the 4th June 2018 the SMH published this article titled "[Flu vaccines 'do little', wear face mask instead says health expert.](#)'

In this article Dr. Chris Del Mar, Professor of Public Health at Bond University states "the influenza vaccine has been oversold in Australia" and this push by the Australian government 'with a "weak" (flu) vaccine is overshadowing effective prevention methods such as hand-washing and mask-wearing'.

Further, Dr. Tony Baratone, president of the Australian Medical Association (AMA), states "that the influenza vaccine is not as effective as a number of other vaccines" yet this information is not being publicly debated and this has resulted in the Australian government recommending the mandating of the flu vaccine for all healthcare workers in aged-care facilities.

This has been adopted in some states even though the **Australian government**, the **Medical Board of Australia** (MBA) and the **AMA** have not provided any evidence to support this policy.

Whilst it is claimed in the mainstream media that there was a horror flu season last year, the AMA has not revealed that there was also a high uptake of the flu vaccine in 2017 (higher than previous years because of the advertising campaign) nor has it provided the number of people vaccinated with the flu vaccine last year that still got hospitalised with flu.

The media and the AMA are being permitted to make claims about vaccines to the public without providing the evidence to support these claims and without publicising an accurate number of the deaths and injuries that are occurring to vaccines - or revealing the ingredients that are injected into the tissues with each vaccine.

The breaches of human rights and discrimination in the government's **No Jab No Pay / Play** (NJNP/P) policies are described in my [webinair](#) that is published on the **Australian Naturopathic Practitioner's Association website**.

The webinair is titled "[Informed Consent to Vaccination in Australia by Judy Wilyman PhD](#)" and it describes why Australia's national immunisation program (NIP) that is promoted by the Medical Board of Australia is not a 'protective' public health policy.

The NJNP/P policies are damaging human health and the genetics of the Australian population because they are not evaluated on the health of the population. In 1995 it was decided by the GAVI alliance (private-public partnerships including the Federation of Pharmaceutical Companies) that global vaccination programs would be evaluated on the immunisation uptake in the population.

Hence doctors and consumers in Australia are paid to vaccinate to 'raise the immunisation rates' based on the **assumption** that this improves the health of the population - no proof is provided that this is the case because the statistics support the opposite conclusion.

Did you know that chronic illness and autism has escalated 5 -10 fold since the 1990's when the NIP expanded? But the Australian government is not required to acknowledge or publicise this fact because they do not assess the success of these programs on population or children's health.

The evidence for these facts are presented in my [webinair](#) describing the crime against humanity that is being committed by the Australian government with its current vaccination program and in my [PhD thesis](#) that is published by the University of Wollongong.

Despite the fact that every other professional or parent who attempts to present the science questioning the effectiveness of vaccines is shut-down in the mainstream media as "anti-vaccination" the **Sydney Morning Herald** has decided to publish Dr. Chris Del Mar's comments without labelling them as 'anti-vaccination'. I wonder what has caused this change of strategy? (See the box below for the explanation).

The public needs to demand that the **Medical Board of Australia** and the **Australian Government** provide:

1. The definition of the term 'anti-vaccination' that they are using to direct health practitioners to promote government vaccination policies to maintain their medical

1. registration? How can doctors and health practitioners put their patient's interests first if they are not permitted to discuss the risks of vaccination without being deregistered from their profession?
2. Why does the Royal Australian College of Physicians (RACP), that has thousands of members in Australia, have an official position of supporting fully informed parental consent to vaccination *without financial coercion*, but it is not required to enforce this position (that is embedded in all international human rights covenants and good medical practice guidelines) with its members? This situation is allowing the MBA to de-register doctors / nurses who present the risks of vaccines to their patients, by describing these risks as 'anti-vaccination'. This is not in their patient's best **interest and this is breaching the MBA's medical code of conduct**. *It is also a situation that does not protect public health in genetically diverse populations.*

There is extreme anxiety and concern in the Australian community regarding the suppression of the scientific debate on vaccination and the removal of the public's voice in government policy.

The Sydney Vaccination Conference will be held from 1-5 pm on Saturday 30 June 2018 with many speakers that are listed on this [link to the tickets](#) for this event. Places are limited so please get in early for a chance to hear from independent researchers and citizens explaining why this debate is being censored in Australia, and globally, and why these government vaccination policies cannot protect our health.

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 [The Science and Politics of the Australian Government's Vaccination Program](#), UOW School of Humanities and Social Inquiry.*



### **The Mainstream Media's Censorship of the Vaccination Debate**

In Australia, universities today are working in partnerships with industry and even the heads of Departments and the researchers have equity and patents in the research that is performed at universities. This [industry-academic partnership](#) is now well



### **Supporting Public Interest Research**

Did you know that in 1990 only 7 vaccines were used and the national immunisation program (NIP) was allocated \$9.6 million to expand this program. By 1993 this was estimated to cost \$53 million to operate and by 2008-9 it was costing the Australian government 'well in excess of \$400 million' (Terry Nolan 2010).

documented and it means that public interest research can be suppressed from the mainstream media.

This is particularly the case when there are powerful lobby groups that push industry interests in government policies such as the Australian Skeptics Inc (and their offshoot SAVN) and the Friends of Science in Medicine (FoSM). These industry lobby groups have chosen deceptive names and they have a powerful voice in the mainstream media and with politicians such as Richard Di Natale - the leader of the Greens who promoted the NJNP/P policies in parliament in 2013.

This has allowed the industry-lobby groups (who pose as 'consumer groups') to harass and abuse academics and professionals in public debates of this issue - with impunity.

The Australian Health Practitioners Regulatory Authority (AHPRA) has stated they will not investigate Dr. John Cunningham, a leader of SAVN, who made fabricated allegations and derogatory / false and unsupported comments about my university research in the mainstream media and on social media. He has no special qualifications or publications in immunology or vaccination policy yet he received an OAM in January 2016 for "Science and Immunisation" after denigrating my academic research on vaccination policy in the mainstream media from 2014-2016.

The University of Wollongong, that is in partnership with industry, does not have policies that require them to correct the false information about university research that is provided to the public by lobby groups in the mainstream media. The University has remained silent as unqualified journalists and AMA doctors alike have denigrated my research in the mainstream media - with false and unsupported claims.

After I published my Newsletter 199 (25 May 2018) describing the false information that the SMH is promoting on the flu vaccine this

**Terry Nolan was** the Chair of the ATAGI vaccine advisory board from 2005-2014 who reported directly to the federal Health Minister for this decade. Here are the potential conflicts of interests he had with vaccine manufacturers that were not provided to the public during this decade.

He was also the Deputy Chair of the NHMRC for this decade and he influenced the allocation of funding for research and the information being presented to doctors in the Australian Immunisation Handbook. This handbook (Ed 10) has removed all references prior to 2006 and after 2013. This means that valuable evidence about vaccines and our health has been removed and is being ignored in the government's promotion of vaccination policies. This is the document that the government is using to claim that all "vaccines are safe and effective".

My PhD thesis investigating the evidence for the Australian government's vaccination program was refused government funding in 2007. Further, it is only funded research that is promoted to the public. Universities do not promote student research to the public.

This is why it became necessary to fund my own website and newsletters in 2012 to promote this independent research that is in the public interest. I would like to thank everyone who has supported my research and newsletters over the last 5-10 years. If you have appreciated this unfunded research and debate of children's health I hope you will consider a \$5 donation for the upkeep of my website and continuation of my voluntary newsletters.

My website Vaccination Decisions became necessary because the University of Wollongong is not required to rectify the academic record to the public when organised industry-lobby groups provide false information about my university research in the mainstream media and when the industry-funded Conversation website and PHAA Conference will not present this research in

article by Chris Del Mar and Peter Collignon appeared on the [Conversation website](#). Many other academics and citizens, have been attempting to present these scientific arguments for debate from 2009 - 2017 on the Conversation website and in other public forums, but our [scientific arguments](#) are always framed as "anti-vaccination". Please visit **Elizabeth Hart's**, [Over-Vaccination website](#), to see the conflicts of interest that are riddled through government vaccination policies.


The Conversation website is in partnership with the [industry-funded universities](#) and in 2014 it refused to publish my research on the [HPV vaccine \(promoted to prevent cervical cancer\)](#) that was showing the dangers of this vaccine. At the time my university research had been published in a [medical journal](#) and presented at [two international conferences](#) (San Francisco and London) - no reason was provided by the Conversation [editor](#) for declining my HPV vaccine article.

This vaccine is now being debated globally as dangerous to human health and unnecessary. It has also been removed from the [national immunisation program](#) of **Japan** for the health concerns that it poses and many class actions are occurring in [other countries](#).

The [Conversation website](#) and its industry partners are now promoting themselves as "[a not-for-profit charity](#)" that brings you the facts from "real experts". This is how many medical institutions are also promoting themselves and it enables them to hide their links to industry funding and hence the biased information that they are presenting to the public.

It was refreshing to see this latest article by Collignon and Del Mar, on the [lack of efficacy of flu vaccine](#) which demonstrates that [a debate on this topic is essential to protect public health](#).

their forums.



*Email Judy Wilyman* | [http://us8.forward-to-friend.com/forward?  
u=f20605fde3732e41929f4a3f2&id=0b631f471f&e=fec8337d3c](http://us8.forward-to-friend.com/forward?u=f20605fde3732e41929f4a3f2&id=0b631f471f&e=fec8337d3c)

*Copyright © 2018 Judy Wilyman, All rights reserved.*  
You are receiving this email because you opted in at our website.