

'Anyone Who Tells You Vaccines Are Safe And Effective Is Lying.
Here's The Proof.'

Dr Vernon Coleman MB ChB DSc FRSA

'The patient's champion.' - *Birmingham Post*

'A persuasive writer whose arguments, based on research and experience, are sound.' -
Nursing Standard

'The doctor who dares to speak his mind.' - *Oxford Mail*

' He writes lucidly and wittily.' - *Good Housekeeping*

This book is intended solely to provide information about vaccination. Before contemplating any vaccination you should ask your doctor to confirm that the procedure will be safe and effective for you.

'Vernon Coleman writes brilliant books.' - *The Good Book Guide*

'No thinking person can ignore him.' - *The Ecologist*

'The calmest voice of reason.' - *The Observer*

'A godsend.' - *Daily Telegraph*

' Superstar.' - *Independent on Sunday*

' Brilliant!' - *The People*

'Compulsive reading.' - *The Guardian*

'His message is important.' - *The Economist*

'He's the Lone Ranger, Robin Hood and the Equalizer rolled into one.' - *Glasgow Evening Times*

'The man is a national treasure.' - *What Doctors Don't Tell You*

'His advice is optimistic and enthusiastic.' - *British Medical Journal*

' Revered guru of medicine.' - *Nursing Times*

' Hard hitting...inimitably forthright.' - *Hull Daily Mail*

' Refreshingly forthright.' - *Liverpool Daily Post*

' It's impossible not to be impressed.' - *Western Daily Press*

'Outspoken and alert.' - *Sunday Express*

'Controversial and devastating.' - *Publishing News*

'Dr Coleman made me think again.' - *BBC World Service*

'Marvellously succinct, refreshingly sensible.' - *The Spectator*

' Probably one of the most brilliant men alive today.' - *Irish Times*

' King of the media docs.' - *The Independent*

' Britain's leading medical author.' - *The Star*

' Britain's leading health care campaigner.' - *The Sun*

'Perhaps the best known health writer for the general public in the world today.' - *The Therapist*

2014

2011

Drug companies make billions. Doctors make thousands. The big question is not 'Is it safe?' or 'Does it work?' but 'Is it profitable?'

Governments believe that by vaccinating whole populations they reduce the incidence of illness and therefore ensure that people spend more time at work and less time at home, wastefully tucked up in bed with a hot water bottle and a bottle of pills.

There are three main types of vaccine.

First, there are the live vaccines which contain an attenuated strain of a microorganism. The hope with these vaccines is that they will produce a subclinical infection. Viral vaccines may contain attenuated strains of a virus or an inactivated virus. They are prepared in tissue culture, which may contain antibiotics, or in chick embryos. These vaccines are, therefore, unsuitable for patients who are allergic to the antibiotics concerned or to egg protein. (Sadly, many doctors do not bother to ask their patients if they have any allergies which might make vaccination especially hazardous. And so these vaccines are not infrequently given inappropriately.)

Second, there are vaccines which contain killed micro-organisms. These vaccines may contain an intact (but dead) organism or a sample pack of specific antigens.

Third, bacterial toxins which have been inactivated are also used in vaccine preparation.

Vaccines can be given by mouth, nasal spray or injection but these days most are given by injection. Whatever the route or format, a vaccination is designed to give the body enough exposure to a particular pathogen to develop defence cells, but not enough of the pathogen to produce signs and symptoms of illness.

Unfortunately, this is a balancing act which the vaccine manufacturers don't always get perfectly right. And there are many potential hazards. For example, if a live vaccine is given to someone with an ineffective immune system the result can be catastrophic - and fatal.

The immunity provided by vaccines varies enormously. Some vaccines provide lifetime protection. Some vaccines fail to work and provide no protection at all.

The bottom line is that there are many things that can (and do) go wrong. Anyone who claims that all vaccines are always safe and always effective is a nincompoop - and yet that is a claim that is frequently made by British doctors and nurses.

Not surprisingly, many people are confused and worried about vaccines. They don't know what to believe. Are vaccines as safe as the Government says they are? Are they essential? Parents, in particular, can become very bewildered. Will their child die if he or she doesn't have the usual series of vaccinations? Most patients and parents are prepared to accept the Government's assurance that vaccines are safe and utterly essential; they contentedly accept what they are told. But those who want answers will probably find it difficult to get them. Many of my readers who have tried to discuss vaccines with their doctors have complained that their physicians, rude and certain in their ignorance, simply insist that vaccines are perfectly safe and that is the end of the matter.

Those GPs aren't alone in their single-minded defence of vaccination. In Britain, politicians, doctors, nurses and journalists all enthusiastically insist that vaccines are entirely safe and free from side effects. They are all either lying or ill-informed. Lest you assume that is hyperbole let me point out that when, in April the US Health Department's National Vaccine Injury Compensation Programme released its figures for the report showed that allegedly safe childhood vaccines officially killed or injured no less than 2,699 children in the year in America. The parents of those children received \$110 million in damages. The US Government has reportedly also paid compensation to the parents of autistic children. And at roughly the same time the Japanese Government halted part of its own vaccination programme after a number of children had died after being vaccinated. (Can you imagine the fuss there would be if a food company marketed a product which killed or injured 2,699 healthy children in a single year? How long would they stay in business with that sort of record?)

I believe that everyone should be told the facts so that they can make up their own minds about the value of any vaccine. Deciding whether or not to have a vaccination is a big decision. It isn't something to be done lightly. The wrong decision can easily lead to a lifetime of regrets.

Sadly, one big problem is undoubtedly the fact that many doctors simply don't know very much about the safety or effectiveness of vaccines. They know what the Government tells them and they know what the company which makes the vaccine tells them. And that's it. But no sensible person trusts Governments and I don't think I am alone, or being unduly cynical, in thinking that companies making vaccines aren't a reliable source of unbiased information about the effectiveness and safety of vaccines.

'My doctor implied that I was just being stupid when I said I wasn't sure that I wanted my child vaccinated,' complained one reader of mine. 'His attitude was that it had nothing to do with me and that I should just allow him to do whatever he thought best.'

'My wife came home crying,' complained another reader. 'She had the temerity to question her doctor about vaccination. He told her that if she refused to have our child vaccinated he would call in the social workers since in his view our refusal to allow vaccination made us unfit to be parents. What really upset me is that my wife hadn't refused to have our child vaccinated. She just wanted to talk about it.'

This paternalistic attitude seems strong among doctors and other health workers, most of whom seem to prefer to answer any questions with abuse rather than facts. I suspect that this is a consequence of the fact that doctors and health visitors are full to the brim with ignorance and don't have any room for facts with which to answer questions. (Curiously, GPs invariably fail to mention that they have a vested financial interest in promoting vaccination.)

I believe that the whole vaccination story is one of the great modern scandals of our time. The entire

medical profession (at least the part of it in general practice) has been bribed and most doctors, whether working as hospital consultants, GPs or public health officials, know very little about vaccination but simply follow the establishment line, never question what they are told by the drug industry, dismiss all critics of vaccination as dangerous lunatics and get very rich by promoting mass vaccination programmes which have never been proven to be safe or effective.

In Britain, doctors give fistfuls of potentially lethal vaccine to tiny babies with developing immune systems. They start dumping the damned stuff into babies when they are two-months-old, for heaven's sake. And yet there is no evidence proving that vaccines are safe when given in job lots like this and no evidence proving long-term safety. The absence of evidence isn't much of a surprise since no research is done to check either safety or efficacy. The establishment puts the onus on the doubters to find evidence that there are dangers, knowing that this is pretty well impossible to do without the cooperation of the drug companies, the Government or the medical establishment.

If you or I want to sell home-made sweets to kids we will have all sorts of health and safety officials crawling over us, our kitchen and our shop. But doctors merrily squirt gallons of potentially toxic junk into babies who are still breast feeding.

Where's the sense in telling nursing mothers to be aware that what they swallow will end up in their breast milk (and in their developing baby) when the Government promotes its pre-school vaccination programmes with Goebbels-like efficiency?

I fear that doctors have lost their way.

GPs receive massive payments for giving vaccinations and huge bonus payments for vaccinating large quantities of their patients. A GP who jabs enough patients gets a thumping great wodge of cash paid straight into his bank account. A GP who is questioning and discerning will be punished because he won't get the bribe money. And if he doesn't watch his back very carefully he could well find himself being nicely fried by what I believe to be the world's most entirely useless watchdog: the General Medical Council.

And so the vast majority of GPs do as they are told. Most know nothing about the dangers of the damned vaccines they so happily jab into patients' arms and I suspect that they don't want to know anything. Politicians, nurses, and journalists all bury their fears and suspicions and help bang the drum for vaccination. Question the whole damned sordid business and these ill-educated propagandists (who, like the doctors, know nothing about the risks of the toxic mixtures they are promoting) will throw up their hands in horror.

As vaccinations increase so the number of health problems caused by vaccines will soar. At the same time the link between vaccinations and illness will continue to be as strenuously denied as was the link between smoking and lung cancer.

Countries which have not yet adopted mass vaccination programmes would, perhaps, be wise to ask some serious and rather fundamental questions before starting to do so. Here are a few questions that might be asked.

Who benefits most from vaccination programmes?

Are vaccines given to protect the community or to protect the individual?

Where is the scientific evidence showing that vaccines are really effective?

Where is the long-term scientific evidence showing that vaccines are safe?

Where is the long-term scientific evidence showing that giving a ton and a half of mixed gunk into an eight-week-old baby doesn't cause brain damage?

the years, discovered many of the hazards of telling the truth. My books are rarely reviewed these days. Most national newspapers and magazines ban all advertisements for my books. Planned interviews are invariably cancelled before they take place. In the last ten years I have twice been mysteriously investigated at length by HMRC (on both occasions it turned out that I had paid too much tax.) And, as I show elsewhere in this book I have even been banned from speaking to groups of NHS employees. I mention all this to show just why only one-sided is the information provided for public consumption. It is hardly surprising that parents without medical training and a special interest in iatrogenesis believe the lies they are told about vaccines and think that people like me are half-baked, dangerous lunatics.

I believe that if you are giving a drug to save someone's life (and it is clear that if the drug is not tried then the patient will most certainly die) then it may be ethically acceptable to take risks. But when you are giving a vaccine to perfectly healthy individuals in order to protect the community (and the State) from inconvenience and cost then risks are not acceptable. And yet vaccines are given to millions of people without anyone really having any idea what the long-term consequences may be.

As you read through this book remember that if these facts weren't true I would either be sued or struck off the medical register. Why haven't you read the truths in this book elsewhere? Well, over the last 40 years I've made a lot of enemies who do whatever they can to ensure that the truth is suppressed. The medical establishment works hard to protect itself (and that includes the pharmaceutical industry) and to pressurise journalists into perpetuating the officially acceptable myths and lies.

As you read, remember that I have no vested interests. I don't represent anyone. If I thought vaccines were marvellous I would say so and attack the people trying to oppose their use. My only interest is the truth. My concern is that I believe that the amount of illness and the number of deaths caused by vaccinations far exceed the amount of illness and the number of deaths caused by the diseases against which vaccinations are supposed to offer protection. Remember that I have no vested interest for or against vaccines. I don't receive money from drug companies. I don't sell alternatives to vaccines. All I have to sell are my books; my only product is the truth. The whole vaccination story is one of the great modern scandals of our time. The entire medical profession (at least the part of it in general practice) has been bribed by the Government, using taxpayers' money. In my first book *The Medicine Men* (1975) I wrote that doctors who did what the drug industry told them to do could hardly describe themselves as belonging to a profession. Even I did not then imagine just how easy it would be to bribe and buy an entire profession.

The truth is that doctors, whether working as hospital consultants, GPs or public health officials, know very little about vaccination. Most simply follow the establishment line, never question what they are told by the drug industry and dismiss all critics of vaccination as dangerous lunatics.

I've been writing about vaccines for decades and in the days when radio and television stations were allowed to interview me, and arrange debates, I often met doctors promoting the official 'vaccines will save the world' line. Most of them didn't know any of the stuff in this book. They just believed what they were told by the Government and the drug industry and looked at their bank statements every month with growing pride (and perhaps a little incredulity).

Remember: everything in this book is true. Everything *they* tell you is a lie.

And ask yourself: Why has Vernon Coleman written this book? I promise you I don't need the money (if I did I could make far more money writing another book about cats). I certainly don't need the hassle. I don't *need* to write about vaccines (there are scores of other things I would find more fun to write about) and I could think of a hundred book topics that would sell better (I know from past experience that serious medical books don't usually sell very well at all). So why have I written this book? The answer is simple. I've written it because it is the truth and no one else will tell this particular truth.

I can share this truth and so I have.

Most practising doctors and nurses at the sharp end of medicine undoubtedly believe that vaccines have helped wipe out some of the deadliest infectious diseases. Many members of the medical profession would put vaccination high on any list of great medical discoveries. Those who promote vaccines often claim that vaccination programmes have reduced illness, prevented millions of deaths and are the main reason why the average life expectation has risen. These are all barefaced lies.

Vaccination is widely respected by doctors and others in the health care industry because of the assumption that it is through vaccination that many of the world's most lethal infectious diseases have been eradicated. But this simply isn't true: it is a myth. As I have shown in many of my books infectious diseases were conquered by the provision of cleaner drinking water and better sewage facilities. The introduction of vaccination programmes came along either just at the same time or later when the death rates from the major infectious diseases had already fallen. There really isn't any evidence to show that vaccination programmes have ever been of any real value - either to individuals or to communities.

The mythical power of vaccination programmes has for years constantly been sustained by governments and organisations announcing, apparently with complete conviction, that such and such a disease will be eradicated when the relevant vaccination programme has been completed.

The principle behind vaccination is a convincing one.

The theory is that when an individual is given a vaccine - which consists of a weakened or dead version of the disease against which protection is required - his or her body will be tricked into developing antibodies to the disease in exactly the same way that a body develops antibodies when it is exposed to the disease itself.

But in reality things aren't quite so simple. How long do the antibodies last? Do they always work? What about those individuals who don't produce antibodies at all? Vaccination, like so much of medicine, is a far

more inexact science than doctors (and drug companies) would like us to think.

The truth is that it is a ruthless and self-serving lie to claim that vaccines have wiped out many diseases and have contributed hugely to the increase in life expectation we now enjoy. The evidence shows that the diseases which are supposed to have been wiped out by vaccines were disappearing long before vaccines were introduced. And the argument that we are living longer is a statistical myth which rests upon the fact that in the past the infant mortality rate was much higher than it is now (because of contaminated drinking water and other public health problems). When the infant mortality rate is high the average life expectation is low. When the infant mortality rate falls then the average life expectation rises. (If one person dies at the age of 1 and another dies at the age of 99 they have an average life span of 50 years. If the person who died prematurely lives longer then the average life span will be much longer).

The bottom line, then, is that the evidence shows that vaccination programmes have not done the things they are credited with but have done most of the things they are blamed for. The decline in disease, the reduction in infant mortality rates and the increase in average life expectation are all due to improved living conditions. Cleaner water, efficient methods of removing sewage, fresher food, less poverty and less overcrowding are the real reasons why these improvements have taken place. Anyone who doubts this has only to look at graphs showing mortality rates and life expectation rates alongside graphs showing when vaccines were introduced. The graphs show clearly that the improvements took place before the vaccines were introduced. Study the evidence relating to whooping cough, tetanus, diphtheria, smallpox, polio and other diseases and it becomes clear that the incidence of these diseases, and number of deaths caused by them, were in decline long before the relevant vaccines were introduced.

As the years have gone by the number of vaccines available has increased steadily but remorselessly.

A decade or two ago the only vaccines available were against a relatively small number of diseases including smallpox, tuberculosis, polio, cholera, diphtheria, tetanus and whooping cough. Today, the number of available vaccines seems to grow almost daily. In the past vaccines were produced against major killer diseases. Today vaccines are produced against diseases such as measles, mumps and chickenpox which have been traditionally regarded as

bit dangerous - and to whom. The only certainty is that manufacturing (and giving) vaccines is big business. The people who sell vaccines make a lot of money. And the doctors who give them (or who authorise nurses to give them on their behalf) make a lot of money too. Vaccination is a big, and very profitable, industry. This is vaccine bonanza time for drug companies and doctors.

It doesn't require a great deal of learning to realise that there must be dangers involved in injecting a potentially dangerous foreign substance directly into the body. Even an idiot can see that must be hazardous. And yet where is the evidence showing that vaccines have been tested? For example, I have not been able to find any evidence that studies have been done to prove that giving babies numerous vaccines within a short period of time is safe.

One of the problems with setting up any such research programme would undoubtedly be the problem of obtaining informed consent (an essential requirement before any new product can be tested). Obviously, an eight-week-old baby cannot give consent to being jabbed with some potentially toxic material. But how can the parents give consent for a potentially dangerous procedure, on behalf of their baby, when their baby is perfectly well? If a baby will die unless a new treatment is tried - and existing therapies have proved ineffective then the parents are clearly justified in giving their consent. That is how new treatments are properly tested and developed. But how can parents give consent for their baby to be given a potentially dangerous vaccination when the child is perfectly healthy? And what parents would give their consent under those circumstances? When new drugs and vaccines intended for adult use are introduced they are tested on volunteers, under controlled circumstances. The guinea pigs are carefully observed. Even so there are some disasters when new pharmacological products are tested for the first time. Adult patients used as guinea pigs are well paid for the risks they take.

The bottom line is that it is, in my view, impossible for drug companies and doctors to perform ethically acceptable research to test out new vaccines designed for use on babies and children.

I suspect that if research had been done which proved that vaccines were safe then it would be published and widely promoted (if only to silence critics like myself). At the moment we must all rely on the unsupported confidence of drug companies and the doctors who give vaccinations - all of whom have a vested interest in promoting vaccination and in assuring us all that there are no risks.

Just as surprisingly, and just as shocking, is the fact that as far as I have been able to find out no long-term research has been done, or is being done, into the safety and effectiveness of vaccines. Drug companies and doctors simply assume that vaccines are safe and effective because they want them to be. I wonder how many enthusiastic supporters of vaccination know that, as far as I've been able to find out, neither doctors nor drug companies conduct long-term follow-up studies to prove that vaccines are safe. I wonder how many know that the Government doesn't bother either. It is a scandal of brooding proportions that little or no ongoing research is done to find out how safe or effective vaccines are in the longterm. Drug companies and politicians say that vaccines are safe and effective. And people believe them. Doctors (and others) who speak out against vaccines are ignored and their work is suppressed. Madness.

The basic problem is that these days research work is usually done with a specific, commercial purpose in mind. Research into new products is begun under the guidance and approval of drug companies and the aim is to obtain some useful results which can be used to promote a particular product. What drug company is going to pay for research which might show that its product kills people? Most doctors who do research have links to drug companies and aren't likely to bite the hands that feed them so well. Even if a research programme did show that a vaccine was unsafe the results would be unlikely to be published. Drug companies have a track record of suppressing inconvenient or commercially damaging research results. And, of course, it is very easy to 'fiddle' research in order to prove a particular point. By redefining diseases, by choosing patients selectively, by diagnosing diseases in a different way

cruel).

Drug companies and researchers like using animals because they cannot lose. If, when a drug is being tested on animals, it appears that the animal is harmed then the drug company will say: 'This is of no consequence, since animals are different to humans'. They will then sell the drug for use on people. My book contains a list of several dozen drugs which cause cancer and other serious disorders in animals but which are sold for human use. When a drug is tested on animals and there are no side effects the drug company concerned will say that this proves that the drug is safe for people. This system means that they cannot lose! What is the point in testing drugs on animals? Only the drug companies gain. It is far better to test new drugs on human tissues in the laboratory than it is to test drugs for people on mice. Such tests are easier, quicker, cheaper and far more reliable than animal tests. The problem is that drug companies don't like such tests because they mean that many potentially dangerous drugs are thrown out by the testing and can never be sold.

The evidence clearly shows that animal experiments are a complete waste of time, that animal experiments have never led to any useful breakthroughs and that they are never likely to lead to any useful breakthroughs. Despite this, much of the research work done on vaccines is performed on animals.

A standard test used on rats gives results which can be accurately applied to human beings just 38 per cent of the time. This means that 62 per cent of the time the results obtained through animal experiments are wrong. Since tossing a coin would give a long-term 50 per cent chance of accuracy it would clearly be quicker, more effective, more efficient and cheaper for these scientists to spend their working days sitting around tossing coins to assess the safety of chemicals. ('Yes! Heads! We can give this to patients! No! Tails! Patients can't take that one.') But, in political and financial terms, tossing a coin would certainly not be as useful as using animals. Consider tobacco, for example. The link between tobacco and cancer was identified many years ago by doctors whose observations and research work had involved human patients. But long after doctors had established the link between tobacco and cancer in humans, animal researchers were still forcing dogs to smoke, and painting tobacco tar on the backs of mice, in attempts to show whether or not there was a laboratory link between tobacco and cancer. Politicians who wanted to avoid taking action against the wealthy and big tax paying tobacco companies were able to do so on the grounds that they were still awaiting laboratory confirmation of the link between tobacco and cancer. Decades of vague, inconclusive and contradictory results enabled the world's tobacco industry to keep selling a product which was responsible for approximately one third of all cancer deaths and which, over the years, must have been responsible for more deaths, disease and misery than any other product ever invented.

Vivisection provides a perfect example of what psychologists call 'confirmatory bias'. They collect together all the evidence that supports their thesis and then ignore the evidence that is left - the stuff that doesn't support their belief. If pushed into a corner they delight in confusing the issue in every way they can.

To summarise: my argument against vivisection is very simple and there is no answer to it. I actually have two main arguments. First, drugs are allowed onto the market even if they cause problems in animals - on the grounds that animals are different to humans. And drugs which don't cause problems in the tested animals are allowed onto the market on the grounds that they have been proved safe. Second, the vivisectionists admit that over half of their experiments on animals are unreliable and worthless. But they also admit that they don't know which of their experiments are in the minority which, they claim, may be useful. So, they clearly don't ever know which of their experiments may be of value. And if you don't know which experiments are of value then all of them are useless.

Those are the arguments I used when giving evidence at the House of Commons and the House of Lords. No one said anything in opposition to these arguments. Not a word. (That's why vivisectionists now refuse to debate with me.) Moreover, when the House of Lords committee sent me the evidence offered by the Department of Health in support of vivisection I was able to destroy, systematically and logically, every shred of their evidence. I proved all their arguments in favour of vivisection to be entirely fallacious and nonsensical. I proved, without any shadow of doubt, that vivisection is worse than useless - it is dangerous. (My demolition of the Government's evidence 'supporting' vivisection appears on my website www.vernoncoleman.com)

I confess that I was not terribly impressed by the peers who sat on the House of Lords committee on animals. It was a not unpleasant experience. As a witness I was treated

on the NHS telephone line (provided as an alternative to a disappearing GP service) by telephone operators who were, presumably, satisfied that their diagnostic skills enabled them to differentiate between flu and early signs of other, more deadly disorders such as meningitis. (Making diagnoses on the telephone is a dangerous business even for a doctor.)

Senior politicians in Europe subsequently called HiNi a faked pandemic and accused pharmaceutical companies (and their lackeys) of encouraging a false scare. Limited health resources had been wasted buying millions of doses of vaccine. And millions of healthy people had been needlessly exposed to the unknown side effects of vaccines that in my view had been insufficiently tested.

As always, vaccinations were given with greatest enthusiasm to children and the elderly - the most immunologically vulnerable and the easiest to damage with vaccines.

We don't develop immunity to influenza and the common cold because the viruses that cause these diseases are constantly mutating and changing. And for the same reason the anti-flu vaccine will be useless within months, weeks or days. For the drug companies this is great news because it means they can insist that everyone who is vaccinated needs revaccinating regularly.

The strains of influenza virus used are the available strains which the drug companies and the authorities guess might be the ones which will hit in the current year. The chances are, of course, that the strains of flu which will spread will be quite different.

Because the flu virus is constantly changing, scientists have to try to predict which strains are likely to produce an epidemic a year ahead. This is a bit like forecasting the weather a year ahead. Actually, it's not a bit like that. It's exactly like that.

Moreover, for the sake of economic convenience, drug companies, politicians and doctors often talk about 'this year's flu vaccine' as though the flu virus mutates just once a year. This, of course, is nonsense. Viruses don't take any notice of the calendar. They change as much as they like and as often as they can. The idea of giving anti-flu jabs on an annual basis is arbitrary and entirely unscientific. Once the drug companies have got hooked on an annual financial bonanza they will suggest that vaccines be given biannually. And doctors, who also make huge sums out of giving flu vaccinations, will be equally enthusiastic.

The vaccination programme is all about money.

I wonder how many people who have the flu jab know just what they are allowing their doctor (or, more likely, a nurse) to dump in their arm? How many know that a pretty standard influenza vaccine may contain: different strains of influenza viruses propagated in chicken embryos; formaldehyde (used as a preservative); polyethylene glycol (used to stimulate the immune system); gelatin (made from cows' bones) and thimerosal (which contains mercury).

In studies suggested that innate immunity is vital to flu resistance and that alveolar macrophages help to clear the flu virus out from the lungs. University of Texas researchers announced that enhancing this natural action would increase the body's resistance to flu infection. The obvious thing to do, therefore, is to encourage people to improve their natural immunity by avoiding activities which are bad for the immune system and by eating foods which help the immune system. In contrast, the whole principle of vaccination is to encourage fake immunity. But does multiple vaccination increase or lower the body's general immunity? Personally, I believe vaccination could well lower real immunity. I don't think I'm the only doctor who worries about this. When I was in practice as a GP I don't think I ever met a doctor who had an anti-flu vaccination himself (or gave one to members of his family). To be honest, I would be most unwilling to trust the judgement of such a doctor if I ever found one.

The big question which no one answers (and hardly anyone asks) is: could the widespread use of flu vaccine be spreading flu, encouraging the developing of more potent viruses and, therefore, be responsible for the fact that a surprising number of relatively young, and healthy, individuals are now dying from the disease? I don't know. And I don't believe anyone else does, either. What I do know is that flu jabs don't have any useful effect on preventing hospitalisation, death or time off work.

7. Doctors trying to promote vaccines often claim that the disease poliomyelitis was eradicated by the use of a vaccine. This is, to put it politely, a barefaced lie. I know facts are unfashionable with the medical establishment these days but the hard evidence shows quite conclusively that the polio vaccine has endangered vast numbers of healthy people, still kills healthy people and played no part in eradicating the disease.

Proof that the introduction of the polio vaccine wasn't the success it is often made out to be isn't difficult to find. In Tennessee, USA, the number of polio victims the year before vaccination became compulsory was 119. The year after vaccination was introduced the figure rose to 386. In North Carolina, the number of cases before vaccination was introduced was 78, while the number after the vaccine became compulsory rose to 313. There are similar figures for other American states. If you don't believe me, check out the figures. The evidence isn't that hard to find. In America, as a whole, the incidence of polio increased dramatically (by around 50 per cent) after the introduction of mass immunisation. The number of deaths from polio had fallen dramatically before the first polio vaccine was introduced.

The truth is that as with other infectious diseases the significance of polio dropped as better sanitation, better housing, cleaner water and more food were all made available in the second half of the 19th century. It was social developments rather than medical ones which increased human resistance to infectious diseases.

But the profitable vaccine is still popular. Today, paralysis caused by poliomyelitis is unheard of in many countries. But every year there are cases of paralysis probably caused by the oral polio vaccine.

However, whether or not the polio vaccine actually works is, for many people, a relatively unimportant health issue.

Of far more significance is the fact (revealed in my book *Why Animal Experiments Must Stop* in 1991) that millions of people who were given polio jabs as children in the 1950s and 1960s may now be at a greatly increased

risk of developing cancer.

The problem is that although the first breakthrough in the development of a poliomyelitis vaccine was made in 1949 with the aid of a human tissue culture, when the first practical vaccine was prepared in the 1950's monkey kidney tissue was used because that was standard laboratory practice. Researchers didn't realise that one of the viruses commonly found in monkey kidney cells can cause cancer in humans.

If human cells had been used to prepare the vaccine (as they could and should have been and as they are now) the original poliomyelitis vaccine would have been much safer.

(As a side issue this is yet another example of the stupidity of using animal tissue in the treatment of human patients. The popularity of using transplants derived from animals suggests that doctors and scientists have learned nothing from this error. I sometimes despair of those who claim to be in the healing profession. Most members of the medical establishment don't have the brains required for a career in street cleaning.)

Bone, brain, liver and lung cancers have all been linked to the monkey kidney virus SV40 and something like 17 million people who were given the polio vaccine in the 1950s and 1960s are probably now at risk (me included). Moreover, there now seems to be evidence that the virus may be passed on to the children of those who were given the contaminated vaccine. The SV40 virus from the polio vaccine has already been found in cancers which have developed both in individuals who were given the vaccine as protection against polio and in the children of individuals who were given the vaccine. It seems inconceivable that the virus could have got into the tumours other than through the polio vaccine.

The American Government was warned of this danger back in 1956 but the doctor who made the discovery was ignored and her laboratory was closed down. Surprise, surprise. It was five years after this discovery before drug companies started screening out the virus. And even then Britain had millions of doses of the infected polio vaccine in stock. There is no evidence that the Government withdrew the vaccine and so it was almost certainly just used until it had all gone. No one can be sure about this because in Britain the official records which would have identified those who had received the contaminated vaccine were all destroyed by the Department of Health in 1987. Oddly enough the destruction of those documents means that no one who develops cancer as a result of a vaccine they were given (and which was recommended to their parents by the Government) can take legal action against the Government. Gosh. The world is so full of surprises. My only remaining question is a simple one: How do these bastards sleep at night?

Oh, I do have one other question.

Did your doctor, practice nurse or eager health visitor mention any of this when extolling the virtues of vaccination?

being quite the threat to life that it had been.

But this isn't true.

Robert Koch discovered the pathogen that causes TB back in 1883. After that BCG vaccination was introduced and then, subsequently, mass treatment programmes were devised with chemotherapy. None of these discoveries or introductions had a significant effect on the incidence of tuberculosis.

Contracting TB doesn't provide any immunity against a second infection. And if a natural infection doesn't provide protection then a vaccination certainly won't provide protection. How on earth can it?

It was noticed decades ago that in the lung sanatoriums that specialised in the treatment of TB patients there was no difference in the survival rates of patients who had been 'protected' against TB with BCG vaccination when compared to the survival rates of patients who had received no such 'protection'.

The tuberculosis vaccination (the Bacillus Calmette-Guerin - known as BCG) consists of a weakened, living bovine mycobacteria. The vaccine was used for many years but a trial in India showed that the vaccine offers no protection against the disease. Indeed, when new cases of tuberculosis increased annually in the area where people had been vaccinated against the disease the trial seemed to suggest that there might be a link between the vaccine and outbreaks of the disease.

Many countries have now abandoned the TB vaccine - and have no plans to reintroduce it even though the disease is now once again a major health problem.

Throughout the 1970s and the 1980s I was a passionate critic of a number of vaccines most notably the whooping cough vaccine.

The story of the whooping cough vaccine provides us with a remarkable example of dishonesty and deceit in medicine.

There has been controversy about the whooping cough vaccine for many years but in the UK the Department of Health and Social Security has consistently managed to convince the majority of medical and nursing staff to support the official line that the vaccine is both safe and effective. The official line has for years paid little attention to the facts. Put bluntly, successive governments have consistently lied about the risks and problems associated with the whooping cough vaccine.

I will explain exactly I think that governments have lied to their employers (the public) a little later. For the time being I would like to concentrate on the history.

The first point that should be made is that although official spokesmen claim otherwise, I don't believe the whooping cough vaccine has ever had a significant influence on the number of children dying from whooping cough. The dramatic fall in the number of deaths caused by the disease came well before the vaccine was widely available and was, historians agree, the result of improved public health measures and the use of antibiotics.

It was in 1957 that the whooping cough vaccine was first introduced nationally in Britain - although the vaccine was tried out in the late 1940s and the early 1950s. But the incidence of whooping cough, and the

number of children dying from the disease, had both fallen very considerably well before 1957. So, for example, while doctors reported 170,000 cases of whooping cough in 1950 they reported only about 80,000 cases in 1955. The introduction of the vaccine really didn't make very much, if any, difference to the fall in the incidence of the disease. Thirty years after the introduction of the vaccine, whooping cough cases were still running at about 1,000 a week in Britain.

Similarly, the figures show that the introduction of the vaccine had no effect on the number of children dying from whooping cough. The mortality rate associated with the disease had been falling appreciably since the early part of the 19th century and rapidly since the 1930s and 1940s - showing a particularly steep decline after the introduction of the sulphonamide drugs. Whooping cough is undoubtedly an extremely unpleasant disease but it has not been a major killer for many years. Successive governments have frequently forecast fresh whooping cough epidemics but none of the forecast epidemics has produced the devastation predicted.

My second point is that the whooping cough vaccine is neither very efficient nor is it safe. The efficiency of the vaccine is of subsidiary interest - although thousands of children who have been vaccinated do still get the disease - for the greatest controversy surrounds the safety of the vaccine. The DHSS has always claimed that serious adverse reactions to the whooping cough vaccine are extremely rare and the official suggestion has been that the risk of a child being brain damaged by the vaccine is no higher than one in 100,000. Leaving aside the fact that I find a risk of one in 100,000 unacceptable, it is interesting to examine this figure a little more closely, for after a little research work it becomes clear that the figure of one in 100,000 is a guess.

Numerous researchers have studied the risks of brain damage following whooping cough vaccination and their results make fascinating reading. Between 1960 and 1981, for example, nine reports were published showing that the risk of brain damage varied between one in 6,000 and one in 100,000. The average was a risk of one in 50,000. It is clear from these figures that the Government simply chose the figure which showed the whooping cough vaccine to be least risky. Moreover, the one in 100,000 figure was itself an estimate - a guess.

Although the British Government consistently claims that whooping cough is a dangerous disease, the figures show that it is not the indiscriminate killer it is made out to be. Whooping cough causes very few deaths a year in Britain. Many more deaths are caused by tuberculosis and meningitis.

The truth about the whooping cough vaccine is that it has, in the past, been a disaster. The vaccine has been withdrawn in some countries because of the amount of brain damage associated with its use. In Japan, Sweden and West Germany the vaccine has, in the past, been omitted from regular vaccination schedules. In America, some years ago, two out of three whooping cough vaccine manufacturers stopped making the vaccine because of the cost of lawsuits. On 6th December 1985 the *Journal of the American Medical Association* published a major report showing that the whooping cough vaccine was, without doubt, linked to the development of serious brain damage.

The final nail in the coffin lid is the fact that the British Government quietly paid out compensation to the parents of hundreds of children who had been brain damaged by the whooping cough vaccine. Some parents who accepted damages in the early years were given £10,000. Later the sum was raised to £100,000. My startling conclusion is that for many years now the whooping cough vaccine has been killing or severely injuring more children than the disease itself. In the decade after 1979, around 800 children (or their parents) received money from the Government as compensation for vaccine produced brain damage. In the same period less than 100 children were killed by whooping cough. I think that made the vaccine more dangerous than the disease. And that, surely is quite unacceptable. So, *why* did the British Government continue to encourage doctors to use the vaccine?

There are two possible explanations. The first explanation is the more generous of the two and concerns the Government's responsibility for the health of the community as a whole. The theory here is that by encouraging millions of parents to have their children vaccinated the Government can reduce the incidence of the disease in the community. In the long run this (theoretically) reduces the risk of there being any future epidemics of whooping cough. In other words the Government risks the lives of individual children for the good of the next generation.

The second, less charitable explanation is that the British Government was looking after its own interests by continuing to claim that the whooping cough vaccine was safe enough to use. If the British Government had withdrawn the whooping cough vaccine, it would have been admitting that the vaccine was dangerous. And it would obviously have had to pay out a great deal of money in compensation. By a good deal I mean billions. Lots of billions.

Whatever explanation you consider most accurate, the unavoidable fact is that the Government has, in the past, consistently lied about the whooping cough vaccine, has distorted the truth and has deceived both the medical profession (for the majority of doctors and nurses who give these injections accept the recommendations made by the Government without question) and millions of parents.

The British Government may have saved itself a tidy sum in damages. But the cost to the nation's health has been enormous.

And today no one with anything resembling a functioning brain believes anything the Government says about vaccines or, indeed, anything else.

The whooping cough vaccine used to be given to older children but young babies (who had not been vaccinated) still died from the disease (although the so-called experts claimed that by giving the vaccine to older children the disease would be eradicated and babies would not get it). So now they give the vaccine to eight-week-old babies and hope not too many of them die and that when babies do die no one can prove it's the vaccine.

How many children will be killed by the vaccine? Will Arsenal win the 2020 FA Cup? Will Tony Blair ever be imprisoned for war crimes? These are all imponderables. For the answers, we must wait.

Governments are enthusiastic about vaccination not because the politicians want to protect citizens from illness (when have Governments ever cared a jot about individuals?) but because they believe that vaccinations help prevent the spread of disease within a community. They're wrong, but that's what they've been told and that's what they believe.

The idea is a simple one.

The theory is that if enough children (or, indeed, adults) are vaccinated then the incidence of a disease is likely to be lower. Vaccinations don't by any means provide complete protection (many children who are vaccinated still develop the diseases against which they have been vaccinated) but the hope is that they may cut down the incidence of a disease.

And the advantage to a Government is obvious. If, instead of a million children being ill with measles just half a million develop the disease then the number of parents having time off work will be reduced accordingly. Vaccination programmes are favoured by Governments because they ease the economic burden on the State. Vaccinations are given not to prevent death or serious injury (the diseases against which most vaccines are now given do not usually kill or seriously injure) but to protect the community.

Here's the deal: Child A is vaccinated to stop children B and C getting the disease and to stop the parents of B and C needing to take time off work. So it is, as usual with vaccination, all about money. The aim is to help maximise the State's income. But it is, of course, Child A who takes all the risk.

If you're a public-spirited parent then you perhaps won't mind risking your child's health for the sake of the State.

But it would be nice if they told you all this, wouldn't it?

Maybe they don't because, deep, deep down, they rather suspect that most parents would be touched by unpatriotic reluctance when expected to risk their child's health for the sake of the nation (or, more accurately, our EU region).

The philosophy behind vaccination programmes is remarkably ruthless. The State comes first. The individual comes nowhere.

Let me explain it another way: if you could cure all present cancers and prevent anyone ever getting cancer again by performing an experiment on one healthy child, would you go ahead - knowing that the child would certainly die? Would you sacrifice an innocent and perfectly healthy child for the good of the community?

Let's make it more interesting.

Let's assume that the child is yours.

The dilemma is now a simple one.

If you allow scientists to kill your child then no one will ever again develop cancer.

Would you allow them to kill your child?

Well, that's the decision the Government has already made on your behalf by electing to recommend (or insist) that your child be vaccinated. They are pushing vaccination not for your child's benefit but for the good of the community. But they didn't bother to ask you what you thought about it. Instead they lied to you - telling you that the vaccinations were for your child's benefit.

Not many people realise that vaccination programmes are primarily designed to reduce the incidence of infection in the community, rather than keeping individual children healthy. I wonder how many of those who promote vaccination so enthusiastically realise that children are put at risk to protect the community. Politicians don't tell parents the truth about this because they suspect (probably rightly) that many parents would refuse to have their children vaccinated if they knew. The bottom line is that Governments promote vaccination for financial reasons. They believe that if they persuade citizens to be vaccinated (and to have their children vaccinated) then the incidence of infectious disease will be lower and workers will need less time off work.

Knowing all this, do politicians have their children vaccinated? Well, that's where it gets interesting because politicians who use their children at every possible opportunity suddenly become shy and reticent when asked if their children have been vaccinated. 'You can't possibly ask me that,' they say indignantly. 'My children are private individuals.' And then two weeks later they talk endlessly about their children's illnesses in order to deflect criticism of some outrageous piece of behaviour, or they pose with their children in order to help win a vote or two or to deflect criticism of some indefensible Government policy. Most senior politicians are just bright enough not to have their children vaccinated, and even when vaccinations become compulsory (as they will) they will find a way to avoid them. Politicians are ruthless. They will kill your children in the hope of cutting community costs (and in the certainty of pleasing drug companies). But, for some reason, they are less enthusiastic about killing their own. And do doctors have their children vaccinated? Well, most aren't saying and that, in itself, is pretty telling.

Nothing is going to force politicians to change their view. First, the cost of looking after individuals who have been brain damaged by vaccination usually falls onto families, rather than the Government. It is parents who, more often than not, take on the huge financial, physical and emotional burden of caring for a vaccine damaged child. And second, Governments have promoted vaccines and vaccination programmes with such fervour that they cannot now back pedal. If they did they would expose themselves to vast, multi-billion pound lawsuits. Governments are now firmly committed to vaccination and politicians aren't going to change their views about

vaccines. Politicians, doctors and drug companies are joined together irreversibly.

Enthusiasm for vaccination has become almost hysterical in much of the world. Drug companies promote vaccination programmes because they make billions out of vaccines. Doctors are equally enthusiastic because they can charge huge fees for vaccinating their patients. And Governments everywhere are enthusiastic because they have been told (by drug companies and doctors) that vaccination programmes help prevent disease and therefore save money.

But vaccination is, in my considered view, a massive confidence trick.

And there is now much talk in America and Europe of compulsory vaccination programmes being introduced.

Compulsory vaccinations have already been introduced in some areas of the world and in Britain some general practitioners (GPs) are already refusing to look after patients if they don't agree to have their children vaccinated. There is a simple, selfish financial reason for this. If patients refuse vaccination, British family doctors lose out on huge cash bonuses.

I now have no doubt that despite the dangers and inefficiencies known to be associated with it, vaccination will become compulsory in the West. The hazards and inadequacies will be ignored. It will not be the first time. Compulsory vaccination was introduced in Britain in the mid 19th century and in 1871 Public Vaccinators were appointed.

There are already many senior members of the medical establishment in Europe and America who want vaccination to be compulsory. You will not be convulsed with shock when I tell you that drug companies which make vaccines would not be averse to their products being made compulsory. I understand that. I would like my books to be made compulsory reading.

Politicians have been persuaded that vaccinating the population at large helps save money. The theory is that if you vaccinate 1,000,000 children against, say, whooping cough (aka pertussis) and, as a result, you prevent 1,000 children getting the disease then the country will avoid the cost of 1,000 parents staying at home for a week or so to look after their child. If one child is permanently brain damaged by the vaccine that is bad luck on the child and his or

upon fear to women.

But then the Labour Government created a Statutory Instrument amending the Public Health (Control of Diseases) Act 1984, and so now recommendations of the receive the full question would probably be: 'When will the JCVI make vaccination compulsory?' As more and more General Medical Council in the UK now requires doctors to the size (and cost of the NHS) because they have

Financial Times

International Journal of Clinical Investigation

been alleged that a component used in that anthrax vaccine was later introduced in one of the swine flu vaccines approved for use in the UK.)

Vaccinations have been linked to a number of other general health problems. It now seems possible, for example, that individuals who receive vaccinations may be more prone to develop allergies (such as asthma), arthritis, eczema and bowel disease (such as Irritable Bowel Syndrome). The explanation - which makes sense to me - is that vaccinations interfere with the immune system and make the recipients more susceptible to disease. The human immune system is a wonderland of protection. It is one of God's great gifts to us. And yet, as I showed in my book *Superbody*, our immune systems are being battered and broken and damned near destroyed by environmental factors largely outside our control. What if vaccines damage the immune system in some way? We know that when the immune system is damaged people become more susceptible to illness. And more likely to die. Just how much damage are vaccines doing? It is possible, and I believe extremely likely, that vaccines damage the human immune system and, as a result, weaken people and make them more likely to fall ill in the future. People with poor immune systems are more susceptible to infectious diseases and more likely to succumb to cancer. Are some vaccines more dangerous than others? How many people die because their immune systems have been damaged by vaccines?

I still have no idea of the answer to any of these (officially) unasked questions. Your doctor doesn't have any answers either. He'll waffle and burble and tell you that the Government says vaccines are wonderful and ask you, with a sneery, knowing smile, if you really think the Government is out to kill your children and he'll tell you I'm a dangerous heretic. But he won't have any answers. And, remember, he gets paid for giving vaccinations.

In 1998, the French Government abandoned its mandatory Hepatitis B vaccine programme for schoolchildren after more than 15,000 lawsuits were filed for brain damage and autoimmune reactions including arthritis, multiple sclerosis and lupus.

In an infant the brain is developing very quickly. During this time infants are given an ever-increasing barrage of vaccinations. You might imagine that dumping all this potentially toxic stuff into a developing body might put a huge strain on the developing immune system. Scientists have not yet looked into this. I find myself constantly puzzled by the failure of other doctors to question what is happening. Who (other than a drug company spokesman) wouldn't expect an infant to show serious signs of distress when deliberately injected with potentially toxic foreign substances? Why shouldn't such injections cause a severe immune response? What, you may wonder, is the effect of squirting all this gunk into babies and small children? I certainly wonder. And, I hope that one or two members or the medical establishment will one day have the wit, and the conscience, to wonder too.

Meanwhile, as we wait for more research work explaining precisely how much damage vaccines do, we should perhaps all remember that the American Government has officially recognised that in the year 'perfectly safe' childhood vaccines officially killed or injured 2,699 children in America. And that, remember, is 2,699 children who were perfectly healthy before they had their vaccinations. Those children, and their families, paid quite a price so that drug companies and doctors could make a great deal of money. We should be aware, too, that there are still many unanswered (and usually unasked) questions about vaccination. For example, we know that vaccines cause neurological damage. And we know that the first symptoms of disease may appear some considerable time after

vaccination has taken place. 'Is it possible,' asked my wife, Donna Antoinette, when she had read an early draft of this book, 'that the rise in the incidence of multiple sclerosis (MS) could be a consequence of the increase in childhood vaccination? Could the increase in the number of young women affected by MS be a result of the extra vaccines now given to young girls?' I had to tell her that I have no idea. Moreover, I doubt if any of the gung-ho vaccinators have ever even asked those questions — let alone thought about answering them.

Finally, here is a quote from a former American vaccine researcher: *'If I had a child now, the last thing I would allow is vaccination. I would move out of the State if I had to. I would change the family name. I would disappear. With my family. I'm not saying it would come to that. There are ways to sidestep the system with grace, if you know how to act. There are exemptions you can declare, in every State, based on religious and/or philosophic views. But if push came to shove I would go on the move.'*

Food for thought?

The number of children diagnosed as suffering from autism has rocketed just as the number of children being vaccinated has risen. This isn't just true of the UK; it's true of all countries where children are vaccinated. I have for many years believed (and argued) that epidemiologically and logically all varieties of autism (including such brands as Asperger's) are nothing more than vaccine damage. Where's the evidence? Well, there's a startling absence of research but in the USA a huge medical practice of paediatricians with 30,000 child patients do not vaccinate their patients at all. They have no patients with autism. In the old days such an observation (known as epidemiological research) was regarded as valuable. Today, bizarrely, it is dismissed as irrelevant.

Some patients with autism are severely damaged and some are lightly damaged. Only a complete fool (or someone more enthusiastic about money than truth) would deny that there might be a link. But when a research project was set up to investigate any link between vaccination and autism drug companies applied to a court for an injunction to stop the research. Now, why would they do that?

Here are seven incontrovertible facts.

Fact one: Autism is (in its more serious forms) a disorder which involves brain damage.

Fact two: Vaccines cause brain damage. (If vaccines are known to cause brain damage isn't it logical to assume that they may also cause the disease which is known as autism but which would, I believe, be more properly and honestly known as vaccine brain damage? I suspect that the children currently being diagnosed as 'autistic' are actually suffering from various levels of brain damage caused by vaccines - and should have been awarded damages by drug companies, doctors and the Government.)

Fact three: The incidence of autism has rocketed as the number of vaccinations being given has also rocketed. There's a surprising correlation between the two. If someone noticed a statistical correlation between the number of people sucking humbugs and the number of people losing their teeth I bet you a devalued pound to a devalued penny that teams of highly paid medical scientists would start investigating. (The humbug manufacturers would complain but I doubt if they have as much clout as the international pharmaceutical industry.) Once rare (in the 1990s it was generally accepted that autism affected no more than 4 or 5 people in every 10,000), it is now officially claimed that autism affects more than 100 in every 10,000 children in Britain. (Some experts claim that the real figure is much higher than this.) Figures from around the world show that the incidence of autism is rising in all developed countries - just as the number of vaccinations given is rising. None of this proves that vaccines cause autism but how anyone can simply deny the possibility of a link between vaccination and autism is quite beyond me. The epidemiological evidence is overwhelming.

Fact four: Children who suffer from brain damage after vaccination are numbed and need a good deal of stimulation. They respond well to flashing lights, colours and movement. Exactly the same thing happens with children suffering from severe autism.

Fact five: Some so-called experts claim that autism is caused by environmental pollution. Curiously, these 'experts' do not believe that injecting foreign matter into small children is pollution.

Fact six: A number of parents have reported that their autistic children responded particularly badly when they were given their childhood vaccinations. From the evidence reported to me I believe that if children scream a good deal after vaccination, or are unusually quiet, or show other unusual signs, then there is, I believe, a real chance that they will develop autism.

Fact Seven: The American Government has reportedly accepted that vaccines may cause autism.

I believe, and have believed for many years, that autism is caused by vaccination. I believe that the evidence (including the epidemiological evidence) supports this hypothesis. I suspect that some children have a hereditary susceptibility and respond badly to vaccination. And if vaccines are known to cause brain damage isn't it logical to assume that they can also cause autism? Isn't it logical to at least want to do some pretty high-powered research to find the nature of the link?

Part of the problem is that there isn't really any clear way to define autism. It is a ragbag diagnosis used to describe a whole range of symptoms - ranging from severe brain damage to relatively mild behavioural problems. Many doctors now agree with me that severe autism is simply vaccine produced brain damage while very mild autism may merely be an excuse to be used when a child doesn't do as well as its parents expected. In those circumstances the diagnosis provides a social excuse for academic failure.

The word autism is used, like the word cancer, as an umbrella term for a range of different problems. Patients with autism are said to have development disorders which affect their ability to interact socially and to communicate with other people though this is a fairly recent interpretation and the word now seems to be used as a catch-all for a whole range of problems. (In one medical dictionary on my shelf autism is defined as 'morbid self-absorption' which hardly fits the range of symptoms seen.) These days, I suspect that the word is used more as a dustbin word rather than an umbrella word. It helps the profession appear to know what is the matter when they don't and, at the same time, it enables them to avoid taking any responsibility for what has happened. The word is used to describe almost any symptoms which doctors cannot explain.

Social workers and other professional morons play the game because it enables them to build well-funded empires around the 'care' of autistic patients. For governments it is, of course, a lot cheaper to provide a modest amount of 'care' for autistic patients than to acknowledge that these children have been made ill by the official vaccination policy, and should have been provided with vast amounts of compensation. Every day that vaccination programmes continue makes it ever more unlikely that governments will ever accept that there is any association between the two.

Doctors and drug companies and politicians much prefer to talk about autism rather than brain damage because the former suggests a natural disease while the latter suggests that there may be an external cause. Innocent and desperate parents collude with this nonsense because they prefer to describe their children as autistic than as brain damaged.

Those who oppose the conclusion that vaccination causes brain damage which is in turn often mislabelled as autism sometimes claim that the recorded incidence of autism is going up because doctors are better at making the diagnosis. This is patent nonsense for which there is no scientific evidence. (It is, I must point out, also possible that the incidence of autism is going up for the same reason that the incidence of other fashionable pseudo diseases such as ADHD is going up. They may all be rising because they are fashionable and popular diseases which suit the personal and political motives of various groups of people - particularly parents who are looking for an appropriate label to stick on their child. Certainly, the list of symptoms said to be associated with autism is now increasing so rapidly that it will soon be easier to diagnose someone as *not* suffering from the disorder.)

I believe that autism was devised so that drug companies could avoid the embarrassment of seeing children described as vaccine damaged. Once the new disease had been invented, drug companies started to sell treatments for this newly created and nonexistent disease. You have to admire their marketing brilliance.

The drug companies (and the doctors, hospitals and politicians who support them) all claim that there is no link between autism and vaccination. (But then they would, wouldn't they?). They claim that there is no convincing scientific evidence proving a link between the two. On the other hand there is no convincing scientific evidence disproving a link between vaccination and autism. The one scientific paper I've been able to find which claims to disprove the link between autism and vaccination was written by a group who worked for the Government in Denmark. One of the researchers involved has reportedly been charged with stealing more than \$i million in autism research money from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta, USA.

In answer to those who still claim that there is no link between vaccination and autism I would again remind readers that the US Health Departments National Vaccine Injury Compensation Programme has reportedly accepted that hundreds of children have officially developed autism after vaccination. That goes quite a long way towards proving that I'm right and the vaccine supporters are wrong.

2010 2010, *worthwhile contribution to the debate on the link between vaccination and autism?*

Many people (me included) believe that many or even most cases of autism are a result of brain damage caused by vaccination. For the National Autistic Society to accept money from a drug company which produces a vaccine which has been linked to autism in this way seems to me to be extraordinarily immoral.

The Society seems to be claiming that it hasn't accepted very much money from GlaxoSmithKline and that it is not, therefore, compromised by this association.

So, how much money will GlaxoSmithKline have to give before the National Autistic Society is compromised by the association? How many other drug companies contribute to the Society?

(I note, incidentally, that in your letter you refer not to GlaxoSmithKline (the name of the drug company) but simply to GSK - as though not printing out the full name of the company will somehow make the link less embarrassing.)

Personally, I feel that a hooker who charges £5 for sex is no less a hooker than a hooker who charges £1,000.

This correspondence will appear on my website and in a forthcoming book.' I didn't hear from them again.

Could it be possible that doctors don't search for the truth about vaccines and vaccination programmes because the medical profession has been bought?

The fact is that drug companies aren't the only ones to profit from vaccines. Doctors make large amounts of money from vaccines too. General practitioners (GPs) receive chunky fees for giving vaccines and receive massive bonuses if they can persuade/blackmail/pressurise enough of their patients to have vaccinations. This really is appalling and I fear that GPs lost their final scrap of integrity on the day when they agreed to accept bribe money if they managed to vaccinate enough of the patients they were already being paid to look after. I'm old-fashioned enough to believe that this sort of cold-hearted, conveyor belt, bonus-ridden philosophy is better suited to the manufacture of motor car parts than the practise of medicine. The current system, whereby GPs are paid according to the number of people they vaccinate, is appalling and is nothing more than bribery and corruption. The State is doing the bribing and corrupting. And doctors are the ones who have been bribed and corrupted. The whole idea of giving doctors a bonus according to the number of patients they vaccinate is a bizarre one. Doctors don't get paid more if they prescribe tons of antibiotics or if they refer an officially acceptable percentage of their female patients for hysterectomies.

Only doctors who are very stupid, or ill-informed, do not understand that vaccines are potentially dangerous, inadequately tested and often ineffective. Sadly, it seems that there are far more stupid and ill-informed GPs around than there really ought to be and giving doctors a financial incentive to perform a particular medical procedure has doubtless tilted the balance and persuaded doctors to ignore the hazards. It is a grossly unethical practice and I am appalled both that doctors don't seem to care much about this and that the General Medical

Council sees nothing wrong with it.

The tragedy is that I have absolutely no doubt whatsoever that the financial incentive encourages doctors to vaccinate without considering all the possible dangers and complications. The fact that doctors are bribed to vaccinate might suggest to some that the authorities *need* to bribe doctors in order to persuade them to get busy vaccinating. It seems reasonable to assume that if doctors really believed in vaccination they would do it anyway without the bribes.

It is not unknown for doctors to throw patients off their lists because they won't accept vaccinations - because this affects the GP's earnings. One journalist who interviewed me told me, indignantly, that his own GP had threatened to have his family removed from the GP's list of NHS patients if he would not allow his children to be vaccinated.

And all this goes on in considerable secrecy. How many doctors tell their patients that the Government pays GPs an extra £50,000 a year each, on top of the more than adequate wage of £100,000 to which they receive for a basic 40 hour week with no night calls, no weekend duty and no bank holidays, to push their patients into accepting vaccinations? Not many, I suspect, though I believe that those who don't should be serving time for fraud.

The Medicine Men, that terrible thing it is public, or some contrivance to raise prices.'

achieved.'

I have more decide on the final programme. I thought the conference was an important one and would give me a good opportunity to tell NHS staff the truth. I signed a contract.

PasTest wrote to confirm my appointment as a consultant and speaker for the PasTest Conference Division. And then there was silence. My office repeatedly asked for details of when and where the conference was being held.

Silence.

Eventually a programme for the event appeared on the Internet. Curiously, my name was not on the list of speakers.

Here is part of the blurb promoting the conference:

'Against a background of increasing media coverage into the number of UK patients who are either becoming ill or dying due to adverse reactions to medication our conference aims to explain the current strategies to avoid Adverse Drug reactions and what can be done to educate patients.'

Putting the blame on patients for problems caused by prescription drugs is brilliant. Most drug related problems are caused by the stupidity of doctors not the ignorance of patients. If the aim is to educate patients on how best to avoid prescription drug problems the advice would be simple: 'Don't trust doctors.'

The promotion for the conference claims that 'It is estimated errors in medication...account for 4 per cent of hospital bed capacity.' And that prescription drug problems 'reportedly kill up to 10,000 people a year in the UK'. As I would have shown (had I not been banned from the conference) these figures are absurdly low.

The list of speakers included a variety of people I had never heard of including one speaker representing The Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry and another representing the Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency.

Delegates representing the NHS were expected to pay £25.3 plus VAT (Ei£293.75) to attend the event. Delegates whose Trust would be funding the cost were asked to apply for a Health Authority Approval form.

So why was I apparently banned from this conference?

This is what PasTest said when we asked them: 'certain parties felt that he (Vernon Coleman) was too controversial to speak and as a result would not attend.'

Could that 'certain parties', I wonder, be the drug industry? Is the drug industry now deciding whom they will allow to speak to doctors and NHS staff on the problems caused by prescription drugs? If I was banned at the behest of the drug industry do NHS bosses know that people attending such conferences will only hear speakers approved by the drug industry and that speakers telling the truth will be banned? (I think it is safe to assume that I won't be invited to speak at any more conferences for NHS staff.)

If I was banned at the behest of the medical profession why are doctors frightened of the truth?

I could not, of course, be banned by the NHS itself. Why would the NHS not want its employees to know the truth about drug related problems?

Why are people who had me banned so frightened of what I would say? It can surely only be because they know that I would have caused embarrassment by telling the truth.

The scary bottom line is that the NHS paid to send delegates to a conference where someone representing the drug industry spoke to them on drug safety. But I was banned. The truth was uninvited.

Details of the ban were sent to every national and major local newspaper in Britain. None reported it.

The question is this: If doctors or drug companies believe I am wrong why don't they let me speak and then explain why I am wrong?

The unavoidable answer is that they know my criticisms of the profession and the industry are accurate and unanswerable.

What happened with PasTest is by no means unusual. All sorts of strange people (mainly politicians and administrators) have taken control of medical care these days; their brains are uncluttered with scientific stuff and they 'know best'. Vaccination is now a political issue rather than a scientific issue. Facts are just a damned nuisance that get in the way and about as welcome as hot dog vendors at a meeting of vegetarians.

When the London Assembly (in reality the best known EU Regional Assembly in England) invited members of the public to send in thoughts on vaccination for their 'rapporteurship' I sent them a copy of my book *Coleman's Laws*, which contains a lengthy medical explanation of why vaccination is irresponsible and dangerous and a significant cause

Time Wired Oriental Morning Post are size surprisingly few exceptions) they were not silenced in the way that original thinkers are silenced today. The modern medical establishment was bought by the drug industry decades ago. Today, there is no room for initiative and originality and both are actively suppressed. Dissent is officially stifled. The great men of medicine, heroes such as Snow, Semmelweis and Lister, would not have survived in today's environment. Anyone who studies medical history can see that the significant developments always come from free thinkers outside the system. Today, more than ever, the free thinkers outside the system are suppressed. They will doubtless be defrocked when the new rules of revalidation are introduced to protect the establishment and the pharmaceutical industry.

Traditionally, the medical establishment has quite a record of supporting the wrong view. Today, the power of the establishment to suppress makes things a thousand times worse. Existing therapies which are dangerous, ineffective and even lethal are protected. Antibiotics are wildly overprescribed. Benzodiazepines are still prescribed in massively dangerous quantities - creating millions of addicts. Patients are routinely dispatched to profitable screening clinics which do far more harm than good. Animals are slaughtered in laboratories which are used to preserve the profitability of the drug industry at the expense of patients. Vaccines are injected by the lorry load and children are paralysed and killed by the classroom.

Any doctor who disapproves of vaccination, or questions the effectiveness or safety of something that has

become accepted as just as essential and as normal and as safe as food and water, is treated as a dangerous lunatic. Critics are silenced. Alternatives are not even considered. Eyes are closed to the dangers of genetic engineering and the reckless overprescribing of dangerous prescription drugs. The potential advantages of alternative remedies are dismissed out of hand simply because they might threaten the profitability of the industry which now owns what used to be a profession. As I explained in *How To Stop Your Doctor Killing You* it has been proven without doubt that most heart surgery is unnecessary. A sensible regime of diet, exercise and stress reduction can reverse the problems now regarded as indications for surgery. But the establishment continues to promote surgery because it is enormously profitable. New, innovative, safe and effective ways of dealing with diabetes are ignored, suppressed even, because they threaten corporate and professional profitability. Doctors don't bother looking at scientific evidence any more. It tends to get in the way of profits. The dangers of electricity, mobile telephones and prescription drug contaminated drinking water are all ignored because drawing attention to these threats may prove financially embarrassing to other parts of the establishment. Powerful evidence proving that all these are real health problems, responsible for many thousands of deaths a year, is suppressed without hesitation.

The medical establishment is nearly always wrong. It has always been nearly always wrong. And as pseudoscience develops and the drug company lobbyists push their patented cures faster and harder so they cause more and more problems.

Iconoclasts are never popular. The people who own and worship the icons don't much care for them being smashed. And these days the icon owners have all the power and most of the money. They control the politicians, the legislature and the media.

Just about every major advance in medicine has come as a result of the work of eccentric, passionate, determined unclubbables who have fought the establishment and who would today almost certainly fail the registration, licensing and revalidation procedures designed to ensure that only doctors who obey every rule of the establishment will be allowed to practice. Advantageous changes to society happen only through the determined work of unreasonable men. Great things happen only when enough unreasonable men care and are brave enough to be unreasonable in public. All real progress is made as a result of observation and deduction but these skills are not valued today. Just about all great discoveries in history have been made by people who weren't recognised by their peers before they made their discoveries and often weren't recognised for years afterwards either.

There has been woefully little really original thinking in medicine in recent years. This is partly because medical education discourages original thinking, the medical press suppresses original writing and the medical establishment outlaws original thinkers. It is, therefore, hardly surprising that there have been very few medical breakthroughs, no critical studies and hardly any bright ideas. Controversy is suppressed and the obvious ignored for fear of upsetting any part of the Unholy Trinity (doctors, drug companies and politicians) and of upsetting Government protected industries.

Over the last few years it has become increasingly clear that bankers, lawyers and politicians have all betrayed us. Despite my best efforts, the public has not yet realised that *Bodypower* And so, are rarely today's researchers are simply *The 100 Greatest Englishmen and Englishwomen I* are always, almost by definition, an anathema to the ideas and developments come from crazy, neurotic people. lot crazy be odd but they entirely stable. Great advances are made by people Things medicine, and exposing hidden truths, for long enough to know that it is unlikely that politicians will take any notice of my views on vaccination. Nor is the medical establishment likely to change the way it does things.

And since my books are now widely banned I know that very few people this book.

But you've read it. And so now one more person now knows the truth. Share the truth with your friends and relatives. And, together, maybe we can change things.

'Strive to preserve your health; and in this you will the better succeed in proportion as you keep clear of the physicians.' - *Leonardo da Vinci*

You will probably have gathered, by now, that my view is that vaccines are unsafe and worthless. I would not allow myself to be vaccinated again. This is, however, a purely personal view and in fairness I stress that it is not a view shared by the majority of doctors, nurses, health visitors, journalists and war criminals. Readers must make their own judgements based on all the available evidence. I strongly recommend that anyone contemplating vaccination discuss the issue with their own medical adviser.

The bottom line is that I do not advise anyone not to be vaccinated, or not to have a child vaccinated because I am merely an author: it is not my job to tell people what to do. My role, as a writer, is merely to provide information (which isn't provided by the Government or the medical profession) and to give some idea of the sort of questions which readers may like to ask when considering a vaccination programme.

Coleman's Laws. For a full list of books by Vernon Coleman please visit
<http://www.vernoncoleman.com/>

If you found this book helpful it would be an enormous help if you gave it a positive review on Amazon.

There is also a list of books by Vernon Coleman on his Amazon author page.