

## Vaccine Benefit/Risk Ratio: Time for Patients to Choose Between Beliefs and Knowledge



We would like to respond to Susan Rohwer's recent article on vaccines\* because unfortunately, the fairytale picture she paints is a far cry from reality.

We live in an era of vaccine fever in which the medico-pharmaceutical establishment is doing everything in its power to persuade us that "more (vaccination) must be better". [1] Most research today is geared to finding the best possible argument for persuading people to get vaccinated, regardless of the consequences, rather than making a serious effort to assess the real risk/benefit ratio. Instead, the benefits are always automatically assumed to outweigh the risks, as if vaccination were an **unquestionable dogma**.

Against this backdrop, there is of course no room for any neutral and objective understanding of the subject or for consideration of alarming confessions and data finally being released by the vaccine manufacturers themselves, each more incredible than the next. Ms. Rohwer appears to be totally unaware of this information; perhaps she is not familiar with the internet?

How infuriating when Ms. Rohwer tries to convince us that there is unanimous agreement among doctors about vaccination! The truth of the matter is that it is more a case of "Do what I say, not what I do": an official 2005 INPES (French National Institute for Health Prevention and Education) survey of a representative sample of 400 French pediatricians and general practitioners revealed that **58%** of them questioned the usefulness of childhood vaccines and **31%** questioned their safety. [2]

Strange, isn't it, that these results, which must have dismayed the establishment, were never published! The public must of course be kept in the dark.

Ms. Rohwer feels that doctors must take a stand with their patients when speaking of vaccination and take back some of their expertise, but what expertise are we talking about when we consider the shocking confessions made by **Dr. Jean-François Saluzzo**, Viral Vaccine Production Director at Sanofi Pasteur and also **WHO consultant**, who stated in an online Vaccinology course that they "simply do not know how vaccines work" and that "if we want to develop other new vaccines in the future, we'll have to start by studying the immune system!" [3] Vaccinology then showed its true colours: a false science geared to generating profit but totally void of substance.

We could mention other comments like those of **Dr. Nathalie Garçon**, GSK Global Vaccine Adjuvant Center Director, who confessed in 2002, at a symposium in the USA : "Actually, the adjuvant, the only one that is licensed for human use, is the one which is the most empirical. I mean, **nobody knows how it works, nobody knows the biodistribution. I mean, it has really not much known about this one. [...] Actually, I believe that if alum was coming now, it won't be accepted.**" [4]

How does Ms. Rohwer explain the fact that vaccines are not tested for their carcinogenicity and mutagenic potential while for cosmetics, the use of which is never mandatory, such analyses are required? Most vaccines contain **formaldehyde, labeled a carcinogen** back in 2004 by the IARC (Chemistry in Cancer Research Working Group), a unit overseen by the WHO. [5] So please tell us: why are we turning our backs on knowledge and Science?

Why are we so hesitant to conduct a comparative study over several years of vaccinated individuals and children on the one hand and unvaccinated (i.e. 0 vaccines) on the other? Using a totally unvaccinated population would be the only way to eliminate bias and prevent vaccines being shown to be safer than they really are.

How can we possibly talk of ‘**informed consent**’ when there is so much uncertainty, deliberately perpetuated by the establishment, around the short-, medium- and long-term effects of vaccines? Perhaps Ms. Rohwer feels that consent is already free and informed because side effects are no more than a slight pain or redness at the site of injection? If so, she might be surprised to learn that in December, 2012 and January, 2013, we published a number of absolutely shocking, confidential GSK and Pfizer documents on our website: more than 800 different possible side effects were listed for Infanrix hexa, including cases listed by the company as autism, sudden infant death, diabetes and even shaken baby syndrome, to name only a few [6]! The officials are also aware of the fact that co-administration of the Infanrix hexa and the Prevenar vaccines *triples* the risk of neurological side effects [7], but in spite of this, we continue vaccinating as if there were no problem at all!

How can we claim that we vaccinate “in the interest of children and the broader community” when thousands of healthy children are becoming ill, and we simply ignore the fact that underneath it all, before they were vaccinated, they already had a marvelously functioning immune system? Where is the ‘greater good’ when public freedom is so restricted that children are removed by the courts, as was the case in Maryland, to be forcibly jabbed with chicken pox and Hepatitis B vaccines [8]? Where, Ms. Rohwer is the ‘greater good’ when researchers’ funds are withdrawn because we are uncomfortable with the fact that they are looking into the risks of vaccination, or when they are not allowed to organize a press conference, as was the case for French neuro-pediatrician Pr. Marc Tardieu, because he had discovered a high risk of multiple sclerosis linked with the Hepatitis B vaccine (French publication *Libération*, October 14, 2008) [9]?

Where is the ‘greater good’ when misinformed journalists take great pleasure in trying to tarnish the reputation of Dr. Wakefield, neglecting to remind us (knowingly or not) that his works have been confirmed and replicated several times [10] over by other research teams whose work has not been discredited the same way? And that’s not even mentioning all the other research incriminating vaccination as a contributing factor in the triggering of autism by other mechanisms or even by other vaccines (autism not being the exclusive side effect of any one vaccine). [11]

Ms. Rohwer’s aspiration is a society which substitutes beliefs for knowledge, a society which brandishes altruism in an attempt to sway parents into vaccinating out of guilt but which in reality offers a totally false support system which only works in one direction because shamefully, most serious vaccine victims are abandoned and left to their own devices. Remember that only 1-10% of serious vaccine adverse effects are actually reported. In 1993, Dr. Kessler quoted only 1% in the JAMA. [12] In November, 2011, the French publication *Revue Française du Praticien* specified that only between 1 and 10% of **serious** adverse effects are reported. [13] Think about it.

Our aspiration is different: we want **real Science** and freedom of choice. Without real Science, the imposition of anything on anyone is ethically indefensible. Lastly, let us remind you of some powerful statistics: according to Milgram’s experiments in the Sixties, 65% of submissive people will blindly obey orders from an outside authority capable of ‘impressing’ them. Here’s another one for you: according to the October, 2012 French Auditors’ Office Report, vaccination represents 12.6% of French general practitioners’ and 33% of French pediatricians’ annual incomes. [14] Please take time to think about that one, too.

On behalf of Initiative Citoyenne (Belgian health watchdog),

Marie-Rose Cavalier, Sophie Meulemans, Muriel Desclée.

Namur, Belgium, November 13, 2013.

\* Susan Rohwer’s contribution in the LA Times:

<http://www.latimes.com/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-vaccines-doctors-20131105,0,6638791.story#axzz2juO6moM3>

## References

- [1] [http://www.pharmatimes.com/Article/12-04-24/US\\_biopharma\\_nearly\\_300\\_vaccines\\_in\\_R\\_D.aspx#.T5hUbtFLuM.facebook](http://www.pharmatimes.com/Article/12-04-24/US_biopharma_nearly_300_vaccines_in_R_D.aspx#.T5hUbtFLuM.facebook)
- [2] <http://ddata.over-blog.com/3/27/09/71/INPES--guide-pratique-pour-le-medecin.pdf>  
(See page 12 of the leaflet (page 14 on the pdf) and page 35 of the leaflet (37 on the pdf)... « non publiée » = NOT published !)
- [3] [http://www.canal-u.tv/video/canal\\_u\\_medicine/cif\\_vaccinologie\\_2011\\_fabrication\\_et\\_controle\\_des\\_vaccins.7080](http://www.canal-u.tv/video/canal_u_medicine/cif_vaccinologie_2011_fabrication_et_controle_des_vaccins.7080) (fast forward to the 51st minute)
- [4] <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/NATHALIE-GARCON--ADJUVANTS.pdf> (p 220)
- [5] International Agency for Research on Cancer (June 2004). *IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans Volume 88 (2006): Formaldehyde, 2-Butoxyethanol and 1-tert-Butoxypropan-2-ol*. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from:  
<http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol88/index.php> .
- [6] <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/confid.pdf>
- Analytic press release on these confidential documents about Infanrix hexa:
- <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/Initiative-Citoyenne-Press-Release-Infanrix-Hexa-6--12--12.pdf>
- [7] <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/Wyeth-confidential-neurological-events.pdf>
- + <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/emea-responses--Prevenar-13-Pfizer-Confidential.pdf>
- + <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/Prevenar--confidential--overview-clinical-trials.pdf>
- Analytic press release on these documents about Prevenar 13:
- <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/Initiative-Citoyenne-Press-Release-about-Prevenar-13.pdf>
- [8] [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r6Vj0EX\\_STU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r6Vj0EX_STU)
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G6z3htbpq70>
- [9] [http://www.liberation.fr/sciences/2008/10/14/cachez-ce-risque-que-je-ne-saurais-voir\\_114959](http://www.liberation.fr/sciences/2008/10/14/cachez-ce-risque-que-je-ne-saurais-voir_114959)
- [10] <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-388051/Scientists-fear-MMR-link-autism.html>
- [11] [http://mercury-freedrugs.org/docs/00mdd\\_EISAAbstractSubmission\\_IncreasedRiskOfDevelopmentalNeurologicImpairmentAfterHighExposureToThimerosal-containingVaccine\\_.pdf](http://mercury-freedrugs.org/docs/00mdd_EISAAbstractSubmission_IncreasedRiskOfDevelopmentalNeurologicImpairmentAfterHighExposureToThimerosal-containingVaccine_.pdf)

<http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/MIT--aluminium--autisme.pdf>

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18482737>

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20424565>

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3774468/>

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20628444>

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21299355>

<http://www.ane.pl/pdf/7020.pdf>

[12] <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/dec-2011/KESSLER--JAMA--1993.pdf>

[13] <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/Pharmacovigilance-vaccins-Jonville-Bera--Revue-du-Praticien.pdf>

[14] <http://ddata.over-blog.com/xxxyyy/3/27/09/71/2012-2013/Rapport-2013-Cour-des-Comptes-vaccinations.pdf> (p 114)



# Initiative Citoyenne

## Liberté vaccinale- information