

Educate Before You Vaccinate

If you swallow something poisonous like Drano, you'll vomit immediately. You might be sick for a few days, but you probably won't die. If you take the same amount and inject it into your bloodstream – you're finished! What's the big difference?

The FDA have guidelines on the quantity of substances are considered 'generally safe' to enter the body, but these stats are based upon ingestion through the typical channels of entry, which are the mouth, nose, and even the skin. Because vaccinations are injected directly into the bloodstream, the body cannot easily remove poisonous contents (including aluminum, mercury, polysorbate 80 and formaldehyde) through the normal channels of evacuation which are the mouth, nose, skin, urine and back passage. Unlike the gut, the blood has no way of regurgitating or vomiting. Unlike the lungs, it cannot sneeze.

The method of exposure matters!

The immune system is built on the pathway of the mucosal lining, and 70% of your immune system is in the gut. It's not in the bone marrow, or the thymus, or the lymph. It's called gut-associated lymphoid tissue (GALT). When you inject, as opposed to taking something in through the mouth by swallowing it, it doesn't go through the usual pathways that the body uses to recognize it as foreign and sound the alarm in a cascading sequence. You skip right past blue, yellow and orange to 'red alert'.

Joy Garner wrote: "Our digestive system is an intelligent organ, full of intelligent cells that are constantly making 'decisions' about what to allow into our bloodstream and what to send on down as waste. The same thing is happening with our lungs, and even our skin. Not all toxins can be prevented from gaining access, but these protective systems are there for a reason. It can be disastrous to sneak past our bodies own discerning mechanisms into the blood by injection. That's why the FDA's 'generally safe' levels of toxins should NEVER be applied to INJECTIBLE products, and yet it's based on these levels that they are judged as safe."

The mainstream medical scientists believe they have proven that vaccines "work" because after administering a vaccine, the body produces antibodies. When you go to red alert – you do build antibodies, that much is true. The immune system responds to the injection.

The problem is – antibody titer increase has nothing to do with immunity. It just means you have been exposed to an antigen and your body has reacted. You have to look at the natural killer counts: The T cells, the B cells, the memory cells, the

enhancer cells. There are 27 instruments in the immune system. So, while the medical scientists are saying, “Hey look, we got an antibody titer increase when this vaccination was administered,” that has nothing to do with the immune system strengthening.

Dr. Suzanne Humphries says: “No vaccines increase the health of a human because there is nothing in a vaccine that our bodies actually require. We don’t require aluminum, mercury, polysorbate 80, formaldehyde, or any of the ingredients commonly found in vaccinations, so there is no nutritive effect of the vaccine.”

The CDC could prove once and for all the overall benefit of vaccinations by conducting a large-scale study comparing of the long-term health outcomes of fully vaccinated children and those of unvaccinated children. Unfortunately, they steadfastly refuse to do one.

However, a study of exactly this kind appeared in 2017, conducted by the epidemiologist Dr. Anthony Mawson, along with Brian D. Ray, Ph.D., Azad Bhuiyan, PhD., and Dr. Binu Jacob, Md.

Dr. Mawson and co. compared health outcomes in home-schooled children, many of whom had not been vaccinated at all, with children who had. This made a valid comparison between health outcomes in vaccinated and unpopulated populations. As might have been expected, the vaccinated population were less likely to have been diagnosed with chickenpox and pertussis, but – controversially – they were more likely to have been diagnosed with pneumonia, otitis media, allergies and neurodevelopmental disorders, and each of these reached a high level of statistical significance.

Dr. Mawson also found that children who were born prematurely, before 37 weeks, were at far greater risk of contracting these diseases. The ones who got the vaccine at 12 to 18 months on the CDC’s recommended schedule were at much higher risk of Autism than those who got the MMR vaccine after 36 months. This shows that the younger a child is when they get vaccinated, the more likely they are to be harmed by the vaccines.

According to the CDC and the American Academy of Pediatrics, unvaccinated children should be cesspools of festering infection that act as a source of contamination and contagion for the rest of the community, but the study showed that the unvaccinated children turned out to be remarkably healthy, as well as very clever. What is more, when they are exposed to infections they recover very quickly.

One of the interesting observations is that in families who have vaccinated one child and not the next, the vaccinated child demonstrates illness, while the subsequent

child is remarkably healthy, even though there is a huge overlap genetically, and environmentally in the way these children are raised. In other cases, the parents of children who were injured by vaccines did not put the negative effects down to the shots, and took them for a booster. Perhaps their doctors convinced them it was just a coincidence. Tragically, when they do get their children do get the second shot, we see catastrophic regression following the second dose.

This “re-challenge phenomenon” is taken in court to be the most powerful evidence of causation. By analogy, if you are prescribed a drug that gives you a rash, this could be a coincidence, maybe. However, if upon being given the same drug a second time give years later you develop exactly the same rash, this should be taken as causation until proven otherwise. That is what we see with children who have been injured by vaccines.

Dr. Mawson’s paper on this pilot study went through at least four rounds of rigorous peer review and was accepted for publication. It was later declined or withdrawn from the journal.

People on the internet will jump to the conclusion that because the paper was withdrawn that therefore proves that the findings are wrong, but it can still be found online. Scientists can check the methods, but they can’t disprove them!

The real question is who funds the CDC? Who advertises in the journals that are supposed to publish these studies? Exactly the pharmaceutical companies who profit from the sale of vaccines. Editors of the most respected medical journals have themselves warned that they cannot protect readers from pro-industry bias. In fact, the editors of the New England Journal of Medicine and The Lancet both resigned in disgust, claiming that at least 70% of the articles in their journal were trash and biased towards the corporate health care industry bodies that funded the research. Richard Smith, who was the editor of the British Medical Journal for 25 years said, “Major medical journals are just an extension of the marketing departments of major drug companies.” Richard Horton of The Lancet wrote, “Journals have developed into information laundering operations for the pharmaceutical industry.” Journals want to avoid alienating their advertisers. They often reject studies that demonstrate existing treatments are less safe than originally realized if the manufacturers of those drugs advertise in their pages.

If the CDC was objective and concerned only with everyone’s health, then they would be desperate to run a larger scale version of this study. If the study proves that vaccinated populations are healthier than unvaccinated ones, then they can finally put to bed our “damaging anti-vaxx conspiracy theories.” However, if they confirm Mawson’s findings they will save hundreds of millions of people from adverse health outcomes.

They are not likely to do the study because they have too much to lose. They will not only kill the money they receive from the manufacturers of the vaccines, they will have to destroy their own reputation by saying, “Sorry folks, we’ve been telling you to poison your kids for decades. We knew there was evidence of harm, but we ignored it because we were riding the gravy train.” That’s why they will smear anyone who tries to do the study and use their considerable weight to discredit them. They get attacked hard. They will end up like Wakefield.

If you look up Dr. Wakefield online you will find out that he is “discredited,” but discredited by whom? The same people who told you that Hormone Replacement Therapy was safe and effective, or continue to push chemo even though it was shown to be 97% ineffective in a study published in the Journal for Clinical Oncology? The people who have failed to cure cancer, Type II diabetes, heart disease, arthritis, Alzheimer’s disease, or any other major illness despite spending trillions of dollars and still claim theirs is the only medicine that is scientific. Who has been discredited? The reason why they say he is discredited all over Wikipedia is so that skeptics can just run a quick google search and then dismiss him out of hand without ever listening to a single thing he is saying. Anyone who takes an hour or two to hear him being interviewed will hear that he has evidence to back up all his claims. But they know that a lot of people will just search someone’s name and if Wikipedia says they are discredited that is enough for them.

The Dean at Dr. Andrew Wakefield’s medical school told him that if he continued this vaccine safety science it would be bad for his career, whatever the merits of the science.

Other doctors he worked with told him they could not be seen, as paediatricians, to question the safety of the MMR jab. None of this has anything to do with a science or a medical viewpoint. It is purely politics, and it is costing lives.

If vaccines are safe and effective, why is it that drug companies are protected from liability by the U.S. government, meaning that if their products injure a child, their parents can’t even sue the manufacturer!

This arrangement came to pass in the 1980s because the whooping cough component of the DPT (diphtheria, pertussis, and tetanus) vaccine was causing a lot of injuries and a lot of death in children, far more than was acceptable, and the manufacturers were getting sued left and right. They went to the government and said, “You’re the ones who mandate the vaccine, yet we are the ones picking up the tab for the injury litigation! Either you protect us from liability, or we will stop making the pertussis vaccine, children will die, and it will be your fault!”

In 1986 Ronald Reagan signed into law the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act which removed liability from vaccine manufacturers.

Having to pay compensation in the case of injury is an essential deterrent against companies cutting corners during safety procedures. No drug is completely safe, but weighing up the price of compensation for injuries against overall profits is one of the ways that society is supposed to determine whether a product does more harm than good.

If very few people are injured it will remain profitable despite the occasional pay out, but if too many people get sick, it will be taken off the market. The government has created an industry with the perfect business model. A mandated market with no liability. All they can do is make a massive profit. Then they use the profit to influence the CDC and the FDA. They take adverts out on television channels for their drugs, and then those stations don't want to report on the proven negative effects of drugs and vaccinations because they know they will lose their advertising revenue. Of course, now there are more lobbyists on Capitol Hill for the pharmaceutical industry than there are politicians.

This creates the incentive to introduce as many vaccines as possible and make the case that they are necessary. The government buys the shots with tax dollars, giving a nice big handout from the public purse to big pharma, and if the shots cause damages the manufacturers do not have to compensate victims.

This explains why vaccines are administered for tuberculosis and tetanus, drugs that can always be contracted again, and to which no one is ever immune, as well as to Influenza and hepatitis B which become strongly resistant to antibodies of the vaccines, making these two shots completely useless. Everyone is vaccinated for German measles, even though 90% of women are naturally protected from them, and the risk of contracting the sickness is limited to the first three months of pregnancy. Diphtheria, which was only contracted by 7% of the population during the biggest epidemics, is also part of the vaccine schedule for everyone, because each set of shots means another handout to Big

Pharma. This is not based on need, it is based on greed.

One thing they never safety test with vaccines is the accumulated safety of the entire schedule. They might "prove" that one vaccine is safe on its own, but this does not prove that that vaccine is safe along with the other 71 shots.

If vaccines are completely harmless, why are they so miserly with them, administering only 72 shots? Why not administer 720 shots? Why not 7,200 shots?

If you understand that the body is not designed to receive substances that it is not made of, but has its own intelligence designed to deal with foreign antigens, then it makes sense that the body can bear so much – like the straw that broke the camel's back. The heavy metals in the vaccinations are now being passed from one

generation onto the next in utero. There are more vaccine injuries than ever because we have been vaccinating for more generations than ever before. Your parents probably only received three vaccinations as children. If we were to believe the vaccine industry and the makers of public policy then that entire generation should have been wiped out. Instead, many of them are healthier than our children are likely to be at this rate. Life expectancy is now falling instead of rising. Statistically, more people than ever will develop a chronic illness.

Now is the time to learn about the risk of vaccines and spread the message so people can understand the underlying reasons why they are harmful and protect their precious children.

Autism is 1 in at least 28 children today in 1981 it was 1 in 10,000. It's impossible to have a genetic epidemic, so please learn from our mistake and "Educate Before You Vaccinate!"

April Renée Oakes's site operates at: www.vacinfo.org.

Everywhere you go they will tell you that the vaccine-autism link has been debunked, but when you hear the testimony of those who were involved in bringing this information to light it will become obvious that the evidence has only been buried. Now they are banning posts from Facebook and taking videos down from YouTube if they concern vaccinations, because they know that the many people can still be convinced by the strength of the evidence.