

Vaccines - without any censorship

Facts that the health system (really) does not want you to know

By Dr. Gil Yosef Shahar (M.D)

December 2018

The vaccine controversy can not be ignored.

Especially in view of the current measles outbreak, which once again raised the issue of vaccinations to headlines.

Following the article "What your doctor will not tell you about measles," which received more than 2900 shares on Facebook, I received many inquiries with questions about vaccines. People wanted to know how there might be people who oppose vaccines, when the whole world of science supports them openly and declares that vaccines have been tested in a large number of quality studies and have been found to be beyond doubt, and that the fear of "vaccine opponents" stems from opinions revolving around Facebook rather than science. They wondered if all the doctors were lying.

This article will give you an answer.

In addition, on the occasion of the publication of the most important book ever written on vaccines (see below), I decided that this was the opportunity to bring you some facts about vaccines.

Facts that the health system really does not want you to know.

Facts that will give you a real answer to the question of why there are "vaccine opponents" and whether their concerns about vaccines are based on science or science fiction...

I will start by saying, I am not against vaccines as an ideology. Vaccinations have advantages. There is no doubt about that. But they also have risks. There is no doubt about that either.

I'm not against vaccines as an ideology.

I'm for the truth.

So here it is before you, as I have never introduced it publicly.

Without any censorship.

Vaccination is a medical procedure, just like amniocentesis, colonoscopy, tonsillectomy, and more.

The basic right of every person, which is also enshrined in the patient's rights law, is called the right to informed consent.

Informed consent means that the patient should be given all the relevant information about the medical procedure he is about to undergo.

From its benefits to risks and damages that may occur following the procedure.

Some of the information relevant to the patient, in order to make a decision with informed consent, is related to the safety of the procedure.

Even if there is no proven evidence of damage due to the procedure, if the procedure has not been examined in quality, controlled and appropriate clinical trials, the patient has to know about it.

If this is not told, the meaning of this figure is that the patient actually serves as an examinee in an unofficial experiment, without his knowledge and without his consent ...

The concealment of such information about the quality of the studies done on the procedure means denying the right of informed consent from the patient.

When it comes to injecting substances into the body, informed consent also means knowing the range of injected substances, their safety according to scientific research and what the risks are.

When a number of medical procedures are performed in a given period of time, even if each procedure separately has studies that prove the safety of the procedure, the safety of all procedures should be checked at the same time to ensure that their combination does not cause any unexpected damage following each procedure separately.

This is especially true when injecting substances into the body.

Materials that accumulate in tissue from injection to injection.

Even if one injection was found to be safe, it can not be said that repeated injections are safe, based on the fact that each injection was found to be safe.

What is the similar parable?

Suppose we had a study that proves that smoking 20 cigarettes on a one-time basis does not increase the risk of lung cancer.

Is it possible to say on the basis of this study that smoking on the next day 20 cigarettes and the next day, etc., etc. for 5 years and the risk of lung cancer will not increase, because there is a study that proved that 20 cigarettes in one day, one time did not increase the risk Lung Cancer?

It is clear that a study that tests smoking of 20 cigarettes a day for five years should be done to reach such a conclusion.

Unfortunately, vaccines are medical procedures that are performed without informed consent.

Here are some facts you probably did not know about vaccines.

Facts that the medical establishment had to tell you, in order for the injection of the vaccine to be considered an act of informed consent.

Fact number one:

Each vaccine, in addition to the virus / bacterium that is killed or the antigen, or parts of it, also has preservatives, and some of them contain adjuvants, which in turn lead to increased activity of the immune system (to produce a large number of antibodies) Cells or residual cells with the size of the virus or bacteria.

These materials can be formaldehyde, aluminum, cells of human embryos or their residues and more.

Some of these substances are defined by the world's health authorities as carcinogenic substances or have a negative effect on the nervous system.

Fact number two:

The vaccination program in Israel (and in the rest of the Western world) has never been examined in any controlled clinical trial compared with placebo. Even if every vaccine was tested and found to be safe, injection of **dozens of vaccine doses** from age zero to two years of age has never been tested in any controlled and randomized clinical trial, as it should be.

Would you be willing to smoke 20 cigarettes a day for five years, based on research showing a one-time dose of 20 cigarettes did no harm?

This is exactly how the vaccination program is conducted in Israel.

Fact number three: (You will find it hard to believe it, but it is true!)

None of the vaccines currently available in the State of Israel has undergone random, controlled, double-blind, controlled clinical trials comparing it to a real placebo.

Let us explain this:

When testing the safety of a drug / vaccine, it should be compared to providing a substance that has no doubt that it is safe and does not cause harm.

The only material that meets this criterion with certainty is water.

When you want to check the safety of a vaccine, you should take a group of children of the ages you want to vaccinate, divide them randomly into two groups.

One group will receive the vaccine and the other group will receive an injection of sterile water (saline).

Both the parents and the medical staff would not know which child received the vaccine and which child received the sterile water (the syringes would be completely identical).

This study, in which both the subjects (or their parents when it comes to children) and the medical staff, do not know who belongs to which group, is called double blind research.

These children should be followed for several years to see whether there are differences in the prevalence of epilepsy, deafness, crib death, autism, cancer, developmental and behavioral problems, retardation, autoimmune diseases, and more.

Only this type of study, which will be carried out on a large number of children (at least 3,000 children, in order to identify differences in relatively rare phenomena in the population), will show that there is no difference in the incidence of these diseases between the two groups. Such research has never been carried out.

Even though the vaccine was given in the State of Israel.

And not only has not such a study been conducted to monitor the children for several years, such a study was not carried out **even for a few months**, to see whether there is an increased risk of SIDS, a regression to autism and more.

Let's understand the meaning of this.

Not only is the vaccination program in general and the provision of multiple doses of vaccines in short periods of time, has never been tested in a controlled, random manner, as is common in medicine, but every vaccine alone has not been adequately tested to ensure it is safe!

This is a meaning that the brain refuses to believe.

It does not really make sense.

It sounds like science fiction.

This is an extremely serious claim against the health authorities that are in charge of our health.

So just ask, how did the FDA (and subsequently the Israeli Ministry of Health) approve the vaccines as safe?

The answer is that safety studies have been done, comparing the complete vaccine to the injection that does not contain the virus or the bacterium that is killed or weakened, but only contains all the other substances in the vaccine.

In some cases, the vaccine was compared to another vaccine (which has also never been controlled and randomized compared with placebo for sterile water).

What is the similar parable?

A study that would compare ordinary cigarette smoking to the smoking of cigarettes that removed nicotine, but left all the other thousands of toxic substances in the cigarette.

It is clear that if the problem with the cigarette is not the nicotine, but the other substances found in it, such research will never find that there is a problem smoking cigarettes!

The incidence of lung cancer will be the same in both groups, which will "prove" that cigarette smoking is safe and does not increase the risk of lung cancer.

That's exactly what they did in the safety studies with vaccines!

If the problem with vaccines is not the antigen (the virus or the bacteria), but the other substances in the vaccine, such a study will never show that there is a problem with vaccines!

This means that safety studies on vaccines in the first place were designed so that they can not even theoretically find that there is a problem with vaccines!

Why did the pharmaceutical companies choose to design the experiment in such a way and actually sterilize it from any real meaning regarding the safety of the vaccine?

I leave you to answer this question.

Is it hard for you to believe that this is the situation?

Do not believe me.

Ask your doctors to show you controlled, randomized and randomized trials that compared the vaccine to a saline placebo. Challenge them.

There should be several such studies on each vaccine (a medical procedure performed on

millions of children and should have more than one quality study that examined the safety of the procedure), but let us suffice with one.

Do not give up to your doctors.

You will need to see at least one high-quality, controlled, randomized, double-blind study comparing the vaccine to sterile water.

Why should we settle for less when it comes to health, quality of life, and perhaps our children's own lives?

This is the standard for proving safety in the medical world.

Your doctors knows that.

Can vaccines be said to be safe in the absence of such studies?

It can be said.

As you can say anything.

But this is not a scientific statement.

This is a hypothesis that, as of today, has no proof.

Just ask, do not all the family doctors and pediatricians who care for us and are responsible for our child's immunization program knows that?

How do they tell us again and again that vaccines have been properly tested in hundreds of studies and found to be safe?

Are they lying to us?

The answer is that your doctors rely on the official responses of the establishment.

99% of physicians have never read vaccine safety studies.

And those who did, apparently did not bother to read the chapter on research methods carefully to see exactly what the placebo was in the same study.

It's not that they're lying to you.

They simply recite the establishment's answers without examining them themselves in depth.

sad.

But that's the truth.

Ask how the doctors at the head of the establishment, at the head of the health system, those who put together the vaccination program in Israel and approved their income into the health basket, how do they keep repeating that vaccines were properly tested and found safe?

That you should ask them.

And only them.

Does this mean that there is no need to vaccinate?

No.

That's not the meaning.

It is certainly possible that the benefits of vaccines exceed their risks.

But as of today, we do not know that.

The medical establishment, which has the ability to design and carry out the right and appropriate vaccine safety testing to determine whether the risks of vaccines are less or

greater than the benefits of reducing morbidity, **consciously chooses not to perform them.**

Apparently they know the reason.

Everyone has the right to decide whether to vaccinate or not to vaccinate, but at least now, after reading this article, when you know that vaccines have never been proven safe (proof as is accepted in the medical world), your decision, whatever it is, a little bit more 'Informed consent' than before.

And so it should be.

This is the right enshrined in the Patient's Rights Law.

A right that is not fulfilled today in everything related to the medical procedure called vaccinations.

Now you know that if you chose to vaccinate your children, you chose to add them to the experiment.

Perhaps the largest clinical experiment in the history of mankind.

You have the right to do so.

But at least you'll know what you're doing.

Informed consent.

Today, many voices are heard in the Israeli public, in the media and among legislators, enacting laws that force parents to vaccinate their children, or impose many sanctions and restrictions (so-called vaccine obligation).

What is the moral right to force people to join clinical experiment against their will?

There is no such thing.

So why do you still hear such voices?

Just for one reason.

Those who call for this simply do not know that vaccines are a large-scale clinical experiment of humans. They are confident that vaccines have been proven safe by standard medical standards.

And if we are dealing with moral questions, the real moral question that must be asked is as follows:

How did the health authorities approve studies in which one group was vaccinated without the antigen, but only with the other substances in the vaccine?

After all, this vaccine has no health benefit for them.

The group that received the complete vaccine may benefit and benefit from antibodies that will protect it from the disease.

But the children in the antigen-free vaccine group do not get any benefit (the vaccine can not cause them to develop antibodies) and endanger them by injecting substances, some of which have been found to be toxic, without ever having been scientifically tested according to accepted medical research standards.

What moral right did the heads of the health systems risk the lives and health of these children without any chance of benefiting them?

Did the parents of those children who participated in these studies were aware of these facts?

Did they know that their children might have a vaccine in their group containing only the preservatives, some of which have already been proven to be toxic and without the substance that is supposed to cause them to develop antibodies?

Do you know a parent who would agree that his son would participate in such an experiment?

Would you agree to enroll your child in such an experiment?

These studies are a serious departure from the basic rules of morality between researchers and subjects.

They are also a serious departure from the doctors' ethics rules.

They go beyond the oath of the doctors - the Hippocratic oath (first - do no harm).

Those who have to justify their actions are not the ones who refuse to participate in the 'large vaccine experiment', but those who have carried out such studies and now want to force participation in the 'large vaccine experiment' on the entire population.

Those who are supposed to stand and defend their position are not the "anti-vaccine opponents" but supporters of the vaccines!

They are the ones that need to bring proof of the safety of every vaccine and vaccination and the provision of multiple doses in a short lifetime.

It is no coincidence that I chose this article in parables from the world of cigarette smoking.

For decades, after many evidence of cigarette smoking began to emerge, tobacco companies continued to claim that the cigarettes were safe and so were parts of the official medical establishment (some of which had thick economic ties to the rich tobacco companies).

Today, there is no longer a question. Scientifically, there is no doubt that cigarette smoking increases the risk of morbidity, both for heart disease and for cancer.

Will vaccinations become the second case in the history of such a fateful mistake? time will tell.

Do you want your decision on vaccinations to have more and full informed consent?

I strongly recommend that you read the most important book ever written about vaccines.

The book '**Turtles All the Way Down - Vaccines: Science and Myths**'.

This is a new book that has just been published.

The book was written by a group of people who are familiar with the world of medical research and its sole purpose is that your choice of vaccinations will be 'informed consent'.

The book brings hundreds of facts, backed by scientific support, that will keep you open-mouthed.

It shatters myths about which we grew up, one by one.

And it does it elegantly and logically. A science book.

It brings everything the medical establishment **knows** and does not want to tell you.

The book is not only extends the whole issue of vaccine safety and analyzes in depth the research in the field, it also analyzes in depth a number of very important issues in the

discourse on vaccines:

Are vaccines truly responsible for the reduction of mortality from infectious diseases and the disappearance of certain diseases?

Do all vaccinations really grant herd immunity, as we are told day and night?

How much extent have the side effects of vaccines been studied? How much do they really want it to be investigated?

Are health authorities monitoring reports of vaccine attacks as they should? Do they even want to do so?

A whole world is about to be revealed to you.

When I read the book, I could not put it down.

Every page I found many facts I did not know (some of them written in this article).

The authors have carried out a study that I think has never been seen before when it comes to vaccinations.

It was read like a thriller.

The book is written clearly and shows you step by step, how the perceptions of the majority of the public about vaccines and what is behind the scenes of the world of vaccines have been born.

I would not exaggerate to say that this book is about to revolutionize.

So who wrote the book?

I do not know. Its authors do not identify.

Just ask, if the book is scientifically backed, why do the authors of the book remain anonymous?

Are they afraid to stand behind what they wrote?

They are not afraid to stand behind the text. Definitely not. Everything is backed up.

There are two reasons why they chose not to identify themselves:

One is that the authors of the book want the establishment to respond to the merits of the matter. On the merits of an argument. And will not try to shift the discussion to a discussion about the character of the authors of the book.

But the second reason is really frightening.

They chose to remain anonymous because they are afraid.

They know that the establishment and the rich drug companies are capable of making their lives miserable, smearing their names, falsifying them, destroying their careers and even destroying their lives.

Some are really afraid of their lives literally.

The fact that they are afraid should frighten us more than anything else.

Should the State of Israel 2018, scientists and researchers should be afraid to say their opinions, only that perhaps they are not the views of the establishment?

This is appropriate for dark regimes like Iran, China and North Korea.

Not democratic regimes that espouse tolerance for different opinions (especially if they are scientists who back their words in scientific studies).

And the truth is that after writing the article you're reading now, with all the facts I've brought here, I'm afraid too.

Afraid a lot.

I know that the authorities can take many steps to harm me, my name, my livelihood and more.

They really have no cause.

Everything I wrote here is true.

Facts that anyone can check on their own.

(And also committed to the Patient's Rights Act!) That every parent knew before he could inject his children with the vaccine.

But although telling the truth is not a violation of any law or regulation, I will not be surprised if the health authorities try to slander my name, curtail my steps or cause me some harm or other.

It is not unreasonable that by writing this article, I have turned myself into the number one enemy of the Ministry of Health.

A doctor who dares to ask questions in public about the policy of the Ministry of Health?!?

And more about vaccines? The "sacred cow" of conventional medicine.

is it possible?

So why did I decide to write this article and risk all that I had built with great effort and for many years?

Because, more than I fear the establishment, I am afraid of the Creator.

Not that he will punish me, God forbid.

I'm afraid to disappoint him.

I am afraid of a burden on a mission I feel I have been given.

I know I've been given a talent for conveying complex issues in a simple and clear way and I know I'm expected to use this talent to help people.

Hope I helped you,

Gil Yosef Shahar MD

<https://www.rambam-medicine.org.il>