



The Quack Whack Newsletter©2009
Commentary About the POLITICS of Health Issues

Editor: Catherine J Frompovich

Some of them wanted to sell me snake oil and I'm not necessarily going to dismiss all of these, as I have never found a rusty snake.

— Terry Pratchett

Speech to Alzheimer's Research Trust Conference, March 13, 2008

~~~~~

***Volume 1, Issue 6***

***Are Vaccines Environmentally Safe?*** Why, at this late date in vaccine history, would one ask such a question? Probably because healthcare consumers have taken for granted that the gobbledygook they have been given by the media and others was accurate and factual. Maybe we have to rethink that, or as they say, revisit that.

However, before we learn about how unsafe they are for the environment, let's ruminate on a Johns Hopkins University study that found the number of healthcare consumers in the United States who have misgivings about vaccines is on the rise. One indicator of that is that the percentage of parents opting out of vaccinating their children has risen from 1.26 percent in 1991 to 2.54 percent in 2004. Hopefully by now it's even jumped higher because of all the information that is surfacing.

One factor that parents must consider is what happened recently (late October—early November 2009) to a fourteen-year-old Alexandria, Virginia, young man. Within hours of having received the H1N1 flu vaccination he came down with the dreaded ***Guillain Barre syndrome***—a paralyzing syndrome that, unfortunately, even can lead to death.

The teenager was hospitalized for five days. Perhaps his family now may be thinking that getting a case of the flu may not have been that bad after all. That young man probably will spend up to a year or more in physical therapy trying to regain use of his limbs, since his photograph showed him in a wheelchair. The story made Internet news headlines but not much elsewhere from what I can gather. I wonder why.



Ironically there are 51 studies indicating that kids under 2 years of age get no protection at all from flu vaccines. Furthermore, according to what I've been able to uncover, most vaccines are contaminated with viruses that cause diseases ten to twenty years later. They can include cancers, brain disorders, and many forms of chronic disease. Furthermore, stealth-type viruses in vaccines seem to be associated with degenerative neurological diseases. One indicator of that is that laboratory animals given vaccines containing the adjuvants MF59 and AsO3 contracted lupus, an autoimmune disease.

I find this astounding, and can we believe that Anthony Fosse, MD, head of a vaccine study program, says there's no data on vaccine use in children. I wonder why. Also, I'm convinced that pregnant females should NOT be given vaccinations as there's a greater chance than not that their fetuses can be impacted negatively.

Recently I came across some research that indicated a former flu vaccine maker's package insert used to say, "fetal changes, decreased offspring survival and lung tissue changes. ...Exposure in utero [the womb] and in children cause mild to severe mental retardation and mild to severe motor coordination impairment." So why don't public health agencies promote this stuff? Doesn't anyone read package inserts? Shouldn't that information be mandated to be plastered on medical facilities' walls?

### *How Environmentally Safe Are Vaccines?*

If diehards need a "smoking gun" to be convinced about the dangers of vaccines, I think I've found it, and it may wind up being a 20-gauge shotgun! Listen up.

Wisconsin's Department of Natural Resources, Waste & Materials Management (Madison, WI) web page *Managing Excess Vaccines* is dynamite! Right out of the shoot it says, "**Depending on vaccine ingredients, discarded vaccines may be infectious waste, hazardous waste or non-hazardous solid waste (regular trash).**" It then goes on to list which vaccines may be infectious waste when discarded.

Next, it addresses *Vaccines that may be hazardous waste when discarded*, and here's what that says:

*Some vaccines are preserved with 1:10,000 or 0.01 percent Thimerosal*

And it goes on to describe it. Then this:

*Thimerosal contains about 50 percent mercury by weight. ....According to state and federal hazardous waste management requirements, discarded Thimerosal-preserved vaccines may need to be managed as hazardous waste, using the waste code D009 (mercury).*

Hey, folks! I'm not making this up and they're injecting this stuff into your body! But that's not all. Further down the 3-page *Managing Excess Vaccines* directive, this appears:



***Options for Managing Excess Thimerosal-Preserved Vaccines.*** Please read these options carefully, as they all have conditions and one option may be required for certain generators.

***Option 1.*** Ship unexpired vaccines to the manufacturer for use or proper management (with prior permission from the manufacturer)

***Option 2.*** Manage the vaccines under the state of Wisconsin hazardous waste management contract

***Option 3.*** Transport the vaccines to a Wisconsin VSQG Hazardous Waste Collection Facility

***Option 4.*** Contract directly with a hazardous waste management company to manage the vaccines.

Well, what do you think? Why would vaccines be considered hazardous wastes to dispose of but not when injected into a human's body? Where's the logic? Where's the science? Why are we having so much dementia nowadays? Medical literature in the past does not support a pandemic of dementia. Testimony to current statistics is all the dementia management and care centers. They are cropping up all over the place like mushrooms after a spring rain.

Oh, and here's another environmental factor to consider. Merck, one of the larger vaccine makers, happens to be in my county not too far from where I live. Unfortunately, there was a chemical discharge into the creeks that feed the gorgeous Wissahickon Creek watershed with a resulting fish kill.

A June 2006 Merck release forced the Philadelphia Water Department to shut down its Schuylkill River drinking water intake pumping station for two days because the Merck release went into the Wissahickon Creek, a tributary of the Schuylkill River. The state of Pennsylvania banned all recreational use of the Wissahickon Creek from June 14 to July 10, 2006. According to postings on the Internet, Merck supposedly released vaccine substrates into the creek on August 8 and 9, 2006, and these releases caused foam to float on stretches of the creek.

As a result, the courts decreed that Merck & Co. must give \$2.9 MILLION to seven environmental projects along the Wissahickon Creek watershed. So much for violating the *Clean Water Act*.

So, are vaccines safe? That's for you, the reader and healthcare consumer, to decide.

*The bird in our logo may not be what you associate with a quack-quack resonance.  
Quacks are a matter of perception.*