



Ricardo Beas
April 27, 2015

ARGUMENT AGAINST CA SB 277 – MANDATORY VACCINE LEGISLATION

To view PDF version on Web for easy access to links, [click here](#)

Dear Governor Brown and members of the California Senate Judiciary Committee:

My name is Ricardo Beas and I live in San Diego County. I am writing to you today to explain my reasoning as to why I am against Senate Bill 277 and the removal of the “personal belief” exemption from current law as a means to avoid having my children vaccinated, and urge you to say no to SB 277 becoming law, based on the following reasons:

The basic argument for passing this bill is that Senator Richard Pan and others want to protect vaccinated children at school from getting sickened by children whose parents opted to not vaccinate their children. This argument completely contradicts the reasons why supposedly vaccines work. Here is the logic:

- If a vaccine works, a child will not get sickened by the disease the vaccine purports to protect the child against.
- If the vaccinated child will not get sick that means that any person “vaccinated or not” that develops the disease cannot pass it to the vaccinated child.
- If an unvaccinated child cannot infect a vaccinated child there is no reason to ban the unvaccinated child from school.

It is that simple, no rocket science, no need to do clinical trials. The pro-vaccine industry (vaccine manufacturers, distributors, sellers, hospitals, CDC, FDA) insists that vaccines work, so why should unvaccinated children matter?

The reality is that vaccines in many cases don’t work! To make matters worse, there is ample evidence that vaccines can cause serious diseases like autism and vaccines themselves could be the cause of children being susceptible to a certain disease they may have been vaccinated against. Here is my evidence (documents referenced are attached to this email as a PDF file or follow the letter if faxed):

1. On August 5, 2010 the San Diego Union Tribune newspaper (hereinafter UT) reported that there was a whooping cough outbreak in California and urged vaccines against this disease. The report stated that there were 4 new cases in San Diego County: a 10-year-old and a 9-year-old, **BOTH CURRENT ON THEIR IMMUNIZATIONS**; the other two, a 13- and 11-year-old, **had their immunization but were missing the buster shot**. In this case, **ALL** of the children that were infected were vaccinated and if they got the disease that obviously means that they could spread it to both vaccinated and unvaccinated children. In this case, the sickened/vaccinated children should be the ones prohibited from going to school. See Exhibit 1. See exhibits at <http://www.cafepeyote.com/files/Vaccines - No On SB 277 - Exhibits to Letter to Gov Brown.pdf>.

2. On August 26, 2010, the UT reported 3 more whooping cough cases. A 3- and 5-year-old, **BOTH UP-TO-DATE ON IMMUNIZATIONS**, and a 10-year-old who was only **due for a buster shot**. **In this case, all new cases were of vaccinated children**. See Exhibit 2.
3. On October 7, 2010 the UT reported 10 chickenpox cases at Escondido schools. Of the 10 students: two of them had two immunizations to chickenpox, one had only one, and seven others were fully immunized. Therefore, of the 10, only one child was not immunized. Based on this info it appears that children that were vaccinated had a 9-10 chance of getting the disease, while the unvaccinated children had a 1-10 chance of getting the disease, and thus seem better prepared to have their immune system fight against chickenpox than the vaccine treatments. See exhibit 3.
4. Around this time I had been communicating by email with San Diego Public Health Officer Wilma Wooten, M.D., M.P.H. regarding the whooping cough outbreak noted above and her department recommendation that children get vaccinated. In an October 5, 2010 email she replied: **“MANY of the pertussis (whooping cough) cases reported in San Diego have had the five series, as well as he booster shot. This is a reminder that no vaccine provides 100% coverage”** (email on file). Although I had requested the specific numbers be provided, she just said “many” had their vaccines. This is additional proof that both vaccinated and unvaccinated children can get infected and that either could spread the disease, making it unnecessary to keep unvaccinated children out of school, even if there was an outbreak.
5. On October 15, 2009 the UT published an article promoting vaccines and noted that “the CDC has asked neurologist to report new cases of Guillain-Barré syndrome, **A RARE NERVE DISORDER THAT WAS ASSOCIATED WITH THE LAST NATIONWIDE SWINE FLU VACCINATION CAMPAIGN OF 1976. The disease, which can cause paralysis and death, surfaced in SEVERAL HUNDRED PEOPLE who received a shot that year. MORE THAN 30 OF THEM DIED.”**

The article finished with a statement from Dr. Francesca Torriani, medical director for infection prevention at UCSD Medical Center, as to children who do not get immunized: **“If they don’t get the disease, they will be able to thank all the others who got vaccinated and protected them.”** See Exhibit 4. If Dr. Torriani’s statement is true, this means that unvaccinated children are not a threat to vaccinated children, contrary to the claims of the proponents of SB 277.

6. It is commonly believed that the Guillain-Barré syndrome cases above were due to the preservative used in that vaccine known as Thimerosal, which contain among other things mercury, a known neurotoxin, and while this substance was removed from vaccines for a while, it has been reintroduced in most modern vaccines. In an annual vaccine campaign in 2011 the vaccine manufacturers even attempted to protect themselves against suits from persons that may claim they or their children got this disease from the vaccine by writing on their publicity posters the following: “To receive a flu shot you must: ... (4) NOT HAVE AN ALLERGY TO THIMEROSAL (USED AS A PRESERVATIVE IN VACCINES) ... (6) NOT HAVE A HISTORY OF GUILLAIN-BARRE SYNDROME. See Exhibit 5.

7. The dangers of Thimerosal and the vaccine industry's knowledge of this is well documented in Robert F. Kennedy's book *Thimerosal, Let the Science Speak*. See this short clip from www.TraceAmounts.com, an organization affiliated with Mr. Kennedy's research, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sqgiy8DhyH0&feature=youtu.be>. See also the documentary *Vaccine Nation*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j8nrdybZZzA>.
8. The vaccine industry knows very well the dangers that their vaccines pose to human health, and it does not matter if one person in a million can suffer such severe consequences, including death, or if the numbers are 1:1,000, or 1:100, it is not worth the risk. And this brings us to autism, a disease that many actual cases and medical reports link to vaccines. This is what the CDC says about children in American today: "***The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that 1 in 68 children (or 14.7 per 1,000 eight-year-olds) in multiple communities in the United States has been identified with autism spectrum disorder (ASD).***" See <http://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2014/p0327-autism-spectrum-disorder.html>.
9. Let's take this information and do a little analysis. Let's say for the sake of argument that it is true, that thimerosal (or other components of vaccines, such as aluminum and glutamate) do cause autism. To rate a child as to whether he/she has autism a behavioral/physical test is conducted, using the Autism Spectrum Rating Scale. Depending on the resulting score a child can be rated as to whether they have autism and to what extent or if they do not. The CDC numbers above only tells us what children have gotten the higher score, at which point autism is considered to be present, but what about everyone else below that score. Can these persons also be affected, even though not diagnosed as autistic or with other serious or lesser mental/physical disabilities?

If thimerosal is very bad for some children, then it has to be bad for all children and adults, except that the degree of harm may vary and may not be as evident (like children's tics that have been associated with vaccines; see Huffington Post report, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-kirby/cdc-mercury-in-vaccines-d_b_66007.html). An easy way to illustrate this is to take alcohol as an example. Within a certain period of time, let's say two hours, you can get 3 persons to drink 6 alcoholic beverages, like Whiskey or Tequila. As a result of the drinking, one of them can feel a buzz and lightheaded, one of them could get drunk, and one of them could pass out. They were all affected by the alcohol and all drank the same amount, but each individual body has a different tolerance to alcohol, for whatever reason. The same could be said of the dangers of thimerosal on all vaccinated children. This is another reason why a parent might want to avoid vaccines for their children.

10. The manufacturers of vaccine and the nation's network of vaccine distributors know about the risk of vaccines. This is very obvious by reading the consent statement on the "Immunization Consent Form" you are required to sign in order to get a vaccine. A June 2010 form from Maxim Health Systems reads in part:

"I (the person receiving the vaccine) believe the benefits outweigh the risks and I voluntarily assume full responsibility for any reactions that may result. ... I, for myself, my heirs, executors, personal representatives and assigns, **herby release** Maxim, any retail site, grocery store, pharmacy,

corporation, school, school district, physician and/or medical director ... **from any and all claims arising out of, in connection with or in any way related to my receipt of this or these immunization(s).** Maxim and the other aforementioned parties **shall not at any time or to any extent whatsoever be liable, responsible, or in any way accountable for ANY LOSS, INJURY, DEATH OR DAMAGE SUFFERED OR SUSTAINED BY ANY PERSON AT ANY TIME IN CONNECTION WITH OR AS A RESULT OF THIS VACCINE PROGRAM OR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE VACCINES.**” See Exhibit 6.

11. Robert F. Kennedy Jr. writes: “Vaccines are big business. Pharma is a trillion-dollar industry with vaccines accounting for \$25 billion in annual sales. CDC’s decision to add a vaccine to the schedule can guarantee its manufacturer millions of customers and billions in revenue with minimal advertising or marketing costs and complete immunity from lawsuits ... Big money has fueled the exponential expansion of CDC’s vaccine schedule since 1988, when Congress’ grant of immunity from lawsuits suddenly transformed vaccines into paydirt. CDC recommended five pediatric vaccines when I was a boy in 1954. Today’s children cannot attend school without at least 56 doses of 14 vaccines by the time they’re 18 ... Big Pharma is among the nation’s largest political donors, giving \$31 million last year to national political candidates. It spends more on political lobbying than any other industry, \$3.0 billion from 1998 to 2014.” See http://www.robertfkennedyjr.com/docs/Skyhorse_USA_Today_Final_colorNZ.pdf.

The vaccine industry, using all the tools at their disposal, like the CDC and the FDA (whose high ranking officials come from this same industry or are controlled by the same interests), their lobby machine and the media, is shifting the focus away from vaccine safety: it has its efforts focused on parents who do not vaccinate their children, who are becoming informed, making medical and health choices that they believe (and the evidence shows) may be either better than vaccines, not as dangerous, or that at least do not have risks associated with them. These parents are the targets of this industry because they represent a threat to the vaccine industry and their future profits. This is nothing more and nothing less than greed placed above common sense and people’s health. And you, as a public official, have an obligation to protect all California citizens from harm, allowing them to make their own choices as to whether vaccines are harmful and if they should be administered to them and their children.

12. This vaccine industry is so powerful that it got the federal government to create a special court for them in 1986, a court known as **“a special no-fault vaccine court”** (The National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, VICP), so that no suits could be filed against them. These lawsuits go to that court and if a family proves harm, the government (taxpayers!), not the vaccine manufacturers, pay for such settlement awards. In a Feb 23, 2011 UT article about a family that sued a vaccine manufacturer for injuries to their child, which included autism, it talks about this arbitrary law. In the article the U.S. Supreme Court denied the parent’s petition. The article states in part:

“A federal trial judge and the 3rd U.S. Circuit of Appeals ruled in favor of Wyeth (the manufacturer). Indeed, **state and federal appeals courts have ALMOST ALWAYS sided with the vaccine manufacturer** in preventing the lawsuits from going forward.”

The article closes with a statement from Dr. Marion Burton, the President of the American Academy of Pediatrics: "Today's Supreme Court decision protects children by strengthening our national immunization system." Really? Again, let us apply logic. Below his statement the article continues, "**The vaccine court has paid out more than \$1.9 billion to more than 2,500 people who claimed (and if they got paid, OBVIOUSLY PROVED) a connection between a vaccine and serious health problems.**" See Exhibit 7. Vaccine proponent could argue that it was only 2,500 people out of millions. If so, they are forgetting the rest of the article; did it not say that these courts deny most cases? That means that if 2,500 only represent 10% of the claims (and I bet the number is lower), then 22,500 claims could have been filed. But the article says "almost always denied." What if it is 1% -- that would be 250,000 cases from people who could have been seriously harmed by vaccines.

To this we can add all those that did not have the money to bring a suit or did not have the time to take it to court, maybe due to all the care this disabled child has to go through and the medical expenses related to it, or who considered it fruitless to fight because the court would most likely rule against them. How about those that don't bring cases to court because they don't see the connection between their children's sickness and vaccines, including symptoms in that lower range of the autistic rating scale I was discussing above.

Vaccine manufacturers, through legislatures, have made it virtually impossible for vaccine victims to be compensated if any of the vaccines cause a serious injury. In the above case Justice Antonin Scalia, who wrote for the court, stated (from the UT article, Exhibit 7):

"(Justice Scalia) said that when a vaccine is properly prepared and is accompanied by proper directions and warnings, **lawsuits over its side effects ARE NOT ALLOWED UNDER THE 1986 LAW.**

What does this mean in legal terms? It means that as long as they manufactured the vaccine **as they intended**, and put warning labels for you to read (who reads them when getting a vaccine?), you cannot sue them, even if the vaccine caused proven and obvious injury, even if they knew it could or would cause injury. Is this fair or is this more of an incentive for the vaccine industry?

13. On January 20, 2010, the Associated Press issued an article noting that government officials were investigating an apparent increase in fever-related seizures in young children after they got a flu shot. The article reads in part:

"The U.S. Food and Drug Administration on Thursday said there have been reports of 36 seizures this flu season in children ages 6 months through 2 years. **ALL THE SEIZURES ACCURED WITHIN ONE DAY AFTER THE YOUNGSTERS GOT A VACCINE** called Fluzone, which is made specifically for younger children."

What was the vaccine manufacturer's response? "The maker of the flu shot says **THERE IS NO CLEAR LINK BETWEEN THE VACCINE AND SEIZURES, AND THEY MAY HAVE BEEN COINCIDENTAL.**" What else do you want as proof? The seizures happened within one day in all cases. But even they can't hide it, as they used the word **MAY**, meaning, **VACCINES MAY BE THE CULPRIT!** See Exhibit 8.

The CDC and FDA, the official spokesmen for the pharmaceutical industry, continue to push vaccines as if there was no safety concern at all. On the issue of the seizures noted above, in the FDA's website on Jan 20, 2011, it stated: "Recommendations for the use of the flu vaccine in children **have not changed**. CDC recommends that **all persons** age 6 MONTHS AND OLDER **receive a flu vaccine EVERY YEAR.**" See Exhibit 9.

14. Aside from other toxic substances in vaccines noted above, there is substantial evidence that mercury in vaccines causes serious disorders like seizures and autism. The vaccine industry points to supposed valid studies that prove the substances/chemicals in vaccines are safe, but how accurate are these reports? The UT published an article on September 27, 2007, titled "Study: Mercury in vaccines not harmful to kids," that points to a "large" federal study that concluded that thimerosal/mercury "does not raise the risk of neurological problems in children." The article continues with this disturbing information:

"However, the study DID NOT EXAMINE AUTISM, the developmental disorder that some critics blame on vaccines."

"However, they said one finding merited further study: Boys exposed to higher mercury levels SEEMED TO HAVE MORE TIC PROBLEMS – A LINK SEEN IN PREVIOUS RESEARCH."

The CDC led this study and published the results in the New England Journal of Medicine. The CDC study was reviewed by a supposedly unbiased independent panel of scientists and statisticians that contributed to the report. Here are the facts about the panel: (1) of the whole panel, only one was a vaccine opponent, Sallie Bernard, executive director of the consumer group SafeMinds. She asked to be listed as a "dissenting member" because she disagreed with the study's conclusion; (2) the research was led by William Thompson, a CDC epidemiologist **who once worked for vaccine maker Merck & Co.**; (3) four other researchers **have received fees from drug companies**; and (4) one has served as a consultant to a CDC committee on immunization. See Exhibit 9.

"The lead CDC researcher on the above study, William Thompson, is now a CDC whistleblower, and claims the CDC has been hiding for years, at least 12 years, that vaccines cause autism. From the INQUISITR website, dated August 23, 2014 (<http://www.inquisitr.com/1428491/cdc-whistleblowers-claims-cause-uproar-in-autism-community/>):

*"A top researcher working for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), along with Focus Autism Foundation's Dr. Brian Hooker, alleged that the **CDC has been involved with vaccine research data manipulation** reigniting the MMR and autism link, according to Yahoo News."*

*"Dr. Hooker and the whistleblower claimed **the CDC knew of the risks as early as 2003**, prior to the study's publication... Initially, the CDC employee spoke anonymously. Now, a video where his image and voice are not disguised, presented by the controversial gastroenterologist Andrew Wakefield, is making its way around the globe. The whistleblower was identified as **Dr. William Thompson, who indeed worked at the CDC and was considered a highly respected professional.**"*

You can hear Mr. Thompson making his claims on the following video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y-Xpl4uYRBc>. This video will also expose some of the other illicit activities of the CDC.

CONCLUSION:

To conclude, all that I have pointed above only has one aim, to avoid having the state of California refuse to allow parents to take their unvaccinated children to school, for whatever personal or religious reason. I have no problem with people using vaccines if they wish. If people want to continue to have their children vaccinated, that is their choice; if people want to ignore the evidence against vaccines, that is their choice; if people are willing to risk their children getting a serious disease due to a vaccines because they only have a one in a million, or 1 in 68 chance of getting sick with something like autism (remember, the CDC says 1 in 68 children have autism and anti-vaccine proponents have proven vaccines are a contributor to autism), that is their choice. My choice and that of many Californians, as well as thousands around the world, is to not take that risk, and we have a God given right to make this decision for us and our children, regardless of labels used in school vaccine forms as “personal beliefs” and “religious beliefs” claimed by authorities to be the only way to avoid getting children of school age vaccinated.

I don’t know what the answer is to avoid people from getting a disease that vaccines purportedly protect against. I understand the pain and suffering these diseases can cause and do not wish them on anyone. Yet, there are numerous reports and studied (like the ones mentioned here, among thousands) that to me prove that there are better alternatives to vaccines, including but not limited to, fortifying the immune system, eating health and natural foods, avoiding herbicide and pesticide laden foods, better hygiene, taking vitamins and other nutritious supplements and using homeopathic medications that have proven for centuries to be effective.

By what was presented above, apparently vaccines are not the answer and can cause even greater harm than the disease the vaccines purportedly protect against.

Mr. Governor, members of the CA Judiciary Committee, is it worth taking the risk to have your children and grandchildren inoculated with a vaccine that can cause serious ailment? For my family, that would not be the best choice.

Mr. Governor, members of the CA Judiciary Committee, for all the reasons noted above, I urge you to vote and argue against SB 277. And I urge everyone else reading this to fight against its approval.

Respectfully submitted,

Ricardo Beas
San Diego, CA