

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

Mrs. Penny S. Pullen (Retired school teacher and member of the PPI Forum (NHS) Morecambe Bay Area.

List of questions

The definition of public health

Do you agree with the definition of public health introduced above ("What we, as a society, collectively do to assure the conditions for people to be healthy")? If not, please explain why. What alternative definition would you propose?

I can't see the definition of public health so am unable to comment. One concern that comes to mind, without seeing your own is that a definition of public health should include substantial references to 'holistic health' which is a balance of mind, body and spirit.

The status quo at the moment dwells heavily on 'band aiding' the symptoms of disease, which hugely swells the profits of the pharmaceutical companies and very often adversely affects the health of the public - especially our children. Also many organised religions have a huge influence on people and contributes to their suppression and lack of self esteem.

Factors that influence public health

Do you agree that interactions between the following five factors are the main influences affecting public health: the environment, social and economic factors, lifestyle, genetic background, preventative and curative health services? **I will put these in orders of priority in my opinion, plus adding a couple of my own.**

1. Self-esteem and understanding of personal power in relation to a person's emotional and spiritual well being. (loving oneself is paramount to the correct mind set which will then favour good health.)

2. Lifestyle e.g. A person eating organic, unprocessed food, drinking pure water, following full integrative health and understanding that they are responsible for creating their own lives and that victim consciousness is self-created, will more than likely be healthy. Also if they de-tox from the intentional and unintentionally introduced poisons and toxins that their body is burdened with, then this will help them immeasurably. E.g. They need to get rid of mercury amalgam and avoid other toxins such as Aspartame and Fluoride and adopt a gentle vegetarian way of life with as many natural foods as possible. (This is living in harmony with nature and is essential in my opinion.)

3. Preventative and curative health services. These are not always readily available under the NHS at the moment as preventative services would not generate profit for the pharmaceutical companies. E.g. there are cancer cures that have been proven, but are suppressed by the government run medical organisations. Cancer is big business and the pharmaceutical companies already 'disease monger' and their research organisations and drug trials are often corrupt at various levels. E.g. Many drugs have proved to be harmful years ago and yet this information is suppressed in order to sell the offending chemical substances. In America there

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

are many, many law suits against big pharmaceutical companies which do not make the media in the UK.

However, if the Prince of Wales Trust for Integrative Health is studied and adopted, then everyone stands more of a chance of being treated holistically for their problems. The allopathic medics need to recognise and acknowledge the existence of toxic body burden and employ de-tox regimes which will enhance the immune systems of people and especially children who may have inherited toxicity from their parents. (Mercury is a big offender here.) It goes without saying that vaccinations, which are medication without informed consent, should be researched and treated as being very suspect.

The curative health services need to be less influenced and controlled by the pharmaceutical companies as thousands of people every year are harmed and killed by adverse drug reactions and iatrogenic illness, as they are probably toxic before the drugs and medical procedures are undertaken.

4. Social and economic factors are very important as to follow a regime of complementary therapies, which is really needed to repair the damage often done to a person by allopathic medics, money is needed in large amounts. Also private dentistry costs are huge and that is needed to remove the mercury amalgam safely and upgrade to other restorations which do not harm. Also, unless a person has access to a computer, then his/her own research will be more difficult to undertake and he/she will more likely to follow the status quo and accept whatever pressure is put upon him/her to comply with 'doctors' orders or psychiatrists' orders.' (In Sweden the government pay 75% of the dental costs when a person needs to replace their amalgam restorations.)

5. Genetic background is important - mainly from the stand point of inheriting toxins.

If so, do you think some are more important than others? Are there other factors we should include? If so, what are they? **(I have included these other factors within the description and expansion of the above points.)**

Prevention of infectious diseases through vaccination

Some countries have a compulsory rather than voluntary system of vaccination. On what basis can such policies be justified to achieve herd immunity? Should they be introduced in the UK?

Never, never should a compulsory policy of toxic vaccination be justified or even thought of in the first place. Please do your own research here and look up well documented papers on web sites of medical professionals such as Dr. Joseph Mercola, Dr. Vernon Coleman, Dr. Sherry Tenpenny, Lynne McTaggart (Edits 'What Doctors Don't Tell You,' John Rappaport (interviews ex vaccine researcher) or simply type in 'vaccine dangers' into your computer and see the huge amount of information that comes up. I have two friends with 4 children between them, all of whom have been vaccine damaged. One little boy was fine until he had his MMR and now he is mildly autistic. His mother has many teeth full of amalgam fillings!!

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council. **The EU charter specifically states that it is not permitted to administer medications without informed consent. Who really knows exactly what is being injected into them?? The answer is no-one was no-one is informed and if the ordinary person took the trouble to research the vaccine methods of manufacture and the additives etc. they would run a mile from the nurse or doctor with the full syringe. Here is a brief list of the toxins within vaccinations - mercury, formulin, formaldehyde (the list goes on and on and it is not easy reading.)**

Here is a message from E-NEWS FROM THE NATIONAL VACCINE INFORMATION CENTER

> Vienna, Virginia <http://www.nvic.org>

Do have a look at their web site as they are really well informed and they are great 'whistle blowers.'

' If the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services has given \$1
> billion dollars out of the taxpayers pocketbook to drug companies to create
> new flu vaccines, you can bet that when those flu vaccines are ready to be
> sold to a public they have conditioned to live in abject fear of a case of
> the flu, government health officials will be lobbying states to pass laws
> mandating that every citizen get a flu shot every year.

>

> How else will those drug companies make big bucks after they get a big
> handout from Uncle Sam for creating vaccines that public health officials
> persuade politicians to force everybody to use?'

For childhood vaccinations, parents make decisions on behalf of their children. Are there cases where the vaccination of children against the wishes of their parents could be justified? If so, what are they?

Never, never, never should children be vaccinated against the wishes of their parents and neither should their parents be pressurised in any way, shape or form. In America children are taken away from their parents if they refuse vaccination. This is horrendous and abhorrent to even think about. It must never happen here.

Control of infectious disease

Control measures for specific diseases depend on how infectious a disease is and how it is transmitted. For infections that are directly transmitted from person to person, what justification would be required to render interventions such as forced quarantine, which helped to control the outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in Asia, acceptable in countries such as the UK where such measures may be considered to infringe civil liberties? If you think such measures cannot be justified, what are the principal reasons?

SARS was generated on purpose as a fear based hype to depress the immune systems of millions of unsuspecting people who trust their governments and who believe what they read in the newspapers. It is better to help educate the people to enhance their own immune systems by not giving any disease mongering fear generated by the medical cartel credence and instead believing in themselves and the power of their own physical bodies, accompanied by high self esteem and self-love.

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

(Bird flu is in the same category as SARS and if you scan the web site of Dr. Joseph Mercola, he has his book for sale at a very reasonable price called 'The Bird Flu Hoax.' I have ordered a copy and intend to network the main message as far and as widely as possible.)

I am hugely wary of any 'control measures' introduced by the government, especially since millions of us know that the 'bogus war on terror' was generated on purpose since 9/11, which incidentally was totally an 'inside job' in order to justify invasion of the Middle East and to clamp down on civil liberties in the USA and UK. Watch Loose Change 2 DVD and/or 9/11 Eyewitness for the truth and you will begin to understand the 'big picture.'

In general, the earlier that an outbreak of disease is detected, the easier it will be to control. What would be suitable criteria to determine in what circumstances, and to what extent, the state should provide more resources to develop methods of preventing outbreaks of serious epidemics in other countries?

I am not sure that our country should be spending money and energy in preventing outbreaks of diseases in other countries, unless that country asks us for help. There is a plant somewhere on this planet which will help or cure every known disease to humans and animals. Often the indigenous peoples' wisdom is far superior to the medicine as practiced by the so-called civilised countries.

Military Industrial Complex must finally once and for all, expose to the people its own bio-terrorism activities and what diseases it holds that can be a danger to human and animal health. The extremely cruel and barbaric practices of testing military and biological weapons on animals must stop. This alone should be at the top of the list and emblazoned in letters four feet tall on banners strung across every major highway in the UK and USA. We harm our animals and we harm ourselves - end of story....!!

Travel and trade are key factors in the spread of infectious diseases. Global travel and exchange of goods are increasing rapidly. Each day, two million people travel across borders, including around one million per week between developing and developed countries. Disease-causing organisms and vectors can therefore spread quickly around the world. Are new measures needed to monitor and control the spread of infectious diseases? If so, what would be promising strategies?

The importing of bush meat must stop as the methods employed for checking this trade alone is pathetic.

E.g. If you travel to New Zealand, the whole of the interior of the aircraft is sprayed with (?) to help stop the importation of anything infectious. All baggage is thoroughly checked for anything on their banned list, which is very long and comprehensive. This procedure could be copied.

Under which circumstances, if any, would mandatory testing for highly infectious and life-threatening diseases such as tuberculosis or HIV/AIDS be justified?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

I can't believe that I am reading this question, as I thought that it was common knowledge that the test for HIV is flawed. Also I have researched long and hard and have found out that HIV was again created (if it exists in the way we have been lead to believe) by scientists and released on the public with the necessary guidance of the reaction and provision of a solution. (Classic 'Illuminati' scenario.) Check out who benefits from this HIV issue and you will find out that the drug companies benefit again.

Obesity

Food is closely linked with individual satisfaction and lifestyle. This means that any strategy that seeks to change people's behaviour is likely to be perceived as particularly intrusive. How should this sensitivity be considered in devising policies that seek to achieve a reduction in obesity?

I think you need to add another word to your statement about food and that is that it is linked to *emotional stress*. Also, with general low self esteem, which millions of people have, together with a strong feeling that the world is being ruled by 'dark forces' and that things are drastically wrong and they feel helpless to do anything about it, this is fertile ground indeed for the development of many eating disorders, with obesity being one of them.

If some attempt is made to educate the public into the real causes of obesity e.g. additives in processed foods, Aspartame, Fluoride in drinking water and pressure from high powered advertising etc. as well as to low self esteem, then the proper picture would be realised. If an attempt is made to educate people with the necessary esoteric knowledge re their own personal power etc. which will help to generate high self esteem, then eating for emotional reasons will lessen. Many prescription drugs contribute to obesity in many ways. Just research the plethora of adverse side effects which are available on reliable web sites or within the BNF.

Again, the organised religions are involved with their suppression of self esteem and schools are implicated with their part they have played in enabling the school environment to be a food outlet of easily obtainable 'junk' food which helps cause obesity. Obviously this was before Jamie Oliver blew the whistle - but some damage had already been done and old habits die hard.

Exercise in natural surroundings should be encouraged and swimming skills taught in school as well as water safety. Yoga, meditation and an introduction to Emotional Freedom Technique would be on the core curriculum in schools, which should be run on the Steiner and Montessori models. Influence to a more gentle vegetarian lifestyle would greatly enhance the physical well being of people as well as being much kinder to animals and chickens, as well as fish. Every being deserves to live freely in an unpolluted environment and that applies to our creatures as well as to humans.

While there is clear evidence about the extent and scale of obesity, there is far less clarity about what measures should be adopted by the government and other stakeholders to prevent it. In view of this uncertainty, what would be suitable criteria for developing appropriate policy?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

Some policy has already been outlined in the previous question, however I will re-state the importance of researching thoroughly an unbiased view on the real causes of obesity in a holistic way. I will mention some other issues which have not been stated before.

Some prescription drugs and especially psychiatric drugs can be implicated; individual sensitivities to EMF radiation and in fact anything that upsets a person's metabolism or/and endocrine system such as toxins and contaminated food e.g. micro-waved cooked food and food high in MSG should be researched. The food industry has responded to the demands of the big corporate companies - whether they are supermarkets or huge agri-businesses which are foisting GM technologies on the unsuspecting public such as 'Monsanto.'

Supermarket processed foods are often high in additives and may be irradiated to improve shelf life. Modern research has shown that huge sections of the public - particularly those on a low income - are forced to purchase the cheaper, mass produced foods and battery hens' eggs for example instead of wholesome organic, locally produced food which are high in essential nutrients.

Meat eating is promoted by the government which is contrary to humans' physiology, which is bound to cause problems. (33 feet of intestine is more suited to plant processing as the food residue is very toxic when it reaches the end of the human alimentary canal.) Also, the ingestion of fish oils are scandalously pushed by the media which I expect is government sponsored and any fish oils are bound to be contaminated, as our oceans are polluted and the oil is the concentrate.

Also the animal welfare issue of factory farming and slaughtering of millions of poor creatures who are very often pumped full of hormones and anti-biotics, is so necessary to consider when viewing the whole picture. Commercial fishing is a crime against sentient beings.

(I had better stop as I could go on for ages.)

What are the appropriate roles and obligations of parents, the food industry, schools, school-food providers and the government in tackling the problem of childhood obesity?

First and foremost my answer to this question is the absolute necessity of taking personal responsibility as an individual. (This applies to children as well.) Everyone needs to do their own research and make themselves aware of the real causes of obesity and the part they play in allowing it to happen. Knowledge is power and everyone can re-claim their health if they trust in their own judgement. Correspondingly, every shop and supermarket who sells poison within their foodstuffs must take responsibility as well and inform the public exactly what they are buying. Better still, the offending items should be taken off the shelves and replaced with wholesome, organic alternatives.

The Brahma Kumaris have developed a brilliant approach to food and that is connected with the knowledge that water responds to thought and intention. (check out Dr. Masaru Emoto and his work. He lectures in many countries of the

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

world and his books have been translated in many languages and sold in their millions.) This knowledge should be taken into schools and also broadcast on the media.

To complement the above, it is also necessary for every doctor and dentist to take responsibility for the addition they are facilitating to the toxic body burden, which may lead to metabolic disruption and probable obesity in so many people. If I am able to make myself aware and have an open mind to accept well researched and documented truths, then so can they.

Head teachers must also take full responsibility and insist that their schools happily follow Jamie Oliver's advice and example. (I taught for many years in a comprehensive school in the Midlands and knew that the large self-service machines which dished out crisps, chocolates and fizzy drinks to pupils, were helping to harm their bodies and minds. Even some of the pupils knew themselves that if they ate the chocolate bar or drank their Coke, their concentration would be shot to pieces. After lunch time, many afternoon lessons were a write off.....!!)

Lessons should be put in practice which tell the truth and enhance self esteem and self love, also love and respect for animals, birds and fish etc and the Earth Herself.

A vegetarian diet could be encouraged within schools and full disclosure of factory farming and slaughtering given to the children through Compassion in World Farming's excellent videos and DVD's which are available to schools, along with full accompanying lesson notes.

The food industry should be encouraged to stock more locally grown and organic, veggie produce and people such as Donald Rumsfeld who has succeeded in influencing the FDA into accepting toxic Aspartame, should be brought to justice. There should be monetary help and advice given to any farm or shop who wishes to expand their organic range and pesticides must be reduced as many are endocrine disruptors and cancer causing. (Daily Mail featured a double page article some months ago, which showed a girl of 11 years old with 35 toxic chemicals in her blood. As mercury doesn't always show up in blood, then this additional toxin was missed out completely.)

The government must look within to uncover the real truths about themselves. There is huge evidence to prove that humans and especially children are being deliberately distracted and dumbed down through various health issues. Why this is happening will be stated later on in the document.

Is it acceptable to make the provision of NHS services dependent on whether a person is obese or not (see example in Section 4.2 of Part B)? If so, what criteria should govern whether or not interventions are provided, and should similar criteria be developed for other lifestyle-related health problems that are significantly under the control of individuals?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

As obesity is often the result of deliberate 'Global Elite's' mind and food control and manipulation and this 'government in the shadows' give orders to the 'puppet politicians' at the top, then all health problems resulting should be provided free of charge for everyone. However, the very definition of the word 'interventions' should be closely examined and checked out to preclude anything which will add to the often already emotionally traumatised and physically damaged that many people are.

Smoking

The effects of smoking on health have been known for a very long time. Comprehensive measures by governments to prevent harm to the population are relatively recent. In your view, what are the reasons for this delayed response? Are there any lessons that can be learned from other countries, or from strategies pursued in other areas of public health?

There is a simple answer to the first part of this question and that is because the top levels of government who are in their turn ruled by the 'secret government' do not really want ordinary people to be healthy and mentally bright. Similarly to the issue of dental amalgam, the smoking issue has been totally manipulated, whereas for example the dangers of drinking large amounts of alcohol in the form of spirits has been left to the individual's personal choice.

There are no warnings on bottles of spirits and in my opinion alcohol related health problems are more serious as there are huge social problems accompanying them which cause a monumental drain on the NHS and police services etc. (Not to mention the emotional trauma of families which are split up and devastated by marriage breakups and early deaths.) Smoking does not have the same far reaching ramifications within the very fabric of society and yet there are very large government health warnings on every packet of cigarettes!!

Also, it is the toxic additives in manufactured cigarettes which are guilty of causing so much illness, as organic tobacco which was smoked by the Native Americans is much more benign.

Last thing to mention is the huge amount of revenue in taxes which the government has raked in over the years from smoking. This would stand up on its own as a reason for not warning people of smoking related illnesses until recently. However there are other more sinister agendas going on and when considering these reasons, it is very necessary to make health 'services' available to all. However, I must add my sentiments re treatment of lung cancer of any cancer for that matter.

Cancer is big business and it is not in the interests of the pharmaceutical companies to find a cure, that is precisely why none has been 'found.' Or rather the cures that have been found are continually suppressed with threat of prosecution and the like. What an appalling state of affairs!!

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

Research the work of Phillip Day who publishes his books and audio tapes through 'Credence Publications.' He is blowing the whistle long and hard and he is only one of many well qualified, thoroughly trustworthy people who are uncovering truths. What Doctors Don't Tell You publication 'The Cancer Hand Book,' is available also and Lynne McTaggart organises conferences on this very subject.

A lady I know provides hyperbaric oxygen for children with brain damage and this treatment is known to help people with cancer, as cancer cells cannot live in an oxygen rich environment. However, she is prohibited from helping people with cancer by strong laws and this is directly linked to pharmaceutical company control. (Just look at the history of the pharmaceutical companies which is available on sites such as :-

http://www4.dr-rath-foundation.org/PHARMACEUTICAL_BUSINESS/index.html

This link is to the site of Dr. Matthias Rath, a Swiss cellular biologist who worked with Dr. Linus Pauling...on this page you will his big-picture presentation of the Nazi origins of the pharmaceutical industry, how they conspired to create disease in the human population so they could sell their carcinogenic drugs to everyone.

Rath has outstanding suits in the World Criminal Court in the Hague against every member of the Bush administration, as well as the CEO of every major pharmaceutical corp.

He covers it all...plus his main thrust is health through "nutrient synergy."

cheers jeff phillips

www.cryobenthics.org www.regainyourbrain.org www.synthaissance.blogspot.com (NEW!)

"I must create a system, or be enslaved by another man's." *William Blake*

The other reason why so much public's attention is drawn to the issue of smoking hazards recently is because this is in itself a smoke screen (no pun intended) or a distraction to the real health hazards which are being totally caused by the 'Global Elite's manipulation of war in the Middle East and that is one of Depleted Uranium.

Please research this as none of this potentially horrendous health hazard which will ultimately affect all of us, makes main stream media. There is a cover up going on and the weapons of destruction which the US are using against innocent civilians in the Middle East (in our name) has resulted in a rise in contamination, as the DU dust is blowing around the world. DU damages DNA and the photos of horribly deformed children which are born as a result of this intentional damage is totally heart rending. (Remember that the 'Global Elite' do not feel emotions as we

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

do. This is how they are able to generate the most cruel and damaging scenarios which our poor controlled minds have accepted for generations as being the 'way of the world.' Not any more as we are waking up and re-claiming our physical and mental health.)

What are the responsibilities of companies that make or sell products containing hazardous substances, such as nicotine, that can be addictive? Should they be prosecuted for damaging public health or required to contribute to costs for treatments?

I suggest that you examine closely the top level managers of these companies and find out if they are connected to the 'Global Elite family bloodlines' in any way. The companies must also take responsibility for selling hazardous known toxins to the public as well and any money made available as compensation to the damaged people themselves, as well as to their health 'care' should be made available. (By care, I mean not controlled by pharmaceutical company controlled allopathic medics, but full integrative health care which is desperately needed in the West.)

In comparison, any company who sells organic tobacco which carries no health risks at all should be exempt. Again, I will repeat here how many indigenous peoples have smoked organic tobacco for centuries without any ill health. Look to the wisdom of the ancient people and never believe all you read in history books as there are many lies incorporated in them in order to help control and dumb down the population.

Should smokers be entitled to higher than average resources from the public healthcare system, or should they be asked for increased contributions? Would similar charges be justified for other groups of people who deliberately or negligently increase their chances of requiring public health resources, such as people engaging in adventure sports?

Proper integrative health services should be available to all without judgement and discrimination as I have stated before. However, people who engage in hazardous adventure sports could take out their own insurance if they wish. Active people often damage themselves but on the whole they are more healthy if they lead a busy outdoor life than people who are encouraged by the State to sit in front of a TV and eat and drink junk foods. (Have you noticed how many adverts there are on TV for sofas and junk food?? Who owns our media? Answer is the same people who own almost everything else and who manipulate our governments.)

Smokers argue that they choose to smoke. What rights does the state have to impose sanctions to prevent them from smoking? Does the state have the right to prevent the sale of tobacco, which is known to be addictive and highly dangerous? How vigorously is it reasonable for the state to act to prevent children and teenagers from smoking?

With cigarettes supplied by the manufactures that are so toxic and addictive, then these questions are reasonable to consider. I am not a smoker myself and both my parents died prematurely from smoking related diseases so I should be more informed re toxic additives within manufacturers cigarettes. This is one area where essential information has been successfully suppressed and if the State uncovered

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

the truth and became totally transparent and the public were educated properly on the lines of 'Rudolph Steiner and Montessori methods' and not mind controlled and manipulated by the same 'powers that be,' then there would no need for these questions at all.

People with full knowledge of the toxins within cigarettes and with decent organic alternatives would naturally make the shift to a more healthy life-style. I have to add that only when the necessary esoteric knowledge of our grand place in the Universe and the power of our consciousness is given to children, which is our birthright - then true high self esteem and self value will result and people will not do anything to their bodies or minds to damage them.

I realise that this is a far reaching statement, but one that must be considered when considering the manifestations of the low self worth which has dogged people for generations. (Kept in place by many organised religions which often play a big part in primary children's education.)

Alcohol

The effects of excessive consumption of alcohol on the health of individuals and society have been known for a very long time. It can be argued that in view of the significant harm to individuals and society, comprehensive measures by governments to prevent harm are lagging behind those for tobacco. In your view, what are the reasons for this?

The reasons for this is bound up with the increased dangers of drinking large amounts of alcohol in the form of spirits which is correctly stated has been left to the individual's personal choice. There are no warnings on bottles of spirits and in my opinion alcohol related health problems are more serious as there are huge social problems accompanying them which cause a monumental drain on the NHS and police services etc. (Not to mention the emotional trauma of families which are split up and devastated by marriage breakups and early deaths.)

When this state of affairs is closely examined it has to be said that the very fact that alcohol damages society so much, is the main reason that it has been left alone and in fact positively encouraged by the government. E.g. Laws have been passed recently to enable pubs to stay open 24 hours. The consumption of alcohol in public places or on the streets has been allowed which is contrary to America.

Also, the fact that naturally fermented, organic alcohol has been enjoyed for centuries by people who didn't have any inclination to wilfully and knowingly harm their health in any way, should be studied. I make my own home made wine from the fruits and plants of the field and garden. It is organic and made with spring water that hasn't been contaminated by manmade chemicals. I am very healthy since I got rid of my intentionally introduced toxins and never ever drink to excess as I value my physical and mental health too much. (Many lessons are available from this simple statement I am pleased and proud to say.)

In view of the impact of excessive consumption of alcohol on individuals and society, what are the roles and responsibilities of agents other than the government to limit consumption? Are there different responsibilities for producers and, for example, retailers? If so, which?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council. **It is very easy for the government to 'pass the blame' onto others in a variety of ways. They are very good at doing this and have done so for many decades, if not centuries. The root cause of the excessive consumption of alcohol must be researched and I have hinted at these root causes within this document. Retailers are providing what the public want and although I grant that they should make themselves aware of the part they play in the great scheme of helping to advance the 'New World Order,' which is the ultimate agenda of the 'Global Elite' and which will romp on unabated if the population is sufficiently dumbed down and distracted by health issues, they shouldn't be held totally accountable for the status quo. They are being manipulated and mind controlled along with millions of other people.**

Producers are a different matter and I suggest that they have the capability of becoming aware of the desperate need for wholesome organic drinks - whether alcoholic or not and that this should be their first priority.

Supplementation of food and water

Fortification of some foodstuffs such as flour, margarine and breakfast cereals has been accepted for some time. Why has the fluoridation of water met with more resistance? What are the reasons behind international differences in the acceptance of fluoridation of water? What criteria are there that determine acceptance?

I think that the well documented research re toxic fluoride has reached the designers of this document according to the latest newsletter from the Association for Pure Water, which I belong to. The headlines in this newsletter pointed to the fact that this entire question has been restructured or omitted, but this computer won't access the site given to view the amended section.

My own views on fluoridation of water is similar to the other views I have re medication without informed consent. When that medication consists of toxins designed to affect the minds and bodies of unsuspecting, trusting people - then it is a crime and should be treated as such.

Which democratic instruments (for example, decision by Parliament or local authority, consultations or referenda) should be required to justify the carrying out of measures such as fluoridation?

This question obviously reflects the lack of sound, unbiased research on the actual dangers of fluoridating water supply and people who are forced to consume such water should be made aware that this infringes the Human Rights Act. They must protest strongly and insist that they have access to pure water. This is a basic human need and is our heritage and birthright.

Achieving population benefits of fluoridation means restricting choice of individuals. Children benefit the most from fluoridation. However, as with vaccinations, adults, rather than children, are making decisions about whether or not to receive the intervention. Under what circumstances is it acceptable to restrict the choice of individuals in order to protect the health of children?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

I can't believe I am reading such a statement as 'children benefit the most from fluoridation!!' Thank goodness this whole section has been changed, however I am pleased that I have the chance of expounding my sincere views and sentiments on the whole sorry issue. Never should the individual choice of a well informed person be over-ridden by the government - especially not in the minefield of vaccinations.

Please, please do your own research on the whole topic of toxic vaccinations together with the reasons behind why this state of affairs has been allowed and encouraged. Type in 'Global Elite, New World Order, Bilderberg Group, Illuminati and you will see the huge amount of information which comes up on your screen. People like me who are informed are not conspiracy theorists but factists. There are whistle blowers from MI5, MI6 and the CIA, plus a wealth of other academics who live in many countries who understand many of the hidden truths. Please make every effort to find out these truths as well.

(I have just checked out the amended document on the website and can't really see much change to it...)

Ethical issues

In your view, is there one of the following principles that is generally more important than the others: autonomy, solidarity, fair reciprocity, harm principle, consent, trust (see Section 5 in Part B)? If so, which one and why? Are there any other important principles that need to be considered?

They are all important, but only when there is full transparency and truth in the public arena, instead of fear based propaganda from the media who are controlled by the 'Global Elite.' This is the other issue which needs to be considered - that of lifting the suppression and control and encouraging individuals to be aware of truths about themselves and the way in which the world is ruled, which encompasses a total lack of democracy which we help to keep in place decade after decade.

People need to be encouraged to re-claim their health and their personal power and to work together in communities which will provide healing centres based on ancient plant based wisdom and energy medicine, together with spiritual healing and awareness.

Can these principles be ordered in a hierarchy of importance? If so, how would such an order relate to the five case studies (infectious diseases, obesity, smoking, alcohol, and the supplementation of food and water)? Would the order have to be redefined for each new case study? Are there particular principles that are of special importance to some case studies?

I think that I have stated enough already re hierarchy of importance. Truth must come out and the suppression and control cease, only then will the people be free to re-claim their heritage and birthright and assume their correct, powerful place in society. This society needs to be run on the principal of small communities which are healthy in mind, body and spirit. The people will work in harmony with nature and children will be taught to respect all life, with a manifestation of their emotions springing from gentleness and true compassion.

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council. In cases such as vaccinations or fluoridation parents decide on behalf of their children. Which ideas or principles should guide parents in their decisions?

Again, I will state that the pressure put onto parents and indeed all sections of society to agree to medical intervention without informed consent, must stop immediately and the truths must be made freely available. Only then, will parents be able to understand the situation which exists within the NHS and be able to make informed choices. Better still, the choices will be available to them which are based on the highest principals instead of choices rooted in corruption and corporate greed, as well as helping to advance the sinister agenda which underpins much of the pharmaceutical company influenced and funded medical school training, which has given rise to the huge numbers of ill people that exist today.

The case studies have been chosen because we think that they highlight a number of important ethical tensions and conflicts between different agents, ranging from individuals to families, to NGOs, companies, healthcare professionals and the state. Other case studies could have been chosen to illustrate the same types of tensions and conflicts. We would be interested to hear if you think that there are other types of ethically relevant issues concerning public health that we should address.

The list could go on and on e.g. Psychiatry, psychiatric drug dangers and ECT.

My husband was given no less than 3 and sometimes 4 psychiatric drugs to take after he experienced a stress related mental breakdown. The reason for this deliberate poisoning of his body and mind was because psychiatrists are not taught to even recognise that stress related mental breakdown actually exists. They are taught to diagnose mental 'illness' which has to be treated with dangerous chemicals which can (and in my husband's case did) lead to serious iatrogenic illnesses and often permanent damage and death.

My husband ended up in a coma after being given a staggering 8 different medications to take for two years!!! He would have died, if he had not thrown all his drugs away after he was sufficiently frightened to realise that his drugs were causing his terrifying illness. This is true and I have to live every day seeing the result of this horrendous damage - all of which has been denied by his medics.

He was already mercury toxic from leaking amalgam fillings and together with his gold crown, which resulted in mercury vapour being released constantly, his poor body didn't stand a chance. He hallucinated on pain killers after a knee operation in 1990 and although this surprised his medics and nurses greatly, it wasn't even reported in his ward notes. Two yellow cards were filled in detailing adverse drug reactions during the time after his mental breakdown, when his medication list expanded hugely and they were not sent off to the drug companies. Mind charity has well documented information on the reluctance of allopathic medics to even acknowledge the fact that their drugs - often given in combination can actually harm and kill. (Are they worried that their income and handouts from the companies will be affected??)

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

ECT is barbaric and should be abolished. My husband saw people coming out of the ECT room in a terrible state as they had whole chunks of their memory wiped away. Medics do not know how it works - it seems to me that the poor people cannot remember why they were depressed in the first place and so that is how it works. The long term effects are often horrendous and even Mind is campaigning vehemently for the abolition of this out dated practice. My husband was pressured nearly every day he was in the private psychiatric hospital to agree to ECT and so was I pressured to encourage him to agree to it. Thank goodness he wasn't sectioned! Even now - 8 years later, he still has nightmares when the men in white coats are coming to drag him away to the ECT room.

Both my Mother and Uncle - Sir Malcolm Arnold (composer) had been damaged by psychiatric drugs and ECT. If I ever need help with low moods, it will be Kava Kava or St. Johns Wort or just a glass or two of my home made wine!!

This brings me on the next subject of 'polypharmacy.'

Lynne McTaggart, Dr. Mercola and Vernon Coleman to name but a few people, have published extensively on this subject. Many people are subject to this dangerous practice and again - who benefits? Answer is the chemists and drug companies and G.P's - certainly not the people. The most vulnerable sectors of society are exploited and harmed the most. They are :- the disabled, mentally ill, children and the elderly - the very sectors that need protecting and nurturing in my opinion.

Drugs are given which often result in unacceptable side effects and so more drugs are given to combat these side effects and so it goes on. This is exactly what happened to my husband and is a manifestation of 'medicines out of control.' (See book written by Dr. David Healy.)

Unless full integrative health is made available with choices given of treatments that help the body, mind and spirit - then the situation will stay as it is. Insurance companies could be encouraged to change their policies and include even more complementary therapies. HSA include a fine list at this moment in time, but there is room for improvement. Integrative health should be available free to all people.

Toxic body Burden should be considered a.s.a.p. for reasons already described. I have been a teacher in a large comprehensive school in the Midlands for 27 years and only retired early when my husband was suicidal when he was taking the plethora of psychiatric medication and it was obvious that he needed more care. The children I taught and observed around the school steadily displayed increased evidence of poor health in many ways from autism and allergies to poor concentration and agitated behaviour. This is often connected to inherited heavy metal toxicity from mother's dental amalgam plus a whole melting pot of other toxins.

Suicidal depression has been proved to be linked to heavy metal toxicity and many prescription drugs - especially SSRI anti-depressants and now some oral contraceptives and acne medication have been added to the list.

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

For many years there has been a cover up by the pharmaceutical companies re this important information and still there is little or no recognition by the 'experts' of why suicide among young people is increasing at a staggering rate - especially among boys. Boys are more sensitive to toxins as girls have a stronger constitution. My son had more mercury toxicity symptoms than my daughter when they were very young.

They had their own vaccinations as I was unaware of the dangers then. My daughter liked shell fish, which are laced with mercury and other toxins and in my opinion, the trigger for her suicide when she was aged 29 was an oral contraceptive called 'Femulin' which contained a chemical called 'etyndial diacetate' which carries a side effect of 'depression.'

She already had allergies, which is a classic mercury toxicity symptom and as she was figure conscious, she had her fair share of diet drinks etc. which contain Aspartame. The accumulation of toxins within her poor body was just too much for her and on June 8th. 1993, she put a plastic bag over her head. She was a successful physiotherapist who was engaged to be married and we had just been to a wedding exhibition to choose her cake and all the other trimmings. She had her own cottage in the country with a much loved cat and a horse.

There was no reason for her to end her own life and I and Dr. Hal Huggins (holistic dentist in Colorado who I have been corresponding with and who has written extensively on mercury toxicity and suicidal depression) are convinced that neuro-toxic body burden was the cause of her suicide.

This traumatic experience is sufficient in itself to drive me on relentlessly campaigning for the truth to come out. I am sure you can understand and I would be so interested in learning of your reactions to my whole story.

When medical schools teach medics to recognise and acknowledge this huge problem then things will change.

If I am able to make myself aware of this issue, then so can all the people along the line who help to keep it in place. They are all responsible in their own way as with the Internet, there is no excuse for lack of knowledge. Also, damaged people should be compensated.

Nutritional and Environmental Medicine.

There is a desperate need for medics to be trained in the above. We are what we eat and it is no coincidence that the medical schools even now hardly touch on nutrition. (Remember that it is not in the drug companies interests to have people who are bursting with good health!!)

Environmental medicine is hugely important as people are being adversely affected by their micro-wave cookers (especially if they cook their food in them and the EMF radiation is able to pass through walls, so when the cooker is switched on, they are being zapped in the area of their heart as most cookers sit on work tops.) Mobile

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

phones and the contamination from base stations has to be considered as I can vouch from experience that the high pulsed frequencies that the masts particularly, are belting out does adversely affect humans and animals within the beam of greatest intensity.

For 3 years my husband and I were being zapped by 1,800 mega-hertz from an Orange 3G phone mast which blasted into our bedroom and during that time I had terrible nightmares and disturbed sleep along with pins and needles in the arm and shoulder facing the mast when I woke up. We had to pay out yet again to protect ourselves from this bombardment and buy silver impregnated net curtaining for the window at a cost of £135. Who gave the mobile phone companies the frequency range, you may ask? Answer - the government. The Tetra police systems are even more damaging and have given rise to cancers and other health problems.

Even geopathic stress can adversely affect human health and yet none of the above seems to come within the consciousness of medics. (Except good complementary therapists such as Roy Watkins who runs our local natural health centre. He has the following cutting edge energy therapies which my husband and I have used to help us repair the damage and which has helped our bodies heal themselves :- SCENAR (Interex 5000) This machine has the ability to shrink cancers, but is only allowed in this country for pain control. (We all know why!!) This machine is Russian invented.

QXC1 (Quantum Energy Scan) This American invented machine is able to scan more than 2,000 systems in the body and pick up on so many areas which allopathic medics just do not have the training to do e.g. one simple one is whether the body is acidic or alkaline. So simple and yet so important and one which G.P's do not even know about.

RISTA (Russian invented diagnostic machine) This brings up a diagram on the computer screen which tells the therapist the state of all the major energy meridians.

Zenon laser powered Crystal Light Colour Dome.

Other therapies at the centre include - Colonic Irrigation (essential for de-toxing.) Shiatsu massage/ aromatherapy/nutritional therapy/EFT and hypnotherapy/reflexology ... There may be more, but I can't remember off hand.

Two years after I had my mercury amalgam replaced safely by Dr. John Roberts who has an integrative health practice in Huddersfield, I am still de-toxing and improving my health. We drive two hours each way for the best holistic dentist in the NW. He trained in America and often lectures there. When are our medics going to be able to train in this country???

In my opinion, these main items I have mentioned - toxic body burden/adverse drug reactions/iatrogenic illness/fear based propoganda and vaccinations affecting immune systems along with public general low self esteem - are many of the reasons why the NHS is groaning financially.

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on *Public Health: ethical issues* between May and September 2006. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

I sincerely hope that much of this information I have given here will be channelled to the correct places to help much needed change.

Some of the questions asked with reference to a specific case study also apply to other case studies, for example whether people who accept some kind of damage to their health as part of their lifestyle, such as smokers, should be entitled to fewer resources from the public healthcare system, or be asked for increased contributions. Respondents are welcome to comment on these specific questions in a general manner.

Due to the extensive comments I have made already on these issues, I have to sum up by saying that proper integrative health care must be made available to all sectors of society and full compensation made to the people who have been damaged by the very health care industries who have pledged to help and heal.

To date, my husband and I have paid out staggering amounts of money for private dentistry and complementary therapies to help repair the damage. Even with BUPA dental insurance and HSA, we are substantially out of pocket. We are both retired and my husband had to retire early aged 50 after his breakdown and subsequent iatrogenic illness. He is at present receiving Incapacity Benefit and Disability Living Allowance from the government as he is unable to work due to the damage he sustained when his consultant of neurology refused to acknowledge his iatrogenic illness and left him for nine days with very high pressure in his brain. Coupled with psychiatric drug damage and mercury toxicity - he didn't stand a chance.

I feel very sorry for the people who are financially not well off and who are stuck in their 'toxic cages.' What is going to be done about them I wonder?