

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.

Ms Magda Taylor

## **QUESTIONS ANSWERED:**

### **Question 1 The definition of public health**

#### **ANSWER:**

This definition would be correct if we all had the same understanding of what 'health' truly means. Lack of symptoms of dis-ease are not necessarily a sign of health. Equally symptoms of dis-ease are viewed by some as the body's self-healing capabilities to return to homeostatis. Ideally, 'health' needs to be studied much more thoroughly and properly understood, and practiced by society before society can collectively assure the conditions for people to be healthy. I feel there are many misconceptions about health which are promoted to the public as facts and this makes the task of achieving public health difficult. A broadening viewpoint is strongly needed. 'We as individuals should take full responsibility for our own and our family's health based on a true understanding of health, so that we as a society will be collectively healthy!'

### **Question 2 Factors that influence public health**

#### **ANSWER:**

No, I don't agree that all the five factors listed are the main influences affecting public health if you are talking about a positive affect on public health. I do agree that the environment plays a very important role and the state of the external environment will have an enormous impact on our own individual internal environment which ultimately dictates our state of health and well-being. Improvements in living conditions, sanitation, clean water and good nutrition have had a huge impact on disease, and resulted in dramatic declines in cases and deaths from various diseases from the mid 1800s to mid 1900s. The Role In Medicine by Thomas McKeown highlights this and features a number of graphs showing these major declines. Social and economic factors undoubtedly affect our health. This can be seen clearly in areas of the world where there is poverty and malnutrition. However even in the more affluent areas due to excessive living habits and junk-food diets another type of malnutrition can occur - this can be observed in countries like USA, UK and other so-called developed countries. Genetic background has been trumpeted around in recent years all too often, leaving individuals with the belief that we are at the mercy of our genes. I would highly recommend your council members read a recent book by scientist, Bruce Lipton PhD, entitled 'The Biology of Belief'. Here is a brief extract from this publication: 'Genetic control, argues Nijhout, has become a metaphor in our society.....But metaphor does not equate with scientific truth. Nijhout summarises the truth-"When a gene product is needed, a signal from its environment, not an emergent property of the gene itself, activates expression of that gene." In otherwords, when it comes to genetic control,it's the environment." (Nijhout H F (1990) Metaphors & the Role of Genes in Development, Bioessays 12(9) 441-446. I do not agree that preventative and curative health services have played a positive role as I do not view the so-called health service, ie, the NHS as a health service. The best aspect of NHS hospitals are the Accident and Emergency

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.

departments which undoubtedly are needed and possibly some palliative care in some other circumstances. In my opinion acute and chronic disease should be assisted using alternative measures. This brief description highlights why I am suggesting this. The body is a self-healing organism and the body's intelligence is always trying to preserve life, unless it has become so toxic that it is beyond the point of no return. The body may produce certain symptoms to reach its goal of moving from dis-ease to ease and this is where two very polarised viewpoints come into play. The orthodox view is that the symptoms are the 'problem' and attempt to stop those symptoms by so-called curative measures, such as medications, treatments and surgery. The alternative view is that the symptoms are a sign of resolution and that they must not be stopped or suppressed but supported to allow the body to eliminate the problem and return to health. Therefore I do not see the present, well-meaning, 'health' service in a favourable light and feel that the increase in ill-health may be as a result of medical drugs and treatments. One factor that I feel needs to be mentioned as affecting public health is fear. Fear can have an effect on the body to the extent that some can develop serious illness through living in a constant state of fear. There is a constant flow of scare-mongering propaganda broadcast to the public through the media coming from the powers that be, and unless the public are informed on the various issues this can have a negative affect on many, and increase their susceptibility to dis-ease.

#### **Question 4 Control of infectious disease**

##### **ANSWER:**

I do not agree with forced quarantine as I do not agree with the present 'established view' regarding disease which is based on the Germ Theory of Disease. Even Pasteur admitted on his death bed that the germ was nothing and that it was the soil (the host). As regards to the 'infectiousness' of disease and what a virus is there are many interesting articles published over the years which challenge the current beliefs. For example, I recommend your council read articles by Stefan Lanka, a virologist, on virus, AIDS and infectiousness. Here is one link: <http://www.neue-medizin.com/lanka2.htm> If the state wants to prevent outbreaks then the simplest way is to provide proper education regarding health and to provide proper living conditions. Outbreaks will become less and less as the public become more and more healthy. I do not agree with the statements you make about travel and trade and the spread of disease so find it impossible to respond as such. Healthy living habits and commonsense are the main requirements needed whether we travel or not. We are all teeming with microbes on a daily basis and this does not indicate that we are sick. Many who travel for their holiday in the sun will often over-do the sunbathing and over-consume rich foods and alcohol and then when they fall ill a particular microbe gets the blame. For example, in the publication Eurosurveillance, 14/09/2000, it reported on a small outbreak of meningococcal disease in Cyprus. It stated that all five (3 Swedish, one Norwegian and one British) were aged 18 to 20 years old and had visited or stayed in Ayia Napa. No further connections between the cases were identified. This is a typical situation and it is quite obvious why these individuals became compromised in their health! This was not a case of the disease

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.

spreading, there was a clustering of these isolated cases simply because these individuals were participating in similar lifestyle habits at that time. The best measure to control 'disease' is to educate the general public to take responsibility for maintaining their own and their family's health, and to use good commonsense when travelling to very different climates etc to allow their bodies to adjust to the changes. Testing for HIV/AIDS is highly questionable since AIDS itself is still being debated. I am not convinced that the present views surrounding HIV/AIDS are correct. Therefore I am not in favour of these questionable tests. Tuberculosis is a disease of overcrowded living conditions and compromised immune systems. I would highly recommend the book by medical doctor Dr Gerhard Buchwald - 'The Decline of Tuberculosis despite "Protective" Vaccination, 2004.

### **Question 3 Prevention of infectious diseases through vaccination**

#### **ANSWER:**

Firstly, I do not agree at all that vaccination prevents infectious diseases after researching this subject for the last 15 years, and I find your consultation papers extremely bias. I have come to view vaccination as an entirely inappropriate and erroneous procedure. So my answer to your first question would be that there is NO justification to introduce compulsory vaccination. Regarding 'herd immunity' -it has always puzzled me that considering individual immunity is not understood then how can one talk about herd immunity? Antibody production does not equate immunity, even the WHO admit there is no precise relationship. Some individuals with high antibody levels go on to contract a particular disease whilst others with no detectable antibody levels do not. For example, A Study of Diphtheria in 2 areas in Gt Britain, Medical Research Council Special Report No 272, 1950. There is absolutely NO justification for the vaccination of anybody, let alone of children when it is against their parents wishes. What kind of society would we have if no matter what our individual views were the authorities could have the right to enforce such things as vaccination?? I'd like to quote from an extremely interesting book from 1940 entitled: Health, Diet, and Commonsense by Cyril Scott (a prolific composer of music and a very deep-thinking author of 41 books): p197 - "Anyone who can prevent an occurrence positively that he does not know is bound to occur is indeed a seventh day wonder." Altogether the evidence seems to point to a gross exaggeration and exploitation of the germ theory as a means of creating fear in the public mind. Germs do not act in the way that medical orthodoxy persistently declares in the face of some of its leading lights. Prof. Merchnikoff maintained he had found the bacilli of Asiatic cholera in the waters of several localities where no epidemic had been known to occur. Indeed, to prove that "deadly" germs were harmless in a healthy body, Prof Tentenkoffer swallowed several millions of cholera germs and suffered no ill-effects. Subsequently Prof. Emmrich made a culture from the intestines of recently dead victims of the same disease, swallowed millions of the germs, and remained alive and well. Even this seemed not enough to prove the harmlessness of germs in a healthy organism, so Dr Thomas Powell went one better and introduced the germs of seven supposed to be deadly diseases straight into his bloodstream. Once again nothing untoward occurred. These heroes, moreover, who

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.

use their own bodies for the tests, were no quacks but reputable members of the Profession; and yet, presumably to sell serums and vaccines, we are asked to have our children immunised against various diseases when after all the best and only harmless! protection against them is a healthy body. -

## **Question 5 Obesity**

### **ANSWER:**

The area I have been involved in for the last 15 years is vaccination and I helped set-up and now run the organisation The Informed Parent, so I have focused my attention in answering your previous sections as that is where I have some expertise. Therefore I have not answered your questions directly but just made a few comments on obesity. Regarding obesity it is quite possible that, apart from the increase in unhealthy lifestyles in the last 50 years, the subtle damaging effect of vaccination may also be playing a role. For example, there is apparently a lot of scientific-based evidence regarding vaccine damage and obesity. A communication I recently received stated: 'If you look at the cell membrane communicators they are turned off by viral and thimerisol activity. The increase in insulin (a hormone) is aggravated by toxins like vaccines. There are some studies on the MMR and the disruption of the amylase production in the parotids. MMR blocks this enzyme which is responsible for carbohydrate breakdown. If you don't naturally have mumps and get vaccinated instead you have compromised your ability to break down carbohydrates. This is totally in line with the growing numbers of type II diabetes.' - Kimberly D. Balas, PhD, ND, Board Certified Naturopath. Obesity may still occur even if the public start to reduce their intake because their systems may be clogged up with their previous lifestyles which can disable their systems into being unable to break down, absorb and assimilate the various foodstuffs they do eat. As their health improves their systems will become less sluggish and obesity will decline. Good role models are needed in this area to inspire others into action. That must come from all levels from the family to the government. Ministers of Health should actually know about, and practice, good health before given such a position of minister of Health, which certainly does not happen generally. The food industry are ultimately there to make money and with the high demand for junk foods and drinks I can not imagine that they would discontinue many of their lines to reduce obesity. I find it ironic that in recent years there has been pressure from the EU to ban various nutritional supplements and yet to suggest the banning of various junk food outlets would be met with horror! I feel it is acceptable for those who allow themselves to become so obese to the point where they are placing such a burden on their skeleton and organs and then require hip replacements etc should contribute more into the system. They are responsible for their own state of health, and others who maintain their health reasonably should not share the costs.

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.

### **Question 6 Smoking**

#### **ANSWER:**

As with the previous issue of obesity this is not an area I have specialist knowledge on and so I have kept my comments brief. I would presume the reason for a delay would be that the tobacco industry is a huge money-making business and the government would certainly miss the taxes earned from this industry. As a non-smoker myself I am very much in favour of smoking bans in public areas to protect the non-smokers of an unhealthy environment. More educational programmes should be implemented aimed at children and teenagers, to try and stop early habit-forming. A company that makes or sells products containing hazardous substances is grossly irresponsible in the first place. Yes, they should be prosecuted for producing addictive products which can be damaging to health, if that is the case. Smokers should have to contribute more into the system as they are indulging in a habit which is recognised as unhealthy and are much more likely to require medical assistance in their lifetimes. Yes, this should apply in other areas as you have indicated.

### **Question 7 Alcohol**

#### **ANSWER:**

As stated previously my area of expertise is in vaccination so my response is brief in this section. I would like to point out one thing about the increase in consumption of alcohol, smoking and obesity which may be relevant. These habits are all stimulants which in my opinion stem from cravings of an unhealthy system. Those who are extremely healthy do not have the need for stimulants - they have a healthy body and mind. The more one increases one's level of health the more clarity comes into being, and the desire for stimulants, such as alcohol, junk foods and nicotine are greatly reduced or disappear altogether. So why would there be an increase in the need for stimulants? A healthy mind would not indulge in these harmful habits, unless the mind had been slightly altered/damaged in some way. It is my well-considered opinion that much of the increase in these areas, as well as increases in bad social behaviour, learning difficulties, autism and so on, may be as a result of minimal amounts of brain damage caused by the vaccinations that have been introduced over the last 60 years. Minimal brain damage may be subtle, and overlooked in the early years of a child's life, but it could result in de-stabilising the mind to different degrees hence the need for stimulants in teenage and adult life. A very interesting read on this aspect can be found in the book by medical historian Harris L Coulter entitled: *Vaccination, Social Violence and Criminality - The Medical Assault on the American Brain* (1990). A reasonably healthy mind acts in a moderate manner so should there be any desire for certain stimulants then these will be in moderation which will place much less of a burden on public health. As far as roles and responsibilities go, as with the tobacco industry and junk-food industry, these companies involved in alcohol production are only concerned with profit margins and maximising their sales. They are not interested in limiting consumption.

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.

### **Question 8 Supplementation of food and water**

#### **ANSWER:**

I find your questions extremely bias, particularly where you state that children benefit most from fluoridation. I have come to understand fluoridation as being harmful to both child and adult, and I certainly am NOT in favour of mass medication of the water. There are also question marks surrounding fortifying various foodstuffs, especially in products such as margarine and breakfast cereals which are questionable food products in the first place, and some nutritionalists would say that the packaging may be more nutritious. Foods should be as close to their natural state as possible and if individuals wish to use supplementation then it should be on a personal basis. I am in favour of freedom of choice. In your case study notes you say that a total of around 400 million people receive 'enriched'(a bias opinion) water, that does not mean to say that any of those people know much about the issue or the controversies surrounding fluoridation, it just means they were accepting.(Isn't that one of side-effects of fluoride....lethargy?) This reminds me of the statements from the Dept of Health when they state that most parents have their children vaccinated. In my experience over the last 15 years of dealing with numerous parents, the main reason they agree to vaccination is because they assume the health authorities have sound evidence, in otherwords they agree out of trust not out of knowledge. I do not agree that there are any justifications for fluoridation at all, and a truly democratic society should be able to choose. It is NOT acceptable under any circumstance to restrict the choice of individuals in areas such as fluoridation and vaccination. Parents are responsible for their children until they reach adulthood and that position must be respected. Your, once again, bias assumption at the end of the last question gives me great concern that this consultation paper and study is totally one-sided.

### **Question 9 Ethical issues**

#### **ANSWER:**

Autonomy must be preserved so that individuals can choose their individual/family lifestyles independently. As I have stated throughout my previous answers, responsibility for ones own/family health and lifestyles should be taken by the individual. However there are still many who have become very dependent on the state for their decision-making and this principle may be initially difficult for some. In my opinion it is wrong for the state to force citizens to contribute to so-called social welfare systems if they do not view that system to be of benefit. I feel for those who choose to contribute to an offered system (ideally the system should have a wide range of choices) then the principle of 'fair reciprocity' would be appropriate and as suggested those people who take higher health risks etc should make additional contributions to a public healthcare system. If it becomes cheaper to be healthier this would be a big incentive to many. A good and successful health service should be closing down hospitals and services because they are not required. This is certainly not the situation we have on our hands with the NHS! The concept of consent would be fine if the public were truly informed on various issues, but sadly this is not the case. As regards to vaccination many parents will sign consent

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.

forms for various vaccination campaigns with very little understanding or knowledge on the subject. Why does this happen? These parents have a blind 'trust' due to the fact that the state tells them that these subjects are too complex to understand and that the 'experts' know best. The public is constantly being disempowered to the point where they begin to lose their thinking abilities, natural instinct and commonsense. The result is a totally dependent non-thinking public. Fortunately there are a growing number of individuals world-wide who are now challenging many of the 'established' views and we can see that an increasing number of individuals are not so full of trust, and they are looking into things for themselves and making informed decisions. I would like to quote a brief extract from *Doctors, Disease and Health* (1938) by Cyril Scott, p286: 'To regard disease merely as a departure from normal health, no matter what form this departure takes, simplifies its consideration so greatly that it does not require medical training to appreciate it fully, nor anything resembling talent to find means for its relief...' Yet in spite of this self-evident fact medical science as a whole would have us believe that the treatment of disease is something so mysterious and so complex that it cannot be discovered without a prodigious expenditure of money and labour and a display of learning so profound that even years of study can hardly make it intelligible to the most intelligent.' - Fortunately more and more people are waking up to the fact that they do have the ability to research and understand subjects such as health, and in my experience often become more knowledgeable than their educated medical professionals. (One may be educated in a subject but lack intelligence and commonsense.) Parents should decide on behalf of their children, they are the rightful guardians and their decisions must be respected. Therefore the principle of autonomy is appropriate in all situations.