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.

Sukhvinder Sohpal – World Truth Coalition Party & The Truth Ark

Dedicated to Soul, Emma, Penny, Sarah, (especially Karen and Ro), and also to anyone else struggling to survive in this oppressive paradigm. May you all be blessed on your journeys to true freedom and optimum health.

List of questions

1. The definition of public health

Do you agree with the definition of public health?

> "[W]hat we, as a society, collectively do to assure the conditions for people to be healthy"[1]?

Yes, I agree in principle, however, I would go further to clarify who 'we' as a society are; starting with the individual/citizen, then in succession as a cascading flow diagram, a community of people/citizens, national groups of communities (linked to operate as a whole), the media (including independent alternatives to mainstream, small and large), the industries (including Eco-friendly domains, holistic scientists/healers, eco-designers, builders and suppliers), and the government (cross party independent groups, not regulated/controlled by any secret society's).

ALSO, I would clarify 'what we collectively do' to assure the conditions for people to be healthy including real efforts to ensure that voices silenced by mass (commercial) media are always included, to keep the people informed, and to balance the claims made by dubiously funded medical research bodies, linked to Big Pharma (and the military industrial complex (MIC)). These efforts to clarify what we do collectively should always include a strong element of health promotion/education/consultation spearheaded by people/organisations chosen by the people, who show a range of knowledge from all quarters, and who can show that they can reach out to disadvantaged communities both white and ethnic. Public health should mean the public are involved with improving their own health at all levels, thereby making any actions 'collective'.

2. 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?**
> **If so, do you think some are more important than others? Are there other factors we should include? If so, what are they?**

The five factors detailed above encapsulate all the factors that influence public health in one way or another, and I have expanded on this later on in this section with a detailed list of additional factors to include. However, I believe one very important factor that has

---

[1] (Institute of Medicine (1988) *The Future of the Public Health* (Washington, USA: The National Academies Press).

been left out, which needs to be looked at openly and honestly, is the government/state. Let me explain.

> "As long as the oppressed remain unaware of the causes of their condition, they fatalistically 'accept' their exploitation" **(1).**

I believe - and this is backed by research **(2, 3, 4, 5)** - that the factor that influences public health the most is a person's lifestyle.   However, there is a serious conflict here between how a person chooses to live and how they are socialised (nice way to say forced) to live.

A person's (so called) choice of lifestyle is dependent largely on their social class and how the individual is socialised.

The social class of an individual - in turn - directly influences what they eat **(6, 7)** which has a direct impact on the bodies ability to fight illness, since nutrition has been strongly linked to health. **(8)**.

Also, for many years now, the link between ill health and 'class' has been made strongly (its also logical). **(9)** The link between income and ill health has also been strongly made **(10)** and it's suggested that this alone will be the strongest determiner of an individual's health. Note, the lower social classes are the lowest income households! (Although there are few exceptions to this rule i.e. entrepreneurs and lottery winners!).

For example, if you happen to be born into the lowest social class, you may want to eat healthy food, and take part in many activities that maintain/improve health, but your access to such a lifestyle may be greatly reduced due to;

- Your inability to afford such a lifestyle (socio-economic class - poverty),
- Your lifestyle itself and the culture of your peers;
- **The burdens pressed (forced) upon you by the state, exasperating the vicious circle (cycle) of poverty**.

This raises very serious questions for true public health leaders. What good work is done at the school level – to change behaviours and encourage a better lifestyle - is almost reversed once they enter the 'big wide world', which should aptly be named the **world of state and capitalist oppression**. It's not the big wide world at all, but simply a paradigm being enforced by a few at the top of the economic ladder, the elite or what ever.

However, the worrying trend amongst (state-appointed) public health leaders is this notion that a person chooses their own lifestyle, and as a consequence chooses to be ill, and is therefore some how liable for their bad lifestyle/illness. Buzzwords emanating from 'best practice' suggest that people think 'outside the box' if they want to change their lifestyle and improve their lot. **(11)**. However, it is very difficult for children (and adults) to live outside the box, particularly if the state and their peers enforce the walls to the box.

From the cradle to the grave - the majority within the lower classes are kept in a strong (unnatural & forced) 'work mentality' and self regulate each other by gate keeping themselves to be the same, often to the detriment of their own physical and mental health, directly due to the capitalist system driven by the state and their insistence on tax-payers.

If there is an underclass that is socialised into poverty, that are disadvantaged in every way possible, how then can it be justified to burden them further with state taxes, (capitalism is institutionalised bribery) which only go towards – again - enforcing the box of bad lifestyles.

This picture is clearly to be seen as an oppressed section of society with the state as the oppressors, where the individual is left no option but to live in a culture of subservience, conformity, bitterness and mostly debt.

Capitalism and state taxes can be seen clearly to be taking its toll on the working classes; mortgages or the grip of death (mort – death, gage - grip), are having a marked effect on the health and well-being of whole sections in the society **(12)**, particularly the lower classes whose access to high paying roles is almost forbidden, and instead are forced into manual labour roles or superficial retail posts where there sole purpose is to perpetuate the retail (capitalist) world that has already enslaved them, simply to pay taxes.
This could also explain why there are so many unemployed today. The states insistence on the individual to 'pay taxes' within a capitalist paradigm has created a situation where the individual is forced to get a job, instead of being allowed to understand the world around them, and to choose for themselves what they would like to do as a role in the world – at their own pace. The options of what the individual can do - to feel they have a purpose in life - are seriously limited by the present paradigm (capitalism) to factory work or pointless wage earning roles. Therefore, the individual is presented with seriously limited opportunities to realise their dreams, and as a result looses hope. This in-turn inhibits the creative power of the individual, and so becomes more 'like the rest', instead of breaking away from the system to live a more fulfilled life.
This leads to extreme resentment and alienation to the systems values, and as a result, the individual may become difficult to employ and therefore be unemployed long term. The research to show that the unemployed are at serious risks to health is immense **(13, 14).**
The tax system has also been pointed out to increase an individual's risk of being on the wrong side of state laws, opting to work for cash in hand with out paying the taxes **(15)** due to the poverty already being experienced, and others simply refuse to pay this exploitative sum of money for others (the state) to do with as they wish **(16, 17).**

Note, the link between state oppression and income opens a whole can of worms regarding the currency. Whose choice was it to have the present monetary system, and why was it designed to be so unforgiving on those at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder, (perhaps dialogue to have at a later stage).

If an individual realises they have been born into poverty (many do), and sees also the unfairness (injustice) of having to pay rent and taxes in order for them to be accepted by their peers and 'society in general, they are ultimately left with few options to 'psychologically' come to terms with their situation. They either;

- Come to terms with their lot by allowing the herd mentality to rein, providing what little self control they may have, to make the best of a bad situation (by 'towing the line'), or,
- Those who are more aware of the 'mind control' and 'box settings' will 'psychologically' refuse to take part in this blatant exploitation and instead seek to escape from their nightmare by turning to **alcohol, drugs, gambling, crime and ultimately suicide.**

The gate keeping mentality found within the lower social classes (and across the capitalist ethos) is used to scorn those who leave the flock and the 'herd' mentality. Those who try to leave, quickly realise that the herd is against them, (backed by the state who regulate the strong work ethic).
Many see this as the moral individual, trying to exist within an immoral society, where the individual is made impotent to react to the systems oppression.
This creates serious problems for the **mental health** of those who see the lies/bad lifestyle culture and legitimately desire to escape the herd and their terrible ways, leaving many no other options but to **commit suicide**, i.e. remove themselves from the herd in the only way they know how, (with few other options). (This is also the model used to explain sub-cultures, i.e. those who refuse to take part in mainstream activities but do not choose suicide).

This has immense implications for the 'public health' agenda, since those who do not accept the rules, are often left to fend for themselves, labelled and boxed into impossible state controlled systems, (such as the benefit system) increasing the risk of negative lifestyles, and poverty.

Note, there is also a percentage that flatly refuses to live by these unfair (unjust) rules and instead seeks to control their own box by turning to crime. The ultimate control is to be 'outside the box' of society, particularly if it's ethically flawed, and in turn the state creates laws to further damage and isolate these individuals, providing them little support and enforcing the states control, by keeping them under more control, than if they had chosen to come to terms with the system. Many people within the prisons are from a mindset that simply cannot and will not accept the present structure to society, even if they are unable to articulate this refusal, its evident in their actions.
A very important public health agenda/strategy should seek to 'heal' the children who turn to crime, since they are probably the most damaged already, and if presented with a '**different' way to live, would not see the need for crime. A compromise is needed soon,** where instead of finding more and more ways to bribe people to live in the state system, an alternative is provided that would allow the individual to feel empowered and free from exploitation.
If we can heal the most disadvantaged within society, the process of doing so would give us the model needed to heal ALL of society, where illness would become a thing of the past.

Therefore, it can be seen clearly that it is desperation for many children that leads to negative lifestyles and life choices such as suicide, after realising how unfair the present system is - particularly if they belong to the lower social classes - with added burdens such as tax. Money worries are strongly linked to mental health **(18)** and suicide **(19)**,

since those who are in poverty cannot compete with the lifestyles of those who are well off or in work. This is backed by studies in other countries that were forced to adopt the capitalist system within the last century (due to invasion and war) **(20).**

As public health advocates we can no longer ignore one of the highest levels of suicide in the world within our own borders, (and cannot ignore the states hand in this) where in Northern Ireland it is clearly stated that suicide rates are at epidemic proportions! **(21)**. The terrifying trend to treat mental illness with more toxic interventions must be reversed, with headlines such as 'young failed on mental health' **(22)** somehow giving the green light – advocating - the pharmaceuticals to treat this epidemic with more drugs (many of which are dubiously proven to work).
Note, these sorts of policy directions need to be stopped. Those with the knowledge could and should claim **racial discrimination** for such policies. The ethnic groups are now being seen as clearly the most 'weather sensitive' and also the most reactive to bad diets, therefore, instead of drugging these groups, more funding and strategy needs to be put directly into solving the issues surrounding the incidence of mental illness and sensitivity to weather, as well as supporting these groups to return (where possible) to diets that complement their make up and cultural heritage. I would also suggest that headlines such as 'Therapy could cut benefits' **(23)** should not only single out 'psychotherapy' as an effective reducer of depression. There are many alternative 'THERAPY's that could and should be used to alleviate depression and risk of suicide, and again racial discrimination can be claimed if this is not backed by policy.
In a crude and horrid way, the high rates of suicide seems to actually benefit the capitalist system, since the ones who refuse to take part remove themselves, leaving only 'do as your told' people, and again making it even more difficult for young people to reject the systems values.

Even if individuals can enact a level of self-control, by putting up with the injustices, this level of self-control does not reverse the **serious lack of education**, knowledge or access to a healthy lifestyle. If you belong to the lower social classes, your lack of education will present barriers to good health. The education system has been controlled by the manufacturing industries for many years now **(24)**, and therefore - instead of creating a climate of openness and transparency to ALL knowledge (including health knowledge) - education has become a token exercise to keep the majority 'uneducated' (a system designed to encourage docile unquestioning clones for industry), and who only see food as a means to satisfy hunger to maintain work levels, as opposed to it being the elixir of life (health) itself.
The lower social classes are often given little opportunity to become equally paid to the higher social classes and are instead streamed by the 'dubious' education system to only feel they can access low paid jobs that are largely manual. **The manual classes are again at high risk of all sorts of illnesses and also have the unhealthiest lifestyles (25)**.
This is reinforced by only allowing those within society from the higher social classes (and those who have profited from the capitalist system) into higher paid roles **(26)**.

So can ill health be described as a problem created by the state? The inequalities in the UK are growing, and the gap between those who are healthy and those who are not, is also growing. However social class alone cannot explain this gap, since, many within the

lower social classes are becoming wealthier, but still suffer from serious illnesses. It needs to be considered that even if a person becomes financially wealthy (rich in the economic sense), that does not mean that their lifestyle will also improve, or their overall knowledge about health. More money could simply mean a way of **making the 'prison pretty'!**
The individual's lifestyle - governed by the herd that they belong to, (and they may still have strong links to that herd and value system) - ensure that the desire to consume unhealthy foods is maintained – even inbred, even if they become wealthy.
The herd gate keeps each other to actually want and like certain types of food, which are ritualistically eaten in the lower classes, as they are cheap, tasty and widely available, but that have been proven time and time again to be bad for health, such as meat (full English breakfast) every day.

A note needs to be added here to point out in no way is this an attack on the English breakfast, and instead is an attack on the way foods such as a full English breakfast are manufactured/processed/prepared. Many of the foods prepared in the lower social classes are done for maximum profit (capitalism) and by using the cheapest mass-produced products to supply the demand of cheap products, due to the levels of poverty. The full English Breakfast, is now largely cooked using mass produced eggs from caged hens fed on muck, pork from pigs that are mass-produced (and very unhealthy), bleached white bread, now being acknowledged as poisonous and linked to diabetes **(27),** and all cooked in HYDROGENATED OILS, being linked to again diabetes **(28),** and many other health problems **(29, 30)**. Then this is washed down with the lowest nutritional tea - Black tea - with bleached white sugar and milk that is now being linked to many illnesses **(31, 32)**.
Also, due to the very nature of the forced labour lifestyles found within the lower social classes, the 'good' foods are seen as useless, pointless, overpriced, and only desirable for rich folk, who (many believe) have never seen a hard days work in their lives!

I believe an individual simply wants to be happy and healthy, instead of working themselves into an early grave just to appease the paradigm of capitalism, which is flawed, as we are seeing more and more today, **driven by the state tax system**.

I need to also add here, that this is not in any way an attack of the lower social classes, and is instead an attempt to expose the way good honest people are being controlled and made ill - *perhaps by design*.

I would suggest that the work ethic has hijacked and exploited the humble strong workers that used to be happy to 'grow' food for their own families and communities before the start of the ultimate hell, the industrial re-(de)-volution, for profit and control.

If the higher wage earners (those who are socialised into being the 'oppressors') are bitter about having to support the lower social classes and the unemployed, then wouldn't a better system be to allow the lower social groups to live autonomously without any interference or 'benefits' from the state, since their forefathers were encouraged to migrate into the cities in return for 'rewards and work' in the first place. There is now a lack of work and rewards.
Those who choose to live independently should see the pact their forefathers made with the state to 'work the system' in return for freedom, honoured, by reintegrating them back to the way they lived many years ago, free, healthy and happy with no tax system.

I understand and acknowledge that there should be a 'group' of people who do the manual work, but this should be designed so it consists of those who *choose* to do this work, and as an ultimate token of thanks, the rest of us, should seek to make their health our most important agenda. They should be the most looked after within the world, not the most oppressed.

I would also suggest that if we really want to see people healthy, there needs to be a change in paradigm, along with a return to what was and will always be human friendly living, with the earth and nature, not machines and man-made systems such as the state **(33, 34)**.

To assist this paradigm shift, I would go further and suggest that access to preventative and curative health services are also a key factor, since if the body is kept to a high level of health, illness is less likely to occur.
It is becoming widely accepted that the preventative and curative health services should not only become integrated (advocated by HRH Prince of Wales **35)**, but should actually be the main focus of the NHS, since every 'body' has the ability to be healthy, and this ability needs to be encouraged by healing methods that compliment the bodies ability to heal itself, without harm.

Therefore, instead of synthetic chemicals (often extortionately priced and hazardous) being offered by the NHS, it should be aiming to 'heal' people before they get ill, as the ancient cultures did, by creating situations where non-invasive, non-chemical based practices become the norm. Adherences to herbal remedies need to be re-employed which are still widely used the globe over, especially and including **'Ayurvedic herbal medicines' (36)**.

People need to also be educated in this 'science of life' subject, so they can work out for themselves what foods are good/bad for them on the individual level, since we can all be categorised into certain body types, such as Vatta, Pitta and so on, and which govern our bodies reactions to foods and guide choices in lifestyle. Many healing methods could be used, and the NHS only needs the right structure to allow them to operate freely without hindrance, funded by the state.

If the state does not want to fund such healing remedies, then it should allow the practitioners to be exempt from ALL taxes, including council tax and rent, otherwise they will not be able to survive, since **the art of healing is not to seek profit**. The fact that preventative and curative methods are not being widely funded by the state only bears weight to voices that claim the NHS is controlled by BIG PHARMA, and has no intention of healing people, and instead only looks to prolong illness for greater profit, much to the disadvantage of the lower social classes.

Other factors that should be included that effect public health, is a communities/ individual's exposure to outside influences out of their control, examples include;

- The 'scandalous' adding of poisons to water (such as Fluoride), linked to obesity, diabetes, osteosarcoma, osteoporosis, neural brain transmitter damage and much

more. **PLEASE READ MY ARTICLE (37)** on the debate over Fluoride, submitted with this consultation response.

- The (poisons) additives within foods and drinks such as excitotoxins including Mono Sodium Glutamate (MSG –linked to brain damage) and ASPARTAME, an exceptionally toxic substance being marketed directly to the children, and which has been linked strongly to brain cancers, obesity, and much more. **PLEASE READ MY ARTICLE (38)** on the debate over Aspartame, submitted with this consultation response.
- **Weather Sensitivity**: The very real and documented effect changes in weather have on the bodies' release of hormones and its direct effect on brain chemistry, leading to many conditions labelled in the modern world as 'mental illness'. I have done extensive research into this area myself, and have completed one ground breaking pioneering study into the effects the weather have on human health, particularly sleep. **I am willing to share this study with the working group on request (39)**.
- **Electrical Hypersensitivity**: The highly damaging effect of PHONE MASTS, being linked to cancers, and all sorts of conditions detailed in the growing awareness of Electrical Hypersensitivity **(40)**. This also raises VERY SERIOUS issues about the TETRA system, now being widely used by the police force in the UK **(41)**.
- **Air conditioners**, can now be linked to increases in stress hormones, and changes in brain chemical functioning, leading to increased levels of mental illness and the fabled 'sick building syndrome', however, I need time and funding to prove it!
- The prolonged effect of '**CHEMTRAILS**' over whole communities, where research has clearly shown that the poisons present within the jet fuel directly effect the air we breathe **(42)**.
- The serious burden on **mental health**, (due to many factors that are avoidable), particularly for those who do not accept the herd mentality. It is becoming widely accepted that the way we 'think' and 'feel' (our well-being) directly effect's our bodies ability to regulate 'dis-ease', and therefore must not be excluded from the factors effecting 'public health'. Anything that reduces an individuals 'feel good factor' should be identified as 'promoters' of mental illness **(43)**.
- The (poisons) **pharmaceutical drugs** - given by the NHS - to 'treat' dis-ease – especially mental illness, instead of looking to cures and educating the individual on better holistic ways to heal themselves, without the need for synthetic poisons. It is becoming widely accepted that the toxins introduced by the medical industry under the guise of healing actually over-burden the body, leading it to a reduced level of health overall, increasing the need for more pills or pills to relieve the side effects of the original drugs etc **(44 - 47)**.
- The curse of the **white powders**. Once heralded as scientific breakthroughs the synthetic white powders can now be exposed as toxic hazards to health. These include, Fluoride, Aspartame, synthetic salt, processed bleached sugar, bleached white flour, talcum powder, cocaine, MSG and many more. These powders are widely consumed by – in particular - the lower social classes, and they do so without the knowledge of the harm they cause. Please let me detail each one in turn to allow the public to truly understand the harm they cause, research is what I desire to carry out.
- **Chemicals** within our care products such as Sodium Laureth Sulphate and Propylene Glycol linked directly to causing illness **(48, 49)**.

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 danger of consuming **Genetically Modified foods**, that have not been thoroughly tested, and in real terms are unnecessary.
- **Mercury**, present in vaccines and amalgams are proven hazards and need to be abolished immediately **(50-58).**
- **Structures** (such as high rise flats) distorting the earths natural energy system commonly known as ley lines or earth meridians, which not surprisingly effect the lower social classes disproportionately. The ancient cultures - including the far eastern cultures - have long recognised the energy grid system, where terms such as 'dragon lines' were used to explain their power. Many years ago, the 'elite' within the UK actually employed many far eastern experts to ensure that their manor houses were placed in locations that complimented this energy grid, and thereby benefiting from the 'flow of energy'. It is time that we recognised the damage being done to the communities within the UK, who have these energy systems distorted and damaged by dubious structures as mentioned above **(59)**.
- **Large scale tragedies**, including 911 and 7/7 as events that have caused immense confusion and increases in **mental illness** amongst the population. Particularly amongst those who see these events as 'state controlled', which is a growing number **globally (60-66).**

Such factors (above) must be included when we consider what directly influences the way our own bodies can fight dis-ease, and therefore are absolutely important for public health.

3. Prevention of infectious diseases through vaccination

Some countries[2] 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?

NO absolutely NOT, policies for compulsory vaccination should never be introduced, and can never be justified, and the only situation where this is justified have been detailed in my response to Question 4.

For example, in the recent case with the 'suggested' rise in Mumps in Scotland, a closer look shows that the data itself is *possibly* flawed. It is clear that from when the doctors were encouraged to report cases of Mumps, in the years that show the huge increases, they were also given financial incentive to do so **(1)**. This in seriously UNETHICAL, and misleads the public, distorts the data, as well as increasing profits for orthodox doctors. Note, as a student, I would never have been allowed to offer financial incentive to participants to take part in any project, as it was quite rightly pointed out that, data would then be BIASED.
Also, there is a problem between getting clear 'reported cases' and 'confirmed cases'. There is so much distrust in the medical world today (and its state apparatus) that even if the 'confirmed cases' show the increase to be real, many people would still not trust this conclusion, and see it as a method to scare people into conformity.
Can this pattern also be applied to the recent scare stories about the rise in Measles in the UK?

---

[2] Countries with mandatory vaccination policies include the USA and France. In these countries children must have received certain vaccines before they can start school.

Note, there does seem to have been a serious erosion of scientific knowledge amongst the lower social classes, which only adds to the effect of scare stories, since the majority are unable (un-skilled) to investigate claims themselves. We are missing a true leader in health in the UK, and await the emergence of a truly trustworthy research group, to tell us the facts and give us a full picture of any health related topic.

A much better method would be to allow, truly independent research bodies, (if they exist I am unaware of them at present) that in no way are linked to the state or Big Pharma, to carry out research into dis-eases to provide a TRUE picture of incidence. Once again the majority of people will never trust the research emanating from the state, since it is too heavily linked to the NHS, and therefore major contracts with Big Pharma and vaccines.

The need to create herd immunity can be simply achieved by changing the way the medical industry operates, where instead of creating new dis-eases to control dis-eases, money should be pumped into raising children's immunity through diet and awareness of their own healing abilities, with 'no strings' attached funding (apart from reporting progress) from the state.

I would personally prefer to see all people trained fully on healthy diets, and healing methods (that are common in many other countries) that can raise the children's immune system to a level where vaccines are not needed.
As pointed out in Q2, this education needs to be supported by a whole raft of policies that remove taxation from the people, thereby reducing the strong work ethic (particularly amongst the lower social classes) increasing their WILL to eat healthily and improving their own quality of life -without being exploited.

However, it gives me great pain to concede that this does not rule out the potential for bio-terrorism (possibly even created by the state itself) to justify the use of vaccines if there is an agenda to vaccinate children irrespective of the public's wishes, particularly if very powerful corporations who control the vaccine pools are losing profits. I make no accusations, and am simply raising the scenarios.

I do not have an ultimate answer to regulate such activities (state bio- terrorism) apart from what I have suggested in Q4, including mass education and awareness.

> **Are there cases where the vaccination of children against the wishes of their parents could be justified? If so, what are they?**

NO, NEVER! The parent must retain the right over the child ALWAYS, unless the scenario described in Question 4 is allowed to occur.

The right to vaccinate or not should remain with the parents of children, and every parent must be told the truth about vaccines, including its dangers, before they opt for them. This true spreading of knowledge must be done at the community level, where special attention is given to talk to the people on their terms in a language they feel comfortable with, otherwise there is high risk of them seeing any initiative as another brainwashing exercise. Strong adherence to neutrality and the facts must be used.

The mercury in many vaccines is highly damaging, where even the EU are looking to ban Mercury outright from vaccines **(2)**, however this has not yet reached the radar of the public, and is therefore evidence for the need for mass education programs for the community.

This mass education needs to include the many INDEPENDENT voices **(3, 4, 5, 6)** speaking out about the dangers overall with vaccines whose voices deserve to be heard by the community, their websites and literature should become as mainstream as the 'state voices' which seem to have infected the media in an altogether unbalanced/biased manner.

I assume that many within the medical and media industries will accuse me of not giving a fair or balanced view of the way messages reach the people. It can be argued that if a media organisation - such as the BBC - has published an article on the dangers of mercury, then they have done their job. I do not agree with this, in fact strongly disagree. A message in the interest of public health must be given at the grass-roots level, where each and every person has been given the opportunity to ask questions and track progress (research) themselves, without having to be a scientist.
Many parents (not enough) are now thankfully doing their own research into the damaging effects of vaccinations, and if 'the state' demand children be vaccinated, this will lead to yet more evidence that we are being dumbed down, where we and our children are being treated like cattle.

There are serious human rights issues here also; at what stage does the state become so powerful that the peoples voice is no longer heard? Choice should mean choice, and it should be enshrined in human rights. Every individual should be openly and honestly given the FREE WILL to decide whether to vaccinate or not, and this should be backed up fully and comprehensibly with information awareness.

Further, without informed choice the people are being treated like cattle, and instead of forced vaccination, the state should suggest that if you do not take up any vaccination programs then any damage/death is your own responsibility, after EVERYONE has been educated on both sides of the debate, fully, honestly, openly and transparently.

Many parents are already (not enough) taking their own measures to protect their children. However, this is dependent on the parents 'social class', where those from the lower social classes are bullied by the herd mentality (detailed in Q2) to do as they are told, enforced by scare stories from the state. Those that refuse to follow the herd become scorned upon, and if the state prevails, become excluded from mainstream activities.

The situation we see emerging in the United States and France, where children are refused admission to schools if they are not vaccinated, is seriously unethical, unjust and unfair. If a parent has been provided with open honest dialogue about vaccines and then chooses not to opt for them, how can it be justified to remove services that they have already paid for through the (unjust) tax system? Instead their contribution to the tax system should be quantified and pooled with others to look to creating a separate system, where they can operate in true freedom, and health, with out the pressure of state controlled vaccine programs. **Those who opt to refuse any vaccine program should be provided with equal resources to set up separate schools and systems, so they are not disadvantaged or 'bullied' into vaccinating by the state or the herd.**

Perhaps if policies were designed to support those who refuse vaccination for their children, we would see whole sections of society refusing them also. This in turn would

create an unacceptable climate for (and ONLY for) the Pharmaceuticals and those profiting from them. However, it could see the emergence of a truly empowered and 'people' friendly society, one to live along side the illness infested 'modern world'.

Many people would respect the true choice being offered, and care little for the loss to the Big Pharma, who profit in the Billions today anyway.

So, there needs to be REAL TRUE health promotion to address this glaring lack of knowledge amongst the people, particularly the working classes. Health promotion is the KEY here;

Thomas Jefferson once said that a government was 'republican' to the extent that it 'embodied' the will of the people, and added an important proviso, that the public had to be informed. Otherwise, citizens 'could not be trusted with their own government.'

4. 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?

It is becoming clear to many within the UK that there is a deliberate and sustained attack on what we are allowed to perceive as true liberty, and all this within a system that is rooted on injustice and exploitation, the capitalist way.
Therefore, when we hear terms such as 'forced quarantine' rightly so, many become seriously mentally disturbed.

With regards to forced quarantine, in the event of a pandemic or epidemic, perhaps a 'universally legal' method of operating (and humane) could include allowing those who refuse (choose not) to be vaccinated **safe passage to locations outside the perimeters of the main cities**. Let me explain.

If we look at detail at the way the populations are moving, we can see that there is a clear movement into the main cities **(1)**. Therefore, it should be the cities themselves that become quarantined, and not the people. If we take the UK, we have several major cities, such as London and Birmingham.
If there is such a serious out break, whether instigated by nature, or by other devious means **(2)**, it should be set out in policy that it is the cities themselves that would become quarantined, and not the people.

A situation would quickly occur where we see those who want to return back to nature and health leaving the cities BY CHOICE, and those who prefer to trust the state remain in the cities BY CHOICE. There would be a compensatory net movement of people, so those who leave the cities, by choice (without getting vaccinated), would be replaced by those who enter/remain in the cities by choice, who then can also be vaccinated – even against their wishes.

If we are to believe that there is a TRUE order to the Universe (and I do), then we must accept the concept of FREE WILL. It must be left to each and every individual to decide for themselves whether they allow the state to control their lives or not. And if they choose to remain free, the state must fund their transition to return back to the ways of their elders, a way that has continually been eroded and destroyed by the state. This must be addressed within policy.

Those who leave the cities would then be free to operate outside the city perimeters, and if they do fall foul to any dis-ease, it will be their responsibility, and they themselves will not be able to infect those within the cities, since the cities will be quarantined.

As a bonus those outside the city perimeters could return back to the way ancient cultures lived, and the wisest amongst them would have already built eco-villages that incorporate modern eco-friendly sustainable technology such as free energy devices (solar panels and others we are unaware of at present). They would grow their own food and create their own economies based on LOVE and fairness, instead of control and exploitation.

Note, I am aware of a growing body of factual research and evidence that shows perhaps all major infectious diseases are the result of state/military bio-terrorism **(2)**, which is used to justify the taking away of liberties, and the introduction of foreign substances to the public, to reduce their immune systems and to create illness. If there is any doubt, leave it out!

I like many others would prefer to let the UNIVERSE govern when we leave this planet, as I personally do not fear death; therefore, I have no fear of disease or infection, and would fight these ills with ancient medicine anyway. I have faith, and trust that there is a grand design (more elevated than the one at present) for humanity.

Also there is strong emerging evidence to show that the recent outbreaks of various diseases particularly amongst animals, is yet another method being used by multinationals to actually control and own the global market of these livestock **(3)**. If you look carefully there is already one company that owns the market of beef for the WORLD, and it looks like there is as much chaos being created to ensure that one company owns the rights to supply for chicken also. If this is true, and we can only truly find out with INDEPENDENT UNBIASED research, then this is simply EVIL, and we should not encourage people to follow the states direction any longer, where instead we encourage people to choose for themselves.

> **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?**

First and foremost the Military Industrial Complex (MIC) 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.

Independent medical research institutes should have the right to access all the held diseases within the military so they can independently catalogue and identify what strains they hold. Then if/when there is an outbreak of anything (like the anthrax sent in the mail post 911 – linked to the US military), the independent medical institute can assess whether it is a strain held by the military or a new one, created by nature herself.

Note, I feel strongly that ALL vials of 'Tamiflu' should be tested randomly for the strain of 'Spanish Flu' that the military have admitted recently recreating, **(4, 5)** before there is mass panic and millions inoculate themselves, or as the vials are sent out to areas, the INDEPENDENT research institute, must select at random vials to test. I cannot stress this more.

I know this request will fall onto deaf ears and I will be labelled a crackpot, however, I am well backed up by many independent researchers globally, so I am confident in requesting the above, and can handle whatever the media or state label me as. I will speak the truth until I leave this planet.

We should NEVER interfere with another countries ability to control its own outbreaks. Instead, multinationals and governments should expose their own financial benefits (if any) to the outbreak, particularly with regards to global markets, for example, who really benefits from Bird Flu and chicken production, foot and mouth disease and Beef production, and any other similar factors.

If a company profits from an outbreak, by becoming the only 'so called' safe supplier, they should make this public knowledge, as well as any links they may have to the military, through their board of management and known personnel. The public record must be upheld.

If an outbreak occurs in other countries, I would refer back to the scenario of quarantined cities, where anyone leaving/entering them should be screened, but the state should not interfere with other countries at all, instead it should consolidate resources to its own borders, protecting its own people (those who choose to be quarantined), and who by CHOICE live within the quarantined areas.

Those outside the quarantined areas should be told of the outbreak liberating/empowering them to take their own measures (if any) to avoid contraction. It's a risk that many are prepared to take in order to remain FREE.

I sited the example of the so-called foot and mouth disease amongst our cows. This many people agree, is simply the cow cold **(6)** and how it became a mass problem is beyond comprehension, particularly amongst farmers.
It only lends support for many voices suggesting that the outbreak was dealt with to maximise profit, **(7)**.
If this was such a problem, then how was it possible that infected cows were taken by the UK military and put into cold storage, before the ILLEGAL war in Iraq? If such cows were being slaughtered due to 'risk of infection, something does not seem right here. A better method would have been to vaccinate the cows within the quarantined areas, or amongst those farmers that CHOSE to vaccinate and to leave the others who CHOSE not

to vaccinate their herds to fend off the cow cold for themselves. Note, that those cows that survive outside the quarantined areas would in effect become super cows! Able to fight any dis-ease that nature (or the MIC) presents.

> **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.[3] Are new measures needed to monitor and control the spread of infectious diseases? If so, what would be promising strategies?**

NO, no new measures should be considered. I can see that this will only lend support to the emerging terrifying state controlled implantable microchip **(8)**, which in my opinion will mean the death to humanity, as we know it.

For the public record, many others and I are directly opposed to this brave new world of technical implants, which is clearly the work of darker forces. Call me what you like, that's what I believe and I will maintain my stance.

We are not robots and we are not cattle. I can see that the implantable microchip may present the ultimate monitoring (literally) and control method of diseases, but again, people must CHOOSE this as an option, and by doing so, designate themselves as property of the state, quarantined within the cities scenario.

If there is a question of screening goods/people/cattle before they enter quarantined cities, then maybe the states insistence on monitoring is valid. However, those who choose to live outside the cities should be allowed to travel freely, without monitoring, control or screening, as long as they do not enter the quarantined cities (unless by choice).

Liberty must be maintained at all costs, even if it means excluding people from the coming advances that technology (and outside forces, **9**) may offer very soon within the cities, and only open to those who choose to give up their personal sovereignty to the state, i.e. choose to get microchipped.

A note here to point out that the state should support communities that CHOOSE to live outside the quarantined cities NOW, to ensure they are provided with the needed skills to live independently from the state. If you don't feel this is right, then ask yourselves, what are 'state benefits' for, if only to erode a person's ability to live truly independently. When the state benefits were introduced/negotiated it was to entice the independent people to allow the state to control aspects of their lives, in return for 'benefits'. The state forced the people to live like cattle by providing such state benefits, so now; the state must provide real opportunities for people to live like HUMANS, free, and independent once again with MOTHER NATURE, (how we lived before the emergence of the state).

---

[3] USA National Intelligence Council (2000) *The Global Infectious Disease Threat and Its Implications for the United States – Factors affecting growth and spread: International trade and commerce*, available at: www.cia.gov/cia/reports/nie/report/nie99-17d.html, accessed on: 19 Apr 2006.

Initiatives for Eco-villages must be fully supported before the terrible sweep of pandemics, which we are being warned will happen ANY TIME SOON! Please see reason, and support those with the WILL to survive.

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

Once again, I would suggest that such 'mandatory' (police state) measures should ONLY be introduced when the cities become separate and quarantined. Then those who are within the city limits cannot argue with any 'mandatory' methods of testing, screening, monitoring, tracking, controlling, experimenting etc, as they will be within the quarantined areas by CHOICE, and would have given over their personal sovereignty to the state and its instance on total control.

However, until the quarantined cities exist, under NO circumstances must there be mandatory testing. I am aware that many of my own people from the Indian sub-continent underwent mandatory testing for TB before they were allowed to enter the UK, back in the early 40-50s. Such measures were proven beyond doubt to be pointless, since the very people being tested, contracted TB from the indigenous peoples of the UK AFTER they settled here, much to the delight of the political leaders of the time, who twisted the facts to make the Asians look like pusses of poison, and this demonisation continues today, and for many 'external peoples' entering the UK. Politics needs to change, and I offer my services to ensure it does, IN POLICY.

5. 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?**

First and foremost all preventable factors that are proven to increase obesity in humans must be removed from the population. Factors such as Fluoride **(1, 2)** and Aspartame **(3, 4)**, which contrary to the 'state sponsored' medical stance, have been shown to be HIGHLY damaging including the causation of obesity.

An individual can only live in a way that they have been shown to, which is also heavily controlled by their peers, as pointed out earlier (Q2) with the 'gate keeping herd mentality. Therefore, the state must provide REAL training sessions for ALL people (especially those with ears to listen) on ways and methods of reducing the obese culture, at no cost to the individual. I would go so far as to suggest that policy must be amended as soon as possible to start this re-education within the community.

However, this also needs to be backed up by real life changing policies that eliminate the exploitation of people, including the removal of taxes and the need to 'get a job'.

Then, those who still choose to live in unhealthy ways, (after all known external factors have been taken out of society such as Fluoride & Aspartame) do so at their own peril. Those who choose the healthy way, would benefit, and in time encourage their own communities to change, particularly at the grass-roots level. The greatest compliment is

and always will be imitation; (change by example), therefore, we must become the change we are looking for, as communities and individuals, but this cannot happen overnight and without the support of the state or CHANGES IN POLICY.

Once upon a time, the Health Education Authority was really making inroads to reduce ills, and increase health knowledge with real health promotion, however, a nasty/nanny state took over and destroyed its ability to truly inform - particularly those at the bottom of the socio-economic pile – about real strategies to improve their own health. In fact it was totally closed down, and in its place is an 'out of reach' academic orientated thing, totally out of reach of the common people.

This disgraceful situation should be reversed and a similar 'grass-roots organisation (like the HEA) should be re-introduced with GUSTO, and urgency, to balance the way media has taken over this role, where the media is guilty continually of sending out blatant misleading messages, dis-empowering the uneducated to make truly informed decisions about their own health.

At one stage the Commission for Patient and Public Involvement in Health (CPPIH) was put forward as this new link the people would have to change the way the health delivery operates, however, after having experienced its forums myself, I agree (for once) with Parliament, that there needs to be radical overhauls and changes to both the way it operates and its remit. We need instead truly 'people –grassroots – orientated' public forums, where people are protected (NO FEAR) to speak their truths and to be free to speak openly and frankly about what they think is reducing health. These public forums need to be backed up strongly in policy and the role of administrating them should go to an independent group of community specialists, with proven ability to reach out to all communities.

There needs to be no less than a critical intervention into reality for many people, who at present feel powerless to change their own circumstances. They are blatantly prevented in their own process of inquiry by structures established and regulated by the 'oppressors' who strictly gate keep legitimate dialogue and/or clarification of known truths, particularly health information.

The new forums need to be designed so people who attend them can access the wealth of medical information on BOTH sides of the debate about many issues including obesity, where specialists can provide the information in a people friendly manner, not in a situation where people need to conform to rigid structured stuffy committee style meetings (wearing shirts and ties), before they even get a look in. These types of forums have been consistently shown to be flawed, and only give power to those trained in the ways of corporateness, totally inadequate for people at the grass roots.

> **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?**

First and foremost, a true honest look at the causes. This should involve accurate unbiased research, that is being done, but is being censored by Big Pharma, and its seriously powerful legal support, and (sorry to say this), Universities who are unwilling to

go against what Big Pharma says in case they loose funding for research that is guided and controlled by Big Pharma.

RESEARCH is KEY, and it must be supported once again by the state IN POLICY. I reject the establishment of research excellence centres, being created by the higher education white paper, EVERY University must be funded to carry out research, and to encourage its students to LOOK OUTSIDE the box, for creative life changing theses. That is what Education is for.

An area that must be exposed is the damage being caused by Fluoride and Aspartame (as repeatedly pointed out earlier), where evidence is showing clearly that they lead to obesity, as well as Diabetes and many other ills that are AVOIDABLE.

Aspartame, is exceptionally dangerous for humans, and should be banned IMMEDIATELY, as should fluoridating the water. Fluoride is very toxic for humans, and destroys the very amino acids needed for true body fat regulation. I will go on the public record to prove this. I will accept any ridicule and damnation to tell the truth once and for all publicly. Hydrogenated fats must also be banned.

Specific criteria for developing appropriate policies should include independent unbiased research on each factor known and unknown to increase/decrease obesity. Therefore ALL the ingredients in food today should be looked at again, as well as providing people with alternative methods of nutrition including access to organic foods, and knowledge on how to grow their own.

Obesity has increased hugely due to the sedentary way of life the state has encouraged, by dis-empowering people from going out into the fields to grow their own food. The policies should change this state dependency, but by doing so with transitional steps, so the poor people are not told to fend for themselves (as many are doing today anyway). We should all be empowered to return to simpler more active ways of living and we would then see our obesity problem disappear. We would also become happier, and our intelligence would improve vastly as a people, and a great country. The UK is a shadow of what it used to be, and that's coming from an ethnic person.

I cannot guarantee obesity to reduce amongst those who choose to live within the controlled cities (in my quarantined scenario), therefore, methods should be looked at that create a responsibility for people to grow a percentage of their own food on ANY available land within the cities. I wonder why this is not done already? How many times have you been on a train, or a bus, looked out the window and seen nothing but wasted land? ANY available land, with soil and access must be used to grow food.

So, policies for a reduction in state control, and an increase in people power, to empower them to loose weight in creative and fun ways such as growing their own food, and eating ONLY organic foods, produced by themselves, in their own country.
Also, a strong initiative to create community education centres to aid the spreading of skills and knowledge to make this happen (more on this later).

> **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?**

Parents should be informed about how lifestyle damages their body's ability to regulate itself. T.V. in my opinion (and backed by sound research, **(5)** is the real culprit here. The way media controls the people has a lot to answer for the way our children and fellow people live today. We must break this link if we are to see a truly healthy population.

The state should start regulating the T.V as soon as possible to FORCE the media companies to air at least 70% of all programs that look honestly (without capitalist propaganda) at how we can improve our own lives. We see this is already starting to occur where truly honourable people are trying to make sure that 'junk food adverts' are not aired at times when children are watching the 'evil eye' **(6, 7).**

Those individuals that refuse to accept life improving T.V. programs (can't think why they would) should be given the option to continue watching the garbage that has taken over the airwaves, but they should not be allowed to stop the new T.V programs being aired, possibly in a separate T.V channel, funded and supported by the STATE, with as much opportunity to reach the masses as the few major media corporations present today.

The state should also be obliged to fund independent unbiased research to prove that the waves emitted by the TV and other such devices are harmful to our health, and furthermore they should provide alternatives, including a return back to community theatres and plays, where everyone can join in to create their own 'media'. The state should be compelled to support this in EVERY community with the massive profits they gain yearly from our taxes.

I personally do not want to see token projects set up that only benefit small groups in one or two areas, which no one finds out about until they have been discontinued. Instead, there needs to be a widely spread strategy for EVERYONE. The idea of centres of community education can and should be introduced where TRULY INDEPENDENT groups, whose sole aim is TRUTH, TRUST and EDUCATION, regulate all projects. There should be a central database of knowledge similar to the Internet but separate and accessible by all (including the Internet). ALL areas of life must be covered, and every side must be given the opportunity to state their truths.

The food industry is controlled and sustained by profits, due to the system they operate within (capitalist). Profits are gained by creating cheap low quality food that tastes good, and that can be mass-produced. How far must the food industry be forced to return back to organically HOME grown food, that in turn begs the people to look again at their lifestyles, such as use of the evil microwave.

This is a big area that needs serious informed debate and accurate robust independent research. We MUST stop the influence of the DNA destroying technologies such as GM food, and MONSANTO should be closed down forever, not split up into sister companies, like IG Farben (Bayer) of NAZI Germany was, (EVIL to the top degree).

The food industry should also be forced by the state to contribute to the new strategy of education through community engagement. The schools should be used as places for this strategy to be realised as well as community purpose built theatres (independent

centres of education) that can be used by travelling groups to spread truth and knowledge. Parents should at every point be given full details of events and encouraged to attend by letting them off paying tax etc for the days when the events are being held.

> **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?**

Taking into account that the Government itself is negligent in allowing poisons such as Fluoride and Aspartame into the public domain, why then should the people foot the cost of putting the disease right, if that is what hospitals actually do?

The Government and BIG PHARMA should foot the cost of health care. How can a sensitive child be truly healthy if poisons and negative lifestyle inducements are bombarding them? Take the simple examples of the TV, Fluoride in the water, lack of PE at School (reduced further by the nanny state), and many more.

There should NEVER be a policy that deny's people access to true health measures. In my experience, the vast majority of people are simply waiting for real healers to provide them with information on how they themselves can improve their own lives. People simply do not trust doctors or their synthetic medicines and yet are given no other option but too. There is no question here of people being anti-health measures. They have been forced into the state of un-healthiness by many factors out of their control; therefore, we should seek to heal them in many ways. I would suggest that the policy to support eco-villages be used creatively to provide the most ill with respite from their lives and factors that are killing them. They should be given access to all sorts of healing methods, not just super-hospitals, stationed in cities, where the access will soon be controlled by the **implantable microchip**.

6. 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?**

It is wrongly stated that the health effects of smoking have been known for a long time, I would re-state this as the health effects of smoking have been witnessed since the Pharmaceuticals took over the way tobacco is grown and produced, and can be tracked to around the 1950s ONLY **(1)**.

This in itself is a major reason for the delayed response for 'comprehensive' measures, since the tobacco industry itself has polluted the healing plant, which for many years has been smoked by many ancient communities, who still smoke and do so with little ill health effects. Its all about profit, the governments have been guilty of allowing the

adulterated tobacco onto the market, even after studies showed that this poisonous version was bad for health (a killer), to ensure that the owners of the companies did not loose profit.

There are many strategies that can really change the way tobacco itself is viewed, and also reduce the rates of illness caused by specific grades of tobacco within the population.

Serious INDEPENDENT studies need to look again at the interaction to health of Pharma grade tobacco and totally organically grown tobacco.
Pharma tobacco has around 600+ additives **(2)** (WHY?) whereas organic tobacco has 0 (zero) additives **(3, 4)**. Something is being missed here once again by so called researchers, but is reaching the radar of truly honourable researchers. **(5)**.

I propose that a study (double blind) is carried out immediately to see if there are any changes (both perceived and real) in the health of smokers, with one group taking Pharma grade (with 600+ additives) and one taking organic tobacco (with zero additives). I believe the results will speak for themselves, and I challenge you all (working group) to stand up and speak out if what I'm hinting at is born out in the results. Factors to measure include, changes in kidney filtration rate, effects on the Liver, heart and lungs. Also the perceived change in health of the smoker, the ability to not smoke, or to only do so when they choose, i.e. frequency of urge to smoke, and much more, measured scientifically and INDEPENDANTLY of the Pharma controlled tobacco company's.

Tobacco has been smoked for thousands of years in many ancient cultures, many of whom have NOT resorted to the poisonous Pharma grade, and who still use the same tobacco that has been used for thousands of years in rituals to this day.

To what extent do the ills from organic tobacco affect these communities? Where is the research? Who is covering up this glaring gap in research? Why should we accept the states insistence in social control when the very reasons for the control are flawed?

I see a picture building here - find out what the humans like to enjoy, poison it, and then force them to stop taking it due to the 'measured' adverse health effects. An easy and straightforward way to again, increase dependency on the state, and to control the humans, by taking away liberties based on flawed research. Perfect and devious.

> **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?**

YES, they should be prosecuted and publicly shamed. However, caution needs to be exercised when labelling tobacco companies as all the same.

The main large multinational players are all the same, as the same people own them! However, smaller companies that only supply organic produce must not be labelled in the same way. Again, research is KEY here to prove what I'm saying.

The main poisonous tobacco brands should also be forced to support the growing of pure organic tobacco within every country, and they should be forced to contribute to the costs of correcting health problems born from taking their poisons. **This should be policy!**

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?

NO, the real culprits should be funding any short fall within the health system, i.e. Big Pharma. Once there is adequate funding, the Big Pharma must also be forced to fund UNBIASED health promotion, and even promote products that it does not produce, i.e. ORGANIC TOBACCO.

There must be a balance to reverse the evils these companies have orchestrated for over 70yrs to date.

It is well known that Fluoride whilst making the bones stronger, cause them to become brittle, therefore, if the state insists on keeping such poisons in our water supply, then they should also be prepared to foot the health cost of damage that occurs to people doing sports.

If we are to encourage people to live active lives, how can we then say to them that they are responsibly if they break a bone etc? What backward logic is this?

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?

Once again, the liberties of humans are being taken away, particularly from ethnic groups whom culturally smoke tobacco, either in pipes or hookahs, or even just the leaf itself, and in many cultures tobacco is seen as a healing plant! Any policy that denies an ancient rite, must be opposed, and I would urge those with the WILL to come forward and challenge these police state measures in policy, by pointing out that it is racially discriminative to deny the habit of smoking ORGANIC additive free tobacco, anywhere.

The state should be imposing sanctions on the producers of tobacco, to enforce them to take out the additives, so ALL tobacco is 100% additive FREE. Those companies that refuse to grow ONLY 100% additive free tobacco should be banned by the state from selling products anywhere within our UK borders.

Why not go one step further and agree that tobacco is produced within our own borders ONLY, slashing the price and guaranteeing 100% additive free. That is a role I would like the state to play, and just think of the many jobs that would be created, and the active role people could play, again reducing obesity.

Once this picture has been reached, it would not be necessary to target more police state measures on the young people, who whether they chose to smoke or not, would be protected in POLICY from harmful grades of tobacco.

7. 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?

Once again we come across a method of social control that is flawed.
The consumption of alcohol goes back well into the thousands of years, with products such as Mead being refuted as enjoyed by man and gods alike **(1)**. This product was made from honey, which has shown time and time again to be a healing product **(2)**. However, today the main beverages are produced using mechanical methods that mass-produce toxic chemical based drinks.

Like tobacco, this opens a big can of worms. If an individual insists on drinking, and that habit is causing them and others harm, to what extent is the harm being caused by the cheap quality chemical based beverages, (as opposed to the alcohol itself or the individuals insistence on habit)?

Studies need to be carried out that look at drinkers who only take multinational cheap mass produced alcohol, and those who only drink organic locally produced alcohol such as MEAD.

The design for clarity is here, we only need support to test and prove/disprove the hypothesis: organic alcoholic beverages are safer and healthier than mass-produced chemical alcohol beverages, discuss.

How can we investigate it if we are never funded to carry out honest unbiased research? I would like to see ONLY ORGANIC alcohol being produced in the UK, for sale in the UK. If this is really about public health, why hasn't the state insisted on this already? Organic locally produced alcohol has never harmed anyone, and apparently there is little hangover too. Germany insists on pure beers **(3)** and has even gone on the record to state that they do not get vicious hangovers witnessed by the British **(4)**.

What are the true effects of the additives and chemicals that are added to the alcohol by the multinationals? Do they directly effect our body's own ability to process it, by making too much work for the liver, again effecting the body's ability to stay healthy?

Whatever the outcome of such research, and I would like to spear head its design, there also needs to be real support for those who drink excessively.

The individual's body mind and spirit need to be healed. If it works for drug (cocaine/crack) addicts going to Buddhist retreats in the Himalayas, then why not holistic retreats run by coalitions of healers in the UK for drinkers?

Research is also KEY here. Without the real causes of why a person wants to drink, how can they be fully cured? There is some sort of interaction between the brain chemicals and the weather, however, how are researchers like me going to ever prove it, if the paradigm is fixed around 'drinkers' do it to themselves, and should therefore be punished? I have never met an alcoholic that is one by choice; they are ill, and need healing.

I request humbly that funding be provided so I can show that it is the way their brain chemicals behave when the weather changes that increases their risk of relapse beyond control.

I would also suggest that those who do drink excessively have been damaged by this unjust (capitalist) system, and perhaps have a serious trauma they have not come to terms with, which again would be dealt with in a dedicated healing retreat. I wonder if HRH Prince of Wales would work with us to create this healing retreat, which would also add robust research to the direction he is advocating we follow, alternative therapies?

There is an alcoholic who lives over the road from me, and I watch him daily destroying himself, which makes me feel like I have failed him. His background is from the original gypsy people that were forced to settle here years ago, and it makes me again realise that groups are being discriminated against by the system. His people are nomads, they are most happy when they are free (like most of us) so perhaps those who are alcoholic and descended from the gypsy peoples should make a direct claim of racial discrimination about the way the system is designed and enforced. Many would suggest it's simply evil. I would support any groups that want to start this re-negotiation of rights, and they only need contact me, if they still exist.

All alcoholics obviously have a problem that needs dedicated support and care to solve, which seem to go unnoticed by the states apparatus, who look to short term solutions. I was always told that if there is a problem, looking to deal with the 'branches' was not long-term; dealing with the ROOT causes was and still is the most effective healing method. There is no policy for healing retreats, no policy to investigate fully the individuals need for a new way of life. The individual needs to be given the option to be taken out of the system, to a holistic retreat in the countryside where real healing can take place.

What's needed is real organic herbal medicine (such as Ayurvedic) as well as lifestyle support, and I only need the support to prove it.

Could this be why effective measures to truly deal with alcoholics have not been forthcoming? Could it be that the state already knows why there are those who seek to remove themselves from the system, by becoming 'drunk' every day, and that true effective measures would include healing retreats and 'a changing' of system rules for these most damaged individuals.

I wish we could have true open dialogue about this.

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?

As mentioned earlier, the companies that produce alcohol should be forced to produce only locally grown organic –additive free- alcoholic beverages. They should be creating farming systems that look directly at supporting the organic farmer, and NO chemicals should be added to the products.

Retailers can help greatly by forcing the state and the multinationals into this strategy by refusing to buy and support alcohol that is mass-produced. Local pubs should have links with local producers of organic produce. However, this is doomed to fail since the average person is trying to get by in the system, and is looking to increase profit, even if its from the misery of alcoholics. I would like to see a system that changes the way people treat each other!

People should not be encouraged to consume alcohol everyday, after work and during lunch time etc, and instead should be encouraged to indulge at specific times in the week, at festivals, and ceremonies, just as it used to be.
Perhaps the state could encourage this by making alcohol free during festivals such as the solstice events, what about the ancient festival of Beltane?

Those who continue to demand alcohol every day, should be encouraged to seek help and healing from the true healers out of the cities in the healing retreats.

If they still want to drink excessively, then a strategy should be implemented where they are only exposed to high quality healing beverages, such as MEAD. Further, to ensure they are making a contribution to life, they should be encouraged to live with the producers and produce their own supply. Why not have the odd drunken master/mistress, living happily on apple cider that they have produced, on a plot of land where they CHOOSE to live! If its what they choose, who are we to impose our rules on them? If they are healthy and also become educated in moderation, why should we stop them? I think they would enjoy life again, and really appreciate the beverage once its ready to drink. Also the burdens of the state and taxes must be taken away from them, as they are obviously not made for such a lifestyle.

8. 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 disagree that fortification of foods such as flour has been accepted for some time. Quite simply the consultation structures did not really exist when this was being proposed, and instead of the common people being truly able to give an informed choice, token consultation was carried out to bring about the result that the industry required.

In my experience, there has NEVER been real debate or consultation to find out whether the people agree or not with supplementation of food or water. It has been quite literally forced on the people. Any consultation that has taken place - such as fluoridating the water - was either flawed or only carried out ON groups who wrongly claimed to be representing the majority.

I personally would like to carry out whole rafts of public consultation, and education, to once and for all decide if additives to food or water are wanted or needed. This would also include finding out whom directly financially benefits from such supplementation. Who profits from putting Fluoride into the water?

Water fluoridation has met strong opposition globally since the rise of the Internet, and our own personal ability to check the facts without any covering up of the truth. We have been strongly alerted to its negative health effects. Will this working group say publicly that fluoride is harmless, at any concentration? I have written a detailed article on the debate over Fluoride and its damning conclusion should see fluoride BANNED for good.

To my horror, I have been consuming Fluoride ever since I was born. I have witnessed whole communities suffer from epidemics of diabetes, arthritis osteosarcoma **(1)** and many more illnesses that should not be present in any human population, and as the history shows only ever effected a small percentage, however I cannot prove this, since I cannot gain access to the history of incidence of such conditions, and crave the access to prove it.

Nonetheless, I believe that this is directly attributed to the water supply, and Fluoride, as well as other poisons being added to our diet. Please help us to remove these poisons from our water, as well as the other poisons such as Prozac!!

I believe that if there is a question mark over the safety of any substance, it should be researched in detail, and excluded from the public domain until it is proven SAFE BEYOND DOUBT, without any influence from those profiting from its use. So many studies have been ignored by the UK state, and unlike other countries appropriate people never carry out consultation.

How can we expect the state funded NHS, with strong links to industry and Big Pharma to carry out consultation? Simply saying the NHS is owned by the public and therefore unbiased is a mockery to true scientific debate.

Community groups that specialise in community consultation should be pioneering the debate at the community level, with openness and transparency, access to independent unbiased research and the funding to carry out REAL consultation.

The funding must not be linked to outcomes, and instead only to processes, i.e. the percentage of people that have been reached by the consultation.

The outcome can be measured by the public voice itself.

Education is key here, without informing the people about the dangers of something, how can they then be asked to make an informed decision about it. Specific criteria should be set out where in the consultation, people must individually answer questions about the substance in question, before they be allowed to state whether they want it or not, to ensure that they are not working for the state, or profiting from making wrong decisions.

This will also make sure that people are really educated, as based on the responses, you will be able to identify if the people have truly understood what's being taught.

For example, on the 'ballot' sheet there should be questions such as, what effect does Fluoride have on the Thyroid mechanism, what effect does fluoride have on bones, what effect does fluoride have on amino acids, does fluoride effect the glucose mechanism and therefore cause diabetes? And so on. Then a final question should be, should fluoride be banned? Instead of do you want fluoride in the water to help your teeth?

The evidence of the fluoride helping teeth is again seriously flawed, and as more and more of us find out, more and more people will demand that it is removed from the water supply.

So why not change the way we operate and prove to everyone that we are open and transparent by doing consultation honestly. Then as people find out the truth about Fluoride they will see this working group as being 100% honest and HONOURABLE, something that many government agencies lost the right to many years ago. Stand up above the rest and show the people you are trustworthy and have their best interests at heart, and not profit from allegiances to the evil BIG PHARMA, and profit. I want to help you so please bring me on board. I suffer daily from seeing people ill, and only desire an opportunity to heal them with clear honest methods.

Please note there are international differences because other states would not dare lie to their people, and instead encourage the truth to be known so people can make truly informed decisions. It also has a lot to do with the way secret groups (freemasons) have operated (and profited) from keeping the public uninformed about the truth, particularly here in the UK, and instead have conspired to create a society based on the strong work ethic. Too many people are profiting from other peoples misery.

Is it a wonder that we in the UK are one of only a handful globally that still poison its people through Fluoride in the water. When is this going to change? And when is the state going to become truly honourable once again, if ever?

> **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?**

None of the above. As pointed out earlier any consultation is flawed if it is carried out by any of the states apparatus/instruments. A much better method would be to train strong individuals and groups who are fully independent, (i.e. NOT FREEMASONS) in sound community consultation methods that have been proven and are best practice (I know of many).

These groups can then be given the power to go into communities to fully inform the people about all sides of the debate. Groups such as Mental Health Media, and other such media groups should be given the role of filming and recording all the consultation that takes place, to ensure that no devious groups muscle in and destroy the consultation process. Everything must be kept open and transparent, therefore honourable people will not mind being filmed and recorded for the public record. All sides of the debate must be aired.

Then as pointed out above, when a watershed of people has been reached, people should be asked to go into voting booths set up on specific days to answer questions on

paper, or to a video camera, and then state what they want to see, Fluoride or NOT, the choice is yours.

All the information should then be collated by independent organisations, which are charged with holding the public information, that can then be analysed and the conclusions can be marketed to the people. The state must then be compelled to do the will of the people; this is what our parliament is for.

> **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?**

I fully reject this assumption that children benefit from fluoridation. The evidence is showing strongly that children are the ones most harmed by fluoride. They are affected mentally and physically.

The only case I can see when its acceptable to restrict the choice of adults to protect the children is when they are affected mentally and physically, so what does this mean for the state and the poison fluoride?

The state is poisoning the people, and its children, therefore they must be restricted to only carrying out the WILL of the people, using the methods of TRUE community consultation I detailed above. Does the state have NO shame?

I even wonder if this working group has actually reached out to the experts on fluoride on BOTH SIDES OF THE DEBATE so far? I wonder if this working group has ever heard of the Fluoride Action Network **(2)**. For me the evidence that fluoride is damaging is overwhelming.

The only scenario that I feel it's acceptable to forcefully vaccinate, fluoridate, microchip, track etc is the scenario of **'within the quarantined cites'**.
I will prey for those who decide to be quarantined, and send them all the LOVE of the universe to help them see their condition!

9. 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?**

Maybe this is a trick question, since all of the above are important. Infact the principles become secondary with a truly informed public, the first principles should be **honesty and transparency, leading to autonomy and trust.**

> **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?

Autonomy, education, consent, trust (as based on trustworthy research) on all subjects **(1)**.

In cases such as vaccinations or fluoridation parents decide on behalf of their children.

Which ideas or principles should guide parents in their decisions?

Autonomy, education, and then trust in the state to carry out our WILL.

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 debate about Aspartame.
- The Debate about mental health, what is being mental?
- The debate about low and high frequency waves.
- The debate about the implantable microchip, its dangers and implications for human rights.
- The debate about underground facilities and the Military Industrial Complex. How deep do these bases go, and who is down there? What experiments are being carried out and why are they hiding them from us? Are their people down there that need to be liberated? **(2)**.

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.