Ugly Story Proves the Media is Lying to You About Vaccines

Reprinted from Mercola.com
By Barbara Loe Fisher

On October 17, 2009 I was at the Atlanta airport on my way back to Washington, D.C. when I stopped at a newsstand.

Like most weary travelers waiting for a plane, I was looking for something to read that would give me a break from my work, which included, two weeks earlier, hosting the large Fourth International Public Conference on Vaccination for an audience of 700 concerned scientists, health care professionals, journalists, legal experts, ethicists and parents from around the world.

Suddenly, my eye caught the distorted, photo-shopped image of a baby with the word FEAR in bold letters imprinted on the baby's chest.

I paged through Wired magazine to find out who wrote the article and discovered it was a woman named Amy Wallace, one of the many journalists I had talked with in 2009, who had contacted the National Vaccine Information Center, a non-profit, educational organization I co-founded with parents of vaccine injured children in 1982.

As I scanned the article to find out why it was entitled "An Epidemic of Fear: One Man's Battle Against the Anti-Vaccine Movement," I quickly realized it was a puff piece for vaccine patent holder, Dr. Paul Offit, who alleges that vaccine injuries and deaths are largely a myth.

Then, I saw my name. And then, I saw the words, "She lies."

When All Else Fails, the Name of the Game Becomes Character Assassination...

I felt a knot in the pit of my stomach as I read the unsubstantiated, unchallenged slur made by Offit against me. And in those two words "SHE LIES," I knew that the propaganda tactic of character assassination was being used to attack the credibility of my nearly 30 years of work as a vaccine safety consumer advocate.

1. Now, I have never met Amy Wallace. We have never shaken hands or shared so much as a cup of coffee together. We had one interview on the telephone in 2009. In a sworn statement she stated that she did not use any quotes from our telephone interview in her Wired article. No, she didn't.
2. She also did not tell *Wired* readers what I told her, which is that I have always encouraged everyone to become educated about the risks of diseases and risks of vaccines and consult one or more trusted health care professionals before making an informed decision - just like every intelligent person should do before using any pharmaceutical product.

3. Instead, Ms. Wallace said she based her description of me on a speech I gave at a conference, a speech that she did not attend.

4. Nobody at *Wired* magazine called me while they were presumably fact checking Wallace's article to ask me point blank, "Dr. Offit said that you lie. Do you have a response?" Wouldn't a responsible journalist or editor have made some attempt to verify such a serious attack on another person's character? No, Dr. Offit's defamatory statement remained in the article, unchallenged.

5. I was left with two options: 1) I could ignore it; or (2) I could take action to defend my integrity.

*Suing for Libel or Slander is Not for the Faint of Heart…*

After consulting Jonathan Emord, a constitutional and libel law attorney, I selected option number two. I sought justice in a civil court, which is my constitutional privilege as an American citizen and my responsibility as the president of a non-profit organization, whose supporters depend upon the accuracy, honesty and integrity of what I say and do, as does everyone I know.

Requesting a jury trial in a U.S. civil court to sue for slander or libel is not for the faint of heart. You have to review and be prepared to defend the truthfulness of every statement you have ever made and every action you have ever taken in your life. You, your family, friends and colleagues could be subpoenaed and drawn into a potentially very public, drawn-out battle, especially if those you are suing are wealthy, influential and politically connected.

I had never sued anyone before and I certainly never thought I would find it necessary to sue a journalist. The majority of journalists I have worked with over the years have been honest men and women, who have taken care to do their research and fairly report the facts without prejudice, including accurately describing who I am and what I do.

This was different. I had never been defamed before and I knew I had no choice but to take steps to defend my integrity.

I was confident that, if my case was presented to a jury of my peers, I would win. I had no doubt I would win on the facts because I did not lie and there was no evidence that could be produced to substantiate the defamatory statement made by Offit, amplified by Wallace, and printed by *Wired* magazine published by Conde Nast.

After Mr. Emord filed a [Complaint with Demand for a Jury Trial](http://www.albanylaw.com/publications/era/2010/7/7.pdf) on Dec. 23, 2009 in a Virginia U.S. District Court asking for one million dollars in damages, we waited for a response from the defendants. When I read the [Motion to Dismiss brief filed on Jan. 22, 2010](http://www.albanylaw.com/publications/era/2010/7/7.pdf) by the defendants attorneys, I could not believe what I was reading.
That CYA brief is better reading material than anything I can write or say here.

Instead of providing one piece of solid evidence to support Offit's defamatory statement, Wallace claimed I could not sue her because she is a resident of California. And Offit, who has no trouble keeping a straight face when he states flatly that it is absolutely safe for a child to get 10,000 vaccines at once and 100,000 vaccines in a lifetime, claimed he was simply having an emotional meltdown when he hysterically told Wallace "flatly" that I lie. And to draw attention away from the seriousness of engaging in libel per se, the defendants' attorneys argued that "the quoted remark 'she lies' is not capable of being proven true or false" because the civil court system cannot prove whether vaccines do or do not cause harm.

In my Opposition to Motion to Dismiss brief filed on Feb. 3, 2010, Jonathan Emord and his associates brilliantly outlined why it is inconceivable that the self characterized "dispassionate, objective" Dr. Offit described by Wallace in her article as a "mild mannered" rational man of "science," suddenly would have lost his mind when maliciously calling me a liar. Mr. Emord points out that it is far more logical to conclude that Dr. Offit knew exactly what he was doing.

Mr. Emord also makes a compelling argument that Ms. Wallace knew exactly what she was doing when she wrote an article "void of balanced criticism" that set me up for ridicule as a person "unworthy of any professional association."

Mr. Emord rightly stated that the libel lawsuit we filed was not about "the intellectual debate surrounding vaccination," it was about proving before a jury of my peers that Offit and Wallace defamed me in order to discredit my long, successful public record of consumer advocacy to defend the informed consent ethic in medicine.

Did They, or Did They Not, Mean what They Said?

On February 12, 2010, the case was argued in front of Judge Claude Hilton, a Ronald Reagan federal court appointee. On March 10, 2010, a Memorandum Opinion was issued by Judge Hilton granting the defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

In his opinion, Judge Hilton explained why he would not allow me to face my accusers in a court of law in front of a jury of my peers. First, Hilton said that protection of First Amendment free speech rights are "at their zenith" in this case because Paul Offit and I are public figures debating an issue of "substantial public concern." Second, he said there would have to be a discussion about "which side of this debate has 'truth' on their side" and that would be impossible to prove based upon a "core of objective evidence."

Third, Hilton offered the opinion that Offit's allegation "cannot be reasonably understood to suggest" that I am "a person lacking honesty and integrity" and that Wallace and Wired magazine were only reporting Offit's "personal opinion" about my "views" and none of the defendants intended to make a "literal assertion of fact" that I lie.

In other words, they really didn't mean it.

Seriously.
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That was the substance of their main defense – they really didn't mean it – and Hilton bought it.

However, if all three defendants really didn't mean it, as they claim in their legal brief, then, ethically, all three defendants should have stated so publicly in a clarification published in *Wired* magazine to correct the public record.

That has not happened.

I weighed the option of taking the case to the federal Court of Appeals, where a three-judge panel would have reviewed Hilton's opinion and had the opportunity to overturn it, as has happened in the past. However, if Hilton's opinion were overturned on appeal, my case would have gone back to Hilton's court for a jury trial and he would have been the presiding judge with an obvious bias.

So I did not appeal and moved on.

**Where Did All the REAL Journalists Go?**

However, Ms. Wallace continues to paint herself as the innocent victim of an unprovoked libel lawsuit, even as she becomes the shameful face of *yellow journalism*, a nasty, lowbrow kind of tabloid reporting that "exploits, distorts or exaggerates" to create "sensation and attract readers."

In an *August 30, 2010 article* published on the Internet, Wallace addressed fellow journalists about the difficulties of being sued for libel and complained about being called bad names by grieving parents of vaccine injured children, whom she had cruelly demonized in her article. Casting herself as a martyr with Offit for the cause, she said "The beast doesn't tire, it seems, of taking whacks at those who dare to describe it" and suggested that she had been vindicated by Hilton's opinion and the inclusion of her *Wired* article in an upcoming book on *Best American Science Writing* edited by a doctor with financial ties to the pharmaceutical industry, including vaccine manufacturers.

Sadly, Wallace is looking into a mirror when she describes the "beast."

She, Offit and *Wired* magazine have feasted on the shattered lives of vaccine injured children and their parents to sell magazines.

They have taken delight in belittling vaccine victims and those who are trying to help them, while defending bad science and one-size-fits-all vaccine policies that create more vaccine damaged children every day.

Amy Wallace, who wrote an article full of factual errors and silly quotes from a doctor hyping vaccine mandates like a used car salesman, is a classic example of the bully who can dish it out but sure can't take it.

During the 1980's, 1990's and early 2000's, I worked with award winning truly professional print and broadcast journalists, who were committed to maintaining high journalistic standards and intelligently covering all sides of the multi-faceted vaccine safety issue. They did not
sensationalize and dumb down the conversation to a black and white, "pro" and "anti" slugfest that is the hallmark of tabloid journalism.

There are fewer smart, responsible investigative journalists writing about the science, policy, law, ethics and politics of vaccination in America today. Perhaps that is because, today, health journalists are being warned by those in positions of authority to only report one side of the vaccine safety story.

**The Need to Stand Up for What’s Right**

Do I regret my libel lawsuit, even though I didn’t get my day in court in front of a jury of my peers to prove who is lying and who is not?

Not at all.

I know I did the right thing when I stood up to those who are desperately trying to shut down all public discussion about vaccine risks, a subject that public opinion polls reveal concerns more than 50 percent of Americans today. Perhaps that is because, today, nearly everybody knows somebody who was healthy, got vaccinated, and then became sick or disabled for the rest of their life.

Doctors, journalists and judges in denial cannot change that harsh reality. It is a reality that the American people are not going to tolerate for much longer before they rise up, break free, and take back their health and their choices.

**Vaccine Awareness Week: November 1 -- November 6, 2010**

Mercola.com and the National Vaccine Information Center (NVIC) are dedicating the first week of November as Vaccine Awareness Week!

In a lengthy collaborative effort to raise public awareness about important vaccination issues, Dr. Joseph Mercola and NVIC will publish a series of articles and interviews on vaccine topics of interest to Mercola.com newsletter subscribers and NVIC Vaccine E-newsletter readers.

Vaccine Awareness Week arose from the following shared goals:

1. Raising public awareness about the need to take an active role in changing vaccine policy
2. Prevention of vaccine injuries and deaths
3. Protection of informed consent—defending your legal rights to make voluntary vaccination choices for your and your family
4. Raising funds for NVIC, a non-profit charity that has been working since 1982 to educate the public about vaccination
Vaccine Awareness Week, hosted by Mercola.com and NVIC, follows a month-long vaccine awareness effort in October that was recently announced on Facebook by parents highlighting Gardasil vaccine risks.

**My Appeal to You**

Don't sit this one out! We've got them "on the run."

Tell everyone. Tell your friends, your family. With a little bit of effort, you can make significant strides toward preserving your freedom to make VOLUNTARY health decisions affecting you and your children's future.

Stay tuned to this newsletter for updates, or follow the National Vaccine Information Center on Facebook.

And while you are at it, please make a donation to NVIC so they can continue fighting to preserve your freedom of choice about healthcare.

**Sources:**
- NVIC September 9, 2010
- CBS News September 9, 2010

**Dr. Mercola's Comments:**

I thank Barbara for sharing this piece and setting the record straight about what happened. I'm no stranger to attempted character assassination, and I know just how difficult it can be to handle.

In the end, we must all stand up for what we believe is right and just.

When it comes to vaccines, I, like Barbara, believe the right and just thing is to have informed consent and free choice.

Neither of us are advocating for the complete elimination of all vaccines. We're simply saying that before a vaccine is released, it should be proven safe, and effective. We want to see vaccines monitored for side effects, and if problems arise post-marketing, they should be swiftly and thoroughly investigated and addressed.

We believe every person should have a say about what they're willing to inject into their own bodies, and the bodies of their own children.

And we think that the childhood vaccination schedule needs to be re-evaluated to make it safer for every child, including those who may be more prone to damage.

**First Ever Vaccine-Autism Claim is Awarded**

One such child, who definitely suffered damage from vaccines, is a young girl named Hannah Poling.
In the 2008 landmark case, federal officials conceded that Hannah's autism was caused by an underlying mitochondrial dysfunction that was aggravated by vaccine injections.

As described in a recent article by CBS News, Hannah's health rapidly deteriorated after she was vaccinated in 2000 against no less than NINE diseases at the same time: measles, mumps, rubella, polio, varicella, diphtheria, pertussis, tetanus, and Haemophilus influenzae.

Her parents filed a case with the Vaccine Court, and for the first time ever in an autism case, the family won.

According to CBS News,

"Poling will receive more than $1.5 million dollars for her life care; lost earnings; and pain and suffering for the first year alone.

… In addition to the first year, the family will receive more than $500,000 per year to pay for Hannah's care.

… In acknowledging Hannah's injuries, the government said vaccines aggravated an unknown mitochondrial disorder Hannah had which didn't "cause" her autism, but "resulted" in it.

It's unknown how many other children have similar undiagnosed mitochondrial disorder.

All other autism "test cases" have been defeated at trial. Approximately 4,800 are awaiting disposition in federal vaccine court."

Mitochondrial Dysfunction May Be More Common Than Anyone Suspected

The government has stopped short of admitting a direct link between autism and vaccines, but has conceded that vaccines may be a danger for children who have a "rare" dysfunction in their mitochondria.

But is it really that rare?

Mitochondria are the powerhouses in your body's cells that produce energy. And according to some experts, mitochondrial "dysfunction" is not so rare at all. Up to 1 in 50 children (or 2 percent of all children) may be at risk for mitochondrial dysfunction!

And guess what... About one percent, or 1 in 100, of American children between the ages of two and 17 now have some form of autism spectrum disorder.

But that's not all.

It is also quite possible that what the government calls a "genetic dysfunction" might actually be a "normal" biological response to severe environmental assaults.
Yes, Mitochondrial Dysfunction Can Also be INDUCED

Byron Richards, CCN, explains it quite well:

"What the government isn't saying is that, independent of a true genetic issue, mitochondria can be taxed into a state of stress that predisposes any child to autism risk.

You don't need to have a gene mutation; that is simply a diversion and cover-up attempt."

So some children may not have any underlying "disorder" until they're exposed to an onslaught of vaccinations, some of which contain ingredients that can harm your mitochondria.

Your mitochondria can be stressed and damaged by:

- Mercury / thimerosal
- Aluminum (which is also added to many vaccines)
- Pollution
- Pesticides
- Medicines
- Prenatal alcohol exposure

Even the standard American diet, so full of inflammatory foods like high-fructose corn syrup and refined grains, has been blamed for "making this mutated gene become more pathogenic."

Well, the vast majority of infants are exposed not only to pollution, corn syrup and pesticides, but also to medications, not to mention a number of vaccines, right from birth.

So it seems prudent to expect that most children may have stressed mitochondria that, upon even more assaults from vaccines and other environmental triggers, could theoretically increase their risk of autism.

Educate Yourself!

Please remember, there is far more to autism than just ONE factor. Thimerosal gets most of the media attention, but there are many other factors that can come into play as well.

In the end, it's a matter of making sensible decisions to protect and promote health.

The National Vaccine Information Center web site (NVIC) offers tremendously well-researched information about vaccines. I strongly recommend you make use of it to help you make better informed decisions about the vaccines you're considering giving your child, or taking yourself.
There you can find information about:

- **Diseases & Vaccines** -- A list of diseases that have vaccines, selected stories about the diseases and the vaccines, and other links to find information about them.

- Vaccine Manufacturers’ Product Inserts

- **State Laws & Vaccine Exemption Information**

- How to become a Vaccine Choice Advocate in your state to protect vaccine exemptions

In addition, if you have been harassed for your vaccine choices, you can file a report on the NVIC's **Cry for Freedom Wall**.

It's time for *real* conversation about vaccines, and for unbiased investigation. It's time for answers. Slandering those who are trying to ignite such a discussion is simply cowardice – a last ditch effort to stop further investigation in fear of what the truth might turn out to be.

There are generations of children whose lives depend on a new conversation about vaccine science, policy, ethics and law. One that leaves the fear of the last decade behind; one based on real science, that takes the best interests of your child into consideration rather than what biased government planners cite as being best for society.

Show us the science and give us a choice as to whether to get a certain vaccine, and whether to risk any possible adverse reactions that might be connected with it.

That's all you want, really, when you ask questions about vaccines, or any medical procedure, isn't it?

And I believe that is your right. Don't you?
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