

January 10, 2020

An Open Letter from an Anonymous Vermont Physician to All in VT

International Human Right to Informed Consent Prior to Medical Procedures and Vaccination Choice

Dear Vermont Citizens and Honorable Elected Representatives,

Greetings to you and your families, and very many heart-felt thanks for your time, focus and energy spent serving the citizenry of Vermont through your service in public office – the community runs smoothly and thrives on the basis of your work and contribution.

It has come to my clear awareness and I am therefore writing to advise, that the Vermont legislature continues to be faced with the possibility of passing legislation that would make vaccines mandatory without parent exemption – which would explicitly violate all national and international codes of Human Rights and Medical Ethics (Informed Consent), specifically defined and articulated from 1947 onwards. (Nuremberg 1947, Geneva 1948 & 2006, United Nations 2005, AMA 2016). I speak about H238, H622 and H515, which you must oppose. This letter explains why.

As a medical doctor having taken the Hippocratic Oath I find myself oath-bound and morally obliged to ensure that all voting members of our legislative community as well as the Vermont citizenry at large, fully and clearly understand the context, time line and human rights agendas centrally placed within the current debate and proposed legislation relating to the impending compulsory immunization of Vermont citizens.

There has been and surely will continue to be ongoing debate regarding the desirability, safety and effectiveness of vaccines and other medical treatments of every kind, both known and under current or future development.

All of us wish to have the very best of health care treatment available to ourselves and our families, and are grateful and excited by the successes and advances in promising medical science as well as by

the tried and trusted treatments and remedies available in the various representations of the nutritional, naturopathic, chiropractic and other holistic medical paradigms.

I trust that we may all continue to explore reach and share with our families the highest levels of health available to us, with free and open access to all avenues of health care and support available to us as we may choose.

Currently proposed legislation however, removes our fundamental human right to choose when and what medical treatments to use for ourselves, and our families in case of minors under age 18.

This legislation, specifically removing freedom of un-coerced choice in health care for Vermont Citizens, explicitly crosses the line of debate from that of medical opinion into a matter of clear and explicit human rights violation.

In as brief and concise a manner as possible here, I outline history and details below so that we can all see and contemplate this picture clearly together.

A brief History of Human Rights and Medical Ethics

After atrocities, violations and abuses upon persons and members of vulnerable groups and individuals before and during the second world war, most notably those of the Nazi Holocaust against the Jewish people, the international community gathered together in Nuremberg in 1947, and together wrote for the first time a defining international code of human rights to apply forever to the citizens of all nations, including those pertaining to medical ethics.

Three American Judges substantially wrote these at the time, and it is of note that countless US servicemen and women over subsequent decades, including many members of the Vermont National Guard, have subsequently and currently served and sacrificed to uphold these fundamental human rights for citizens of foreign nations ever since – I believe that we are left with the trust especially of those who gave their lives to ensure that what they fought and died for is held sacred for their families here at home.

After Nuremberg in 1947, these core values and universal human rights were re-affirmed at the Geneva Conventions of 1948 and 2006, the United Nations in 2005, and most recently in the AMA Code of Ethics 2016.

The essence of our human rights in regard to medical ethics and treatment is very clearly outlined and stated here in the 2005 Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights by the United Nations:

“The interests and welfare of the individual should have priority over the sole interest of science or society.

Any preventive, diagnostic and therapeutic medical intervention is only to be carried out with the prior, free and informed consent of the person concerned, based on adequate information. The consent should, where appropriate, be express and may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason without disadvantage or prejudice.

In no case should a collective community agreement or the consent of a community leader or other authority substitute for an individual’s informed consent.

No individual or group should be discriminated against or stigmatized on any grounds, in violation of human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedom.”

I think that this very clearly speaks for itself in terms of guiding our assessment of any legislative proposals affecting this matter. Assuming that we wish to retain for Vermont Citizens the universal human rights defined for all global citizens and signatory nations – proposed **bills such as H238, H515 and H622 must be voted NO.**

We should note here that Vermont Citizens asserting their human right to health care choice are now and currently experiencing censorship, stigmatization and violation of human dignity, utterly in violation of the above defined human rights.

The legislative precedent for laws affecting compulsory medical treatment, including vaccination, is also of greatest importance to clearly understand in considering current and future legislation. There are two precedent cases in US law which are significant and are being used in reference:

Jacobsen vs Massachusetts 1905

In this critical ruling, now being used as precedent law, Jacobsen is found guilty by the court for refusing to pay a \$5 fine for refusing the smallpox vaccination – a vaccine not used anymore.

This then underpins a subsequent ruling on Eugenics practices in 1927, which supported the non-consented sterilization of women for reasons either of race or other minority identity discrimination,

Buck vs Bell, 1927

“Society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. The principle that sustains compulsory vaccination is broad enough to cover cutting the Fallopian tubes. (Jacobsen v Massachusetts, 197 US 11)

Three generations of imbeciles are enough”

Oliver Wendell Holmes Jr., US Supreme Court, Buck vs Bell, 1927

Pursuant to this ruling, the University of Vermont then became an internationally recognized center for the practice of un-consented eugenics, sterilizing many women considered unfit to breed and produce offspring for the reasons and prejudices of the day.

Joseph Goebbels, senior Nazi politician, and ultimately chancellor of the German Reich, visited Vermont to review the UVM eugenics program in 1933, and took his knowledge and experience back to Nazi Germany to subsequently apply and extend non-consented medical experiments and treatments to the Jewish community and other minority groups there.

Human Rights relating to medical ethics and practices were defined as a consequence and established at Nuremberg in 1947, and have defined the moral code of the Free World ever since. Countless US

service-men and women have served, fought and died, including many Vermonters, to defend these fundamental internationally agreed upon rights, as our current members of the Vermont National Guard and many other Vermont service-men and women continue to do.

It is clear with this contextual and historical understanding, with human rights and medical ethics being clearly defined only in 1947 and subsequently and consistently re-affirmed through 2016, that laws precedent to 1947 cannot be reliably used as solid, sound or reliable basis for contemporary legislation, which inevitably falls now in our present time under the highest moral jurisdiction of the United Nations and the Nuremberg and Geneva Conventions on Human Rights.

Vermont Legislation Now

Having voted to abolish the right to hold philosophical objections against mandatory vaccine, I believe that the Vermont Legislature is in fact currently in contempt and violation of the Nuremberg, Geneva and United Nations declarations of human rights. The ban imposed on parents has been in effect now since July 2016 and should be lifted. The philosophical exemption should be reinstated, as it essentially protected the human rights of these individuals.

The Vermont Legislature is now considering removing and/or suspending the religious exemption to mandatory vaccination (I refer to bills H238 introduced in 2019), which would further exacerbate an already unethical arrangement.

A bill restoring proper legitimate freedoms consistent with US Signatory to International Human Rights should indeed be what elected officials should be contemplating – something such as bill H310 might at least place accountability on the physicians to ensure informed consent has taken place.

Vermont now stands at a crossroads, and our consideration and decisions regarding this matter will affect not only our own citizenry, but those of states and nations far and wide for years to come.

I trust that no influences, however persuasive, will distract us from our fundamental task and duty to uphold the highest standards of human rights in Vermont.

I ask that we all rise above the debate and controversy of the safety, effectiveness or perceived desirability and look at the ethical quandary at hand and consider not restricting but ensuring, protecting and enshrining these most core and fundamental values of human rights forever into our Vermont Legislative Codes.

Thank you for your time in reading and considering the content of this letter – I do request that this matter be a priority issue. May our state not regressively revisit it's dark history of human rights and medial ethics violations of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s, but stand now for those who expect you to protect their right to informed consent without coercion.

I live and raise family here because I think it is the most wonderful of all places in the world – I trust that sentiment is shared amongst us and that we will all speak, act and vote to keep Vermont free and safe for our children, grandchildren and the many generations beyond and to come. This means being adults being able to choose with one's own free conscience.

Yours faithfully,

A concerned Vermont physician.

I wish to remain anonymous at this time.