Submitter:	Carol Hoon
On Behalf Of:	
Committee:	Senate Committee On Health Care
Measure, Appointment or Topic:	SB1598

There is currently a RICO lawsuit against the American Academy of Pediatrics. I'm going to tell you about the fraud and the way that parents have been deceived. Please take the time to read this. My body, my choice.

This is a RICO CASE. WHICH MEANS RACKETEERING.

This new lawsuit mentions a name many people remember. Dr. Paul Offit. He once made a crazy vaccine claim. But for the first time, we learn from the lawsuit the really sinister cause behind Offit and his claim.

In reading the full lawsuit complaint, you come across a section on how AAP, the American Academy of Pediatrics (with 67,000 pediatricians as members) handled the growing worries of parents.

What were these worries?

That too many vaccines loaded into their children could be harmful. The parents wanted to know whether that was true.

AAP, as the front PR group for "vaccines are fine" came up with an answer. A reassuring answer.

But it wasn't an answer to that question.

It was sheer drivel, written by Paul Offit, MD. Offit made a famous and insane claim.

He came up with a fake answer, which THEN BECAME HOLY SCRIPTURE FOR 67,000 PEDIATRICIANS WHEN THEY TALKED TO PARENTS ABOUT VACCINATING THEIR KIDS.

FRAUD.

TOTAL FRAUD.

HIGHLY DANGEROUS FRAUD.

Here is the section from the lawsuit complaint[1] that spells it out:

"By the late 1990s and early 2000s, there was widespread concern among parents that cumulative exposure to multiple vaccines and their adjuvants might pose risks to infants and young children. Surveys found that 23% of parents questioned the number of shots their children received, and 25% were concerned that vaccines might weaken the immune system. AAP needed a response."

"In January 2002, AAP published its response in its journal Pediatrics: an article with lead author Paul A. Offit, M.D., FAAP, a member of AAP's Committee on Infectious Diseases, titled 'Addressing Parents' Concerns: Do Multiple Vaccines Overwhelm or Weaken the Infant's Immune System?'"

"The title reveals the article's purpose: public relations to reassure worried parents. The article contained theoretical and modeling extrapolations for the 67,000 AAP member pediatricians to use to reassure parents with concerns."

"Parents were asking a toxicological and clinical question: Is it safe to inject my infant with multiple vaccines containing aluminum adjuvants, thimerosal, formaldehyde, polysorbate 80, residual DNA fragments, and other components? Offit answered a different question, an immunological one about whether the immune system could theoretically generate antibody responses. Offit produced a purely theoretical calculation… concluding that 'each infant would have the theoretical capacity to respond to about 10,000 vaccines at any one time.' This is like answering 'Is it safe to drink ten beers?' with 'The liver can theoretically process unlimited water,' a response about organ capacity, but non-responsive to the actual safety question. Offit's calculation said nothing about cumulative aluminum dose and tissue retention in developing brains, mercury toxicokinetics in infants, synergistic effects of multiple adjuvants, neuroinflammation, autoimmune activation, or any clinical safety endpoint."

"This is fraud: using the trappings of science to deceive parents (or providing AAP's Fellows [pediatricians] a document to help them effectuate the fraud). Offit's paper created the illusion that parents' safety concerns about the cumulative effect of the vaccine schedule had been resolved when they had been misdirected. Offit's theoretical PR article did not study, and could not prove, the safety of the cumulative [vaccine] schedule. It just changed the subject."

"But the misdirection accomplished something more insidious. It created a framework that made the [parents'] question appear illegitimate. Under Offit's paradigm, concerns about cumulative vaccine load became anti-science; the paradigm declared that immunological capacity was theoretically infinite. Questioning the sched