

Schools Shouldn't Mandate 'Most Dangerous Vaccines in Human History'

By [Children's Health Defense](#)

Global Research, January 14, 2022

[Children's Health Defense](#) 13 January 2022

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the "Translate Website" drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@globalresearch_crg](#).

As schools weigh COVID vaccine mandates for children as young as 5 years old, former Pfizer exec warns injections "are toxic by design" and it seems obvious "criminal acts are being committed."

In late [October](#) and early [November](#), the self-serving members of two committees advising the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) without a second thought endorsed experimental [COVID vaccines](#) for children as young as 5 years old.

Ignoring the [99.995%](#) COVID survival rate for those age 17 and under, the 31 pharmaceutical "experts" also appeared unconcerned by reams of damning data about COVID-vaccine-related [disabilities](#) and [fatalities](#) already occurring in the 12-17 age group — unnecessary tragedies being acknowledged that very instant in a [panel discussion](#) convened by U.S. **Sen. Ron Johnson** (R-Wis.).

Predictably, [adverse event data](#) and urgent frontline healthcare provider [testimony](#) began pouring in almost immediately after the FDA-CDC go-ahead, with 5- to 11-year-olds experiencing the same kinds of "terrifying" vaccine reactions as adolescents — including blood clots, strokes and other brain and heart problems previously almost unheard-of in young people.

In the lead-up to the FDA's Emergency Use Authorization of [experimental](#) COVID jabs for younger children, state politicians and municipal school districts also started to grease the skids to mandate COVID injections for in-person school attendance.

To date, the number of states and school systems announcing or adopting coercive plans, either for K-12 students or students ages 12 or 16 and up, is still small. However, the symbolic weight of the "early adopters" is significant.

These include states like [California](#) and [Louisiana](#) (and soon [New York](#)); major cities like

[Washington, D.C.](#) (and probably [New York City](#)); and large school districts such as those in [Oakland, California](#), and [Los Angeles](#).

In addition, the New York City and Washington, D.C. school districts, and some or all districts in California, Hawaii and Maryland, require students involved in [sports and other extracurricular activities](#) to get jabbed.

In what sounds like good news, the National Academy for State Health Policy (NASHP) [confirmed 17 states](#) — Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Montana, New Hampshire, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas and Utah — have enacted laws or issued executive orders that ban COVID-19 vaccine mandates for students.

However, most of the bans are limited to certain circumstances, with some applying only to higher education and some [only to vaccines authorized under emergency use](#) — meaning the ban would not apply to COVID vaccines that in the future gain full FDA approval for children.

Most dangerous ever

For decades, vaccines have been [wreaking havoc](#) on children’s health. For instance, consider the following:

- The [400 adverse events](#) listed in the package inserts of licensed childhood vaccines
- The [epidemic of chronic health problems](#) in American children — including [1 in 16 boys with autism](#) in California, the state with the highest autism rate in the nation
- The precipitous [decline](#) in sudden infant deaths that coincided with the disruption of “routine” vaccination during the 2020 lockdowns.
- The [superior health](#) of far less heavily vaccinated Japanese children.

So, when observers familiar with COVID injection data pronounce them “the most dangerous vaccines [in human history](#),” that is saying something.

Dr. Joseph Mercola [warned](#) the COVID jabs are setting up children for “potentially lifelong health problems,” including serious heart problems resulting from [myocarditis](#). As he [wrote](#) in early January:

“[T]he recent push to inject children with a genetic experiment may be one of the worst public health offenses perpetrated on a population of people who are unable to speak for themselves, do not have a legal voice and depend on adults to protect them.”

California ‘leads’

California spent the past half-dozen years systematically [eliminating](#) personal-belief vaccine exemptions and gutting [medical exemptions](#).

Not content with those assaults on health freedom, Gov. Gavin Newsom [announced](#) in early October — apparently reading the minds, weeks in advance, of the FDA and CDC committee members who subsequently rubber-stamped the COVID shots for 5- to 11-year-olds — that his state would impose a K-12 mandate in both public and private schools, making California

the first state to mandate COVID-19 vaccines for in-person school attendance.

The mandate hinges on the vaccines “receiving full licensure from the FDA for children,” which the state expects in July 2022.

Seeking to normalize his COVID mandate, Newsom compared it to the existing school requirements for measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) vaccination.

However, in light of the strong, [statistically significant relationship](#) between MMR vaccines and autism — and given California’s status as the state with the highest autism prevalence — Newsom’s comparison is scarcely reassuring.

Louisiana ignores

In mid-December, Louisiana **Gov. John Bel Edwards** added COVID vaccines to the list of required school shots, [overturning](#) a bipartisan vote against such a mandate by the state’s House Health and Welfare Committee.

The push for the mandate originated with the Louisiana Department of Health. The House Health Committee then voted 13-2 to reject the department’s recommendation, stating that COVID vaccination “should be the parents’ decision,” a common-sense view [shared](#) by legislators and parents around the nation.

However, the governor vetoed the committee vote — and the wishes of citizens who packed the committee meeting to protest mandates — dismissively characterizing their objections as “overheated rhetoric.”

Louisiana’s governor and health officials also ignored [remarks](#) delivered at the health committee hearing by experienced Louisiana nurse **Collette Martin**, R.N. Martin provided testimony about serious adverse reactions in children and their widespread underreporting. She told the committee:

“We are not just seeing severe acute reactions with this vaccine, but we have zero idea what any long-term reactions are. Cancers, autoimmune [disorders], infertility. We just don’t know.”

Louisiana’s mandate, which goes into effect in fall 2022, currently applies only to students ages 16 and up, “but could expand as the vaccines get the highest level of approval” from the FDA.

School districts (try to) impose

In early January, White House Press Secretary **Jen Psaki** asserted that decisions on school vaccine mandates “[are up to local school districts](#).”

However, the U.S. Department of Education has been working with school districts, Psaki said, “to provide resources, connect school officials with testing providers, and set up vaccine clinics....”

Last September, Maryland’s health secretary disingenuously made similar comments, telling the press that the state prefers “not to be intentionally overbearing” or “interventionist” and instead encourages school systems “to [take the lead](#) in their individual jurisdictions.”

In California, school board members in several large school districts showed, as early as September, they were willing to “take the lead” in imposing mandates for in-person instruction.

The plans of school boards in Los Angeles (the nation’s second-largest school district), Oakland and San Diego have been undermined, however, by the large number of unvaccinated students and other apparently unforeseen pitfalls.

The Los Angeles school district, for example, [pushed back](#) its initial Jan. 10 deadline to the fall of 2022, because tens of thousands of uninjected students would have “overwhelmed the district’s independent study program.”

L.A. students ages 12 and up are supposed to upload proof of vaccination into a “[Daily Pass](#)” system. The L.A. district already requires students to undergo [weekly testing](#) (regardless of vaccination status) and subjects them to [other measures](#) such as “daily health checks,” masking and contact tracing and isolation of cases.

[Three out of ten](#) students failed to show up on the first day of school following winter break, “having tested positive for the coronavirus.”

Oakland’s school district will not enforce its mandate until Jan. 31, a month later than originally planned. When the school board [voted](#) (5-1-1) in favor of mandating COVID shots for in-person instruction for students 12 and up, it apparently did not bargain on nearly two-fifths of students in that age group (38%) remaining unvaccinated.

Casting the lone “no” vote, Oakland school board member Mike Hutchinson stated, “I don’t think we should be rolling out at midnight on a not very publicized meeting, talking about mandatory vaccinations when there’s nothing wrong with taking our due time to deliberate to make sure that we get it right.”

In December, however, Hutchinson [indicated](#) he would be comfortable deferring to the state-level mandate.

In late December in San Diego, a judge [struck down](#) the school district’s COVID vaccine mandate for students 16 and older, arguing the state legislature has not given individual school districts the authority to mandate vaccines for school attendance.

Not timid

An Oakland pediatrician who egged on her city’s school board to vote in favor of COVID mandates [argued](#) last fall, “This is not the time for timidity.”

However, as evidence accumulates about the injections’ outsized risks for children, it seems increasingly clear that a number of so-called public servants do not have a problem with timidity, having shown themselves perfectly willing to harm — and kill — children.

For former Pfizer executive **Dr. Mike Yeadon**, who has argued for months that the COVID injections “are [toxic by design](#)” and “were always going to harm people,” it seems obvious “criminal acts are being committed.”

Now is the time to push back against criminality and coercion — including COVID vaccine mandates and “[vaccine passports](#)” — in whatever ways we can. Our children’s lives, and our

own lives, depend on it.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Featured image is from CHD

The original source of this article is [Children's Health Defense](#)
Copyright © [Children's Health Defense](#), [Children's Health Defense](#), 2022

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Children's Health Defense](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca