

Attn: Members of the Oregon Joint Ways & Means Committee; Representative Dan Rayfield

Representative Dan Rayfield
900 Court St NE H-275
Salem, OR 97301

--PART 1--
VERY RESPONSIBLE CONSTITUENT URGES
MEMBERS of the OREGON LEGISLATURE
to
OPPOSE HOUSE BILLS 3063 and 2783

“The act of plugging the crippling national disease burden into the computation of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) does not mean that America is, today, a rich country.”

Dear Members of the Oregon Legislature:

My representative is Dan Rayfield. However, since I might not attend and testify at your meeting in Portland on March 21st at 5:30 PM, I have addressed this letter to the Joint Ways & Means Committee. The topics discussed here are very relevant to Oregon's economy.

Introduction:

Surely the Nuremberg Code ought to provide guidance in all forms of public health policy! This document was written in the aftermath of World War II—a historical event which included horrendous and cruel forms of medical “experimentation” on children by NAZI doctors.

The Nuremberg Code provides [1], in part:

The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; ...

While many mainstream allopathic health agencies have *theoretically* supported the idea that the Nuremberg Code ought to guide public health policy, they have not in practice upheld the rights of Americans to medical informed consent. Forcible administration of pharmaceutical products has been

increasingly the goal of very much legislation in America!

Phase IV clinical trials have been, in fact, a type of medical experimentation which include post-marketing surveillance for harm. [2,3] For this reason it might be argued that the Nuremberg Code (which addresses the topic of medical experimentation) does provide for health freedom in all circumstances, even during phases which the existing official news platforms have not considered to be experimental. The majority of the death and health harm caused by the drug Vioxx was during the post-marketing surveillance period. Osteopathic physician Joseph Mercola DO says that he had given early warnings of the great harm which surely would be caused by putting that drug on the market [4], because of the preliminary studies done by the drug company itself. In my opinion and in the opinion of others (i.e. Marcia Angell), this and other types of fraud have been extremely common in the pharmaceutical industry. But it is not even necessary, for the purposes of this letter, to prove fraud in the medical literature. Just take the words of Marcia Angell, Richard Horton, and John Ioannidis which show that the peer-reviewed medical literature is simply untrustworthy. I argue that untrustworthy research cannot possibly be the foundation of any sound public health policy—including and especially vaccination policy. An October 2015 article [5] in the *Canadian Veterinary Journal* explained the positions of Angell and Horton, respectively, as follows:

“It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published, or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I take no pleasure in this conclusion, which I reached slowly and reluctantly over my two decades as editor of *The New England Journal of Medicine*.” [6]

More recently, Richard Horton, editor of *The Lancet*, wrote that “The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a turn towards darkness.” [7]

The *Canadian Veterinary Journal* concludes:

The take home message is that readers must exercise caution in interpreting the published literature, regardless of the reputation of the journal in which an article is found. [5]

Richard Horton also wrote the following in his piece in *The Lancet*:

“A lot of what is published is incorrect.” I’m not allowed to say who made this remark because we were asked to observe Chatham House rules. We were also asked not to take photographs of slides. Those who worked for government agencies pleaded that their comments especially remain unquoted, since the forthcoming UK election meant they were living in “purdah”—a chilling state where severe restrictions on freedom of speech are placed on anyone on the government’s payroll. Why the paranoid concern for secrecy and non-attribution? Because this symposium—on the reproducibility and reliability of biomedical research, held at the Wellcome Trust in London last week—touched on one of the most sensitive issues in science today: the idea that something has gone fundamentally wrong with one of our greatest human creations.

[7]

Later, when you Members of the Committee read the Children's Health Defense letter [24], you will learn that John Ioannidis stated in his legendary 2005 paper that:

There is increasing concern that in modern research, false findings may be the majority or even the vast majority of published research claims [31,32,33]. However, this should not be surprising. It can be proven that most claimed research findings are false.

I hold that nobody should be forced to participate in medical experimentation or forced medication of any kind. And how much more reasonable is this opinion of mine in the light of what these editors of prestigious journals (*The New England Journal of Medicine* and *The Lancet*) and the very well-respected John Ioannidis have said about the medical literature—that it is extremely untrustworthy?

Religious freedom is foundational to the United States of America:

While it is true that the wealth of scientific evidence pertaining to safety concerns caused me to begin to take a second look at vaccines—and the efficacy concerns followed—one of my greatest objections to House Bills 2783 and 3063 is religious in nature.

The United States of America was designed to not be a theocracy—in fact, that was the primary goal. House Bill 2783 seems already to have served as a springboard for even worse legislation to increase the heavy-handed medical tyranny which has been steadily increasing in America and in Oregon. Not long ago it was reported that Representative Mitch Greenlick had:

...ordered up a bill to eliminate a provision of Oregon law that allows parents to forego vaccinations for their kids because of religious or philosophical reasons. ... [8]

It seems that bill is House Bill 3063.

Forced administration of any pharmaceutical product or other “medication” is wrong in itself, but it also would utterly prevent the exercise of religious beliefs most especially in the case of the proposed House Bill 3063, as it would force a great number of children in religious families to be injected with cell lines which have been cultured from aborted fetuses.

I have included a copy of the current *Vaccine Excipient and Media Summary* from the CDC website—please take note of the aborted fetal cell lines MRC-5 and WI-38, among others, and please verify for yourself that the document does indeed come from the CDC official website. [9] Also verify that vaccine excipient MRC-5 is an aborted fetal cell line by checking webpages of vendors. [10,11] Also verify that WI-38 is an aborted fetal cell line by checking webpages of those same vendors. [12,13]

In a nation where religious freedom is foundational, should parents be forced to inject their children with such plainly unethical materials, or else forfeit their loved ones to an over-reaching dictatorial state? No. That would not be religious freedom, plain and simple!

When it comes to administration of pharmaceutical products, I am 'pro-choice': the patient *must* have the unqualified right to choose which medicines—allopathic or otherwise—he does or does not use! If House Bills 2783 and 3063 were passed, then the State of Oregon would continue the trend of

legislating allopathic medicine into a “legally-protected monopoly,” and would further trample on the religious freedom which was the foundation of this country. Of the two bills, House Bill 3063 is the most blatantly unconstitutional: it would infringe on the First Amendment right of Americans within the State of Oregon to freely practice religion, for instance by avoidance of aborted fetal cell cultures—which is not even to mention the countless other perfectly legitimate religious objections to vaccination which Americans should have no obligation to explain to their government! For the US Government or the State of Oregon or any US state to mandate that everyone should be injected with aborted fetal cells would be to violate the First Amendment of the US Constitution [29], because it would be to support the religion which has been called “atheism.” To pass House Bill 3063 and thereby decide that people of every religion or no religion must be injected against their will with such materials would be to establish that atheism is the official religion of the State of Oregon. It is *precisely because* the scientific method has, by definition, been incapable of proving the absence of G-d that atheism is a religious belief. And it would be a state-sponsored religious belief if vaccines made by pharmaceutical companies—including and especially vaccines which included aborted fetal cell lines—were forced on the population; it is undeniable that anyone of any religious faith would be disgusted by the very idea of this.

Agnosticism has not been a religious belief, since being an agnostic has amounted to refraining from reaching a conclusion about the existence of G-d. But House Bill 3063 would not be agnostic in nature. It would be atheistic in nature because, if passed, it would through its enactment assert the belief that mankind is the definitive arbiter of morality, and the motto of humanism that “the only G-d of man is man himself,” Heaven forbid. [citation research in progress] If passed, House Bill 3063 would indicate that, in the eyes of the State of Oregon, not one religion could possibly be true.

I don't care if my statements here might either have or lack a precedent in the US Supreme Court, for instance. Take the good reasoning for what it's worth, no matter the source!

Support a free medical market and free exchange of information:

I (an individualist) like to say: “If it's worth doing, then it's worth choosing to do.”

Those on the opposite side of this war (collectivists) have, through their actions, been 'saying': “If I/we happen to believe it's worth doing, then it's worth forcing the entire population to do it.”

So let medicine be a free market, and do not cave in to the very great pressure to increasingly make allopathic medicine into a state-sponsored (subsidized) 'religion' of sorts.

I say that the existing law, ORS 433.267 [14], is wrong, but at the very least I hope that you will oppose House Bills 2783 and 3063 which would make things worse!

You also need to know about the very unique legal status which has been enjoyed by the pharmaceutical companies which have been making vaccines: the US Congressional 1986 Childhood Vaccine Injury Act [15] launched the no-fault National Vaccine Injury Compensation Fund and indemnified the manufacturers from virtually all lawsuits for injuries and deaths resulting from vaccines, while the 2011 United States Supreme Court decision BRUESEWITZ v. WYETH found that because vaccines were “unavoidably unsafe”—the words of the US Supreme Court, not my words—the

manufacturers should be indemnified from any “design-defect” claims (claims which allege that the manufacturers could have made a safer product). [16]

[Vaccine Injured Petitioners Bar Association](#) President Renee Gentry reportedly said this about the decision in the BRUESEWITZ v. WYETH case:

[To successfully sue a vaccine manufacturer today, you would have to prove fraud. [17]

And so, because of the almost completely perfect indemnity to injury and death lawsuits enjoyed by the manufacturers, there appears to be *no economic incentive* to make “safe” vaccines and seemingly no penalty for making unsafe vaccines. You Members of the Joint Ways & Means Committee surely can easily see the problem with that since financial matters are the key to your meetings.

To pass House Bills 2783 and 3063 would be, inarguably, to uphold that the people of Oregon are so stupid that the government must tell them which health choices to make—and as such the rationale behind them is not remotely credible. I think the low fat, low cholesterol, low salt diets and formerly the USDA Food Pyramid (recommended by the government) have taught us all a lesson and shown the disastrous results of this country telling its entire population to make specific health choices! I personally think it is very likely that if there were a free medical market and a lack of government strong-arm tactics, vaccines probably would not exist.

It is surely in the ongoing competition between differing ideas that the good ones have shown themselves to be good and the bad ones have shown themselves to be bad. For the State of Oregon to pass laws which would force the whole population to do the same thing would be a continuation of the health disaster which we have seen increasing in this state and throughout America, and would go a long way towards eliminating innovation. A quotation misattributed to Einstein says that the definition of insanity was:

[...doing the same thing over and over again, but expecting different results. [18]

So if people want childhood chronic illness to remain at an all-time high or increase, then they should be supportive of legislation such as House Bills 2783 and 3063 and any other similar bills—because these would, by the force of law, homogenize our population into a uniformly sickened mass with no Earthly (that is, non-miraculous) hope of escape. The act of plugging the crippling national disease burden into the computation of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) does not mean that America is, today, a rich country. Can you imagine what the Founding Fathers would say if they were told that Americans would be living in a time when there would be more childhood chronic illness than ever before in history and would regard themselves as rich because their medical bills would be so high? Obviously, this is just as relevant to the economy of Oregon as it is relevant nationally, so I hope you Members of the Committee will consider the economic impact of increasing the mandates for public health policy which has already failed miserably and has disabled untold numbers of children, who are the future of this country and are the economic future of Oregon. Surely this has been the cost of state-sponsored monopoly medicine.

If you have been told that nothing substantial or of value has been revealed or produced by the folks who have been promoting medical freedom/informed consent or have been questioning or opposing vaccines, then consider where you've been getting your information from: have you been getting it

from the same media which has been airing pharmaceutical advertisements for a great portion of its commercial breaks? Could it be possible that this partnership has impacted the content of the news which they have been reporting or might have caused you, the Members of the Committee, to have a certain bias? I hold that one very significant economic reason why such information has been promoted (information which most all of us have heard repeated since childhood from allopathic sources) is *because pharmaceutical products have been patentable*.

Censorship of vaccine information in America—appalling but not new:

In recent months we have seen that many of the largest technology companies such as Google, Facebook, YouTube, Amazon and others have been asked by US Representative Adam Schiff [19] and the American Medical Association [20] to censor information which examines vaccines in a critical light or opposes vaccines. Though their letters to CEOs of these companies did not use the word “censorship,” this description is accurate because hints were made, at the very least, to encourage such companies to alter search results on their websites.

Similarly, the National Academy of Sciences has said (my emphasis added in bold):

The current measles outbreaks in the United States and elsewhere are being fueled by misinformation about the safety of vaccines. To help counter such misinformation, we created a website [21] that provides clear, concise, and evidence-based answers to questions about vaccine safety and other commonly asked questions about health and science **as identified through our partnership with Google.** [22]

I can assure all of you Members of the Committee that the truth does not require any police force or any censorship in order to cause people to believe in it.

Calls for censorship of information critical of vaccines are nothing new in America! The June 1st 1984 issue of *Federal Register*, the daily journal of the US Government, made this chilling statement about the live oral polio vaccine (my emphasis added in bold):

However, although the continued availability of the vaccine may not be in immediate jeopardy, **any possible doubts, whether or not well founded, about the safety of the vaccine cannot be allowed to exist** in view of the need to assure that the vaccine will continue to be used to the maximum extent consistent with the nation’s public health objectives. [23]

Any honest investigator can see the intellectual dishonesty and scientific irresponsibility inherent in a statement such as that one made in *Federal Register* back in 1984.

After your Committee has read the CDC document establishing the presence of aborted fetal cell cultures in vaccines, I request that you, the Members of the Committee, also read the following letters:

- Children's Health Defense letter to CEOs of Facebook, Google and Amazon [24]
- Representative Bill Posey letter to CEO of Facebook [25]

NOTE: Children's Health Defense is one of the websites of RFK, Jr. I also feel that Representative Bill Posey's stance is currently too moderate, in fact—but it raises some questions and concerns which may be very accessible to the Members of the Oregon Joint Ways & Means Committee if this committee has been previously unfamiliar with this topic. Truly, both the CHD letter and the letter by Rep. Bill Posey are more moderate than my own views. But at the very least, the Committee should adopt the *moderate* stance that Americans and parents of young Americans must have the unqualified right to medical informed consent (which, by definition, includes the freedom of refusal of medical intervention) and the unqualified right to free speech instead of the *radical*, over-reaching, anti-religion, unconstitutional and un-American approach of House Bill 3063.

Preliminary reading which I have requested in this letter:

- *CDC Vaccine Excipient and Media Summary*, [9] current as of June 2018
- Children's Health Defense letter to CEOs of Facebook, Google and Amazon [24]
- Representative Bill Posey letter to CEO of Facebook [25]

Note: I checked every single reference in this CHD letter, and was able to verify the veracity of each of them with the exception of a few (maybe 3 or 4) peer-reviewed papers that were hidden behind paywalls.

Note: I also checked all of Representative Posey's references in his letter and I can verify that, in essence, they do say just what he claims they said. However, I could find no evidence in his ninth reference, the Time Health article, that former CDC Director Julie Gerberding necessarily agreed or disagreed with the ruling in the landmark Hannah Poling case.

I hope that the Committee will carefully consider these three documents and ask the following question:

Which sounds more like NAZI Germany or perhaps the Soviet Union? The letters from Representative Adam Schiff [19] and the American Medical Association [20] plainly requesting censorship or the letters from Representative Bill Posey [25] and Children's Health Defense [24] essentially promoting free speech and medical informed consent, respectively?

Closing words:

I thank you very sincerely for your consideration and I hope that you will ask for more information: I have much more to offer if you should choose to ask. Another great resource on this extremely critical topic is Alan Phillips, JD of North Carolina [26]—America's most important vaccine attorney. According to a 2017 news article in *Science Magazine*, there are about 200 vaccine attorneys in the United States. [27] But I think Alan Phillips is the most influential because of his waivers and legislative activism.

This brief letter was intended to be an overview of some general health freedom concepts and not a scientific literature review. As someone who has talked with families of vaccine-injured children, and as a person who sustained a very obvious neurological injury from a vaccine as an adult (causing

migraine headaches 24/7 and leading to my withdrawal in my fourth year of Biochemistry and Biophysics from the Oregon State University) I can tell you this is a topic which is close to home—it is not for me just some dry cerebral effort of looking at scientific papers. It would be a terrible understatement to say that vaccine injuries have been very common. I am most willing to provide more information at your request. I have written many reports about: health, homesteading and religion; from February 2017 to February 2018 I taught a free, email-based self-study course in medical politics called *Pre-Medical School 101*; I am building a website so that it will be a repository for my written work and course materials (all available for free to the public); and I am, of course, more than happy to provide vaccine-related information if you, the Committee, should decide to ask for it.

I did not imagine that fear of a trivial and beneficial childhood illness such as measles would whip some Americans into a frenzied panic through the efforts of an almost perfectly dishonest news reporting establishment. Since I know about some of the nutritional factors which prevent complications (i.e. blindness) with measles and other childhood illnesses, I can tell you that as a previous vaccine supporter I hope that my future healthy, unvaccinated children will receive the lifelong benefits of infection in childhood—at the least with measles, mumps and chickenpox.

Increasing legislative support for the legally-protected monopoly which allopathic medicine has been can only increase the outrageous burden of childhood chronic illness, impoverishing Oregon's future. While some might get temporary economic benefit from this vaccine mandate, expansion of the existing medical state of affairs could only be reasonably expected to increase the number of welfare recipients and public insurance policyholders in the decades to come. In my opinion the members of the Joint Ways & Means Committee, should they choose to do their homework, will find that vaccine injury is today so dramatically under-recognized and under-reported as to be expected by any honest investigator to produce, through House Bill 3063, more iatrogenic (doctor-caused) chronic illness than any other intervention known today. To ignore this warning would be to go full steam ahead with continuing and even greatly increasing the existing medical state of affairs: allopathic monopoly medicine which has ruined the quality of untold numbers of lives of children.

I learned about House Bill 3063 through the efforts of the outstanding Weston A. Price Foundation [28] and also because of Oregonians for Medical Freedom [30]. Imagine what a joke it would be if there would be an opposing organization called Oregonians for Medical Tyranny—they would be laughed at as if they were white supremacists.

Very best wishes to all Members of the Oregon Legislature!

John

John H. Hingson IV, Health and Homestead Consultant
Insulting Consulting

References:

[1] *The Nuremberg Code*, single page version. NIH Office of History.

<https://history.nih.gov/research/downloads/nuremberg.pdf>

[2] from NCI Dictionary of Cancer Terms definition for *phase IV clinical trial*:

A type of clinical trial that studies the side effects caused over time by a new treatment after it has been approved and is on the market. These trials look for side effects that were not seen in earlier trials and may also study how well a new treatment works over a long period of time. Phase IV clinical trials may include thousands of people. Also called post-marketing surveillance trial.

From URL: <https://www.cancer.gov/publications/dictionaries/cancer-terms/def/phase-iv-clinical-trial>

Accessed: 9/2/2018

[3] “Many vaccines undergo Phase IV formal, ongoing studies after the vaccine is approved and licensed.”

From URL: <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/basics/test-approve.html> Accessed: 9/2/2018

[4] <https://articles.mercola.com/sites/articles/archive/2010/01/19/top-12-mercola-predictions-that-came-true-part-1-of-4.aspx>

So far, I have not been able to confirm that Dr. Mercola actually gave this warning at the time he reports that he gave it, but that doesn't mean the proof does not exist. I am inclined to take him at his word. In any case, other specific examples of fraud within drug development have been well-documented, such as the promotion of statin drugs. For starters, see *The Oiling of America*, a video presentation which was generously made available for free to the public by permission of Sally Fallon Morell, President of the Weston A. Price Foundation, at the following URL:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fvKdYUCUca8>

[5] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4572812/>

[6] Angell M. *Drug Companies & Doctors: A Story of Corruption*. The New York Review of Books magazine. Available from: <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2009/jan/15/drug-companies-doctors-a-story-of-corruption/> Note: the paragraph quoted by the Canadian Veterinary Journal is not to be found in the free part of the article. I confirmed on 3/19/2019, by private email communication with The New York Review of Books, that the quotation attributed to Dr. Angell was accurate.

[7] Horton R. *Offline: What is medicine's 5 sigma?* www.thelancet.com. Available from:

<http://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lancet/PIIS0140-6736%2815%2960696-1.pdf>.

[8] <https://www.opb.org/news/article/measles-vaccination-exemption-law-oregon-greenlick/>

[9] <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/pubs/pinkbook/downloads/appendices/B/excipient-table-2.pdf>

[10] https://www.coriell.org/0/Sections/Search/Sample_Detail.aspx?Ref=AG05965-D

[11] <http://www.atcc.org/Products/All/CCL-171.aspx>

[12] <http://www.atcc.org/products/all/CCL-75.aspx>

[13] https://www.coriell.org/0/Sections/Search/Sample_Detail.aspx?Ref=AG06814-N&PgId=166

[14] <https://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/433.267>

[15] *National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986* (42 U.S.C. §§ 300aa-1 to 300aa-34)

URL: <http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?>

[path=/prelim@title42/chapter6A/subchapter19&edition=prelim](http://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?path=/prelim@title42/chapter6A/subchapter19&edition=prelim) Accessed: 9/2/2018

[16] BRUESEWITZ v. WYETH No. 09–152. Argued October 12, 2010—Decided February 22, 2011

URL: <https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/10pdf/09-152.pdf> Accessed: 9/2/2018

[17] URL: <http://cronkitenewsonline.com/2015/05/vaccine-injury-fund-tops-3-5-billion-as-patients->

[fight-for-payment/](#) Accessed: 9/2/2018

[18] <https://www.businessinsider.com/misattributed-quotes-2013-10>

[19] https://schiff.house.gov/imo/media/doc/Vaccine%20Letter_Zuckerberg.pdf

[20] <https://www.ama-assn.org/system/files/2019-03/madara-vaccination-letter.pdf>

[21] <http://sites.nationalacademies.org/BasedOnScience/index.htm>

[22] [http://www8.nationalacademies.org/onpinews/newsitem.aspx?](http://www8.nationalacademies.org/onpinews/newsitem.aspx?RecordID=03082019&_ga=2.21317051.1286607208.1551715918-1507064465.1548270950)

[RecordID=03082019&_ga=2.21317051.1286607208.1551715918-1507064465.1548270950](http://www8.nationalacademies.org/onpinews/newsitem.aspx?RecordID=03082019&_ga=2.21317051.1286607208.1551715918-1507064465.1548270950)

[23] *Federal Register*. Vol. 49 No. 107. Friday, June 1st 1984, Page 23007. To confirm this quotation, see Page 255 within the PDF scan of this issue at the Government Publishing Office webpage:

<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-1984-06-01/pdf/FR-1984-06-01.pdf>

[24] <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/wp-content/uploads/FINAL-CHD-Letter-to-Facebook-1.pdf>

[25] <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/wp-content/uploads/Rep-Posey-Letter-To-Mark-Zuckerberg-Vaccines-March-4-2019.pdf>

The above URL is not from Representative Posey's official website. Even though I thought it would be unlikely that someone would forge a letter using Bill Posey's letterhead, I called his Washington, DC office on 3/20/2019 and confirmed that the letter was genuinely of Representative Posey's authorship.

[26] <http://www.vaccinerights.com/>

[27] The approximate figure “200” is rounded up from 195, the number found in this year-old article: “Vaccines on trial: U.S. court separates fact from fiction” by Meredith Wadman Apr. 27, 2017

URL: <http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/04/vaccines-trial-us-court-separates-fact-fiction>

Accessed: 9/2/2018

However, it is possible that a more exact number could be determined from counting the most recent Federal list of vaccine attorneys I have been able to find, here:

<http://www.uscfc.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/Vaccine%20Attorneys%208%2001%2018.pdf>

[28] <https://www.westonaprice.org/or-alert-for-mandated-vaccination/>

[29] “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.” Quoted from:

https://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/first_amendment

[30] <https://www.oregoniansformedicalfreedom.com/hb-3063-oppose/>

Note: References 31, 32 and 33 (below) correspond respectively to references 6, 7 and 8 in Dr. Ioannidis' paper.

[31] Colhoun HM, McKeigue PM, Davey Smith G (2003) Problems of reporting genetic associations with complex outcomes. *Lancet* 361: 865–872.

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(03\)12715-8/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(03)12715-8/fulltext)

[32] Ioannidis JP (2003) Genetic associations: False or true? *Trends Mol Med* 9: 135–138.

[https://www.cell.com/trends/molecular-medicine/fulltext/S1471-4914\(03\)00030-3?returnURL=https%3A%2F%2Flinkinghub.elsevier.com%2Fretrieve%2Fpii%2FS1471491403000303%3Fshowall%3Dtrue](https://www.cell.com/trends/molecular-medicine/fulltext/S1471-4914(03)00030-3?returnURL=https%3A%2F%2Flinkinghub.elsevier.com%2Fretrieve%2Fpii%2FS1471491403000303%3Fshowall%3Dtrue)

[33] Ioannidis JPA (2005) Microarrays and molecular research: Noise discovery? *Lancet* 365: 454–455.

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(05\)17878-7/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(05)17878-7/fulltext)