

As promised. My mate Emma (not real name) came on yesterdays show. She works for a massive international company in a senior role. She told me about how friends and colleagues were expressing concerns to her, that they may be forced to accept a vaccine, in order to keep their jobs. Emma posted this, which prompted me to invite her on the show. I haven't edited it.

I really like doing my job and I'm incredibly grateful to still be employed and, as a single parent, I definitely don't want to stop doing what I do. I also really like the company I work for but I also know that

I will not be consenting to this new vaccine under any circumstances. So to anyone worried about the prospect of mandatory vaccinations at work, these are some pretty water tight arguments to use. I really hope that they can reduce some of the anxiety that

I know many people are feeling right now around the prospect of this kind of further encroachment into our lives♥♥:

1. 'You must be vaccinated or you will lose your job'

All vaccines against the SARS-COV-2 virus are still officially still on trial. Pfizer for instance won't be completed until January 29th 2023 <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04368728>.

They are also all, by definition, novel. No candidate vaccine has been in development for more than a few months and several utilise novel technology which has not previously been used. There is therefore no long

term safety data whatsoever which can either be relied upon or used to form the basis of any argument in favour of mandates. Anyone having the vaccine once it is rolled out in December WILL be part of a wider ongoing experiment.

I will not go into the finer details of the The Nuremberg Code here, but the essential premise is that the voluntary consent of the human subject in any medical experiment is absolutely essential. This means that

the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent and should be so positioned as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint

or coercion, and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision.

In simple terms informed consent affords someone the absolute right to say no, and threatening loss of employment or other privileges constitutes coercion.

2. 'Your right to autonomy over your own body and to not be part of an ongoing experiment doesn't include your right to 'infect' others'.

In response to this hypothetical, pseudoscientific and very manipulative, but quite likely guilt trip, I would put forward this article from the BMJ which clearly explains that 'none of the trials currently under

way are designed to detect a reduction in any serious outcome such as hospital admissions, use of intensive care, or deaths....NOR ARE THE VACCINES BEING STUDIED TO DETERMINE

WHETHER THEY CAN INTERRUPT TRANSMISSION OF THE VIRUS’.

<https://www.bmj.com/content/371/bmj.m4037>

Additionally Moderna’s chief medical officer states that “they do not show that they prevent you from potentially carrying this virus transiently and infecting others” <https://www.yahoo.com/.../modernas-chief-medical-officer...>

The reality is that according to their own data there is only a 0.76% absolute risk reduction (IN THE END USER ONLY) against the onset of mild cold symptoms against a total of 2% of all participants who reported significant systemic adverse events akin to influenza.

### 3. ‘Asymptomatic spread is real and dangerous’

In response to this pathologisation of perfectly healthy people, I would put forward these two large and official epidemiological studies showing zero transmission from so called asymptomatic carriers.

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-19802-w...>

and <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32513410/...>

and also Dr. Anthony Fauci, U.S. Director of National Institute

of Allergies and Infectious Disease: "In all the history of respiratory-borne viruses of any type, asymptomatic transmission has never been the driver of outbreaks. The driver of outbreaks is always a symptomatic person." - <https://youtu.be/JIOzN03ZWCY>

If an entity still wants to persist with this biologically implausible position that you, a perfectly healthy person showing no symptoms whatsoever, are a risk to others then the onus is on them to meet your evidence

with actual scientific studies (not models or conjecture or imaginings) showing otherwise.

### 4. ‘I understand where you are coming from but sadly we are constrained by the requirements of other countries and organisations which mean you cannot fulfil your role unless you are vaccinated’

The MHRA has stated that they are expecting high volumes of adverse events:

<https://ted.europa.eu/udl...>

Employers have a duty of care to their employees, which means that they should take all steps which are reasonably possible to ensure their health, safety and wellbeing. Demonstrating concern for the physical and

mental health of your workers shouldn't just be seen as a legal duty - there's a clear business case, too.

It can be a key factor in building trust and reinforcing your commitment to your employees, and can help improve staff retention, boost productivity and pave the way for greater employee engagement.

Legally, employers must abide by relevant health & safety and employment law, as well as the common law duty of care. They also have a moral and ethical duty not to cause, or fail to prevent, physical or psychological

injury, and must fulfil their responsibilities with regard to personal injury and negligence claims.

So if there is a requirement from a third party outside of the organisation that the employees of that organisation are vaccinated then it is up to the company to provide a dispensation against such measures.

5. You could also back up these arguments by asking that your company provide evidence that SARS-COV-2 even exists and is proven to cause the syndrome known as Covid 19 as there have now been several FOIA documents which show that no government body holds this information. Additionally there is the ethical standpoint that the vaccines not only contain or are produced using human foetal cells but also involve the widespread use of horrific animal experimentation <https://www.eara.eu/.../what-animals-are-used-in...>

To therefore coerce someone into having a medical intervention as part of an ongoing experiment with potentially extremely serious side effects and where neither the safety profile or efficacy has been established

and for which there is no data or scientific evidence even suggesting a reduction in transmission is quite simply untenable. This could be presented in various formats depending on the situation, but a letter of conditional acceptance seems to be a common way.

Here you agree to the measures, in this case the vaccine, on the proviso that not only does your company provide you with the evidence to your fair and reasonable requests but also that they will be liable for any harm or damage as a result of it.

At the moment a lot of people are complying with rules that they don't believe in for the sake of a quiet life and a lot of these same people do not want to take the vaccine. However, believe me, it is far easier to not comply with the current rules than it will be to challenge your employer ....so now really is the time to start drawing a line and standing up for what you believe in. What I also suggest everyone does, is to start accumulating a database of any official articles, papers and peer reviewed studies that support the basic tenets outlined above. Make your case water tight.

To those who don't want the vaccine but are resigned that they will take it to keep their job, they need to do this with the understanding that the jack boots of a group of self appointed billionaire corporate rulers

will be on their neck for the rest of their lives.