

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Don Cadora

**Date Submitted:** 11/19/2021 08:59 PM

**Council File No:** 21-0878-S3

**Comments for Public Posting:** Dear City Council Members, Attorneys, and L.A. Public Health Officials, I work as marketing director for over-the-counter medication developed with doctors and scientists, some from Johnson & Johnson. So I understand the current science. I protest the ordinance and mass vaccination campaign with experimental mRNA technologies. This ordinance remains ridiculous as the vaccine efficacy continues to look worse and worse. The vaccines were not designed for the Delta variant which is the primary strain now. Studies now show viral loads are similar for vaccinated and unvaccinated people. Frighteningly, viral loads have been shown to be HIGHER for asymptomatic vaccinated individuals than for unvaccinated people without symptoms. Bill Gates recently said the following: "We didn't have vaccines that block transmission. We got vaccines that help you with your health, but they only slightly reduce the transmission. We need new ways of doing vaccines." These facts point to why in some countries like Gibraltar with near 100% vaccination rates, cases are spiking now. This ordinance has nothing to do with protecting the community. It's obvious that the goal is to encourage vaccination, regardless of the negative effect on public health. If your goals were to protect the community, you would see how allowing vaccinated people to gather indoors sets us up for more spread of the virus. The motive seems to be fiscal, in order to continue massive funding flows that encourage "the program" of mass covid vaccination. No, vaccinating is no longer viable as the primary way to protect the community. "Early treatment" and protecting those at risk such as the elderly should also take priority. As per your law, you should force businesses to also post the component of the ordinance that states people can exempt themselves through self-attestation. Why wouldn't you have headlined this ordinance as "show proof of vaccination or negative test" rather than making the wording of the law misleading as it is? You've framed it as if it is solely a proof of vaccination mandate. You're obviously hoping local businesses will enforce your law in such an imbalanced way, not knowing that ALL individuals in fact have a right to enjoy their services. I'm afraid your exemption clause stuffed into the end of the ordinance does not erase the fact that it represents blatant medical discrimination. Since both vaccinated and unvaccinated can

transmit the disease, all people should have to show a negative test result to gather indoors in public businesses. That is if you were to apply this law legally and fairly. You also frame the law in relation to your failed past measures. Multiple global studies have shown that hard lockdowns (NPIs) failed to stop the spread of COVID19. You say the vaccination requirements are necessary so that we don't have to lockdown again. The rational translation here is "Our lockdown strategy failed. Now comply with our failing vaccination strategy or else we'll have to go back to the old strategy." Both strategies are failing. It really isn't your job to control the health of the public. All you can really do is offer information and resources. Trust the people to do the right thing. That said, it's clear the goals of this campaign are to encourage vaccination, regardless of the effect on the pandemic. Financial flows and conflicts of interest are obvious. Your ordinance discriminates against those with prior immunity which studies in Israel say is 6 times more effective than vaccine-induced immunity. It furthermore discriminates against anyone exercising their medical right to choose. Change course now. Sincerely, Don Cadora