

# Open letter concerning vaccine propaganda from René Riesel to Stephan Pinède, Departmental Director of Veterinary Services<sup>1</sup>

17 October 2009  
Sir,

In addition to the letter you addressed to me on 18 August, I have also received your registered letter, with acknowledgement of receipt, dated 30 September. In it, you once again “require me to have [my] health veterinarian administer a valid vaccination of [my] eligible animals against Blue Tongue<sup>2</sup> serotypes HIV 1 and 8 within a period not exceeding 15 days from receipt of this letter.” You also inform me that, “in the absence of certification, by [my] health veterinarian, of the first primary vaccination injection or a booster shot within these 15 days; likewise (in cases of a primary vaccination), in the absence of a second injection within the time limit established by the laboratory that manufactured the vaccine used,” you will be “forced to transmit to the Public Prosecutor a citation for non-compliance with the compulsory collective measures against animal diseases, a 4th class criminal offense.”

I have taken note of your injunctions. Nevertheless I will persist in refusing to subject my livestock to the vaccinations against either one of these so-called serotypes. This also goes for the others that might be imposed in the future against any of the 22 other known serotypes, the appearance of which in our country is, as one knows, easily imaginable in the more or less near-future.

Thus, I will only mention a single curious detail, necessarily secondary with respect to such a dangerous disease (unquestionably vector-based and non-contagious), which your previous administrative supervisor (now employed by the pharmaceutical industry) presented (with a straight face) as the greatest health crisis in the last 50 years: even if I had the most docile disposition, it would have been, in any case, impossible to comply with your summons in the allotted period. My ewes are either in heat or pregnant and, if one is to believe Chapter 2.1.9, which is dedicated to Blue Tongue, of the *Manuel des tests de diagnostic et des vaccines pour les ruminants terrestres*, which was issued by the World Organization for Animal Health (WOAH), “attenuated virus vaccines are teratogenic and should not be administered to pregnant sheep during the first half of pregnancy as this may cause fetal death and abnormalities.”<sup>3</sup> Likewise, Newsom and Marsh (*Les maladies du mouton*, Vigot, Paris 1961, 2d American edition, 1958)<sup>4</sup> already emphasized that, “In California, it was found that there was a risk to vaccinating pregnant sheep.” Schultz and De Lay (1955)<sup>5</sup> indicate serious losses among the lambs of ewes that had been vaccinated in the first 4 to 8 weeks of pregnancy. Many lambs were stillborn or presented symptoms of imperfect cerebral development. It is therefore recommended that one

---

<sup>1</sup> Translated by Bill Brown and uploaded to the *NOT BORED!* website (notbored.org) in 2010.

<sup>2</sup> English in original.

<sup>3</sup> English in original.

<sup>4</sup> *Sheep Diseases* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1958).

<sup>5</sup> “Losses in newborn lambs associated with blue tongue vaccinating pregnant ewes,” *J Am VetMed Ass* 127:224, 1955.

vaccinate reproductive ewes at least three weeks before they give birth or after the first three months of pregnancy.”

I leave you free to judge if such matters would only be *collateral damages* that count for nothing compared to the benefits that your letter maladroitly attempts to *propagandize*. Such a conviction, moreover, appears to be shared by others, because it is well known that one isn't sparing anything in this comic anti-viral *blitzkrieg*,<sup>6</sup> in which pregnant beasts as well as infected animals are vaccinated, with the results that can be expected. Such results are observable by any animal-breeder, but unfortunately “the quality of the data collected still hasn't made it possible [for specialists] to correctly evaluate the real role of the vaccine in the occurrences of the undesirable effect” and the AFSSA<sup>7</sup> can do nothing other than conclude that, “today, the data collected does not put the principle of vaccination into question” (AFSSA, 31 May 2009).

It is precisely the propaganda, the intimidation and the implicit or explicit lies in your letter that give meaning – well beyond the considerations that concern its direct beneficiary (the pharmaceutical industry, whose prescriptions you demand that I follow) – to the manipulation of which you are the executor.

Here again, you remain free to shrug your shoulders: considering the governmental-mediatic pandemic concerning the dreaded flu that one contracts by blowing one's nose into one's elbow and that one treats with paracetamol, who cares that we treat ruminants *like they were people*? While we might be able to ascertain all this on a daily basis, the prospects for the agents of the Ministry of Fear are excellent, and it has demonstrated *good governance* by verifying – under the cover of animal health (and soon “traceability” when the placement of RFID chips in sheep becomes mandatory, now that human beings have adopted them *freely*, without the least coercion) – that, finally, it will cost very little to perfect the administration of humans.

I see intimidation and an implicit lie in your affirmation that, because my livestock hasn't been “validly vaccinated,” it would constitute, “as such, livestock in which the circulation of the disease could occur, with the health and economic consequences that we know.” The “epidemiological” data of the WOAAH itself indicates that “the rate of mortality is normally low among sheep, but can reach 10 percent during certain epizootics. Non-contagious disease.” And so, where my affairs are concerned, I intend to do what I think is best with regard to what you call the “health and economic consequences” by continuing to develop the natural immunities of my animals the best I can.

I refuse to blindly deliver them to the marketers of chemicals and to submit myself to this exercise in infantilization or, rather, this preparation for future *states of emergency*. And if you should understand me poorly, think of the infernos and devices [used in the treatment] of foot-and-mouth disease or, better still, consult the *Guide d'aide à la décision pour la gestion du milieu agricole en cas d'accident nucléaire*, which your function prohibits you from ignoring. This constantly updated catalogue of technocratic monstrosities and ineptitudes is accessible – *transparency* obligates it – on the Internet site of the Minister of Agriculture, but one often sees it accompanied by the wads of “PAC”<sup>8</sup> formularies that are annually addressed to farmers. Co-produced by the Nuclear Safety Authority and the General Directorate of Nutrition, with the assistance of the technical institutes that are the jewels of the “profession,” this catalogue is the

---

<sup>6</sup> German in original.

<sup>7</sup> *Agence française de sécurité sanitaire des aliments*.

<sup>8</sup> *Politique agricole commune*.

result of an initiative at whose origin one finds the famous Professional Agricultural Organizations. In the light of the kind of solicitude that is expressed there for animal and human livestock, we can better understand what the discipline already acquired in previous “crisis situations” will be used for: foot-and-mouth disease, warble flies, and FCO,<sup>9</sup> for which *eradication* continues to be the rallying cry of bureaucratic impotence.

But above all, you cannot be unaware that a non-vaccinated herd presents no risk at all to neighboring livestock. Otherwise, wouldn't we have to fear for the limitless *reservoir* that constitutes the “biodiversity” of our “territories”? Nature does not make things easy for you: no vaccinations are possible for wild ruminants! But of course there is nothing here that puts into question the statistical truth of the threshold of 80 percent vaccinated animals that you inevitably glorify yourself for having attained. Here you follow the example of the Stalinist bureaucracy, which regularly exalted the pulverization of the objectives of its five-year plans or, more trivially, the police officer who has *made his quota*.

I will add three remarks to have done with this subject. The first is that the convoluted thinking of the WOAHP with respect to the inverse perspective (culicoides carrying attenuated viruses from vaccinated animals) causes a certain perplexity at least. The second is that, by boasting that you have won a battle – “no outbreak has been recorded in Lorèze for the year 2009 (for the record: 111 outbreaks in 2008)” – but without making clear what criteria (serological reactions? clinical manifestations?) was used to generate a reduction so large that it makes one think of the propaganda for roadside radar detectors or *video surveillance*, you deliberately neglect to distinguish between the temporary effects of these vaccinations and the more durable effects of the animals' acquisition of natural immunity, which the AFSSA itself doesn't contest. The third remark will be brief: vaccinations have been carried out in South Africa since the beginning of the 20th century.

Finally: who could fail to see that the lie, explicit in this instance, rushes to the aid of intimidation (but perhaps you are – without knowing it, due to functional habits – convinced of the virtue of self-realizing prophecies) in that part of your letter in which your word processor wrote that my not “validly vaccinated” livestock “constitutes, in this respect, an exception in our department”? The number of similar letters that you had to print out and send that very same day to others in this department who are guilty of insubordination absolutely contradicts that assertion. Moreover, there is no need to participate in any kind of collective (although some have been able to produce a remarkable *disintoxication*: in particular, I am thinking of the veterinarians of the Groupement d'Interventions et d'Entraide Zone Verte) to know that such “exceptions” continue to manifest themselves openly all over France.

Of course, some people have not failed to let the firmness of their convictions erode in the face of threats, which is what you count on, but, at the same time, many signs indicate that, after a somewhat shaken minister's announcement of a second obligatory (but free!) campaign in 2010, and having seen the results of the first one, you have had to *raise your voice* against the new recalcitrants so that the vaccinal order continues to reign. It doesn't suit me to help you do this. I declare my practical solidarity with the others who are opposed to this campaign of forced vaccination.

Sir, please accept my sincere salutations.

René Riesel<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Blue Tongue.

<sup>10</sup> A breeder of organic sheep.