

We Get Letters & E-Mail

"Quoting Questionable Statistics Based on Sloppy Science"

Dear Editor:

In "[What's Good for the Goose Is ... Ethics and Vaccinations](#)," by Stephen Perle, DC, MS, with Randy Ferrance, DC, MD [Feb. 12 issue], the authors make the astounding assumption that damage from vaccination is comparable to damage from chiropractic care. They write: "We believe that it is unethical to recommend avoiding vaccinations while also recommending adjusting, because of the comparable level of risk. ... teaching or preaching that vaccinations are bad without looking at their benefits ... harms people by scaring them away from preventive treatments - vaccinations - that have been shown to be effective. ..."

I found their paper to be unscientific, naive, illogical and disingenuous.

The authors also write: "The chiropractic profession has long suffered from difficulties with honesty." They should have replaced "chiropractic" with "medical," especially when it deals with vaccine research.

The authors, who are so eager to condemn their own profession, accept statistics of vaccine safety and efficacy at face value, even though the papers on which those statistics are based have been repeatedly shown to be of shoddy or junk science.

For example, in December 2002, the FDA approved GlaxoSmithKline's Pediarix for diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, hepatitis B, and polio in children under 6 months of age. The study¹ claimed that "there were no vaccine-related serious adverse events to any group after any vaccine dose," but serious adverse events did occur.

Quoting the study, Sherri Tenpenny, DO, writes: "Two subjects withdrew from the study because of serious adverse events that were determined by the safety monitor to be unrelated to vaccination. One subject in Group A was diagnosed with a seizure disorder 14 days after the first immunization. Another subject in Group B had a neuroblastoma detected 6 weeks after the first immunization. Six other reported serious adverse events involved hospitalizations for bronchiolitis/pneumonia (4), meningitis (1) and apnea (1) and were also determined to be unrelated to vaccination."

"Why is it," she asks, "that whenever an adverse event occurs during the course of a vaccine clinical trial, that 'event' is never related to vaccination?" Dr. Tenpenny urges consumers to read the package inserts for vaccines with care, especially the one for Pediarix. It contains a troubling list of additives, adjuvants and contaminants, including formaldehyde, glutaraldehyde, 2-Phenoxyethanol (antifreeze), Thimerosal (12.5 nanograms), VERO (monkey) cells, neomycin, polymyxin B, polysorbate 80, and yeast protein.

The above is one of many, many examples of the kind of "research" that goes into "proving" vaccines are safe and effective. In fact, if you study paper after paper coming from the vaccine camp, you soon discover that the design of all vaccine safety studies is seriously flawed.

Why didn't the study authors point out that no controlled studies are even done in vaccine research? Why didn't they mention that vaccinated children are not compared to non-vaccinated children in safety/efficacy tests? Why did the authors not inform us that there are no long-term studies on vaccine safety? Why did they not inform us of the increasing papers indicating clear connections between vaccines and chronic illness? My guess is that such statements would have invalidated the bizarre conclusions of their study.

Why didn't the authors discuss research showing the following?

- Vaccines cause illnesses, including autoimmune diseases, allergies, ear infections, and more.
- There is a very real link between vaccines and developmental learning and behavioral disorders in children.
- Vaccines have never been proven safe.
- The ingredients and contaminants in vaccines are detrimental to your health.
- Vaccine studies are seriously flawed

Drs. Perle and Ferrance write: "We call upon the profession to be stringently honest when discussing risks and benefits." I agree, and they should not blindly quote medical junk science, often produced by the pharmaceutical industry, as the gospel truth.

As increasing numbers of researchers in the medical profession are openly questioning vaccine safety and efficacy, it is shocking to see that chiropractors, traditionally on the vanguard of criticizing the bizarre and medieval practice of childhood vaccination, are jumping ship and actually supporting this dangerous and unproven practice that is contrary to our philosophical orientation toward life and health.

Such a stance reminds me of the American Chiropractic Association's (ACA's) ad in the *Wall Street Journal* that supported using antibiotics for ear infections, just as articles in medical journals were criticizing the procedure.

When will we ever learn to be scientific and not try to imitate the failing medical model? Drs. Perle and Ferrance added nothing to clarify this important issue; they just muddied the waters up a little more by quoting questionable statistics based on sloppy science.

In my opinion, the authors might want to consider taking a credible course in ethics themselves.

Reference

1. Sylvia H. Yeh, MD, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of a pentavalent diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis, hepatitis B and polio combination vaccine in infants. *Ped Inf Dis J* 2001;20:973-980.

Tedd Koren, DC
Gwynedd Valley, Pennsylvania

"D.C." Does Not Stand for Deepak Chopra

Dear Editor:

I read with joyful anticipation the recent column by Dr. Marc Heller, titled "The Evolution of Chiropractic (Jan. 15, 2005 issue). I came away with some glimmer of hope from Dr. Heller, but felt the article's title suffered from a headline writer who simply didn't get it, or perhaps the title

reflects some continued mix-up in the author's thinking.

Being a graduate of the same educational institution as Dr. Heller, namely a chiropractic college that no longer calls itself such, I can appreciate the article's explanation about abandoning certain scientific biases in favor of vitalism. Perhaps that abandonment is an evolution. (The college's name change, however, represents more of an emergency stop-gap measure to attract a broader-based student enrollment, as history will attest to the fact that enrollment at our alma mater had dropped below subsistence prior to the name change.)

"You see" (to use an idiom of a former president of that institution, the late Dr. Joseph Janse), chiropractic has not evolved or changed. Rather, society and yes, even some medical opinions, however scientific, are coming round to chiropractic's thot (to use one of B.J. Palmer's words). Perhaps it's the ol' "what goes round, comes round" hypothesis.

Actually, it's simply another incidence of truth winning out. Thus, a more appropriate title to an otherwise hopeful piece would be, "The Revolution of Chiropractic." In the meantime, the preponderance of medical thought continues to define "M.D." as "Manager of Disease."

Will Tickel, DC
Cincinnati, Ohio

MARCH 2005