

## QUESTIONS ABOUT VACCINE SAFETY

(Paul Offit, "Bad Advice" Book Discussion, 10/29/18)

1. Your book BAD ADVICE blames celebrities and politicians for vaccine skepticism. But isn't it true that respected scientists including Dr. Christopher Shaw in British Columbia, [Dr. Chris Exley](#) in England, [Dr. Romain Gherardi](#) in France, [Dr. Zhibin Yao](#) in China and [Dr. Yehuda Shoenfeld](#) in Israel have all published studies in reputable medical journals that cast doubt on the safety of aluminum adjuvants in vaccines and the process of immune activation?
2. Scientists like Dr. Christopher Shaw and Dr. Chris Exley, the world's premier biochemists and aluminum specialists, and Dr. George Lucier, a previous Director of the Environmental Toxicology program at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), have offered to debate you on the continued use of neurotoxicants in vaccines. Would you accept their challenge?
3. A [2001 Institute of Medicine \(IOM\) report](#) recommended that pregnant women, infants and children not receive vaccines containing Thimerosal (a mercury preservative). Why do you advocate flu vaccines for pregnant women when Thimerosal, contained in an estimated 80% of this year's flu shots, has never been tested for safety in pregnant women, studies have shown it causes mutations in mammals and, just recently, a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) study found that women who get a flu shot have a more than [7-fold increased risk of miscarriage](#)?
4. An investigation by the Congressional Committee on Government Reform stated that you had a substantial conflict of interest because you have received tens of millions of dollars for selling your patent for rotavirus vaccine to a 52-billion-dollar industry. How do you ethically justify voting to add rotavirus to the mandatory childhood vaccine schedule at the same time that you co-owned a patent for a rotavirus vaccine that ultimately made you millions?
5. In your book, you explain that rotavirus infected 4 million U.S. children yearly, which resulted in mild dehydration for most and death for about 60 babies. According to the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS), your RotaTeq vaccine has been reported in association with 4,594 serious adverse events and 420 deaths. Why should healthy children be mandated to risk death from your vaccine, when the disease itself only has a death rate of .000015 (60/4,000,000)?
6. Dr. Marcia Angell, former editor-in-chief of the *New England Journal of Medicine*, has [stated](#):

...Clinical trials are also biased through designs for research that are chosen to yield favorable results for sponsors. ...In short, it is often possible to make clinical trials come out pretty much any way you want which is why it's so important that investigators be truly disinterested in the outcome of their work.

It is 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 an editor of *The New England Journal of Medicine*.

Why, then, should we trust you when you have a clear bias inspired by the millions you've made from your own vaccine, and most of the science you quote comes from the vaccine manufacturers themselves?

7. Last week in your interview with Dr. Zubin Damania (ZDogg), you explained that the risk of death from measles before the vaccine was introduced was 0.1% (500/3,000,000). You also bragged that you confidently treat kids with measles because, unlike Dr. Damania, you contracted measles as a child, giving you superior lifelong immunity compared to vaccine-induced immunity, which wanes after several years. How do you justify vilifying parents who simply want their kids to have the same lifelong immunity that you got from a measles infection that statistically kills no one?
8. In 2011, the IOM stated in a [report](#) that it could not rule out a causal relationship between diphtheria-tetanus-and-acellular-pertussis-containing vaccines and autism, because no studies had been done on the subject. In fact, of the 16 childhood vaccines, only one (the MMR) has ever been studied for its relationship to autism. Therefore, how is it scientifically accurate for the CDC to claim that all “vaccines do not cause autism,” when 15 out of 16 vaccines have never been through any studies to prove it?
9. Your book blames celebrities, politicians and misinformed parents for incorrectly linking vaccines to autism. How do you discount people like neurologist Dr. Jon Poling, who witnessed his daughter's regression into autism after vaccination, in the same way that hundreds of thousands of parents have described it around the world? And how do you ignore the fact that an [Omnibus Autism Proceedings \(OAP\) witness](#) in the Poling case—world-renowned scientist Dr. Andrew Zimmerman of Johns Hopkins—has submitted an affidavit to the Department of Justice (DOJ) stating that his testimony (that an underlying mitochondrial disorder is the mechanism by which vaccines can and do cause autism in some children) has been misrepresented by the government's “vaccine court” ever since his statement helped the Polings win their case in 2010?
10. A subsequent [IOM report in 2013](#) regarding the childhood immunization schedule and safety reported, “No studies have compared the differences in health outcomes...between entirely unimmunized populations of children and fully immunized children.... Studies designed to examine the long-term effects of the cumulative number of vaccines or other aspects of the immunization schedule have not been conducted.” In 2017, Dr. Anthony Mawson's “vaxxed vs. unvaxxed” [study](#) found that vaccinated children were 4 times more likely to be diagnosed with autism and ADHD than unvaccinated children and 5 times more likely to have learning disabilities. Until the CDC does a larger vaccinated vs. unvaccinated study (like the IOM describes) that disproves Mawson's results, shouldn't we hold off on the claim that “The Science Is Settled”?