

Illness Explained

Information and advice for parents and doctors about chronic illness from founder of Hope For Autism, Dr. Renee Tocco.

[Home](#)

[Archives](#)

[Profile](#)

[Subscribe](#)

11/04/2010



Even Green Vaccines Belong in the Trash

The controversy of vaccinations has led to a whole industry of advocacy groups - some protesting for "green" vaccines, some for the removal of mercury, others for vaccine choice and even pro-life groups speaking against the use of aborted fetuses in vaccine production. With all of these issues, and fingers pointed at so many potential problems in vaccines, it is easy to miss one of the most important issues of all: Are vaccines even effective or useful to begin with?

This is a premise that is assumed to be true in most cases... but what if it's not? Would there be any need to try to produce vaccines without mercury, without retrovirus contamination, or without infected, aborted fetal tissue?

Based on my understanding of the whole theory of vaccination, even if I was offered the "greenest" vaccine, free from the usual heavy metals, contaminants and carcinogens, I would still refuse it, even in the midst of an outbreak. This may seem absurd and even totally extreme to some readers but my position is based on not only science but logic.

It is believed that vaccines prevent disease because they can cause the body to produce antibodies. This theory is only important if you accept the premise that antibodies in the blood create immunity to disease. The antibody theory of immunity was built from the understanding of the immune system that was accepted in the early 1900's when vaccines were invented. In actuality, the antibody theory was disproven over 50 years ago, meaning that modern science has PROVEN that antibodies do not equate immunity. This fact has been demonstrated in several different ways. First, it has been shown time and again that individuals with high levels of antibodies can contract the very disease for which they are supposedly protected. In fact, after researching all the outbreaks in the last several years, to my knowledge in every single case, a large majority of infected people are always fully vaccinated. A great example was the [mumps outbreak in Brooklyn](#) in February 2010, which was named the worst outbreak since 2006 by The New York Times. In this instance, over 75% of the infected people had been fully vaccinated. Further evidence mounts against the antibody theory of immunity with the fact that research has shown that individuals with low or zero antibody levels exhibit immunity. In a diphtheria lab in Great Britain during an outbreak, no correlation between antibody level and immunity could be found.

Furthermore, some people suffer with a condition called agammaglobulinaemia. In simple terms, this means their body cannot produce antibodies. If the theory that substantiates vaccines were true, people with this condition would be absolutely doomed. They would never be able to obtain immunity for any disease. However, in real life, these individuals not only recover from disease incidence almost as rapidly as their peers, but in addition, exhibit good immunity to further exposures. To make this case for vaccines even weaker, vaccines are not even highly effective at raising antibodies to begin with. For this reason, booster shots to revaccinate children are added to the vaccine schedule almost yearly. But the #1 reason that I would refuse any and every vaccine is because of the true effect they have on the immune system. Rather than causing immunity, vaccines