

# Pro-Vaccine Pediatrician Refuses Debate with Vaccine Rights Attorney to Avoid Facts, Claims He's Not a Responsible Participant

By [Alan Phillips J.D.](#)

Global Research, April 20, 2015  
[Natural News](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

A live radio debate over whether or not vaccines should be mandated was scheduled to air on *The Fairness Doctrine* with Jennifer Sullivan of WMNF Radio in Tampa, Florida, on April 8, 2015. Both parties — Pediatrician and Mt. Sinai Assistant Professor of Global Health Professor Dr. Annie Sparrow, and U.S. Vaccine Rights Attorney Alan Phillips (this article's author) — confirmed weeks in advance, but late in the day before the debate, Dr. Sparrow cancelled. The debate took place anyway, with Ms. Sullivan taking Dr. Sparrow's place by reading pro-vaccine articles from Dr. Sparrow and Hastings Law School Professor Dorit Reiss. You can hear an online archive of the debate, here: ([Sound.WMNF.org](#) — the debate show starts about 3 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> minutes in). You decide for yourself, but I heard only vague, unsupported assertions from the pro-vaccine side that were soundly refuted by my clear, referenced facts...

Meanwhile, Dr. Sparrow's cancellation email stated, in reference to her debate opponent:

He is not a doctor, is not a responsible participant in this incredibly important issue, and I prefer not to elevate him by giving him credence or legitimacy on air. This is unfair to the audience. I cannot participate in such a debate.

First, we must identify Dr. Sparrow's cancellation for what it truly was: a classic information-control technique based on this principle commonly used by those who do not have the facts on their side:

Disparage your opponent to avoid the facts.

This is not an original comment on Dr. Sparrow's part, it's the classic reason that [vaccine](#) proponents always give for not debating vaccines, regardless of who the opponent is — they don't want to "dignify" the opposing side. Dr. Sparrow apparently missed the memo prohibiting doctors from openly debating vaccines, and so she initially agreed to [debate](#). In doing so, Dr. Sparrow committed the ultimate pro-vaccine faux pas — she naively agreed to a vaccine debate, and then had to come up with a reason to withdraw when, apparently, one of her peers informed her that they are not allowed to debate vaccines. It doesn't matter what the opponent's credentials are, pro-vaccine doctors will never engage in a fair and open debate, for two simple reasons: 1) They can't win, and 2) medical science has yet to come up with an effective treatment for the more severe cases of kicked-butt-itis. The pro-vaccine position is not about truth; it's about maintaining a false

pretense of public health to further covert agendas that have nothing to do with public health, and you don't further those agendas by debating vaccines.

Let's move on to Dr. Sparrow's specific accusations: Actually, I am a doctor. OK, I'm a juris doctor (lawyer), but my independent vaccine research has been used in medical schools in three countries (Italy, UK and U.S.), was translated and published in several European countries as well as in Russia and China and was published in two homeopathic journals in India. But more importantly, the debate topic ("Should Vaccines Be Mandated?") is primarily a *legal* question. Legislators decide who has to get a vaccine and when, and who gets to refuse and how; and a complete understanding of the interpretation and application of laws falls squarely within the scope of legal expertise, not medical. The real question, then, is whether or not Dr. Sparrow, who has no training or expertise in law whatsoever, was qualified to participate in this debate.

The fundamental vaccine questions are, of course, ultimately medical: "Are vaccines safe? Are they effective? Are they necessary?" But the vaccine controversy has a substantial legal component. For example, the Federal Court of Claims lists 140 attorneys in the U.S. who handle vaccine injury and death cases. Medical doctors may testify as expert witnesses in these cases, but the cases are managed by attorneys and adjudicated by Special Masters (judges). Next, vaccines are required by law in all 50 states and U.S. territories, and by the federal government for military members, immigrants and some federal employees; exemptions and waivers are available in all 50 states and U.S. territories, in federal statutes, and in federal EEOC, DOD, and USCIS regulations for employees, military members and immigrants, respectively. A complete understanding of the proper interpretation and application of these laws requires formal legal training and expertise. What is the correct exemption procedure in each instance? Which laws are unconstitutional and why? Who does or doesn't qualify for any given exemption and why? These are all purely legal questions that require formal legal training and expertise to address fully. So, if either debate participant was not competent to engage in the discussion, it was Dr. Sparrow.

More important than Dr. Sparrow's lack of legal training, however, is the practical reality that the fundamental issue of the vaccine controversy is political, the underlying corruption of our political system by the pharmaceutical industry. While some aspects of the corruption involve medical and legal details, an understanding of the basics requires neither legal nor medical expertise. Many well-informed lay people with no medical or legal credentials could debate Dr. Sparrow into the ground with one hand tied behind their backs. Indeed, the very fact that Dr. Sparrow initially agreed to debate the matter on the pro-vaccine side reveals that she has no understanding of this most fundamental aspect of the issue. (Or perhaps her cancellation reveals that she understands it all too well?)

Dr. Sparrow hoped, of course, that her cancellation would prevent the debate from happening, to avoid personal embarrassment followed by reprimand from her peers, and to prevent vaccine truths from being spotlighted. But in this instance, the technique backfired. The debate went forward anyway, not only "elevating" me personally, but also exposing the dark side of vaccines. The truth is, pro-vaccine advocates will NEVER participate in a fair and open debate, because that would risk exposing the truth about vaccines to a wider, mainstream audience, and that is not what the ruling pharmaceutical elites want.

When the facts are not on your side, you can't control public perception in an open debate. You control public perception by ensuring that your communications are always one-sided,

and by presenting them in forums that do not allow for rebuttal. And whenever your unsupported propaganda is challenged, you discredit the other side to avoid having to address the facts. We should not respond to these emotional attacks defensively, though, as that may actually reinforce the attacker's position. Instead, we should respond by calmly pointing out the technique being used: Emotional attack to cover up the lack of any real information. We can defeat emotional attacks by calling the pro-vaccine trolls out on what their attacks truly are:

Shameless attempts to substitute a psychological control technique for real information.

This is what Dr. Sparrow's cancellation statement was, pure and simple, and it speaks volumes about who she really is. Engaging in an honest, open vaccine debate would risk weakening the pharmaceutical industry's control of public perception, exposing the false vaccine paradigm. Perhaps it was unprofessional of me to agree to debate Dr. Sparrow, since she is arguably not qualified to debate the issue of vaccine mandates. But truth is more important. And in this instance, the truth prevailed.

Thank you, Jennifer Sullivan and WMNF, for *The Fairness Doctrine* radio series of open debates, shows of which are consistent with the fundamental American tradition of "free speech," a tradition that pro-vaccine advocates fear and unethically avoid.

-----  
Attorney Phillips' primary debate argument with referenced citations:

[VaccineRights.com](http://VaccineRights.com).<sup>[PDF]</sup>

Archive of *The Fairness Doctrine*, April 8, 2015, "Should Vaccines Be Mandated?" debate:

[Sound.WMNF.org](http://Sound.WMNF.org) (the debate show starts about 3 1/2 minutes in).

*Alan Phillips, J.D., is the nation's leading Vaccine Rights Attorney. He advises clients, attorneys, legislators and legislative committees throughout the U.S. concerning vaccines required for newborns, students, employees, military members, immigrants, parents in custody disputes, etc. For more information, see [www.vaccinerights.com](http://www.vaccinerights.com).*

About the author:

Alan Phillips, Vaccine Rights Attorney

attorney@vaccinerights.com, 1-828-575-2622

[Vaccine Rights](http://Vaccine Rights) ([www.vaccinerights.com](http://www.vaccinerights.com))

The original source of this article is [Natural News](#)

Copyright © [Alan Phillips J.D.](#), [Natural News](#), 2015

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Alan Phillips J.D.](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)