

Michael Rossoff Replies

Steven Acuff's response to my article, "Should You Take Covid-19 Vaccine?" (*Macrobotics Today*, Spring 2021), ends with the sentence, "Fear not." Yet his explanation of the available vaccines is built on generating fear.

For example, when referring to Pfizer's mRNA vaccine he writes, "how risky their jab is with a long list of recorded harmful aftereffects...." (my emphasis). Most common are soreness, chills, fever, headache, and malaise, all of which can easily reflect the body's immune system responding appropriately. Another example is when he writes, "These conventional vaccines (J&J and AZ) have become notorious for triggering...dangerous blood clots...." There have been 6 cases of serious blood clots (among women 18-48 years old) out of 7,000,000 people who received the J&J vaccine.

After he acknowledges "these are rare but serious short-term reactions" he adds the ultimate fear: "The bigger scarier unknown is what the long-term aftereffects will be." Since the future is unknowable, it is easy to paint a scary picture, predicting a "wave" of auto-immune diseases and cancers. Using "experts" like Dr. Tenpenny and van den Bossche, who are well-known anti-vaxxers, reveals the bias that Acuff has injected into his analysis.

In my article, I acknowledge the side-effects of the various vaccines without inciting fears. Further, I state, "the long-term repercussions remain unknown. In this sense everyone taking these vaccines is part of a mass

experiment."

Other misleading, inaccurate or unproven statements include:

- J&J and AZ vaccines "contain toxic preservatives such as formaldehyde and nanoparticles mercury as well as aluminum." I can not find any proof of this.
- "... risk of harm or death from Covid-19 is low at 1.8% in the U.S." This is inaccurate. Rather the death rate is 1.8% while the risk of harm, such as scarring of the lungs, is obviously higher and depends on the definition of 'harm.'
- The assertion that these vaccines are not true vaccines since they do not promise 100% immunity to the coronavirus, is not the point as much as they are promising to avoid serious complications or death from an infection.

More concerning is Acuff's view of macrobiotic people: "Less understandable is the decision of those living a macrobiotic lifestyle to go along with the official narrative [and take a vaccine]." Indeed, many long-time macrobiotic people have been wary of medical experts, myself included. But that hasn't made me discount science or the need for Western medical treatments.

For over 50 years I have counselled many thousands of people with a myriad of complaints, from minor (headaches) to life-threatening (cancers). I have seen where Western medical treatments have helped (e.g., thyroid conditions) and harmed (over-treatment with radiation or chemotherapy).

From my experience the vast majority of macrobiotic people in the world who are dealing with disease are combining Western medicine along with macrobotics. To scare them into thinking that a Covid vaccine will harm them greatly is dangerous. It is well known that those who get coronavirus infection with existing chronic conditions such as diabetes, heart and circulatory disease, and cancers are more likely to have life threatening Covid reactions.

Even Acuff agrees that macrobiotic dietary practice is not enough to secure great immunity. His recommendations of vitamin D₃, vitamin C, zinc and omega 3 parallel my own recommendations.

It seems Steven's response was triggered by my recommendation that people over 70 years old should take the vaccine. I am glad to know that at 75 years old Steven is confident in his health and immunity. Most people in macrobotics may not be or may not have the strong constitution that Steven obviously has. Please watch the video on my website (www.MichaelRossoff.com) called "The 49%/51% Ratio for Greatest Health," which says that even the best dietary practices are only 49% of what creates health and immunity. Among the other 51% is first and foremost your constitution, which you inherited.

My article was not to promote vaccines but rather to educate you on the pros and cons and insist on self-reflection, intuition, and common-sense. There is no "right" answer, only the best decision for you personally.