

# The “Hairy Biped” Attacks!: Handley vs. Reality

By David N. Brown

**This is a PUBLIC DOMAIN document (dated 2/18/10). It may be copied, forwarded, cited, circulated or posted elsewhere. The author requests only that it not be altered from its current form.**

Due to editorial policies at a site to which I contribute, I have referred to him on many occasions as “the HB” or “Hairy Biped”. This has been in reference to Fortean/cryptozoological terminology: In these circles, “HB”/“Hairy Biped” refers to sightings of “Big Foot” or similar creatures outside the Pacific Northwest. This is more than a default geographical distinction: “Big Foot” sightings in the Northwest present a picture of a creature that is reasonably consistent and satisfies at least the bare minimum of zoological plausibility. “HB's”, on the other hand, differ not only from typical Big Foot sightings but also from each other. Even more problematically, many sightings take on an overtly paranormal aspect: Witnesses have described them being shot without effect, disappearing inexplicably, and walking without leaving tracks.

Returning to the “Hairy Biped” of more immediate concern, since my exhaustive debunking of everything JB Handley wrote in 2009 (see “JB Lies Handily”), I have not invested much thought in this disgusting creature. But, he has butted his way back into my consciousness with a [response](#) to something I wrote:

“Don’t trust anything that guy Wakefield publishes, it’s all lies!”

“He probably poisoned those poor monkeys, with something other than vaccines I mean!”

In fact, some yahoo apparently protested to Neurotoxicology, the journal with the courage to publish the first phase of the unvaccinated monkey study, letting them have it for even considering publishing something with Andy’s fingerprints on it. This yahoo claims that he wrote:

“It has been reported that your journal has or will soon publish a paper cowritten by Andrew Wakefield, against whom there are well-substantiated charges of fraud. If so, you have breached professional ethics, and unless you retract immediately, I feel it is the duty of all professionals to boycott your magazine and all others in the Elsevier line. I would welcome any explanations or clarifications you have to offer.”

The editor of Neurotoxicology apparently responded to said yahoo with the following response:

“As Editor of Neurotoxicology this is to inform you that the referenced manuscript has been subjected to rigorous independent peer review according to our journal standards. If you have issues with the science in the paper please submit them to me as a Letter to the Editor which will undergo peer review and will be subject to publication if deemed acceptable.”

For those of you who don’t speak “Scientist”, the response from the Editor of Neurotoxicology actually reads: “No.”

I must say, I am extremely disappointed in Mr. Handley. I can understand his declining to threaten a

lawsuit: It is my long-standing opinion that he is a cowardly bully without the necessary fortitude to carry out such threats. (See “A Call to Arms”.) It is only to be expected that, faced with a person who has shown as much disregard for the clear and present danger of lawsuits as I have (see “Aliens Vs. Exotroopers”), he would refrain from brandishing that particular paper tiger. But, after all the things I have written about him, the best he can come up with to say about me is “some yahoo”?

He is more in character in distorting my letter and its context. The irrelevant made-up line about “he probably poisoned those poor monkeys” is especially striking. I have no doubt that the monkey study was on some level fraudulent, but I did not make this argument to the editors of *Neurotoxicology*, and I find the scenario the Hairy Biped spins obviously absurd. If there is indeed a way to cause the neurodevelopmental delays allegedly observed in the monkeys, I would expect that only a trained neurologist could pull it off. For Wakefield, a gastroenterologist, to attempt it would be pretty much the same as a proctologist performing brain surgery. What I think probably happened is that they, particularly the grossly underqualified Laura Hewittson, observed baby monkeys acting more or less normally, but reported otherwise. Ironically, it can be added that, given Hewittson's apparent lack of any qualifications whatsoever in the study of animal behavior, if there had been something wrong with the monkeys she could easily have missed it.

Several further distortions of reality can be observed. He fails to note that this correspondence occurred last November, probably meaning to imply that I am only just making or reporting my protest, so that this can be fitted in with GR's paranoid-delusional stance that Wakefield's latest misfortunes are part of a well-planned campaign to discredit the paper. His prominent use of “claims” and “apparently” further distract from the reality of the situation, by disregarding my ample and clearly dated documentation of the protest. Finally, there is the flippant summary of “No”. What rhetorical question is this supposed to answer? Is he trying to say or imply that the editor received and then rejected a submission from me presenting evidence that the paper was fraudulent? If so, he is clearly in the wrong: I did send a letter (which Handley makes absolutely no mention of), but I opened by stating, “I am not interested in rebutting this paper... I do not care if what I have to say is published.” Or, is he trying to say that the journal refused to withdraw the paper? Oops, they did.

But this is only on par with other distortions of reality in the post. He refers to the need for a “Vaccinated vs. Unvaccinated”, without making any reference to a study by GR which exonerates vaccines despite massive fraud. (See “Stupid Like a Fox.”) He also stated that children in the first year of life receive “26 vaccines”. As I pointed out in a recent [contribution](#) to LBRB, his list was of at most 20 vaccines. A reader “corrected”, “You do know that the DTaP is actually 3 vaccines, right (that’s why they call it a 3-in-1)?... So, by my count, 26 is correct.” (See “The 36-vaccine Fallacy.”) As I pointed out, previous publications by Handley and/or GR had counted doses of DTP as a single vaccine (see “The 36 Vaccine Fallacy”) and if they have changed their practice it merely demonstrates an intent to continue to exaggerate the number of vaccines.

That brings us to the other subject of this essay: Handley's latest screed against longtime critic Steve Novella, headlined, “[Dr. Steven Novella Makes The Case for Vaccine Autism Link... By Mistake](#)”. Among the things Handley takes Novella to task for is (shall we add allegedly?) reporting, “Many children are diagnosed between the age of 2 and 3, during the height of the childhood vaccine schedule. This lends itself to the assumption of correlation and causation on the part of some parents... What this and other studies show is that not only is the assumption of causation fallacious, the observation of correlation is likely flawed as well. The true onset of autism in most ASD children likely began a year or two prior to the vaccines that are blamed as the cause.” Handley counters, “The height of the childhood vaccine schedule is not between the ages of 2 and 3 as Novella falsely contends, it’s between

the ages of 2 months and 12 months, which perfectly matches the period of regression reported in the study.”

Handley also offers a list, which I will repeat here with helpful numbers and coding:

Multiple doses not counted, *multiple doses counted*, multiplication of multivalent vaccines

Birth: Hep B (1/1/1)

2 months: Hep B (1/2/2), Rotavirus (2/3/3), DtaP (3/4/6), Hib (4/5/7), PCV (5/6/8), IPV(6/7/9)

4 months: Rotavirus (6/8/10), DtaP (6/9/13), Hib (6/10/14), PCV (6/11/15), IPV(6/12/16)

6 months: Hep B (6/13/17), Rotavirus(6/14/18), DTaP(6/15/21), Hib (6/16/22), PCV (6/17/23), IPV(6/18/24), Flu (7/17/25)

12 months: MMR (8/18/28), Hib (8/19/29), PCV (8/20/30), Varicella (9/21/31), Hep A(10/22/32), Hep B (10/23/33)

15 months: DtaP (10/26/36)

18 months: Flu(10/27/37), HepA (10/28/38)

30 months: Flu (10/29/39)

42 months: Flu (10/30/40)

48 months: DtaP (10/31/41), MMR (10/34/44), Varicella(10/35/45), IPV (10/36/47)

54 months: Flu (10/37/47)

66 months: Flu (10/38/48)

This illustrates graphically how Handley/GR uses changing assumptions to fit their agenda. By counting separate doses multiple times, they turned 10 vaccines into 36. By counting doses of multivalent vaccines multiple times, they change 36 vaccines into 48. Their choices make definite strategic sense. GR's long-standing soundbite has been “10 vaccines” given in 1983 compared to “36 vaccines” given in 2008. If they had multiplied for multivalent vaccines then, they would have had larger numbers, but a lower apparent percentage increase: something like 23 in 1983 and 48 in 2008, which would show a doubling where the other method suggests nearly quadrupling. One possible reason for this change is that I have directed attention to how factoring in multivalent vaccine use will further diminish their already inflated numbers. Counting diseases vaccinated against dispenses with any need to address such technicalities.

Of undoubtedly more significance is that the latest method maximizes the number of vaccines given before age 1. The old method of inflation shows 29 vaccines given by 30 months, of which 17, or 59%, are given by 6 months. The new method shows 39 vaccines by 30 months, of which 25, or 64%, are administered by 6 months. (The 26<sup>th</sup> is probably a prenatal vaccine for the mother.) The new emphasis on the “first year of life” ultimately serves to compensate for two major adverse developments: The further disintegration of any support for an MMR-autism link, and the growing evidence that autism begins well before 12 months of age.

What should be clear, to anyone with memory and reflection, is that they are defending an a priori assumption of vaccine causation by arbitrary *post hoc* rationalizations. When it seemed that autism appeared around age 2, they blamed MMR, which is administered at 12 months or later. Now that strong evidence shows that 12 months is *too late* for a cause of autism, they are looking backward into vaccines before age 1. In a further display of selective memory and perception, 6 of the 25 “vaccines” listed are the PCV and rotavirus vaccines, which were added well after the early- mid-1990s “autism epidemic”. They do not just “move the goal posts”, as critics have charged; they also move the first-down lines, switch the end zones, rewrite the rule book and change the game to cricket.

And that draws a circle back to the other HB's. Even by the standards of Fortean, these are strange

and disconcerting beings, they seem to impinge upon the realm of reality without fully answering to its rules. JB Handley, similarly, charges around the realm of science and logic, but refuses to meet such basic rules as a testable or even consistent theory, a mutually accepted body of data, and a shared standard of evidence and proof. Fortunately, unlike the creatures of Forteana, this “Hairy Biped” is vulnerable to the weapons of the knowable universe. When he lies, he cannot avoid being called a liar. When he makes baseless threats, he can be held accountable for them. When he changes his story, he can be confronted with the differences. But, if he is abused long enough, he just might act like a Fortean HB and disappear without a trace.

David N. Brown is a semipro author, diagnosed with Asperger's Syndrome as an adult. Previous works include the novels *The Worlds of Naughtenny Moore*, *Walking Dead* and *Aliens Vs Exotroopers*, and the nonfiction ebook *The Urban Legend of Vaccine-Caused Autism*. This and other articles related to autism are available free of charge at [evilpossum.weebly.com](http://evilpossum.weebly.com).