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1. In the 2008 campaign, both Senator’s Obama and Clinton promoted fear and doubt about vaccines, thinking they were capitalizing on the anti-business sentiment of their voters. Really, they were both against science, something they criticized the opposing party about when it came to the climate. In 2016, it seems like only the kooky fringe is against vaccines, wealthy elites from the coasts relying on poor kids for herd immunity on one pole and sub-literate people catering to a naturalistic fallacy on the other.

Yet in the primaries, businessman Donald Trump sounded a lot like they did in 2008, so his television appearance discussing his medical records promised to be interesting - if a mainstream doctor were doing the interview, that is. Instead, Mr. Trump appeared on the Dr. Oz show, where we knew he would be basically unchallenged, because there is almost no alternative belief Trump could have that Oz isn't even more wrong about. On vaccines, Oz trotted out both Joe Mercola, D.O. and Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. so he can't criticize anyone else there. The Daily News was understandably aghast and asked us for commentary [1]. Most doctors won't go on the record - they work at hospitals and health care is an arm of politics now, and they may want to be on the Dr. Oz show some day. Mr. Trump may be President and he can clearly hold a grudge.

Yet we'll go on the record. We work for the American people in a way politicians only pretend to, so we were happy to note that with Trump and Oz talking about medicine, it was hard to know who could be more wrong. What we did note was that the ratings for the Dr. Oz show have plummeted since we got nationwide attention last year asking Columbia University to remove him from their faculty due to his promotion of miracle foods and alternative techniques - and everywhere Trump goes ratings follow. So Oz’s medical advice is still suspect but his instinct for self-promotion is as strong as ever.

2. The Inquisitr also linked to us [2] but busted a Newsweek journalist being even more wacky and conspiratorial. He claimed Trump was in a mental institution and that's why he wouldn't release his "full" records either. Since you want a neutral force for public health understanding, it must be noted that candidates traditionally only release a recent bill of health from a physician. Secretary Clinton is not going to turn over details of Chelsea's birth, for example.
3. Our criticism of the CDC's promotion of "prediabetes" hysteria continues to have legs. America is the only country that has embraced a number with almost no clinical relevance - 5 percent of the people with that number range will ever get diabetes, most won't be in that range at their next test - and will cause people to rush toward medication or panic about their health.

A Forbes blogger says my article in Chicago Tribune about the hype is misguided [3], scolding me with "Well, once again, the drug industry is being portrayed as the problem..."

No, I said exactly the opposite. As I wrote, the CDC is the problem, they created an artificial metric that no other health body outside the US uses, and for good reason. Half of China would be prediabetic if the CDC's number was used there. I said instead that the drug industry will instead be a solution no one needs to a disease that does not exist.

Perhaps he needs some work in reading comprehension. He also someone to tell him how to spell diabetic. They certainly need to hire an editor if they are going to be taken seriously in science and health.