

Excerpted from a longer letter containing a review of GFI materials by a class leader. The whole letter can be found on the "Others Respond to the Critics" page.

"Physical and Emotional Endangerment"

In this bullet Terner asserts: *"Another controversial aspect of GFI is an emphasis on parental control from infancy on 'control that has been associated with infant failure to thrive cases and has raised concerns about the potential for hurt and angry children. '"*

This criticism obviously targets the Prep class ... Let me add to what I have already written that Failure to Thrive (FTT) is not so uncommon among newborns. In a recent comment in the *International Journal of Epidemiology* 33 (2004) 847-848, Dr. Peter B. Sullivan from the John Radcliffe Hospital at the University of Oxford, England, states: *"The population prevalence of FTT has been found to range anywhere between 1.3% and 20.9% depending on the definition of FTT that is used."* and *"There is, in fact, little objective evidence to support this putative link with poverty [a link between poverty and FTT that has been suggested in some of the older literature]. '"* *Recent studies suggest, in fact, that the majority of children with FIT come from the larger population of more 'average' income backgrounds "*

The Ezzos' critics often contend, based on anecdotal evidence, that *Prep for Parenting* and the Ezzos' *Babywise* book is responsible for thousands of FTT babies. While these numbers are obviously not researched, let me simply point out that even if they were true, it would represent a stellar record for GFI. Based on the *Babywise* book sales and the numbers of families that have gone through *Prep* a total of approximately up to 5 million babies may have been raised according to these principles. Assuming only the most conservative estimate of FTT babies of 1.3% this would translate in an expected number of $1.3\% \times 5 \text{ mio} = 65,000$ FTT babies over the years if the rate were the same as that of the general population. I readily admit that these numbers have no scientific relevance whatsoever, but they show that in order for the critics to do a better job criticizing the program with numbers, they should claim that hundreds of thousands of babies have suffered FTT due to the program.

I realize that in the above section I have not dealt with every single criticism that is presented in Terner's CRI (and CT) articles. Honestly, I don't think it is necessary to "drink the whole barrel to find that it is vinegar rather than wine" and have therefore only picked a couple of perhaps the most egregious examples of Terner's process of "fact-finding," *i.e.*, taking the Ezzos out of context, and conveniently leaving out pertinent information.