

Glenn Hagele -
Council for
Refractive [View](#)
Surgery Quality [profile](#)
Assurance

May 6 2003,
9:27 am

>Glenn's paid job with the refractive surgery industry

I am paid by our nonprofit organization that is involved in the refractive surgery industry only to the extent that we evaluate and certify refractive surgeons based upon actual patient outcomes, and we provide factual and objective information about refractive surgery issues.

Our funding is derived from the certification fees we charge the surgeons we evaluate, but receiving funding from doctors should not be an issue for you, Sandy. **Your** intrepid leader Ron Link has accepted donations from doctors in the past and I know is seeking donations from doctors now. Link was not the least bit troubled by asking the American Society of Cataract and Refractive Surgeons (ASCRS) for \$380,000 to fund SurgicalEyes. At least CRSQA provides a certification service for the doctors who provide our funding.

>is to point out here

What I do is provide substantiated information and a bit of objectivity to the hyperbole you and other zealots post.

>that "a gazillion things can go wrong during lasik, just like a gazillion
>things can kill you, but the risk is tiny and of course, it would never be
>you who is hurt."

You are using quotes, but that is absolutely not what I have said. I have never said the risk is tiny, nor have I said it would never be you who is hurt. That is an outright lie.

The risk in refractive surgery is relatively small, but relatively small is...well...relative. Three percent to one person may be small, but to another may be way too high. That is why everyone must make his or her own decision about refractive surgery.

There ARE a gazillion things that can go wrong with refractive surgery, just like there ARE a gazillion things that can kill you.

The relevant question is: "What is the probability that something will affect me?"

>My unpaid job is to post all gazillion complications here, one by one, and
>inform you that yes, it might be you who is harmed. If so, how will that
>affect **your** life? Is it worth it? Is it worth the possibility that you
>might end up undergoing multiple cornea transplants in **your** quest to see
>again post-lasik?

You are affirming my position. One must not only ask if the possibility of problems is worth the risk, but one must also ask what is the probability of the problem affecting me.

>Glenn: "At six-months postop, 3% of patients report an unresolved
>complication
>induced by refractive surgery."

>Sandy: "This is 30,000 people per year, given about a million surgeries
>performed yearly in the U.S."

Yes, we agree on this point.

>Glenn: "Only 0.5% report a complication that was catastrophic."

>Sandy: "This is 5,000 people with a catastrophic result from laser eye
>surgery each year. Catastrophic doesn't include night vision problems,
>double vision, dry eyes, regression, fluctuating vision, etc, etc. etc."

We agree on the number, and agree that "catastrophic" does not include the potentially disruptive, but relatively minor, problems you list. All those problems you list would be within the 3% category.

>Only 5,000 lives are shattered each year....."

That's enough Sandy. I am fed up with **your** whimpering and whining.

I have volunteered for years, since long before excimer laser ever came about and long before you decided to have LASIK, for the National Federation of the Blind (NFB). I have been a member of the President's Club since the mid 1980s. I can tell you that these fine people, who are functionally or totally blind and don't have options for vision restoration, would take you to task for even suggesting

that they or someone who has functional but disrupted vision have "shattered" lives.

Your suggestion that someone who needs a corneal transplant to restore vision has a "shattered" life is offensive, rude, abusive, and mean spirited. Who the hell are you to tell these people their lives are shattered?

Look at yourself. You had a catastrophic LASIK outcome. By **your** description, you have gone through hell. You have decided not to have a corneal transplant that several doctors have suggest may be beneficial, but even without a transplant and by **your** own admission, **your** vision now is 20/20 corrected, functional, but not perfect.

You operate **your** own business, you have a family life, you have friends, you travel, you are able to communicate here and on **your** own website. There is no doubt that all of the things you do are limited or done with limited vision, but where do you get off calling **your** life "shattered". I don't know what you consider a "shattered" life, and everyone has his or her own opinion about what that would mean, but people with real problems would not consider **your** life "shattered". Not one bit.

Why don't you visit the NFB's convention this July and tell them how **your** life is so terribly shattered because **your** 20/20 vision is distorted and you won't have a transplant. How dare you insult these fine people by characterizing **your** wimpy-ass problems as "shattering" **your** life.

You just don't get it Sandy. You never have and you never will. The **world** doesn't give a damn about Sandy Keller and her little problems, because the **world** knows what real problems are. You are a mosquito in the Taj Mahal. You go on and on about how you had to do this and have to do that while there are people out the functioning perfectly well without a complaint who don't have any vision at all. Then you have the audacity to characterize them as having "shattered" lives. You are the worst kind of zealot. You are so full of yourself and **your** "problems" that you don't see or give a damn about people who really do have difficulties and challenges.

The fact that you received over \$250,000 dollars in a malpractice settlement indicates the severity of **your** difficulties, but

"shattered" is not an adjective that anyone who has encountered real vision difficulties would use to describe you, the great anti-refractive surgery/surgeon/industry zealot whiner.

Not everyone who has a bad refractive surgery outcome - even catastrophic - considers the event "life shattering". Not everyone who experiences a corneal transplant (for whatever reason) will spend hours a day on the Internet trying to scare anyone foolish enough to listen. Just how "shattered" a life may be by a bad refractive surgery outcome is going to depend an awful lot on the personality and mental stability of the person involved. You obviously do not have the personality or mental stability to deal with **your** own problems without inflicting **your** misery on the **rest** of the **world**.

There are tens of thousands of corneal transplants performed every year due to natural causes and eye trauma that have nothing to do with refractive surgery. These people's lives are not "shattered". Their lives are challenged or disrupted, but not "shattered". Their vision is restored (probably not perfectly, but certainly functionally) with a surgical procedure. That is not exactly a "shattered" life, and at least they have the option of having some vision restoration with a transplant. Not everyone gets this opportunity.

I have said time and again that refractive surgery is not just about the physiology of the eye. It is about what the individual patient expects from refractive surgery. If someone is unable to accept the 3 in 100 possibility of any kind of unresolved problem and the 1 in 2,000 possibility of a catastrophic outcome that might even result in a transplant, then that person SHOULD NOT have refractive surgery. If someone is unable to emotionally handle the consequence of the potential adversity, then that person SHOULD NOT have refractive surgery - or any other elective surgery, for that matter.

Next time you are going to spread **your** bovine fertilizer here or anywhere, think about the white cane that YOU DO NOT USE and think about the people who you insult by claiming some sort of righteous indignation because you made a bad decision in **your** life.

Not only have you demonstrated time and again that you don't have the emotional ability to handle **your** own problems without **vomiting your neurosis** on the **rest** of the **world**, you have the unmitigated gall to tell people who have real problems that you have a "shattered" life.

I, for one, have had enough of you. Take **your** sniveling whining to SurgicalEyes where it is appreciated and leave the **rest** of the sane **world** out of **your** self-perpetuated gloom.

Glenn Hagele
Executive Director
Council for Refractive Surgery Quality Assurance
<http://www.usaeyes.org>
glenn.hag...@usaeyes.org

I am not a doctor.

[Reply to author](#) [Forward](#)



You must [Sign in](#) before you can post messages.

To post a message you must first [join this group](#).

Please update your nickname on the [subscription settings](#) page before posting.

You do not have the permission required to post.

[View profile](#)

Steve, I have accepted my share of responsibility in posts to this group and on my website. I have no problem stating that I NEVER should have trusted my OD of 14 years to tell me that lasik was safe; I was an excellent candidate; that my surgeon was getting better results than the docs at UCLA, and every other lie he told me. What I have learned through this nightmare is this: "Be careful what you agree to do when the risk is all yours." Hopefully, he has learned to stop lying to patients; to reveal his financial interest in the laser center and the surgeon he refers to; that pupil size does have something to do with refractive surgery and how to differential between DLK and SPK. Hopefully his staff never turns away another patient complaining of decreasing vision after surgery. I don't need you to judge me. I won my lawsuit. "Steve " <stops...@mindspring.com> wrote in message

Sandy Keller news:3eb7c080.91844992@news.mindspring.com... > X-No-Archive: yes > schn...@btinternet.com (Schnide) wrote: > >Sandy - accept one fact: everyone who goes for surgery knows that > >there is possible risk. They accept the odds when they go for surgery > >and believe that risk to be an acceptable one. > I'm afraid Sandy will never accept that fact. In her mind, she > considers herself a victim--and she will never admit that she has some > responsibility (albeit small) for deciding to undergo surgery in the > first place. I'm not saying that what happened to her is >

May 6 2003,
11:51 am