

Chapter 16:

Interview with **Allison Folmar**



Ty: Well, Allison, thank you for joining me today. I really appreciate you taking the time out of your busy schedule here.

Allison: Thank you for having me. This is a very important issue.

Ty: Yeah, it is. So, tell our viewers a little bit about what you do. You're an attorney?

Allison: I'm an attorney. I practice in the Detroit metropolitan area, but I represent parents actually from all over the country who have had to fight this very unfair, unfortunate fight against Child Protective Services when they assert the authority that they are given by the state and they remove children who have disabilities and/or autism, and I get their children back for the parents.

Ty: Wow!

Allison: Yeah.

Ty: What a noble job, yeah.

Allison: It is a noble job. It's a tireless work, because unfortunately, gradually there's a trend, a very aggressive trend to supersede and usurp the authority that parents have, given by the Constitution, to be able to make those choices in the upbringing or rearing of medical health decisions of their children.

Parents know what's best for their children. There's a presumption in the law, in the federal law, that parents are acting in the best interests of their children. And the standard is a very high standard for the court to intervene.

It is an immediate threat. It is a compelling state interest, yes. But yet at the same time, when a parent is choosing a course of medical treatment, one course of medical treatment over another course of medical treatment, that is not neglect.

Neglect is in the face of having to do something medically, you do nothing. The difference here is that when a parent chooses an alternative method, that parent is to be given deference. And that deference is where the slippery slope is really spinning out of control here.

Because—and that's why more and more children are being taken from their parents, family's rights are being evaded. And what's more important than evading someone's rights is that you are intervening in the health or welfare of a child when it is unwarranted.

These children are on healthy, progressive paths that their parents are putting them on with certain courses of treatment. So, it's a very fine line. Judges are somewhat intimidated, quite honestly, because they don't know enough.

They don't want to play God and say "Well, I will make that decision about what course of treatment is best." So, that's where you need skilled lawyers and litigation to be able to bring out and cross-examine doctors in terms of their medical opinion.

Because it is actually just that. It's just another course of treatment. And when the parent knows what's best for their child, that parent is the one knowing that their child doesn't respond to certain medications or drugs that doctors want to prescribe.

Their child may not be a child that can take certain anti-psychotic drugs. That's not what the parent wants to give to the child because that's not what's best for the child. And that,

absent any abuse or neglect, that parent's choice of treatment has to have careful consideration and deference in a court, and that's what's not happening.

Ty: That's really interesting information. I didn't know that. You mentioned that there's a presumption in favor of the parents.

Allison: From the beginning, from 1925, there's a case—

Ty: We don't see that, typically.

Allison: Exactly. Well, the founders came upon all the—our fundamental rights. You have a fundamental right to act in the best interest of your child, raising and rearing your child, being able to choose what school your child goes to, what religion you want to be, and what medical choices.

There are some people who choose a holistic path, and there are some families who don't. But whatever that parent feels is best for that child, and there is no level of immediate risk of harm to that child, that parent, the law says that that parent is to be given deference to their choice of treatment, and that's what's not happening.

Ty: And so, you've seen personal choices where that preference to the parents has not been—

Allison: It's done over and over again. Unfortunately, it's the complete opposite. When a parent—when Child Protective Services involves—for example, you can have someone to just make an anonymous call and say “Hey, I think that child over there, their parent is...”

They can say anything. “...is having some whack type of treatment for the child. I don't think it's right.” And now Child Protective Services is knocking on your door to investigate how you parent, how you live. And the burden has to shift.

It's a burden, a preponderance of evidence that the state has to show, and a compelling state interest. What, if so, is there any immediate risk of harm? I may not want my child to have gluten. Okay? And you can't come in and say “Well, no. We choose to have graham crackers and all kinds of sweet things that's offered at school, and your child has to partake of that.”

I mean it's something that simple. And what happens is that things just spiral out of control to a point where now, the child is being—there's a presumption against the parents before they ever have due process, before they ever walk into court, before they can ever hire a skilled lawyer.

You shouldn't have to hire a skilled lawyer to protect a fundamental right of interest when you're being accused. Because the burden is not on you. It's on the state.

Ty: Right.

Allison: The case log gives parents wide access to being able to raise their children. Not only in areas of their physical health, but their mental health as well. The courts have recognized, just historically, that a psychiatrist can be absolutely wrong about their opinion about the course of treatment for a child.

Now that is one of the biggest issues right now. Every child has ADD, ADHD. There are all types of labels that are being given to a child. Well unfortunately, along with that label is also a prescription for some type of anti-psychotic drug.

That parent has an affluent right to say “I’m not going to alter the course of my child’s brain forever by temporarily giving my child this drug that we don’t know the side effects. And even when you do know the side effects, they’re so horrible that I don’t want my child going through the side effects of this medication. Let’s go through this therapy. Let’s go through this treatment.”

And the state comes in and says “No, no, no. Your child is way too far.” Well, who’s determining too far gone? Who’s determining these behavioral issues? Teachers or other unqualified administrative staff? So, the system has to be able to work.

Back way in the day, social workers were truly social workers and not little mini police officers trying to step into the lives of families and regulate what a family does. But there is this push, this very aggressive push now, for children to be in foster care.

So, why is that? Well, at least in Michigan, for every child that is signed up to be in foster care, the state receives \$12,000 from the federal government for every time a child is removed from their home and put into some type of placement. \$12,000.

Ty: Wow!

Allison: That’s not even to mention if they claim the child has some diagnosis, or some mental health issue. Well, what child wouldn’t have some emotional mental health issue when you rip him from his family, the only stability and family that he’s ever known?

Ty: Right. You just created it.

Allison: You just created an emotional storm by removing a child. And so, I’m working with a number of organizations to say “Hey, wait a minute. Families first.” That’s how it used to be. Families first. Let’s go back to how we used to do things.

It’s not a teacher trying to designate that a child is supposed to be—the form of what a child is supposed to be. Every child is different. There are some children who are very rambunctious. Okay? Well, we don’t want to necessarily label those children, because those are geniuses. Those are our microbiologists. Okay? But instead of seeing that, what they see is a little rambunctious kid.

Ty: So, let’s drug them.

Allison: Let’s drug them. Let’s dumb them down. So instead of Johnny being rambunctious and running around because he finished his work an hour ago, and the rest of the kids are still working on theirs, we’re going to give him this drug, and [slurring] he’ll be like this.

That’s not life. And it’s not quality of life. And a parent has a right to say no, whether it’s to an anti-psychotic drug, whether it’s to choose whether or not to vaccinate their children. That’s what this whole conference is about: children and the vaccinations, and what do we know about autism.

That is that parent’s choice, to raise their child in accordance to their beliefs. These parents are not doing nothing. They’re doing something. And because there’s an alternative treatment methodology that they choose to take, that’s not medical neglect.

And therefore, the state cannot interfere, because “I choose to believe something different about a course of treatment.” And whether it’s diet, no matter what it is. So, that’s a major issue now that parents are dealing with.

Ty: It is. Have you seen the government, or the CPS try to step in to parents that would not vaccinate?

Allison: Oh, absolutely. There have been forced vaccinations. I mean, downright, forced vaccinations, where they will come and remove the child and take custody of the child legally, and bring that child so-called up to standard or code of where that child is supposed to be.

And it's mandated by the state under the guise of the child is in a public school. Well, guess what? You can't—a child has a fundamental right to a free public education. So, you can't take one fundamental right, which is the right not to be vaccinated, and conjoin and take away another fundamental right, which is to a free public education.

But that's what's happening. The state is saying "If you're going to have your child in not only a public school, a private school..." Well, what's going on with that? So, the medical exemptions, the religious exemptions, the personal belief exemptions, that's all going out the window.

So, there is a push to have a one set frame of mind of how all children need to be, based on scientific data that is not conclusive. Okay? And I'm not a doctor. I'm not going to argue that position. What I do know is that it is assault and battery to mandatorily give a child a permanent vaccination that will change the course of his or her life on a basis where the court takes the child over for a temporary period of time.

And now "Here you are. I'm going to give you back now a damaged child. You gave me a whole child. I'm going to give you back a damaged child." And then they say "Oh, hands off." "Oh, your child is thrown into autism? Oh well."

Ty: "Sorry about that."

Allison: Exactly.

Ty: Well, I appreciate what you said. You're not a doctor, but you are an attorney.

Allison: Absolutely.

Ty: You know the law—

Allison: The legal ramifications of it.

Ty: And you said, and I did not know that there were—the idea of forced vaccinations, you're forced to get a vaccination. But what you're saying is they've actually taken children and taken them to the doctor's office and caught them up.

Allison: Well, essentially what they do is take custody, temporary physical custody of the child, and place the child in foster care.

Ty: And then they catch them up?

Allison: Then they catch them up.

Ty: And the reality is, when you—let's say they're 20 shots behind. They catch them up. We don't know the ramifications.

Allison: That's what has caused so many vaccine injuries to our children over the years, and that's one of the cases that I have right now, with the Ariana [indiscernible 0:13:35] case. Ariana needed to be—well she—many parents subscribe to even a graduated schedule of vaccines. Again, that is that parent's choice based on the research and the knowledge that that parent has in terms of what their child's reaction would be.

Ty: That's their right.

Allison: That's their absolute right. Absolutely. And so, yeah, that's what we're dealing with, unfortunately.

Ty: Well, you said that many parents agree to a graduated schedule. What—that's the parent's choice, right?

Allison: That's the parent's choice. And not just that, many parents they're right. These are not just parents who said "Oh, well I'm going to wake up and just decide to do that." They've done the research. They know. They have other children who have been vaccine injured and said "You know what? This is not for my child. They go into seizures immediately after being vaccinated. What else can you relate it to?"

So, there are legal ramifications, and that's what we're trying to enlighten the legal profession, the judiciary, about. Because ultimately, these cases are going to court. You can deal with the social worker or CPS, but ultimately a judge has the final word on whether or not a parent has a constitutional and fundamental liberty interest in the upbringing of their child, as long as there is no abuse or neglect present.

Ty: As an attorney, Allison, you did say that's assault and battery.

Allison: It is assault and battery.

Ty: When they take your child, and force a vaccine.

Allison: Against parent's will, against a child's will. You are physically—it's a physical touching of another without their consent. That's assault—that's battery. The anticipation of that battery is actually assault.

Ty: Okay. So, it's assault and battery.

Allison: It's assault that I know is coming because now I am afraid of an immediate—I have apprehension about immediate physical unconsensual touching. So, the assault is my apprehension of what is to come, which is the physical touching without my consent.

Ty: Okay. So, it most clearly is assault and battery.

Allison: Absolutely. All day long.

Ty: And that's not even to mention what's in the needle.

Allison: Exactly. Having permanent, lifelong, lasting effects. And so, you have to respect the parent's position. You have to respect the parent's fundamental right and the case law, the statutes that go along with those rights all throughout history.

Ty: And so, you're right. You do. It seems like we've lost our context of history of what's hap-

pened in the past.

Allison: And our rights have been watered down over time. And there's an erosion of your parental rights as it pertains to making those core educational decisions, making those core societal decisions. What you want your child to see on television, what you want your child exposed to hearing in school, certain teachings about sexual education, etcetera.

What might be acceptable for one child at one age is completely not acceptable for another child at another age. Where a parent can't be able to step in and intervene and say "Wait a minute. My child has had a different experience. I don't want my child to have that course of education."

Ty: They've taken away individuality and put us all into a collectivism.

Allison: That's exactly right. And no parent should have to go through a court system to assert something that they have a fundamental right in having, just by being a mere American citizen. This is still America.

Ty: Yes, it is.

Allison: Absolutely.

Ty: It is. And that's why what you're doing is so important.

Allison: Yes.

Ty: Last question for you. This is something that strikes me as odd, that you have seen children that have been taken, forced vaccinated, and you said caught up. So, they've done multiple doses to catch that child up. This is so unmedical, for lack of a better term. I mean you can't take a prescription drug unlimited. You can't take a whole bottle of Xanax, or you'll die.

Allison: That's exactly right.

Ty: You can't even take a gallon of water and drink it all at the same time. If you're a child, it will drown the child. But you can sip it over the course of a day. But then when it comes to vaccines, they just go inject them with 10-20, whatever it takes to catch up. And they say there's no harm in that.

Allison: Exactly.

Ty: That is intellectual dishonesty.

Allison: Well, and it's just beyond human comprehension that no one is fighting against these vaccine companies against this. I mean this is a federal issue that this big pharmaceutical company versus the everyday Joe and Jane Parent. You see?

And so, that's the fight we're in that no one is caring about that, that these children, the course of their lives are changed forever. And I have to go and sue in federal court to try to get compensation for my child when they're vaccine injured? This child is damaged, damaged for life, because of something I knew would harm my child, and I said no to it.

And by exercising my right, and now this is where we are. Because they're saying that the common good of society is benefited by each and every child being vaccinated, and

nothing could be further from the truth.

Ty: So, Allison, what's your experience with parents that try to avoid—in California, we had mandatory exemptions. I know you're in Detroit, but in California, mandatory vaccines.

Allison: Fight against the SB 277.

Ty: You did?

Allison: Oh yeah. So, I was there, yes.

Ty: So, you're against it? I knew you would be.

Allison: Yeah.

Ty: What's the experience now? Can parents home school to get out of that?

Allison: You can home school, but you've got to remember, not every family's able to home school.

Ty: True.

Allison: There are parents who actually have to get out and work and sustain their families. So, it doesn't work for every parent to be able to home school your child. That's a certain talent and gift that many parents are blessed with, but many parents are not.

Ty: Yeah.

Allison: So, what about those parents?

Ty: Yeah. And many of the parents that are—that have kids, may be a single parent, right?

Allison: Exactly.

Ty: And let's say they're low income.

Allison: Exactly.

Ty: They have to work. They're not financially independent.

Allison: And that's what we say. It's not a one size fits all.

Ty: Yeah, this is—in a way, that law, the SB 277, is really discriminatory against the lower class.

Allison: Exactly.

Ty: It is.

Allison: Absolutely. And see, that's where we're making awareness to even African-Americans community, because the pervasive thought is "Oh, well black people vaccinate their children." Many African-American people are not aware of the full extent of how these vaccines are impacting their autistic child and how that damage even occurred.

Because we're busy trying to pay the bills and work and being single parents, that things

that other races of people have long realized and they're working to prevent and avoid, and we're falling into that loop. So, right now it's a major movement of education. And that's what this whole conference is about. That's why I'm so honored to be here.

Ty: It is. Thank you so much. One more question, because you just mentioned the African-American community. As an African-American, how does it make you feel about the CDC whistle blower story, that the CDC knew that the MMR vaccine was causing autism at something like three to four times the rate in black babies?

Allison: It's unconscionable. And there has to be an awakening in the African-American community. We have got to reach out to our churches to—our legislators, and have a voice in this.

Black boys are three times more—well no, I'm sorry, 296 percent more likely to become autistic than those children of other races as a direct link to the MMR vaccine. So, tests say that there is not that connection. It just does not make actual sense. It does not make legal sense.

Ty: And the CDC knew, and they had a good old book burning, or document burning party.

Allison: Exactly. So, that's why every parent needs to get out and see Vaxxed.

Ty: Wow, well you know what, Allison? What you're doing is so important.

Allison: Thank you.

Ty: I really appreciate that mission to help these parents and these children.

Allison: Absolutely. Thank you.

Ty: Thank you so much for your time today.

Allison: Absolutely. Thank you for having me.

Ty: You bet.

[End of transcript]