

# Chapter 26:

*Interview with*  
**Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.**



**Ty:** A striking resemblance to what's going on today, the fact that you mentioned that we have basically a religion of vaccinology and then you went back and talked about Copernicus and Galileo. So, could you talk about the religion of vaccines and what happened to Copernicus and Galileo, they were heretics right?

**Robert:** I'm a science person. My background is in law and I've hundreds of legal cases, almost every one of the on environmental issues. Almost every one of them involved a scientific controversy. So, if I were not willing and able to read science I could not have prevailed those cases.

I'm very comfortable reading science and I love science. My book, *Thimerosal*, is a summary of all the science that has been done on thimerosal. All the published peer reviewed studies and we spent three years writing this. I had a team, I raised a quarter million dollars to make sure we looked at every scientific study that was ever done. We did not cherry pick studies, we put everything in here.

We found over 1,400 references, over four hundred studies, close to five hundred studies. Virtually all of them say the same thing: that thimerosal is a potent neurotoxin, also does horrendous damage to the other organs in the body. It's reactive to human tissue.

It's the most neurotoxic element in the universe that we know of that is not radioactive. The science was really clear. I was kind of naive when I wrote this book because I thought people were saying, "oh, the science is clear, the science says that there is no link between thimerosal and autism." But I was reading science and couldn't verify that. Not only that, the science I was reading was saying just the opposite.

I assumed that if people saw what the science said that the policies would then follow and the attitudes would then follow. But what I encountered was in the establishment, the medical establishment, the pharmaceutical industry and the vaccine industry was more akin to religion than science. You saw the same kind of dynamics that we've seen in orthodoxies throughout history which is a misplaced faith in an undeserving authority, which is the CDC.

And then a need to silence any kind of dissent. So that heretics get burned, there's no debate. We have to make sure that nobody even talks about this. Nobody questions the received orthodoxies and the dogma.

**Ty:** And that's really the opposite of science. It's more religion, isn't it?

**Robert:** That's the opposite of science. One of the weird emblems, really strange emblems, was that in the 2003 and 2004 the Institute of Medicine, which is supposed be the arbiter of medical science in our government. Made the declaration that this controversy, the issue about whether thimerosal is causing autism "should no longer be studied, that it was settled now."

No scientist ever says that. Every hypothesis is subject to further adjustments and challenge. That's what science does. It challenges existing hypothesis. Is this real? Do the facts that we now know today support that hypothesis or do we need to rethink it?

They declared no more study should be done and the NIH and CDC and all the institutions got in lockstep of that and said we're going to defund anybody who wants to look at this question. We're going to make sure that they're not funded, and that's what's happened ever since.

The only studies that have come out from America are the studies that were engineered by CDC and the vaccine industry. IOM originally in 1999 said to CDC "you've got to look at this, and you've got to look at it with toxicological studies, with biological studies, clinical

studies, animal studies, cadaver studies etc.”

What CDC did is it went out and did a series of epidemiological studies. Epidemiology is the study of populations and the impact, for example, of an environmental condition or toxin on an entire population. So, what epidemiologists try to do is they look at the population that was exposed to the toxin and they examine their health outcomes, and then they look at an unexposed population which is called the controls.

Epidemiology is notoriously susceptible to manipulation. You can design an epidemiology study that proved that sex does not make you pregnant. How would you do that? You would eliminate all the pregnant people before you did the study. So, that you just ended up studying people who were having a lot of sex but nobody was getting pregnant, ergo sex doesn't make you pregnant.

That's what they did with these epidemiology studies that the CDC orchestrated. They eliminated the populations that had autism before they did the study. That's a simplification, but that essentially is what they did.

You can do that by eliminating boys because the boys are more susceptible to mercury poisoning than girls. You can do it by eliminating older children, and those are some of the gimmicks that they used.

There's a saying in my racket which is environmental litigation which is that, "statistics don't lie but statisticians do." And statisticians with an epidemiology study in their hands have a perfect opportunity to manipulate data.

**Ty:** When I hear you say that about the CDC kind of cherry picking the study or the control group or the groups to get the decision that they wanted, to get the study to show what they wanted. I grew up I guess naive thinking that they were unbiased, that they just really wanted to find out what's the truth and protect the people from the things that would make us sick.

But it seems like that's not the goal. And to me it feels like I've been betrayed in a way. I don't know if I'm describing it properly but that's not what I thought they were supposed to be doing.

**Robert:** What shocks me is how much faith people put in CDC knowing what we do about other agencies. There's a dynamic that is well described and well documented that I encounter virtually every day of my professional life, which is called "captive agency phenomenon."

That is the process by which agencies become captured by their own orthodoxies or by the industries that they're supposed to regulate. So, they become sock puppets for the industry that they're supposed to regulate. A lot of times they become even more radical in protecting those interests than the industry itself.

So, I see this in the coal industry in West Virginia, in virtually every state EPA you see that kind of capture and the federal EPA. It's well documented and it's not surprising to me that EPA has also been captured.

The stakes at EPA are so high and it's not the whole agency by the way. It's a small number of people who have become corrupted, and mainly those people are in one office which is the immunization safety office. That's the office that is charged with reviewing and conducting vaccine safety science. I think there are specific members of that group that have corrupted that group.

**Ty:** Now is that at the EPA?

**Robert:** That is at the CDC.

**Ty:** The CDC, okay.

**Robert:** There are two groups within CDC that are relevant to vaccine regulation that have been corrupted and that we should be concerned about. The first of those is the Advisory Committee for Immunization Practices. And that is the group that decides which new vaccines can be added to the schedule. So, the recommended schedule that essentially becomes mandatory when it gets to the state level.

When I was a kid I got a smallpox vaccine and I got polio vaccine and that was it. My kids received 69 doses of 16 vaccines. How did that change? It changed virtually in one year which was 1989 and the reason it changed was because the vaccine industry in 1986 was granted complete immunity from litigation by Congress, we call it the Vaccine Act.

Congress passed the Vaccine Act which gave the vaccine companies immunity from litigation and liability. No matter how reckless their behavior, no matter how grievous the injury, no matter how poisonous the vaccine ingredient, you cannot sue them. So, no matter how badly you're injured you cannot sue a vaccine company in this country.

That act suddenly provoked a gold rush in the vaccine industry. When I was a kid there were—I don't even think the polio vaccine was patented. Nobody was making money on vaccines when I was a boy. They were essentially a civic duty by the vaccine companies, by the pharmaceutical industry.

But suddenly the industry realized now we have a product that the federal government is going to order a hundred million or even two hundred million people to buy, the profit margins are huge, some of these vaccines cost \$300 per shot. There's no advertising cost, there's no marketing cost, and there's no liability.

And also, the process for approving those vaccines were streamlined. They don't have to do the standard double blind placebo studies that the rest of the pharmaceutical industry has to do to bring its product to market. It's a streamlined process that's very, very little in the way of safety scrutiny compared to other drugs.

So, there was a rush. A gold rush to put new vaccines onto the schedule. The group within the CDC that made the decision about which vaccines to add. In a perfect world that would have been a group of kind of geeky scientists who are completely preoccupied with public health outcomes and that's what it used to be.

That's why we were able to block a lot of bad drugs that came onto the market in Europe in previous years because we had a very, very vigorous FDA and CDC. Thalidomide is an example. We blocked thalidomide in this country because we had independent, really good regulators.

By 1989, CDC's structure had changed and the people who sit on that committee, the Advisory Committee of Immunization Practices, many of them are not even CDC employees. Almost all of them have some financial ties or conflicts of interest to the industry.

I'll give you an example. In 1989, CDC put Dr. Paul Offit, who was one of the great promoters of unlimited vaccines. He is a vaccine industry insider. He holds a chair at Merck, at the Children's Hospital Philadelphia that is financed by Merck, and he sat on the advisory

committee when the advisory committee of immunization practices voted to add the rotavirus vaccine to the schedule.

Paul Offit owned a patent to a rotavirus vaccine and yet he did not recuse himself. He voted to add it. As a result of that, of having a rotavirus vaccine part of that mandatory schedule, Offit was able to sell his product a couple of years later for 182 million dollars.

**Ty:** A 182 million?

**Robert:** Yeah and we don't know exactly how much of that Offit personally pocketed, but it's estimated generally around 29 million dollars. Oh, he's become a multimillionaire through conflicts of interest. In 2008 the inspector general of HHS did an investigation of that scandal and what they concluded following that investigation is that Offit had not done anything that was illegal because the strictures and rules that CDC were so loose. The ethical obligations, the rules were essentially nonexistent.

The inspector general said that up to 97 percent of the people who sit on those committees could have the same kind of conflicts as Offit. So, when the American people know about that it's hard to believe that all of these vaccines, these cascade of vaccines that were added to the schedule in 1989 and a couple of years after, were added strictly because of the scientific determination about public health outcomes. Because so many people on that committee have that conflict.

Now 1989 is what EPA calls the "gateway year." It's the year that all of this epidemic of childhood illnesses began. Autism, ASD, ADD, ADHD, speech delay, language delay, tics, something called misery disorder which I'd never heard of before. Tics is Tourette's syndrome, a family of grave neurological injuries that became epidemic that year. SIDS, narcolepsy, seizure disorders, and of course food allergies and asthma. All of those things began in 1989.

On all of those illnesses there is science today, there is science out there that indicates that those illnesses are being caused by thimerosal or adjuvants like aluminum or squalene or some other vaccine association.

But the science varies on those questions. The link between thimerosal and autism is very, very strong. On some of these other diseases the science is less strong, but it least there is what you would have to say was a prima facie case. There is virtually no science that clears the thimerosal particularly.

So, if we're operating by the precautionary principle, well we're not operating by the precautionary principal, we've abandoned the precautionary principal. Our health agencies have abandoned the precautionary principal and there's been no studies to show that we're actually improving health outcomes in our children. There's lots and lots of evidence that thimerosal is making this the sickest generation in the history of our country.

**Ty:** It's sad and we are seeing a very, very sick generation of children. You'd think that doctors that have taken the Hippocratic Oath – first, do no harm – you would think that the precautionary principle would be foremost in their mind. Do not harm. It seems like that would be something that would be of utmost importance to doctors, pediatricians specifically, to make sure that the vaccines are safe.

**Robert:** Pediatrician and doctors, what I've found, is that they don't read the science. For them CDC is a judicious arbiter of science. So, if CDC says there's no evidence they're not going through the abstracts and going out to PubMed and looking up hundreds of documents

and trying to make up their own mind.

I understand that because it's a lot of work. I mean it took us three years to do this book and we had some really great scientists and doctors looking at it. It's hard to figure out how much weight to give to individual studies etc.

So, people just accept CDC's word that this is all safe and then there are very, very strong financial incentives for doctors to get their patients to comply with the CDC's schedule. Doctors are punished financially and very dramatically. Insurance companies like Blue Cross Blue Shield if they don't get a certain percentage of their patients to comply with the schedule.

**Ty:** I had a medical doctor just a month ago, sent me a PDF that Blue Cross Blue Shield, I think it was Blue Cross, sent them and it had the percentage of their patients that they had to have, I think it was 63 percent.

**Robert:** If 63 percent are not compliant they don't get any of their bonuses. The bonuses are lots of money. Tens of thousands of dollars. So, if a pediatrician does not persuade his patients to comply with the CDC schedule he suffers a terrible, terrible financial punishment from Blue Cross Blue Shield.

**Ty:** You mentioned Offit, was he the guy that said that kids could get ten thousand vaccines, what that the same guy?

**Robert:** Yeah.

**Ty:** Okay, that's a lot of vaccines. You think he really believes that or was that just hyperbole?

**Robert:** Oh, I think H.L. Mencken said "it's hard to persuade a man of a fact if his salary depends on the nonexistence of that fact." I can't go into Paul Offit's head to understand whether he's actually malicious. But my own private conversations with him it's been clear to me that he knows that what he's saying is not true. I've caught him lying and I have that documented.

**Ty:** You mentioned, Bobbie, that after 1986 that these pharmaceutical companies are exempt from lawsuits, they're basically immune. Is that ethical or moral to have these companies be able to produce a product that they have no liability and it's even mandated now, if it's in the CDC schedule it's mandated. That just seems like, to me, it's not an ethical situation that we're in.

**Robert:** Well I think the choice at that time was not an irrational choice by Congress given the alternatives that they were presented. The alternative was that—I think the calculus was based upon the idea that at that point there was so much litigation against the vaccine companies that the pharmaceutical industry was considering abandoning vaccines altogether.

I think vaccine companies went to Congress and said "we're going to stop making vaccines and that's going to be a national security problem." Because if there is a bioterrorism attack or if there is an epidemic there's going to be no factories that are up and running that can create new vaccines that can respond to those national emergencies. So if you want us to continue to make vaccines you're going to have to give us immunity from litigation," and that's what happened.

I think the result has been predictable. If you look at the pharmaceutical industry, even

when they know that they have a very active plaintiff's bar looking over their shoulders and you see advertisements by attorneys every day saying "if you've taken this drug or that drug and you've had a bad reaction, call us and we'll get a recovery for you."

So even when those guys are looking over the industry's shoulders they still make a hundred million dollar mistakes. They still do things that are really wrong and bad and you have to ask yourself then what would happen if you got rid of all the lawyers?

You got rid of the courts, you got rid of the class actions, you got rid of the depositions, and you got rid of cross-examination and you also neutralize the press? So, nobody's looking up your shoulder. So, the press wouldn't even cover this issue. You go on the evening news and look at how many of those advertisements are pharmaceutical company ads, I was told by a network executive—[phone rings] I'm sorry.

**Ty:** Go ahead.

**Robert:** One of the problems is that all of the institutions in our democracy that are designed to protect little children from a predatory corporation have in essence been neutralized or removed. You've had the Vaccine Act get rid of all the lawyers, all the judges, and the class action suits and the multi-district litigation suits and depositions. All of the things that curb bad corporate behavior in every other sector, including the pharmaceutical sector.

They've gotten rid of the CDC by capturing that agency, and that's the agency that's supposed to be the frontline agency that protects little children from a predatory corporation. They now have been thoroughly captured by the industry they're supposed to regulate.

The press has effectively been neutralized. All you have to do, Ty, is sit down and watch the six o'clock news on TV and see how many of those stories are bracketed by pharmaceutical ads.

I was told by a network executive that during non-election years or in some months during the election years up to 70 percent of his news division revenues are coming from pharma. So, that is definitely going to mute the appetite that those news divisions have for exposing these kinds of stories about the pharmaceutical industry who's certainly their major payer.

**Ty:** Yeah, they're paying for their show.

**Robert:** Right and this network president told me that if one of his talk shows allowed me on the air that he would fire the host. This person is a friend of mine and "I would have to fire the host because this is where our advertisers are" and if he lost an advertiser it's a major catastrophe for the network.

So, they've been neutralized and it's not all just money, again there is the dogma that if anybody says anything bad about vaccines you're going to fuel this mythical anti-vaccine movement and children are going to start dropping dead. So your action is going to end up killing babies.

That's kind of the moral gloss on a major financial incentive that the news divisions have not covered this anyway. So, it effectively locks out any kind of debate that you have. Not just in the major networks but also in the so-called alternative media which is supposed to be the antidote to corporate control. Places like Salon and Slate and Huffington Post and Daily Beast and Mother Jones, also those media outlets will not cover this debate.

It's frustrating. Somebody said that, I think that it was Malcolm X said that, "the greatest

power of the press is the power to ignore” and that’s what we see in this sphere.

**Ty:** Yeah, I think you’re right. It’s just almost as if, you mentioned the fact that science is not ever settled, right? We should question, that’s part of the scientific method.

**Robert:** Let me just say this, in our democracy we have a number of institutions that are there to protect little children from predatory corporations. All of these have been neutralized here.

You have a regulatory agency, the front-line protector of public health that has been captured by the agency to become a sock puppet to the industry that it’s supposed to regulate. It’s an arm of the pharmaceutical industry. CDC sells 4.6 billion dollars’ worth of vaccines every year itself and it owns the patent.

**Ty:** Wait, CDC sells vaccines?

**Robert:** Yes, CDC sells vaccine. So CDC is regulating an industry that it’s part of. You have a CDC that’s been captured and FDA in the same way. FDA owns patents on the vaccines and they have all kinds of internal financial entanglements that have accelerated and fortified this agency capture.

You have the bar, the attorneys, the courts, the judges that have been eliminated. There are no class action suits, there’s no malpractices, there’s no multidistrict litigation, there’s no depositions. That’s all out of the pictures. They would protect them.

The politicians have been paid off. The pharmaceutical company puts more into lobbying, more money than any other industry. You would think oil and gas. That’s number two and pharma puts double what oil gas puts in. Four times what military and aerospace puts in.

There’s more pharmaceutical lobbyists in Washington DC than there are congressman. So, they’ve neutralized the politicians, regulatory agency, the courts, the judges, they’ve neutralized the press. They are the biggest contributor now to news division revenues and the last thing left to protect this little child are the parents. And now you’re seeing these laws around the states that essentially remove parental control and informed consent.

So, all of these institutions that stand between the child and the predatory company have been neutralized. That’s not democracy and it’s not the way that democracy is supposed to work.

**Ty:** No. I’m still blown away by the fact you just mentioned that CDC sells vaccines.

**Robert:** Yeah.

**Ty:** How do they get away with that? They’re supposed to be regulating that?

**Robert:** They buy and sell billions of dollars worth of vaccines annually. And that actually is probably one of the least alarming conflicts that you see within CDC. There are so many financial conflicts between people who work for CDC or who work for the vaccine program and direct financial conflicts, financial entanglements with the pharmaceutical companies.

**Ty:** And we see this revolving door over the years of CDC to vaccine manufacturers to pharma, whatever. One of the things you just mentioned about informed consent, parental rights, we’re here in California. SB 277 was passed that basically mandates vaccines for any kid in school. What’s your take on mandatory vaccines?

**Robert:** Well I focus on thimerosal and in California thimerosal is supposedly illegal because the state legislature made it illegal to bring thimerosal vaccine into the state. But there was a loophole in that bill that was passed eight years ago, that says that if the health commissioner of California declares a state of emergency that you can bring thimerosal vaccines in to the state.

As it turns out virtually every other year, four out of the last seven years, since this bill was passed the State Health Department has declared an emergency vaccine shortage. Even though the vaccine manufacturers themselves say there is plenty of thimerosal-free vaccine for everybody in California and we don't need to be shipping thimerosal vaccines into the state. Even though the industry is saying there is no shortage the Department of Health of California declares a shortage every other year.

**Ty:** Let me ask you this, speaking about thimerosal, wasn't thimerosal removed from the vaccines in 2003? That's what I've read.

**Robert:** Yeah, thimerosal was removed from three childhood vaccines in 2003. But the same year CDC mandated flu vaccines for pregnant women and for little children. The flu vaccines at that time, almost all of them contained mega doses of thimerosal. So, children who were receiving vaccines after 2003 would get as much thimerosal as children prior to the removal of 2003 from those other three vaccines.

And the first time they began giving it to pregnant women, so children were getting thimerosal at much more vulnerable period of their lives. So, it's kind of a myth to say that thimerosal was removed from vaccines. It was removed from some vaccines but it was added to others.

**Ty:** So, if I'm not mistaken the multi-dose flu vaccine still contains thimerosal as a preservative, correct?

**Robert:** Yes. Originally in 2003 to around 2010 or 12, around 95 percent of the flu vaccines that were available on the market contained thimerosal. Today it's about a third. About 53 million vaccines I think last year out 150 million.

**Ty:** So, a lot of thimerosal is still out then.

**Robert:** It's a lot of thimerosal. In fact, in some states if a doctor takes a multi-dose vial and drops it by mistake on the floor and it breaks he is required by law to evacuate the building and to bring in hazmat crews to clean it up before the building can be reoccupied. Hazmat crews wearing moon suits and respirators.

And we're taking that same toxin and flu vaccines have to be treated as hazardous waste if you're going to dispose of them. That thimerosal vial is legally hazardous waste. It can't be disposed of in a garbage can and we're taking that and we're injecting it into pregnant women and little babies. If it's early in the pregnancy which is recommended under the current advisories, that little baby could be getting as much as a million times what EPA says is safe.

**Ty:** That's unbelievable that if the doctor drops it it's hazmat material, but we inject it into the mother and the baby. That's totally unbelievable.

**Robert:** That is not the rule in every state but it's the rule in some states, so you can look it up in here.

**Ty:** And if it's not the rule in some states it should be, because mercury is that toxic. Let me ask you one last thing Bobbie. Thank you by the way for a great interview. You made this easy

on me because you're just hitting all the topics. You covered almost every question and I didn't have to ask you half of them. But I want you to tell the folks that are watching a little bit about your project with Robert De Niro.

**Robert:** Robert De Niro and I have offered a 25-thousand-dollar reward to anybody who can come up with a single peer reviewed published article that shows that thimerosal is safe. If you talk to the press or if you talk to doctors, your pediatrician, he'll say "Oh, there's lots of science out there that proves that thimerosal is safe" because he's injecting you with thimerosal. So parents will ask him and he'll say there's lots of science that says that. But if you ask the next question "can you tell me the name of one document?" he won't be able to do that because there are none.

There are six documents, six scientific studies that CDC has relied on that are on its website. But all six of those studies have been discredited. In fact they're so badly discredited that when the Institute of Medicine asked to review the science in those studies, CDC instructed them not to and threatened to defund the Institute of Medicine if the Institute of Medicine tried to review those studies.

It's clear that CDC knows the studies are fraudulent. The principal CDC author of—there's essentially three American studies and three foreign studies, Scandinavian studies. The author of their Scandinavian studies Poul Thorsen, who was the CDC liaison and the data collector, is now on the run from the FBI and from Interpol for having stolen the money he was supposed to spend on that study. A million dollars from CDC

He's been fired by his university in Aarhus in Denmark and he is facing 22 counts of wire fraud and theft. He's wanted by Interpol and the FBI and yet his studies are still up on CDC's sites as the principle studies that supposedly exonerate thimerosal from the autism epidemic.

Meanwhile, CDC's own studies since then, including a 2013 study published in *JAMA Pediatrics* have shown that as soon thimerosal was removed in 1993 from Denmark—

The reason people like to study Denmark is because Denmark was the one country that really did remove thimerosal in 1993. So you can look at what was happening before and what was happening after. What CDC's own study shows is that as soon as they removed it there was a 30 percent drop in autism in Denmark.

So, it's pretty clear that we should be removing it in this country and removing it from circulation in the millions of children in the developing world that we're giving it to every year.

**Ty:** Yeah, no doubt. Bobby thank you so much for this is awesome information. I really thank you for what you're doing. We are all on this mission together to try to bring awareness to the world, to our country and to help kids and really that's what it's all about it.

**Robert:** You said thimerosal was removed, yeah it was removed from childhood vaccines in this country and then it was added to the flu vaccine at the same time. But in the developing world, Africa, Asia, and Latin America, virtually every kid is getting fully loaded thimerosal vaccines, every year.

So, those kids are being sickened. Imagine if somebody told you should inject lead into your baby. Almost everybody knows enough about lead to say "no, that would be crazy." Mercury is far more neurotoxic than lead. It's very well documented. I mean every fresh-water fish in America now has advisories on them telling pregnant women not to eat it.

The mercury in thimerosal is 50 times as toxic to brain tissue and twice as persistent in the brain as the mercury in fish. So why would we inject that into a pregnant woman or a little baby? It doesn't make any sense.

**Ty:** It doesn't. This was on Facebook a couple months ago. There was a woman and she was just trying to make a point. She's a mommy blogger and she was trying to get advice from her friends. She said my pediatrician tells me that I should feed my baby mercury, aluminum, formaldehyde, all these things that are in vaccines. She's making this up. She says "my pediatrician says I should feed my baby so I'm going to go ahead and feed my baby this."

She got lambasted by everybody that answered. They said "I'm going to report you to the police, you're going to get thrown in jail, you're going to damage your child" and at the end she said "I'm just trying to make a point. This is the same things that we inject into our children." So, it made a good point. Yeah. Thank you so much.

**Robert:** Thank you.

**Ty:** Awesome interview.

[End of transcript]