

Chapter 40:

Interview with
Dr. Larry Palevsky, M.D.



Ty: Dr. Larry Palevsky, thank you for joining me today, really appreciate it.

Dr. Palevsky: Good morning. It's a pleasure to be here. Thank you.

Ty: I know that you have avoided interviews for the last seven years now.

Dr. Palevsky: Pretty much.

Ty: I appreciate you taking the time to travel down here today. You practice in New York City.

Dr. Palevsky: I do.

Ty: We're outside of DC, so you flew a long way there to come see us.

Dr. Palevsky: It was a pleasure.

Ty: Appreciate it.

Dr. Palevsky: I look forward to the interview. See what happens.

Ty: Awesome. Tell us a little bit about your education and your background Dr. Larry.

Dr. Palevsky: Well, I entered NYU School of Medicine in 1983, finishing in 1987. I did a three-year pediatric residency at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, from 1987 to 1990. Then I did a year of an outpatient fellowship in the pediatrics department and then the ER department from 1990 to 91 at Bellevue Hospital at NYU School of Medicine.

Then, after I finished all my training, four years of medical school, four years of residency in fellowship, I went on to work in the Bronx in New York in a pediatric emergency room as an attending there. I did that for four years. While I was there, I also worked on weekends at a private practice in Manhattan covering sick calls, newborn babies, on call problems.

By 1995, I had switched over to being the director or the chief of the Acute Care Unit at Lenox Hill and Pediatrics. There I covered patients who were sick, who couldn't stay on the ward, who came into a more acute care setting.

I followed patients on the inpatient ward. I covered the ER when there was an emergency in pediatrics. I also covered the neo-natal ICU. I'd spend five nights a month sleeping in the hospital, covering emergency deliveries and any emergencies that happened in the neo-natal ICU. I also covered the newborn nursery when there were problems and had my own outpatient clinic.

After five years of being at Lenox Hill, I moved over to Beth Israel Medical Center's Continuum Center for Health and Healing, which was an integrative medical center for the public. It was really the first of its kind in New York starting in 2000.

I stayed there for a couple of years and then took some time off and then by 2005, I was practicing on my own and have been practicing on my own since then.

I'm seeing kids who are looking for solutions to their medical problems without the use of pharmaceuticals or over-the-counter drugs. That seems to be very successful for those families who are looking for more alternatives.

Then I see children who are looking for more wellness approach, interventions that don't involve suppression of symptoms, and parents who are looking for other ways of understanding how to raise their kids in a healthy manner, other than the way in which I was taught in medical school.

Ty: Okay. You have some experience with the little people.

Dr. Palevsky: I do, and the big people.

Ty: Both.

Dr. Palevsky: Sure.

Ty: When you mentioned the way that you were taught in medical school, what were you taught in medical school?

Dr. Palevsky: The majority of the material presented in medical school was these are the diseases and these are the ways in which you treat them. As I became a physician out in the field in the ER and in private practice on weekends, and even in the intensive care unit, I started to see things that happened, live, in person, with children in their course of disease that didn't model or didn't match what I was told was supposed to happen.

Rather than just ignore it, I actually tried to figure out why things weren't matching what I was taught. The other piece was that all these kids were getting these diseases and I had no handle on what was producing these symptoms.

Why they happened? Why they kept happening? I realized that nothing in medical school geared me towards thinking, in a way that pondered, why are these kids getting these symptoms. What do these symptoms represent? Is it something other than take a medicine, suppress it, everything's good, go home and go away.

I realized that actually symptoms happen in children mostly because the body was trying to re-create homeostasis, re-create balance. Try to find a way to take what was happening in the body, what stressors were happening in the body, and make it more balanced, more well. I realized that the suppression of symptoms was actually an inappropriate intervention in treating children. It's probably the same in adults, but I treat children.

My idea is to understand what brought the symptoms on, what are the stressors that created the imbalances in the body that moved the child towards the development of those symptoms, and how do I support the body so that the body can resolve those symptoms without suppressing them.

Most often, the development of symptoms is the body's attempt to remove excess wastes due to increased stressors. In children, almost all of those stressors come from diet and the emotional environment. A stressful emotional environment.

We learned almost nothing about nutrition in medical school. In fact, the Dean of my medical school got up there on the first day of medical school, 1983, and said, "Nutrition is not a field of medicine." It was geared towards, "Here's a problem, fix it. Here's a problem, here's a medicine. Here's a problem, here's a surgery. Here's a problem, here's a therapy."

It was not geared towards understanding what brought the child to that state of health and what is the significance of that state of health and how can we help guide it so that we

don't suppress it. So we understand what's really going on physiologically interesting in the body.

There's definitely a need for surgery. There's definitely a need for emergency medicine. There's some great work that's done in that field of conventional medicine. I can practice medicine without using pharmaceuticals.

That is a blow to me having being trained in conventional medicine. It's a blow to most physicians to realize that medicine is not needed most of the time in children. What's needed is an understanding of what's really going on physiologically and how to help children move through those states of symptoms so that they can heal and get better.

Even when I was a medical student in the mid 80s, the physicians who were teaching us medicine, had been practicing medicine in New York City since the 1940s. They used to say that when children had their illnesses, and you left them unsuppressed, if you just allowed them to be guided through their illness and their symptoms, they almost always had a developmental growth spurt after the symptoms were over.

The significance of that rings true today. Because in fact those illnesses are ways in which they clean themselves out, they prune their nervous system, they prune their immune system, they get rid of excess wastes, and they actually go on to heal and be stronger.

In Western Medicine, we're taught that germs cause disease. If we really look at the literature today and see what the literature is telling us, germs may cause disease, but in fact, germs may help children develop the illnesses to enhance the removal of the wastes. They may be part of the solution to the stress that creates the excess junk in their body, not the cause of the excess junk.

Ty: They might be part of the solution.

Dr. Palevsky: They might be part of the solution. Viral illnesses and even some bacterial illnesses may be part of the way that the body heals from stress, rather than the germs causing the stress. That shakes the foundational roots of conventional medicine.

Ty: The Germ Theory of Disease.

Dr. Palevsky: Everything about conventional medicine is based on, "Oh you have an infection. Here's a medicine to stop it." When in fact, science is showing us that those germs are taking part in the solution to the stress that's built up in the body that creates the excess waste that must get out.

Even today, scientists are using poliovirus, measles virus infections to cure cancer. The viruses themselves are playing a role in healing stress in the body, not necessarily causing it.

Ty: That's a great distinction because I think that maybe western medicine's lack of focus on cause and effect, it muddies the waters with the germs as well. Because we look at the Germ Theory of Disease and it's "destroy the bacteria, destroy the virus," as opposed to, what kind of an effect might that have on your internal terrain, and fighting off future—

Dr. Palevsky: It's not a consideration.

Ty: It's not, is it?

Dr. Palevsky: That's okay. For the model and the ideological standpoint, it's not a consideration. For

many people, both in the lay public and in the medical field and in the fields of other practitioners who don't practice western medicine, we're seeing that it is a consideration.

People are flocking towards that understanding that we need to consider what we're doing to the microbiome. We need to consider what we're doing to these germs with our choices in society. With our dietary choices, our environmental choices and our medical choices. More and more people are flocking away from, "Oh, the germs are bad." That's creating a little tremble in the conventional model.

Ty: You mentioned earlier, Dr. Larry, that we're seeing that exposure to these childhood illnesses actually protects them later in life from certain things. Then you mentioned the polio virus, the measles virus being used to cure cancer, to treat cancer. What childhood illnesses specifically were you referring to that can then protect children later in life?

Dr. Palevsky: Many people who hear what I'm about to say would be very angry at what I'm about to say. They would say that measles is a deadly disease. It's not. We create fear because we need to use that fear to get people to get vaccinated.

Measles is not a deadly disease. In fact, more than 99 percent of the time, it's not a deadly disease. In places where there's poverty, malnutrition, poor sanitation, dirty water, starvation, any virus can be a deadly virus because the conditions are what create the opportunity for the symptoms to develop.

What my mentors were telling me when I was in medical school, when we were in medical school, was that these illnesses are uncomfortable. But with the right setting, with the right nutrition, with the right environment, they actually promote the pruning and the healing of the nervous system and the immune system.

These diseases: measles, mumps, rubella, chicken pox, even flus, other viral illnesses, are actually considered rites of passage because they play a role in pruning the immune system. In getting rid of toxins that were accumulated in utero, of cleaning out excess genetic material between the mother and the father, and creating a more stronger, more vibrant organism.

These diseases actually play that role in strengthening the immune system. What we're seeing by stopping these viral illnesses, is the creation of something else in its place which is chronic illness. We've traded the pretty benign, not difficult to manage acute illnesses, that in the right circumstances go on to develop very few if any, sequelae, horrible side effects, to the development of what we now see.

Now, here we are in 2016. Based on a study that was done, a national survey that was done in 2007, looking at around 91,000 children, that 54 percent of children have at least one of 20 chronic illness.

Ty: Wow.

Dr. Palevsky: That's based on 2007 National's data, health survey data. In 2011, there was a study published that surveyed over 91,000 children that showed that 54 percent of those children had at least one of 20 chronic illness.

Here we are in 2016. I started medical school in 1983. These were not the date we were seeing. 54 percent of children with at least one of 20 chronic illness. Everyone is sitting around going, "We don't care how or we don't care why, we're just going to find the treat-

ment that's going to stop the symptoms or make the symptoms better." No one's looking at what's creating this imbalance, this disease in the immune and nervous system.

From a 1997 to 2008 survey, it was clearly shown that one in six children had some form of a neurodevelopmental disability. Here we are in 2016, one in six children with a neurodevelopmental disability, and boys were three to four times as likely than girls to have these neurodevelopmental disabilities.

One in six children with neurodevelopmental disabilities that doesn't demarcate what is the incidence of neurodevelopmental disabilities in vaccinated children and what is the incidents of neurodevelopmental disabilities in non-vaccinated children. All we know is one in six children with neurodevelopmental disabilities as of 2008.

Here we are in 2016. We don't have any new data. If we look around at the schools, the therapists, the guidance counselors, the teachers, we know the incidence in children of neurodevelopmental disabilities continues to rise because more and more children are requiring services. Something is happening to the brains of our children. Something is interfering with the normal neuro-sequencing of brain development.

Because when babies are born, their brain is not developed. When babies are born, they have more nerve cells than their brains need. It's through life experience, that the tracks are laid down to create the proper sequencing of muscular development, speech development, cognitive development, and emotional development.

Something is interfering with the proper sequence of those steps. Something is getting in the way of the brain developing properly. No one is asking the question, why?

Why are so many kids having an interference of the proper sequencing of brain development? Why as of January 2016, are we seeing one out of every 20 children under the age of five with a seizure disorder?

Something is happening to the brains of our children that is exciting, igniting, inflaming, irritating, agitating, and interfering with the proper sequencing of how the nerve cells sequence, develop, and proceed towards normal brain development.

Speech delay is not a given. Learning disability is not a given. Low tone, weak muscles, lack of coordination, not sitting still, not focusing, not paying attention, these are not things that are a given. They are only happening because something is irritating, inflaming, agitating the brain and interfering with the way in which the brain is supposed to properly, sequentially develop.

Vaccine ingredients cause brain inflammation, period. All anybody has to do is open up the package inserts, look at the ingredients and go into the literature, and read about the characteristics of those ingredients and see that those ingredients in the vaccines get into the brain and cause inflammation.

There are plenty of studies to demonstrate how the vaccine ingredients, singularly by themselves and in combination with each other can pass the blood-brain barrier, get into the brain, and interfere with brain development.

Ty: The studies are there?

Dr. Palevsky: Not in humans.

Ty: Okay.

Dr. Palevsky: But when you look at the actual chemical, biological characteristics of these ingredients and you read about them, you'll see that they directly infiltrate the brain across the blood-brain barrier.

Ty: Dr. Larry, these things that you're sharing with us, I would assume that in medical school, when you went through your courses on vaccines, that you learned about all the potential side effects of these ingredients?

Dr. Palevsky: Vaccines were not very much discussed in medical school other than, "this is what vaccines do, they save lives, they protect people from disease and this the schedule you need to use in your pediatric clinics to give to kids."

I started medical school 1983, and it wasn't until 1998 that a mother came over to me and said, "Dr. Larry, did you know that there's mercury in vaccines?" I said, "No." Instead of just pushing it aside and saying, "Oh, it's just such a small amount, it doesn't matter," I actually started looking to what else is in vaccines. I realized that there's a great amount of material in vaccines that impairs many cell structures and cell functions.

Mercury is still in vaccines. It's not just in the flu vaccine. It's still in trace amounts, in the vaccines that previously had tremendous amounts of mercury in it. Thimerosal is still in the vaccines, ethyl mercury being the organic form of mercury that's in the Thimerosal, is neurotoxic.

But now there's more aluminum in the vaccines. Aluminum and mercury together potentiate its dangerous properties of creating death in nerve cells than if you had just the aluminum and mercury alone. Aluminum is a neurotoxin.

One time in New York, I think in maybe in 2011, 2012, I gave a talk on the H1N1 vaccine. I talked about the vaccine ingredients. I went through the package insert and showed how it says, that it's not been tested on pregnant women, so its effects on fetuses are unknown, even though pregnant women were being told to get the vaccine. I went through all the ingredients. I went through the properties of the ingredients.

A physician who is interesting he audience, came up to me and said, "Why did you tell the people what was in the vaccines?" I just looked at her and she said, "Of course there's going to be stuff in there that's not good for you." I just didn't know what to say.

Ty: I don't even know how to respond to that. Was she upset that you shared the ingredients?

Dr. Palevsky: She was upset that I was scaring people. She was upset that I was scaring people about what's in the vaccines. She wanted to hold and uphold the sanctity of vaccines. That they were much greater than any side effect could be.

Everyone knows there's a risk benefit to every decision we make. Parents know that all the time. The question is, is there a greater risk to vaccination, then there is to a benefit? More and more of the science is showing, more and more life experience is showing that there is a greater risk to vaccination, then there is benefit.

The public is learning this. They are learning it first hand and they are learning it by doing their research. Every attempt is being made to stop them from learning it. The science is clear. The vaccine ingredients are clearly poisoning the body and the brain.

One of the disease states that's rising exponentially right now is a disease state called mitochondrial dysfunction. The mitochondria are the fuel pumps of the cells. They provide the energy for the cells to function properly.

Many of the chronic illnesses that we're seeing actually have mitochondrial dysfunction. Which means that the cells are sluggish and when they're sluggish, when they're not providing the energy to make the cells work properly, cell function diminishes, even to the point of developing cancer.

Vaccine ingredients are known to directly impair mitochondrial function. Vaccine ingredients are known to directly impair mitochondrial function. It's in the literature, what some of the vaccine ingredients can do and do do to the function of mitochondria.

You have one in six children with neurodevelopmental disabilities, many of them with mitochondrial dysfunction. You have 54 percent of children with at least one of 20 chronic illness, many of them with mitochondrial dysfunction.

You have one in 20 children under the age of five with seizures. I imagine there's mitochondrial dysfunction in those cells as well. You have all these kids who are being vaccinated with materials that impair mitochondrial function, and get into the brain past the blood-brain barrier causing inflammation and interference with brain sequencing and development.

No one is saying, what are we doing. People are actually saying it's okay to develop these kids with neurodevelopmental disabilities, with brain damage, with seizures, with mitochondrial dysfunction because we're saving lives with vaccines.

If you're a parent that's not okay. Because almost all of these chronic illnesses are lifelong debilitating impairments. Most of these illnesses that we vaccinate against can be cured and are self-limited. Most.

Ty: What you're saying is that in this theory of vaccination for the greater good, when you damage my kid, it's not worth it to me, right?

Dr. Palevsky: There's definitely a philosophy that it's okay to sacrifice the health of a few in order for the good of many. When you see politicians, medical doctors, parents, governmental officials saying "vaccines are safe, they've been properly tested, they are effective." Anybody who runs with those statements has only read the title of the article. They've not gone further than the title. It's very difficult.

What we're dealing with is an actual psychological warfare. It's very difficult to create any inroads into ideological thinking. What we're seeing is a very, very strong position of ideology. There's no self-reflection. There's no taking a step back and saying, "What are we doing?" People's lives are being threatened for asking the question, "What are we doing?"

In medical school, we were taught something called the scientific method. I blame my medical school training on what I'm about to say. We were trained to create a question, go through the steps of evaluating the answers to that question, and be willing to look at the data and not eliminate it if we don't like it.

Then come to some conclusion about our original question, even if we don't like the conclusion we come to. The scientific method requires us to think and ask a question, even if it's an uncomfortable question.

In our current state of affairs, we're not allowed to ask the question. That's not science anymore. That's ideology and dogma. What's happening is, people are asking the question. The authorities don't like it. You have presidential candidates who are saying, "the science is clear, vaccines are safe, the earth is round. Vaccinate your kid. Grandmother knows best."

Has she read past the titles? Has anyone who says that read past the titles of the articles? What we have is a lot of people who are espousing what other people tell them.

If I presented my medical research around vaccines to my colleagues in medicine, they would be ashamed of themselves because they would never know that the aluminum in vaccines is not the same aluminum that you ingest or inhale. That the aluminum in vaccines is in such a structure that it can easily pass into the brain, and bring with it viruses and bacteria.

That the emulsifiers in vaccines, called Polysorbate 80, are used by the pharmaceutical industry to get drugs to pass into the brain across the blood-brain barrier. They're also in vaccines. They also attach really strongly to aluminum.

As an adjuvant, aluminum has a kind of structure that binds tightly to the bacteria and the viruses. Then the Polysorbate 80, the emulsifier, binds really tightly to the aluminum and to the bacteria and viruses, and can walk into the brain the way a ghost can go through a wall. The pharmaceutical industry uses particles like aluminum that are in vaccines to attach to drugs, to get them to go across the blood-brain barrier because drugs don't go across the blood-brain barrier otherwise.

Then the pharmaceutical industry uses an emulsifier like Polysorbate 80 to attach to the nanoparticle, that aluminum-type particle that is bound to the drug, to increase the entry of that drug into the brain twenty-fold. That same technology that the pharmaceutical industry uses to enhance delivery of drugs across the blood-brain barrier into the brain is the same technology in vaccine.

Knowing that science, the question has to be asked, do vaccine materials enter the brain? No studies. Are vaccine materials supposed to get into the brain? No. If vaccine materials get into the brain, what happens? One in six children with neurodevelopmental disabilities. One in 50 with autism. One in 10 with ADHD. One in 20 below the age of five with seizures, until proven otherwise.

Ty: But, they've not done the studies?

Dr. Palevsky: Correct. But we're told vaccines are safe. Anybody who reads that article, vaccines are safe, they've never read below to see well, have the ingredients been tested to see if they have entered the brain, to see if they impair mitochondria? The blood-brain barrier has the highest concentration of mitochondria of anywhere in the body. Vaccine materials can go right through it, penetrate it, destroy it, go right into the brain.

Ty: That's why we're seeing the mitochondrial dysfunction?

Dr. Palevsky: That's one of the possible reasons. Again, theory. This matches what's going in the lab, the animal studies. We're seeing the same thing in humans that's happening when these type of ingredients are injected in animal studies.

The question is, if these ingredients do this in the animal studies, and we're seeing this in humans, is there a correlation? People who say vaccines are safe don't know a thing about what vaccine ingredients do to the body. They don't know anything.

Ty: They do the thing that the parents do. Right? “Why should I do this?” “Because I said so.”

Dr. Palevsky: Correct.

Ty: They did the same with vaccines. Vaccines are safe and effective because we said so.

Dr. Palevsky: Correct. What you bring up is a really important point. In today’s climate, you have the, “get your kid vaccinated now.” Then you have a growing climate of, “don’t vaccinate your kid.” Now neither standpoint allows for owning a decision and understanding why you make that decision.

If I give you information about vaccines and vaccine ingredients and then I show you the data of neurodevelopmental disabilities, mitochondrial disabilities, allergies, asthma, and immune dysfunction and then show you that these vaccine ingredients can do that. Now, what’s your decision?

Ty: That’s called informed consent, isn’t it?

Dr. Palevsky: Correct, correct. Doctors would be ashamed to know that the vaccine ingredients do this to the body. They don’t want to know. Even though we’re seeing so many chronic illnesses in kids.

Ty: It’s odd to me that I find that the doctors don’t want to know but as you referred to earlier Dr. Larry, the scientific method means you test and you make an unbiased decision based upon the results. You don’t back into a decision. But isn’t it odd that if we question vaccines, which is scientific, we are told that we are anti-science?

Dr. Palevsky: And heretics.

Ty: Yes, it’s like a church.

Dr. Palevsky: Doctors rely on Big Daddy, the governing bodies to tell them what to do. They’re not supposed to break out of line. They’re not supposed to get out of the marching orders. They just follow what they’re told and that’s okay.

The parents know that it’s different than that. The efforts to keep educating the public should be maintained and put forth because the doctors are not going to be the first to get onboard, they’re going to be the last. Because the public already knows the information about the vaccine ingredients. They already know it and they’re learning it more and more.

Nowadays, everybody knows somebody who’s vaccine injured. It’s no longer a secret. It’s no longer under the table. It’s right out in the open. People don’t want to know that it’s happening, because they want to be able to rely on Big Daddy.

They want to be able to trust that their authority is protecting them. Every story about kids who’ve been vaccine injured, the parents almost always state, “I didn’t want to do it. I knew it was wrong. I had this gut feeling, but my doctor bullied me into doing it.”

Ty: One of the things that—I’m not knocking church because I got to church every Sunday. This is like a church. The vaccine mafia, well vaccine lobby, whatever you want to call it. My good friend Robert Scott Bell calls it the vaccines, he says the vaccines are “the sacred cow of the church of biological mysticism,” because of what we’ve been saying, we’ve been talking about and you’ve been sharing the fact that they’re not supported by testing safety.

They haven't been tested. They work because we say they work and he equates that to a church hierarchy saying this is true because the church says is true and you just believe it.

Dr. Palevsky: Again, if anybody says vaccines are safe, are they saying that because they actually investigated the issue themselves or, they're saying that because they just accepted what they were told true is true? You get a lot of angry people who are realizing that they accepted what they were told is true and are now realizing that it may not have been.

I don't blame them for being angry. Vaccines have never been proven to be safe anywhere in the literature. Anybody who says that they are, hasn't read past the tittle. They haven't done their due diligence. They haven't done their true scientific exploration. They're not supposed to in a dogmatic ideological state.

Ty: Many of the inserts that I have personally read and I don't remember the specific vaccines, but they say, "this vaccine has not been tested for mutagenicity or carcinogenicity." In other words, on the package insert they're telling us they have not been tested if they're safe, but they tell us they are.

Dr. Palevsky: In the realm of mutagenicity and carcinogenicity, correct, they're not safe because they've not been tested. In 2005, the FDA put out a report about the contaminants of foreign DNA in vaccines. They said in their presentation, "we do not know if any of the contaminants that we know exist in vaccines from foreign DNA will lead to the development of any event."

They left it as "an event." They didn't know what event that would lead to. Whether a take-over of the DNA in the body, cancer, cell death, inflammation, they have no idea.

In 2005, admitting that there are foreign DNA particles in vaccines, that are unavoidably in there, they said "we don't know if any of these foreign DNA particles can lead to an event." Okay, so you don't know. How are you going to find out if they do? Were you just going to leave it up to chance?

Ty: They've left it up to chance, apparently.

Dr. Palevsky: It seems that way.

Ty: Dr. Larry, in 2000 there was an article in the Pediatrics Journal that describes that before World War II, we looked at pertussis, measles, flu, tuberculosis, scarlet fever, all of these childhood diseases were actually being reduced if not almost completely wiped out before the introduction of the vaccine. How do we explain that?

Dr. Palevsky: The actual article discussed the decrease in mortality in children between the ages of one and 19 before World War II. What the data showed was a very large decrease in the mortality rates of children dying from infectious diseases.

In the article, the author concludes that without the presence of antibiotics and vaccines, these disease states and the mortality went down. The reasons for the reduction in mortality were due to improved sanitation, improved water, better living conditions, and better nutrition.

Some people have stated that the diphtheria vaccine was introduced in the 1920s and that's the reason diphtheria mortality rates went down. And that the pertussis vaccine was introduced in 1949 in the form of the DPT and that's the reason the death rates went down.

If that were true, how do you explain the reduction in mortality rates of all the other infectious

diseases for which there were no vaccines? Because they went down without vaccines.

There is evidence in the literature to show us that lives can be saved without vaccines. That death doesn't have to happen with infectious diseases and without vaccines.

Ty: The CDC and the American Academy of Pediatrics, state that there is no connection between vaccines and autism. Have they done proper studies with proper controls to make this statement?

Dr. Palevsky: The whole subject of vaccines and autism is a very, very hot topic. It's very controversial, because everybody goes back to Dr. Wakefield's study. What gets lost in the conversation is the science. Putting aside Dr. Wakefield's science, and his study and the whole issue around him and what people think of him, what is autism?

Autism is an interference of proper brain sequencing. It's improper development of brain. It's loss of many milestones that should be seen in normal brain development. It's part of the one in six umbrella of children with neurodevelopmental disabilities.

Something has interfered with proper brain development and proper sequencing of brain development. We just happen to call one in 50 of them "autism."

What we really need to do is look at them as children with neurodevelopmental disabilities, whose brain development has been interfered with by one or more factors. Vaccine ingredients can be one of those ingredients, one of those interventions that can create an interference of normal brain sequencing.

I'd rather not call attention to autism because it's only a small part of the picture. I don't mean to demean the children who have autism. That's not what I meant by saying it's a small part of the issue. One in 50 is within the one in six, and in the 54 percent of children with some form of chronic disease with immune and neurological dysfunction and mitochondrial dysfunction.

You never know what vaccine ingredients are going to do in each person's body. You never know where they're going to land, at what stage of development the child is introduced to these ingredients.

What parts of the cells and what parts of the brain are at most rapid development at that time that are most affected with the introduction of those ingredients. You never know. For one kid, it may really be autoimmunity. For another kid, it may be brain damage.

Ty: Again, it sounds to me almost like a crapshoot and if you're going to play craps then maybe you need to know your benefit versus your risk.

Dr. Palevsky: Correct.

Ty: It goes back to informed consent.

Dr. Palevsky: Right. One of the other disease states that's on the rise besides neurodevelopmental disabilities, immune dysfunction, mitochondrial dysfunction, is autoimmunity. Autoimmune diseases are tremendously on the rise in both the pediatric and the adult population.

Ty: What exactly does autoimmunity mean?

Dr. Palevsky: Auto-immunity means—Well let me step back. The immune system is meant to protect us from harm. It attacks whatever the immune system perceives is a threat to the safety of the body. If the body perceives part of our own self as a threat, our immune system is going to attack us and that's autoimmunity. The immune system attacks us, thinking that something within us is an enemy. We literally start eating ourselves alive.

No one has stopped to question whether there's anything in vaccines that could be leading towards our bodies developing an immune response against ourselves. Now Dr. Yehuda Shoenfeld in Israel has come up with the "Asia Syndrome," where he's showing the adjuvant aluminum is contributing to the increase in autoimmunity. But there's more.

Anytime you inject a foreign material into the body, you increase the chances that the body is going to see that foreign material as an enemy. The body will mount an immune response to reject it, to attack it. If any part of the material that's injected is also similar or the same to your own body, those vaccine ingredients will trigger an immune system to start attacking you. Autoimmune disease is on the rise.

Are there ingredients in vaccines that the body amounts an immune response against? Are there ingredients in vaccines that the body mounts an immune response against, that then tells the immune system to find that particle anywhere and attack it and end up finding part of yourself?

No one has questioned whether the rise in incidence of cases of autoimmunity in the pediatric and adult population could be attributed to the use of vaccinations.

The way autoimmunity works is the body perceives that there's something inside the body that's a threat and mounts an immune response to reject it. Now, if the body then sees that same protein that exits as part of the self, the immune system is not going to differentiate. It's just going to attack itself. That's what autoimmunity is.

We've never explored whether the injection of vaccine ingredients, which creates an immune response against those ingredients, actually has some component in the ingredients that the immune system rejects but then finds is also part of the self and then rejects the self.

The mere injection of material into the body is a medical problem, because you will always, always create an inflammatory response and the body's need to reject that material and attack it.

Why do you think we're having so many food allergies? Because there are food proteins in vaccines, starting from the vitamin K shot that babies are given at birth.

Ty: What's in the Vitamin K?

Dr. Palevsky: Egg phospholipid and castor oil. All you have to do is do a literature search. Does castor oil cross-react with peanuts and tree nuts? The answer is yes, it can. If you inject egg into the body, the body will see that protein as a foreign enemy.

You then eat it and the body will reject the egg, mount an immune response, and try and get rid of it. That's why you get symptoms, to get rid of what the body has perceived as wastes that don't belong in the body.

If you inject castor oil into the body, the body will mount an immune response against it. If you then expose yourself to any part of that food, that the body has perceived and reprogramed to reject, you're going to attack it and thus develop symptoms. The onset

of symptoms is meant to get rid of excess wastes that have accumulated in the body in response to something that the body perceives as a threat.

Ty: April 2005, Dr. Larry, there was an article in the *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* that looked at the health outcomes of children who were fully vaccinated, partially vaccinated and then not vaccinated at all. When they assessed the data, they found that the largest number of reports by parents of children with atopic illness were kids that were fully vaccinated. The lowest reports were the unvaccinated. What is this specific study telling us?

Dr. Palevsky: Well, number one the study tells us that we have to do another study. Is this repeatable? Is this an aberration or is this something that's real? Do parents of children who are not vaccinated continue to report lower amounts of atopic illness in their children versus parents who have children who are fully vaccinated? Let's do it again.

If you can't accept that that's possible, or if you think that having an atopic illness is an okay, acceptable disease just so that you can get vaccinated, well then there's a problem. Because an atopic illness is a permanent impairment. It's a permanent impairment of the body.

Ty: What is an atopic illness?

Dr. Palevsky: The word "atopi" just means allergic, allergy. Adverse response to whatever you're exposed, whether it's through the air, through the food, or on the skin. The purpose of an allergic response is to attack what the body perceives as a threat. You're creating a very excitable, very inflamed response on the immune system. Potentially, based on that study, if you vaccinate. What you create is a very stressed immune system.

Ty: We have a system that's called the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System, the VAERS. I've interviewed other pediatricians and a couple of them didn't even know that it existed. Isn't the fact that we have the VAERS system, doesn't that in and of itself tell us that there are adverse events that are associated with vaccines?

Dr. Palevsky: Well, there are several issues here about VAERS. One is anyone can report. It's not a specific scientific body of information. A nurse can report, a parent can report, a doctor can report, a grandparent can report, a neighbor can report. It's just a belief. There's no full scientific proof that what is being reported actually is related to the vaccines.

Doctors are not taught what a vaccine adverse reaction looks like. In fact, when a parent calls the doctor and says, "My child was vaccinated, I can't wake them up, he'll only wake up to feed. He's sleeping for two days." The parent is told "that's normal."

When the parent raises the question, "Could this have been from a vaccine," meanwhile the kid had never done that before. The doctor almost unanimously says, "No, it's just a coincidence."

That kid suffered brain damage. Sleeping for two days as an infant, not waking up, other than to feed, that kid was brain damaged, had brain inflammation. Not waking up for two days, other than to feed is a neurological event. That's not normal. That's from the injection of material into the brain.

Doctors don't make the connection. Reports show that maybe 10 percent of true vaccine adverse events are really reported. If you don't have doctors who are educated, and you don't have a system that's streamlined to be scientific, how do you really know? If the

doctors are made to believe that adverse events can't be happening from vaccines, how do you have a reporting system that's legitimate?

Ty: It's almost impossible, isn't it? It's like the whole deck of cards is stacked against ever implicating vaccines in any damage.

Dr. Palevsky: Correct. Then you're back to an ideology, you're not back to a discussion.

Ty: Yeah. We're back to the point that we get to—there's almost nothing that inflames discussion like posting anything that questions vaccines on any social media. Literally, on our Truth about Cancer Facebook we have seven or eight hundred thousand likes or whatever, followers whatever they call it.

I can post on just about anything. If I post something that questions vaccines, they come out in droves and say, "You're a quack, you're anti-science. Vaccines are proven safe." It's just like this—

Dr. Palevsky: "You're a baby killer."

Ty: Yeah. "You're putting my child at risk." There's this long litany of talking points that they always regurgitate if you question vaccines.

Dr. Palevsky: Again, I don't even talk to those people. I won't even answer them because they're not open to, "Hey, where did you get your information from? How come you're such an expert? What research have you done to understand all of this, all of what you're saying?"

"Are you aware that there's more information? Have you looked to see if there's more information? Have you blindly accepted what you've been told? Or have you actually done your own research?" You can't even ask those questions because they'll feel shame and embarrassment and arrogance that you would even think that their authority should be questioned.

Ty: Someone recently responded to one of the vaccine posts. They said "The science is settled. Vaccines are safe and effective." Isn't that statement, in and of itself, unscientific? Science is never settled, is it?

Dr. Palevsky: No.

Ty: Isn't it always a progress of learning and learning more?

Dr. Palevsky: Right, but you see there's a growing group of people in this world who believe that they have all the science that's needed. In every system, there are people who believe that they're at the highest level of knowledge. It's true in intelligent systems, it's true in social systems, it's true in religious systems, it's true in advertising systems, it's true in governmental systems, it's true in medical systems.

That keeps people down, because you end up believing that those in authority are at the top of what there is to know, until you start thinking for yourself. In a totalitarian system, you're not supposed to think for yourself. You are supposed to blindly follow. The people are waking up.

Ty: I think that blind acquiescence to the safety and efficacy of vaccines is required in this medical system, isn't it?

Dr. Palevsky: Well again, it's the livelihood for many people. It is an ideological slant for many people that they have to hold on to, because to question it would not work in their system. Their foundations will crumble if they actually said, "My basement is cracked" or "my basement is broken," or "my house is sinking."

Ty: Right. Herd immunity.

Dr. Palevsky: Oh God.

Ty: You knew that was coming.

Dr. Palevsky: Don't.

Ty: Is that a real thing? Because we hear about herd immunity. We hear about herd immunity and I think that's part of the logic that goes into parents claiming that if "your child isn't vaccinated, then you put my child at risk who is vaccinated." It's part of this herd mentality. Is herd immunity a real thing and if it is a real thing, is the herd immunity that we hear about today the same thing as the real thing?

Dr. Palevsky: The concept of herd immunity is based on the idea that disease can only be transferred from one person to another. The concept of herd immunity is based on the idea that contagiousness is the only way for disease to spread.

It's based on the idea that the only way I can get sick, the only way I'm exposed to the germ, is if you who are sick give it to me. As if there's no other possible way I could be exposed to that germ without being exposed to someone who's sick.

That is the biggest problem regarding infectious diseases, contagiousness and herd immunity, because it doesn't allow for all the permutations, all the ways in which you could have a germ in your body and still not get sick, that you could be exposed to a germ from the environment without having been near anyone who had the illness.

As if the only vector of exposure is someone who's sick. If you break down that understanding of how disease spreads, herd immunity can't exist because it's not people spreading it from one person to the next anymore. It's the germs having a different life cycle based on completely different criteria.

There's an article that was in the CDC, published in 1999, that actually states that "science forgets that germs actually are subject to forces other than human beings. That the life cycles of germs can be turned on and turned off having nothing to do with humans."

When babies are in utero, they have little to no exposure to germs in the world. Recent study show that there are some bacterial particles in the amniotic fluid that come from the mother's mouth or the mother's intestinal bacteria. Otherwise the amniotic fluid is basically sterile. There's almost nothing in it.

We as adults have over 100 trillion bacteria and microorganisms in our body. How does a baby go from almost none, to a person with over a 100 trillion? Just by living. Life is your exposure.

You can't tell me statistically that a baby comes in to the world, develops his or her path towards over 100 trillion microorganisms, but if never exposed to someone who's sick with these germs, those organisms aren't in his or her body. Statistically impossible.

If you don't get a disease during an epidemic, it doesn't necessarily mean you don't have the germ. It just means that the relationship between you and the germ didn't get to a place of activity of that germ.

Herd immunity is based solely on the idea that you can only get sick if you pass a germ from one person to the next. If enough people have the disease in a community, they'll be less of that germ to pass on to those who have yet to get sick.

Therefore, those who don't get sick are protected by the herd. That's the theory of herd immunity in live infectious illness. Then that myth is extrapolated down to vaccination, because the belief is that if you vaccinate you get rid of the germ.

That's a myth. You can't vaccinate the germ out of the air, nor can you vaccinate the germ out of your body. What you can do is change the way the germ expresses itself. You don't get rid of the germ.

The herd immunity thinking in vaccination is that vaccines will stop the germ from being carried in your body. That's preposterous. Therefore, there's less ability for you to transmit the germ to others, again thinking that vaccination wipes the germ out of your body, when it doesn't.

Ty: Haven't we even seen instances over the last several years where the vaccinated actually spread the disease?

Dr. Palevsky: Correct. There was a study recently in baboons that even vaccinating them against pertussis, they still had the pertussis bacteria in their airway. Well that makes total sense because vaccines don't eliminate the germ from your body, nor can they eliminate the germ from the air because exposure is due to living.

Again, the myth that's transmitted, or the myths that are transmitted is one, "exposure to a germ can't happen unless you are near someone who is sick." Not true. Two, "exposure to a germ will make you sick." That's not true.

Ty: So, it's built on a foundation of untruths?

Dr. Palevsky: Correct. Because contagiousness is not the only way that disease happens in a community. Sometimes, there are other forces that turn organisms on and off that have nothing to do with me giving it to you or you giving it to me.

Therefore, giving a vaccine to someone doesn't necessarily stop the person from transmitting the germ, because anyone who lives can be equally exposed even if no one is sick. The whole foundation of contagiousness, infectious disease, and vaccines and herd immunity are based on untruths, myths, and incomplete statements about what we know in science.

Ty: Great information. Zika Virus, mosquitoes, at the filming of this interview, we're literally seeing mass spraying in South Florida, dumping pesticides from helicopters to kill the mosquitoes that carry the Zika Virus that allegedly causes microcephaly.

Dr. Palevsky: Right

Ty: What's the truth about? Because, the reason I ask this in regards to vaccines are, I'm already seeing on the news almost daily, we're working on a vaccine for Zika. We're work-

ing on a vaccine. Vaccine for Zika virus is coming. What are some of the common maybe misconceptions about Zika?

Dr. Palevsky: When a child gets a vaccine and develops brain damage, regression of symptoms, the entire medical community says there's no correlation. Even though one event occurred directly after the other event.

With the Zika virus, there's direct correlation if the virus is present with microcephaly. Can't have it both ways. You can't deny correlation because you don't believe in it, and then apply correlation because you need to believe in it, in order to put forth another myth.

This is what I know, but based on just my research, I wasn't in Brazil, microcephaly only occurred in the northeast section of Brazil. Zika virus occurs everywhere. The incidence of microcephaly don't. The presence of the Zika virus doesn't necessarily correlate with microcephaly because the Zika virus exists in many places other than the northeast section of Brazil.

Ty: What happened in the northeast section of Brazil?

Dr. Palevsky: That's the question. Many theories have been put forth. I don't know which one is true, if any of them are true. One of them is that that section was sprayed with an excess amount of pesticides including Roundup. Glyphosate.

Another one is that those pregnant mothers were given a DPT vaccine and/or an MMR vaccine. Both vaccines, in the literature, are known to contribute to the incidence of microcephaly. We don't see the incidence of microcephaly where there's also a large increase in Zika virus infections.

As far as I know, based on the literature, the Zika virus illness is benign. In New York, in the month of August, because of the threat of Zika virus, they sprayed different communities. When I read the list of all the communities, it was all the communities where minorities live.

It wasn't the white wealthy areas of New York City or Long Island. It was all areas where there are known to be minority populations. I don't know any conclusions from that, other than to say, why?

Ty: It's a good question. I guess the mosquitoes don't travel to Manhattan.

Dr. Palevsky: Or, only the people of color and Latinos are the ones who have the Zika virus or something else.

Ty: Yeah, good question. Speaking of New York City, I was up there a couple of years ago. It was during October. It was flu season. Literally I walked down, in a square block, I passed six pharmacies that all had get your flu shot, big signs in the windows. What's your opinion of flu shot?

Dr. Palevsky: Well it makes no sense and here's why. Number one, the virus most likely to cause the flu illness is rarely an influenza virus. The incidence of actual influenza virus illness is very, very low.

Most illnesses that lead to flu-like symptoms are not caused by the influenza virus. The vaccine itself is toxic. When people say they got the vaccine and got the flu anyway. No, they got poisoned.

The body's response to being poisoned is to get sick, to remove the poisons because you were injected with poisons. For those people who don't get sick after the flu vaccine, the

materials stay inside, or if they're lucky, they'll just excrete them out without being affected.

Most flu illnesses happen because the body's been stressed. There's a buildup of wastes, the body needs to get rid of the wastes. By injecting these materials, you're creating more stress. There was a study in the journal *Vaccine* back in 2012 that looked at the injection of flu vaccine into pregnant mothers.

No one had ever measured what happens to the immune system. What they found was that by injecting the flu vaccine into pregnant mothers there was an increased circulation of inflammatory immune markers.

No one really understood what those inflammatory markers actually meant to a growing fetus. There are studies in the literature that clearly say schizophrenic disorders, psychiatric disorders, and autism have all been found to have as its precursors a history of inflammation in utero.

Inflammation happens in the body because the body perceives that there's a threat. The immune system mounts an immune response to attack it. Vaccines create inflammation, period. That's their role. That inflammation can destroy any part of the body including the brain, including the immune system, including the mitochondria. Inflammation is a way for the body to protect itself.

All the chronic illnesses that we see have too much inflammation because the body is constantly working to attack what it perceives as some threat. Rather than trying to identify what's creating all these inflammation, we just keep medicating it.

We don't realize that we're actually causing the excess inflammation which leads to wastes. That's why the body gets sick, to get rid of inflammation, to get rid of wastes that have come through every avenue of entry into the body, vaccines notwithstanding.

Ty: Flu vaccine's a viral vaccine. Are there any safe viral vaccines? Injecting viruses into the body is—

Dr. Palevsky: There's no safe injection of anything. The injection of material into the body forces the body to see that material as an enemy. If any of those materials, you then eat, you will have an inflammatory reaction against that food because you've been told to attack it.

If any of those materials are part of your body, you will start attacking yourself leading to autoimmunity. If any of those viruses or bacteria are actually embedded in your own DNA, you will then attack your own DNA.

Remember, because the belief about vaccines is that the bacteria and the viruses are not in your body yet because no one's been around you to give you the bacteria and the viruses, because, the only way to get those bacteria and viruses in your body is to be exposed to someone who's sick with them. That's a myth.

We don't even entertain the idea that you could already have bacteria and viruses in your body, laying dormant by the time you're vaccinated. If that material is embedded in your DNA, you can potentially start attacking your own DNA. As I said, autoimmune disease is greatly on the rise.

Ty: Dr. Larry, last question for you. You practice medicine outside of the realm of believing that the vaccines are the answer. What are alternatives to vaccines to keep kids healthy or do

we even need an alternative?

Dr. Palevsky: Many people say, “If I’m not going to vaccinate, how do I keep my kids strong?” That’s based on two assumptions. One, that your child’s immune system is not already strong. And two, that vaccines protect you and make you strong.

The body is already strong. There’s a way to keep it strong. There’s a way to prevent it from weakening. But that doesn’t utilize pharmaceuticals. It utilizes good food, good water, and healthy environments. All studies have shown that good food, good water, and healthy environments create healthy kids. The dirtier, the healthier, because germs are not our enemy.

Ty: Not what we’re hearing in the typical school where we believe that children are deficient in Ritalin. They’re not going to be normal unless they have the Ritalin. What you’re saying is that the environment and what we put into the body has everything to do with keeping your child healthy?

Dr. Palevsky: Correct.

Ty: Well Dr. Larry, this has been an excellent interview. I really appreciate you spending the time with us today.

Dr. Palevsky: Sure.

Ty: I appreciate you breaking your seven-year hiatus.

Dr. Palevsky: Thanks.

Ty: Awesome.

[End of transcript]