TETYANA OBUKHANYCH

Introduction

I know of many alternative health practitioners and even of a few pediatricians who have embraced the non-vaccination approach to health. However, I have yet to encounter one among my own kind: a scientist in the trenches of mainstream biomedical research who does not regard vaccines as the greatest invention of medicine.

I never imagined myself in this position, least so in the very beginning of my Ph.D. research training in immunology. In fact, at that time, I was very enthusiastic about the concept of vaccination, just like any typical immunologist. However, after years of doing research in immunology,

VACCINE ILLUSION

observing scientific activities of my superiors, and analyzing vaccine issues, I realized that vaccination is one of the most deceptive inventions the science could ever convince the world to accept.

As we hear more and more about vaccine injuries, many individuals are starting to view vaccination as a necessary evil that has helped us initially to overcome raging epidemics but now causes more damage than benefit to our children.

As an immunologist, I have a different and perhaps a very unique perspective. I have realized that the invention of vaccination in the 18th century has precluded us from seeking to understand what naturally acquired immunity to diseases really is. Had we pursued a different route in the absence of that shortcut, we could have gained a thorough understanding of natural mechanisms of immunity and developed a truly effective and safe method of disease prevention compared to what

TETYANA OBUKHANYCH

vaccines can possibly offer.

The biological term *immunity* refers to a universally observed phenomenon of becoming unsusceptible to a number of infectious diseases through prior experience. Because of the phonetic similarity between the words immunology and immunity, it is tempting to assume that immunology is a science that studies the state of immunity, but this is not the case. Immunology is a science that primarily studies an artificial process of immunization - i.e., the immune system's response to injected foreign Immunology does not attempt to study and therefore cannot provide understanding of natural diseases and immunity that follows them. The "knowledge" about the function of the immune system during the natural process of infection is nevertheless inferred from contrived immunologic experiments, which typically consist of injecting laboratory-grown microorganisms (live

VACCINE ILLUSION

or dead) or their isolated parts into research animals to represent the state of infection. Because immunologic experiments are unrealistic simulations of the natural process, immunologists' understanding of nature is limited understanding their own experimental models. Immunologists have confined the scope of their knowledge to the box of experimental modeling, and they do not wish to see beyond that box. Thinking within the box only reinforces the notion of vaccination and cannot provide any other solution to the problem of diseases.

Despite the fact that the biological basis of naturally acquired immunity is not understood, present day medical practices insist upon artificial manipulation of the immune response (a.k.a. immunization or vaccination) to secure "immunity" without going through the natural infection process. The vaccine-induced process,

TETYANA OBUKHANYCH

although not resembling a natural disease, is nevertheless still a process with its own risks. And it is not life-long immunity that we gain via vaccination but only temporary immunity. For this reason, vaccination at its core is neither a safe nor an effective method of disease prevention. Yet, immunologists have nothing better to offer because they can only go as far as their deeply rooted immunologic dogma allows them.

Three important factors have contributed to my disillusionment with gradual immunologic paradigms and their applications - vaccines. First, inconsistencies significant within several immunologic theory made me quite unsatisfied with its attempted explanation of immunity. Second. I observed how seasoned some immunologists would omit mentioning the outcome of crucial experiments to make their publication on new vaccine development strategies

VACCINE ILLUSION

look very promising. This made me suspicious about the vaccine development process in general and eager to take a look at the other side of the vaccination debate.

The third factor was the birth of my child. This event compelled me to take a break from laboratory research for a few years. I completely shed my identity of an immunologist and became a parent determined to raise a healthy child. I was amazed at how clueless I was about what really matters for health despite my proficiency in all those fancy immunologic theories amassed in the Ivory Tower. For the sake of my child, I had to reconsider everything I knew from my immunology education.

This book is intended to give parents essential immunologic background for making vaccination decisions for their children. Making vaccination decisions is an important personal