

# Dispatch from the Trenches



REPORT THIS AD

## The Gardasil Scam: HPV Does NOT Cause Cancer

Posted on March 14, 2008 by Mick

Some time ago at Matewan I expressed doubts about Gardasil, the vaccination that was being forced on teenage girls supposedly because it acted to prevent cervical cancer. I suggested then that there was something fishy about all the political wheeling and dealing behind the scenes that had resulted in various governors – Texas’ Rick Perry for one – making Gardasil vaccinations mandatory.

It all sounded cooked. To begin with, Perry had very heavy connections with the pharmaceutical industry, including the companies that manufacture and distribute Gardasil. Secondly, studies show that some 94% of sexually active women have some form of HPV and in almost all those cases, **it goes away by itself**. Why, I wondered, would we be making the injections mandatory for a disease that cures itself without troubling the patient for the sake of *maybe* protecting the small slice of the population that *might* develop cervical cancer from HPV?

It sounded like another Bog Pharma scam but it may be far worse. Turns out that studies actually show that not only does HPV **NOT** cause cervical cancer, the Gardasil itself **does**.

This revelation should be quite shocking to anyone who has been following the debate over Gardasil and mandatory vaccinations of teenage girls. First, it reveals that **Gardasil appears to increase disease by 44.6 percent in certain people** — namely, those who were already carriers of the same HPV strains used in the vaccine.

In other words, it appears that **if the vaccine is given to a young woman who already carries HPV in a “harmless” state, it may “activate” the infection and directly cause precancerous lesions to appear**. The vaccine, in other words, may accelerate the development of precancerous lesions in women.

This was sent to me via email from a friend and comes from a websight called NaturalNews. Below is the entire text, with links. Read it and make up your own mind. It's long but if you have or know a teenage girl or her family, it's crucial information worth taking the time to read.

NaturalNews) For the last several years, HPV vaccines have been marketed to the public and mandated in compulsory injections for young girls in several states based on the idea that they prevent cervical cancer. Now, NaturalNews has obtained documents from the FDA and other sources (see below) which reveal that the FDA has been well aware for several years that Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) has no direct link to cervical cancer.

NaturalNews has also learned that HPV vaccines have been proven to be flatly worthless in clearing the HPV virus from women who have already been exposed to HPV (which includes most sexually active women), calling into question the scientific justification of mandatory “vaccinate everyone” policies.

Furthermore, this story reveals evidence that the vaccine currently being administered for HPV — Gardasil — may increase the risk of precancerous cervical lesions by an alarming 44.6 percent in some women. The vaccine, it turns out, may be far more dangerous to the health of women than doing nothing at all.

If true, this information reveals details of an enormous public health fraud being perpetrated on the American people, involving FDA officials, Big Pharma promoters, and even the governors of states like Texas. The health and safety of tens of millions of young girls is at stake here, and what this NaturalNews investigative report reveals is that **HPV vaccinations may not only be medically useless; they may also be harmful to the health of the young girls receiving them.**

This report reveals startling facts about the HPV vaccine that most people will find shocking:

- How it may actually increase the risk of precancerous lesions by 44.6 percent.
- The FDA has, for four years, known that HPV was not the cause of cervical cancer.
- Why mandatory HPV vaccination policies may cause great harm to young girls.
- Why HPV infections are self-limiting and pose no real danger in healthy women
- Little-known FDA documents that reveal astounding facts about Gardasil
- How Big Pharma promoted its Gardasil vaccine using disease mongering and fear mongering

Click the NEXT button below to continue reading...

## The Trail of Evidence

This story begins at a company called HiFi DNA Tech, LLC (<http://www.hifidna.com>) a company involved in the manufacture of portable HPV testing devices based on DNA sequencing analysis. HiFi DNA Tech has been pushing to get the FDA to classify its HPV detection technology as a “Class II” virology testing device. To understand why this is a big deal, you have to understand the differences between “Class II” and “Class III” virology testing devices.

Based on FDA rules, a Class III virology testing device is one that is considered by the FDA to have

“premarket approval,” meaning that it cannot yet be sold to the public. In order for such a device to be marketed to the public, it must be downgraded to Class II status, which is considered a “special controls” status. Class II devices are, “...those devices for which the general controls by themselves are insufficient to provide reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness, but for which there is sufficient information to establish special controls to provide such assurance, including performance standards, postmarket surveillance, patient registries, development and dissemination of guidelines, recommendations, and any other appropriate actions the agency deems necessary.”

In other words, a Class II device may or may not actually be safe, but the FDA considers it safe enough to release to the public.

HiFi DNA Tech has been trying to get its HPV detection device downgraded to a Class II device based on the following arguments:

- For more than 20 years, the FDA had regulated the HPV test as a “test for cervical cancer.”
- But since at least 2003, the FDA has changed its position on the relationship between Human Papilloma Virus and cervical cancer, stating that the HPV strain is “not associated with cervical cancer.”
- Accordingly, HiFi DNA Tech is arguing that the HPV test it has developed is **no longer a test for cervical cancer, but is merely a test for the presence of Human Papilloma Viruses** — a shift that makes the test far more reliable in its primary purpose. In other words, the test is merely detecting the presence of a virus, not making a diagnosis of a disease (which would be a much higher standard to meet).

On October 12, 2007, HiFi DNA Tech sued the Food and Drug Administration in an attempt to force it to downgrade its HPV detection technology to Class II (see <http://www.news-medical.net/?id=31180> (<http://www.news-medical.net/?id=31180>)). Earlier in the year — on March 7, 2007, HiFi DNA Tech filed the HPV PCR test reclassification petition with the FDA. **It is the information in this petition document that led us to the FDA's knowledge that HPV is not linked to cervical cancer.**

Got all that? This is a somewhat complex story to follow, so here it is again in summary:

- A company that manufacturers a DNA testing device that can detect the presence of HPV (Human Papilloma Virus) is petitioning the FDA (and suing the FDA) to get it to reclassify its medical device as a “Class II” device based on the revelation that the FDA has already adopted the position that HPV infections do not directly cause cervical cancer.
- This would mean that **the FDA has been aware for years that HPV does not cause cervical cancer**, which means that the FDA’s approval of the Gardasil vaccine — as well as the national push for Gardasil vaccinations — is based on a grand medical hoax that, not surprisingly, appears to be designed to exploit the fear of cancer to sell vaccines. The victims in all this, of course, are the young girls who are apparently being subjected to a medically useless (and potentially dangerous) vaccine.
- None of this information was apparently known during the more recent debates over the safety and efficacy of Gardasil, the HPV vaccine now in use. This means that the public debate over mandatory HPV vaccinations lacked key elements that now seem essential to reaching rational, evidence-based conclusions over the safety and efficacy of such vaccines.

Next, we reveal the FDA’s statement that HPV is “not associated with cervical cancer.”

# The Text of the Petition

The Reclassification Petition, dated March 7, 2007, is still posted on the FDA's website:

<http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/dockets/07p0210/07p-0210-ccp0001-01-vol1.pdf>

(<http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/dockets/07p0210/07p-0210-ccp0001-01-vol1.pdf>)

In case the FDA removes this document (as it has been known to do), we've posted a backup copy of the document on our own servers: <http://www.NaturalNews.com/downloads/FDA-HPV.pdf>  
(<http://www.naturalnews.com/downloads/FDA-HPV.pdf>)

This document reveals the following text:

*The FDA news release of March 31, 2003 acknowledges that "most infections (by HPV) are short-lived and not associated with cervical cancer", in recognition of the advances in medical science and technology since 1988. In other words, since 2003 the scientific staff of the FDA no longer considers HPV infection to be a high-risk disease when writing educational materials for the general public whereas the regulatory arm of the agency is still bound by the old classification scheme that had placed HPV test as a test to stratify risk for cervical cancer in regulating the industry.*

NaturalNews sought to verify the existence of the FDA news release referenced by this petition reclassification document and found that, indeed, the FDA news release exists. In fact, it's still posted on the FDA website at <http://www.fda.gov/bbs/topics/NEWS/2003/NEW00890.html>  
(<http://www.fda.gov/bbs/topics/NEWS/2003/NEW00890.html>)

In it, the FDA says, "The HPV DNA test is not intended to substitute for regular Pap screening. Nor is it intended to screen women under 30 who have normal Pap tests. Although the rate of HPV infection in this group is high, **most infections are short-lived and not associated with cervical cancer.**" (Emphasis added.)

In other words, the FDA knew in 2003 that HPV infections are not associated with cervical cancer.

Furthermore, the FDA states, in the same press release, "Most women who become infected with HPV are able to eradicate the virus and suffer no apparent long-term consequences to their health."

In other words, **HPV infections do not cause cervical cancer!** Remember, the entire push for mandatory HPV vaccinations of young girls across the country has been the urgent call to "save" these young girls from cervical cancer. The vaccine push has been about "saving lives." But as these documents clearly reveal, HPV is no threat to the lives of young girls. In fact, as you will see below, HPV infections are naturally self-limiting!

## HPV Infections Resolve Themselves, Without

# Vaccines

As the reclassification petition reveals, HPV infections are naturally self-limiting — meaning that they are controlled naturally, without requiring intervention with drugs or vaccines. It is not the HPV virus itself that causes cervical cancer but rather a persistent state of ill-health on the part of the patient that makes her vulnerable to persistent infections.

As the petition states:

*"Based on new scientific information published in the past 15 years, it is now generally agreed that identifying and typing HPV infection does not bear a direct relationship to stratification of the risk for cervical cancer. Most acute infections caused by HPV are self-limiting [1, 4-7]. ...Repeated sequential transient HPV infections, even when caused by "high-risk" HPVs, are characteristically not associated with high risk of developing squamous intraepithelial lesions, a precursor of cervical cancer."*

*A woman found to be positive for the same strain (genotype) of HPV on repeated testing is highly likely suffering from a persistent HPV infection and is considered to be at high risk of developing precancerous intraepithelial lesions in the cervix . It is the persistent infection, not the virus, that determines the cancer risk."*

The FDA agrees with this assessment of the relationship between HPV and cervical cancer, as evidenced by its 2003 news release quoted above.

Next, we reveal evidence that HPV vaccines actually *cause* precancerous lesions in women.

## Do HPV Vaccines Increase the Risk of Precancerous Lesions?

The reclassification petition cited above also reveals that Gardasil vaccines may increase the risk of developing precancerous lesions by 44.6 percent in some groups of women. This is found in a quote referencing a document mentioned in the petition, which states:

*"PCR-based HPV detection device with provision for accurate HPV genotyping is more urgently needed now because vaccination with Gardasil of the women who are already sero-positive and PCR-positive for vaccine-relevant genotypes of HPV has been found to increase the risk of developing high-grade precancerous lesions by 44.6%, according to an FDA VRBPAC Background Document : Gardasil HPV Quadrivalent Vaccine. May 18, 2006 VRBPAC Meeting. [www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/06/briefing/2006-4222B3.pdf](http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/06/briefing/2006-4222B3.pdf)"*

NaturalNews tracked down the correct URL of the document referenced above and found it in the FDA docket archives. We have placed a safe backup copy at: <http://www.NaturalNews.com/downloads/FDA-Gardasil.pdf> (<http://www.naturalnews.com/downloads/FDA-Gardasil.pdf>)

Sure enough, this document reveals startling information about the extreme dangers apparently posed by Gardasil vaccinations. On page 13, this document states:

### ***"Concerns Regarding Primary Endpoint Analyses among Subgroups***

*There were two important concerns that were identified during the course of the efficacy review of this BLA. One was the potential for Gardasil to enhance disease among a subgroup of subjects who had evidence of persistent infection with vaccine-relevant HPV types at baseline. The other concern was the observations of CIN 2/3 or worse cases due to HPV types not contained in the vaccine. These cases of disease due to other HPV types have the potential to counter the efficacy results of Gardasil for the HPV types contained in the vaccine.*

*1. Evaluation of the potential of Gardasil™ to enhance cervical disease in subjects who had evidence of persistent infection with vaccine-relevant HPV types prior to vaccination. The results of exploratory subgroup analyses for study 013 suggested a concern that subjects who were seropositive and PCR-positive for the vaccine-relevant HPV types had a greater number of CIN 2/3 or worse cases as demonstrated in the following table:*

*Observed Efficacy*

*- 44.6%*

*It appeared that subjects in this subgroup of study 013 who received Gardasil™ might have had enhanced risk factors for development of CIN 2/3 or worse compared to placebo recipients."*

## **Revealing the Dangers of Gardasil**

This revelation should be quite shocking to anyone who has been following the debate over Gardasil and mandatory vaccinations of teenage girls. First, it reveals that **Gardasil appears to increase disease by 44.6 percent in certain people** — namely, those who were already carriers of the same HPV strains used in the vaccine.

In other words, it appears that **if the vaccine is given to a young woman who already carries HPV in a "harmless" state, it may "activate" the infection and directly cause precancerous lesions to appear**. The vaccine, in other words, may accelerate the development of precancerous lesions in women.

This is information that has simply not been made available in the debate over Gardasil vaccination policies. The pro-vaccination rhetoric has always been about "saving lives" and it carried the implied statement that Gardasil is perfectly safe for all women, posing absolutely no increased risk of cancer. What these documents reveal, however, is that Gardasil may, in fact, pose a serious increase in the risk of cervical cancer in some recipients of the vaccine.

Next: Will health authorities "interrogate" young virgins over their sexual activity (or lack thereof)? What are the bioethical ramifications of this vaccine being mandated to all teenage girls?

## **Interrogating Young Virgins**

The FDA directly admits the vaccine is utterly useless in these women, stating in the same document,

"Finally, there is compelling evidence that the vaccine lacks therapeutic efficacy among women who have had prior exposure to HPV and have not cleared previous infection (PCR positive and seropositive)."

What this essentially means is that the "safe" administering of the Gardasil vaccine requires that **it be administered only to virgins** (because virtually all women who are sexually active carry HPV strains). That, of course, would require the direct questioning of the sexual habits of all young girls before administering the vaccine.

Is this what the Governor of Texas really had in mind when he mandated such vaccinations for all young girls in Texas? ... a male doctor with a vaccination needle in his hand and a thirteen-year-old girl sitting in a private clinic room behind closed doors, with the male doctor asking her, "Have you ever had sex?"

Clearly, this kind of patient questioning crosses all kinds of ethical barriers when such vaccinations are made **mandatory** (as they have been made in Texas). It puts the State in the positioning of ascertaining the sexual habits of very young teenage girls and then potentially causing them harm. It's not hard to suppose that most sexually active teenage girls would claim to still be virgins (especially if their parents were present), creating a situation where vaccines would be routinely administered to precisely the HPV carrier subgroups for which it has been demonstrated to greatly increase the risk of precancerous lesions.

In other words, under a mandatory Gardasil vaccination scenario like what exists in Texas today, a sexually-active young teenage girl has to make a tough choice:

- 1) She can lie to her doctor, claim to be a virgin, receive the vaccine and thereby potentially increase her risk of cervical cancer.
- 2) She can tell her doctor she's sexually active, thereby surrendering her privacy and possibly subjecting herself to various consequences from her sexual status being learned by her parents or guardians. (One would hope, of course, that such sexual habits were not secrets, but alas, we live in the real world where many teenage girls do indeed have sex at a very early age...)

Furthermore, the young girl is unlikely to be given accurate information about the health risks associated with the vaccine, since virtually all health authorities are heavily involved in promoting pro-vaccination propaganda, routinely ignoring scientific evidence that might give reasonable people pause.

Naturally, the better scenario here is that the young girl is not sexually active to begin with, but in a society where 8th and 9th graders are already routinely engaged in sexual activities — almost always unbeknownst to their parents — it seems naive to expect that such girls would suddenly honor pledges of celibacy in order to protect themselves from possible future dangers posed by a present-day vaccine (especially when doctors blindly claim the vaccine is harmless).

There are also serious questions about the safety of the vaccine for non-sexually-active young women. Yet even if the vaccine poses no increased risk of cervical cancer for non-sexually-active young girls, there's still the more serious question of: Does the vaccine work? Does it really prevent cervical cancer in the first place? And that question has already been clearly answered by the FDA's own admission that HPV infections are not the cause of cervical cancer in the first place.

Next: Do HPV vaccinations help anyone? We reveal a four-quadrant comparison that shows the

vaccine to be more harmful than helpful.

# The Four Quadrants of Gardsadil Vaccinations

When considering the safety and effectiveness of Gardasil vaccinations on young teens, there are essentially four quadrants to consider, as shown in the table below:

Quadrant I: Non-Sexually Active No Gardasil Vaccine	Quadrant II: Non-Sexually Active Receives Gardasil Vaccine
Quadrant III: Sexually Active No Gardasil Vaccine	Quadrant IV: Sexually Active Receives Gardasil Vaccine

Based on what we've learned from the FDA's own documents, here are the likely outcomes of each of the four quadrants:

## **Quadrant I: Non-Sexually Active, No Gardasil Vaccine**

Outcome: No risk of cervical cancer.

## **Quadrant II: Non-Sexually Active, Receives Gardasil Vaccine**

Outcome: No medical benefit from vaccine.

## **Quadrant III: Sexually Active, No Gardasil Vaccine**

Outcome: HPV presence is self-limiting and does not lead to cervical cancer.

## **Quadrant IV: Sexually Active, Receives Gardasil Vaccine**

Outcome: 44.6% Increased risk of precancerous lesions. No reduction in cancer risk.

In other words, **Gardasil adds no benefits to any quadrant!** There is no subgroup that actually benefits from a Gardasil vaccination. But there is at least one quadrant in which Gardasil achieves an increased risk of disease. Put another way, Gardasil helps no one, but it harms some.

This is hardly a position from which to mandate the vaccine for everyone, especially since the vaccine has been widely prescribed as "completely safe" for everyone. It is widely claimed by medical authorities that the vaccine has no downside: No health risks, no increased risk of disease and no potential to cause harm in women. Clearly, these assumptions have no basis in scientific fact.

Keep in mind, too, that Merck, the manufacturer of Gardasil, has publicly suggested that *young boys* should receive Gardasil vaccinations! Why? Because they might engage in oral sex with girls who carry the virus. Therefore, the story goes, young boys should be vaccinated against this virus that they claim causes cervical cancer! (Never mind the fact that boys don't have a cervix...) There is no end, it seems, to the pseudoscientific nonsense that will be spouted in an effort to sell more Garsasil vaccines to people who don't need them.

Next: New clinical study shows Gardasil to be medically useless.

# Research Shows Gardasil to be Useless

To further investigate this conclusion, NaturalNews took a closer look at research published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (August, 2007), entitled, "Effect of Human Papillomavirus 16/18 L1 Viruslike Particle Vaccine Among Young Women With Preexisting Infection"

This research sought to determine the usefulness of the HPV vaccine among women who already carry HPV (which includes virtually all women who are sexually active, regardless of their age).

This document can currently be found at a University of Louisville document archive reprinted from JAMA. Click here to read the PDF yourself. (<http://louisville.edu/medschool/med-peds/residents/journal-club/11-07%20Article.pdf>)

Just in case that copy disappears, we've also hosted the PDF here: <http://www.NaturalNews.com/downloads/HPV-Vaccine-Effects.pdf> (<http://www.naturalnews.com/downloads/HPV-Vaccine-Effects.pdf>)

This document reveals startling information about the ineffectiveness of the Gardasil vaccine. It reveals that **the HPV vaccine often caused an increase in the presence of HPV strains** while utterly failing to clear the viruses in most women.

These shocking results caused the study authors to publish this sobering conclusion, printed in JAMA:

*"No significant evidence of a vaccine therapeutic effect was observed in analyses restricted to women who received all doses of vaccine or those with evidence of single HPV infections at entry (Table 2). We observed no evidence of vaccine effects when we stratified the analysis on selected study entry characteristics reflective of [various parameters] (TABLE 3). Similarly, no evidence of vaccine effects was observed in analyses stratified by other study entry parameters thought to potentially influence clearance rates and efficacy of the vaccine, including time since sexual initiation, oral contraceptive use, cigarette smoking, and concomitant infection with C trachomatis or N gonorrhoeae (Table 3)."*

In other words, the authors found no evidence that the vaccine worked at all. This observation led the authors to offer this damning conclusion that appears to render Gardasil nothing more than a grand medical hoax:

*"... rates of viral clearance over a 12-month period are not influenced by vaccination."*

The study goes on to state words that should cause every doctor, Governor and health authority across the United States (and around the world) to rethink Gardasil vaccination policies:

*"...given that viral clearance rates did not differ by treatment group and that persistent viral infection is the best established predictor of risk of progression, it is unlikely that vaccination could have a significant beneficial impact on rate of lesion progression.<sup>1,17</sup>*

*Results from our community-based study provide strong evidence that there is little, if any, therapeutic benefit from the vaccine in the population we studied. Furthermore, we see no reason to believe that there is therapeutic*

*benefit of the vaccine elsewhere because the biological effect of vaccination among already infected women is not expected to vary by population.*

In other words, the vaccines didn't work on the population studied, and there is no reason to believe that those same vaccines would magically work on other populations, since the biology of women and HPV is so similar across various populations.

Next: Is Gardasil a grand medical hoax?

## The Conclusion: HPV Vaccinations a Medical Hoax

It is difficult to take an honest look at this scientific evidence and the statements made by the FDA and not come to the conclusion that mandatory Gardasil vaccination policies being pushed across U.S. states right now are based on something other than science.

There are many theories exploring the motivation for such vaccination policies. Possible theories include:

**Financial benefit:** Big Pharma is pushing mandatory Gardasil vaccination policies so that it can profit from selling more vaccines to the states. This idea is at least partially supported by the fact that the first state Governor to mandate such vaccines (Texas Gov. Rick Perry) had undisclosed ties to Big Pharma. (A top official in Perry's administration worked directly for Merck, the manufacturer of Gardasil.)

**Conspiracy to poison the people:** This theory, which may stretch the bounds of belief in some readers, proposes that such mandatory vaccines are put in place in order to create future disease by poisoning the people with dangerous chemicals and DNA fragments that are knowingly added to vaccines. The poisoning of the people, it is said, will pay off in future profits for Big Pharma when those people develop other serious diseases requiring "treatment" with medications. Many people who support this theory currently believe, for example, that AIDS was engineered by human scientists and then administered to the gay population in New York in the late 1980's through vaccines.

**Control the sheeple:** This theory supposes that the main purpose of mandatory vaccines is to train the American public to get used to submitting to compulsory medicines. Once a certain segment of the population is targeted and effectively injected with mandatory medicines, these policies can be extended to other groups and, eventually, can encompass the entire population.

The first theory — Financial Benefit — is the simplest and easiest theory to believe. It requires nothing more than simple greed on the part of Big Pharma, along with the usual level of corruption at the FDA. NaturalNews believes this is the most likely explanation for events surrounding Gardasil vaccination policies, but we do not rule out other possible explanations, either.

# Profits at Any Cost

What's clear in all this is that mandatory HPV vaccination programs are not based on anything resembling good science. They seem to be based on a carefully planted *meme* — an idea that, coincidentally, spreads from one person's mind to the next much like a virus, gaining momentum as the mainstream media (MSM), health authorities, FDA and drug company reps repeat the meme on a regular basis. And what is that meme? That HPV causes cervical cancer, and, therefore, HPV vaccinations could halt cervical cancer and save lives.

This meme appears to have no real scientific basis. It is more of an urban legend than anything resembling scientific fact. Furthermore, it appears to have been conjured by those in a position to financially benefit from the adoption of that meme (the drug companies who manufacture, sell, and profit from the sale of HPV vaccines). In this case, that drug company is Merck, a powerful corporation with a dubious history rife with charges of price fixing, large-scale tax avoidance (it set up offshore accounts to avoid billions in U.S. taxes), widespread biopiracy, conspiring with the FDA to discredit its critics, burying negative evidence about its drugs (see the history of Vioxx at [www.NaturalNews.com/vioxx.html](http://www.NaturalNews.com/vioxx.html) (<http://www.naturalnews.com/vioxx.html>) ) and numerous other actions that many consider to be criminal in nature.

There is no question that Merck has the lack of ethics, the willingness and the means to commit medical fraud on an unprecedented scale. Based on the information revealed in this report, the mandatory vaccination of young girls with Gardasil appears to be the boldest medical hoax yet perpetrated by the company. You can read the true history about Merck and its crimes at: <http://www.NaturalNews.com/Merck.html> (<http://www.naturalnews.com/Merck.html>)

NaturalNews believes Merck is currently engaged in a massive medical fraud, and that it has influenced, corrupted or otherwise recruited FDA officials and state health authorities in a grand scheme to sell vaccines that are at best medically worthless, and at worst medically dangerous. Halting cervical cancer seems to have nothing to do with the marketing and prescribing of Gardasil. The entire campaign push for mandatory HPV vaccinations seems to be based entirely in the realm of sales and marketing.

The “marketing” of HPV vaccines involves classic disease mongering — spreading fear about a disease as a way of corralling patients into begging for the “solution” that just happens to be readily available from the same pharmaceutical company that promoted the disease in the first place. The hype over cervical cancer and Gardasil seems to be nothing more than a classic case of fear-based marketing designed to create such consumer fear over cervical cancer that a massive public outcry would result in legislation mandating the vaccines.

Please share this article with others.

Permission is granted to reprint this article in its entirety, for any non-commercial purpose, as long as full credit is given to the author (Mike Adams) and a clearly visible clickable link is placed back to this URL at NaturalNews.com. You may also freely quote from this article with proper citation.

# Sources Cited

HiFi DNA Tech files lawsuit against FDA

<http://www.news-medical.net/?id=31180> (<http://www.news-medical.net/?id=31180>)

Reclassification Petition – Human Papillomavirus (HPV) DNA Nested Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) Detection Device (K063649 )

<http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/dockets/07p0210/07p-0210-ccp0001-01-vol1.pdf>  
<http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/dockets/07p0210/07p-0210-ccp0001-01-vol1.pdf>

FDA Approves Expanded Use of HPV Test

<http://www.fda.gov/bbs/topics/NEWS/2003/NEW00890.html> (<http://www.fda.gov/bbs/topics/NEWS/2003/NEW00890.html>)

VRBPAC Background Document, Gardasil™ HPV Quadrivalent Vaccine, May 18, 2006 VRBPAC Meeting

<http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/06/briefing/2006-4222B3.pdf> (<http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/06/briefing/2006-4222B3.pdf>)

Effect of Human Papillomavirus 16/18 L1 Viruslike Particle Vaccine Among Young Women With Preexisting Infection

Journal of the American Medical Association, August, 2007



[REPORT THIS AD](#)

**Earn money  
from your  
WordPress site**

**WordAds**

[REPORT THIS AD](#)

Filed under: [Big Pharma](#) | Tagged: [cervical cancer](#), [Gardasil](#), [HPV](#), [mandatory vaccination](#), [Rick Perry](#) |

« [...and Who They've Decided to Help \(2\) Gardasil Update](#) »

## 57 Responses

**Fear-Mongering Over Gardasil** « [Dispatch from the Trenches](#), on March 17, 2008 at 8:44 am said:  
[...] workersGardasil UpdatePrivatization Leads to Fraud, Mismanagement, and Employee Abuse at WackenhutThe Gardasil Scam: HPV Does NOT Cause CancerBush: 'Economy Is Improving'; Economy: 'Like Hell I Am'Retirement in the Age of the Ownership [...]

[Reply](#)



**Dona**, on April 26, 2008 at 4:28 am said:

And the public is duped yet again, , and young girls will die as a result of greed and an attitude of supremacy. Laws should be inacted, that the idividuial who develops the vaccine of mass destruction, be given a dose of hie/her brainchild every year until he/she expires..Rather like getting a dose of your own medicine, literly....

[Reply](#)



**John A**, on June 11, 2008 at 1:57 am said:

So in the first part of your argument you establish that HPV doesn't really cause cervical cancer, and then in the second part of your argument you establish that guardasil actually "activates" the dormant HPV infection in people, thus causing cancer.

How are both of these positions possible? How do you explain the incidence of a person with a string of partners all of whom develop abnormal cells and HPV infection-coincidence?

Reply



**Hector**, on August 9, 2011 at 2:53 pm said:

I think they say that HPD doesn't cause cancer. I think there is, however, a correlation between people with constantly compromised immune systems that get recurrent infections/breakouts, whatever, and the inability of their bodies to fight off cervical cancer.

Reply



**Mick**, on June 12, 2008 at 1:00 pm said:

John, you didn't think this through at all. I'll try again:

HPV doesn't cause cancer *unless* the Gardasil vaccination triggers it. In other words, it isn't the HPV that's the culprit but the – I'll be kind here – misguided attempt to treat a condition that in 95% of cases **doesn't need treatment**.

Does that help clear up your confusion?

Reply



**John A**, on June 12, 2008 at 9:38 pm said:

"HPV doesn't cause cancer unless the Gardasil vaccination triggers it"

So what caused the cervical cancer in the thousands of women before the discovery of Gardasil in 1993?

Reply



**John A**, on June 12, 2008 at 9:46 pm said:

As far as the FDA "renouncing that HPV doesn't cause cervical cancer, via the 2003 statement:

"Most women who become infected with HPV are able to eradicate the virus [without intervention] and suffer no apparent long-term consequences to their health... most infections are short-lived and not associated with cervical cancer."

Key word: MOST. What about the minority of women who can't eradicate the virus? What about the particular strain of HPV each women has? HPV has over 200 strains, if only a handful of them cause cervical cancer, than it would be true that most women have no harmful effects from HPV. Drawing the conclusion that that statement means HPV doesn't cause cervical cancer is erroneous

Reply



**Mick**, on June 13, 2008 at 12:45 pm said:

*So what caused the cervical cancer in the thousands of women before the discovery of Gardasil in 1993?*

Who knows? There are a lot of different triggers. What's important is that, whatever it was, it wasn't HPV.

*Drawing the conclusion that that statement means HPV doesn't cause cervical cancer is erroneous.*

Alright, you wanna split hairs, split this one:

In women not vaccinated with gardasil, the cervical cancer rate is under 5%.

**In women who've been vaccinated with gardasil, the rate of cervical cancer increases by almost 50%.**

So 95% of women having HPV **don't** get cancer. Technically the statement is mildly erroneous.

Reply



**JD**, on April 28, 2011 at 9:29 pm said:

Actually less than 1% of women get cervical cancer.

Reply



**b**, on July 10, 2008 at 3:15 am said:

Thank you v.much for this informative blog.

Reply



**Shellie**, on August 4, 2008 at 7:17 pm said:

I received the Gardasil vaccine in Feb or March of this year after having a normal Pap. In May or June, there were some physical signs on my body that concerned me so I visited my OB-GYN who then diagnosed me with HPV. I have since had multiple surgeries, and yesterday was told that I had precancerous lesions. I knew the timeline of the events was a little fishy. Thank you for this information. [s\\_rae2005@hotmail.com](mailto:s_rae2005@hotmail.com)

Reply



**Mick**, on August 5, 2008 at 1:55 pm said:

You're welcome. If it turns out you were one of those whose HPV got triggered, I'm sorry. You're in for a long haul. And it didn't have to happen.

Reply



**Pamela**, on September 18, 2008 at 11:45 am said:

Incredible!!! Thank you for the information.

Reply



**Pamela**, on September 18, 2008 at 11:46 am said:

I wish there were a way to email this to all of my children.

Reply



**Jessica**, on October 22, 2008 at 8:42 am said:

I was devastated to read (actually skim this article). I was aware of the fact that I may have had at least one form of HPV from my first partner. I went to my local Planned Parenthood and got regular paps with no issues. I went through a stage in my early twenties, after my divorce (long story) and was a bit promiscuous. I got at least 1 or 2 paps during and after that stage and still nothing abnormal. THEN, my local Planned Parenthood suggested I get the Gardasil shots and that I could get them free, since they were doing a promotional "first 50 free". I got them, with some hesitation...but, how many Americans turn down "free-bees"?? ANYWAY, long story short, before I was finished with the series (by the last shot) I all of a sudden had my first abnormal PAP!! I was shocked and scared. I went in for the follow-up colposcopy and had a "level 2" whatever that meant...I was rarely talked to as if I was a person except during the colposcopy. WHICH for me was quite painful...even the nurse and doctor said that my cervix reacted much more than everyone else they have seen!! YET STILL they pretty much said...."Oh, honey you just worry too much, it's not that big of a deal." And when I said, that I was concerned that the Gardasil was the cause they treated me like a moron from that point on. I finally got up the nerve/courage to go back for my RE=PAP 8 months (instead of 6) after my first abnormal PAP the doctor tried to calm me and reassure me that it would "probably" be normal this time.....NOT NORMAL!! NOW WHAT.....all they said was, "ok, let's just schedule you for your regular PAP/Exam in 4 months and have a good day."

WHAT??!! HELP??!! Well, I feel better just typing this so....thanks for the article.

Reply

**H.P.V. Shots for young girls. - Page 2 - AllDeaf.com**, on November 24, 2008 at 6:09 pm said:

[...] a lot more thought before doing anything. I would read this site, and do a lot more research. The Gardasil Scam: HPV Does NOT Cause Cancer ♦ Dispatch from the Trenches \_\_\_\_\_

"Voici mon secret. Il est très simple: on ne voit bien qu'avec le cœur. [...]

Reply



**gnat**, on December 11, 2008 at 11:28 am said:

I have never been vaccinated with Gardasil, I have HPV, and I have cervical cancer cells containing HPV. The changes to my cervical cells are a direct effect of having HPV. I'm sorry – I can't comment on the Gardasil vaccine and I don't doubt there may be some problems with it. However, this blog is ENTIRELY wrong to state that HPV does not cause cervical cancer. The link has been established scientifically. Period. Out of more than 100 strains of genital HPV, there are 4 strains – 16, 18, 31, and 33 – that are considered "high-risk" and have been shown to cause cancer in approximately 1 out of 25 women. I'm one of them. Even these high-risk strains are often cleared naturally by the body's immune system without causing any complications. And then there are those of us who do develop complications. Please don't promote pseudo-science as a way to promote your agenda against the

Gardasil vaccine. If you don't think girls should be vaccinated, just say that. But to say HPV does not cause cervical cancer is simply inaccurate.

Reply



**Mark**, on October 28, 2011 at 5:44 am said:

As you said...

"Even these high-risk strains are often cleared naturally by the body's immune system without causing any complications. And then there are those of us who do develop complications."

There are many reason why those that do develop cancer might that has nothing to do with HPV.

- \* Sex Toys that contain phthalates release toxic chemicals carcinogenic.
- \* Smoking is a hazard to your entire body and effects your oxygen level in your body.
- \* A diet of refined processed food and sugar create a acidic environment that helps cancel thrive.
- \* Excessive Alcohol feed the body with sugar also and can do the same.

Like wise there are many things that kill cancer...

- \* Google "Budwig Diet"
- \* Visit phoenixtears.ca THC help oil kills cancer.
- \* Visit PHkillsCancer.com in prostate and in other parts of the body.
- \* Study on Iodine regarding breast and other cancer.

Reply



**Alan Foos**, on January 1, 2009 at 12:18 am said:

Thank you for an exceptionally informative and vitally IMPORTANT article. The citizens of our country and others are being heavily victimized by medical and government fraud: bad medicine, bad science, heavy profiteering, racketeering, and pharma money lining the pockets of politicians and gov agencies charged with protecting us. Amalgams have hit us extremely hard as well as vaccines. After very close examination, it becomes clear that there is very likely NO such thing as an effective vaccination, and ALL of them are seriously debilitating... thanks, again...

Reply



**Mary L.**, on January 5, 2009 at 6:34 pm said:

Quoting gnat above:

"Even these high-risk strains are often cleared naturally by the body's immune system without causing any complications. And then there are those of us who do develop complications."

So, the ones who do develop complications, maybe the "focusing" on the complications is why the condition persists? Your thoughts are very powerful as well as the feelings you put to those thoughts. I wish you the best and hope your health improves. 😊

Reply



Aly, on January 9, 2009 at 9:49 am said:

I am devastated! I have just received my last shot of Gardasil and today I decided to google "Gardasil" randomly and found sites after sites of all these negative information of Gardasil. What I don't understand is that I did research on Gardasil early 2008 when it was introduced to my town and none of these negative information was available, why now right after I have received all 3 shots? In fact, I had no intention of getting this vaccine if not because early 2008 my fiance was treated what was suspected as genital warts for the first time and we are getting married in few months time. I didn't want to be infected with genital warts and there it appears in front of me a solution – Gardasil, so I receive it without much thinking.

Now you are telling me Gardasil is just going to make it worse for me and I am paying to get infected? Why does any government let this happen in the first place? How did it get approved? What are we supposed to do now, we're only in our 20s.

Reply



**Hukd on Foniks werkD fo me**, on January 23, 2009 at 2:24 pm said:

I have listed the address for the March posting of the FDA's response to these negative comments. If you read the article it does confirm that not ALL forms of HPV lead to cervical cancer but

"four HPV types (6, 11, 16, and 18) cause about 70% of cervical cancers and about 90% of genital warts. They are also known to cause some vulvar and vaginal cancers."

Of course they tell you that the percentages are not "well defined" but if you look at the numbers... NO ONE is going to claim that high of a % if they don't have some pretty solid data to back that up. If you look at ANY scientific study, most information is not 100% accurate. In the words of Albert E. "If we knew what it was we were doing, it wouldn't be called research, would it?"

The point of this vaccination is to prevent #'s 6, 11, 16, & 18 from causing a problem. It is not being "forced" onto anyone and yes your doctor will probably ask you every time if you want the vaccination. Doctors prescribe meds, get used to it. You are the one in charge of what gets put into your body. I recommend abstaining as opposed to vaccination. Unfortunately that is more like asking a dog not to sniff.

Reply



**Tyciol**, on February 27, 2009 at 12:30 am said:

I came to the same conclusions as John A, there's some contradictions here, makes me suspicious.

Reply



**Scientist**, on February 27, 2009 at 1:27 am said:

So you, a self-proclaimed "working-class wonk" in financial difficulties, are qualified to make this opinion how?

You stitch together bits of information from the internet and a single journal article which you probably don't fully understand, make some kind of opinion, and disseminate it to the world with

the request that it be spread around.

I'm sure you do this with the best of intentions, but your good intentions are misplaced. The "evidence" which convinced you enough to adopt the anti-Gardasil position is complex and requires expert interpretation. If you just imagine for a second that the brilliant scientists (many of them) who worked on it know far more about this than you, perhaps you might realise that their combined knowledge eclipses yours by orders of magnitude, that you should perhaps stick your nose elsewhere into something worthwhile, and that even if they are 100% right, you could be undoing their good work and harming girls whose ignorant parents adopt your position.

Reply



**mick**, on February 27, 2009 at 5:51 pm said:

Leaving your witless *ad hominem* attack aside, your insinuation that only a "scientist" has the right to criticize or question scientific evaluations is either naive or disingenuous. That's what many "scientists" said in the 60's when some "non-scientists" questioned the safety of pesticides. If we'd listened to their corporate-driven reassurances, we'd still be using DDT, unaware that it was highly carcinogenic since your "experts" said it wasn't.

*If you just imagine for a second that the brilliant scientists (many of them) who worked on it know far more about this than you, perhaps you might realise that their combined knowledge eclipses yours by orders of magnitude, that you should perhaps stick your nose elsewhere into something worthwhile...*

This is insulting and arrogant. Worse, it is the same argument used by Big Pharma and polluting corpo's like GE, who poured millions of gallons of poisonous PCB's into the Housatonic River and then told people to butt out because their pet "scientists" said there was no danger. Meanwhile, people kept dying in Pittsfield. The "experts" aren't always right, especially when their "expertise" has been bought by a corporation with a lot to lose if those "scientists" diss the product.

*...and that even if they are 100% right, you could be undoing their good work and harming girls whose ignorant parents adopt your position.*

And if they're not I could be keeping those girls from harm the drug company doesn't give a shit about causing as long as they sell their product for a big profit – and the profit would be HUGE if they can convince every girl in America to get these shots, wouldn't it?

Go ahead, Mr "Scientist". Tell me no Big Pharma corpo would ever endanger the lives of consumers with a dangerous and unnecessary product just for the sake of raking in massive profits. Tell me no corporate scientist would ever jigger results for the sake of his stock options. Go ahead. Tell me and be prepared for the horse laugh from all quarters. We're not that stoopid any more, "scientist".

So, Mr "Scientist" which drug company do you work for? Do I have to ask? Or have you already made it abundantly clear?

Reply



**youre an idiot**, on March 10, 2009 at 1:29 pm said:

You are an idiot for taking this position. You have zero molecular medicine education/expertise to back up your opinion.

Its funny how cervical cancer has existed before the gardasil vaccine. It is also funny how scientists are finding HPV in oral cancers now.

You can rant on and on about your conspiracy theories, but please don't persuade to believe your ridiculous ideas.

Reply



yoy50, on May 15, 2009 at 1:53 pm said:

Well hello Dispatch! I was attempting to write a post today on Gardasil myself, so I began to surf to try find documentation to back up my theories to this scam as well. I thought you did such an excellent job of posting the many facts, I've decided to let you hold the ball on the subject. I don't see a place where i could actually improve upon what you've so thoroughly researched so a BIG KUDOS! I'm also adding you to my blog roll! I will post a headline instead that will link your blog post on the subject for others to see. I mean, this is really outstanding work here! I recently signed up with wordpress.com so it's good to know that I'm in good company with some bloggers and the subject matters we want to write about. Stop by and check us out @ yoy50.wordpress.com and tell us what you think. Again, we're just getting starting and we are certainly not experts, but we are a few people that are simply outraged by some occurrences that are happening around us, therefore, we created a blog. Oh- a few words of encouragement for you- don't pay attention to the nay sayers, they have effectively been programmed therefore, no matter the facts (and sometimes it's simple logic), they will not see the "forrest for the trees". Our government is an expert at "brainwashing" the masses. This is exactly why we are in so many 'pickles' right now. Look forward to a reply soon- have a great day and keep blogging!

Reply



**Gardasil... is this bad for your health after all?** « **Why O' Why?**, on May 15, 2009 at 2:55 pm said:

[...] So here's the link to Trenches.wordpress.com's exceptional research on the subject.

<https://trenches.wordpress.com/2008/03/14/the-gardasil-scam-hpv-does-not-cause-cancer/>. Again, our goal at Why O' Why is put out sound information, and we will always encourage [...]

Reply



A. S., on July 14, 2009 at 4:31 pm said:

First, let me say that I agree that the masses are brainwashed and just plain stupid, however the logic in this article is faulty pretty much every step of the way.

I am a female in my late 20s who tested negative for the 4 (among hundreds of harmless) types of high-risk (dangerous) strains of HPV that cause cervical cancer, and ONLY THEN, was I administered the Gardasil vaccine which is only for those 4 dangerous strains of HPV. Had I tested positive, I would not have been given the vaccine (which is a no-brainer).

If someone isn't tested for these 4 strains before being given the vaccine, that is the fault of the specific health care providers who don't know what they're doing.

I did not become sexually active until I was in my early 20s and had undergone PAP smears when I was a virgin. As a virgin, my PAP smears were slightly irregular, and after Gardasil, they have

remained the same as they were when I was a virgin.

The crucial point that this article misses is that this vaccine is only for those without the 4 high-risk strains of HPV that cause cervical cancer.

Reply



Mick, on July 14, 2009 at 5:10 pm said:

The logic is NOT “faulty” and you somewhat misunderstood the problem. What you say *may* be true but even if it is (and the research doesn’t show it) neither Merck nor Rick Perry are selling it that way. Perry – who gets BIG campaign donations from BIG Pharma corpo’s, including Merck – wanted to make Gardasil injections **mandatory** for every teenaged girl in every Texas high school, and Merck’s promotional literature was using fear to sell injections to every girl in America. Neither was making any attempt whatever to make distinctions such as the one you make. Even by your own rules, that’s irresponsible and dangerous.

Reply



STOP THE VAX, on August 29, 2009 at 11:17 pm said:

Vaccines are POISON. The only one[s] who benefit from vaccines are PHARMACEUTICALS. Lots of Vitamin D will protect you from the flu and many other diseases. DON’T be fooled by paid off media hype. STOP the sickening assault on humanity.

Reply



Luna, on September 1, 2009 at 8:18 am said:

God what has this country come to, putting fear in our heads to make us do everything?!

You don’t buy the Crest toothpaste, your breath will stink, you won’t get the girl.

You get this vaccine, you’ll die.

What about the negative aspects? We as a people have survived before this piece of crap vaccine, why do we need it now?

Tell me this crap, I had to get this idiotic vaccine, and they knew I was sexually active. They didn’t test me for anything, they gave it to me. I was 14, and I wasn’t a virgin, and they didn’t test me. THEN they gave it to me with the meningitis vaccine, too!

I couldn’t decline, it was my mothers choice. I had no voice in the matter. I’m deathly afraid of needles, so they poked me with TWO. and I passed out.

Then they handed me a paper on the vaccines I just got. On the paper, it said “Gardasil has not been approved by the FDA, and studies have shown a few complications to occur, including redness and pain at the injection site, fainting, Guillain-Barre syndrome, and death.”

Then I looked on the meningitis vaccine, it said the same thing, except. IT IS NOT SUPPOSED TO BE INJECTED AT THE SAME TIME WITH THE GARDASIL VACCINE. Studies have shown a high risk of Guillain-Barre syndrome when included with Gardasil.

WHAT?? I just gambled with being paralyzed because my mother is uninformed like the rest of this country! Good god, how stupid!

However, death may occur if severe pulmonary complications and autonomic nervous system problems are present.[7] Guillain-Barre is one of the leading causes of non-trauma-induced paralysis in the world.

Reply



**Luna**, on September 1, 2009 at 8:19 am said:

I meant you DON'T get this vaccine, you'll die.

Reply



**beefpelican**, on May 1, 2012 at 9:38 pm said:

You lost me at the part where you told me you don't brush your teeth. Is hygiene also a conspiracy?



**ELizabeth**, on September 23, 2009 at 9:51 am said:

I wish I would have had a chance to read this two years ago! I got the Guardasil vaccine in early 2007 (while I was still dating my husband) under doctor recommendation to my mother. I had been sexually active prior to meeting my husband and prior to the vaccine (my doctor was aware of this). We were married at the end of 2007 and got pregnant early in 2008. We miscarried, but got pregnant again the summer of 2008 (about a year after I had the vaccine). I gave birth to a healthy baby girl this past March, but found out this past May that I have HPV and a "mild dysphasia" on my cervix. I have no doubt that this was caused by the vaccine, because I had had yearly exams and perfectly clean pap smears up until this year. (I couldn't have a routine check up in 2008 due to my pregnancy.) Is there anywhere I can file this against the pharmaceutical company or the doctor who forced this vaccine on me?

Reply



**Mick**, on September 23, 2009 at 3:58 pm said:

Not that I'm aware of. IAC, a court is unlikely to buy the idea that a doctor "forced" you to have the shot. But I hope you'll consider calling the CDC or the FDA or – better yet – Merck to let them know you are one of those who got cancer from their vaccine that's suppose to prevent it. And warn as many of your female friends as possible. This vaccine is a dangerous scam and could very easily adversely affect their health.

Reply



**ELizabeth**, on September 23, 2009 at 7:14 pm said:

Thanks, Mick. I guess "forced" was too harsh of a word to use. However, my doctor did not give me all of the information before giving me the Garadsil vaccine—I didn't even know the vaccine was for HPV. My mom and I were just told that it was necessary for me to get it because there is a history of cervical cancer in my family.

I don't have cancer—yet. I do have precancerous cells, though. Pretty scary considering I am a young mother and have hopes of having more kids someday.

Reply



**Ashley**, on April 2, 2010 at 12:30 pm said:

Wow. Your reading comprehension is awful. And your condescending tone to people who have tried to explain the mistakes in your comprehension to you is stunning.

That's giving you the benefit of the doubt, though. It could be that you're deliberately misstating the facts because you have some ideological axe of your own to grind.

Reply



**Ashley**, on April 2, 2010 at 1:05 pm said:

Screw it. I was going to leave this alone, but your arrogant, condescending tone to the posters who were trying to explain YOUR mistakes to you — “Does that help clear up your confusion?” “you somewhat misunderstood the problem” — reveals you as one of those people who cannot admit when he’s wrong. Talk about dangers to society.

I don't have time right now to go over all of your reading comprehension/logical reasoning mistakes, but I'll start with one. If you respond in a snotty way, I'll come back and do more of them.

Your reading comprehension mistake #1:

“In women who've been vaccinated with gardasil, the rate of cervical cancer increases by almost 50%.”

Reading comprehension FAIL -AND- Math FAIL.

The material you quoted \*actually\* said

“vaccination with Gardasil of the women who are already sero-positive and PCR-positive for vaccine-relevant genotypes of HPV has been found to increase the risk of developing high-grade precancerous lesions by 44.6%”

Your math fail is that the risk of developing precancerous lesions increased by 44.6% IN THE WOMEN WHO WERE ALREADY POSITIVE FOR THE TYPES OF HPV IN THE VACCINE.

It doesn't increase the risk in all women. Those women are a very small percentage of all women.

Therefore, for you to say that it increases “in women who've been vaccinated with gardasil” overstates the number BY SEVERAL ORDERS OF MAGNITUDE.

(By the way, I noticed your little “rounding up” there from 44.6% to “almost 50%.” Those little bits of fudging and inaccuracy contribute to an appearance of overall carelessness with the precise truth.)

Your reading comprehension FAIL here is that it is the risk of PRECANCEROUS LESIONS that goes up by 44.6% – not the risk, as you said, of “cervical cancer”.

Not all precancerous lesions go on to become cervical cancer.

Reply



**Ashley**, on April 2, 2010 at 1:15 pm said:

And you know, I blame people like you for the fact that the FDA didn't widely publicize the fact that it increases the risk for women who already have the HPV strains in the vaccine.

If people could hear that information and understand it, there wouldn't be any problem. It's people like you who hear that and go "HURF DURF GARDASIL GIVES CANCER TO 50% OF VIRJINS!!!!" that the FDA was probably worried about.

Reply



**Sarah**, on October 13, 2010 at 10:43 pm said:

As someone who has had stage 3 (pre-cancer) cells in her cervix caused by HPV 16 and had to go through the Leep procedure...this article is just plain insulting. I had my pre-cancerous cells surgically removed way before I ever had the Gardasil shot. The shot did not cause my pre-cancer cells...HPV did...way before I even heard of Gardasil.

The logic in this article is seriously flawed.

Reply



**Lauren**, on December 3, 2011 at 12:45 pm said:

I just posted below about the prevalence of HPV in the population and just because it is correlated, that does not imply causation. No one is trying to insult you. This blogger just wants to give information lest more people become misled by the intention of the pharma cos to sell more vaccines. I put my post below so you don't have to look to find it

"I even did some poking around on Google Scholar, found a published medical paper from some German doctors which states that HPV is found in tissue of 73.5% women with cervical cancer. However, if HPV is endemic in the population, with anywhere from 50-95% of women contracting the virus at some point in their lives, then this correlation proves absolutely nothing other than the cancer patients have the same prevalence of HPV as the general population."

Your body produces cancer cells aka abnormal cells all the time. A healthy body will fight them off. If for some reason you are stressed, have negative emotions, bad nutrition (hard to avoid with the toxic crap they sell as food these days), drink toxins in your water (fluoride) or otherwise bad environment, your body's ability to clear abnormal cells is compromised and those cells replicate. That is what causes cancer.

Reply



**Sarah**, on November 20, 2010 at 4:42 pm said:

This article comes from a familiar, lung cancer may be published on the posts, other blogs.

Reply



Jenny H, on April 28, 2011 at 4:19 am said:

SOrry I got my email address wrong the first time! Can I have a second go?

I have searched and searched but cannot find the following quotes or any information about detection devices at either of the addresses given. Can you hlep me?

"PCR-based HPV detection device with provision for accurate HPV genotyping is more urgently needed now because vaccination with Gardasil of the women who are already sero-positive and PCR-positive for vaccine-relevant genotypes of HPV has been found to increase the risk of developing high-grade precancerous lesions by 44.6%, according to an FDA VRBPAC Background Document : Gardasil HPV Quadrivalent Vaccine. May 18, 2006 VRBPAC Meeting. <http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/06/briefing/2006-4222B3.pdf>"

NaturalNews tracked down the correct URL of the document referenced above and found it in the FDA docket archives. We have placed a safe backup copy at: <http://www.NaturalNews.com/downloads/FDA-Gardasil.pdf>

I cna't find this one either: The FDA news release of March 31, 2003 acknowledges that "most infections (by HPV) are short-lived and not associated with cervical cancer", in recognition of the advances in medical science and technology since 1988. In other words, since 2003 the scientific staff of the FDA no longer considers HPV infection to be a high-risk disease when writing educational materials for the general public whereas the regulatory arm of the agency is still bound by the old classification scheme that had placed HPV test as a test to stratify risk for cervical cancer in regulating the industry.

NaturalNews sought to verify the existence of the FDA news release referenced by this petition reclassification document and found that, indeed, the FDA news release exists. In fact, it's still posted on the FDA website at <http://www.fda.gov/bbs/topics/NEWS/2003/NEW00890.html>

Reply

**Feds continue to ignore mounting Gardasil bodycount - Grasscity.com Forums**, on October 24, 2011 at 2:25 pm said:

[...] [...]

Reply



**Matt D, on November 4, 2011 at 5:52 pm** said:

to Sarah;

You talk about comprehension mistakes! How about misuse of grammar?

Do you mean failure? I know that many folks find it trendy and fashionable to use meme's such as "FAIL", but in reality you present yourself as yet another follower...another slave to groupthink.

You criticize the author for his arrogance and condescending tone, yet you forgot to leave your emotion out of the equation. Essentially, you are committing the same fault as the author you attacked.

Maybe, if your rebuttal more reflected that of an adult, you could have a point. And you still may have some points... but why not try a different approach?

Reply



**Matt D**, on November 4, 2011 at 6:26 pm said:  
pardon. I meant Ashley. Sorry to Sarah that was a mistake.

I would love to address this entire thread with great detail, but honestly, I had a long day and I don't feel like arguing for arguments sake.

I agree with the author concerning Big Pharma/doctors/FDA etcetera.

Dear Ashley, this is for you 😊  
<http://thebestpageintheuniverse.net/c.cgi?u=epic>

Reply



**Lauren**, on December 3, 2011 at 12:40 pm said:  
I even did some poking around on google scholar, found a published medical paper from some german doctors which states that hpv is found in tissue of 73.5% women with cervical cancer. however, if hpv is endemic in the population, with anywhere from 50-95% of women contracting the virus in some point in their lives, than this correlation proves absolutely nothing other than the cancer patients have the same prevalence of hpv as the general population.

Reply



**Mike**, on December 26, 2011 at 4:55 am said:  
I've been exploring for a little bit for any high quality articles or weblog posts in this sort of house . Exploring in Yahoo I finally stumbled upon this website. Reading this information So i'm glad to convey that I've an incredibly just right uncanny feeling I found out exactly what I needed. I most without a doubt will make sure to don?t omit this web site and provides it a glance on a relentless basis.

Reply



**saddened mother**, on April 13, 2012 at 12:28 am said:  
Well I am another women that now has Low Grade Squamous lesions within a year and a half of recieving the shot that are precancerous. I was sexually active when I recieved the shot, but had no known visible outbreaks of HPV and recieved pap smears every six months since becoming sexually active at 17. I am now 25, I recieved the Vaccine when I was 23. Before having the vaccine I had two partners, but they had both had promiscuous sex in the past. I probably had a strain of "inactive" HPV. The Doctor that administered the vaccine did not do any blood labs to check if I had any of the 'high risk' strains already. I strongly feel that their was a direct correlation between the three month period of when I finished the last shot of the vaccine and when the HPV first appeared, it was not on my cervix. It only took three months from recieving the shot and I had HPV that was active. Before that, I had had never had an STD or an abnormal pap. Tested routinely. For years. A year and half later, after first sign of HPV, I now have Low grade squamous lesions. Just had my cervix biopsied yesterday to see if the cells have become high grade. They are pre cancerous. I also have an auto immune disorder (psoriasis) so that may have also contributed to me being more suseptible of being in the percent that cannot ward off the disease and clear it from the body as well as others. I am saddened that this could have been prevented if I had done my research on vaccines earlier. I was

naive and young though, and I thought I was protecting myself. I recently gave birth, and my son is beautiful amazing and eight months old. His Dad is currently in jail, awaiting prison, looking at least seven years. I am a single mom and all he has. If this takes my life, he will be all alone. IF YOU ARE SEXUALLY ACTIVE ALREADY, DO NOT GET THIS VACCINE. DO YOUR RESEARCH BEFORE RECEIVING ANY VACCINE OR TAKING ANY NEW MEDICATION. THEY DO NOT TELL YOU THE HEALTH RISKS. HALF OF THEM ARE PULLED OFF THE MARKET WITHIN 5-10 YEARS. I believe Gardasil is a silent killer, I believe there is a correlation in the time of my vaccine and the HPV I developed. I DO believe Gardasil causes cancer some in women. 46.4% if you are already sexually active. That is like flipping a coin with your life. I wish I could go back and know then what I do now. I pray my health will be fine again and I will be able to raise my little boy.

Reply



puameliaclinic, on June 26, 2012 at 10:44 am said:

Reblogged this on The Pua Melia Clinic and commented:

This is a superb post I am reblogging and as a medicinal chemist myself, I am looking at the evidence which is showing itself on how the FDA in America is killing these young lasses. Now Gardasil is due to be used here in the UK starting September 2012. It was bad enough here with cervarix and that has only 2 strains of HPV, Gardasil I believe from viewing the jab information has 4 strains in it!

Reply



Me, on May 11, 2014 at 5:51 am said:

I developed invasive cervical cancer due to HPV. I would have had the vaccine if given the chance when I was young.

I received all the vaccines (polio, t.b., smallpox etc) and have never contracted these diseases. Obviously the people that are now rubbishing the HPV vaccine have never suffered the consequences of cervical cancer. I HAVE...

Reply



sandysez, on February 26, 2015 at 4:24 am said:

<http://sanevax.org/hpv-not-cause-cervical-cancer/>

The excellent article from 2015 "What if HPV does NOT cause cervical cancer?" is a true eye-opener. It describes the karyotypic speciation hypothesis which, when compared to the "HPV-cervical cancer link" hypothesis appears to be far more logical.

It certainly provides satisfactory explanations regarding questions which hitherto are unanswered.

Reply



sabretruthtiger, on December 19, 2017 at 10:47 am said:

There's a big logical problem with this post. It claims HPV doesn't cause cancer but then goes on to say the vaccine activates the dormant HPV which then causes cancer.

Reply



Mick, on December 19, 2017 at 9:38 pm said:

Maybe I wasn't clear. HPV *may* cause cancer but if so, causes it in a tiny percentage of cases. Using Gardasil **increases** that risk by 65%, which means it **creates** hundreds of cases that wouldn't have happened without it. That seems ludicrous to me.

[Reply](#)



**Cancer, what causes it? What may help with it. – Lee's Stuff**, on July 29, 2018 at 8:58 pm said:  
[...] <https://trenches.wordpress.com/2008/03/14/the-gardasil-scam-hpv-does-not-cause-cancer/> [...]

[Reply](#)

**The Gardasil Scam - HPV Does Not Cause Cancer - Holy Hormones Journal**, on August 19, 2018 at 4:59 pm said:

[...] MORE... [...]

[Reply](#)

[Blog at WordPress.com.](#) WP Designer.