

## **My reply to the misinformation provided in the Australian newspaper in the story:**

### **'University stands by anti-vaccine student'**

**By Rick Morton (26 September 2012)**

The article published in the Australian newspaper (26 September 2012) titled 'University stands by anti-vaccine student' provided incorrect information. The journalist, Rick Morton, based this article on misinformation and emotion from social media websites and he did not provide evidence to refute the information on the HPV vaccine that I have presented at international conferences. Even Professor Ian Frazer, who is interviewed in the article, does not provide evidence against the statements I have made about HPV vaccines.

The article states that 'Professor Ian Frazer has declined to comment' on the information I have presented. Why would he do this if the information I presented was incorrect?

The misinformation that Rick Morton has provided in this News Ltd newspaper includes:

- He discusses the issue as 'anti-vaccination' yet this is a label he has attached to the science that demonstrates the risks of vaccines. Scientific evidence is not less valid when it is labeled 'anti-vaccination' and it should not be ignored in the assessment of health issues. Journalists are attempting to stigmatise the issue as 'anti-vaccination' to prevent proper academic debate in mainstream channels.
- Rick Morton has falsely claimed that I said a family whose child died of whooping cough 'are liars'. This is a fabricated comment taken from social media websites. I have never made this comment. The issue I have discussed is why anecdotal evidence from parents is being used to promote vaccines to the public. The government has not replied to this question.
- He uses the word 'conspiracy theory' in his article yet I have never used this word. This is another label that journalists are using to prevent proper academic debate of the conflicts of interest (COI) that exist in government vaccination policy. COI are an issue in

all government policies and they should not be dismissed as a 'conspiracy theory' in immunisation policy.

- Kristine Macartney, deputy director of the NCIRS states 'that she took issue with the assumption that some cervical cancer deaths are deemed allowable'. Again I have never presented this argument and my arguments are available on my website for everyone to see.
- At no time have I ever contacted the McCafferys or 'used their daughter's death for my own gain'. This comment is a fabrication by the journalist.
- I have never stated that 'the McCafferys were paid to promote this vaccine to the public'. I stated that 'they received an award from the Skeptics lobby group for being involved in the promotion of whooping cough vaccine to the public. There is no suggestion that the motive for their involvement in the campaign was for money.

In 2005, Ian Frazer, the Australian inventor of the HPV vaccine claimed that 'almost all cervical cancer occurs in the developing world' yet this vaccine was approved for all young women in many *developed* countries, like Australia, in 2006. It was known that cervical cancer was a very low risk to women in developed countries. Now the vaccine has been approved for all teenage boys and girls in Australia and other countries (12-13 years of age) even though it is a low risk in developed countries and there are known 'risk' factors other than HPV that are known to be necessary.

The most effective prevention for cervical cancer is Pap screening (WHO) and vaccinated women will still require Pap screening. The public is entitled to debate the necessity for this vaccine without false and misleading information being presented by journalists in the media and on social media websites to disparage people's reputations.

Judy Wilyman

PhD Candidate

[www.vaccinationdecisions.net](http://www.vaccinationdecisions.net)