



A RESOURCE FOR PHYSICIANS & LAYPERSONS



## Scientists Sue Merck: allege fraud, mislabeling, and false certification of MMR vaccine. Suzanne Humphries, MD

- JUNE 25, 2012 (EDIT POST)

POSTED IN: ARTICLES

Vaccinationists tell us we don't understand science. Well maybe they are right. "Science" in the world of vaccines could mean, throwing out results that don't fit the desired outcome, throwing out the evidence before the FDA comes to inspect, offering bonuses to scientists to deliver the necessary results ...I was the head technician in a biochemistry lab for two years prior to medical school, yet I never saw science carried out like that. Maybe Temple University was just a bit behind the times in its evolution of "science."



This is the story of the MMR vaccine and two Merck scientists who filed a lawsuit in 2010 over Merck's efforts to allegedly "defraud the United States through Merck's ongoing scheme to sell the government a mumps vaccine that is mislabeled, misbranded, adulterated and falsely certified as having an efficacy rate that is significantly higher than it actually is." Merck allegedly did this from 2000 onwards in order to maintain its exclusive license to sell the MMR vaccine and keep its monopoly of the US market.

Folks, if you haven't already heard this elsewhere, this is HUGE news. **HERE** is Hilary Butler's excellent account of the ordeal as well as both the

2010 and 2012 official legal complaints.

In the complaint, the scientists outline in great detail exactly how Merck manipulated the efficacy results in order to be able to say they had a 95% effective vaccine so that they could meet the fairytale goal of vaccine-induced "herd immunity by 2010." Well, it turns out that the vaccine could not meet the goal that CDC projected to eradicate mumps by 2010, BECAUSE the vaccine, in its current state cannot reliably confer immunity, and is in fact a dilute version of what it once was when Maurice Hilleman invented it using the virus of his five year old daughter. The same viral mumps strain has been in use in every mumps or MMR vaccine Merck has made since 1967.

In order to mass-produce live but non-infective vaccine virus, the "wild" virus from 1967 has had to be "passaged" through different cells or animals over and over and over. In that passaging, mutations take place that render the virus non-infective or "attenuated" but also, those many years of passaging the same original viral strain has lowered the antigenicity, or the antibody-stimulating capacity of the virus.

When testing was performed to show the efficacy (neutralizing antibody provoking potential) of the forty-year-old virus strain, for use in the newer combination mumps vaccines, Merck's scientists could not produce a 95% efficacy rate.

Merck got the old virus to pass its new tests by doing three things. First they tested efficacy on the vaccine strain virus and not the wild virus as had previously been done. The testing is done by vaccinating children and testing the ability of their blood to neutralize the virus before and after the vaccine. There should be a marked difference between the two tests. For the new testing method, the children's blood was tested for its ability to neutralize the virus, using the vaccine strain virus, instead of the wild type strain that is much more infective, and the one that your children would most likely catch. By using a weaker virus, the old vaccine strain virus allowed the neutralization to occur much more easily. But still it was not 95% effective.

In order to make the blood pass the test, antibodies from rabbits was added. The addition of rabbit

### Follow Us!



### Search Across Related Sites

Google Custom Search

### Subscribe to Doctors on Vaccines

Hundreds of medical doctors are here to tell you the truth about vaccines. Protect yourself and your children. Subscribe to periodic updates via e-mail.

Enter your email address:



Delivered by **FeedBurner**

### Recent Posts

- "Herd Immunity." The flawed science and failures of mass vaccination, Suzanne Humphries, MD
- An Interview With Research Immunologist Tetyana Obukhanych, PhD, Part 3 of 3, Catherine Frompovich
- Forbes Magazine Tilts at IMCV and Gives Merck a Free Pass, by Hilary Butler
- Important Pandemic Update by Jane Burgermeister
- Scientists Sue Merck: allege fraud, mislabeling, and false certification of MMR vaccine. Suzanne Humphries, MD
- Potential Hazards of Modern Whooping Cough Tests; False positive results, unnecessary antibiotics, and inaccurate statistics, by Hilary Butler
- An Interview With Research Immunologist Tetyana Obukhanych PhD, part 2
- Whooping Cough Treatment: What doctors don't know. By Hilary Butler
- Interview with PhD Immunologist, Dr Tetyana Obukhanych - part 1, by Catherine Frompovich
- CDC and Friends Sprinting Towards the

antibody increased the efficacy to 100%. But that was not the end, because the test has to be done on pre-vaccine blood and post-vaccine blood. Just the addition of rabbit antibody made the pre-vaccine blood go from 10% positive to 80% positive and that was such an obvious sign of foul play that yet another manipulation had to be made. The desired end result is to have very low pre-vaccine viral neutralization and 95% or more post-vaccine viral neutralization.

So...yet one more change in procedure was made: The pre-vaccine "positive" tests were all recounted. None of the post vaccine tests and none of the pre-vaccine negatives were recounted, just the pre-vaccine positives. According to the Merck scientists, they did this by fabricating the "plaque" counts on the pre-vaccine blood samples, counting plaques that were not there. The test is called a "plaque reduction neutralization" (PRN) assay. Plaques are areas on cell culture dishes where virus attacks cells, demonstrating viral activity and lack of immunity. Because the rabbit antibodies were used in the pre-vaccine tests, there was positive PRN meaning that the pre-vaccine blood looked immune, or that there was plaque reduction. This is not desired when wanting to show that the vaccine is what led to the immunity, where you would only want the post-vaccine samples to have positive PRN- or a reduction in plaques. So, the pre-vaccine positive PRN assays were recounted because there were not enough plaques to show the desired result- that virus was active in the pre-vaccine tests. According to the scientists, plaques were counted where there were none. This allowed a mathematical dilution of the pre-vaccine positive PRN tests, turning them negative. The complaint says that 45% of the pre-vaccine samples recounted were revised.

According to the complaint, the plates used to recount the pre-vaccine positive PRN tests were discarded just before the FDA arrived to inspect.

While this alleged fraudulent activity was occurring in Merck's labs, two courageous scientists voiced their objection. They claim to have been told that if they called the FDA they would be jailed. They were also reminded of the very large bonuses that were on the way after the vaccines were certified.

If what these scientists claim is true, the net result of Merck's questionable activity was epidemics and outbreaks. It is known that the mumps component of all MMR vaccines from the mid 1990's has had a very low efficacy, estimated at 69% (Harling 05). The outbreaks started in UK and Europe in 1998. USA's outbreaks began in 2006.

These mumps outbreaks have already been proven NOT to be the result of failure to vaccinate, but vaccination failure ... and now it looks to all be a result of Merck's cooked books, used in order to maintain a commercial monopoly to generate increased revenue from increasing numbers of boosters.



TAGS: **Butler, Humphries, Merck, MMR**

**Polio "Finish Line," by Suzanne Humphries, MD**

Translator



Donate



Tags

A. Majid Katme AH1N1 aluminum  
**autism** Butler flu flu vaccine  
flu vaccine risks **Gardasil**  
Gary Null Guillain-Barre Syndrome  
**H1N1** Harold Buttram hepatitis B  
Hilary **HPV** **Humphries**  
immunology influenza Islam  
Joseph Mercola Len Horowitz  
Len Saputo Leonard Horowitz  
**Mayer Eisenstein** mercury Muslim  
Narcolepsy Nick Haas Pertussis  
Recorded webinars **risks**  
**Sherri Tenpenny** **Suzanne**  
**Suzanne Humphries**  
**Swine Flu** vaccination  
**vaccine** vaccine damage  
**vaccine risks**  
**vaccines**  
Vaccines: Get the Full Story vitamin c  
Whooping Cough  
**William Douglass**

Trackbacks / Pings

1. Immunizations – Harmful to your Child or Not? By Dr. Aisha Hamdan – Page 6

Leave a Reply

Logged in as admin4. Log out?

Comment

You may use these HTML tags and attributes: `<a href="" title=""> <abbr title=""> <acronym title=""> <b> <blockquote cite=""> <code> <del datetime=""> <em> <i> <q cite=""> <strike> <strong>`

Notify me of follow-up comments by email.

Notify me of new posts by email.

---

International Medical Council on Vaccination © 2010. All rights reserved. [Disclaimer](#)

[About Arras WordPress Theme](#)

[Switch to our mobile site](#)

