

To the University of Wollongong,  
Faculty of Science, Medicine and Health  
11 October 2016

Dear Professor's Jones and Yeatman,

I have recently been made aware of an article by John Cunningham that was published in the Australian newspaper on 20 January 2016 – ten days after my thesis was published on the UOW website. The article was titled “***Wollongong should never have accepted Judy Wilyman's thesis***”. In this article he presents his opinion of the assessment of my PhD research and criticisms of UOW's involvement in the assessment *without providing any supportive evidence for his claims*. Similarly, Heather Yeatman, has presented her opinion of immunisation on the UOW website *without providing any supportive evidence for her claims*. UOW has a duty to the public to maintain academic integrity in public debates of scientific issues and this requires UOW to promote claims that are evidence-based on the UOW website.

These comments by a member of the public and a UOW academic who has not addressed all the evidence, are influencing the public debate on health. They are suppressing the arguments that I have presented in research completed at the University of Wollongong. Therefore, I am requesting that you provide the evidence for the derogatory statements about UOW's assessment of my PhD thesis by John Cunningham or remove Heather Yeatman's opinion of immunisation from the UOW website until the evidence for vaccination policies has openly debated.

John Cunningham, is a pro-vaccine activist for several lobby groups and he has been permitted to use the University's processes to disparage my research – without evidence. The opinion of immunisation that UOW is promoting represents dangerous misinformation if it cannot be supported with evidence and openly debated. This is a breach of academic integrity by UOW and it can be ***considered an abuse of your duty of care to the general public, negligence and malfeasance of office and such parties can be prosecuted for crimes of genocide and causing conditions of life intended to destroy (Criminal Code Act 1995 (Cth) S268)***.

Therefore, I am directing you to provide the supportive evidence for John Cunningham's opinions of UOW's assessment of my research or remove the dangerous misinformation that you are promoting on the UOW website *until it has been openly debated*.

Here are John Cunningham's comments in point form taken from his article (20 January 2016) that I would like you to support with evidence. My comments are in bold:

1. My research has been slammed by "critics from many corners" (**Name these critics. I have received significant support from researchers and academics at many universities/institutions**).
2. "Wilyman demonstrates a profound lack of understanding of vaccination and immunology (**Evidence required**)
3. Her thesis is "not fit for purpose". (**My thesis has been published for 10 months and no errors have been brought to my attention**)
4. She has made errors that "would surely be unacceptable in an undergraduate course" (**Refer to the above comment**)
5. "Wilyman also appears to demonstrate a lack of understanding of the principles of vaccination, distort and misrepresent references and present bizarre conspiracy theories to explain vaccination policy". (**Evidence required**)
6. You state that I have provided "dangerous public health misinformation". (**Provide examples. I am seeking an open and transparent debate of the literature**)
7. "Wilyman has been exercising her freedom of speech for some years, sometimes in a cruel and inhumane fashion" (**Example?**)
8. "In 2012 she wrote that she suspected the parents of a child who died of whooping cough were receiving money from a lobby group to promote vaccination" You described me as "callous" for discussing the ethics of governments promoting vaccines on anecdotal evidence (**In 2009 The McCaffery family received the Thornett award of \$1,000 from the Australian Skeptics Inc lobby group for their efforts in promoting the whooping cough vaccine to the public. The SAVN lobby group is an offshoot of the Australian Skeptics and is supported by John Cunningham and the PHAA – Heather Yeatman is the president of the PHAA**).
9. .."her seemingly flawed understandings were repeatedly pointed out to her. Time and again, she refused to correct these glaring errors". (**Provide examples. I responded to all the suggestions by examiners and other academics and made the appropriate changes**)
10. "We've subsequently learned that she even rejected formal advice from an immunologist." (**Who was this immunologist and when did this occur?**).
11. "Wilyman's thesis is grossly flawed". (**How? No academics have made this claim**)

12. "...it is difficult to comprehend the behaviour of the university. In a case of corporate narcissism, it endorsed her thesis." **(Please answer this question)**
13. "While this may be so, even the most controversial research has to adhere to basic standards of evidence and argument. Passing work that fails to meet those standards tarnishes the standards of the university." **(What standards did it fail?)**
14. "A document based on a mountain of erroneous understandings and flawed conclusions is simply not valid."
15. "It may be better labelled as a work of fiction" **(Why? Evidence)**
16. "In my view Judy Wilyman did not have adequate supervision from a person qualified to consider and remedy her lack of scientific appreciation of vaccination. "**(Please explain how Brian Martin's and Andrew Whelan's qualifications were inadequate in this field of study)**
17. Her supervisor "...seems to have neglected to prevent her committing fundamental errors." **(Examples)**
18. "The release of this thesis demonstrates the failings of the university on multiple levels". **(Examples)**
19. "The university has failed its students and staff and has potentially been complicit in one of the worst miscarriages of academic endorsement this country has ever seen." **(How?)**

I direct you to provide the evidence for these opinions ***within one week of this letter or remove Heather Yeatman's claims about vaccination until the evidence has been openly debated.***

UOW has either failed to provide adequate supervision and assessment of a PhD thesis or it is failing in its duty of care to support academic integrity by promoting evidence-based claims on its website. These actions can result in harm to the population and UOW needs to address this issue or be responsible for the harm that may be caused by these actions.

I look forward to a prompt reply to this letter as the health of the community is at risk if the University of Wollongong does not fulfil its role in maintaining academic integrity by allowing an open and transparent debate on vaccination policies.

Yours Sincerely,  
Judy Wilyman PhD