

Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 2:40 PM

To: 'Loussikian, Kylar'

Cc: 'Gillian Triggs'; 'wellings@uow.edu.au'; 'Judy Raper'; 'tim@uow.edu.au'; 'ghw@uow.edu.au'; 'Brian Martin'; 'awhelan@uow.edu.au'; 'herring@uow.edu.au'; 'Jennifer Courtney'; 'Nicholas McLaren'; 'Laurence.Emily@abc.net.au'; 'Anna Salleh'; 'Mark Maley'; 'walker.ian@abc.net.au'; 'Melinda James'; 'wamornings@your.abc.net.au'; 'hutchison.geoff@abc.net.au'; 'belinda_muir@uow.edu.au'; 'rwarner@uow.edu.au'

Subject: RE: Some questions for an article in The Australian

Importance: High

The Australian Newspaper
Journalist - Kylar Loussikian

Kylar,

Thankyou for these questions. To date you have written many disparaging articles on my research, *without my input*, and by misrepresenting the arguments being presented. Your main focus has been to disparage the academic process. Please read this information carefully so you can present my research truthfully and fairly to the Australian public. As you can see I have copied these comments to the Australian Human Rights Commissioner, the University of Wollongong (UOW), other journalists and the concerned community who would like to know why our questions are being ignored and why journalists are not presenting these arguments and medical literature for debate.

The public is entitled to debate public health policies *before* they are introduced, yet the Australian Government has implemented a Social Services policy that removes 'informed consent *without coercion*' and 'religious, personal and philosophical exemptions' to a medical procedure for healthy people, without any public debate. Our government health, social services and public health authorities, including the directors of the NCIRS, Peter McIntyre and Robert Booy, all declined to debate the medical literature when they were invited to a public forum at the university (UTS) on 15 October 2015. Here is the presentation I gave at this forum.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=srTsNXUjRFM&feature=youtu.be>

Kylar - have you and other journalists reported on this lack of willingness of the Australian government to debate this important public health policy? A true scholar demonstrates a willingness to entertain other people's viewpoints and engage in public debate yet the Australian government has implemented a policy that removes human rights ***without being willing to justify this measure to the public.***

Australian doctors can be de-registered for not providing 'informed consent without coercion' to patients with respect to any medical procedure. However, this new Social Services policy ***does not allow doctors to provide 'informed consent without coercion' on vaccination***, and this policy is for ***healthy people***. Kylar - have you and other journalists reported this information to the Australian public and questioned why, at a time when infectious diseases are ***not a threat in Australia*** (and when over 95% of the population is using vaccines) this ***mandatory*** policy is even necessary?

You have asked me 4 questions and here are my answers:

- 1) My website and newsletter provide my researched information on the medical literature on vaccines. I am providing the medical literature that will assist the public to make an informed decision about using vaccines. I do not provide advice to people about whether they should or should not use vaccines. The debate is not about pro- or anti- vaccination: it is about ensuring that the public is accurately informed about the medical literature that exists or *does not exist*. Promoting the medical research that demonstrates the risks of

vaccines does not make me an 'anti-vaccination' campaigner. I am an independent researcher promoting the results of my research, **not my views on vaccination**.

The government and doctors have been negligent by not presenting this medical literature so that the public can give their 'informed consent' to using vaccines. The public is entitled to know that the directors of the NCIRS (2004-2016), Peter McIntyre and Robert Booy, **have never done the long-term health studies, in animals or infants, of the combined schedule of vaccines**, that they are now mandating in a government policy. This study is critical to the health of the population and doctors can be de-registered for not informing the public that this study **has never been done**. Here is Peter McIntyre admitting this fact <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oSQoDrlqWoU> I presented this information at the Australian Health Promotion conference in Perth 2009 whilst teaching at Murdoch University – the poster is attached.

- 2) The University of Wollongong is promoting the **personal opinions/views** of Alison Jones and 60 colleagues about *government immunisation policy* on the UOW website. These personal opinions were formed based on the government's claims *and without any assessment of the medical literature that I presented in my PhD thesis*. I would like to know why a university is promoting personal opinions on government immunisation policies, particularly as the University's policy states that "UOW does not promote or support student's/academics views on vaccination. Why is this policy not being consistently applied? Particularly, as I am presenting my researched information on vaccination – **not my views on vaccination**. Alison Jones, dean of the UOW faculty of medicine, has also contributed to an article that attempts to suppress the academic literature in my PhD (Durrheim and Jones 2016). Whilst Alison Jones is entitled to debate the arguments she is not entitled to suppress the literature *with disparaging comments and opinions that are not supported with evidence*. Please read this article to see how Alison Jones is attempting to suppress the assessment of the medical literature I have presented *without addressing any of the arguments* in the thesis – this is a political strategy. <https://social-epistemology.com/2016/07/18/public-health-and-the-necessary-limits-of-advocacy-kevin-dew/#comments>
- 3) My research has been carried out in the Faculty of Health (Master of Science (Population Health) 2007) and I requested in 2007 that I continue in this faculty with a PhD. The University would not provide supervisors in this faculty stating this topic was too political. It was recommended that the research should be performed in the area of Science and Technology Studies (STS). This is an area of Social Science's that assesses scientific technologies/procedures in the cultural and political context. The UOW was correct to transfer this research to the humanities because it encompasses the medical, political and ethical context of government vaccination policies. My research **is not my opinion/views** it is my researched arguments for the position I have adopted on this medical procedure. That is why it was completed at a university.
- 4) I applied for funding from Wollongong University and also at Murdoch University when I transferred to teach and research at Murdoch in 2008. Neither university would provide funding for this independent research that the public needs to make an informed decision on vaccination. The NCIRS, medical societies and the UOW dean of the faculty of science, medicine and health (Alison Jones), and others, **have not criticised the arguments I have presented** by debating the evidence. They have disparaged the PhD with false and misleading information from lobby groups (eg. Dr. John Cunningham (SAVN), Matthew Berryman (Australian Skeptics groups) and John Dwyer (Friends of Science in Medicine) and with your assistance (and other journalists) who have mislead the public about the examination process for my PhD. This amounts to a smear campaign – a political strategy – not a valid criticism of the research.

The risks of vaccines that are well documented in the medical literature are being labelled by powerful lobby groups, such as the Friends of Science, SAVN and the Australian Skeptics as ‘anti-vaccination literature’ and this is the medical literature (described in my PhD thesis) that is not being presented to doctors or the public. These powerful lobby groups have influence in the Australian media and the Australian Communication and Media Authority (ACMA) is claiming that it is ‘false balance’ to present the medical literature on the risks of vaccines. This is a fallacious argument and a political strategy to suppress this medical literature. **All the medical literature** needs to be assessed in a scientific debate by **all the stakeholders** and a consensus must be formed by the community of scientists – not just industry. Good science needs to stand up to scrutiny and only when the community agrees that there is a consensus on the science can an argument of ‘false balance’ be employed. Until then it is a political strategy to suppress the scientific literature to promote a desired outcome.

I trust that you will read this information carefully to ensure that the Australian public is accurately informed about why some Australians have lost their right to choose what they put into their own bodies and why human rights have been breached without any justification to the public.

Here are some references that you need to write your article:

Correcting the false and misleading information provided by Dr. John Cunningham, a leader of the SAVN lobby group <http://vaccinationdecisions.net/correcting-the-information-provided-by-john-cunningham-in-the-vaccination-debate/>

The Motor and Sensory clinical damage from HPV Vaccines (cervical cancer vaccine) – the situation in Colombia where the vaccine is being described as a “crime against humanity” and yet there is no debate about the serious side-effects of this vaccine in the Australian media.

<https://pompiliomartinez.wordpress.com/2016/03/04/motor-and-sensory-clinical-findings-in-girls-vaccinated-against-the-human-papillomavirus-from-carmen-de-bolivar-colombia/>

I would be very happy to debate these issues with Alison Jones and any other academics or medical practitioners, **after** they have read the arguments I am presenting and when they are willing to engage in a scientific debate.

Yours Sincerely,

Judy Wilyman PhD

Science and Politics of Australia’s Vaccination Policies (<http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/4541/>)
www.vaccinationdecisions.net