



Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>

The vast conflicted network influencing coronavirus vaccination policy

1 message

Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Sun, Dec 20, 2020 at 11:01 PM

To: president@royalsociety.org, "V. Ramakrishnan" <ramak@mrc-lmb.cam.ac.uk>, dcannadi@princeton.edu

Cc: press@royalsociety.org, press@thebritishacademy.ac.uk

For the attention of:

Sir Adrian Smith, President of the Royal Society

Dr Venki Ramakrishnan, previous President of the Royal Society 2015-2020

Sir David Cannadine, President of the British Academy

Dear Sir Adrian, Dr Ramakrishnan and Sir David

The AstraZeneca/Oxford vaccine is being rushed through for authorisation by the UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA).

According to a report in the UK Telegraph today, Health Secretary Matt Hancock is using the excuse of the 'new variant coronavirus' to suggest keeping Tier 4 restrictions in place until coronavirus vaccination is rolled out. In other words, it seems people are going to be restricted until they accept the vaccine. Will restrictions ever be lifted?

It's appalling that coronavirus vaccine products are being fast-tracked and pressed upon mass populations without due ethical consideration of potentially deleterious consequences.

Public discussion of coronavirus vaccination has been deliberately hindered by the Royal Society and British Academy via the **COVID-19 vaccine deployment: Behaviour, ethics, misinformation and policy strategies report**, which calls for oppressive action against people questioning COVID-19 vaccination policy. Dr Ramakrishnan responded to me that he was "completely happy with the report", but I suggest the report is a shameful example of a self-serving and conflicted scientific establishment seeking to stifle debate.

I presume AstraZeneca must be well-pleased with their funding of the Royal Society, and the Royal Society's actions in helping to suppress open and unhindered critical analysis of coronavirus vaccination policy.

Despite the oppressive atmosphere being created by the Royal Society and the British Academy and others, concerned people such as myself are continuing to strive for transparency and accountability for the disproportionate and ill-targeted response to SARS-CoV-2. In this regard, please see below my recent rapid response published on The BMJ, accessible via this link: <https://www.bmj.com/content/371/bmj.m4847/rr-16>

Liberal democracies being turned upside down to 'protect health services'

Dear Editor

Healthy people are being compelled to wear masks, to be tested with questionable PCR testing, and to be quarantined on the basis of questionable 'positive' tests. In South Australia and elsewhere, people are expected to have their every move tracked by QR codes in case of 'outbreaks'. People of all ages are now potentially at risk of mandatory coronavirus vaccination, possibly every year or even more often, with fast-tracked coronavirus vaccine products, for a virus which isn't a threat to most people, certainly not to those under 70 years.[1]

And all this is supposedly to protect health services, such as the NHS in the UK, which apparently are not fit for purpose, and not equipped to respond to need, e.g. respiratory illnesses which emerge every year, particularly in the elderly. If all the money and resources that are currently being spent on questionable testing[2] and the more than 200 coronavirus vaccine candidates[3], were instead spent on finding effective treatments and preventatives for the vulnerable, how much better off might we be?

To put things in perspective, consider that over the past eleven months, globally 1.64 million deaths have been attributed to COVID-19.[4] These 1.64 million deaths must be seen in context with the 56 million deaths expected in the world annually.[5]

There has been a disproportionate and ill-targeted response to SARS-CoV-2, a response which has created dramatic upheaval throughout the world. Deaths and 'case' numbers attributed to COVID-19 have been used to impose serious restrictions on people's right to free movement and association, resulting in massive damage to the economy and social interaction. There must be independent and objective critical analysis of the global statistics being used to impose draconian restrictions.

Our 'liberal democracies' are being turned upside down by the current response to SARS-CoV-2, with civil liberties being trashed, and police forces being unleashed on those who dare to protest publicly. This is the most shocking political experience of my lifetime, at the hands of 'our own governments'.

Academics from various disciplines, e.g. via advisory groups such as SAGE, have influenced politicians, who appear to have yielded completely to these people, and imposed onerous on-going restrictions on the community. But who are these academics? I asked this question in my BMJ rapid response: **Who are the members of SAGE? There must be transparency and accountability for coronavirus policy**.[6]

At last The BMJ is eliciting some information, for instance we're finding out about conflicts of interest of SAGE members which were previously not disclosed.[7] There is much to consider here, not just about SAGE, but also about other groups, there's a vast network which is influencing coronavirus policy.

This is an extremely serious political situation - the quest must continue for transparency and accountability for the disproportionate and ill-targeted SARS-CoV-2 response.

References:

1. See deaths by registered age group. Deaths registered weekly in England and Wales, provisional: week ending 4 December 2020. Office for National Statistics: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deathsregisteredweeklyinenglandandwalesprovisional/latest>
2. Elizabeth Hart BMJ rapid response: Coronavirus mass testing - a gross waste of money and resources: <https://www.bmj.com/content/371/bmj.m4460/rr-2>
3. Peter McIntyre et al. COVID-19 vaccines - are we there yet? Australian Prescriber, 17 December 2020: <https://www.nps.org.au/australian-prescriber/articles/covid-19-vaccines-are-we-there-yet>
4. Number of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) deaths worldwide as of December 16, 2020, by country. Statista: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1093256/novel-coronavirus-2019ncov-deaths-worldwide-by-country/>
5. Worldometers: <https://www.worldometers.info/> accessed 18 December 2020.
6. Elizabeth Hart BMJ rapid response: Who are the members of SAGE? There must be transparency and accountability for coronavirus policy: <https://www.bmj.com/content/371/bmj.m4235/rr-1>
7. See: Rebecca Coombes. Covid-19: SAGE members' interests published by government 10 months into pandemic: <https://www.bmj.com/content/371/bmj.m4911> and Paul D Thacker. Conflicts of interest among the UK government's covid-19 advisers: <https://www.bmj.com/content/371/bmj.m4716>

Sir Adrian, Dr Ramakrishnan and Sir David, in my BMJ rapid response I refer to conflicts of interest, and the vast network which is influencing coronavirus policy. The Royal Society and British Academy are part of this network, and it must be investigated.

I still await your response to **my previous email about the failure to disclose conflicts of interest** on the Royal Society's and British Academy's COVID-19 vaccine deployment: Behaviour, ethics, misinformation and policy strategies report.

Sincerely

Elizabeth Hart

Independent person investigating the over-use of vaccine products and conflicts of interest in vaccination policy