Elizabeth, 

Sorry for the lack of response. It's very busy for those of us who have infectious disease expertise and who are institutional leaders. I also wasn't quite sure what to say.

My feeling at the moment is this. In both the UK and the US, COVID is causing carnage. Thousands are dying each day. We should be doing everything we can to mitigate that. I can't see any ethical reason to withhold vaccines and let people die based on possible evolutionary trajectories the virus might take (with unknown probabilities). We absolutely need to study the virus evolution going forward, and as soon as we can, address any evolution that's been triggered, especially since there are many options going forward. But right now, the top priority has to be to stop the carnage. As we can see in the UK and the US nothing else has worked. Hopefully the vaccines will.

Andrew
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,

please see below my email to Professor Andrew Read, referring to his 'leaky vaccines' paper published in 2015, and asking: If Covid-19 vaccines don't prevent transmission, can they facilitate the evolution of more virulent variants?

As noted in my email to Professor Read, I raised this matter in a rapid response submitted on a BMJ article, but my rapid response was not published. (BMJ article: Covid-19: What new variants are emerging and how are they being investigated? 18 January 2021.)

It's very disappointing The BMJ did not publish my rapid response, and that Professor Read has not responded to my email, as the questions raised are very important to consider in regards to the current rushed rollout of experimental coronavirus vaccine products around the world.

This is yet another example of the medical/scientific establishment refusing to acknowledge and respond to concerns of the public. People asking questions about vaccine products are often tagged as 'anti-vaxxers', and marginalised and even censored, a situation fostered by the Royal Society and British Academy's recent COVID-19 vaccine deployment report, which infers such people are spreading 'misinformation' and should be subjected to criminal prosecution. It's appalling the scientific establishment threatens people who question the status quo with criminal sanction, this is the very antithesis of open-minded scientific inquiry. (COVID-19 vaccine deployment: Behaviour, ethics, misinformation and policy strategies. The Royal Society and The British Academy, 21 October 2021.)

Sir Adrian, Dr Ramakrishnan and Sir David, the current panicked and ill-considered coronavirus vaccine rollout is an unprecedented global event, with the intention of vaccinating the entire global population of 7.8 billion people with these fast-tracked experimental vaccine products, potentially on an annual or even more frequent basis, apparently at the behest of software billionaire Bill Gates, who suggests COVID-19 vaccines "will become part of the routine newborn immunization schedule". (GatesNotes: What you need to know about the COVID-19 vaccine, 30 April 2020.)

The Royal Society and British Academy are eminent academic organisations, albeit with undisclosed conflicts of interest... I bring my questions to Professor Read to your attention, as they are of significant public interest, and request your consideration of this important matter. It's also notable that Professor Read is a Fellow of the Royal Society, and surely he has a duty to acknowledge and respond to this important scientific issue?

Please see below my email to Professor Read. I'm also circulating this email to other parties for information.

I would appreciate your response.

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

--------- Forwarded message ---------

From: Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jan 27, 2021 at 11:32 PM
Subject: If Covid-19 vaccines don't prevent transmission, can they facilitate the evolution of more virulent variants?
To: <a.read@psu.edu>

Dear Professor Read, I recently submitted a rapid response on an article on The BMJ referring to your paper Imperfect vaccination can enhance the transmission of highly virulent pathogens, published in 2015.

My rapid response is in relation to the current coronavirus situation and asks the question "If Covid-19 vaccines don't prevent transmission, can they facilitate the evolution of more virulent variants?"

Please see below my submitted rapid response, which has not been published, I would appreciate your thoughts on this matter:

Questions are being raised about the new coronavirus variants[1,2,3,4], and their emergence in the UK, South Africa and Brazil, where AstraZeneca vaccine trials are under way.

Could this be related to the possibility that the vaccines may not prevent transmission, and facilitate the evolution of new variants?

For example, Deputy Chief Medical Officer Jonathan Van-Tam says "...we do not yet know the impact of the vaccine on transmission of the virus. So even after you have had both doses of the vaccine you may still give Covid-19 to someone else and the chains of transmission will then continue".[5]

With the possibility the experimental coronavirus vaccines might not prevent transmission of the virus, is it possible these could be 'leaky vaccines', i.e. "anti-disease vaccines that do not prevent transmission" which "can create conditions that promote the emergence of pathogen strains that cause more severe disease in unvaccinated hosts"? This is described in Andrew F. Read et al's study re Marek's disease in poultry, i.e. Imperfect vaccination can enhance the transmission of highly virulent pathogens, published in 2015.[6]

While Read et al note most human vaccines are sterilizing (transmission-blocking) - (e.g. the measles vaccine), Read is "concerned about the next generation of vaccines that are being developed against diseases like HIV and malaria. People don't naturally develop life-long immunity to these conditions after being infected, as they would against, say, mumps or measles. This makes vaccine development a tricky business, and it means that the resulting vaccines will probably leak to some extent." Read says "This isn't an argument against developing those vaccines, but it is an argument for ensuring that we carefully check for transmission."[7]
What does this mean for the experimental coronavirus vaccines that are now being rolled out into the community? Is anyone thinking about the potential problems that might arise if these vaccines do indeed fail to prevent transmission, and what this might mean for the unvaccinated, i.e. if these could be "anti-disease vaccines that do not prevent transmission" which "can create conditions that promote the emergence of pathogen strains that cause more severe disease in unvaccinated hosts"?

References:

5. The vaccine has given us hope, but we still need to follow the rules. The Telegraph, 23 January 2021.

Professor Read, I would appreciate your thoughts on this matter.

In my opinion, there should not have been a vaccination response to this virus. It seems the elderly with comorbidities, and other vulnerable groups, are at risk of this virus, but the majority of the population are not. I think the lockdowns and restrictions and masks are the wrong approach, with devastating consequences for society and the economy. There should have been a targeted approach to the at-risk groups, seeking effective treatments, and promising preventative such as vitamin D. To embark on a mission to vaccinate the entire world population, potentially every year or even more frequently, seems like madness to me.

We are now facing the unprecedented situation of planning to vaccinate the entire global population, with who knows what consequences, is anyone thinking this through?

They plan to vaccinate everyone, including children. How can this possibly be ethical as children are generally not at risk with this disease, and to impose annual coronavirus vaccination upon them is to in effect steal their own natural response to the virus. And to impose a lifetime of coronavirus vaccination upon them, with who knows what consequences.

It seems to me this whole matter has been very ill considered, not considered at all in fact. And the 'case' and death statistics are highly suspicious. Also the way in which 'case' and death counts are recited endlessly, but seldom considered in the context of a country's population and annual mortality.

I wonder how this matter can be addressed, now that it is a juggernaut out of control? And people who raise concerns are tagged as 'anti-vaxxers'. This must be rejected, this is an extremely serious situation which may have huge consequences for the human species, this audacious goal to vaccinate the entire global population with these fast-tracked experimental coronavirus vaccine products.

I hope you will respond.
Kind regards

Elizabeth Hart

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