
Re: Health practitioners, Covid jabs and 'valid informed consent' - a medical ethics disaster. Response to Gus Dagleish

Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>
To: Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Fri, Jan 13, 2023 at 9:00 AM

From: **Elizabeth Hart** <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, Jan 12, 2023 at 10:48 PM

Subject: Re: Health practitioners, Covid jabs and 'valid informed consent' - a medical ethics disaster. Response to Gus Dagleish

To: Gus Dagleish

Cc: Kamran Abbasi, Peter Doherty, Peter Openshaw, Arne Akbar, Ramesh Thakur, Andrew Pollard, John Ioannidis, Jodie McVernon, Neil Ferguson, Patrick Vallance, Chris Whitty, Sharon Davies, Peter Doshi, Theodora Bloom, Allyson Pollock, Simon Wain-Hobson, Richard Ebricht, Marc Lipsitch, Michael Osterholm, Tom Inglesby, Carl Heneghan, Michael Levitt, Jayanta Bhattacharya, Karol Sikora, Johan Giesecke, Ian Frazer, Peter Collignon, Roy Anderson, Adrian Smith, , David Cannadine, V. Ramakrishnan, Chris Conlon, Robert Clancy, Sunetra Gupta, Heidi Larson, Graham Medley, Melinda Mills, John Bell, David Kennedy, Peter A. McCullough, Nick Hudson, Emma McArthur, Anthony Harnden, Adam Finn, Adrian Hill, Sarah Gilbert, Chennupati Jagadish, Geert Vanden Bossche, Robert Malone, Jonathan Engler, Andrew Read, Bret Weinstein, Tess Lawrie, Fiona Godlee, David Oliver, Jonathan Ball, Eleanor Riley, Christopher Goodnow, Media Royal College of Physicians, John Shine, Brendan Crabb, Sharon Lewin, Kathryn North, John Edmunds, Norman Fenton, Robert Dingwall, Ultan Power, Martin Kulldorff, Nikolai Petrovsky

Gus, I was astonished to discover that in July 2021 you cooperated with a *Daily Mail* article **that shamed, coerced and pressured young people into submitting to Covid-19 'vaccination', thereby risking (and discounting) their natural immune response.** The article was introduced as **"an attempt to persuade the under-30s why they MUST have the jab"** in which "one of our foremost vaccine experts PROFESSOR ANGUS DALGLEISH gives his forensic analysis - and trenchant rebuttal - of some of the most common objections of young refuseniks". (Copy of article attached.)

What on earth possessed you to participate in such an aggressive and unnecessary promotion of these medical products to young people when they weren't at serious risk of Covid-19? Is this your area of expertise? Was this your own idea, or were you prompted by another party to engage in this blatant product promotion?

Are you proud now that you may have induced countless young people to submit to the jabs, based on what can arguably be described as 'misinformation'? For example, with you describing the Covid jabs as "a set of vaccines that have proved highly effective against a brand new virus...It's the most ambitious, daring, brilliant human accomplishment in decades. Why wouldn't every single person, whatever their age, want to be a part of that?" **Do you still stand by this statement Gus?**

In the *Daily Mail* article you dismissed concerns (seemingly without evidence) about a number of serious issues, e.g.

- people having the jabs after having Covid;
- the quality of the fast-tracked trials;
- the potential risks associated with the jabs, including to fertility and the immune system; and
- very well-founded concerns that 'Big Pharma can't be trusted'.

Gus, your dismissal of potential risks is bewildering given your email to Kamran Abbasi dated 22 November 2022, sent in response to my email to Kamran Abbasi on the subject of Covid jabs and health practitioners' obligation to obtain 'voluntary informed consent', in which you said:

I write in total support of Elizabeth Hart.

COVID no longer needs a vaccine programme given the average age of death of COVID in the UK is 82 and from all other causes 81 and falling.

The link with clots , myocarditis, heart attacks and strokes is now well accepted as is the link with myelitis and neuropathy.

(We predicted these side effects in our QRBD article Sorensen et al, 2020, as the blast analysis revealed 79% homologies to human epitopes, especially PF4 and myelin). (My emphasis.)

You say you predicted side effects in your QRBD article in 2020, **so why did you press the experimental and unnecessary jabs upon young people in July 2021?**

In addition, you raised anecdotal evidence of cancer patients suffering after Covid boosters, with this being reported in articles on *The Daily Sceptic* on 26 November 2022, and 6 January 2023, and *TCW* on 28 November 2022, and 19 December 2022.

Your observation about cancer patients and boosters is most concerning, **but this must not be allowed to obscure the bigger travesty of the grossly disproportionate and ill-targeted Covid-19 response**, i.e. that billions of people have been pressured, coerced and manipulated to have repeated and unnecessary medical interventions, i.e. Covid-19 'vaccines'. In Australia, millions of people have been **mandated** to have Covid jabs in order to work, study, travel and participate in civil society - **the legal and ethical obligation to obtain voluntary informed consent has been trashed, here and in other supposedly liberal democracies.**

Is there any evidence to suggest that Covid-19 needed a vaccine program in the first place? Why was a 'vaccine solution' enacted against Covid-19 given it was known from the beginning most people weren't at serious risk of disease?

Covid appears to be a manufactured catastrophe, which has been used as a means to exploit billions of people around the globe, destroying personal autonomy and bodily integrity - achieved with the aid of health practitioners' abject failure to fulfil their legal and ethical obligation to obtain valid informed consent before ANY medical intervention.

Gus, the medical and scientific establishment is an ethical desert - how could health practitioners capitulate to government tyranny against their codes of ethics? **Why did they not stand up and reject the destruction of the cornerstone of ethical medical practice, i.e. informed consent?**

Where do we look for leadership to address this crisis in medicine and science, when the likes of Kamran Abbasi, editor in chief of the doctors' journal, *The BMJ*, maintains silence on this issue? To whom do we turn when presidents of doctors' professional organisations such as the British Medical Association, the Royal College of Physicians, the Royal Australasian College of Physicians, the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, the Australian Medical Association, etc, fail to deal with this fundamental matter?

I'd appreciate your open response Gus, because the lid really does need to be blown off this massive international scandal.

Sincerely

Elizabeth Hart

Independent researcher investigating vaccine products and conflicts of interest in vaccination policy

vaccinationispolitical.net

On Tue, Nov 22, 2022 at 9:29 PM Gus Dalglish <dalgles@sgul.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear Kamran Abbasi,

I write in total support of Elizabeth Hart.

COVID no longer needs a vaccine programme given the average age of death of COVID in the UK is 82 and from all other causes 81 and falling.

The link with clots, myocarditis, heart attacks and strokes is now well accepted as is the link with myelitis and neuropathy.

(We predicted these side effects in our QRBD article Sorensen et al, 2020, as the blast analysis revealed 79% homologies to human epitopes, especially PF4 and myelin)

However, there is now another reason to halt all vaccine programmes.

As a practicing Oncologist I am seeing people with stable disease rapidly progress after being forced to have a booster, usually so they can travel.

Even my own family and colleagues are developing B cell based disease after the boosters, they describe being distinctly unwell a few days to weeks after the booster

With my brother in law developing leukaemia, my pharmacist NHL, a former PhD student NHL, and now an old school friend who has felt like he has had

Long COVID since receiving his booster who after getting severe bone pain has been diagnosed as having multiple mets from myeloma.

I am experienced enough to know that these are not the coincidental anecdotes that many suggest, especially as the same pattern is

Being seen in Germany, Australia and the USA.

The reports of innate immune suppression after mRNA for several weeks would fit as all these patients to date have melanoma or B cell based cancers

Which are very susceptible to immune control and that is before the reports of suppressor gene suppression by mRNA reports.

This must be aired and debated immediately.

Angus Dalglish MD FRACP FRCP FRCPath FMedSci

From: Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Date: Monday, 21 November 2022 at 11:28

To: Kamran Abbasi

Cc: Peter Doherty, Peter Openshaw, Arne Akbar, Ramesh Thakur, Andrew Pollard, Gus Dalglish, John Ioannidis, Jodie McVernon, Neil Ferguson, Patrick Vallance, Chris Whitty, Sharon Davies, Peter Doshi, Theodora Bloom, Allyson Pollock, Simon Wain-Hobson, Richard Ebright, Marc Lipsitch, Michael Osterholm, Tom Inglesby, Carl Heneghan, Michael Levitt, Jayanta Bhattacharya, Karol Sikora, Johan Giesecke, Ian Frazer, Peter Collignon, Roy Anderson, Adrian Smith, David Cannadine, V. Ramakrishnan, Chris Conlon, Robert Clancy, Sunetra Gupta, Heidi Larson, Graham Medley, Melinda Mills, John Bell, David Kenney, Peter A. McCullough, Nick Hudson, Emma McArthur, Anthony Harnden, Adam Finn, Adrian Hill, Sarah Gilbert, Chennupati Jagadish, Geert Vanden Bossche, Robert Malone, Jonathan Engler, Andrew Read, Bret Weinstein, Tess Lawrie, Fiona Godlee, David Oliver, Jonathan Ball, Eleanor Riley, Christopher Goodnow, Media Royal College of Physicians, John Shine, Brendan Crabb, Sharon Lewin, Kathryn North, John Edmunds, Norman Fenton, Robert Dingwall, Ultan Power, Martin Kulldorff

Subject: Health practitioners, Covid jabs and 'valid informed consent' - a medical ethics disaster

For the attention of:

Kamran Abbasi

Editor in chief of *The BMJ*

Copied to:

People influential on international public health/vaccination policy via the scientific and medical establishment, and other parties

Kamran Abbasi, I've raised with you previously the subject of **mandated Covid jabs and health practitioners' obligation to obtain 'voluntary informed consent'**, 19 October 2022.

***The BMJ* claims to be evidence-based and patient-centred and customer-focused - surely ensuring 'valid informed consent' before medical interventions, such as Covid jabs, should be foremost in your values?**

Sadly, 'valid informed consent' appears to have been sacrificed during the grossly disproportionate and ill-targeted Covid debacle. This scandal is now unfolding in Australia.

FYI, please see below **my response to Australian federal health minister Mark Butler, on the subject of health practitioners' medical indemnity insurance for Covid-19 jab administration, and health practitioners' obligation to obtain 'informed consent'**.

This information has major implications for health practitioners administering Covid-19 jabs in Australia - **they need to know they're not covered by a specific government Covid-19 medical indemnity scheme, and that they're obligated to obtain informed consent before every Covid-19 jab.**

But I strongly suspect many health practitioners have failed to obtain 'valid informed consent' before the Covid jabs. How have things gone so terribly wrong?

This is a very serious situation Kamran Abbasi, at the heart of medical ethics. **This should be a priority topic on *The BMJ*.**

Sincerely

Elizabeth Hart

Independent researcher investigating vaccine products and conflicts of interest in vaccination policy

vaccinationispolitical.net

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

From: Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Nov 21, 2022 at 2:58 PM

Subject: Response re: Are health practitioners covered for indemnity insurance re the Covid jabs?

To: <minister.butler@health.gov.au>

Cc: Rennick Gerard (Senator) <senator.rennick@aph.gov.au>, Antic, Alex (Senator) <senator.antic@aph.gov.au>, Malcolm Roberts <senator.roberts@aph.gov.au>, Emma McArthur <ejminoz@gmail.com>, Medical Indemnity <Medical.Indemnity@health.gov.au>

For the attention of:

Mark Butler

Minister for Health and Aged Care

Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care

Mark Butler, **it appears that health practitioners have been misled by the former Morrison Government into believing they are covered by a specific government medical indemnity scheme for administering Covid-19 jabs, as it has now been confirmed by your department that health practitioners are not covered by a specific Covid-19 government medical indemnity scheme.**

In his response to my previous emails to you (see below), Nigel Murray, Assistant Secretary, MBS Policy and Specialist Services Branch says: (Letter dated 17 November 2022, my highlighting.)

I can advise that rather than putting in place a medical indemnity scheme for health professionals, the former Government established the no-fault Scheme, which commenced operations on 13 December 2021.

and

While a medical indemnity scheme for health professionals administering the COVID-19 vaccine was not established per se, the creation of the no-fault Scheme was intended to support increased participation by health professionals in the COVID-19 Vaccination roll-out.

But the promise of "a medical indemnity scheme for health professionals administering the COVID-19 vaccine" probably *did intend* "to support increased participation by health professionals in the COVID-19 Vaccination roll-out".

In July 2021, the Morrison Government stated it was establishing a "fit-for-purpose COVID-19 vaccine medical indemnity scheme" to "support increased vaccination uptake by assuring Australians that health professionals, including GPs, nurses and pharmacists administering COVID vaccines as part of the Commonwealth vaccination program have appropriate indemnity coverage", with a further announcement in August 2021 stating "The Morrison Government has finalised the details of the no fault COVID-19 Vaccine Claim Scheme following extensive consultation with the peak medical, healthcare, business and insurance sectors to ensure a comprehensive National Scheme", noting "It also ensure [sic] that health professionals administering vaccines will be able to continue with their crucial role in the vaccine roll out with assurance that the claims scheme will offer them protection". (See media releases attached.)

But it now turns out health professionals are not personally protected by a specific Covid-19 medical indemnity scheme.

The letter from Nigel Murray also confirms: "Informed consent should be obtained for every COVID-19 vaccination, as per usual consent procedures for other vaccinations."

Mark Butler, it appears health practitioners *don't* have specific government medical indemnity re the Covid jab rollout, although *they might think they do*. They will have to look to their own medical indemnity insurance to protect them. And they should be obtaining informed consent for every Covid-19 jab...but is this actually happening?

What is the quality of information being provided to people, including parents of children, to enable them to properly evaluate the threat of SARS-CoV-2/Covid-19, and the risks and benefits of the multiple Covid jabs, in their own specific circumstances? Why are people of most ages and health status being called upon to have the Covid-19 jabs? Who is actually at serious risk with SARS-CoV-2/Covid-19? Does having repeated Covid jabs compromise the immune system and make people more vulnerable?

Nigel Murray includes reference to the **COVID-19 vaccination - Patient resources** webpage in his letter (see attached), but this webpage only includes information re Covid jabs for children, not for adults. Nigel Murray's letter also includes a link to a **Consent form for COVID-19 vaccination** (see attached).

How does this information re Covid jabs referred to by Nigel Murray stack up in the 'valid informed consent' stakes? I would say not very well at all...

This is an extremely serious situation Mark Butler - it's highly likely 'valid informed consent' has not been properly obtained by many health practitioners before administering Covid-19 jabs.

***The health practitioners inserting the needle* must be warned they're not protected by a specific government Covid medical indemnity scheme after all...and they need to consider the quality of the information they're providing to people to gain their 'valid informed consent' to the jabs. They must also consider the impact of jab mandates - which pressure, coerce and manipulate people to submit to Covid jabs, in contravention of *The Australian Immunisation Handbook*, i.e. jab mandates inhibit a 'voluntary' decision.**

Mark Butler, please advise what steps you are taking to address this matter.

This email is being circulated to other parties, including the response from your department.

Sincerely

Elizabeth Hart

Independent researcher investigating vaccine products and conflicts of interest in vaccination policy

vaccinationispolitical.net

On Wed, Nov 9, 2022 at 11:26 AM Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com> wrote:

For the attention of:

Mark Butler

Minister for Health and Aged Care

Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care

Mark Butler, are health practitioners covered by indemnity insurance if they fail to obtain valid informed consent before administering Covid jabs?

I have raised this matter previously with you in my emails dated **4 October 2022** and **7 October 2022**, copies attached.

Emma McArthur has also previously sought clarification on this matter in her email dated **11 November 2021** to Greg Hunt, then Minister for Health and Aged Care, in which she asked:

Please could you advise to what extent the Commonwealth Covid-19 vaccine claims scheme provides insurance and indemnity for the civil and criminal liability that would arise where battery and clinical negligence occur due to a failure to obtain valid informed consent?

Please could you also provide the terms and conditions for this scheme.

Emma McArthur received **a response to her queries** from Louise Morgan, Acting Assistant Secretary, COVID-19 Vaccine Claims Scheme Taskforce, Medical Benefits Division, dated 21 December 2021.

The response from Louise Morgan notes the COVID-19 Vaccine Claims Scheme opened to potential claimants on 13 December 2021, and **"has been established as a fit-for-purpose, time-limited claims scheme to respond to the unprecedented circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic"**.

Louise Morgan also notes:

The Scheme does not provide an indemnity for practitioners or insurers, it does however provide patients who have suffered one of the eligible clinical conditions or an administration injury as a direct result of a COVID-19 vaccine, with faster access to compensation rather than a costly and complex court process.

I can advise that informed consent should be obtained for every COVID-19 vaccination, as per usual consent procedures for other vaccinations.

(My emphasis.)

Mark Butler, according to Louise Morgan, **it appears there is no indemnity for practitioners or insurers...and that informed consent should be obtained for every COVID-19 vaccination, as per usual consent procedures for other vaccinations.** In her response, Louise Morgan also referred to the Australian Immunisation Handbook, "which has information about 'valid consent', including criteria for consent to be legally valid..."

This is a very interesting response from Louise Morgan, because in July 2021, Greg Hunt announced that the Morrison Government was establishing a **"fit-for-purpose COVID-19 vaccine medical indemnity scheme"** to **"support increased vaccination uptake by assuring Australians that health professionals, including GPs, nurses and pharmacists administering COVID vaccines as part of the Commonwealth vaccination program have appropriate indemnity coverage"**. (Media release: **COVID-19 indemnity scheme to protect health professionals and patients**, see copy attached.)

The media release notes **"The scheme will support claims made against privately practising health professionals who administer a COVID-19 vaccine approved for use by the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA)"**.

A further media release published on 28 August 2021 states: **"The Morrison Government has finalised the details of the no fault COVID-19 Vaccine Claim Scheme following extensive consultation with the peak medical, healthcare, business and insurance sectors to ensure a comprehensive National Scheme"**.

The media release notes **"It also ensure [sic] that health professionals administering vaccines will be able to continue with their crucial role in the vaccine roll out with assurance that the claims scheme will offer them protection."** (See: **No Fault COVID-19 Indemnity Scheme**, copy attached.)

To summarise, in July 2021, **Greg Hunt announced health professionals, including GPs, nurses and pharmacists administering COVID vaccines as part of the Commonwealth vaccination program would have appropriate indemnity coverage**, and the media release published in August 2021 appears to confirm this.

But the letter to Emma McArthur from Louise Morgan dated 21 December 2021 clearly states there is **no indemnity for practitioners or insurers...and that informed consent should be obtained for every COVID-19 vaccination, as per usual consent procedures for other vaccinations.**

So far, I haven't found a media release refuting the announcements of indemnity protection for health practitioners.

Again Mark Butler, I ask you to clarify this matter - **are health practitioners such as GPs, nurses and pharmacists covered by indemnity insurance if they fail to obtain informed consent before the Covid jabs?**

I request your early response.

Sincerely

Elizabeth Hart

Independent researcher investigating vaccine products and conflicts of interest in vaccination policy

vaccinationispolitical.net



What young people MUST be told_ Vaccine expert ANGUS DALGLEISH dismantles beliefs among the 18-30s _ Daily Mail Online.pdf

3515K