

Science is the New Politics: Evan Harris the bigger picture

The 20th century has been characterized by three developments of great political importance: the growth of democracy, the growth of corporate power, and the growth of corporate propaganda as a means of protecting corporate power against democracy.
*Alex Carey.*¹

As the result of the political situation and the frightful, not to say diabolical, triumphs of science, we are shaken by secret shudders and dark forebodings.
*C. G. Jung.*²

Forget party MPs, vote science MPs
*Mark Henderson.*³

PART ONE: THE NEAR PAST

On May 24th 2010, Dr Andrew Wakefield, together with co-defendant Professor John Walker-Smith, was struck off the British Medical Register. The decision came at the end of a three-year GMC 'trial' that cost British doctors in excess of £6M. The campaign to character assassinate Dr Wakefield began soon after he first wrote to Dr David Salisbury of the NHS in 1996 warning of a public health crisis which might be caused by the MMR vaccination. The campaign has continued for a decade and a half and at its height has 'disappeared' at least 1,500 vaccine damaged children. The making invisible of the reality of vaccine damaged children and the casting into the mist of their parents tragedy, heralds the zenith of a propaganda campaign that the pharmaceutical companies have been working on for the last 50 years. The endgame is the absolute denial of responsibility for any kind of iatrogenic damage in contemporary society.

¹ Alex Carey, *Taking the Risk Out of Democracy: Corporate propaganda versus freedom and liberty*. University of Illinois Press. USA. 1995.

² *C. G. Jung. Memories, dreams, reflections*, Vintage. 1989. ISBN-10: 0679723951 ISBN-13: 978-0679723950

³ Mark Henderson. Times on Line Wednesday, 31 March 2010 at 23:00
<http://c0524352.cdn.cloudfiles.rackspacecloud.com/100401MH>. last accessed Jun 2010.

This essay has three themes. First, to explain the larger, extensive network of the science lobby that has supported the vaccine manufacturers in their anonymous campaign to deny any form of adverse reaction caused first by Urabe mumps strain MMR and then by those strains of MMR and MR that caused Inflammatory Bowel Disease and regressive autism in some children. The second theme is to explain the link between the first 'quackbusting' campaigns, in Britain and the US and the extensive contemporary pro corporate science lobby. Thirdly, the essay uses Evan Harris's political activities and elements of his father's career as a vehicle to explain the nature of conflicting and vested interests which should have been declared when Evan Harris began his involvement in the ambush of Dr Wakefield.

After giving a brief history of the 'healthfraud', 'anti-quackery movement'⁴, the essay discusses the identity and work of Evan Harris and places his beliefs, his actions and those of his associates and colleagues in the historical context of the growth over the last twenty years in the power and the organisation of beliefs not in science but in 'scientism' and the ideology of global corporatism.

By using a portrait of one of the major pro-corporate science propagandists, I have tried to show that the social conflict generated by 'quackbusters', 'skeptics' and 'corporate lobbyists' is not, as they characterise it, a battle between rational scientists and mediaeval and unethical anti-scientists - those who believe in mystical alternatives - but a more far reaching and extensive conflict between global corporate, profit based science and science founded in the community and on the public good.

Those who are attacked by corporate science tend to live in a half world unable to understand the enormity of the forces that are organised against them. However, if we understand the map of the post-industrial corporate science lobby and look at an activist such as Evan Harris we can see clearly how personal political and 'philosophical' positions fit almost precisely into the promotion of corporate science and how his personal views and the way that he expresses them also reflect the gathering assault on the more humanistic views of alternative organisations, thinkers and therapists.

Evan Harris was unseated as an MP for the constituency of Oxford Abingdon in the recent General Election. Although it is effectively too late to challenge his many nefarious purposes inside parliament, I hope the essay will educate those who find it hard to understand why and from where they have been or are being attacked. In my opinion, if we are to come anyway near winning this battle now upon us, everyone in the line of fire has to devote time to understanding and learning about 'the enemy'; who are presently, tactically, way out in front of us.

* * *

⁴ Neither of the terms, 'Health Fraud' or 'Quack Busters', are at all useful, because they assume that the people involved have found real 'fraud' and real 'quacks', when often they themselves are the fraudsters and the quacks. It's very easy to use them as shorthand, however, I just hope that when readers come across them they will understand that these organisations are bogus. Wherever possible try to think of the term 'corporate science lobbyists'.

From the end of the industrial period in the 1970s and the beginning of post-industrialism, the organisation and movements promoting corporate science, have developed and grown considerably. The front line troops organised by 'science' were easily noticeable from the beginning. In the US there were three originating organisations, the US National Council Against Health Fraud, The Committee for Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP), now called Committee for Skeptical Inquiry (CSI), and the American Council on Science and Health (ACSH).⁵

In Britain there were three main strands of organisation, the allopathic medical establishment, the drug industry and lobbyists for science. These three forces while originating a large number of smaller organisations created first the Campaign Against Health Fraud that later changed its name to HealthWatch and later still came to be managed by the more obviously corporate science driven organisations: Sense About Science, The Science Media Centre and the community based Skeptics organisations the headquarters of which are with the CSI in the United States.⁶

The American National Council Against Health Fraud (NCHF)

In 1982, US Representative Claude Pepper introduced three Bills in the House of Representatives, one of the Bills called for a national clearinghouse for consumer health information. Another called for increased criminal penalties against 'quacks'. The third called for the formation of a federal strike force inside the Department of Justice, to be used in the prosecution of 'quacks'.

These Bills were defeated, but government agencies began, behind the scenes, to create the kind of organisations that the Bills suggested. In 1984, a meeting was held in Sacramento, California with the main object of fighting 'quackery'. The meeting took place at the Department of Health and was organised by the recently formed National Council Against Health Fraud (NCHF). The NCHF representative was the only person present who was not a government official. Those present included representatives from the FDA, the California Food and Drug Board, the Board of Medical Quality Assurance - a California State Board that has the power to revoke medical licences - the US Postal Service and the Federal Trade Commission.

At its first meeting, the NCHF gave a summary of the groups, individuals and practitioners whom they wanted to regulate and therefore attack: health promoters, chiropractors and 'diploma mills which issue false degrees'³. The later history of the NCHF shows that these subjects were only the tip of the iceberg. Over the next five years, pronouncements by the NCHF listed a wide range of diagnostic aids, therapies and treatments which did not coincide with the views of allopathic practitioners. These ranged from individuals promoting nutritional supplements and vitamins to any form of treatment described as holistic, including

⁵ To read in detail about these organisations, read *Dirty Medicine*, an e-copy of which is available from <http://www.slingshotpublications.com>

⁶ Sense About Science and the Science Media Centre are covered in my e-book *Brave New World of Zero Risk*. Available from <http://www.slingshotpublications.com>

homoeopathy and naturopathy. Diagnostic aids such as hair analysis, testing for food allergies and all alternative cancer therapies were also listed for censure.

In the summer of 1985, there began a tide of health fraud articles directed against 'quackery'. This first propaganda offensive was followed by the first National Health Fraud Conference in September 1985 at the National Press Club in Washington. Organised by the FDA, the Federal Trade Commission and the US Postal Service, its venue gave a hint as to both its membership and its audience. Despite what the Council's leading advocates were to say later, the NCHF did not start because of consumer disquiet, endangered patients, or the frustrations of long-suffering victims of health fraud.

Committee for Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal

At first sight it is hard to see how a US socialist organisation, which in the 1930s set out to attack religion and promote humanism, could by the 1990s be deeply involved in a series of attacks upon alternative medical practitioners in Europe.

Paul Kurtz, the founder of the Committee for Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal (CSICOP), was, when it began, a philosophy lecturer and writer at New York University. A prominent Humanist, Kurtz was originally a member of the American Humanist Association (AHA).

The AHA, which Kurtz joined in the fifties, was formed in 1933, a materialist organisation, it was broadly based on beliefs in atheism, socialism, free thinking and individualism. In 1967, Kurtz became editor of the AHA journal the *Humanist*, for which he managed to recruit distinguished academic contributors and raise funds from wealthy individuals and foundations.

While editor of the *Humanist*, in 1970, Kurtz set up Prometheus Books, a publishing company, which was to become the leading 'free-thought' publisher in the United States. In 1975, Kurtz demonstrated a departure from the previously conservative image of the AHA, apparently concerned about a revival of astrology in the United States, he collected the signatures of 186 scientists 'against astrology'. This radical new direction that Kurtz had set for the AHA, began a series of schisms in the organisation. After drawing up and publishing the document, Kurtz led a breakaway group out of the American Humanists and assumed the name of CSICOP.

It was evident from the beginning that the new group was to be radically different from the old AHA. Out went the overt association with the rather spartan humanist tradition, even further out went any identification with the non-communist Left, to be replaced by a zippy and populist, highly influential pro-science organisation. The tone of the new organisation was slightly marred, some thought, by its dogmatism and incipient authoritarianism.

CSICOP began a journal, the *Zetetic*, which ran for a year before being replaced in 1978 by the *Skeptical Inquirer*. During its first years, the group was riven by disputes. Some of the scientists who had come into the fold found the organisation

too authoritarian. 'Statements contradicting borderline, folk, or pseudoscience that appear to have an authoritarian tone can do more harm than good', said Carl Sagan, a scientist who nevertheless stayed in CSICOP. Others suspected that it was not a genuine scientific organisation. They saw that it was not likely to carry out or sponsor any serious scientific work and appeared to be concerned only with ridiculing or 'debunking' the work of others.

In the mid to late 1980s, CSICOP moved its focus off patently New Age targets and turned its attention towards alternative medicine and any health care therapies that threatened the corporate health industry. They branded homeopathy a cult without any scientific base. In 1987, they organised a fraudulent scientific attack on Jacques Benveniste, one of the most serious medical researchers looking at homeopathic mechanisms. Without any evidence, or integrity, two of the central figures in CSICOP and its diaspora, James Randi, a one time magician then funded by a large US Foundation to 'debunk' alternative beliefs, and John Maddox, the then editor of the science mag *Nature*, destroyed Benveniste's life and work. Following their morally and legally reprehensible attack, Benveniste who had been working in INSERM the French equivalent of the Medical Research Council, found himself without funding or a place to work.

'Studies' that CSICOP initiated, like their attacks on individuals, showed only contempt for any scientific process. Any results which did not produce the results that they wanted, were simply re-written or binned. To those at the centre of the group, privy to the organisation's funding and long-term aims, such exercises must have seemed hugely entertaining. For the serious scientists, doctors, therapists, and producers of such things as supplements, spiritualists and healers, who were the subject of these japes, the costs were personally, professionally and financially extremely damaging.⁷

CSICOP set up a grass roots campaign for corporate science made up of 'Skeptic' organisations⁸. By the mid-nineteen nineties, these small community based organisations had spread across America and Europe, they had their own plan of campaign outlined by central headquarters and they had national magazines siblings of CSICOP's *Skeptical Inquirer*.

In 2006, CSICOP shortened its name to the Committee for Skeptical Inquiry (CSI). The reasons for the change was to create a shorter less bizarre name that was more "media-friendly", and to reflect the organizations broader focus on apparent critical thinking, science, and rationality. It is important to understand the advent of CSICOP in the cultural and political context of the nineteen eighties and nineties. There were many different corporately backed lobby groups set up in this period, they were covertly funded and they gathered grass roots support. Some have suggested that in a period when the US military and the CIA were pouring millions of dollars into researching psychic phenomena, it became important to turn the interests of the laity away from this subject. Others still have suggested that CSICOP was from the

⁷ Uri Geller spent years locked into a personal and financially costly action against James Randi. Geller sued Randi, after Randi accused him of fraud. Following the action, Randi was forced to resign from CSICOP, so that Geller could not sue the organisation.

⁸ This foreign looking word is the US version of the British word 'sceptic'.

beginning a CIA operation that ushered in, at the end of the cold war, the first grand and heavily disguised pro corporate science based lobby groups.

The American Council on Science and Health

The American Council on Science and Health (ACSH), as its title implies, attempts to put the emphasis on the scientific objectivity of its corporately biased advice and information. Set up in 1978, in the modern tradition of the 'think-tank', the Council made it an early objective to publish position papers on a wide range of products and substances and their effect upon health. Equally, from the beginning, ACSH did its best to obscure the link between its position papers and the organisation's sponsors.

The organisation was pump-primed by the Sarah Scaife Foundation with a grant of \$125,000. This grant came at a time when the New Right was in the ascendancy and conservative industrial causes were looking round for organisations and people to champion. Two years after ACSH was set up, Reagan became President and the causes of the Right were taken into the Administration. The Sarah Scaife Foundation money was heavily based upon Gulf oil stock, which had funded a large number of campaigning right-wing groups in the second half of the seventies.

Following a policy decision in September 1980 the organisation decided that there should be no restriction on accepting industry money, from whatever quarter. By May 1st 1981, ACSH reported that it had received donations from a large number of corporations. Of these, 27 had a potential interest in food, drugs, air pollution regulation, or chemicals. Since that time, the link between the funding and the work of ACSH has become bold and obvious. ACSH is funded by many of the largest chemical companies such as: American Cyanamid, Amoco Foundation, Dow Chemicals of Canada, Hooker Chemical and Plastics Corp., Mobil Foundation, Monsanto Fund, and the Shell Companies Foundation. ACSH has published two cancer reports, both of which exonerate chemicals. The President of Dow Chemicals is a foundation trustee of the Rollin Gerstacker Foundation from which ACSH has received payments of over \$75,000.

ACSH has presented work funded by paper companies and timber concerns which use vast quantities of herbicides. The organisation receives money from all the industrial sectors which contribute to the production of chemically-treated foodstuffs. It receives money from most of the largest companies involved in chemical production from the raw materials to the production and distribution of refined chemicals. While receiving money from these firms ACSH publishes reports denying the detrimental effects of chemicals.

Amongst others, ACSH is funded by a number of medical and pharmaceutical interests, including Pfizer and the AMA. Elizabeth Whelan who began and still runs the organisation is a combative career woman now in her sixties who bears comparison with the most dedicated anti-health fraud activists. She has a doctorate in Public Health from Harvard, where she studied under Professor Frederick Stare.

The chemical and pharmaceutical companies often make public the view that the press is responsible for false perceptions about toxins and risk. One of Whelan's arguments is that the media are responsible for running scare stories. ACSH is there to right the balance, Whelan says, by providing conservative scientific information to the press. The origins of such scientific opinions are, however, rarely made clear and Whelan's views have been quoted in many prestigious articles without ACSH's funding sources being mentioned.

If a scientist, or an epidemiologist joins the board of ACSH, it is a clear sign that they have serious ties to industry. Some years before his death, Sir Richard Doll, who always produced epidemiology on behalf of industry and who, it was later revealed, had been receiving £1,000 a day for any consultancy work Monsanto ordered over a of twenty year period,⁹ joined the ACSH extensive Advisory Board. More recently, Professor Simon Wessely, the arch co-ordinator of Britain's health spin policy on behalf of the psychiatric industry, joined the ACSH board.

The UK Campaign Against Health Fraud

The Health Fraud movement in Britain exactly copied its US counterpart. In fact, the instruction for its organisation came directly from the States in the three years between 1985 and 1988. Caroline Richmond called the first meeting of what was to be called the Campaign Against Health Fraud in 1988. She had been laying the foundation for the group, gathering information and organising critical attacks upon clinical ecologists and allergy doctors for at least two years previously.

Even in those early days of the campaign against clinical ecology, the vested interests supporting orthodox allergy work were beginning to show. A Dr Tim David denounced Dr Freed to the General Medical Council, after his name appeared on a list of doctors supporting the Hyperactive Children's Support Group, which had begun campaigning against chemical food additives.

The major players in the British health-fraud movement, Caroline Richmond, Dr David Pearson, Dr Vincent Marks, Professor Michael Baum and Dr Nick Beard, had been coming together since 1985. They were all heavily involved in the defence of scientific medicine and a number of them had a connection, however tenuous, with the Wellcome Foundation.¹⁰ Each founder member also had contacts who would be drawn into the campaign and help in reporting information and publicising cases. One 'quackbuster', whose role in the organisation was to be shrouded in misinformation, was Duncan Campbell. Campbell was later to claim on a number of occasions that he had never been a member.¹¹

⁹ Hardell, Walker, Walhjalt, Friedman and Richter. Secret Ties to Industry and Conflicting Interests in Cancer Research. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*. 2006

¹⁰ As well as working in the Wellcome Institute, and receiving a Wellcome bursary, Richmond acquired 250 Wellcome shares in December 1986. She held these shares until they were sold in 1990.

¹¹ The Autumn 1989 CAHF Newsletter quotes a letter sent by Campbell to *Hospital Doctor*. 'I enthusiastically welcome the recent launch of CAHF. In the few weeks since they launched, I and others have already benefited immensely from their assistance in working to expose the many (other) charlatans who are preying on the vulnerable for commercial gain'.

The organisation had first decided to call the Campaign, *the Council Against Health Fraud*. This is a clear indication that the British Campaign had links with the American Council. In November 1988, Caroline Richmond organised the first steering committee meeting for what was to become the Campaign. The meeting was advertised in the newsletter of the Medical Journalists Association (MJA). The MJA, of which Richmond is a long-standing member, is supported by Ciba Geigy and a number of other pharmaceutical companies; its records for this period have been sealed for some time now. Companies used the Association's newsletter to advertise meetings and conferences and 'freebies' at which they promote their drugs to journalists.

Following the meeting, Caroline Richmond sent round a circular to the press and interested parties. 'At a meeting on 1st November 1988, a group including doctors, journalists and a barrister decided to form the Council Against Health Fraud, an information and action service against the growing tide of quackery.' At the bottom of this short advertisement Richmond gave her address, for contact purposes, as The Wellcome Institute, 183 Euston Road.

Between the first meeting and the official launch of the Campaign in May 1989, the steering committee met at the Ciba Foundation, the academic front for the drug company Ciba Geigy. The Ciba Foundation has an information service, the Media Resources Service (MRS), an early version of the Science Media Centre, which was to some extent already doing the kind of work, in defence of science, health and the pharmaceutical and chemical industries, that CAHF planned.

During the gestation period of the Campaign Against Health Fraud, Caroline Richmond was involved with the magazine *UK Skeptic*, which had been set up in 1987 with money from CSICP. Dr Bernard Dixon was both a founder member of the Campaign Against Health Fraud and a member of CSICP, the British branch of CSICOP. On its inauguration, CAHF was advertised as a co-member of the UK Skeptics¹² in the first page of their magazine *UK Skeptic*. The British branch of the

¹² **British and Irish Skeptics 1993:** Throughout the 1980s, CSICOP began to develop grass roots local organisations of 'skeptics' and in a similar manner to that of the CIA, these organisations were seeded throughout North America and Europe. In January 1987, CSICOP brought its operation to Britain when it launched the *British and Irish Skeptic*, a bi-monthly magazine published in Dublin. The magazine was financed by CSICP, the British section of CSICOP² and according to its publishers was sent out to nearly 500 UK and Irish subscribers and ex-subscribers of the *Skeptical Inquirer*, CSICOP's American journal. The first editor of the *British and Irish Skeptic* was Wendy Grossman, described in future issues as 'Editor of the *British and Irish Skeptic* and a folk singer'. Grossman, who was educated at Cornell University, has more recently written on micro-technology.⁴ The most important person on the Editorial Board of the first magazine was Toby Howard, who later moved to Manchester and presided over the setting up of UK Skeptics and the journal's change of name. Other members of the Editorial Board were Peter O'Hara and Karl Sabbagh, a journalist and filmmaker, who also appears on CSICOP's list of Scientific and Technical Consultants. Sabbagh was also the director of the Merck Sharp and Dohme Foundation, an academic front set up by the drug company of the same name. In December 1987, the first organising meeting of Manchester Skeptics took place. Manchester became the centre of CSICOP operations and the city which James Randi and Paul Kurtz usually visit when in Britain. In 1990, the title of 'British & Irish' was dropped and the English group became UK Skeptics, its magazine the *Skeptic*. From the beginning, the health-fraud strategy was a considered aspect of CSICOP's activities in Britain. As time went by, it became clear that the same

CAHF had the same relationship to UK Skeptics as the American Council Against Health Fraud had to CSICOP. The health fraud campaign was, as it were, the armed wing, while CSICOP and CSICP were made up of theorists.

Those who represented the core of the Campaign Against Health Fraud at its formation in 1989 remained involved over the next two years; others pulled in on the fringe soon drifted away. On April 3rd 1989 at a Steering Committee meeting held at the Ciba Foundation, two joint presidents were elected: Dr Michael O'Donnell, broadcaster and former GP, editor of *GP* magazine, and television and radio presenter Nick Ross.

At that time, soon after the press launch, the leading Campaign activists included, Dr Christopher Bass, a psychiatrist and committee member of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; Dr Simon Wessely; Professor Michael Baum and his brother Professor Harold Baum, Diana Brahams and Dr Vincent Marks. Within a couple of months of its launch, the Campaign Against Health Fraud had produced a newsletter. It was not as professional as its American counterpart⁸ but it provided a good platform for the Campaign to promote attacks and debunking projects which it had initiated.

It was evident how the Campaign was to go about prosecuting their complaints against non-pharmaceutical treatments. Apart from sundry bodies like the Advertising Standards Authority, they were to rely upon the investigators of the then Medicines Control Agency (now the MHRA) inside the DoH. The Campaign even made overtures to the Department of Health, asking if they might be formally recognised as a prosecutorial agency by them.

The British Nutritional Association

The Campaign Against Health Fraud drew under its wing all the organisations that defended corporate science. Aware of the unhealthy relationship between chemicals, food and human health, the food processing industry and the chemical industry have, since the Second World War, made a determined attempt to ensure that they intervene in medicine, dietetics and nutrition. Powerful vested interests have tried to ensure that the public does not make links between food and health. Large companies like Coca-Cola, one of the biggest consumers of sugar in the world, work hard at promoting a healthy, innocent image for their drinks. Food has to be good for you. Even if the

relationship which CSICOP had to the American National Council Against Health Fraud was to be replicated in Britain.

The Skeptic 2010: The Editorial Advisory Board members are:

James Alcock/Julian Baggini/ Susan Blackmore/Derren Brown/ Scott Campbell/ David Clarke/ David Colquhoun/ Brian Cox/ Richard Dawkins/ Sergio Della Sala/Richard J. Evans/ Stephen Fry Actor/ Wendy M. Grossman/ David Allen Green/ Dr Evan Harris (former MP for Oxford West & Abingdon) Liberal Democrat Science Spokesman/ Simon Hoggart/ Bruce Hood/ Professor Ray Hyman/ Robin Ince/ Paul Kurtz/ Stephen Law/ Andy Lewis/ Scott Lilienfeld/ Elizabeth Loftus/ Richard McNally/ Tim Minchin/ P Z Myer/ Mark Newbrook/ Charles Paxton/ Phil Plait Astronomer/ Massimo Polidoro/ Benjamin Radford/ James Randi/ Ian Rowland/ Karl Sabbagh/ Simon Singh/ Karen Stollznow/ Richard Wiseman

product is a synthetic chemical manufactured by a paint company, such as an artificial sweetener, its marketing lever is that it is good for health.

The two major organisations which at that time dealt with food in Britain are the government department, the Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food (MAFF) [now Defra, joined by the Food Standards Agency], and a charity which receives large government grants and is closely linked to MAFF.¹³ The British Nutrition Foundation (BNF) was set up in 1967 and is related to its American counterpart, the Nutrition Foundation of the United States. From 1967, and up until the mid-1980s, the BNF controlled most 'official' information about nutrition, which passed either to the public through the news media, or to parliament via the various Ministry-related food committees.

Both government and charitable organisations are supported by and in turn support British and American industrial interests in food production. Between them and a myriad of satellite committees and institutions, these two organisations control nearly all public information about food and health.

Present subscribers to, and supporters of, the BNF include all the major names in multi-national food production, such as British Sugar, Heinz, Kellogg, McDonalds, Nestle, NutraSweet and Procter and Gamble. But perhaps even more worrying than these sponsors is the sponsorship by such chemical and pharmaceutical companies as: Boots, Imperial Chemical Industries, Roche, SmithKline Beecham and Unilever.

The Rationalist Press Association

The Rationalist Press Association (RPA), the oldest British rationalist organisation, was set up in 1899. Its primary objective was to publish books, provide educational material about the philosophy of humanism and to defend freedom of thought. After the Second World War, the RPA became one of the main theoretical forums of British rationalism. It held seminars, lectures and conferences and published the *New Humanist*.

In 1961, the RPA affiliated to the International Humanist and Ethical Union (IHED). In 1963 the Rational Press Association and the IHEU, both of which had charitable status and so were unable to campaign, came together to sponsor a national body called the British Humanist Association.

In 1970, Paul Kurtz, then a leading member of the American Humanist Association, became an editorial advisor to the RPA journal *Question*. In 1972, despite being short of money and continually in a crisis over staff, the RPA launched a major new journal, the *New Humanist*. Within no time, this journal extended to fifty pages and was published bi-monthly. It had an A4 format and was priced at fifty pence. It carried no advertising and ran a large number of relatively limited articles on subjects of interest to humanists and particularly those humanists who wanted to

¹³ The BNF began receiving a MAFF grant in 1990: £20,000 annually for five years to fund elements of its programme.

debunk paranormal experience. The Association first tried to sell the magazine to the public via paper stalls and shops. Not surprisingly, as it was full of apparently weighty intellectual discourses, it was a failure and quickly returned to being a subscription journal.

* * *

Setting a pattern for the organisations that followed it, the Campaign Against Health Fraud and later HealthWatch was vitriolic in its personal attacks on those involved in alternative and complementary medicine. Some of its shills, like Caroline Richmond and Vincent Marks, appeared terrible angry and on occasions incoherent. Conspiring with the *BMJ* to write an obituary of David Horrobin, one of the best alternative thinkers and producers of omega supplements throughout the nineteen eighties and nineties, Richmond took the opportunity, amongst callous invective to accuse him of being one the world's greatest 'snake oil salesmen'. The *BMJ* received hundreds of letters criticising Richmond. Vincent Marks, on the other hand, is never able to speak in public without foaming at the mouth and virtually falling out of his seat with apoplectic venom. It's always worth re-running a recording of the discussion that followed *Hear the Silence*, the film about Dr Wakefield and the RFH (Royal Free Hospital), shown on Channel Five; Marks is at his spitting best.

After getting off to a fiery start, during which time CAHF managed to almost shut down the Bristol Cancer Help Centre and other alternatively based health care organisations and individuals, using entirely bogus critiques, the 'Health Fraud' movement in the UK collapsed between 1995 and the end of the century. I'd like to think that my book *Dirty Medicine* helped in this collapse, although the major cause of it was the unflagging poverty of intellect and the veritable emotional and psychological disturbance shown by its members. A lobby acting on behalf of corporate science in the twenty first century needed something more intelligent than a group of scientific dull-wits, cat calling and spitting in the dark.

In 1997, New Labour was elected to power in a landslide general election vote. The party and Blair particularly had fought the election with the support of old Liberal hands and old Liberal money. Following the victory, while Blair got on with nothing in particular, the old Liberals, throwing in their hand with the core of the Revolutionary Communist Party about to call itself after its magazine *Living Marxism* (LM), completely realigned science policy in Britain and re-energized UK lobby organisations.

At the Centre of this massing of troops at the start of the scientific revolution, was David Sainsbury, the billionaire GM entrepreneur who donated around £6 million to New Labour before and after the Labour victory. For part of his £6 million Sainsbury was given the job of head of Science at the Department of Trade and Industry. From this commanding position, with the help of his old Liberal buddy and PR agent for the world's biggest pharmaceutical companies, by then 'Lord' Dick Tavern, Sainsbury built a covert lobby for science, technology and industry that has continued throughout the last decade. The stratagem and ultimately the policies they acted out were closely linked to US neo-liberalism and conspiratorial world

government organisations such as Bilderberg and the Trilateral, which the major players attended.

The chosen Liberal Peers, aided in this task by LMs 'grass-roots activists', funded mainly by the largest corporations, particularly pharmaceutical companies, a range of 'covert' black propaganda organisations. These organisations were set up by Liberal Peers and staffed by LM activists. The initial impact of this corporate lobbying style of government can be gleaned from Greg Pallister's brilliant book *The Best Democracy that Money Can Buy*.¹⁴ However, as the government settled in, the Liberals, ex-Liberals, LM activists, assumed a steadier and more covert role and steered science policy steadily in the direction of corporatism.

The considerable power given to the pharmaceutical companies, beyond government, can be seen by the setting up of two organisations. In 2003, the government handed control of the Medicines Control Agency, a regulatory body, originally embedded in the Department of Health and called the Medicines Division, and given more independence in 1968, to the pharmaceutical industry. Although nominally within and answerable to the Department of Health, the new Medicines and Health Care Regulatory Agency (MHRA) is now a completely independent trading company owned by the pharmaceutical industry.¹⁵

The second major initiative set up beyond government was another initiative of the Liberal Peers. In May 1999 a House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology recommended in its Report, *Scientific Advisory System: Genetically Modified Foods* that media coverage of scientific matters should be governed by a Code of Practice, which stipulates that scientific stories should be factually accurate. Breaches of the Code should be referred to the Press Complaints Commission.

A little known PR organisation called the Social Issues Research Centre (SIRC) was unaccountably appointed to develop such a code. The SIRC were partnered by the part corporately funded Royal Society and the part corporately funded Royal Institution of Great Britain.^{16,17} The SIRC claims to be an independent, non-profit organisation, founded to conduct research on lifestyle issues. However, it is funded mainly from the profits of a sister organisation. MCM Research is a problem solving, *risk management* research, positive communication and PR organisation, that works almost entirely for the food-and-drinks industry, its clients including the Ministry of Defence and the Sugar Bureau.

The process of creating *the rules* for the media began in March 2000, when the Royal Society, within which Lord Sainsbury had set up a rebuttal unit to defend

¹⁴ Greg Palast, *The Best Democracy that Money Can Buy*. Pluto Press, Britain 2002.

¹⁵ See *The Fate of Good Man*, by this author, available as an e-book from <http://www.slingshotpublications.com>

¹⁶ Lord Sainsbury, having left the government just before Blair's resignation as prime minister, is now amongst other things, Chairman of the Royal Society's 350-year anniversary campaign fund, which aims to raise £100 million by 2010.

¹⁷ The Royal Society: about a fifth of its funding is declared as coming from corporations, including AstraZeneca plc and Pfizer Limited. The Royal Institution: its building has recently reopened following a £20-million refurbishment. The building contains the Science Media Centre, which is funded by most of the world's pharmaceutical companies, the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express* and a large number of other corporations.

industrial science against critics,¹⁸ published its *Scientists and the Media: Guidelines for scientists working with the media and comments on a press code of practice*.¹⁹ The House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology, a favourite haunt of Taverne, subsequently endorsed this document in its report *Science and Society*.²⁰ In order to produce the *Guidelines*, and to bring together the Royal Society and the Royal Institution with the SIRC, the SIRC formed the *Joint Forum of the Social Issues Research Centre*, combining people from Sense About Science (SAS) and SIRC.

The joint forum included, Dr. Michael Fitzpatrick, with his 20-year history in Revolutionary Communism and Lord Taverne QC, previously top PR man for GlaxoSmithKline. Other members of the Joint Forum included people influential in academia and media; Peter Bell, former controller of policy, BBC News; Philip Harding, controller of editorial policy, BBC; Steve Connor, science editor, *The Independent*; Dr. Graham Easton, GP and 'senior broadcast journalist', BBC Science Radio; Professor Susan Greenfield, director, The Royal Institution.²¹

The Guidelines,²² when they were published, were perhaps the most devastating subversion of British democracy ever. They gave complete control of media reporting on 'health' to a gang of corporate 'experts' all in the orbit of the pharmaceutical corporations. In fact this was corporatism at its most severe in relation to health and the media. It was, however, essential for corporate science if it was to gain the upper hand in, for instance, the battle over MMR and the role of the GMC and Dr Wakefield.

With the setting up of a whole group of other organisations, such as the Science Media Centre and Sense About Science, grass roots skeptics and the renovated HealthWatch, the main corporate lobby groups were re-invigorated. Along with the groups came the individuals, chancers like Dr Ben Goldacre and Dr Simon Singh, who emerged out of thin air and were given high profile places without previous experience; suited and booted to fight to the death for corporate science. It is important to understand that, in the main, these people were not scientists and we must keep reminding ourselves that science journalists are only scientists in as much as they experiment with the truth of words, and TV personalities are only scientists in as much as they, like everyone else, might comment on science. But, most particularly, we must remind ourselves that doctors stopped being scientists when they became drug pushers and they are now some of the people who know least about science of any kind.

¹⁸ Laurie Flynn and Michael Sean Gillard, Pro-GM food scientist 'threatened editor', *The Guardian* November 1, 1999. can be accessed at: <http://users.skynet.be/nwp/genmani003.htm>

¹⁹ *Scientists and the Media: Guidelines for scientists working with the media and comments on a press code of practice*. Royal Society 2000.

²⁰ The House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology. *Science and Society*, 2000.

²¹ Susan Greenfield was pushed out of her top job in the Royal Institute following the fiscal crisis which left the organisation in massive debt. Following her fall Goldacre gave her a good kicking and Greenfield said of him; he's 'like the people who denied that smoking caused cancer'. Greenfield is still, however, a patron of Healthwatch.

²² For a more complete story of the guidelines see, this author's *Brave New World of Zero Risk: Covert strategy in British Science Policy*. available from <http://www.slingshotpublications.com>.

By the end of the first decade of the 21st century, together with various regulatory bodies such as the GMC and the MHRA, these groups and individuals had decimated alternative health and destroyed the careers of a number of caring and thinking doctors and practitioners. Replacing real science with faux-science, health freedom with blog-democracy and freedom to choose in health care with a robotic insistence on allopathy. This movement, however, does not simply support the abolition of alternative medicine, much more importantly it supports and hides all the failings of the technological/science revolution. In this contradiction we can see one of the greatest lies of the movement: a drug industry that kills 55,000 people with one brand named pharmaceutical while giving no redress whatsoever to their relatives,²³ can get up on its hind-legs and bray about the dangers of natural remedies that have had hundreds of years of safe and positive use.

PART TWO

The Present and the Future: Going on now

There can be no doubt that when one looks at Evan Harris's career over 13 years as a UK Member of Parliament that he was a dogged organiser and campaigner, displaying the energy of early more radical parliamentarians of different parties. Reviewing the reforms that he has supported inside and outside parliament they appear to suit every liberal palate. Amongst many campaigns he helped reform the libel laws, campaigned for stem cell research, campaigned against the blasphemy laws, and defended independent scientific advice.

However, there can also be no doubt that something about his character made makes people feel uneasy; it wasn't only Christians who didn't agree with his hard line promotion of atheism, or anti-vivisectionists who didn't agree with his merciless views about testing on animals and primate vivisection; it was perhaps something to do with his apparent coldness that validated his 'Dr Death' title. In the background, most especially in the area of Public Health and for instance in the matter of MMR, it was easy to suspect that like Brian Deer, Harris was pursuing some higher uncomfortable ideology and behaving in a shady, conspiratorial and disreputable manner.

Like a large number of corporate science activists, Harris's ruthless rationalist campaigning seemed to slip almost unnoticed into truthless propaganda. Lurking behind his Liberal views were powerful corporate interests for which profitable science was the holly grail. For some, particularly the residents of Abingdon in Oxford, their distaste may have been fueled by the concern that Harris

²³ Dr. David Graham carried out a peer-reviewed study on the Merck & Co Inc. arthritis drug Vioxx, published in August 2005. Dr. Graham also told the Senate Finance Committee that Vioxx may have caused 55,000 deaths alone, more than the 28,000 projected by the FDA. Graham also indicated Vioxx may have caused as many as 160,000 heart attacks, strokes and deaths, combined.

appeared to be fighting harder for the abstraction of science than he was for the pragmatic problems of his lay constituents.

* * *

Personal and Family Influences

Inevitably familial influences have in some measure contributed to Evan Harris' present views. Such circumstances are rarely stated or acknowledged in terms of conflict of interest, although they might be shown to be precisely that especially where the State or for instance the medical establishment is concerned and where occupations or influence runs in the family from father to son.²⁴

Frank Harris, Evan's father was born in 1935 and graduated in 1957 from the University of Cape Town. After posts at the Groote Schuur Hospital²⁵ and the Red Cross War Memorial Children's Hospital he held a senior research fellowship with the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) in the endocrine research unit of Cape Town University. The CSIR was one of the main emergent organisations after the second world war that promoted corporate scientific research in Africa. The South African Medical Research Council (MRC), a similar organisation to that which existed in Britain developed within the CSIR.

In 1965, Frank Harris left South Africa and with Brenda Harris heavily pregnant with a son traveled to England and took up the position as a senior lecturer in Child Health at Sheffield University, later that same year Evan was born. After his father was appointed Chair of Child Health at Liverpool University in 1974, Evan was educated partly in Liverpool at the Blue Coat Secondary School. Frank Harris was to stay at Liverpool for the next fifteen years and in 1984, Evan was awarded an English Speaking Union²⁶ scholarship to Harvard High School and a year later a scholarship to Wadham College, Oxford, to study medicine in the footsteps of his father. He practised first in the Royal Liverpool Hospital and then at the John Radcliffe Hospital in Oxford.

Frank Harris is now retired, during his career, he sat on the Committee for the Safety of Medicines (CSM),²⁷ was a member of the GMC Committee on education and the GMC Council. In 1996 he was awarded the CBE, and in 1999 became the

²⁴ The person who supposedly farmed out the work from the *Sunday Times* to Brian Deer was Paul Nuki. Nuki's father had been a member of the JCVI at the time that the three brands of MMR were passed for safety and used for a mass vaccination campaign between 1988 and 1992.

²⁵ Famous for being the venue for Christian Bernard's first heart transplants.

²⁶ A rather quirky liberal organisation of the old world order, set up in 1918, and linked to Britain's colonial and imperialist heritage, which places emphasis on the use of the English language and has a strong anglo-American streak. It has a background of educating the middle classes and the governing classes to Britain's cause overseas. Those who have joined in its Anglo-US exchange programmes include, Sir Ian Blair a previous Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, who exchanged with the same school - Harvard-Westlake - as Evan Harris. Sir John Bond, past Chairman of HSBC and Vodophone. Sir Richard Dearlove Director of MI6 1999 - 2004.

²⁷ John Stone, Age of Autism. MP Who Breached Patient Confidentiality Failed to Disclose Competing Interest in MMR Debate. <http://www.ageofautism.com/john-stone-uk/page/3/>

Dean of the New Joint Medical School, when Warwick and Leicester University Medical Schools combined.

The Harris family is particularly close, Evan lives just half an hours walk from his parents house on the North Western edge of Oxford and the family regularly play bridge at the Oxfordshire Bridge Association, within walking distance of his parents house on the Banbury Road. Throughout 2009, Evan was President of the club, while his mother Brenda was the Publicity Officer. Even the Lib Dem's offices are only a few minutes walk away from Evans house near Oxford Station.

Evan Harris, was caught up in the Parliamentary expenses scandal but seems to have been poorly treated by the Daily telegraph investigation. He bought a flat in central London for which he claimed modest parliamentary expenses to refurbish and which he later sold to his parents for a considerably greater sum than he had originally paid for it. Protesting after the publication of the Telegraph claims, Harris said, 'I have never claimed for a new kitchen, a new bathroom, gardening or plasma screen TV or anything like that. My claims have been mainly for my interest-only mortgage, food, utility bills, council tax and modest cleaning bills. Seemingly Harris' claims were modest and little more than the amount he would have had to pay on rent for a flat in Central London.

Other money that shows the closeness of the Harris family is money loaned by Evan's father to Evans local Lib Dem offices, over the years of Evans time as an MP. In the last eight years of his being an MP, Evan Harris's local Liberal Democrat Party, received at least £10,000 in lump sum aons from Frank Harris. It could be of course that Harris' local Lib Dem party was in need of decorating its offices or putting down new carpets, it could even be the case that Frank Harris is a committed supporter of the Lib Dems and their local office was the best place to deposit his donation.²⁸ Any more curious researcher might enquire of Oxford Lib Dems as to whether this money was ring fenced for a particular project.

The period of Frank Harris's life between 1980 and 1992, throws up a series of coincidences and overlapping beliefs now shared by father and son that suggest a bizarre continuity in the life, beliefs and work of both men. While they might be described as 'conflicting interests', they may even more disturbingly be considered 'continuity of interests'. These revelations about the overlap in the lives of Evan Harris and his father throw new light on Evan Harris's determination to defend MMR as well as providing a speculative reason for his vitriolic personal criticism of Wakefield as a doctor whom he accuses of crossing *all* ethical boundaries and whom he suggests should be prosecuted for criminal offences.

²⁸ 3 places where Frank Harris is recorded as having given loans/money to the Lib Dems. Taking all 3 together since 2002 and assuming that the loans registered in 2002 and 2005 are two separate loans the total comes to almost £10k

<http://registers.electoralcommission.org.uk/regulatory-issues/libdemsumloans.cfm>

£4,100

<http://scraperwiki.com/scrapers/show/party-donations-analysis/data/>

£1,020

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200203/cmregmem/nov2002/memi12.htm>

£4,800

* * *

Frank Harris' career to the top of the paediatric establishment, came near to unravelling in the period between the mid 1970s and the end of the 1980s when he was accidentally embroiled in one of the biggest scandals in British medical history.

In the late 1990s, it was revealed that one of the largest children's hospitals in the country at Alder Hey in Liverpool, had routinely retained 'for research purposes' both post mortem and living children's body parts and tissues without first obtaining complete parental consent. It also transpired that the hospital had been routinely selling children's organs glands and tissue damples to pharmaceutical companies for research in the manufacture of medicines, again without parental consent.²⁹

The collection of children's hearts began at Alder Hey in 1948, while a collection of lungs began in 1955, later different organs and fetal material were stored for research. In October 1974 Professor Frank Harris was appointed Professor of Child Health and Head of Department at Alder Hey, after ten years, in September 1985 he was also appointed Dean of the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Liverpool and a year later the Director of the Institute of Child Health (ICH) then newly opened at Alder Hey.

In November 1986 Dr Bouton the long serving consultant pathologist at Alder Hey retired and a locum Dr Ibrahim was appointed. That same November Professor John Davis, the Professor of Paediatrics at the University of Cambridge Clinical school based at Addenbrookes and chairman of the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Foundation for Sudden Infant Death (FSID),³⁰ an organisation set up in the early 1970s concerned with cot deaths, wrote to Frank Harris offering the University £250,000 over five years to fund supporting staff for a new Chair of pathology at the university. On 9th December 1986, Harris replied, informing Davis that the venture had the support of all the departmental Heads of pathology, Paediatrics, obstetrics and Community Health. He gave glowing support for the project coupled with what appeared to be an over inflated description of the physical conditions for accommodating the new post and it's considerable workload.

The Redfern Enquiry into the issue of consent for the retention of body parts at Alder Hay, presented in 2001, was later to say of Harris' glowing description of the pathology premises, that while what he said was true, *'it hid the reality of the cramped conditions and split sites that were later described by an applicant for the Chair'*. Although Harris was talking-up the Chair the facilities were Victorian, run down and

²⁹ This matter was often referred to as the hospital 'donating' body parts to pharmaceutical companies, and these companies giving 'donations' to the hospital.

³⁰ James and Charles Selincourt lost a son called Martin in 1969. It was Jane's mother in law who did something about it. Nancy Hunter-Grey founded FSIDS in 1971 after the Cambridge seminar, in 1970 at the Sir Samuel Bedson symposium in Cambridge, Carpenter presented a brief review of SIDS epidemiology. which was mainly made up of doctors. The first chairman was Charles de Selincourt. The proceedings of the Symposium were published in 1971, edited by Camps and Carpenter, Sudden and Unexplained Deaths in Infancy. FSID had a Scientific Advisory Group which included over the years, Professor Emery, Professor John Davies, Dr Pamela Davies, Peter Fleming, Joyce Epstein, Lin Roche and the Countess Sylvia Limerick.

completely unsuitable to house the collection of children's remains possessed by the hospital. So determined was Professor Harris to sell the Chair, however, that the discussion about prospective candidates, premises and facilities kept faltering over arguments about suitability and sustainability.

The FSID wrote to the University saying that support from FSID was on the understanding that a 'substantial part of the research effort would be devoted to the problem of cot death'. This was a contentious subject at the time, and has remained so, especially in relation to vaccination. Having accepted the offer subject to the agreement of the other parties, Harris then wrote to the Vice Chancellor, Professor Graeme Davies, trumpeting the generosity of FSID and suggesting the Chair be called the 'Liverpool Health Authority Chair in Fetal and Infant pathology'.

Two external advisors were appointed for the creation of the new Chair, the late Professor John Emery and Professor John Wigglesworth. While discussions over candidates got underway Harris seemed to be working to an agenda of his own to promote and secure the Chair at all costs.

The Inquiry highlighted how when Professor Wigglesworth spoke of his substantial reservations over Professor Harris' proposals, Harris in turn questioned his motives and 'his ability to serve as an external assessor.' Against this backdrop of friction, Professor Emery made no secret of his preference for one particular candidate; Professor van Velzen, referring to him as '*being by far the most able and dynamic of the younger generation of paediatric pathologists in Europe*'

Clearly there was some suggestion that Professors Emery and Harris pushed for Van Velzen to be awarded the Chair when as part of the inquiry Professor Van Velzen received a letter dated 12th June 2000 from James Rowley, Counsel to the Inquiry which stated, '*It is the perception of some that your appointment was a "fix" engineered by Professors Harris and Emery.*'

The debate became so heated that in August 1987 Wigglesworth³¹ resigned as an external assessor to the Selection Committee for the Chair. In November 1987 the Job description for the Chair was published and Wigglesworth, still uneasy, was particularly concerned that the small unit that the Chair would take over had insufficient clinical support, nor did he think that any new Chair however capable could handle all the post-mortems and histopathology as well as cataloguing the growing collection of organs.

Professor Heath and the Vice chancellor both met with Wigglesworth in an effort to smooth over the situation. By now concerns about how the hospital could accommodate and facilitate the Chair were coming from several other sources. Wigglesworth eventually made his concerns known to FSID in what Harris termed a '*most unusual way*' that is, he '*communicated them himself*' and the Vice chancellor then had to write to FSID to '*steady their nerves*' following Wigglesworth's approach. After a series of meeting and exchanges, Wigglesworth's fear seem to have been caste

³¹ Professor Jonathan Wigglesworth MD FRCPath FRCPCH (b. 1932) was appointed Senior Lecturer in Paediatric Pathology at the Hammersmith Hospital, London, in 1965, Professor of Perinatal Pathology from 1985 to 1998, Professor Emeritus since 1998.

aside and any general alarm and unease in those he had approached effectively quelled.

Basically, the Chair was going full steam ahead and God help anyone who questioned it although it has to be said that this kind of administrative warfare is common in large institutions. In December Dr Anthony Barson a prospective applicant for the Chair, completely against the protocols, expresses major concern at the University's short-term use of charitable monies and failure to consider the long-term development of the clinical services.

Two members of the hospital, harboured grave reservations about van Velzen, Professor Hart and Mr Cudmore. The Inquiry records show that on the day of the interviews the Vice Chancellor *'spoke to them outside the Committee Room and the final decision was unanimously in favour of Dr Van Velzen'*. The Enquiry reported the appointment in the following terms. *'Mr Cudmore said in evidence that it was obvious that Dr Van Velzen was to be appointed and had he protested the appointment would still have followed'*.

Coincidentally in 1988 and 1989, hospital staff were becoming more concerned about the legitimacy of the body parts collection that they had in the hospital. At this time new laws and regulation were being put into place by the government. As a result of mounting concerns and new legislation in the form of the Anatomy Regulations 1988 Dr Ibrahim brought to Professor Harris's attention the situation in the hospital. A Dr Smith wrote an internal letter to Professor Harris regarding the need to obtain proper consent for the retention of body parts and their use in research. Professor Harris failed to address the contents of the letter and nothing was done to consider the implications of the new legislation for the procedures carried out at Alder Hey in respect of consent for the removal and retention of body parts.

In the hospital Dr Ibrahim wrote to Mr Barter, the Coroner, about the absence of proper consent documentation for the keeping of hearts in the heart collection, and in 1989, The Polkinghorne Report looked at the matter of the use of fetus and fetal material³² this report made it clear that positive, explicit consent would have to be provided in the future.

Following van Velzen's appointment to the Chair of Fetal and Infant Pathology in April 1988 Professor Harris retired as Dean of Alder Hey although he continued with his position at the ICH and Alder Hay Hospital until September 1989. Dr Ibrahim also left the hospital when Professor van Velzen took up the Chair.

By 1989, with little support inside the hospital things did not look good for van Velzen, in fact his task looked formidable. In December 1989 he produces a five-year paper for a regional paediatric, fetal, placental and perinatal pathology services. From January 1990 Professor van Velzen continues the quest for proper consistent long term and adequate funding of the Regional Fetal Pathology Services.

* * *

³² The report recommended complete written consent of the mother.

Just over two years after he left his position in Liverpool, in March 1990,³³ while already a member of the Committee for the Safety of Medicines Professor Harris attended his first meeting of the Joint Sub-Committee on Adverse Reaction to Vaccination and Immunisation (JSCARVI). Other notable attendees at the meeting were Dr Elizabeth Miller, Professor D McDevitt³⁴ and Dr David Salisbury, of the Department of Health all of whom were to turn out the most embittered detractors of Dr Wakefield and the most determined defenders, regardless of safety, of MMR.

This March 1990 meeting of the JSCARVI, as had others agreed not to make too much noise about the Urabe Mumps strain MMR vaccination, despite the steady trickle of adverse reactions. In 1992 this Urabe mumps strain MMR would be withdrawn when it became too difficult to hide the fact that the vaccination was damaging hundreds - if not thousands - of children with mumps meningitis. The adverse reaction caused by Urabe was known by this committee following reports from Canada where it had been banned *before being used* in the UK and by 1990 adverse reaction were increasingly being identified in Japan.

The March meeting began with the Chairman reminding the committee members of the absolute confidentiality of the proceedings; no one was to breath a word outside the meetings, about the damage Urabe mumps strain vaccines were doing. Item 4 of the minutes saw them change one item from the last meeting which had read 'there were no deaths from anaphylaxis', to 'there were no *known* deaths from anaphylaxis'. A small window of escape, but a good start! Para 4.1 drew attention to the fact that there seemed to be problems with under-reporting adverse reactions. Dr Begg reported 19 cases of meningococcal meningitis identified in one area found using a British Paediatric Surveillance Unit (BPSU) monitoring scheme, which it appeared was doing more than the government to track adverse reactions.

David Salisbury in propaganda designed solely for committee members, reported that there had been consistent decrease in measles since the introduction of MMR. This reassurance flew in the face of reason as the single measles vaccine had been in force for the last thirty years and had proved to be very effectively used by a large percentage of the population.³⁵

The Chairman, in a further example of stealth reminded members that a paper on aseptic meningitis as a complication of mumps vaccine by A. Sugiura et al, was not for publication. This paper confirmed cases of adverse reactions from Japan. The meeting got through a fog of issues about adverse reactions, all the time stressing that none of the information was to be disclosed to the public

Frank Harris didn't attend any further meetings of the JSCARVI because it was

³³ Minutes of the Joint sub-committee on adverse reactions to vaccination and immunisation. Meeting held on Thursday 7th March 1990 at 1.30pm in Room119, Hannibel House (LOL)

³⁴ Professor D McDevitt, was the person seventeen years later in 2007, agreed by the GMC to be made Chair of the Fitness to Practice hearing that was to try Dr Wakefield, Professor Walker-Smith and Professor Simon Murch, for suggesting that a possible link between the MMR vaccination and regressive autism should be investigated.

³⁵ Further down the line in this ignoble battle, the DH were to claim that the single measles vaccines were in fact unsafe.

wound up following this meeting. However throughout 1990 and 1992 he along with others, attended gatherings of the Committee on the Safety of Medicines.³⁶

From 1990, if not before, Evan Harris's father became one of the tight inner group, who would determinedly defend the safety of MMR, while retaining their professional status and reputation over the next half century. Evan Harris by then a member of the medical profession himself, would also prove to be a staunch defender of MMR and the vaccine industry and when Dr Andrew Wakefield's research began to bring the adverse reactions of MMR to light, Evan Harris came out fighting apparently on his fathers behalf. As Harris became increasingly involved in the battle to get Dr Wakefield struck off or even charged with criminal offences he avoided mentioning his father's role in the campaign to assure the public of the faux-safety of the MMR vaccine.

The simple historical incidence of Frank Harris's attendance at meetings of the CSM and the JSCARVI, suggests no conflict of interest, especially as he seems to have remained quiet about matters to do with vaccination over the last twenty years. However, if it is the case that Evan Harris began speaking by proxy on behalf of his father or even speaking with the knowledge of MMR's adverse reactions gained by his father from attendance at confidential meetings, it would seem that this would represent a serious conflict of interest. Many people have wondered why Evan Harris has fought so hard against Wakefield's science about adverse reactions. The idea that he was fighting on behalf of his father, is an appealing one.

* * *

In 1997 Evan Harris was Elected Liberal Democrat MP for Oxford West and Abingdon. In 1999 he became Lib Dem front bench spokesman on higher education, science and women's issues and in 2001 after a break to tend his sick partner, Liberal Democrat Science Spokesman from 2003 to 2010. It was in 1999, a decade after he left Liverpool, as Evan settled into his parliamentary position as health spokesman, that the old world came back to haunt Frank Harris.

After years of campaigning by parents, the then health secretary Frank Dobson launched an inquiry in October 1999 following revelations that three children's hospitals had been harvesting hearts, lungs, brains and other organs from dead infants with little attempt to discuss the issue with parents.

The enquiry into Alder Hey appeared to be sparked off when Professor R H Anderson, Professor of Morphology at Great Ormond Street Hospital, (GOSH) giving evidence to the Bristol Inquiry³⁷ made particular mention of the Alder Hey collection, of organs and their use for the purposes of study and teaching.

The purpose of the Liverpool enquiry was to investigate the removal, retention and disposal of human organs and tissues following post mortem examination at

³⁶ Wednesday 21st February 1990.

³⁷ *Learning from Bristol: the report of the public inquiry into children's heart surgery at the Bristol Royal Infirmary 1984 -1995*

Alder Hey, it became known as the Redfern Inquiry. The inquiry, led by chief medical officer Liam Donaldson and held in the absence of the public, examined amongst other things, what information parents had been given and what they understood by 'consent'. The Inquiry Panel was appointed on 17 December 1999. The Chairman, Mr Michael Redfern QC, was assisted by Panel Members, Dr Jean Keeling, Consultant Paediatric Pathologist, Royal Hospital for Sick Children, Edinburgh and Mrs Elizabeth Powell, Chief Officer, Liverpool (Central & Southern) Community Health Council.

The Inquiry formally opened on 9 February 2000 at Norwich House in Liverpool. The Chairman gave an opening statement and published Draft Procedures and Management Arrangements. Alder Hey hospital founded in 1914 was probably the largest children's hospital in North Western Europe, he said. The Hospital he suggested, was an international centre of excellence that treated more than 200,000 children a year from 17 North West Health Authorities, two Health Authorities in North Wales and Shropshire, while also providing significant paediatric support services to the Isle of Man.

When the efficient enquiry ended and the report was published, the public was of a single mind as to who had committed the dastardly crimes at Alder Hey, the 'rogue' Dutch pathologist Dick van Velzen, the alleged insider favourite promoted by Frank Harris, was described as a modern incarnation of Dr. Henry Jekyll who, we were frequently reminded kept an 11-year-old boys head in a jar, on his desk, became the only public offender in this melodrama. The papers were to report frequently that 'during his time at the hospital he systematically ordered the unethical and illegal stripping of every organ from every child who had had a post mortem.' So determined were the media to portray van Velzen as some diabolical Dr Moreau that they frequently gave the impression that he took organs from live children.

The Inquiry report, referred to the years 1988 to 1995 as 'the van Velzen years'. But there was singularly little analysis of the decades before. As by the stroke of a magic wand all the hell that had been created by successive regimes collecting children's body parts, uncatalogued and stored in dilapidated Victorian buildings, had been shifted from the hospital administration to van Velzen. Basic questions of ethical procedures were simply ignored if they appeared to reflect on anyone other than van Velzen. Despite the fact that it emerged Alder Hey had been involved in a disreputable trading in thymus glands from living children with a pharmaceutical company, and while it became apparent that Alder Hey also stored 1,500 miscarried stillborn or aborted fetuses without consent only van Velzen was immediately reported to the GMC who brought a case against him. The media remained utterly silent about the role of other doctors and administrators.³⁸

³⁸ There is considerable similarity here between van velzen's case and that of Dr Andrew Wakefield. Wakefield's case revolved around a case study review paper that cited 12 children who had attended and been clinically examined at the Royal Free Hospital, authored by 13 Doctors and published in the Lancet. However, the prosecution argued that no one else apart from two clinicians, inside or outside the large Royal Free Hospital saw or was responsible for the ethical breaches that Wakefield himself perpetrated. The fact that the prosecution got away with presenting this bizarre view of how a large hospital works was in itself a serious miscarriage of justice.

* * *

Within a short time of serving in Parliament he became extensively involved in a number of power structures that determined policy on science and health, and within a relatively short time he had become the doyen of 'quackbusting', corporate science and parliamentary policy making on science. A considerable amount of his kudos was gained from his intemperate attacks on Dr Wakefield and his calls that Wakefield should face criminal charges. At the time Harris was unseated in the last election, he was in an unprecedented position in relation to national science policy.

During his parliamentary career, Harris declared some of his obvious ties to industry: he was funded by vaccine manufacturer Aventis Pasteur as a member of an all-party group that attended a Chicago conference, and the corporate lobby group Sense About Science, funded by, amongst others, vaccine manufacturers GSK and ABPI, provided Harris with a secretary/research worker. His more complex ties to corporate science and industry, remained hidden because the corporate science lobby pretends that they do not actually represent conflicts of interest.

Parliamentary Office for Science and Technology (POST)

What goes on in parliament or amongst parliamentarians outside of the passage of laws is foreign to most lay people, but basically we might see both houses of parliament, the Commons and the Lords, as one large club where people arrange business and push policies and strategies forward. Harris worked assiduously to gain a place in all the parliamentary groups and committees that were of real importance in progressing science policy.

The major and oldest science committee in the Commons is the Parliamentary and Science Committee (P&S), an All Party Parliamentary Group set up in 1939. Harris was the Deputy Chairman of the P&S Committee, a position he shared with Mr Andrew Miller MP.³⁹ POST was set up by P&S, which set up a Charitable Foundation for it in its early days.

POST, the Parliamentary Office for Science and Technology, was first set up in 1986. Having investigated similar offices serving parliaments abroad they tried to get Parliamentary funding, but Thatcher was skeptical and by 1989 even she was concerned about the committee's power as a lobby group. She accepted the concept, but declined to support it with public funding, instead she suggested POST should be established with money from the scientific community, and run as a demonstration project so that parliament could assess its worth. A director was appointed in 1989, to raise funds for the Office. By October 1990, sufficient funding had been raised to support two further staff, one funded by the Wellcome Trust and one by the Leverhulme Trust.

³⁹ <http://www.vmine.net/scienceinparliament/officers.asp>. Last accessed May 2010.

By 1991, funding was secured from the UK Centre for Economic and Environmental Development for another staff member. POST was run as a charitably-funded Office until April 1993, and was eventually accepted into the Parliamentary establishment and funded from central funds. Based on the US system of organisations within congress that give interns a select place and understanding of parliament, while servicing parliament, POST now advertises itself as 'the Parliament of the United Kingdom's in-house source of independent, balanced and accessible analysis of public policy issues related to science and technology.' POST is determined that the information it researches and provides to MP's and Peers 'is apolitical', and of potential value to Parliamentarians of all parties.

Lord (David) Sainsbury of Turville was Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Science and Innovation, and responsible for the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, from 1997 until 2006. POST was then run from the DTI, where David Sainsbury ran pro corporate science propaganda and covert campaigns of all kinds.

POST, now has nine staff members. The idea of valueless information, is of course blatantly absurd, and the fact that POST does not publish an annual report of any kind, leaves the observer concerned about the nature of the information that is being handed out to members of parliament. In fact POST has cornered the market in parliamentary information, either going into or coming out of the Commons and the Lords. 'POST provides information for a wide range of organisations involved in science and technology, including Select Committees, all-party parliamentary groups, government departments, scientific societies, policy think tanks, business, academia and research funders'.

In 1999, the year after the publication of Wakefield's Lancet paper, POST published one of its short accounts of contemporary issues, titled 'Health Concerns and the MMR Vaccine'⁴⁰. This POST news sheet was particularly rudimentary. Written as if no research at all had gone into it, it accepted the 'government' and DH line without question. The two pages of information in the leaflet came to the conclusion that there was no connection between MMR and inflammatory bowel disease or regressive autism. Even the first couple of paragraphs of this 'objective' information is full of problematic and value laden concerns, while the whole of the rest of the leaflet repeats the conclusions of epidemiological studies, which are meant to, but can not refute, Wakefield's case-review Lancet paper.

Background

Since 1988, the Department of Health (DH) has recommended MMR vaccine for all children without valid contraindications. The vaccine contains live measles, mumps and rubella viruses that have been weakened to prevent them from causing disease.

⁴⁰ 'Health Concerns and the MMR Vaccine'. Parliamentary Copyright 1999. The Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA, tel: [0171] 219 2840. See also www.parliament.uk/post/home.htm

Vaccinating children with MMR familiarises their immune systems with the 'tame' viruses, equipping them with the ability to mount effective immune responses if they ever encounter the 'real' versions. MMR vaccine is first routinely given at the age of 12- 15 months; since October 1996, a second MMR jab has been added to the schedule as a pre-school booster. A mass measles/rubella (MR) campaign was conducted in 1994, targeted at all 8 million 5-16 year olds in the UK; 92% of this target population were immunised. The Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) judged this campaign necessary to avert a UK measles epidemic affecting a predicted 150,000 people in 1995.

The first paragraph of valueless 'Background Information' failed utterly to mention the Urabe mumps strain MMR, which had resulted in hundreds, if not thousands, of children damaged by Mumps meningitis and because of which had been withdrawn in 1992, leaving the DH with only one type of MMR vaccine. In reality, the word 'contraindications' is one which rarely passes the lips of the great majority of doctors or Practice Nurses.

While it might be possible that some doctors did ask parents if their children had any kind of infection, the paragraph doesn't mention the fact that in order to produce MMR, doctors in the vaccine establishment overturned one of their long standing rules that it could be damaging to mix viral agents.

Discussing the 150,000 people expected to be affected by measles, is surreal because the epidemic was a PR artifact that was never going to happen, when it didn't the vaccine promoters said, 'that's because we vaccinated everyone'.

In June 2004 POST's 'valueless' information to the countries MP's and any other interested parties, placed the blame for the falling uptake in MMR and 'a rise in measles cases' on public anxiety over the vaccine.⁴¹ The reality, however, was far more complex, from the beginning there were no medical or health advantages in combining the Mumps Measles and Rubella vaccinations. The combination itself was a scam by the pharmaceutical companies and the NHS to ensure greater profits while offloading less profitable stock. It was also another step in a trend towards manufacturing vaccines which will contained hundreds of viruses, that would, according to promoters wipe out almost *all* human disease.

Measles vaccine was actually the only one of the three given on a mass basis prior to MMR. Mumps vaccination, according to Margaret Ewing MP⁴² had 'never been part of the United Kingdoms routine immunization programme' and the illness itself only became a notifiable condition with the introduction of the MMR vaccine in 1988. Dr Zealley, speaking of mumps, advised the Working party for the Introduction of the MMR vaccine in June 1987 that 'if a disease were not notifiable it could be

⁴¹ POST 219 June 2004 (www.parliament.uk)

⁴² House of Commons written answer dated 8th February 2001

⁴² http://www.dh.gov.uk/ab/JCVI/DH_095297

seen as not being important.⁴³ Before MMR Rubella vaccination was given only to women who had not contracted Rubella before they reached child bearing age.

Part of the governments campaign to help the pharmaceutical industry in the distribution of vaccines, regardless of damage to the nations children, was, to make it difficult for parents to obtain single vaccines. This strategy began with general arguments about MMR being more efficient than the single vaccines, went through a stage where the government argued that single vaccines had more adverse reactions and ended up with the complete cessation of importation in August 1999.⁴⁴

Most recently, the NHS and MMR promoters have been suggesting that at the time of the 1998 Lancet paper when Wakefield had started the 'scare' over MMR single vaccines were not available - this of course is a bare-faced lie. They have used this argument to portray Wakefield as an 'anti-vaxer' who had driven parents into a completely anti-vaccine position.

For one of the few times during the whole 'Wakefield' affair, in 2001 and 2002 the dominant media agreed that parents should be free to chose single vaccines. A BBC news item⁴⁵ in February 2001, claimed that four out of ten GP's wanted an alternative to MMR in the form of single vaccines. And in February 2002,⁴⁶ the Guardian stated that around 75% of parents wanted the Government to provide free single vaccines.

To place responsibility for a rise in the number of cases of measles, if in fact it occurred, squarely on the shoulders of the public, as POST does, while simultaneously failing to address the fact that the rise in the cases of measles would not have been so significant had a choice of single vaccines been available to parents, was entirely disingenuous.

* * *

Evan Harris's position as deputy Chairman of P&S, and his leading position as a member of the POST committee, gave him and his colleagues immense power over information, especially in respect of MMR. If you have ever approached your MP about your vaccine damaged child and received a curt and dismissive response, you can be sure that this view - a received opinion - was fed into the busy MP's schedule of your MP by Evan Harris and his colleagues.⁴⁷ Clearly here we can see a very deep

⁴⁴ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/1100489.stm> The Medicines Control Agency (MCA) has outlawed the importation of older, single-dose measles and mumps vaccines on "safety grounds".
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/432172.stm>

⁴⁵ Sunday 25th February 2001 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/health/1184775.stm>

⁴⁶ February 2002 Alan Travis, Home Affairs Editor. The Guardian
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2002/feb/20/health.immigrationpolicy>

⁴⁷ Just before I began this essay, it was suggested to me that I contact Paul Flynn MP to bring the plight of vaccine damaged children to his attention. When I did, I received only the most scathing reply, (below). While I was writing the essay I found that Flynn was a member with Harris of POST and that

contradiction between Harris's duty as an elected representative of his constituents, and his evident ideological views, which he shared with his father, about science and vaccination.

POST is funded directly out of the operating budgets of the two Houses, however a deeper look reveals that some of the nine staff are PhD students working on 3 month placements, and others are funded by professional bodies such as BES, BPS, IFST, RSoC, Research Councils and the Wellcome Trust. Without an annual report of any kind, it is impossible to know whether the permanent staff have any links with corporate science campaigns or, for instance the MHRA or the ABPI. It is also more than probable that organisations like the British Psychological Society that provides grants for interns, have drawn on POST to organise their campaigns against their own members, such as Lisa Blakemore Brown who they tried, unsuccessfully, to discipline for linking MMR to autism.⁴⁸ POST is the hub of information which is spread both inside and outside parliament, and which, regardless of any vote having been taken, carries the Portcullis logo, making it official.

POST administrators⁴⁹ assure enquirers that there is no 'private' money involved in POST. However, David Sainsbury's Gatsby foundation is presently paying for a project to introduce POST-like organisations to some African parliaments.

POST secured funding from the Gatsby charitable foundation to undertake a programme of activities in African parliaments, specifically in the area of science and technology. 'The aim of the programme is to increase members' understanding of science and technology (S&T) issues and their policy relevance, thus leading to more informed parliamentary debate, and more effective use of S&T by committees, ultimately bringing about more effective scrutiny of governments by parliaments.' The programme officially started on 1st January 2008 and is scheduled to run until the end of 2010. Parts of Sainsbury's billion pound funding empire is based upon research and implementation of genetically modified crops, a subject that could well affect parliamentary policies in Africa.

Interestingly, David Sainsbury's Gatsby Charitable Foundation has also recently provided the Salk Institute for Biological Studies in La Jolla, California, with \$4 million for them to study neuronal circuits underlying higher brain function. The

he, like Harris, was responsible for informing MP's of the 'government' / pharmaceutical company / skeptics view of Dr Wakefield's iniquities.

First reply to a long letter from me: Dear Mr Martin,/ Thanks for getting in touch./ While I have many objections to Big Pharma I do not support the bad science of Dr Wakefield. His evidence of a link is poor and the journal who published his findings have withdrawn its support. While we may agree on many things, I disagree strongly on Doctor Wakefield./ best wishes / Paul Flynn.

Second reply to an even longer letter from me: Dear Mr Walker,/ Thanks for further letter. I have had a scientific training and make judgements on evidence not the exploitation of carefully contrived emotions on the basis of bad science./ Paul Flynn

⁴⁸ For the story of how Lisa was hounded and obstructed, go to the One Click site:

<http://www.theoneclickgroup.co.uk/documents/vaccines/The%20Politics%20And%20Commerce%20Of%20Autism.pdf>

⁴⁹ The pleasant and efficient guy that I corresponded with at POST was a medical doctor, but I hope that this didn't bias him towards allopathic medicine in any way!

Gatsby Charitable Foundation also funds the Science Media Centre, set up with Salisbury's help during his term of office as Minister of Science, and employing LM staff which are devotees of brain transplants and the artificial manipulation of the human brain.

The APHG

In my essay the Ghost Lobby, written in 2005, I wrote about the Associate Parliamentary Health Group. While Harris was an MP either he or his secretary attended many of the meetings of this group, which is perhaps one of the most powerful pharmaceutical lobby groups to infiltrate the UK parliament over the last decades. Below I have reproduced information about the APHG from my original essay, consequently it should be read in the past tense, and some of the personalities might have moved on.

The deception of the APHG, begins with its name. There is a genuine APHG All Party (Parliamentary) Health Group in the commons but this is, like other All Parliamentary Groups, organised by parliamentarians inside the commons. The APHG set up by Networking for Industry, however, is an infiltrator, a cuckoo. Despite having the same generic initials as other group despite having stolen the portcullis logo of the British parliamentary symbol, and despite now providing a health issues data diary for the commons, this group is funded by corporate interests, mainly those of the pharmaceutical industry. The really clever trick of the APHG, however, is in having the APHG managed by a group of Lobbyists beyond parliament.⁵⁰

The APHG was originally described in the following terms on its web site: The Associate Parliamentary Health Group (APHG) is an all-party parliamentary subject group dedicated to disseminating knowledge, generating debate, and facilitating engagement with health issues amongst Members of Parliament. APHG comprises members of all political parties, provides information with balance and impartiality, focuses on local as well as national matters, and is recognised as one of the preferred sources of information on health in Parliament. The APHG was launched in November 2001, following discussions with Ministers of Government, the Department of Health, the NHS Executive, and senior Parliamentarians, on the basis that Members of Parliament need as much high quality and *impartial* information as possible, to fulfil their crucial role in the UK's health programme.

The APHG was set up by Networking for Industry (NFI),⁵¹ a shady extension of corporate pharmaceutical interests, and is administered by them from its offices in Southwalk. While the Associate Parliamentary Group on Health itself has all the appearance of being well grounded and exempt from conflict interests, the group has

⁵⁰ In my essay the Ghost Lobby, I called this organising group beyond parliament, a Ghost Lobby.

⁵¹ I wrote the Ghost Lobby in 2005, so it might be that some of the personnel and individuals mentioned might have changed. One thing that has changed is that there is absolutely no reference to NFI either on the site of APHG or anywhere else on the internet. Now the APHG site reads as if the organisation came into being after earnest talks between industry and government and not at the behest of a shady lobby group.

linked to it a panel of high-powered advisors. These advisors, drawn from experts with the narrowest specialised interests, are firstly dominated by Labour modernizers and secondly by Wyeth–Lederle interests. The secretariat for the APGH operates from the offices of NFI and its senior officer is a serving Wyeth Pharmaceuticals Executive, who works with two assistants paid out of money granted to the NFI by Wyeth and other pharmaceutical companies.

The Associate Parliamentary Health Group (APGH) has registered a number of ‘associate members’ or industry backers, including, Wyeth, Glaxo Smith Kline, Astra Zeneca, BUPA, Abbott Laboratories, BT, Pfizer and PRI MED⁵², each of which, except Wyeth - which declares a contribution of £15,000 – ⁵³ contribute £5,000 annually to the group’s organization. The big pharmaceutical companies, all member companies of the ABPI, and BUPA, the largest medical insurance company in England – which in theory would have to deal with adverse effects of drugs – is headed up by one of New Labour principal donors.

The APHG provides Wyeth Pharmaceuticals and indirectly the ABPI with a direct influence on matters of health inside parliament. Since 2002 the APHG has provided an extensive diary, advice on health issues and agenda for MPs who are members of its password secure web site. The secretariat, the advice group and the web site have, in fact, done everything to support MPs on health matters that a good civil service would do, if it had not been dismantled. The only difference is, that whereas the civil service used to be governed by strict rules to keep vested interests at bay, this civil service is run by Wyeth Pharmaceuticals. It has an agenda of breakfasts and mealtime meetings, seminars and talks, in buildings adjacent to the Commons, which introduce Ministers, NHS and DH staff to drug company executives and private health service providers.

The setting up and funding of groups within Parliament by commercial lobby companies, has become relatively common place since New Labour came to power. And, perhaps, few eyebrows would be raised at the disclosure that the ABPI is controlling a Parliamentary Group on Health. However, in the shadow of this Group, Wyeth and the ABPI have selected another group of advisors, who are not Members of Parliament but who, through the APGH, have direct access to government offices. The advisors contain two Wyeth executives.

The NFI web site makes a point of informing us that ‘the officers’ of the Associate Parliamentary Health Group are answerable to the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards and Privileges, which of course they would be because they are Members of Parliament. In a clever piece of wording, the web site then runs information about the Group’s advisors, intimating that they too are answerable to the Parliamentary Commissioner:

⁵² It is not necessarily the case that any of these companies are Wyeth competitors in this matter. Abbott Laboratories has links with Wyeth, Pfizer is also a member of the Rockefeller Empire and BT, for instance, is contractually linked to Wyeth for which it carries out the communications and web site work. BT has been a partner in the funding of other organisations fronting for Wyeth, in particular, The Amarant Trust.

⁵³ The total figure of £20,000 is relatively meaningless. The APHG web site advertises that it is backed by an unrestricted grant from Wyeth and in fact is probably web mastered by a Wyeth partner organisation.

The Officers of the Associate Parliamentary Health Group are responsible to the Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards for the activities and conduct of the Group, and together with the Advisory Panel provide the motivation and leadership that makes the initiative a success.

Most incredible, amongst these advisors is Duncan Eaton, Chief Executive of the NHS Purchasing and Supply Agency.⁵⁴ Eaton has spent his career in the NHS and held senior positions in a number of Health Authorities. The other advisers are: Professor Kenneth Calman, a previous Government Chief Medical Officer; David Colin-Thome, the National Clinical Director for primary care at the Department of Health; Julie Dent, the Chief Executive of South West London Health Authority; Lord Toby Harris of Haringey,⁵⁵ and Dame Deirdre Hine.

Sir Kenneth Calman was Chief Medical Officer to the government from 1991 to 1998. Calman's residency as Chief Medical Officer was beset with controversies, which included the BSE crisis, the biased CMO Report on ME/CFS (Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome) and the beginning of the row over MMR, as well as the Government support for banning Vitamin B6. Calman has served on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization and the European Environment and Health Committee. He was recently chosen by Lord Sainsbury to take part in the Chemistry Leadership Council (CLC), a body formed in 2003 by the DTI and described as 'an industry led task force', which intends to develop a profitable future chemical industry.⁵⁶ One of the many matters on the agenda of the Council is 'Self-regulation', however, unlike the more obviously profit generating roles of the Council, the CLC web site says that for the moment 'Self Regulation is on the back-burner.'

The two Wyeth executives who act as advisors are Bernard Dunkley and Kevin James. Dunkley is also a Director of Networking For Industry and was named as Special Advisor to the APHG.⁵⁷ With 37 years experience marketing drugs, he is presently a serving *Government Affairs Director* for Lederle and Wyeth Laboratories UK, the part of Wyeth which develops vaccines.

Kevin James⁵⁸ is Executive Managing Director for Wyeth UK. Perhaps more importantly, he is a member of the ABPI Board of Management. This, and the fact that in 2004 he took over Chairmanship of the American Pharmaceutical (companies

⁵⁴ Chief Executive of the NHS Purchasing and Supply Agency, Eaton has worked in the NHS for over 30 years. He is former Director of Operations with North West Thames Regional Health Authority, Chief Executive of South Bedfordshire Health Authority, and Chief Executive of Bedfordshire Health Authority, Past President of the Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply and of the Healthcare Supplies Association.

⁵⁶ Calman was given a place on the Futures strand of the CLC, which throws together people like Jonathon Porritt with the Chairman of BP, with the idea of resolving a green future for chemicals.

⁵⁷ Former national field sales manager for Lederle Laboratories.

⁵⁸ Joined the Pharmaceutical Industry with Lederle Laboratories in 1975. His career has encompassed numerous sales and marketing positions in the UK. He was appointed Pharmaceutical Director for Wyeth at the time of the takeover of American Cyanamid and subsequently appointed Managing Director for the UK and ROI in February 2002.

in England) Group (APG),⁵⁹ make him one of the highest ranking drug salesmen in Britain. The previous Chairman of the APG was Vincent Lawton (1999 – 2004) a committee member of both the Pharmaceutical Industry Competitive Task Force (PICTF) and the Ministerial (Pharmaceutical) Industry Strategy Group.

The last report of the American Pharmaceutical Group (APG), *Headroom for Innovation in Primary Care*, assessed the allocation of additional resources in primary care, while arguing for the faster uptake of new medicines by the NHS. On behalf of the ABPI, James has also argued before parliamentary committees for a closer partnership between the government and pharmaceutical companies in trialling new drugs and conducting post–licensing surveillance.

The Industry and Parliament Trust

The Industry and Parliament Trust is a corporate-Parliament partnership designed to increase the influence of business and give business privileged access to MPs at Westminster. It describes itself as follows on its website:

Established in 1977, the Industry and Parliament Trust (IPT) is a registered charity dedicated to fostering mutual understanding between business and Parliament for the public benefit. The Trust is independent, non-partisan and non-lobbying. IPT facilitates educational exchange Fellowships for MPs, MEPs, Peers and Officers of both Houses with a range of companies from different sectors of commerce and industry. IPT organises a range of study programmes and events for companies in Westminster and in Brussels. IPT arranges attachment schemes for civil servants enabling them to see the parliamentary process at first hand in the company of an MP.

IPT Fellowships are given to MP's who spend time working in selected industrial situations. Fellows are given the opportunity to work with a range of organisations - from multinational corporations and FTSE 100 companies, to social enterprises and arts organisations. Most Fellowships consist of 18 days of placements over an 18-month period working directly with industry. To become an Industry and Parliament Trust Parliamentary Fellow, Evan Harris served his time in 2002 with GlaxoSmithKline UK Ltd.

The IPT was established by the Chief Executives of 10 major British companies to develop an understanding by management about Parliament through 'dialogues' between Parliamentarians and companies. The chief executives who set up IPT were board members of a wide variety of companies including Grand Metropolitan, Lucas Industries, RTZ and National Power, BT, Logica, Lucas Industries, McKinsey & Co., ICI, PowerGen, BP, Barings, The Channel Tunnel

⁵⁹ American Pharmaceutical Group comprises 13 US based pharmaceutical companies, which apparently account for 35% of sales for the UK industry. Chris Mockler, a Senior Policy Advisor to GPC, acts as secretary to the APG, in the Long Acre offices of GPC International. GPC is a Canadian based worldwide government and public relations consulting firm with a network of offices in 16 countries and 500 consultancy groups.

Group and Eurotunnel. They also included the usual input of One Worlders through Baron Christopher Tugendhat, one time chair of Chatham House (from 1986 to 1995) and a Governor of the Ditchley Foundation. And the added input of PR supremo for pharmaceutical companies, and the founder of Sense About Science, Dick Taverne, at that time president of Prima Europe and one time Bilderberg attender. One can't help but wonder if Harris's first contact with Sense About Science and Taverne was through the IPT, although it would seem more likely that they had already met each other through the Liberal Democrat Party, of which they were both members.

The direction and control of the IPT is determined by a Trustee Board composed of 11 parliamentarians and seven non-parliamentarians. Trustees are appointed for a four-year term of office at an Annual General Meeting of the IPT, and may be reappointed for one further period of four years. The composition, election and retirement of Trustees are governed by the Articles of Association. At the 2007 AGM Evan Harris was elected as a Trustee of IPT.

The Commons Science and Technology Select Committee

The Commons Science and Technology Committee exists to ensure that Government policy and decision-making are based on good scientific and engineering advice and evidence, and has been plugged into corporate science since it was first set up. Evan Harris was exceptionally energetic on the committee, which folded in 2007 and was re-established in October 2009, following a campaign from Phil Willis and members of the Science community. Willis became its Chairman. Willis is 'a bluff northerner' who as a teenager had a trial for Burnley youth team. Nothing on his CV gives any indication that he knows anything at all about science or technology.

The Science and Technology Committee originally reported to the DTI and David Sainsbury, but now reports to the Government Office for Science (GO-Science), which is a 'semi-autonomous organisation' based within the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), the organisation which took over from the DTI. GO-Science itself 'supports the Government Chief Scientific Adviser and works to ensure that Government policy and decision-making is underpinned by robust scientific evidence.'

The Committees in both Commons and the Lords act as a kind of clearing house for science issues, advice and instructions, which are then passed on to Ministers. The committees represent the beginnings of *evidence based politics*, just as the pseudo scientists have taken the art, the soul and the craft out of medicine, turning doctors into agents of corporate profit, so they are now trying to take the emotion and the spirit out of politics.

On the Select Committee's contemporary web site, its praises are sung by non other than Ben Goldacre, the journalist with a serious identity crisis, who seems to be a doctor, wants to be a scientist, while actually working at the Institute of Psychiatry, and is evidently a shill. Ben Goldacre, says, - 'I think select committees are really interesting and informative, the one place where politicians do what you'd want them to do all the time, which is to say, sit down and have a good think about

policy.' Sorry Ben, I'd much rather politicians were protecting the vulnerable and disadvantaged, while making society work for the majority, with an exceptionally high degree of participatory consultation.

Originally under the Chairmanship of Dr Ian Gibson,⁶⁰ the Committee has been a problem to all right thinking people from the start. Under Gibson, it strayed into the field of ME and then mobile phone masts. In both these cases, after the committee found no problem, Gibson tried to inveigle campaigners and activists to take their campaigns out of the community and embed them in Parliament. He actually succeeded to a considerable degree, and henceforth neither campaign was heard of again. It is useful to look at Gibson's background and track record in order to get a better picture of how in debt to corporate interests the Science and Technology Select Committee is.

Before he became an MP, in 1997, Gibson was Dean of the School of Biological Sciences at the University of East Anglia (UEA). East Anglia was the base, until the mid nineties, of Fisons, the agricultural chemical company. Funding from the company helped shape research at the UEA, more so when Fisons was bought up by Rhone-Poulenc in 1996. In 1999, Rhone-Poulenc joined with Hoeschst Marion Roussel to form Aventis. UEA has had a funding input from all these companies and, in 2003, it was in the top twelve Universities receiving funds from the BBSRC, the bio-tech quango which dispenses massive funding for GM, some of it from the coffers of the Sainsbury family.⁶¹

Gibson himself declared funding received from Rhone-Poulenc for taking part in scientific meetings. In the early 2,000s Gibson was the Chair, and then an ordinary member of the All Party Science and Technology Committee (APSTC), then situated within the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). The APSTC is funded in part by Astra Zeneca, the DTI and bioscience companies.

Gibson was also a member of the Associate Parliamentary Group on Health and a member of the All Party Group on Cancer, which is heavily funded by all the leading Big Pharma names, including Novartis, Pfizer Lilly and Merck. He was also a member of the All Party Group on Pesticides and Organophosphates, which, until they became more focused on bio-engineering, were staple products of Fisons and Rhone-Poulenc. Gibson is a leading member of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, now called simply the BA, which in the early nineties played a considerable role in promoting the 'quackbusting' Campaign Against Health Fraud. Gibson sat on the editorial committee of the BA's magazine, Science and Public Affairs. The magazine is again a public arbiter of government science policy

⁶⁰ Gibson resigned as an MP in June 2009 after the *Daily Telegraph* revealed that he had allowed his daughter to stay rent-free in his tax-payer funded flat in West London. According to the *Telegraph* Helen Gibson and her boyfriend lived in the flat for several years while the mortgage, utility bills and council tax, were paid by the taxpayer. Mr Gibson claimed more than £80,000 in four years, while staying at the flat a few nights a week. According to the *Telegraph*, Gibson bought the flat in 1999, two years after he was first elected. In 2008, Mr Gibson sold the flat to Miss Gibson and her partner for £162,000. Similar flats on the same street in Barons' Court were worth at least £300,000 at the time.

Ian Gibson MP resignation sparks damaging by-election
Daily Telegraph. Holly Watt. 06 Jun 2009

⁶¹ Martin J Walker, for One Click [Realpolitik and ME](#)

and Gibson shared his editorial role with personnel from the Royal Society of Spin, The Financial Times, the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST) – the science policy-making centre of government - and the Wellcome Trust.

In 2004, *Science in Society*, the magazine of the Institute of Science in Society, one of the most independent and radical science campaigning groups, informed its readers of the collusion between Professor Derek Burke, a leading member of Sense About Science, and Dr Ian Gibson, in defending GM crops on the grounds that they were perfectly safe for human health.⁶²

Also in 2004 Evan Harris showed himself to be vociferously antagonistic to Dr. Horton when he attended the Science and Technology Committee with the Manager of the Lancet, Crispin Davis, a manager of Elsevier and a non-executive member of the board of GSK. The two of them had turned up to talk about medical journals but were regaled with criticisms of the partial retraction 'of the interpretation' of the Lancet paper, that Horton had engineered. Horton describes Evan Harris as a 'shadowy presence' in his book.

In October 2009 the Commons Science and Technology Committee announced an enquiry into homeopathy, and the report of this 'enquiry' was published in February 2010. 'Our second Evidence Check report examines the Government's policies on the provision of homeopathy through the National Health Service (NHS) and the licensing of homeopathic products by the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA).' Of course there was no intellectual rigour in this process and even less thought of science. Willis chaired the sessions as if addressing naughty schoolchildren prone to fibbing. His first questions to those who produced and distributed homeopathic remedies was, 'Do they work?' 'Well that's a difficult ...' 'No, I'm just asking do they work?'

Perhaps Willis should have called Allen Roses, worldwide Vice-President of genetics at GlaxoSmithKline (GSK), who didn't need to be bullied when he gave evidence at the Influence of the Pharmaceutical Industry Enquiry in the Commons in 2003. Roses spelt it out in simple language suitable for MPs: 'The vast majority of drugs - more than 90 per cent - only work in 30 or 50 per cent of the people,' Dr Roses said. 'I wouldn't say that most drugs don't work. I would say that most drugs work in 30 to 50 per cent of people. Drugs out there on the market work, but they don't work in everybody.'⁶³ Of course what no one said at the time was given this disparity in efficiency in relation to individuals, the same could apply for adverse reactions.

To counter any scientific 'evidence' about the efficacy of homeopathy, the committee called Ben Goldacre, and the little known Edzard Ernst, the first ever Professor of CAM who knows nothing about the subject. A little like picking Willis for the England World Cup team in South Africa because as a teenager he had shown

⁶² <http://www.gmwatch.org/archive2.asp?arcid=4142>

Science in Society 23, Autumn 2004. Collusion and Corruption in GM Policy: Claire Robinson editor of SpinWatch

⁶³ Glaxo chief: Our drugs do not work on most patients: Steve Connor, Science Editor *The Independent*, Monday 8 December 2003

some promise for Burnley. Inevitably the cynical and equally unknowledgeable media were on side to drive home the message when the hearing was over - that the committee was telling the government to make clear the absurdity of public funding and regulation of homeopathy. Stop funding it, shut down homeopathic hospitals, cease all homeopathy clinical trials, and crack down on homeopathic efficacy claims, they howled like characters trying to escape Bedlam in the 18th century. In a period thirsty for austerity measures, this message is about par for the course, not just for homeopathy but for all treatments, diagnosis and therapies on the NHS.

As in all matters to do with the pharmaceutical lobby groups, the real people who should be making decisions in this situation are of course taxpayers and NHS users and not expense bloated MP's and carefully placed propagandists like the ignorant Goldacre or even Revolutionary Communist friends of Lord Dick Taverne like Tracey Brown, the Managing Director of Sense About Science - I mean, really what does around twenty years in a failed communist cadre teach you about homeopathy? But there we have it, corporate totalitarianism, New Labour and Big Pharma, moving the pieces about on the board in an atmosphere of disguised fascism.

The committee concluded that if homeopathy did occasionally work this was purely a placebo effect, although they failed to bring a horse to give evidence, even though such an animal, unable to feel a placebo effect could have given more credible evidence than Goldacre, Ernst and Tracey Brown. The committee was beside itself with orgasmic joy, when they announced the foregone conclusion of their evidence check - did anyone think that the result would have been any different?⁶⁴ The Chairman of the Committee, Phil Willis MP, said: 'This was a challenging inquiry which provoked strong reactions. We were seeking to determine whether the Government's policies on homeopathy are evidence based on current evidence. They are not.' Despite Willis's protestations, only 3 MPs ratified the final Report of the Evidence Check; that's evidence based falsehood for you, doesn't work all the time.⁶⁵

With POST providing Committee members with briefing documents and with Evan Harris sitting on both POST and the 'evidence check', it is clear that there could have been no other outcome to this brief look at a well documented area. It is possible that there were other treatments, diagnostic processes, therapies or surgical techniques, that a small cohort of random observers might have thought a waste of

⁶⁴ The Committee published 'Evidence Check 2: Homeopathy', HC 45, its Fourth Report of Session 2009-10, on Monday 22 February 2010. The report included the oral and written evidence.

⁶⁵ One of the best homeopathy sites that kept up with the Evidence Check and keeps up generally with the political attack on homeopathy is Voice of Young Homeopathy at: www.vonsyhomeopathy.wordpress.com. You can also access Carol Boyce's excellent biting writing on this site. Here is what she had to say about the ratification of the report on the Homeopathy evidence check:

'The vote to accept the report and its recommendations to stop funding NHS homeopathy on the basis that the evidence did not support government policy was: Ayes: Evan Harris, Ian Cawsey, Doug Naysmith Noes: Ian Stewart. Tim Boswell abstained again? We'll never know. So this report was ratified by just three MPs: Evan Harris, associate of Sense About Science and it's fair to say rabid anti-homeopathy campaigner, 1023 participant and 'senior counsel for the prosecution'. Ian Cawsey – IT expert, who joined the S and T committee in October 2009, just a month before the meetings and yet chose not to attend the committee's investigation – in fact was nowhere to be seen until the ratification meeting. Doug Naysmith – an immunologist – did not join the S and T committee until January 2010 – so was not even on the committee until after all the hearings – yet was present for the ratification of the report. And he is standing down at the next election.'

money, in terms of efficacy and cost, for example heart transplants and chemotherapy, or more simple procedures like the surgical removal of the gall bladder to remove gall stones, when these stones can be removed effectively by drinking olive oil.⁶⁶

The Skeptics

Beyond Parliament, the science lobby groups have proliferated over the last few years. One of the factors that have helped this proliferation are the Skeptics groups, which ultimately answer to the US based CSI.

After he lost his parliamentary seat Evan Harris became President of Westminster Skeptics in the Pub group, some of the other high flyers in the skeptics movement, like Ben Goldacre and the LM leftovers from the Science Media group and SAS are also attenders at these meetings.

Harris is on the large Advisory Board of the British Skeptics magazine, that throws him cheek by jowl with such notable science cranks as: Susan Blackmore, David Colquhoun, Richard Dawkins, Stephen Fry, Wendy Grossman, Paul Kurtz, Andy Lewis, James Randi, Karl Sabbagh and Simon Singh.⁶⁷

In November 2009, Harris attended a meeting 'Evidence-Based Policy or Policy-Based Evidence?' and later had his photograph taken with Goldacre and Professor David Nutt. One of the pro corporate science web sites, Jourdemayne, the banner heading to which reads, 'Superstition, religion & the human condition', often reports these meetings and a wide range of other skeptic meetings.⁶⁸ Jourdemayne was burned at Smithfield in London for witchcraft in 1441; 'Friend to the eminent and educated of her time, she was sought by many for her knowledge of magic'.

Jourdemayne, whose blog claims to report on the things that people have believed in historically and in the contemporary world, is deeply embedded in the Skeptic and CSI culture, involving comments and views of people like David Colquhoun and James Randi. The Blogs links give you a clear idea of the circles that Jourdemayne moves in.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Gall Stones. While I was looking up the url for this treatment, which I first read in a 19th century book about herbal treatments, I came across the NHS site, 'NHS Choices, Your health, Your choices' and read this short question and answer about the treatment, 'Is it true that drinking a pint of lemon juice and olive oil gets rid of gallstones? No. It's either an old wives' tale or a charlatan's trick, depending on your point of view. You'll only end up passing solidified olive oil and the 'treatment' is often very painful.' This is the clearest example I have ever seen of real choice dependant upon good information bring blatantly denied! The best site for this treatment is, <http://www.worldwidehealthcenter.net/articles-25.html>, although Dr. George J Georgiou, seems very conservative with his advice on apple juice to be taken for 14 days prior to the treatment. The two people I know who successfully carried out the procedure did so the evening after hearing about it.

⁶⁷ <http://skeptical.org.uk/news/>

⁶⁸ <http://jourdemayne.blogspot.com/2009/11/westminster-skeptics-in-pub-evidence.html>

⁶⁹ Anomolistic Psychology Unit at Goldsmiths, Dr. Susan Blackmore, Ben Goldacre's Bad Science, Carmen Gets Around, Dave Cole, Dangerous Talk, Good Grief Linus, Jack of Kent, Crispian Jago on Science, Reason & Critical Thinking, PodBlack Cat, The Quackometer, Reason, Science, Metal, Skepchick, Tessera, Weakly Thunk, Dr Richard Wiseman.

In the week ending 15th May 2010 Brian Deer spoke at the Westminster Skeptics in the Pub meeting. He gave a very long presentation with a power-point visual and a few cynical jokes. The presentation, which was made up of his misconceptions about the work of Dr Wakefield at the Royal Free Hospital, was entitled 'Research Fraud for Dummies'; Evan Harris listened attentively.

The British Secular Society.

The New Humanist is the magazine of the Rationalist Association, which carried the torch for atheism and Skeptics in Britain. Paul Kurtz and the US CSICOP members grew out of the American Humanist Association. Common contributors to the New Humanist are Evan Harris and Frank Ferudi, founding father of the now defunct RCP. The Rationalist Association was formed as a charity in 2002 to continue the work of the Rationalist Press Association (RPA), a free thinking secular publisher for over 100 years.

The battle for rationalism against religion across Europe began in the seventeenth century, and has continued with the growth and development of capitalism. Looking back in retrospect, in the beginning this battle was relatively straightforward, scientific and rational knowledge represented the basis for an organised society, scientific skills like engineering and architecture represented the forward movement of society, giving towns and cities means of transport and such things as sewerage systems. The alternative, or an anti-science perspective, would inevitably have kept people living in squalid unhygienic conditions.

However, the contemporary struggle against religion and spiritualism is a hypocritical affair, because now the issue is not the institutional power of the Church in a battle with capitalism, but a battle by rationalists against the personal beliefs of individuals. These personal and moral beliefs stand against contemporary practices being introduced by a post-industrial science led society, corporate science wants to control procreation, and population, while working towards the replacement of human productive workers with robots for example, and so matters relating to abortion, to fertility, to birth control and robotic control of the human subject all become the subject of battles for science zealots.

Inevitably, science lobbyists do not want to have democratic debates over these matters, and prefer to use authoritarianism to curtail the wishes and feelings of citizens. Having preached for the last hundred years that one of the greatest failings of communism, and one of its greatest dangers, was that it espoused atheism and forbade religion, the scientific establishment in Britain is trying to rid society of religious beliefs. This battle has become a predominant battle mainly because, threatened by a society without community, threatened by scientism and a belief purely in the material presence of the human being, governed only by rational thought, many more citizens are turning to codes of life-understanding that hold communities together.

Evan Harris is a leading member of the British Secularist Society, where he fights everything religious, replacing it with the rationalist view. In 2009 he was awarded the Irwin prize of the year jointly with Lord Avebury for their success in abolishing the blasphemy laws. At a packed lunch-time event they were awarded the Golden Ammonite trophy by Professor Richard Dawkins. Those in the audience included, Ben Goldacre and Simon Singh, Lord Taverne, Baroness Turner and many other celebrities from the world of science and politics. The event also celebrated the 200th anniversary of the birth of Charles Darwin.

Dr Evan Harris MP and MMR⁷⁰

If Evan Harris had knowledge of the fact that his father was on the ARVI committee at the time that this committee discussed and wrongly agreed the safety of Urabe Strain MMR, and yet did not declare this, it inevitably throws doubt upon the objectivity of all his criticisms of Dr Wakefield.

However, the enquiry into the Alder Hey children's body parts scandal and it's aftermath, also placed Professor Harris in close proximity to the GMC and a possible GMC hearing at almost the same time the action was being considered against Dr Wakefield, Professor Murch and Professor Walker-Smith.

Following the publication of the Report of The Royal Liverpool Children's Inquiry, four NHS staff, including the then chief executive of the hospital were suspended. The Redfern report was referred to Merseyside police and passed to the Director of Public Prosecutions, while the General Medical Council (GMC) began an investigation of Professor van Velzen.

Frank Harris had attended the Enquiry accompanied by a notable solicitor and his case had been supported by Miss Sally Smith QC and Mr Owain Thomas, representing the Royal Liverpool Children's NHS Trust, consequently any criticism that attached to his years at the hospital appeared to be immediately forgotten.

Harris had told the inquiry, that he didn't remember Ibrahim or any discussions or actions following on from Smith's letter to him on the issue of parent consent, which issue was after all at the centre of the Inquiry. The Inquiry concluded that *'the opportunity to review the issue of consent of heart/lungs at the ICH was ignored. The concern at the collection of fetus for research without written consent was ignored. And Dr Ibrahim, too was ignored after August 1988'*

In other words Harris' odd, unexplained lack of action and follow-up prior to van Velzen coming on post, contributed to the scandal which ultimately came to light. The Report of the Inquiry made a number of remarks about professor Harris' avoidance of these matters, and while not strenuously reprimanding him, they did make comment on his lack of judgement in the last year of his tenniership. At the end of the Enquiry, however, with Frank Harris sitting on the CSM, deeply embedded in

⁷⁰ John Stones article of this title can be found at John Stone <http://www.theoneclickgroup.co.uk> 14 February 2008, One Click.

the GMC and with a new secure tenure at Warwick University, confusing questions of continuity were left unanswered.

A few months after the presentation of the report in 2001, and some time after van Velzen had been reported to the GMC, Liam Donaldson the Chief Medical Officer reported sixteen doctors to the GMC who had played a part in the Alder Hey body parts scandal.⁷¹ It would seem possible that, even with insufficient proof of any offence, the name of Professor Frank Harris was on this list contained. If it was, it could be said that it was in the interest of Frank Harris, in the years between 2002 and 2006, to ensure that attention was not attracted to what was actually one of the biggest scandal in the history of British medicine.

In the event, no charges were brought against any other doctor at the Royal Liverpool Hospital and Dr van Velzen bore the whole weight of this cruel affair. He was charged to appear before the GMC in March 2005 and was struck off in a quick hearing which attracted next to no attention. Van Velzen himself ignored the whole procedure making it publicly know that he felt he had been scapegoated.

Other more superficial ties that might have influenced Evan Harris to become deeply involved in the attack on Dr Wakefield, included his membership of the All Party Group on Autism and its links with the conservative National Autism Society, his links with Sense About Science, which provided a parliamentary secretary for him and is funded in part by two vaccine manufacturers, and finally his IPT Fellowship course spent with GlaxoSmithKline, which would undoubtedly have left him connected to the vaccine manufacturer. These more superficial reasons are quite separate from his much deeper commitment to silencing any bad news about science.

Evan Harris was deeply involved from the beginning, in the campaign to discredit Dr Wakefield and the Lancet paper; involved in a way that is superficially difficult to understand. He says that he assisted the *Sunday Times* in their investigation of Dr Wakefield with advice and an article on the medical ethics aspects of the story.⁷² On the day that Brian Deer, the *Sunday Times* journalist, put the results of his 'research' to Dr Richard Horton at the Lancet Offices, Harris was present, despite not having been invited'. It is in fact difficult to understand Harris's involvement in this early in the campaign against Dr Wakefield. Was he supporting Deer on the basis of friendship, or on the basis of a pro-science lobbyist attached to parliament in a number of undeclared ways, or was he perhaps helping Deer based on his fathers role in vaccine damage denial?

Simon Singh, the newest addition to the skeptical journalists stable and colleague of Edzard Ernst, describes Evan Harris's distortions in the campaign to character assassinate Dr Wakefield as; 'helping to expose *the fraudulent research* that led to the costly and damaging MMR/Autism myth - Evan was the most vocal MP defending the vaccine at the height of the media scare.'

⁷¹ Alder Hey doctors cited, *The Guardian*, Rebecca Allison, 15 March 2001

⁷² MMR, After Wakefield: the real questions that need addressing. Dr Evan Harris, Published 26 May 2010, doi:10.1136/bmj.c2829 Cite this as: BMJ 2010;340:c2829

Although the Lancet paper was published in 1998, Evan Harris didn't organise a debate about the issue in the House of Commons until March 2004, six years later and immediately following Brian Deer's article in the *Sunday Times*. As I have written elsewhere, there was a very good reason why these two and others waited to attack Wakefield. Up until 2003, over a thousand parents had been taking a legal case against three vaccine companies, the case had been progressing over a decade and was only six months away from court when all Legal Aid was withdrawn from the claimants. Dr Wakefield had been reserved as an expert witness for the parents. Any attack on either Wakefield or the parents up until 2004 could have been seen as contempt or sub judice. When the case was wiped off the board, the science lobby in support of the pharmaceutical companies and denying all adverse reactions were free to attack Wakefield out of hand, Deer produced his 'here's one I made earlier' *Sunday Times* attack, and all the other bottom feeders burrowed into the silt for their pickings. Within weeks of the claimant's case collapsing, Harris in particular was suggesting that Dr Wakefield should be charged with criminal offences.

Amazing that Deer, Harris and their scientific sycophants had managed to turn round the established legal process for damage to over 1,500 children - including damage from Urabe strain mumps vaccine to which the government had all but admitted - and accuse Dr Wakefield of committing criminal offences against the twelve children cited in the Lancet paper.

Harris's Parliamentary Debate

In 2004 soon after Deer's *Sunday Times* article appeared, Harris led a debate in the House of Commons, under protection of parliamentary privilege, re-introducing Deer's confused and unproven accusations.

During his speech⁷³ Harris presented the case for Brian Deer and what was eventually to become the case for the GMC prosecution, however, as he had done at one meeting of the Commons Science and Technology Committee, he expressed apparently clear doubts that either Horton or the GMC could solve this matter which he felt would be better resolved by the police bringing criminal charges. The core of his complaint against Dr Wakefield was this:

In 1996, and subsequently, researchers in the inflammatory bowel disease study group subjected children to a battery of invasive tests. Those included upper GI endoscopy, which is passing a flexible telescope down the throat into the stomach and upper gut through the mouth or nose; ileo-colonoscopy, which is passing a flexible telescope through the anus and rectum right round the large intestine and into the small bowel; and spinal taps, which is passing a needle into the lower back to drain some of the fluid that bathes the brain and spinal cord. Those procedures are not trivial on consenting adults, let alone on autistic children, who must be heavily sedated or even anaesthetised. In addition to those tests, the children underwent blood tests, brain scans and monitoring of electric currents in the brain.

⁷³ Debate is a misnomer although the NHS and DH was able to agree with Harris, no one was given the time to dispute his accusations.

This was almost the whole GMC case that was later to take three years of hearing to fabricate. It differs from any vaguely truthful account of what happened to the children brought to the Royal Free Hospital (RFH) by their parents in three main ways.

First, it fails to record that the children attended the RFH because they all suffered serious bowel problems and were ill and in pain - within any rational meaning of the words - with an undiagnosed illness.

Second, it fails to say under what circumstances and how many children were given these procedures. Lumbar punctures, for example, are given to all children routinely attending hospitals in Europe and America if there is any suspicion of meningitis affecting neurological performance. In fact, the government had dispensed Urabe Mumps strain MMR between 1988 and 1992, causing thousands of serious cases of mumps meningitis. Lumbar puncture was given to a small group of children before it became clear that meningitis was not involved in the cases of these specific children with inflammatory bowel disease, when this was established no more lumbar punctures were given.

Thirdly, this premise tries to maintain the fiction that the children presenting at the RFH were physically well but had non-environmentally triggered 'natural' autism, while parents of all the children made it clear that their children had developed without any problems prior to receiving the MMR vaccination.

The use of the partial, disintegrated and prejudicial information gathered by Brian Deer in the context of a 'debate' where no one in attendance had the faintest insight into the story of what had occurred at the Royal Free Hospital, was clearly a well conceived attack in the dark, carried out on behalf of the vaccine manufacturers.

We have to remember small details in this matter, for instance that Harris MP, here asking for a criminal enquiry into Dr Wakefield, spoke the absolute and utter untruth that Wakefield had developed and sought the patent for a vaccination which would compete with MMR.

Glenda Jackson the member for Hamstead and Kilburn was the only MP to come to the rescue of the accused doctors and in the short space that she had to speak she made the point over and over again that Harris was not listening to what the doctors themselves had to say in response to Deer's tsunami of tittle-tattle.

Hear The Silence

Harris resigned his position of Liberal Democrat health spokesman in 2003 due to the illness of his partner. Shortly afterwards he appeared in the MMR 'Hear the Silence' debate on Channel 5 along side Dr Michael Fitzpatrick, Anjana Ahuja and Professor Vincent Marks and other rabid 'quackbusters'. While Dr Wakefield did his best to defend the facts of the programme, these individuals tried to ridicule him and shout him down.

The much missed honest left wing journalist Paul Foot, probably the first and definitely the last person ever to say a sceptical word about MMR in the Guardian commented in this manner on Hear the Silence:

Last week's Channel Five programme Hear the Silence about the MMR controversy was one of the best dramas I have seen. It was not just a moving true story, beautifully acted. It was also a shocking indictment of the medical establishment. A group of parents were confronted with the fear that their children had become autistic after having the triple vaccine for measles, mumps and rubella. A responsible authority should surely take such fears seriously and deploy the full extent of scientific research to testing the fears, if only to allay them. The reaction of the authorities was exactly the opposite.

"The one senior doctor who took the parents seriously, Andrew Wakefield, had his research stopped and was effectively banished to the US. Despite his record as an often published scientist, he was widely smeared. Legal aid for the parents to sue the government was cut off.

"On the programme, the two sides confronted each other. On the parents' side there was anguished concern, backed by sober science from Wakefield. On the other was outraged impatience, led by two slightly fanatical GPs, including Evan Harris, the Liberal Democrat MP for Oxford West. He insisted there was no link between autism and MMR, and loudly failed to prove that this was so. Instead, he went some way to proving the time-honoured medical principle that doctors know everything, and patients nothing."

Libel Law Reform

Throughout 2009 and the first part of 2010, the corporate science lobby ran a campaign to change the libel laws. Evan Harris championed this cause with considerable energy together with many of his colleagues in the corporate science lobby. Such changes have of course been much needed for many years. I don't think one of my books has been safe from lawyers letters claiming slander. My book *Dirty Medicine* was almost attacked out of existence by the science geek Duncan Campbell an early Ben Goldacre prototype, with the help of Bindman's & Co.

The campaign begun by Simon Singh, and then taken up by Sense About Science, should not be seen as entirely public spirited but also self serving. The basic premise for the campaign was that powerful individuals and groups involved in alternative medicine, were censoring science with libel actions and threats of libel actions. One only has to think about this for a moment to understand that this is Alice in Wonderland, as one expects of the corporate science lobby the reverse has, of course, always been the truth. Fantasy suggestions about the vicious nature of those who believe in alternatives, their use of libel and even physical attacks on 'scientists', have always run parallel with 'quackbusters' real and intemperate attacks on those who practice alternatives.

The Science Lobby has had to change the libel law so that they could freely use the power of corporate science to attack in the most outrageous manner anyone who has different beliefs from them. The campaign against the libel laws began when

Simon Singh MBE - for services to science education and communication - a science writer, wrote a derogatory article about chiropractic. In 2006 Singh says, he had 'investigated' homeopathy and remedies for malaria, this led him he says to a 'deeper interest' in alternative therapies which unaccountably led to writing a book with the prize poser, Edzard Ernst someone intimately related to CSI, who claims to look objectively at alternative therapies.⁷⁴ In April 2008, Singh wrote an article about chiropractic for the Guardian.⁷⁵ The British Chiropractic Association (BCA) claimed Singh's article had defamed their reputation and threatened to sue for libel.

The first seriously organised attacks on Chiropractors, began in the 1970s, in the US, that became the focus of a legal action against 'quackbusters' are not mentioned by Singh or anyone else in this debate. This isn't surprising because with the involvement of the brilliant investigator P. J. Lisa, who later published, *Are You a Target for Elimination*⁷⁶ the Chiropractors won their legal action against the groups that had tried to destroy them and a great deal of information about the AMAs subversion became public. The following information appears on the back of P.J. Lisa's 1984 book.

For years the American Medical Association has conducted a war against those in the field of wholistic healing. The common denominator has been practitioners and professions that do not employ pharmaceuticals in their practice. The drugless arts have been targeted by the AMA for extinction. This book is about one of those professions - chiropractic.

Perhaps Singh didn't know about this history of attempts in the US to destroy Chiropractic therapy. What do you think? The Guardian newspaper offered the BCA a 500 word response to Singh's article and a statement. 'The British Chiropractic have told us they have substantial evidence supporting the claim they make on their website that their members can help treat children with colic, sleeping and feeding problems, frequent ear infections, asthma and prolonged crying..' But the BCA insisted on suing Singh personally and Singh decided to fight on alone with the support of Edzard Ernst (CSI), Skeptics (CSI) and Sense About Science, the corporately funded bogus charity.

Judge Sir David Eady, gave the first judgement in the case, ruling that as a matter of fact Singh had accuses the British Chiropractic Association of deliberate dishonesty in promoting fake treatments. Of course Singh didn't mean this at all! As he wrote later, 'This is unfortunate for various reasons. First, although I feel that chiropractors are deluded and reckless, I was not suggesting that they are dishonest.' It's always the same, isn't it, as they slip away into the thicket, these people always pretend they didn't actually mean to hurt anyone! I should coco!

Sense About Science, the bogus charity set up by Dick Taverne, became the organiser of the Keep Libel Laws Out of Science Campaign. Tracey Brown, one of

⁷⁴ *Trick or Treatment? Alternative Medicine on Trial* Singh and Ernst. Publisher: Bantam Press. England. 2008.

⁷⁵ *The Guardian*, Beware the spinal trap, Simon Singh, page 26, April 19 2008.

⁷⁶ P J Lisa. *Are You a Target for Elimination*. USA International Institute of Natural Health Sciences, Inc. 1984. ISBN Number: 0866640509 / 9780866640503.

Taverne's insiders and an ex-revolutionary communist, threw in her spinning ball: 'We have to show politicians that small tinkering with the libel laws won't do - we need a real public interest defence. Otherwise, there will be more cases like those against Simon Singh and Peter Wilmshurst, and the libel laws will continue to be the tools of *well-funded bullies* who want to silence criticism.' Brown is clearly referring to the pharmaceutical lobby here, so it all gets a bit difficult to understand.

In March 2010, the campaign held a Mass Parliamentary lobby for libel law reform and the working group on libel law reform set up by Jack Straw in January released their report. Tracey Brown had attended working group meeting, sitting with MPs, in the Commons, despite her background as a revolutionary communist dedicated to overthrowing capitalism.

* * *

Behind the facade of this apparently honourable campaign are years of threats, both posed and carried out, by the corporate science lobby. In the UK, HealthWatch and in the US CAHF, either threatened or began many actions for libel or defamation against very ordinary press articles or newsletters which criticised their censorious terror tactics. As a consequence of the first analytical article about the US Council Against Health Fraud, written by Sharon Bloyd-Peshkin for *Vegetarian Times*, the magazine was sued by CAHF and almost bankrupted.⁷⁷

The legal and quasi-legal threat is a strategy used by 'health fraud' activists to make it appear that it is they who are being maligned and wronged. Writing about the lawsuit served by Health Freedom attorney Carlos F. Negrete against Stephen Barrett and his 'health fraud' associates in North America, Tim Bolen the US activist says '... techniques he (Barrett) and his followers have used over and over against practitioners of alternative health methods are lawsuits, and threats of lawsuits.'

In the US, however, this overused strategy led to 'quackbusters' undoing when the courts realised that their constant legal actions were simply an attempt at censure. In the UK, threatened actions by CAHF/HealthWatch lawyers rarely came to anything because of the high cost, but then, the threat was usually enough. And of course, there are as well the many complaints made to the police, the Advertising Standards Authority, the GMC, the BBS and other practice regulating bodies.

No organisation, not even the British state, is more practiced than the pharmaceutical companies and their science lobby groups. On June 17th 2010, Andrew Wakefield was to address a meeting at a venue in County Hall, a famous central London building. The day before the meeting, the company hosting it was inundated with phone calls from people telling them that if the meeting went ahead, they would be sued and bankrupt by the end of the week. Inevitably the company pulled out of the meeting.⁷⁸ This 'politics of censorship and terror' organised by toxic

⁷⁷ Sharon Bloyd-Peshkin, The Health Fraud Cops - Are the Quackbusters Consumer Advocates or Medical MacCarthyites? *Vegetarian Times*.1991.

⁷⁸ Such populist campaigns organised by toxic corporations against health and green activists are

corporations through groups like the Skeptics, is decades old.

In Britain in 1990, members of the Campaign Against Health Fraud were involved with two cancer research charities, the Imperial Cancer Research Fund (ICRF) and the Cancer Research Campaign (CRC), in a combined research project. The study, which looked at the work and results of a small alternative health clinic in the South West of England, the Bristol Cancer Help Centre, concluded that women who attended the centre were three times as likely to die of their cancer, than those who sought conventional treatment. The massive publicity given to the bogus study brought the centre to its knees, while frightening many cancer sufferers who were using alternative therapies.

While the study was being carried out, a reporter, David Henshaw, researched a two-part television programme about the Centre. Unbeknown to the staff who assumed that the programmes were supportive of the Centre, the programmes were actually scheduled to be shown in support of the flawed research.

In 1994, three years after both the research and the television programmes, and long after Sir Walter Bodmer - the head at that time of CRC - had publicly apologised and retracted the fraudulent research, an edition of *Uncensored*, a throw-away supplement produced by the *Observer* newspaper, carried an article by HealthWatch member, the journalist and writer Duncan Campbell. In the article, Henshaw was quoted, claiming that although he had worked on films about Colombian drugs barons, he had never before received the terrible threats which had followed the programme about Bristol Cancer Help Centre. Interesting, women with breast cancer sending threatening letters to journalists who support toxic pharmaceutical companies; if only!

When Dr. Anne Macintyre was working on a revised edition of her book 'M.E. Post Viral Fatigue Syndrome: how to live with it', she included more information about Dr Wessely's treatment of Ean Proctor a boy who suffered from ME. Although Macintyre used another name for Professor Wessely, he claimed that he could be identified. Not only Dr. Macintyre but also her publishers, Thorsons, an imprint of Harper Collins, were threatened with demands that passages be removed from the book. The pressure put upon the publishers was such that they gave in, removing any recognisable reference to Professor Wessely in relation to the case of Ean Proctor.

Richard Sykes was the Director of the ME charity Westcare, Sykes used the good offices of his charity to support a holistic approach to CFS and ME. In 1993, he put the organisational power of Westcare behind a National Task Force to inquire into the illnesses. Westcare also became the UK organisation which distributed the CFIDS Chronicle, the journal of the major North American CFS support group. The issue of the CFIDS Chronicle for Spring 1994 contained a hard-hitting article written by two British women about the published academic views of Professor Wessely. Looking at actual quotations from Professor Wessely's published work, the article raised serious

questions about the credibility of his views. Before the journal was distributed, pressure was put on Richard Sykes to tear out the offending piece. Being a small charity unwilling to risk litigation, Westcare removed the article from every journal they distributed. UK subscribers were furious when they received defaced copies of a journal for which they had paid in advance and against which there had been no injunction.

Elaine Showalter's late arrival in the ME fray and her impeccable academic credentials did not deter her from entering into rude reposte with CFS sufferers who have criticised her work. In her 'book' *Hystories: Hysterical Epidemics and Modern Media*, which she wrote after a ten year association with Simon Wessely, Showalter claimed that CFS and GWS patients were hysterics, and their claims to be ill little different from those who claimed that they had been abducted by aliens. Showalter also made much of alleged threats she claimed were made against her life.

The web site for information about Princeton University, where Showalter is a Professor of English, included in 2002, along with adulatory items such as, 'Renowned Feminist Critic', information about 'Activist Protesters' who have spoken out against Showalter's writing. A feature profile by Nicole Plett⁷⁹ made much of the threats against her, as I wrote in *Skewed*:⁸⁰

Months before *Hystories* was launched, Showalter claims, a colleague, Joyce Carol Oates, had forewarned her not to go on any book tours because she might be assassinated. Showalter, who is clearly capable of perceiving herself as a character in a post-modern woman's crime fiction, gives a classically hysterical account to Plett of the later conspiracy to assassinate her:

Showalter says her Washington talk was winding down when the young man confronted her. 'He was in army fatigues with long hair and a baseball cap, wearing all kinds of badges,' she recalls. 'He had a bright blue ribbon on his fatigues which is a sign the chronic fatigue syndrome people wear. He turned around and said, "You should have taken your friend Oates' advice about not going on this tour." So I said, "Do you mean about being assassinated?" And he said, "Yes, that's just what I mean." And I said, "Is this a threat?" And he said, "Well it's not from me," – sort of implying that somebody else is going to get you. And at that point my driver, said "I think you'd better leave." And we left.'

So this is what it means to be a radical intellectual in contemporary America – a Salman Rushdie of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome. After all, Showalter, working with Professor Simon Wessely, only used her scholarship and status to suggest that thousands of US and British citizens suffering from debilitating physical illnesses, were mentally ill. For this, frighteningly, she was approached by a man wearing lots of badges and ribbons.⁸¹

The disparity in power between agents of corporate science and those who level reasonable criticisms of them and their dishonest tactics, has led us to a situation common to the rest of society, where the most powerful can say exactly what they

⁷⁹ Nicole Plett. Princetown University web site. 2002

⁸⁰ Martin J Walker, *SKEWED* 2003, Slingshot publications. London

⁸¹ Martin J Walker, *SKEWED* 2003, Slingshot publications. London

wish, while the more vulnerable individuals and groups have no way of redressing the balance.

In 2008, Brian Deer responded to one of my essays, with a rant which was obviously intended to 'create a libel situation'. The piece which has quite high ratings on Google is titled 'Martin Walker, Liar for Hire', and on Deer's web site as 'Families duped by sad smearmaster of MMR fabrication and hatred' here are a couple of excerpts:⁸²

A string of recent outings for an array of particularly sickening falsehoods are authored by a 62-year-old graphic artist called Martin J Walker . . . He claims to be some kind of 'health activist', and, although generally of no consequence, is a relentless peddler of smear and denigration, with a track record of latching onto the vulnerable. These he beguiles - like he's their new best friend - and then tries to sell them self-published books, (*lol!*) or better-still, have them give him money. Bizarrely, according to doctors, Walker's interest in the GMC began some years ago when his former girlfriend ran off with the council's [now-former] chief executive, Finlay Scott. But his recent tirades have focused on me: deploying a well-worn modus operandi - fabrication.

The truth is rather different, and rather awkward for Walker, as he seeks to sponge off families hit by autism.

Can there be many greater moral crimes than this man's conduct: deceiving the parents of disabled children for money? What a way to hit old age. What a contemptible beast. I feel lost in the depth of his depravity. (*lol!*)

It never occurred to me to take any action against Deer for this article, because I recognise in it, clearly the strategy used by corporate interests. It is, however, clear from this laughable item why Singh and the science sycophants, campaigned to have the libel laws relaxed.

When I first published *Dirty Medicine* in 1993, my main adversary was Duncan Campbell, another 'science interested' journalist, who frequently claimed that I was an agent working for the drug companies, while another member of HealthWatch suggested that I was a Nazi.⁸³ Obviously such juvenile mendacity hurts like a two mm scratch on the hard pad of a well walked heel. At the end of the day one has to have faith in what one is fighting for, such as the parents of vaccine damaged children, after all each word of theirs is worth thousands from a disturbed scribbler like Deer.

Odds and Ends of Vested Interest

⁸² Brian Deer responds to the 'contemptible' Martin J Walker. Revised and updated 31 March 2010.

⁸³ This eminent HealthWatch member finally hung himself in a Dorset Hotel room, so meeting a similar end as HealthWatch member, much liked and respected oncologist Professor Tim McElwain, who committed suicide shortly after being involved in the bogus research against Bristol Cancer Help Centre.

On the issue of fluoridation, Harris put forward the view that the opinions of those who opposed it should not be taken into account. In the 2001 Annual Symposium on Inequalities in Dental Health, organised by the fluoride lobby group the British Fluoride Society, and held at Portcullis House, Harris made it clear that 'pressure groups campaigning against the evidence (i.e. putting forward alternative evidence) should not be allowed to veto (a say in) local decisions.'

* * *

It is often the case that those involved in the pro-corporate science lobby, are connected with each other covertly in a purposeful network. Individuals who can be trusted are often farmed out by various departments of government, organisations, institutions and funds. This was especially true of the time that David Sainsbury, the billionaire food entrepreneur and corporate funding organiser was in power in the DTI. Sainsbury seconded barefoot 'agents' to help organise the guerilla forces in the country .

In June 2003 Laure Thomas was Evan Harris's secretary. She was also his colleague, seemingly being given the opportunity to work on his campaigns. Like all good agents she was and is still a slightly mysterious character, appearing to flit between various State funded organisations and Evan Harris's side. In 2003, she wrote an article in *The New Humanist*,⁸⁴ a magazine published by the Rationalist Association to which Harris has sometimes contributed.

In 2006, she was with the Medical Research Council (MRC), as a Chief Press Officer where she worked with John Davidson. In January 2007 Harris entered in the parliamentary Register of Members Interests, 'I have been provided with the services of an intern to conduct research work and co-ordinate a project by Sense About Science, an independent charitable trust.' We do not know whether this was the playfully Gallic Ms Thomas.

We do know that throughout 2007 Laure Thomas was writing film reviews for the Institute of Ideas, an LM off-shoot funded by Pfizer that also organises a web site called Culture Wars.⁸⁵ In October 2007, Thomas was still senior Press officer at the Medical Research Council, where in 2008 she was a finalist in the 'Debating Matters Competition', another LM Pfizer subsidised educational opportunity!

Also in 2008, her job as Press Officer allowed her the space and the authority to conduct interviews on Stem Cell research, one of Evan Harris's hobbyhorses. November 2008 she was still working at the MRC, and reporting on a project that

⁸⁴ Le Pen - Reflections from an Expatriate in Westminster. Laure Thomas, a researcher for Dr Evan Harris, MP, reflects on the shock Le Pen vote from the perspective of a French woman. 2002

⁸⁵ Culture Wars is the reviews website of the Institute of Ideas (IoI) in London. In keeping with the IoI's aim of shaping the future through debate, we review books, films, theatre, art and talk events, with a view to understanding how political and other ideas filter through the culture, and Institute of Ideas. Culture Wars, Institute of Ideas, Signet House, 49-51 Farringdon Road, London, EC1M 3JP. Also associated, spiked Liberty, enlightenment, experimentation and excellence

wedded MRC with GSK. In December 2008 she was again doing a second string of interviews on Stem Cell Research. She was still at the MRC early 2010.

Later that year, however, she was back working for the science czar at the BIS,⁸⁶ which is where one assumes she probably started in the first place, during the high and balmy days of David Sainsbury. The Department of Trade and Industry, (DTI) for a decade the lair of Lord David Sainsbury, was turned into the BIS almost immediately Sainsbury left in 2006. And while it had previously been crowded out with private interests and dirty tricks, it now appears a clean government department, free of private corporate interests.

This short history of Laure Thomas, is clearly as full of holes as was Brian Deer's history of Dr Wakefield's work at the Royal Free, however, the conjunction of, Ms Thomas, Evan Harris, with his parliamentary involvement in health and science, Sense About Science (with it's pharma funding), ex RCP activists, LM and organisations such as the Institute of Ideas and Cultural Wars (with their pharma funding), the Medical Research Council (with it's pharma funding) and the governments department for industry, leaves one gazing into the distance wondering how deeply hidden might be some 'ties to industry'

* * *

Biologists play an important part in the pro-science propaganda industry, because their learning touches upon many aspects of the future science landscape, from genetic engineering of plants to robotics, and the conversion of the human form to mechanical devices. Caroline Richmond, the founder member of the Campaign Against Health Fraud, was a member of the Institute of Biology.

Sainsbury set up a number of think-tank type organisations that were to feed their information back to government, or back to the Department of Trade and Industry. In 2001, Sainsbury launched the UK biologists' Science Policy Priorities. Harris attended the inaugural meeting and had his photo taken with the illustrious billionaire. He was after all of the same political party as Sainsbury.

* * *

In 2006 Harris was on the panel of judges for the Association of British Science Writers Awards, supported by pharmaceutical companies, which awarded [Ben Goldacre](#) the prize for best feature article (2005) for the second time.

* * *

⁸⁶ Laure Thomas Phone: 020 7215 5938 Laure.Thomas@bis.gsi.gov.uk
BIS contact: Laure Thomas - Chief Press Officer, Science & Innovation Direct line: 0203 300 8107
Mobile: 07711 805 026 Out of hours press contact number: 07699 741 220. (2009)

In 1998 Frank Harris, Evan's father took part in the First Windsor Conference, organised by the Nuffield Trust. The conference was attended by select individuals and its theme was the introduction of the humanities into science; someone somewhere must have sensed a problem looming. The four organisers of the conference included Professor Michael Baum, an original member of the Campaign Against Health Fraud and vehement opponent of the London Homeopathic Hospital and any kind of alternative treatment and Sir Kenneth Calman,⁸⁷ former Chief Medical Officer of Scotland and England.

* * *

Some Conclusions

The British Department of Education and Science was created in 1964 with the merger of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Science. In 1992, the responsibility for science was transferred to the Cabinet Office's Office of Public Service and the Department of Trade and Industry's Office of Science and Technology, and the department renamed the Department of Education. During the nineteen seventies and nineteen eighties, from the point of view of industry, science policy in Britain was in a mess.

In the nineteen nineties, science education and policy came under the wing of the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) and from that time, corporate science and its organisations breached the boundaries of government and took control themselves of educating both MPs and the public about science. In 1998 with the New Labour's emplacement of the billionaire shopping magnet Lord Salisbury in the DTI, industry took over science policy. In Britain, greedy corporations met irresponsible government and together both parties began a campaign to deny all adverse reactions or other failings to the techniques or products of corporate science.

With government and corporations organised against the laity, the legal system is often the people's first defence. The United States of America is a large diverse country with a legal system that appears to be able to be used on behalf of the people. On the other hand, Britain is two small islands with a tightly unified and controlling class, and a legal system populated with men and women who can no longer find the word principle in their dictionaries. In the US lawyers have fought for claimants against corporations,⁸⁸ while in Britain lawyers and other powerful sectors have simply chosen to agree with the opposition that corporate science has never harmed anyone while doing under the table deals with government. In Britain health consumers have been deprived not only of their right to chose health therapies and

⁸⁷ Throughout the whole of the report of the conference, including the front cover Calman's name was spelt Caiman, which I am reliably informed is Spanish for alligator; sabotage?

⁸⁸ In the US, lawyer Richard A. Jaffe, has laid a new track in defending practitioners and others attacked by corporate agents. His book *Galileo's Lawyer: Courtroom battles in alternative health, complementary medicine and experimental treatments*, (Thumbs Up Press, Houston 2008, USA. ISBN 13 978-0-9801183-0-8) should be read by each of the two UK lawyers who care about patient choice, actually they could share a copy.

produce, but also their right to defend themselves against harm from corporate science and its products.

The pharmaceutical industry specifically, and the allopathic health industry generally, are worth billions, and along with the bio-agricultural industry they represent the apex of corporate science and the carry round with them a new ideology. It is then hardly surprising, that amongst the industrial and post-industrial lobbies, the 'quackbusting' movement, funded by the pharmaceutical industry, became one of the first to come out publicly in conflict with what the industry considered competitive alternative health therapies and products. This lobby was building on firm foundations, with lobbies and PR fronts having been well established in industries like the asbestos and chemical industries in the 1950s and 1960s.

Looking at the contemporary situation, however, we should recognise that while there have been 'quacks', 'quackbusters' and all kinds of lobbies since the eighteenth century and while other industry based lobbies have tried to stifle competition, in the post-industrial era this conflict has now become consolidated around science, and the issue of alternative medicine is only a small part of the whole conflict.

Most sociologists and political theorists agree that society progresses through 'revolutions', which are intimately related to the way that technology advances and things are produced. The last social revolution was the industrial revolution, which came into being in the late eighteenth century, when machines - the spinning Jenny, the steam engine - first produced goods and went on to reproduce other machines. The industrial revolution came to an end in the developed nations around 1970. It was at this time that factories that had depended on heavy manufacturing machinery and labour intensive processes went out of business, and structural unemployment set in. It has long been suggested that the next revolution in production would be a 'scientific revolution' - a time when science - electrical, biological and digital - created the means of production.

All revolutions which bring a new class to the fore, a new politics and a new means of reproduction, face opposition from those without power who find they have to labour in aid of the new productive means without opportunity to develop their identity. In this sense it could be said that society has always lived in three worlds, the inhabitants of one considering economic and technological progress the most important aim of life, those in another giving much greater consideration to the moral, spiritual and philosophical origins and future of life, with a third swath of inhabitants simply living out the poverty of exploitation.

The first contemporary steps in the new scientific revolution began in the 1970's, and they have continued until the present day and will continue into the future. The initial battles have been fought around GM crops, homeopathy and herbalism, vivisection and animal testing, the extensive use of psychiatric pharmaceuticals in areas of undiagnosed illness and mood altering cognitive behaviour substances, abortion and euthanasia, stem cell research, still surviving religion in the developed world, the development of pharmaceutical allopathy, and such things as mobile phones, wi-fi and vaccines. Unfortunately there are presently few democratic political processes in place to make decisions in favour of, or against, these issues.

During the run up to the last general election those British people who read the Times were advised by a pro-corporate run of the mill Murdoch journalist, Mark Henderson, to forget politics and vote for MPs who represented corporate science.⁸⁹ Rather than politicians, Henderson wanted surrogate 'scientists' in power. That Henderson's shallow intellect could imagine that science and scientists do not have shades of political opinion is bad enough, but to promote the idea that corporations could represent citizens in a democracy, is of course an almost criminally intentioned theory.

Across the developed world corporate science is campaigning to become the new politics. Superficially this has two serious ramifications, first that while they use the word 'science' as if it were a sacred spiritual concept, they are actually referring to corporate science, this means that their new language just disguises old politics; corporations, i.e. capital and it's owners must be in control.

The second matter that is thrown up in this exchange of science for politics is that the rule of science could mean the end of free and organic human society as we know it. Corporate scientists might be good at corporate science but many of them are imaginatively, creatively and emotionally challenged. Science in power could turn the world into a mechanised Blade Running hell. It is, as well, worth considering the presently hidden link that exists between the rise of science and the rise of the extreme right wing groups across Europe. It was after all the combination of science, advanced technology, economic slump, unemployment, eugenics and the politics that grew from them that created the fascism that dominated Europe from the 1920s until the mid 1940s.

Because of the inevitable historical development of technology, the scientific revolution, just like the industrial revolution cannot be stopped. Its crudest mistakes, such as the belief of LM supporters in head transplantation research, can no doubt be stopped at least formally, and their lack of morality challenged. Unless, however, we wish to return to the dark ages, or simply go backwards to a system of production before machines, the scientific technological revolution cannot be stopped.

Those who believe in alternatives, have to keep pushing for these alternatives to be seen in a scientific perspective. Believers in alternatives should evince a belief in science, keep repeating that they are not against 'science', but are against the corruption of science which devalues the human condition, aids the control of citizens and brings adverse effects to health and science, which leads to the scientisation of human life. They are also, of course, against liars and shallow minded propagandists and those who pose as scientists when they are actually only crypto-corporatists, and even fascists.

⁸⁹ 'Pick your candidate, tell friends and family, and set your usual party loyalty to one side. Helping to elect a champion for science, in the mould of Evan Harris, Ian Taylor or Ian Gibson, can be worthwhile even if you disagree on other issues. Voting science is a way to make your vote count'. Mark Henderson, employee of Rupert Murdoch one of the world's great scientists. <http://c0524352.cdn.cloudfiles.rackspacecloud.com/100401MH>. last accessed Jun 2010. Times on Line Wednesday, 31 March 2010 at 23:00

Those who believe in alternative solutions, have to develop the science of their practices, because at the end of the day, while science is a useless life-philosophy, it is the only tool for the understanding of material reality. It is at this point that corporate science will put up the greatest resistance, lying, cheating, and fraudulently trying to convince the world that those who believe in such things as homeopathy and herbalism are irrational quacks, trying to damage the health of patients. But to defeat corporate science and allopathic medicine, believers in alternatives have to support and understand a wide range of life issues which reach much further than alternative medicine. If we are now living in the first throws of the scientific and technological revolution that could result in corporate scientists and their creed coming to power, we have to understand much more clearly their faux science, their politics, lack of morality and abject hypocrisy, and we have to oppose all this with our own more honest morality.

All those who believe in 'real' science, and not 'corporately' driven science, have a grave responsibility to constantly challenge the morality, safety and humanity of the scientific revolution that is gradually shaping our society. There is not only one science, and those who believe in alternatives have to fight for a science that works for the people not only for profit, for real science carried out by socially responsible and honest individuals and not by those tied to multinational corporations. They have to choose good science over bad, science with integrity against science driven by the desire to create a new class of rich professionals. Inevitably, how science benefits society, and to what degree society allows scientists to be rewarded by their creative and entrepreneurial skills, together with consideration of the health damage done by different forms of scientific production such as mobile phones, is entirely a political question. We don't just ditch politics when we enter the Century of Science. In fact we have to regain politics and develop a clearer understanding of new philosophies of social organisation.

An essay such as this often begs the question of how we should confront campaigners for corporate science. There are, however, precise and short answers to this question. The first and most absolute rule is that we must never try to reason with them, never enter into a dialogue with them, but accept that they are our implacable enemies, people who will destroy us and our future if we let them.

The second rule, is that we have to organise in groups and educate ourselves to the enemy; I am fed up with hearing people ask, 'Who are the Skeptics?' 'Where does Ben Goldacre fit in?' Do the work, read the material, watch the videos, wear the T-Shirt, forget about your favourite subjects, the professional focus of your life, for a few days, and arm yourself with information. The example of Skeptics in the Pub is useful here, and our own Arnica groups an inspirational strategy; they must be built. We must aim for a network of groups that cover the country, one that is able to come together for conferences and such things as elections, as well as being able to picket meetings, heckle speakers and publish the truth about their message. These groups have to find slogans that market our cause; 'Our Science Not Theirs', 'Science for People Not Profit', 'Keep Scientists in Cages', 'Homeopathy is safe, Corporate Science is Deadly', 'Corporate Science is not Science', 'Corporate Science = Science Fiction', 'Beware Corporate Science'. 'Science = Truth, Corporate Science = Lies'.

Finally, we have to understand that we are on the brink of war, these bastards are storming the fortress of democracy and freedom of choice, they are the barbarians at the gate. They are the swindlers, cheats and liars, but most importantly they are the harbingers of corporate scientific totalitarianism and the death of the human soul. We have to fight their idea of a feelingless robotic future, a world where the majority are disfigured and disempowered by drugs and environmental toxins.