

4 March 2009

THE ONE CLICK GROUP REPOSE Professor David Salisbury Threatens Legal Action



From Left: Professor David Salisbury, Head of Immunisation
One Click Group Director Jane Bryant

For The Attention Of:
Professor David Salisbury
Messrs. Blake Laphom, Solicitors



One Click Group Director Jane Bryant writes: "Firstly, I would like to thank the many friends of One Click for their assistance in the composition of this Open Letter in answer to the litigation threatened against our pressure group by Professor David Salisbury, Head of Immunisation at the UK Department of Health. From the satire to the serious, your creative and constructive proposals from around the world have informed this response. I would also like to personally thank Professor David Salisbury for supporting the wide reach of the material published by One Click. As his solicitors write: *'The postings on the website have a wide circulation....'* Such a ringing endorsement from one such as Professor Salisbury is always welcome. Thank you."

Introduction

On 26 February 2009, Professor David Salisbury, Head of Immunisation at the UK Department of Health, instructed Blake Laphom, a firm of solicitors based in Eastleigh, to initiate legal proceedings against The One Click Group unless we comply with the following: The removal from our website of the [MMR Vaccine – GMC Formal Complaint](#) submitted to the General Medical Council by grandfather Bill Welsh and the article entitled [To Encourage the Others](#) written by investigative writer Martin J Walker. Salisbury not only wants these evidence based factual documents removed from the website, he also wants One Click to apologise to him for having the temerity to publish them. Both these papers deal with vaccine damage that has now reached epidemic proportions in Britain and around the world today.

One Click Response

A most appropriate response to Salisbury's litigation threat would be to take a leaf out of the long and honourable tradition started by satirical magazine *Private Eye*. When confronted with such legal threats, the then *Private Eye* Editor, Richard Ingrams, apparently took up a chunky red felt tip pen, diagonally scrawled the equivalent of 'Go Forth And Multiply' all over the legal papers and sent them back to the solicitors in question by return ☺. For our international readers unfamiliar with the short form of the vernacular, the verbatim first word starts with F and the second, with O.

Since David Salisbury (forever henceforth to be tagged as Outraged of Eastleigh by us due to his solicitor location) has elected to deliver his litigious missive to One Click by email alone rather than by post, this opportunity has been denied us and so it is via the internet currency selected by Salisbury that One Click will respond.

According to his 26 February letter, Outraged of Eastleigh seems particularly piqued that upon One Click's publication of Bill Welsh's *MMR Vaccine – GMC Formal Complaint* published on 9 January 2009 and Martin Walker's *To Encourage the Others* article on 12 January 2009, we did not give him the Right of Reply.

His Eastleigh based solicitors write on Outraged's behalf:

"Your website did not ask for any comment from our client before publishing the complaint. Therefore our client was not given the opportunity to address his well founded concern about the publication of the details of a complaint made to the GMC [General Medical Council]. As a matter of good practice this complaint should not have been published on the internet prior to it being considered by the GMC."

We beg to differ. As a matter of fact, the GMC **had** already formally responded to Mr. Welsh and his GMC Complaint prior to One Click's publication of the contents. We know because Mr. Welsh advised us of this in writing whilst requesting that we publish his offering. But one should never let the facts get in the way of a good Outraged of Eastleigh solicitor's letter though, eh?

As a matter of fact, One Click would have been delighted to offer Salisbury a Right of Reply had he requested it and indeed it is highly unusual for Salisbury to be shy of speaking up at the back. You only had to ask, old boy. You most certainly know where we are.

Instead, Salisbury has elected to despatch a solicitor's letter threatening all sorts. Headed '*Not For Publication*', the letter states amongst its four page offerings: "*We reserve the right to show this letter to the Court on the question of costs...*" What is good enough to be displayed in the public courts is certainly good enough for One Click Readers and Contributors to see too. Furthermore, it seems rather unfair for Salisbury to want to carry out his legal bullying behind closed doors.

One Clickers simply cannot believe that Salisbury did not want us to publish his letter and therefore despite it being headed '*Not For Publication*' we are publishing Outraged of Eastleigh's Right of Reply for this is what it amounts to. There is absolutely no legal impediment in so doing.

See [Professor David Salisbury Threatens One Click](#)

We will leave the two named documents in question to do the rebuttal.



**From Left: Grandfather Bill Welsh
Investigative writer Martin J Walker**

Next Steps

What is Salisbury planning to do? Launch suits against every portal in the world that has carried this material that he so much detests or any reference or link to it? Have a go at all the Blogs? Try to force that from Timbuktu to Alaska and beyond, these documents and all references to them **MUST BE TAKEN DOWN** from Blogs and websites around the world? Outraged of Eastleigh, we wish you all the best with this. Of course you realise that by adopting this approach, these documents could well become the cause celebre of 2009? That around the world, people who'd never really heard of these documents before would certainly hear about this? Backed by court action this has the potential to go nuclear.

Fully in line with the principle of open dialogue and Right of Reply perhaps in David Salisbury's next letter to us as Outraged of Eastleigh despatched by his lawyers, he might care to make comment on the following. It's not just the MMR vaccine that he's got to worry about.

- "It has recently been announced that the US vaccine court awarded damages to a ten year-old child, Bailey Banks, who it said had developed acute brain damage involving autistic spectrum disorder as a result of his MMR vaccination. The ruling was unequivocal. It concluded from the evidence provided by a full neurological examination of the child 16 days after his MMR vaccination that the jab had caused Acute Disseminated Encephalomyelitis (ADEM) which in turn had led to Pervasive Developmental Delay, a disorder on the autistic spectrum. It also turns out from this ruling that the vaccine court had heard two previous cases where the Special Master had found that the MMR vaccine had caused Acute Disseminated Encephalomyelitis."

[Another ruling in the US vaccine court](#), Melanie Phillips, *The Spectator*

- Published in [The Health Protection \(Vaccination\) Regulations 2009 \(No. 38\)](#) is the edict that in the future, as of 4 April start date, it will be the Obligation on the Secretary of State to ensure implementation of Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) recommendations. This says: *"The Secretary of State must make arrangements to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that the recommendation of the JCVI is implemented."* So the Secretary of State will have to take orders from an unelected committee long recognised as dealing with commercial matters, and well known for turning a blind eye to adverse reactions despite having a sub committee with the sole purpose of discussing them. None of this has been discussed openly through the proper parliamentary channels. Could this deceptive move be paving the way for forced vaccination UK, by stealth?

- A 2007 analysis of HPV vaccine Gardasil adverse event reports revealed that there have been at least 3,461 complaints of adverse reactions and eight deaths. The 'side effects' reports also included 28 women who miscarried. Other side effects reported to the FDA included paralysis, Bells Palsy, Guillain-Barre Syndrome, and seizures were also reported. Three young women in the US died shortly after receiving Gardasil, while two other women in Europe also died after the vaccine was administered.
- Cervarix, GSK's cervical cancer vaccine, is now being administered in the UK to girls as young as 11 after the company won a lucrative [`£100m a year supply contract with the UK Department of Health'](#). HPV vaccines are a cause for concern for many parents after the number of deaths and adverse effects associated with administration of the leading competitor, Gardasil. In addition, it is not comforting that the clinical trial data for Cervarix has been compiled for female adolescents and women significantly older (e.g. age 15-25) than the target market (girls as young as 11). This Cervarix vaccine contains a completely novel combination adjuvant system whose safety and efficacy, prior to its introduction, was completely untested on the girls destined to receive it. See [Cervarix HPV Vaccine And The ASO4 Novel Adjuvant System](#), 7 October 2008. How can it be that the UK Department of Health is spending £100m of taxpayer's money on a vaccine that has not been tested properly and has the developing evidence base of causing harm and death in ever-increasing numbers? Why don't you pump more money into the perfectly good facilities already set up around Britain for smear tests and general better sexual health? Why are you spending £100m of our money on this damaging vaccine that does not fulfil the criteria of 'unmet need'?
- In view of the recent withdrawal of 76,000 doses of the Gardasil HPV vaccine by the Spanish Health Authorities, is the Department of Health going to review the safety of its recent programme of HPV immunisation in the UK? (See [Reuters report](#)). In view of your Department's mass-HPV-vaccination policy, do you have any plans to advise UK parents of the reports coming out about HPV vaccines so that they are more able to reach a balanced conclusion about the safety of this vaccination and whether they should, or should not, vaccinate their children?

Let us also not forget about the 17,000 doses of the toxic Meningitis C vaccine contaminated with a version of MRSA despatched to GP surgeries across the land last week. Oh yes, and the chicken pox vaccine that you are proposing to include with the MMR jab that according to reports, is set to increase the incidence of Shingles by 50%. Do you not think that you have enough problems with the controversy and litigation swirling over the MMR vaccine already? Chickenpox in children is generally very mild. Shingles by contrast is at best absolutely awful to endure and at worst, can lead to brain damage and death. Shingles is never mild. Questions about vaccine safety are increasing every day.

There are so many issues that One Click will be more than happy to debate in public with David Salisbury. The link between Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS) and vaccines is definitely one of our top agenda items. Outraged of Eastleigh, we look forward to receiving your Right of Reply on all the above.

Conclusion

On One Click we defend the right of Free Speech. We defend the right to publish formal complaints delivered to the General Medical Council subsequent to their formal response and we defend the right to publish evidence based articles and place them in the public domain. We will not be removing the aforementioned articles from the website and we will not be apologising for publishing them. These items have been published, referred to and linked by websites and blogs around the world and are common currency readily available to all.

One of the dangers for Professor David Salisbury, as we are sure his solicitors will advise, is that if he is so foolish as to want to take on a Mother and her sick child in litigation for being named as owning a website that publishes evidence based information over the vaccines controversy, amongst the many other health advocacy issues covered by One Click, he will end up looking like the defendant rather than the plaintiff.

Commenting on vaccines, Dr Peter Fletcher, former Chief Scientific Officer at the Department of Health, said: *"The refusal by governments to evaluate the risks properly will make this one of the greatest scandals in medical history. There are very powerful people in positions of great authority who have staked their reputations on the safety of MMR and they are willing to do almost anything to protect themselves."*

Jane Bryant states: *"I will not be bullied by David Salisbury. One Click will not grovel to him under duress. I predict that if this case comes to court, it will serve to lift the lid on the UK vaccination policy with the attendant media coverage such as nothing else could possibly do so effectively."*

Salisbury's proposed legal action against One Click, as just one of the internet publishers of these documents, will provide the greatest house cleaning service of the activities of the vaccine industry ever. It is far better than any other initiative that we could possibly have devised.

One Click to Outraged of Eastleigh: If you absolutely insist on this course of legal action, Game On. We'll die all over your shoes and cost you millions. Alternatively, One Click is more than happy to provide you with Right of Reply any time. In fact, I think that it is safe to say that we all positively look forward to opening a mutually beneficial dialogue at minimal cost on a range of vaccine issues that concern people around the world today.

Could we please have your Right of Reply copy in by next week in regard to the aforementioned?

Cheers!

The One Click Group
4 March 2009

Related Links:

* [Concerns Growing About Vaccines](#)

The One Click Group/Holly Richards, Zanesville Times Recorder

* [Grandad jabs at top doctors over MMR vaccine](#)

Phil Doherty, The Sunday Sun

* [Angry grandad drags top docs before GMC](#)

Janet Boyle, The Sunday Post