18th January 2016

GRO-C

Dear Jeremy Hunt,

Thank-you for your letter dated 18th December 2015 regarding your reply to my MP Nick Brown in relation to haemophiliacs infected with HIV/HCV through their NHS treatment sourced from tortured US prisoners at Arkansas State Penitentiary (as proven by lawyers). You were asked in the previous letter to address the Nuremberg Code in relation to treatment of haemophiliacs.

Your letter does in fact strongly support my claim and evidence supported by lawyers that points to 1 to 10 of the Nuremberg Code being violated with regard to treatment of haemophiliacs. I have attached these 10 points for you to address in more detail point by point at the end of this letter.

Let me start off by saying there is NO excuse for the paternalistic culture of the 1970s and 80s within the medical profession... That is exactly what it was a "culture" and one of abuse where key safety information was not only withheld from patients but records show in my husband's case and others he was deliberately lied to and deceived with regard to safety risks relating to the (then) new and experimental factor concentrate "treatment" trialled on UK haemophiliacs. Lies told to my husband Pete, documented in testimony to Lord Archer Inquiry, proven in medical records were to cost him his life.

It was also the paternalistic culture of the day to physically and sexually abuse disabled children with haemophilia at a special "school of excellence" at that time... do you want me to go there too? In fact from school to adult life it was abuse all round for haemophiliacs in those days. So was that culture acceptable also? Do you think a death bed confession from a dying man that he was sorry for not speaking up to protect haemophiliacs at school eased their ongoing suffering? What level of compensation should be awarded to haemophiliacs abused all their lives one way or another? Some of the abusers went on to become very prominent in haemophilia treatment! There are haemophiliacs today that shake violently with trauma at the very mention of that dreadful Hampshire School!

To return to haemophilia itself. My husband's death certificate after autopsy records his death in some detail and went to Coroner's Court... Another failing of the system was that those that had been in litigation for HIV/HCV infection were not told it is a legal requirement after death to have an inquest. Fortunately by chance I discovered this and was able to ensure Pete's death was properly recorded as a direct result of the NHS treatment he received.

The very reason I refer back to the Nuremberg Code was that Britain accepted it, the Code dates back to 1948 and lays down very clear principles with regard to medical treatment, research and experimentation. It supports the Hippocratic oath of "first do no harm" and is the baseline for medical ethics and legislation for treatment of patients. Doctors in the 70s and 80s actually deviated from this and instead of improving safety standards, largely ignored them through their paternalistic attitude. Lord Archer accepted and realized this and the implications and in fact was over generous in allowing the British government a way to compensate haemophiliacs (through parity with Eire) without the need for patients to drag the Department of Health back into court. Yet you chose not to accept this.

Still DOH tries to wriggle out of compensation DESPITE an admittance from a key advisor to the DOH on blood at that time phoning me to ADMIT his own "negligence". As he put it as he is now riddled with guilt at the lives lost. DOH turned us down on compensation "parity with Eire" DESPITE Andrew March WINNING the JR based on my documents and those of Colette Wintle supplied by the Eire government and Irish lawyers. The DOH has still not altered Hansard regarding the lies of Lord Warner and is still relaying a FALSE narrative which is absolutely shameful.

The irony is the UK has now gone a step further than Eire. Let me explain. Andy Burnham wrote to me stating how civil servants tried to tell him the haemophilia bad blood case was closed when he was in the Health Department but when he realized the truth and extent of what had happened from the late Paul Goggins MP, he had it reopened. (I still have my own letters to Andy Burnham from that time informing him of the key issues) but I see he is onside now as he wrote to me so hopefully court can be avoided in his case.

Burnham also used the word "negligence" in parliament, so he is the second person to do so which is a step further than Eire as they never actually admitted negligence. They paid out compensation to avoid stressing haemophiliacs further knowing they would very likely have to anyway if cases went to court. Which is what is written to lawyers from a solicitor who looked at the evidence about UK haemophiliacs in legal files, except it was never shown to clients. So in that respect the conclusion was the same as Eire.

Here are points 1 to 10 of the Nuremberg Code. You must keep in mind early trials of factor concentrates on our men and some women and look at "informed consent" for our haemophiliacs. At that time it was experimental treatment and as my research showed there were heated debates over safety risks given that they were known to be SO high as documented in medical journals of the day.

Tell me... how could anyone give "informed consent" to treatment given that you clearly state, QUOTE...

"doctors generally would themselves determine which treatment option was in the best interests of their patient. They generally provided limited information about risks and alternative treatment options. Clinicians would generally tell patients what they thought they ought to know and how they were going to treat them."

Yes indeed... it was a recipe for disaster and in violation of the Nuremberg Code.... And here it is.

The Nuremberg Code (1947)

Permissible Medical Experiments

The great weight of the evidence before us to effect that certain types of medical experiments on human beings, when kept within reasonably well-defined bounds, conform to the ethics of the medical profession generally. The protagonists of the practice of human experimentation justify their views on the basis that such experiments yield results for the good of society that are unprocurable by other methods or means of study. All agree, however, that certain basic principles must be observed in order to satisfy moral, ethical and legal concepts:

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.

   The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs, or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with impunity.
2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.
3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study that the anticipated results justify the performance of the experiment.
4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.
5. No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians also serve as subjects.

6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.
7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability or death.
8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage in the experiment.
9. During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end if he has reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible.
10. During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgment required of him, that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

For more information see Nuremberg Doctor's Trial, *BMJ* 1996;313(7070):1445-75.

Cite as:

- The Nuremberg Code (1947) In: Mitscherlich A, Mielke F. *Doctors of infamy: the story of the Nazi medical crimes*. New York: Schuman, 1949: xxiii-xxv.

Now to turn to cost. I know the government is naturally concerned about cost which is why Anne Milton told Colette Wintle and I at a meeting at Westminster, the only reason haemophiliacs in the UK were not being properly "compensated" was the "state of the economy". What has that got to do with justice? Anyway the economy has since improved, so much so that David Cameron decided to ensure that war widows who remarried would not be punished twice over losing their allowance, (they will now keep it) something that has not been afforded haemophilia widows that are means tested in relation to any new partner and incredible given the Iraq war was probably illegal based on false information supported by an alleged war criminal Tony Blar.

It is no secret that I write on human rights abuses having lost my career due to years of caring for my dying husband. I also write on the causes of radicalization and insurgency and relationship to US and British foreign policy. Now yesterday I was utterly horrified to discover the level of embezzlement of foreign aid (including ours) by key figures at a high level in Afghanistan. So while the British government denies compensation to haemophiliacs wronged through admitted "negligence" it is prepared to squander billions abroad. Not only that, British aid is funding a system with worse human rights abuses than under the Taliban according to many locals I interview. The Islamic Emirate (Afghan Taliban) are fuming at the contents of this report and that's another reason why they won't engage in peace talks due to the utter hypocrisy of foreign governments. I refer you to recent report, quote

"up until 2014, foreign donors had injected just over 41 billion dollars in hard currency into Afghanistan. However corrupt officials – including at the highest level – embezzled over 21 billion dollars from this amount in such a manner that they have left no traces of records behind.

The majority of these funds had been earmarked for the Kabul security sector such as the training and recruitment of trainees and as salaries for the enlisted men. According to the report a large amount of this missing cash was extracted under guises of ghost soldiers and enlistments.

In addition the 90% of the oil supplies that were imported in the country to supply the foreign occupying forces were stolen by over a dozen supply firms which according to the Committee's report are owned by high ranking army and government officials."

So, you deny haemophiliacs compensation yet you waste billions funding corrupt officials in Afghanistan and those accused of alleged war crimes.

You spend billions on killing people by unethical and possibly illegal drone strikes and more often than not Britain is killing civilians, some poor shepherd boys in the wrong place at the wrong time... or a wedding.

I don't know whether it was Britain or US that attempted to drone IS, Wilayat Khorasan leader, Hafiz Saeed Khan in AfPak region last Thursday but it failed... He is alive on audio tape, furious and now there will likely be more locals radicalized and retaliation bombing... and security in Britain could once again be put at risk by our OWN government. Will the British government never learn?

You destroy the lives of civilians at home, kill civilians abroad and you are NEVER accountable! If the British public knew even a fraction of the abuses committed and billions wasted, they would be horrified!

I look forward to your response on violation of points 1 to 10 of the Nuremberg Code in relation to haemophilia treatment.

Yours sincerely

Carol Anne Grayson (Haemophilia Widow)

Carol Anne Grayson is an independent writer/researcher on global health/human rights/WOT and is Executive Producer of the Oscar nominated, **Incident in New Baghdad**. She is a Registered Mental Nurse with a Masters in Gender Culture and Development. Carol was awarded the ESRC, Michael Young Prize for Research 2009, and the COTT 'Action = Life' Human Rights Award' for "upholding truth and justice". She is also a survivor of US "collateral damage"!