

Tom Lonsdale veterinary surgeon

PO Box 6096
Windsor DC
NSW 2756
Australia

Tel: +61 2 4577 7061

28 August 2017

Chloe Newbold
Clerk to the Disciplinary Committee

Executive Office
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons
Belgravia House
62-64 Horseferry Road
London
SW1P 2AF

By email only: c.newbold@rcvs.org.uk

Dear Chloe,

Re: Lonsdale v RCVS – Challenge to the validity of the 2017 Council Election (“the Election”)

Further to your email of 24 August 2017 and letter of 21 August 2017 from Mr Richard Price OBE QC the Legal Assessor I would like the following points to be taken into consideration.

The Legal Assessor asserts:

The Scheme Rules require that the Committee shall consist of three members of Council who are not elected. It would appear that Mr Lonsdale is objecting to anyone who is a member of the RCVS, and particularly anyone who is a member of the Council of the RCVS, or of any of the other bodies mentioned above. If the objection were to be accepted, it would be impossible to constitute the Committee from three members of the Council who are not elected, as required by the Scheme. My advice is that such an objection should be rejected.

Perhaps Mr Price has not considered the magnitude of the allegations against the RCVS and vet schools in respect to their disregard for the health and welfare of animals, the brainwashing of veterinary students and defrauding of pet owners.

I allege that the veterinary establishment, including the RCVS and the three veterinary schools from which the current panel are drawn, have entered into a Faustian pact with the junk pet-food industry. They have abandoned logical thought and support a fiction that dogs and cats, carnivore species, are better fed from the junk carbohydrate based pet-food can or packet. Their contempt for common sense and common knowledge is shocking to behold.

By way of illustration I refer to the recent video where researchers present the latest ‘scientific’ (propaganda) statement from the RCVS Knowledge group entitled: In Dogs with Periodontal Disease Is Feeding a Complete Raw Meat Diet More Effective Than a Complete Kibble ‘Dental’ Diet at Reducing Periodontal Disease?

The researchers employ defective assumptions about so-called Complete Raw Meat Diet and disregard much existing information for instance from [Australia](#) and [USA](#). However, setting aside a critique of the researchers’ approach I suggest that the video airs three false or unhelpful propositions — propositions helpful to the junk pet-food/veterinary alliance:

- 1.) Veterinary advice must be dependent on extensive (and presumably accurate and unbiased and not junk pet-food funded) peer reviewed publications before a vet or pet owner can depend on that advice.
- 2.) There are no peer reviewed publications on the feeding of a natural diet— the basic reference diet for any species including dogs and cats.
- 3.) Since there are no publications vets should not recommend a natural diet for their carnivore patients. However, according to the RCVS Knowledge researchers, veterinarians should support the feeding of junk food — junk that is recognised by vets (but not doctors or dentists) as being the conventional acceptable standard for pets.

1.) Veterinary advice

So called peer-reviewed, placebo controlled, double-blind, cross over studies are not the only and not necessarily the best evidence for any set of recommendations. There are no veterinary publications confirming that water is wet or that vets, rushing to an emergency, should not step off the kerb in front of an oncoming bus!

Vets need to be, or should attempt to be, logical and to employ appropriate pragmatic judgement in keeping with the standards of society.

Veterinarians should not simply parrot the outpourings of demonstrably incompetent and compromised research establishments, universities and veterinary periodicals beholden to the junk pet-food companies.

2.) Peer reviewed publications

Accepting for a moment that peer reviewed publications and meta-analyses of those publications are of value then it might be appropriate to seek out those publications. The researchers evince surprise that no such information exists. They don’t make any observation as to why there is no evidence. However, I can assure the Legal Assessor that the reasons for the absence of information are various, but include the effective ban on the researching and publication of any subject that may cast adverse light on the junk pet-food industry.

In 1993 Professor Colin Harvey, at that time the foremost veterinary dentist in the USA and maybe the world, attempted to conduct a simple comparison of diet and periodontal disease outcomes for beagles in a research breeding colony. As I understand it Professor Harvey quietly yielded to pressure from his university and the junk pet-food makers Colgate-Palmolive.

Professor Harvey confirmed to me that the adverse outcomes for the junk pet-food industry could be easily anticipated in advance of his proposed study. But he was banned from embarking on the study.

3.) Vets should not recommend a natural diet

Limited by their overweening dependence on peer reviewed literature the RCVS Knowledge researchers advise against the feeding of natural food.

However, just for a moment, let us employ the defective reasoning of the RCVS and the vet schools and agree that no advice should be given about any subject, including a natural evolutionarily determined diet without a mountain of published literature.

If there is no evidence for natural food compared with junk food, then equally the converse is true. By their own admission they indicate that there are no studies confirming that junk food is either suitable or safe as compared with the natural biological standard.

So without a skerrick of information in the veterinary literature and with complete abandonment of common sense and common knowledge the veterinary establishment in association with their junk pet food paymasters promote the notion that dogs and cats must be fed industrial junk for their entire lives.

Undue influence

My challenge to the validity of the 2017 election is based on allegations of the exercise of undue influence by the RCVS.

The exercise of Undue Influence is the *modus operandi* of the veterinary establishment as it goes about its business of fulfilling the Faustian pact with the junk pet-food industry. Undue influence takes many forms of denial, obstruction and suppression of information adverse to the interests of the junk pet-food makers. Simultaneously the vet establishment uses undue influence to facilitate the promotion of junk pet-food propaganda throughout the student curriculum, in periodicals and at conferences.

The junk pet-food industry is portrayed as benefactors to be venerated and encouraged. As such sponsorship monies paid into veterinary schools and associations is celebrated as a point of pride.

However, seen in a clearer light, this flow of funds is ‘hush money’ designed to buy the silence of a corrupt veterinary profession. The funds act as grease and oil to maintain the money making machine for the benefit of the junk pet-food makers and the vet profession.

If the exercise of undue influence and the succumbing to the undue influence of the junk pet-food producers is the *modus operandi* of the RCVS and the veterinary schools and if the exercise of undue influence is of so little account to them then it appears impossible for members of those organisations to guarantee the necessary impartiality and independence.

Individual veterinarians

The individual veterinarians tasked with assessing my Challenge against the exercise of Undue Influence in the 2017 election are active members and supporters of the establishment — the establishment that succumbs to undue influence and uses undue influence as a tool.

Professor Richard Hammond

Professor Hammond had the good grace to say that he felt a conflict existed as per his statement:

Bristol Veterinary School has previously received funding for research from pet food manufacturers as either the parent company or their subsidiary. Although I have not personally received or directly benefited from those funds, as Head of School I am ultimately responsible for approving the application and receipt of those funds and the research conducted based on that funding.

Second, as CEO of Langford Vets (a wholly owned subsidiary of the University), I approve the sale of prescription pet food to our clients for animals under our care. This is no different to any commercial practice.

Implicit in his comments, Professor Hammond sees no shame in being part of a veterinary establishment that I say is engaged in widespread cruelty and fraud as a result of its pact with the junk pet-food industry.

Professor Hammond does point to the acceptance of what I term ‘hush money’ from the junk pet-food makers. Of course there is an implicit assumption that besides doing ‘research’ for the junk food makers, the Bristol students are taught that junk food is the best sustenance for dogs and cats.

In respect to Professor Hammond’s comments about the sale of ‘prescription pet food’ he appears ignorant and dismissive of the known massive adverse effects of junk pet food. His suggestion that ‘this is no different to any commercial practice’ suggests a woeful herd mentality where ‘everyone is doing it, so it must be OK’.

Clearly then, as an active member of the Bristol University brainwashing machine Professor Hammond reveals his fundamental ignorance of the plight of pets, vet students and the pet owning public. He reveals his predetermined views on my campaign and as such I strongly oppose his sitting in judgement on my allegations of Undue Influence in the 2017 election.

Professor James Wood

I’m informed that Professor Wood sees no conflict in his role on the Challenge Committee.

Over the years I have indicated that I believe that Cambridge University Veterinary School and the RCVS corruptly foster the junk pet-food industry. His position at Cambridge is little different to that of Professor Hammond at Bristol. Clearly Professor Wood overlooks serious conflicts of interest.

I believe that the Legal Assessor should ask Professor Wood to recuse himself due to his, Professor Wood’s predetermined views.

Dr Elaine Acaster

I’m informed that Dr Acaster sees no conflict in her role on the Challenge Committee.

A 2014 [internet entry](#) for Dr Elaine Acaster states:

A recently-retired Royal Veterinary College (RVC) Vice Principal received an OBE in the New Year Honours. Elaine Acaster, who retired from the role of Vice Principal for Strategy and Governance last autumn, received the award for services to higher education.

Clearly Dr Acaster has been, and one can assume still is, a loyal servant and supporter of the Royal Veterinary College, University of London — my *alma mater* that I allege is seriously corrupt.

In my view Dr Acaster is seriously conflicted and the Legal Assessor should ask her to recuse herself from the Committee.

Conclusion

Mr Price, the Legal Assessor, reminds us that the RCVS Election Scheme calls for a Committee of three Councillors who are not elected. However, I submit that those who framed the Scheme would likely not have anticipated the wide ranging allegations forming the basis of my Challenge.

I'm not a lawyer but am aware of the Latin phrase: *Nemo iudex in causa sua*.

I also believe that other acts and statutes, for instance those regarding conflict of interest and natural justice, likely take precedence over the RCVS Election Scheme.

Accordingly I suggest that the Committee could delegate its functions to three separate members from other professions or walks of life.

I do hope that the Mr Price will give my comments close and serious attention.

With thanks.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Lonsdale