Questions for Dean of Veterinary Faculty for NCAT Hearing

Date: Sun, 26 Jul 2015 20:37:07 +1000
To: "Rosanne Taylor" <rosanne.taylor@sydney.edu.au>, <sarah.heesom@optusnet.com.au>
From: Tom Lonsdale <tom@rawmeatybones.com>
Subject: RE: RMB Newsletter 10:3 Conniving Veterinary Establishment
Cc: cathy.mcinnes@ipc.nsw.gov.au, aeod@ncat.nsw.gov.au, chancellor@usyd.edu.au, complaints@teqsa.gov.au, c.pyne.mp@aph.gov.au, senator.carr@aph.gov.au, senator.dinatale@aph.gov.au, office@piccoli.minister.nsw.gov.au, canterbury@parliament.nsw.gov.au
Bcc: *f*\RMB list\CVE,

Dear Professor Taylor,

Thank you for your letter of 2/08/2010 below.

I propose to tender the letter in evidence to NCAT.

Additionally, NCAT provides for the voluntary production of documents without need for summons. Accordingly I seek your responses to the five listed categories below.

1.) Suitability and safety of junk pet-food sold and promoted by Sydney University
Nowadays junk food feeding of pets is the norm, largely I believe, due to the active endorsement by vets and the training vets receive in vet school. Despite this widespread acceptance, I am unaware of any long term comparative trials demonstrating the *suitability* and *safety* of junk food as compared with the natural standard as determined by evolution.

I believe that the onus of proof lies with veterinary schools to clearly demonstrate that their recommendations are backed by sound evidence as opposed to secret deals with financial backers. In respect to the general recommendations made by Sydney University Veterinary School and in respect to *particular recommendations relating to the products of its junk pet-food company sponsors* please supply your evidence:

> 1.) Processed dry dog and cat food should be fed as per label claims and is *suitable for purpose* of feeding every day for life without risk of ill-health or suffering and as compared with the natural standard.
> 2.) Processed dry dog and cat food should be fed as per label claims and is *safe for purpose* of feeding every day for life without risk of ill-health or suffering and as compared with the natural standard.
> 3.) Processed canned dog and cat food should be fed as per label claims and is *suitable for purpose* of feeding every day for life without risk of ill-health or suffering and as compared with the natural standard.
> 4.) Processed canned dog and cat food should be fed as per label claims and is *safe for purpose* of feeding every day for life without risk of ill-health or suffering and as compared with the natural standard.

2.) Alleged increase in life-expectancy of junk pet-food fed pets
There is a general view, put about by veterinarians, that junk food, especially the junk food

sold by your sponsors and promoted by you, increases the health and life expectancy of pet dogs and cats.
If you make such claims or your sponsors make such claims or you teach your students such information please supply any evidence you rely upon, in particular by long term comparison with dogs and cats fed a natural diet.

Ideally the evidence you rely upon in your teaching and promotional activities will be from respected independent researchers and research institutions who have no current or past financial or other ties with junk pet-food makers.

3.) Artificial dental hygiene products
I note that your veterinary clinic sells and promotes various manufactured products purported to carry dental hygiene benefits, some of which are produced by your sponsor the Mars Corporation. Hill's, I believe, market a junk food purported to clean teeth. As you know, dogs and cats are designed to consume natural tough chewy food and thus simultaneously clean their teeth and massage their gums.

The need for dental hygiene aids bespeaks a failure on the part of the junk food fed to animals and recommended by you and your sponsors. Dental disease is serious in its own right and is the precursor of many systemic life threatening diseases of man and animals.

Please supply all evidence that the artificial dental products sold and promoted by you are efficacious in long term trials as compared with the natural raw meaty bones evolutionary standard.

4.) Photos and film of junk pet-food displays, posters and logos
Whether in compliance with secret arrangements with your sponsors or for other commercial/educational/scientific reasons your veterinary teaching hospital and clinic carries extensive displays of junk pet-food and other artificial products. The walls and consulting room doors carry junk pet-food logos and advertising posters.

I believe it will be helpful to NCAT to see all such evidence. Accordingly I request permission to take photos and film all veterinary faculty consulting rooms and public areas where such displays are on view to the public at both Camperdown and Camden campuses. If there are areas where only the students and staff see the advertising material, then I would appreciate to film those areas too.

5.) Annual accounts
So that NCAT may gain an appreciation of the magnitude of the issues I would appreciate to see the last full financial year's veterinary faculty accounts. Please ensure that the accounts cover all aspects of teaching, research, clinic and Centre for Veterinary Education. Please mark the accounts to show precisely the amounts of pet-food company funding and to which departments those funds are directed.

In keeping with NCAT summons time frames, your prompt response within five working days would be appreciated.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Lonsdale
PO Box 6096
Windsor DC
NSW 2756
==========
==========

At 10:15 AM 2/08/2010, you wrote:

Mr Lonsdale

This is a totally inappropriate use of our internal Faculty staff email address.

Do not send your newsletter unsolicited, to the Faculty staff or students again.

regards,
Rosanne

Rosanne Taylor | Dean
Faculty of Veterinary Science
THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY
Rm 204, JD Stewart Bld B01 | The University of Sydney | NSW | 2006

T +61 2 9351 6936 +61 2 9351 6936 | **F** +61 2 9351 3056
E **vetscience.dean@sydney.edu.au** | **W** **http://sydney.edu.au**

==========
==========

From: Tom Lonsdale [mailto:tom@rawmeatybones.com]
Sent: Monday, 2 August 2010 10:04 AM
To: vetstaff@vetsci.usyd.edu.au
Subject: RMB Newsletter 10:3 Conniving Veterinary Establishment

Dear Reader,

How's things in your neck of the woods? I trust you and your carnivore companions are well and enjoying life.

How time flies! Back in April my wife, stepdaughter and I were treated to fine hospitality during a two week lecture tour of Auckland, Christchurch and Tauranga, New Zealand.

Dr Lyn Thomson, family, staff and friends worked wonders to make the event a success. Lyn runs Raw Essentials a diet consultancy and rmb supply service in Auckland. As the leading pioneer turning feral pests (rabbits, hares and possums) into food for urban carnivores, Lyn

sets the standard. Do check out her website: http://www.rawessentials.co.nz/. There's a radio interview recorded in Auckland here: http://publicaddress.net/system/topic,2424,dr-tom-lonsdale.sm

A big thank you to Lyn, Richard, Libby, Olly, Kathy, Hailey, Conny and all.
.....

As a reader of this newsletter you know that we seek to combat the multifaceted pet-food fraud. You know that:

1.) Junk food (barf pap included) neither cleans teeth nor massages the gums. Foul smelling septic mouths then poison the rest of the body.

2.) Junk food 'nutrients' flood through a pet's system via the capillaries and lymph vessels of the small intestine. Internal organs and the immune system are under constant siege.

3.) Junk food residues sitting in the large bowel feeds trillions of harmful bacteria. Toxic waste products in contact with the bowel wall create local damage before passing into the blood stream to adversely affect the rest of the body.

4.) Arising from the above three assaults on their health, the majority of pets become prematurely aged with stinking breath, vile skin, dysfunctional immune systems, diseased kidneys, hearts, livers and joints all of which lead to a miserable life and an untimely death. But before death brings a merciful relief the helpless, voiceless pets are poked full of toxic pharmaceuticals costing owners $billions.

When you contemplate the suffering of millions of junk pet-food affected pets, who do you blame? Do you blame the dogs, cats and ferrets for eating the stuff? What about the owners? Do you think they should be pilloried for their inattention to the basic needs of carnivores? Do you blame the RSPCA, PETA and other fake animal welfare societies? Many folks put the responsibility squarely at the feet of the massive multinational poisoners: - Mars, Nestle, Colgate Palmolive and Proctor and Gamble.

As a vet who's seen the reality up close, I'm disappointed that pets become addicted to the junk food and that their owners are caught in a trap feeding their pets' addiction. Unfortunately they are easy prey for the cashed-up and unscrupulous. And as much as I despise the multinational corporations, I do understand that they are simply working the capitalist system within, for the most part, participatory democracies. So who do I hold chiefly responsible for the cruelty, ill-health, economic and environmental disaster flowing from the junk pet-food industry? The Conniving Veterinary Establishment, that's who I blame.

World wide, vets are presented with the evidence in their surgeries every hour of every working day. Sadly, though, the vet practitioners have mostly been dumbed down and rendered insensible to what appears before them. They enter the vet schools as impressionable young people and sit with open mouths as they are spoon fed junk pet-food inspired nonsense by their university teachers. Let's be clear: The folks who run the system and place their imprimatur on the mass poisoning of pets are the universities, the veterinary associations and the veterinary regulatory authorities.

In Sydney, a key pillar of the Conniving Veterinary Establishment is Sydney University.

Let's take a look.

Best wishes,

Tom

Sydney University Conniving Veterinary Establishment

Undergraduate students receive a thorough brainwashing in the veterinary faculty of the University of Sydney. Visitors to the veterinary outpatient clinic might suspect that it's a showroom for Hill's junk pet foods. Flashy posters and racks of Hill's Science Diet (Science Death) proclaim the allegiance of the University to their benefactors Hill's (a division of Colgate Palmolive).

In 2009 I lodged a Freedom of Information enquiry in an attempt to learn more about the University's Faustian Pact with junk pet-food makers. The University disclosed that it has a Memorandum of Understanding with Hill's Pet Nutrition but refused to reveal the contents.

Besides brainwashing undergraduate vets, Sydney University also runs a Centre for Veterinary Education (CVE) specialising in the post graduate education (more brainwashing) of vets in the community. In a previous incarnation the CVE was known as the Post Graduate Foundation in Veterinary Science. And for some years the Directors actually lent support to the Raw Meaty Bones Lobby. You can see comments made by Dr Tom Hungerford OBE and Dr Douglas Bryden AM here: http://www.rawmeatybones.com/vetsay.php
Dr Michele Cotton, Associate Director, wrote a review of Raw Meaty Bones at:
http://www.rawmeatybones.com/pgf/rmb_doc.htm

These days the CVE hosts a procession of pet-food stooges who lecture at seminars and write in the CVE newsletter. Imagine the surprise, in June 2007 when two pet owners were permitted to comment about their dismal experiences at the hands of the veterinary profession in the Post Graduate Foundation Newsletter (soon to be renamed the Centre for Veterinary Education). http://www.rawmeatybones.com/pdf/Sefi.pdf

Their cat Sefi was subjected to hundreds (perhaps thousands) of dollars of tests and investigations all of which were shown to be worthless when a junk food diet was identified as the culprit. Familiar story, you say?

Two months later I submitted a follow-up article asking the Sydney University Centre for Veterinary Education to conduct a thorough review as a means to stopping the abuse of pets by vets. In other words, for the CVE to stop their connivance with the junk food makers and their front people and instead of being part of the problem become part of the solution.

Article submitted August 2007, finally rejected November 2008

Sefi's Ear Discharge

Than and Nichola Wright, owners of Sefi the 6-year-old cat, have done us a great service. They are to be congratulated on their stoicism and forbearance in the face of counterfeit science and techno veterinary medicine.

In the June 2007 Post Graduate Foundation (PGF) Control & Therapy 4803 http://www.rawmeatybones.com/pdf/Sefi.pdf they recount the sorry tale of how a discharge from Sefi's ear led them through an obstacle course of first opinions, expert opinions, bacteriological tests, radiographic tests, test therapies and radical surgery.1 After spending several months, and doubtless hundreds of dollars, the Wrights say:

> We were highly concerned and frustrated at the lack of progress we had made and the costs outlaid which had provided no answers as to why she had the condition or what was causing it. As a last resort, our vet told us about Dr Richard Malik at the PGF.

Dr Malik recommended that the owners discontinue feeding the prescription dry cat 'food' and provide a more natural diet which straightaway had the desired effect: 'After changing her diet, it didn't take long for us to see a rapid improvement in the condition of her ear and the happiness of our cat.'

In conclusion the Wrights state:

> We have learnt that while our vet went through appropriate routine testing to find the cause of Sefi's ear problems, there isn't always an obvious diagnosis and factors such as diet and environment should be investigated in the first instance.

Let's face it, we all make mistakes from which we can hope to learn. The discharge from Sefi's ear contains lessons old and new.

At the 1993 Australian Veterinary Association (AVA) Annual General Meeting the members approved the then PGF Director, Dr Douglas Bryden's motion:

> That in keeping with the AVA policy of providing forums for the membership, the AVA establish an independent committee to prepare a report on the interaction between diet and disease in companion animals.2

In the event the AVA Executive restricted the terms of reference to an investigation of existing literature on the diet and periodontal disease nexus. The committee was 'assisted' by a pet-food company employee. Notwithstanding, in February 1994 AVA News carried the front page article:

Diet and disease link -- final report

In summary the committee found, 'there is sufficient evidence to incriminate an association between diets of predominantly soft consistency and periodontal disease' and that veterinarians "need to be concerned about the relationship between diet and health".

The reasons for restricting the terms of reference as compared to the very broad specification in the motion were as follows:

• The committee believed the concerns raised required urgent attention and comment. It was considered that within the time frame set by the AVA it was not possible to explore every aspect of dietary interaction with disease.
• Information which could be gathered on the broader issues would be unlikely to add more than is already well known.
• Concentration should be placed on periodontal disease and diet because this was the principal area of current concern to the Australian veterinary profession.
• It was felt that if periodontal disease could be prevented then any secondary complications from this problem would be reduced.

There is prima facie evidence to justify concern by veterinarians. Pet owners should consider the need to provide some 'chewy' material as well as the basic nutrient intake of their dog or cat.

Periodontal disease may be associated with the occurrence of other diseases but the available evidence is inconclusive. Periodontal disease is arguably the most common disease condition seen in small animal practice and its effects on the gums and teeth can significantly affect the health and well being of affected animals. This is sufficient in itself to give reason for concern. Proof of additional systemic effects is not necessary to justify further action.

Further research is required to better define the relationship between particular diet types and oral health in dogs and cats. Those investigating small animal health problems should also take diet and diet consistency into account when researching systemic diseases possible confounding effects of diet and poor oral health must be considered in such studies.3

Clearly the AVA Diet and Disease Committee, in 1994, established an ethical and professional benchmark applicable to Australian clinicians, researchers and educators.

Previously in the June 1993 Post Graduate Committee Veterinary Dentistry Proceedings 212 a NSW lawyer's opinion was published indicating that processed pet-food related matters may become issues of relevance in the future:

1. Potential claims by pet owners under various pieces of consumer legislation throughout the States and Territories of Australia.
2. In the Federal sphere potential Trade Practices Act claims for false or misleading claims may be made either in relation to advertising or promotional material or labels.
3. The new Truth in Labelling activities instituted by the Federal Government.
4. Potential problems or claims under the recently introduced Product Liability provisions in Part V of the Trade Practices Act.
5. The, as yet, unknown effect of class actions which have been lawful in Australia since the 5th day of March 1992 which may tend to overcome the existing drawbacks to actions brought by individual pet owners, namely the high cost of litigation and claims which may amount to only several hundreds of dollars in relation to an individual pet.

The foregoing relates to potential claims against manufacturers, distributors and possibly even retailers of processed pet food. Query what may be the legal problems of veterinarians who fail to consider the issues in this paper or fail to address those issues in advising pet owners who make known to the veterinarian that they rely wholly and solely on processed pet food to supply their pets' diet. Is it too much to suggest that, as pet owners, in common with everyone else in the community become more litigious, veterinarians may some day share top billing on a Writ?'4

It seems to me that we know, or at least should know, the biological, ethical and legal imperatives regarding the veterinary treatment of carnivores in our care. Sadly though, in respect to Sefi the cat and thousands like her, these things are more honoured in the breach than the observance. What's to be done and by whom? May I suggest that perhaps the Board of the Post Graduate Foundation* may have a role to play?

As a way forward, and in the first instance, I suggest that the Board could review:

a.) The content of PGF courses and publications, as they relate to both wild and domestic carnivores, in light of biological imperatives.
b.) The objectivity, affiliations and possible conflict of interest of PGF course teachers.
c.) The diverse legal implications of the pet diet and disease issue as may apply to veterinary clinicians, researchers and educators.

Publication of the review findings would honour the good work started by Than and Nichola Wright and would help the veterinary profession to learn from history, keep faith with Sefi the cat and better secure our future.

Notes
1. Wright, T and Wright, N (2007) Waxy Ear Canal in a Cat, *Control & Therapy* No 4803, Post Graduate Foundation in Veterinary Science, University of Sydney http://www.rawmeatybones.com/pdf/Sefi.pdf
2. *Australian Veterinary Association News* (1993) Pet food produces lively AGM, June, pp 1 and 9

3. *Australian Veterinary Association News* (1994) Diet and disease link final report, February, pp 1 and 6
4. Lonsdale, T (1993) Preventative Dentistry, in *Veterinary Dentistry, Proceedings of the Post Graduate Committee in Veterinary Science*, University of Sydney, Sydney, 212, 235244
Web: www.rawmeatybones.com/PrevDent.html

*In August 2007, at the time of submission of this article for publication the Post Graduate Foundation in Veterinary Science of the University of Sydney was overseen by a Board of Directors. The name changed in August 2008 to Centre for Veterinary Education (CVE) overseen by an Advisory Council.

At first the CVE agreed to publish the article. However the new Director, Dr Hugh White, was reluctant and consulted one of his predecessors, Dr Doug Bryden AM. Dr Bryden suggested that the CVE should 'bite the bullet' and publish the article. This, he said, would serve to 'put the CVE on the map'. (Yes, honesty and integrity would stand out like a beacon in the corrupt veterinary environment.)

But fifteen months later and after several changes of mind the CVE finally refused because they said: 'The role of CVE is to provide continuing education, not act as the conscience of the veterinary profession.'

So there you have it. Those controlling the Sydney University Conniving Veterinary Establishment will not be swayed. And whilst their disgraceful ongoing actions speak much louder than words, we who are concerned about the mounting fraud are not allowed even a few words of protest.

(For details of the CVE discussions revealed by a Freedom of Information enquiry go to: www.rawmeatybones.com/pdf/C+T%20cat's%20ear%20IIaa.pdf)

'Free advertising for your business with Pet Oral Health Month.'
www.oralcarefordogs.com.au

Mars Petcare Australia in league with the Australian Veterinary Association are about to work their annual pet dental scam. August is the month when Mars will run radio ads encouraging pet owners to visit their vet for a 'free' dental check.

In the lead up to this disgraceful event Mars are funding lectures for vets and vet students at Sydney and Melbourne Universities. In the lecture blurb Mars say:
'We all know that 4 out of 5 dogs over the age of 3 have Periodontal Disease [PD] so why not get involved in Pet Oral Health Month this August?
Help us to lower the incidence of PD for our favourite little friends by
inviting your clients in for a "free oral health check".'

Mars don't say that:

- Food, junk food made by Mars and other manufacturers, is the reason 4 out of 5 dogs (and cats and ferrets) suffer this easily preventable disease.
- By meeting the periodontal disease problem head-on Mars create the impression that they are the experts in control, earnestly working to find a solution, and thus deflect attention from their poisonous junk.
- By creating the impression that they, Mars, are the vets' benefactors they draw unsuspecting vets into a web of lies and deceit.
- Once the vets, the Australian Veterinary Association and the universities are partners in the scam, it becomes easier to substantiate the use of extruded rice sticks 'To keep your dogs teeth and gums healthy and strong, use great tasting Pedigree® Daily Dentastix™ everyday'.

Sucked into the Mars orbit, vets become the front-line sales force. 'Health' and 'welfare' may get a mention - as camouflage for the elaborate con trick. But no, it's dollars, billions of dollars that drive the entire disgusting, avaricious fraud. Suggesting that the health checks are 'free' is another cruel twist when in fact it's pet owners and their long suffering pets that pay and pay for the excesses of the junk pet-food companies and their vet stooges.

On Friday 9 July my wife and I attended the falsely named 'Improving periodontal health' lectures at the CVE building at Sydney University. As expected Mars DENTAstix girls made us welcome and a tasty buffet dinner was on offer. Propaganda packs complete with DENTAstix samples were waiting on every chair. A film cameraman moved amongst the young vets recording the event for use in forthcoming marketing scams.

We knew to expect a stream of factoids and disinformation. However, we were not prepared for the poor calibre of the speakers, paucity of ideas or the often illegible Power Point Presentations.

Dr Rod Salter was introduced as an old hand who had been part of the Australian Veterinary Dental Association since its inception in 1990. As a vet dentist he was a participant in the Australian veterinary civil war that raged in the early 1990s and lead to the Diet and Disease study commissioned by the Australian Veterinary Association. Even though 'assisted' by Mars corporation flunkeys, the study raised concerns about junk food and made favourable mention of raw meaty bones. You can find the draft version at: http://www.rawmeatybones.com/articles-others/docArticle1.pdf and the published version at: http://www.ukrmb.co.uk/images/WatsonReport.pdf

Dr Salter, however, treated the AVA official review with passing contempt.

His last Power Point slide carried a large DENTAstix logo with the words:

Wayne [Fitzgerald] and I would [like] to thank
Pedigree for the opportunity to
present this lecture and spread
the "gospel"

They know no shame. We must take action. Let vet schools know that you know they are engaged in a monstrous fraud. Let university vice-chancellors know that their veterinary

faculties are bringing the universities into disrepute. Tell politicians and the media. Eventually we can expect a breakthrough. It's just a question of when.

Best wishes,

Tom

Advertisement

Author of animal books, Ann Walker, recently posted commentary on *Work Wonders* and *Raw Meaty Bones* in her April blog http://apps.annwalkerbooks.com/Blog/?d=04/2010 Ann's homepage is: http://www.annwalkerbooks.com/

The books are dual purpose educational tools and useful weapons in the struggle with the Conniving Vet Establishment and their junk pet-food paymasters.

Work Wonders (120 pages) provides practical information for all pet owners.

Raw Meaty Bones (389 pages) presents the evidence for those wanting to understand and resolve the bigger issues behind the pet food fraud.

The books make marvellous presents for family, friends and vets. Many breeders and pet professionals (and some vets) supply the books (especially *Work Wonders*) to their clients. For bulk discounts please contact your nearest distributor listed at: http://www.rawmeatybones.com/order-book.php

---

We welcome copies of correspondence/emails/faxes for possible inclusion in future *RMB Newsletters*.

Please circulate, distribute or reproduce this newsletter as you wish.

The *Raw Meaty Bones Newsletter* is published by:

Tom Lonsdale
Rivetco P/L
PO Box 6096
Windsor Delivery Centre
NSW 2756
Australia

Phone: +61 2 4574 0537 +61 2 4574 0537
Fax: +61 2 4578 1384
Email: tom@rawmeatybones.com
Web: http://www.rawmeatybones.com