

**Emails between Brian Deer, for The Sunday Times of London, and Andrew Wakefield, December 2006, concerning undisclosed payments to Dr Wakefield from the UK legal aid fund to support litigation against MMR vaccine manufacturers. The [figure](#) obtained by Deer under the freedom of information act was £435,643, plus expenses. [See report](#)**

**From: Brian Deer**

**Sent: Friday, December 22, 2006 10:59 AM**

Dear Dr Wakefield,

I'm directed to put to you information presently due to be published imminently in The Sunday Times; to provide you with an opportunity to respond; and to take due notice of any response you may care to give.

The relevant information concerns the very substantial sums you were paid, at the behest of Mr Richard Barr, from 1996 onwards, to support a legal attack on the MMR vaccine. The self-evident sting of any report is likely to be that you were, at least, subject to a very serious undisclosed conflict of interest over these payments, whilst you published what purported to be independent scientific findings. The scale of the payments has shocked everyone with whom we have, for the purpose of comment, shared them.

My rough calculations, based upon the most authoritative figures, are that you were paid by Mr Barr in excess of £60,000 a year to attack the MMR vaccine, even whilst you were apparently fully-employed by other bodies. You received payments ranging from £120 an hour, to £1,000 a day. Were Mr Barr's case against MMR to have been abandoned, you would have expected these payments to end.

Should you wish to comment, please respond to this email. I'm also available, as ever, to interview you, although I hardly expect you to accept this offer.

May I say that I, too, am personally shocked by the scale of the sums you pocketed from your attack on MMR, although I appreciate that it may yet be some time before we fully grasp the scope and detail of your financial arrangements.

With best wishes for a happy Christmas, and a New Year appropriate to your circumstances.

Brian Deer

**From: "Wakefield, Andy"**

**Date: Fri, 22 Dec 2006 13:36:39 -0500**

Response to enquiries about expert fees.

Dear Mr Dear,

Thank you for your email. I have a number of points to make in response, which I request and urge that you publish in full in your forthcoming article in the Sunday Times concerning expert fees. In addition, please would you acknowledge receipt of this by return, since you failed to do this on a previous occasion and omitted to mention our response in your article?

1. I worked as an expert in the MMR class action litigation for nearly 9 years. As instructed, I charged for my services and this was at an hourly rate recommended by the BMA, after consulting with them on this matter.

2. I worked extremely hard on this very onerous litigation because I believed and still believe in the just cause of the matter under investigation. This work involved nights, weekends and much of my holidays such that I saw little of my family during this time.

3. The money that I received was, after tax and out of pocket expenses, donated to an initiative to create a new center, in the first instance at the Royal Free Hospital, for the care of autistic children and those with bowel disease. This was unsuccessful at the Royal Free but ultimately succeeded in the US. This intention was made clear, in writing, to senior members of the medical school.

4. My role as an expert was declared as a conflict of interest in relevant publications (see references below) that discussed the possible role of MMR vaccine intestinal disease and autism and to journal editors. I have referenced the relevant publications below for your convenience.

5. The costs judge has revised the sum payable, by nearly £100,000 and I am happy to abide by this ruling. A substantial part of this money was not paid to me in the first place.

#### References

Stott C et al Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons 2004;9:89-91

Wakefield AJ et al. Medical Veritas 2006;3:796-802

Wakefield AJ and Montgomery SM. (Expert role known to journal editor.)

Wakefield AJ and Montgomery SM. Israeli Medical Association Journal. 1999;1:183-187 (Expert role known to journal editor.)

**From: "Wakefield, Andy"**

**Date: Tue, 26 Dec 2006 09:15:04 -0500**

Dear Mr Dear,

I have a few further pieces of information for you in relation to your pending article.

The letter to the Dean, copied to other senior members of the medical school, describing my efforts to create a new centre for the care of patients with inflammatory bowel disease, is dated 30th March 1995. I say this just in case you were tempted to say that you had contacted the medical school but no one knew anything about it.

Secondly, I received no payment from the LAB for undertaking the 'pilot study' i.e. the viral detection studies as described to you in our legal correspondence. You will now be aware that your original belief that the LAB paid for any aspect of the Lancet report is completely without foundation, other than an erroneous statement made to you by one of the lawyers involved.

Yours sincerely,

AJW

---

[Here is the letter](#) of 30 March 1995 which Wakefield says evidences that the money he received, "after tax and out of pocket expenses", was donated to an initiative at the Royal Free hospital. This letter, in which he admits to trying to give himself a professorship, was written before he had ever been approached over the litigation.

[Here is the audio](#) of Richard Barr, the lawyer who employed Wakefield and who ran the UK MMR litigation for more than a decade. He is speaking to Brian Deer six years after the Lancet paper - which he says he paid for - was published.