



AEROTOXIC PANDEMIC 1921 - 202?

A Poisoning – My Part in its Establishment

By Captain John Hoyte



Aerotoxic Pandemic 1921-202?

A Poisoning - My Part in its Establishment

Captain John Hoyte



Captain John Hoyte in 2004. Photo credit: Margaret Robinson.

First published 2021 by Aerotoxic Association 27 Old Gloucester Street London WC1N 3AX United Kingdom Copyright © John Hoyte. The rights of John Hoyte to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted by them in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book will be available from the British Library. Please share this book as Widely & Freely as possible. Thank you. JHISBN: 978-1-5272-9778-4

All images © Copyright John Hoyte.

Contents:

Foreword by David Learmount (2014).

Introduction.

Chapter 1. How the story ends and how I became involved from the beginning in 1955.

Chapter 2. Mysteries of aviation, The Public & The Establishment – Gaslighting.

Chapter 3. The Cover-up – Public Servants - Lawyers, Media & Government Policy?

Chapter 4. Survivors and the 100-year evidence dated timeline.

Chapter 5. The pantomime – goodies, baddies & sheeple – the players 5/5/90

Chapter 6. Movie genres: Spotlight, Erin Brockovich, Dark Waters, Flight, The Winslow Boy, The Hudson River Miracle, Battle of Britain, A Matter of Life and Death, A Dark Reflection.

Chapter 7. Junk, paid for published science. AS v's Covid-19.

Chapter 8. How did they get away with the cover-up?

Chapter 9. Media (BBC), politicians & being economical with truth.

Chapter 10. When and how will the lies end? Reverse engineering, closing the gap. ‘A’ day.

Epilogue

‘No pity, no prisoners.’ Field marshal von Blücher

‘Next to a battle lost, the saddest thing is a battle won.’ Duke of Wellington

“We know they’re lying, they know they’re lying, they know that we know they’re lying, we also know that they know that we know they’re lying, but they STILL LIE.”

Alexander Solzhenitzen

“Life must be understood backward. But it must be lived forward.” Soren Kierkegaard.

2014 Foreword

Aerotoxic syndrome exists. But so does systematic denial by the aviation industry and its government backers. As an aviation journalist for 35 years at the time of writing this Foreword, for a long time I believed the industry when it told me, hand on heart, that the dangers to pilot and passenger health of engine oil fumes entering aircraft cabins were dramatically exaggerated and very rare. But eventually I agreed to meet two former airline pilots who had suffered damage and lost their careers to aerotoxic syndrome. I had, however, met others before and had not been convinced, so what made the difference this time? Tristan Loraine and Susan Michaelis provided me with the technical data and evidence of something that had been going on for years – about

50 years. They informed me about the chemicals involved, the ongoing biochemical research into the damage these can cause to humans, the fume event occurrences and what makes them happen, and the human stories of pilots and cabin crew affected. And through them I met a network of aeromedical specialists and biochemists who were studying the issue in detail. Then I started asking questions again in the industry, but I was much better informed this time. No aircraft or aero-engine manufacturer denies that fumes from engine oil can get into cockpits and cabins, nor do they deny that these ‘fume events’ happen from time to time. They do not deny either that these engine oils contain organophosphate materials that can cause neurological damage in humans. The oil containers even have warnings on them to that effect. The reason the industry and its government backers can keep the lid on this issue is that the burden of proof about the damage these fumes can cause rests with the victims. The industry answers charges about health damage by denial and dissembling, which the system lets them do because of the rules about where the burden of proof lies. The industry’s lawyers are masters of technical points of law that enable them to claim that the victims have no legal proof of the connection between Aerotoxic Syndrome xvi a fume event and the symptoms that the victims suffer as a result. The lawyers can argue that the cause might lie elsewhere in the victim’s life, or in their metabolism, and this ‘negative’ allegation is very difficult to disprove. There is a precise parallel here between the legal war fought for years between the tobacco industry and damaged smokers and the medical world who were looking for the proof of a connection between tobacco smoking and lung cancer. Everybody knew that there was a connection, but the burden of proof was with the victims, and until a precise biomarker could establish that the cancer was initiated by the effects of tobacco-based chemicals in specific individuals who smoked, the industry could go on denying. The only difference between these two cases is one of scale. The health effects of tobacco affected billions of people worldwide, whereas although aircraft fume events happen regularly, they only occur once every several hundred flights. And when they do, some individuals are affected while others are not, because of metabolic differences between individual humans and the frequency of exposure that any individual suffers. The fact that fewer people are involved makes it easier for the industry and government to continue the denial, and more difficult for those damaged to seek any form of redress – or even acknowledgement of their medical condition. It means ordinary doctors are kept in ignorance of the syndrome and its symptoms, making misdiagnosis more likely. The fact is that, for those who are affected, the effect of aerotoxic syndrome on their lives can be devastating. For that reason it is obscene that the industry washes its hands of the issue, and even worse that governments collude, because there are ways of reducing or even eliminating the risk of airborne fume events. But while denial exists and governments collude with the manufacturers and airlines, these remedies will not be applied. That is what this book is about.

David Learmount, Operations and safety Editor, Flight International

October 2014

Introduction

This book about Aerotoxic Syndrome (AS) or [Aerotoxic Poisoning](#), as the UK government now prefer to call this public disease, has been written before its formal establishment as a medical term on a date sometime in 202?, but it was first named in a published paper of 20th October 1999 by a USAAF doctor, a French forensic scientist and an Australian toxicologist.

AS is still just an unrecognised public medical condition and therefore I can only present facts up to the date of publication but can confidently forecast a predictable outcome -as every man-made thing has a beginning, a middle and an end.

The first book on AS was *Aerotoxic Syndrome- Aviation's Darkest Secret* published by Pilot Press Ltd. in 2014 and was written by professional ghost-writer, Philip Whiteley, and editor Susan Curran (RIP).

Our second book, published in 2017, was *A Tale of Two Ag Pilots* by co-author Peter Lawton and me, in which we described the slightly crazy, varied and, what I thought to be dangerous at the time, first half of my flying career. This book importantly contained fully published evidence of the CAA knowledge about organophosphates from the 1970s and 80s. This evidence has since been 'rewritten'.

A third book was written with the help of co-author, Brett Preiss, an Australian living in the Netherlands, Brett Preiss. *How Planes Poison You! Aerotoxic Syndrome – Aviation's Dirtiest Cover-up* was published in a hurry on Amazon on 30th April 2020. Little did I know then what deadly excitement lay ahead in the next twelve months and beyond as a viral 'pandemic' flooded the airline industry...

So now it is time to publish my final book on Aerotoxic Syndrome- my part in the obituary and I have decided to write it all myself, as it's my personal story and view of the future.

I think most people need at least three exposures to anything modern or 'new' before they accept or reject it.

Firstly, they only hear of the new issue, but don't really register anything apart from maybe remembering the word, but with no context.

Secondly, they may begin to pay more attention and delve deeper, but may still be sceptical and sit on the fence as it is 'new' ground and they require time and effort to understand before they make a decision.

Thirdly, they completely 'get it or don't get it' and finally accept or reject both the word and what it represents or doesn't represent.

But anyone can change their mind again, with new evidence.

Ghandi knew this when he said, 'First they ignore you, then they laugh at you, then they fight you, then you win.'

Obituaries are often written in advance of death – the Duke of Edinburgh being a prime example – where the date and time of 'death' are often the only missing detail.

Like a pre-written obituary my story has, as yet no formal ending, as an ending could cause world aviation to fail, which would be disastrous especially during a 'pandemic' which has already caused the near collapse of a complex and mature network.

So this story will be told in reverse – from the future days, weeks, months and years when the known and available solutions will have been introduced. There will be a single significant date and then a transition period of acceptance so as not to destroy aviation completely, which would be in no one's interest.

Reverse engineering is used to determine how to fix something – so we come back from the future to unravel and, so understand, the problem. Then we can go forwards from today, closing the gap as we go until we arrive at a date in the future when that gap has closed.

So, when will that gap close? 2021, 2026, 2029 – who actually cares? Well, definitely those who have been injured in the past and those who will be injured in the future but also those whose job it is to know about such things as injury to other humans.

The BIG questions the public must ask are:

1. Is [Aerotoxic poisoning](#) of any public interest? Y/N
2. Is it O.K. to talk openly about an inconvenient cause of mass public ill health? Y/N
3. Should paid public servants know of 100 years of existing, dated ‘positive’ evidence? Y/N

Chapter 1

How the story will end and how I became involved from the beginning in 1955

Jet planes of the future will not use unfiltered, unmonitored bleed air from the engines as it will finally be proved and universally accepted one day in 202? that ill health is caused to a significant sector of the population by exposure to toxic fumes in most jet planes and the acute and chronic illness will be confirmed as Aerotoxic Syndrome, which was first written about in a paper published on 20th October 1999.

But how did I get mixed up in this dated timeline of evidence of lies, deceit and bad science – which is a system failure?

My flying story began after my birth in Edinburgh, Scotland on 17th October 1955 as my mother, sister and I flew from Edinburgh to London in preparation for flying out to Colombo, Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) in November 1955 - both these flights would have been in petrol engine, pressurised cabins of, probably, firstly a twin engine De Havilland Dove and then, definitely, a four engine Lockheed Constellation which used mechanical air pumps to increase the pressure of the cabin to allow us to survive at around 24,000 feet.

As flying only really began just over 100 years ago it should come as no surprise to find that the first ‘pressurised’ aircraft flew in 1921 just after the Great War as man pushed the frontiers to the stars.



France was a key nation when the Sud Aviation Caravelle was first flown on 27th May 1955. This twin jet engine aircraft would use bleed air for the very first time because the French realised that there was an untapped source of free, unlimited pressurised air from the jet engines, which could be piped directly into the cabin. Right from the beginning they did not filter the bleed air in any way, despite it taking tiny amounts of oil from the jet engine into the cabin. As soon as they put filters in the way, this limited the air flow and stopped everything.

But it's well recorded elsewhere, that money controls everything in the world and by 1962 the mechanical pumping systems of 'clean, outside air' were causing accountants everywhere to look for a cheaper way of pressurising cabins. It was then that bleed air was first commercially used on a large scale in the Boeing 727.

The Boeing 707 and DC 8 had used mechanical air pumps, which frequently failed.

It would be 2009 before Boeing returned to electrically compressed air pumps with the Boeing 787 Dreamliner but every other Boeing 727, 737, 747, 757, 767, 777 used unfiltered and unmonitored bleed air and still do.

But from the beginning until today and towards the end of the gap, all bleed air was and will be both unfiltered and unmonitored, as it is all a dirty big cover-up and more like the Emperor's Clothes. The only filters in the planes are the lungs of the passengers and crews, as US Attorney, Alisa Brodkowitz, observed around ten years ago.

As was described in our book *A Tale of Two Ag Pilots*, I was mad about flying from the age of about four, after seeing De Havilland Tiger Moths in the fields of Norfolk. I would later go to Town Close House boarding school in Norwich where my House Master/lay preacher, Richard Millard, preached with large pictures of the Battle of Britain Spitfires, Hurricanes and Me 109's, which I assumed was a religion, and I quickly dedicated my life to being part of it all, somehow. My next boarding school was at Woodbridge, Suffolk where a gay priest wanted to confirm me, which totally put me off religion as I could only relate to aeroplanes and the job of flying them. I joined the RAF Combined Cadet Force but was told that I was too stupid to ever have a job. This experience caused me to have an inferiority complex from an early age.

I was never going to have an easy time getting a job flying as there is always 'feast or famine' in the aviation industry so my first three years of work was for Phillips Petroleum at Bacton North Sea Gas Terminal, Norfolk as an industrial chemist measuring gas and pollution. I set out on the difficult 'self-improver' route of first acquiring a Private Pilot Licence in 1977 and then becoming a Flying Club Operations Manager for the Norfolk and Norwich Aero Club, RAF Swanton Morley for a year. In 1978 I took a flying instructor course with Hector Taylor at East Midlands Airport, who was too old to fly in the Second World War so taught the future Battle of Britain pilots.

I would then have two happy years teaching other slightly less green pilots than me at Staverton Flying School, Cheltenham Gloucester airport I was part of a small team dedicated to the highest possible flying standards and was controlled by never having any money and having fun.

After the zero confidence of the first twenty years of my life, I slowly learnt to hold my own in the competitive jungle and the slippery up and down pole of aviation.

I had an initial critical CAA Class 1 medical on 13th May 1980 and passed with flying colours but in the comprehensive diary, which I kept for many years, I commented on the dangers of Organophosphates (OP's) and noted that my blood was tested and my pupils were photographed. Between 1982 and 1987 I worked as an aerial crop spraying pilot, the equivalent of my Battle of Britain. It is clear from my diary entries that I already knew that I would have to manage the effects of deadly crop spraying chemicals in order to be able to fly low and have fun. I would fly all over the UK and Kenya above the Mau at 10,000 feet. For four years I was in Australia and, in South Australia, I successfully pioneered and proved Aerial Fire Fighting. I always knew that I was living on borrowed time and that I was statistically pushing the odds and, after getting quickly married in 1986 and vowing to do certain serious things, I left 'dangerous' flying for slightly safer flying with DC3 Dakota aircraft for two years. In that time I would learn to fly multi engine aircraft in all weathers as a Captain and first officer team. I also become a father and looked for that squeaky safe flying job which would take me through to a happy retirement – jet flying.

My jet flying career is well recorded elsewhere and on the internet. I look back on it now as another life which ended on 30th June 2005 at the age of forty nine, with my health wrecked and at an all-time low. It is hard now to even recall the myriad of chronic symptoms I suffered from for sixteen long years, but the list reads like a horror story and it leaves me wanting justice, not so much for myself, as I've made a near perfect recovery, but for those other people around the world who will be injured today and tomorrow and are still being misdiagnosed and mistreated – utter madness.

But of course since my last book was published just over twelve months ago the whole world has been tipped into a new madness where it is tempting to compare Aerotoxic Syndrome which has a seventy or 100 year seniority (depending on when one starts the clock) versus a 'pandemic'

which has an eighteen month old record but has grave similarities with ASAs, in both cases around 30% of the population are affected with around 3 % being affected severely and a tiny percentage die. 70% of the population are mostly unaffected and the majority always wins? Except when it's a reset pandemic and the rules change.

I suppose we all have reasons for doing things in life and I have personally been influenced by very principled people – mainly my grandparents with my maternal grandfather, John Bryson Hay, being a Victorian and principled beyond words, but also my Grandmother Jemimah, who kindly gifted me £700 for my first flying instructor course. She can be thanked for practical help as principles only go so far in life. Her maxim was to never let the sun go down on an argument or difference.

My father's father, William Norman, was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge and survived the horrors of the First World War. He was awarded an MC & bar and wrote the regimental history for the 10th (S) Battalion of Sherwood Foresters after the war and then returned to Cambridge University. He would go on to become a chemical engineer and spent the Second World War in the relative safety of the USA, cracking petroleum, playing the piano, cooking and being misread by women, just like my own dear father – which seems to have become a family trait. My Grandmother Alice on my father's side was 100% Scottish and both my grandmothers had a Highland sixth sense, which I appear to have inherited.

So I received, unknowingly, all of these strong genes but maybe the best gene has been my excellent health as I've been full circle from 100% health at 35 to feeling like an 80 year old from then until I was 51 in 2006, when I began the return to near perfect health and to feeling 35 again at the age of 65. Whilst many of my pilot colleagues who flew similar aircraft are stone deaf, have replacement hips and other 'normal' age related difficulties or are dead, my one slight weakness is my teeth, but that's easy to manage in 2021.

So my need to record and document much over the past 65 years has led to a ridiculous amount of dated, documented evidence which would soon cause any judge and jury to see what happened to whom and when it happened – particularly over the past fifteen years since discovering a cause of mass public ill health on 22nd May 2006 in a naïve statement written when I was so ill with all of the symptoms all of the time and I needed help.

Fenny Compton
SOUTHAM
Warwickshire
CV47 2YG

To whom it may concern.

It has been long accepted and admitted that compressed air from jet engines has been contaminated with engine oil which contains many harmful chemicals including VOC's and Organophosphate substances which are universally accepted to be harmful to health with well-known symptoms.

The UK Government has been aware and discussing the problem for a number of years whilst the vast majority of the public and medical profession remain completely unaware of scale and extent of the problem.

As a result of 27 pilots blood and fat being tested in March – May of 2006 with associated memory and cognitive function tests carried out at the same time by UCL (University College London) it has revealed shocking and incontrovertible evidence that there is a serious health hazard for anybody who flies in these aeroplanes; especially the crews and is therefore a serious flight safety issue. The report will be available from May 22nd 2006 but may be restricted in its distribution for obvious reasons.

Other people known to be probably are the entire Royal family and senior members of the Government who have flown on the BAe 146 for the last twenty years and have escaped the same contamination.

The BAe 146 and Boeing 757 are well known for being the worst offenders of commercial airliners, possibly due to sharing a similar make of APU or Auxiliary Power Unit and its use on the ground.

There have been many incidents and fatal accidents attributed to 'fatigue' and 'pilot error' on the BAe 146 and B. 757 over the years but never any suggestion that contaminated air is fundamentally to blame.

I wish to make it clear that due to intense covering up of the phenomenon over the past ten years or more it is now my duty to point out that any accident in the future should be regarded as probably being caused by this effect and for any suggestion that it is not a factor to be subject of a criminal enquiry and manslaughter charges for those people denying the link.

Statement by:

John Grahame Hoyte

22nd May 2006.



BAe 146 – 200 G TNTB John Hoyte’s first TNT flight on the type at Prestwick on 15th October 1989 with Captain Terry Gerry. My sudden last flight was on BAe 146 - 200 G JEAS on 30th June 2005 with Flybe First Officer Nick Larkin. Edinburgh to Birmingham.

So here we are, almost exactly fifteen years later at the time of writing, and there is still, allegedly, formally and wickedly ‘no positive evidence’ of any sort of problem, ever in the past 100 years of contaminated air in aircraft cabins and the word ‘Aerotoxic’ is by now absolutely and totally banned by governments, the media (BBC), lawyers, doctors and scientists – those public servants who pretend to serve the public but in reality nothing is further from the truth. But how, exactly DO they get away with that?

The dangers of asbestos, tobacco, alcohol, mercury and other toxic substances are all discovered eventually while we seem to have to join the slow moving queue of being found out about, invented and ‘discovered’ in this man made, silly money game of the Emperor’s Clothes where the argument is about whether organophosphates or carbon monoxide are the *worst* offending chemicals (which is like comparing which shape of bullet kills the best – square or round?) – an argument which could be tested and absolutely concluded in around an afternoon’s work, if there was the will to do so.

The mixture of different chemical compounds and their synergistic deadly effect has always been the menace as no one can test the myriad of different combinations, let alone single deadly compounds like OPs which were first designed to harm over 100 years ago.

The grossly misdiagnosed Aerotoxic community must therefore be formally misdiagnosed with MND, MS, Parkinson’s, epilepsy, ALS etc, diagnoses which never quite fit, but are the closest recognised medical neurological diseases.

We live our lives and, as night follows day, we all do our best each day to fit in, to follow the laws, not to kill each other, to be good but, as professional pilots, we are pre-programmed to

always 'finish the mission' which is the well-known 'Right Stuff' of the astronaut world. It is called 'persistence' and all professional aircrew are trained in it from Day 1 for self-survival, so we have it in our DNA and we will quite cheerfully die in the process as a duty, if absolutely necessary, where public health is concerned. We all have a fundamental public duty to human health, along with freedom of speech and duty to report. This is found in all Health and Safety manuals and I personally answer only to HM The Queen, the boss.

One is sometimes tempted to ask the Negative 5% (which will be explained later) if they can read?

What does the word 'paralyse' actually mean? What does 'inebriated' mean?

Do we have to continually redefine each and every word of any statement or evidence?

What is it that makes most lawyers or attorneys not able to understand certain basic, established scientific principles?

Why does ill health or Aerotoxic disease just affect professional aircrew – why not little babies, the unborn and the wealthy mega rich who also fly in bleed air jets?

I've been told recently that the mercury poisoning argument of decades was finally won in European public Courts in 2018 by using *only* the weakest members of society and the all-important 'environment' as both are apparently sacrosanct.

When my dearly beloved quality standard H&S professional 'theory only' expert trainer wife, Nicki, left me in August 2007 she allowed me to be the sole captain of my own soul again and for the past fourteen years I have chosen to remain single as few women would approve of their partner doing what I've done for my own pleasure and reasons, as it has all cost money - around £300K- and 24/7 of my time which is not reasonable to share with AN Other.

But now I feel ready to settle down again, hand over the madness to doctors and lawyers better qualified than me as it is THEIR and future generations problem and no longer mine as I fly rarely. Any flying would be in non-pressurized aircraft ONLY or totally 'safe' flight simulators. It is on record that, when I scored ½ / 10 or 'Impaired' rage in October 2011 in a NHS cognitive test, I would have scored near zero in mid-2005, when I suddenly stopped my flying career without knowing why.

I had retaken my Class 1 aviation medical with my good friend, Dr Phil Lawrence, in 2009 and he passed me! But I had insisted that, due to both my own problem with 'pressurised jets', documented in my medical records, and the similar experiences of countless others, my medical should be limited by the CAA for non-pressurised aircraft only.

But this was all part of an ongoing big game with the Authorities to try to get them to admit that a problem even *might* exist, and I would have to go to a formal two-day long London tribunal to try and argue my point against CAA lawyers where a kindly lay lady from Devon gallantly spoke up of 'smelling a rat' during the proceedings, before being squashed by the 'professionals'.

It is all written down and recorded in documents and my personal diary of the time, but who really cares twelve years later on? Just one of countless other incidents over the past fifteen years since my personal 'discovery' which will hopefully be fully researched one day in the future. Incidentally, I went back to flying light aircraft again briefly in 2014 and regained my Class 2 medical again about two years ago and still have it now. On both occasions my blood pressure has measured high and yet my family all have low blood pressure, so there are some very strange measurements going on where the present CAA Aero Medical Advisors are STILL being told by the CAA to ignore any Aerotoxic 'nonsense' – which is almost funny, were it not so serious.

So, over the past 65 years I've been able to detach a little, particularly in the past few months of 2021 and take the helicopter BIG overview picture of what's been going on, who is who and more importantly - why?

I can now write fairly objectively about something which I'm expert in and but am no longer directly affected or threatened by. I also describe myself as a *reluctant* expert as given the choice between flying and doing what I am doing – I would always choose my first love, as we can all hopefully agree that no one in their right mind would single handedly take on the Establishment alone and that is why I always, but ALWAYS, work with others around the world and allow them to take the lead as I'm too small and can never or would never want to win alone.

The irony is that I was part of that Establishment – that was until 22nd May 2006 when I realised it was trying to kill, not only me, but countless other members of the public establishment. What a terrible, uncaring club to be part of!

My upbringing was one of control by others, yet I found a massive amount of freedom and DIY in the sky as most pilots agree that by leaving the ground behind one's troubles get left behind too, as we get closer to God.

High Flight

Oh! I have slipped the surly bonds of Earth
And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings;
Sunward I've climbed, and joined the tumbling mirth
Of sun-split clouds, – and done a hundred things
You have not dreamed of – wheeled and soared and swung
High in the sunlit silence. Hov'ring there,
I've chased the shouting wind along, and flung
My eager craft through footless halls of air...
Up, up the long, delirious burning blue
I've topped the wind-swept heights with easy grace
Where never lark, or ever eagle flew –
And, while with silent, lifting mind I've trod
The high untrespassed sanctity of space,
Put out my hand, and touched the face of God.

John Gillespie Magee

An Anglo-American aviator and poet, Magee served in the Royal Canadian Air Force, which he joined before the United States entered the war; he died in a mid-air collision over Lincolnshire in 1941.

The past sixteen years have turned me into an apparent revolutionary anti-establishment troublemaker who simply puts other people and always health first.

The so-called doctors and nurses whom I know (some of them very good old friends) who know what's going on but simply can't understand what I and countless others are trying to achieve is beyond baffling and makes one reassess some fundamental qualities of friends and even family. After all, we are only on this planet for such a short space of time and *Carpe Diem* (seize the day) is the priority for all professional aircrew and it's painful to work and live with others who knowingly do the exact opposite. We all mock jihadists who blow themselves up for a cause, yet who can blame some so called terrorists for going the extra mile against the criminal Establishment?

Maybe the first question when we are all finally judged one day will not be 'How much money did you make?' Yet some people seem to think they can take it all with them, but I personally brought nothing into this world and when I die my children will get any material things I leave - 50/50. Who cares? As I'll be in the ground at Ridlington, Norfolk on the next fantastic journey... Maybe the real one.

The French aircrew pilot and cabin crew Unions are absolutely key here and WILL ultimately win this deadly pantomime. The French decision was known to have been made in early December 2020 and was confirmed verbally on 5th January 2021. An unusually long four day 17th annual Cabin Air Conference, 'normally' held in September, was due to take place from 15-18 March 2021 after which, on 20th March 2021, France would critically, finally and formally accept Aerotoxic Syndrome as an occupational disease after EasyJet and Air Corsica had been in a Paris criminal public Court for five years.

I had been naively present, whilst still unable to speak or think properly, at the very first Global Cabin Air Quality Executive (GCAQE) meeting on 5th October 2006 when Dr Sarah Mackenzie Ross of UCL and an Aerotoxic psychological expert since around 2003 had selflessly spent her fortieth birthday to get the important contra movement going. I had reasoned with her that the so-called Authorities were trying to prove that Black was White and she agreed. We had all taken a whole afternoon to arrive at the complicated GCAQE combination of words which would be mocked later on by some antis – not dissimilar to Monty Python's *Life of Brian*, a fabulously well observed and irreverent film of 1979 where the many different factions of the Roman resistance were named.

I must admit that (especially since the first ever EASA Cabin Air Workshop meeting of 30th and 31st January 2020 where I set out to work psychologically on the 'other side' over prawn sandwiches, beers and causal chit chat about fishing rather than the angry 'kill all' ways which we employed at the beginning in 2006, whilst still very ill and angry from losing so much) time is always THE great healer.

Ironically, my relationship with my former trainer wife and my daughter and son has normalised as I let them do their own business and started to support them unconditionally. But I have seen similar situations in countless others so it's not exactly abnormal, just a big shame that doing one's job for sixteen years can cause so much ill will and so many selective memories of those around one. I managed to rationalise them into three distinct groups in our 2020 3rd book and it is worth repeating them here:

The Positive 5% of the population who know all about Aerotoxic Syndrome, want the illness recognised and the known and available solutions brought in urgently but have no money to achieve this. The Disruptors.

The Negative 5% of the population who also know all about Aerotoxic Syndrome but absolutely do not want the illness recognised or the known and available solutions brought in and actually use their money to STOP achieving this and make money. The Establishment.

The Neutral 90 % of the population who know nothing about this cause of mass public ill health and live in deliberate ignorance; but if they did know would mostly want the illness recognised and the known and available solutions brought in urgently and would willingly pay an extra \$2 per ticket to cover the costs, as they can easily afford it. The Sheeple.

So I now put people into one of these three groups, as we obviously try and close the gap and educate all groups but particularly the 90% group.

In a few years' time the issue will be consigned to the history books along with the Ford Pinto, Asbestos, Thalidomide and other nasty man-made episodes which eventually get sorted out, but nothing happens quickly in this world of deceit, lies and half-truths. I never cease to be amazed how people are happy to witness others discomfort on a larger scale as they have the semblances of sociopaths fully knowing the 'facts', but not being able to help themselves where the mighty dollar rules their daily lives.

It's the mantra that one can't win, the David versus Goliath mindset of failure, whilst the Can Do at any cost and die by doing one's best, is what I was taught.

Calm Focus was recently taught to me by the Dutch Norwich based psychiatrist, Rene Bosman, in 2020 and really that's the whole point now – Calm Focus on an unknown date. As it is either 'Normal or Nuts' for anyone to want AS to be accepted – that now seems to be the key question of anyone still fighting the fight. If one asks the right questions and then waits one normally gets the right answers. The key is not to rush.

But certain sections of society - the so-called lawyers, scientists, doctors and whiter than white media journalists and commentators who are supposed to be the most trusted turn out to be the villains.

Professional aircrew are supposed to represent the height of our society as we take and accept great responsibility yet they are physically banned from public Courts, justice and the law. This is perhaps the greatest perversion of the course of justice ever, yet it is alive and well throughout the 'civilised' world in a coordinated dirty, legal system cover-up.

The real irony, of course, is that around 30% of these negative people are also affected, so that is the real mystery - why they deliberately choose to kill and injure themselves, family and friends? This does take some explaining and justification from the negative people alone, as only they can rationalise that and know their answers..

How does one go from being a traditionally educated, physically wrecked by chemicals, God fearing pilot of 50 years to an absolutely, calmly focused rebel in the space of fifteen years, where everyone reminds one constantly that one's chance of winning against such powerful forces is zero? Why even try?

Well, nothing logical is impossible to some people and that's what keeps one going with persistence - that one day a 'good and decent' celebrity, like a US film star or a young social media competent rap artist, will be on a crowded, public fume event flight and will Google the symptoms and become equally angry that their young, maybe unborn close family and friends have been permanently injured by a single, supposedly 'harmless' flight.

The odds are around 2,000 to 1 of a fume event flight, but as we already know from the published science of 1955, each and every flight in a bleed air jet has traces of chemicals in the air, so it's not dissimilar to car accident statistics where fatal accidents are 'rare', but can in theory happen on any trip. Just as countless ordinary or Princess Diana-like people are daily

maimed on the roads, so too is it happening in the air, but all of the measuring and reporting systems have been cleverly rigged over 100 years to show zero positive evidence.

Aircrew, including RAF pilots, are also ordinary folk who learn to manage dangerous, threatening situations almost daily with a stream of high-quality decisions. In my case, with near 0 / 10 cognitive function, I still managed to bluff my way through like so many others. We are also taught how to downplay dramas and expect the systems to defend our profession when needed and we don't like making a scene publicly, but if we are ignored for fifteen years we will always do the right thing, as there is absolutely nothing left to lose.

In 2006, soon after discovery, I bought and have since consulted constantly a book called *War – 33 Strategies to win*, a DIY book by Robert Greene on how to win psychologically as that is what liars, frauds and cheating enemies can't deal with. Chapter 4 is all about the Death/Ground strategy of having to win otherwise one will die, which doesn't half concentrate the mind. When I sold my house in 2013 and put all of the money into trying to help others it was always a matter of time before that investment paid off as who else would do that? Chapter 22 is The Exit Strategy or how to close something down as often the long-term peace is more important than winning any war.

The key to the past fifteen years has been working with others around the world on a similar journey but one can soon fall out with people on one's own side and this has happened as others have become distracted by the dirty money of industry, which literally buys people off to either be unsuccessful or silent or nasty or all three.

I soon realised that people have been injured on a sliding scale – some people like Captain Tristan Loraine couldn't run a marathon – well he actually scores 1/10 as hardly injured but has done more than anyone on the planet to resolve the Aerotoxic issue. Others equally dedicated and hardworking like Dr Susan Michaelis also don't score highly as injured, but have done huge amounts to right the reprehensible wrong whilst the likes of pilot Richard Westgate scored 10/10 after at least 10 years of pain and paid with his life on 12th December 2012.

I scored myself at 9/10 as I was like an inebriated zombie from 1990-2006 whilst flying but have now reverted and recovered back to 1/10 as I STILL have difficulty with IT and administration/paperwork but have always known that by working with those who excel at this black art anything is possible!

I keep saying that I ONLY wanted to fly aeroplanes and that is still exactly what I want as I find it relatively easy - all pilots become natural at flying and enjoy it.

On 19th June 1983 I (not deliberately) I went through a hedge in Shropshire at 50mph in a crop spraying aircraft PA 25 Piper Pawnee G AVXA as I had miscalculated a critical take off from a farm paddock. I wrecked my beloved aeroplane and cricked my neck, but oddly this aeroplane was rebuilt by my dear friend, Henry Labouchere of Langham, Norfolk and is STILL flying after being first manufactured in 1967. Now it is a glider tug in South Wales and my personal mission (no one else cares a fig) in 2021 is to fly her again and if anyone tells me that I can't do that – how dare they be negative or one of the 5%?

So can we all agree (apart from the so-called lawyers) that anyone coming backwards from the future, where bleed air has been outlawed just like asbestos and mercury, would know the precise date when 100% of the world accepted the 1999 term Aerotoxic Syndrome as being yet another highly inconvenient, costly human medical condition affecting huge numbers of innocent members of the public for around seventy+ years since the advent of unfiltered, unmonitored bleed air?



Henry Labouchere & John Hoyte, Langham airfield, Norfolk, UK 17th October 2020

Chapter 2

Mysteries of aviation, The Public & The Establishment – Gaslighting

Many people are still fearful of flying, even now with an apparently near perfect safety record since commercial jet flying really got going in the 1960s. We all know that most flights pass off without any trouble, rather like a car journey and new comforts continue to make flying extremely comfortable with beds, baths, and cocktail bars and the life of most pilots has been turned into a job of watching the systems and tweaking the odd tiny detail to save an operator money as severe turbulence can still be a killer. But the professional crews have absolutely no fears as they go about their work 100% confident that every take off will produce a landing somewhere and if it is at a diversionary airport due to good old fashioned bad weather – well that's life.

I wrote of total inherent trust in the various systems in my previous books, the technical progress, the constant learning from mistakes and errors caused by the most bizarre circumstances where no risk is allowed to develop into a threat of any sort – perfection?

Even old fashioned 'Airmanship' has been redefined as Threat Error Management – recognising that we all will always make errors, whilst deliberately making an error is a big non, no. Yet planes still crash, burn and explode spectacularly, occasionally and the public are killed as we have all witnessed with the too clever by half - Boeing 737 Max which killed, in two separate accidents, around 350 passengers and crew. It finally brought about its grounding for a couple of years as a third crash would have been unforgivable in accordance with the Tombstone Imperative, which states that changes are only, only, only finally maybe made when many of the public are killed and huge amounts of money are spent sorting out the mess.

Some passengers admit being nervous whilst flying and special courses are designed to calm their nerves and explain the strange sounds of gear, flaps etc which help deal with a flight. As a pilot of forty years, I never once doubted that I wouldn't survive the approximate 15,000 flights I made - somehow. Like every other green pilot, in the first fifteen years I too got 'caught out', running out of fuel and many other silly reasons for walking back to the airstrip (once aboard a friendly RAF helicopter!) but on the whole, my jet career only had one full Mayday (where a dire life and death emergency exists). Yet we practised everything endlessly in the far too real simulators, so we were always fully ready and confident that we could get down alive, but maybe with a very broken aeroplane – it didn't matter – so long as everyone somehow survived to live and fight another day.

Aviation is mysterious as visibly excitable, talkative, nervous passengers try to explain a finer point of flying they don't think you've actually personally encountered and how Murphy's Law states that 'If it can happen, it HAS happened to someone, somewhere & sometime.' But that's probably true of law, medicine, teaching, farming and every other job - there's always something to laugh a bit too loudly and nervously about.

So pilots are used to accepting the risk of having hundreds of souls in their hands but rationalise it that - if they save their own necks – then everyone survives, so best not to worry about numbers – just fly as carefully and normally as ever and just forget altogether about the 'self-loading freight' behind you.

I was a night freight dog pilot for nine years, flying around Europe in the wee small hours for TNT and the joy of not having any passengers on board cannot be over emphasised as they just cause trouble as they complain, report and judge landings etc. But passenger flying is fun too, as one used to be able to take one's family to work, show off a little, invite the curious to the flight deck, but all that changed after 9/11 such that one couldn't take one's sister in the flight deck – just in case she....

I loved the above average pretty girls and boys too as it was all a big, non-stop laugh although it had to be done seriously as we were all constantly monitoring each other as the CAA insisted on 'safety'. But flying is also a macho world where women are tolerated despite being mostly better pilots than men, as they knew clever stuff, just as in life outside flying, which men just don't see or feel. Macho is bad though, as it means that pilots are putting on an image and ignoring vital clues, which as we will see does not help in certain safety critical areas.

Cockpit or Crew Resource Management (CRM) was introduced in the mid-1980s just as I entered jet flying as too many macho situations had caused unnecessary deaths like the two Boeing 747's colliding on the ground at Tenerife on 27th March 1977 and this sort of accident would soon be stamped out, but always leaving other unnecessary and unknown 'new' accidents still in theory waiting to happen now in accordance with the timeless Murphy's law. So most aircrew are taught or learn to act very early on – trivialising impending doom and never, ever allowing the public to really know what's going on as it might just create panic if they really knew; sometimes ignorance of a looming disaster is best – the least said, the better.

The recent 'pandemic' has cast a serious threat to the whole future of aviation as the whole system has shut down whilst the scientists, doctors and politicians create a new world order with a total 'reset' yet to come not dissimilar to the end of the airship era with the Second World War and a new opportunity or chance to 'start again' with lessons learnt – what an awful cliché.

It was former UK Prime Minister Theresa May who wisely stated in around February 2021 that it takes a minimum of three months to wind up the whole aviation system and that's what is happening now as I write.

Yet one feels sad for everyone as no sooner does a chink of light appear than a predictable rogue viral strain in India or Albania is detected and comes along which throws ALL of the expensive intertwined plans into chaos – just like a predictable winter snowstorm or rogue 'flying deadly drones' can and have paralysed London Heathrow & Gatwick airports for several days costing many millions of dollars, ALL of which require an explanation to the bean counters. Tell God your plans in aviation - at your peril...

So the public are in the middle of a no win situation where yesterday can never be tomorrow as it was just 'plain stupid' and wrong and everyone knew that 99% capacity of any major airport was always going to end in tears and now it is only freight traffic flying the globe with grapes, lettuces and other vitally important perishable time sensitive cargo.

I have used the 'Establishment' in my title for the final book as it represents the so-called establishment of people and facts beyond reasonable doubt, yet it also describes the sinister group of 'Established' vultures in commerce as the not nice people allegedly right at the tiptop who appear to run the world for their own greed and benefit and to whom I and many others obviously do not and never wish to belong.

The so called 'establishment' clearly belong to the 5% negative club as they make money out of other people's known discomfort but also by definition exist in the 90% neutral club or group as they know little about science or aviation – they just exploit everything and everyone – but I can't help thinking that they would pay to be made well again, if sick themselves, as they also have no morals.

I'm trying to set the scene to explain how so many really clever people can be so hoodwinked over so many decades by a few people at the top as it is beyond doubt that many so-called lawyers have not the slightest interest in changing H&S disaster areas such as

Aerotoxic Syndrome – they are only interested in the making money and the short-term milking of our system for their own benefit.

Indeed, at the Balpa Cabin Air conference of 20th and 21st April 2005, US Attorney Stuart Calwell carefully explained how no one wanted ‘to kill the goose which lays the golden eggs’ as that stops their deeply evil game for everyone - so they milk others to provide for their families, fully aware of the crime that they are committing by perverting the course of justice on an epic scale.

Here is the full & unabridged published text from 2005 of a top US so-called lawyer:

Throughout these experiences, I have become accustomed to the sing song mantra of the large corporation’s response to those bold enough to complain of injuries caused by exposure to toxins: “Well you might feel sick now, but it won’t hurt you in the long run”; and, “You’ve probably been eating too many tomatoes, they’re full of acid”; and, “We see a lot of this, but it’s mostly in your head, you feel a little sick, someone suggests it’s caused by something or other and pretty soon you think you’re sick.”; and, “You just can’t get exposed (in an airplane for example) to enough of this stuff to hurt you. You’d have to drink a gallon of it”; and, my personal favorite, “Look, we’ve studied and studied this chemical. It’s safe. [† Prof Abou-Donia, Dr Howard, Prof Furlong, Dr Jamal and others have been most patient and extraordinarily instructive in preparing me to present cases involving nervous system injuries and exposures to organophosphates.

Without their expertise and guidance through the difficult scientific issues I would have enjoyed little or no success in my endeavours on behalf of persons injured by these toxins. There’s no reason for you to be worried about a little bit of this stuff leaking out into the air. It just won’t cause any long term or permanent injury or disease. We’ve studied it.” I call statements like these: “the flying saucer defense”. Here’s how it works. The company creates its own junk science (they call them internal studies), takes advantage of its position as an important business providing jobs and convinces people that chemical diseases don’t exist.

Then when someone claims to have a chemically related disease he’s made to feel as though he or she is crazy. The injured person begins to feel as though he or she is trying to convince “sane” people that a flying saucer really did land in the back garden. The more insistent the injured person becomes, the crazier he or she is made to feel or seem by “proper persons” who know there are no flying saucers. In point of fact, the injuries and illnesses that people suffer from these toxins in the workplace are real. They actually do land in the back garden, and I’ve spent the better part of my career successfully proving it. You who fly the skies in these large contraptions full of contaminated air can prove it also.

By way of this introduction, I also point out that one must be sensitive to the “politics” of lawsuits. My law firm and I represent a number of trade unions. It is most always in the best interest of the union to promote, protect and work for the success of the industry in which its members work. Destroying the industry the union serves is obviously “killing the goose that lays the golden egg”. With that overriding principle in mind, however, it is necessary from time to

time to find ways of protecting the membership from the industry it serves. The art in this is to find ways of achieving justice without shooting one's self in the foot.

A 'cottage industry' was so observed in the Spotlight movie of 2015 where countless Roman Catholic Church paedophile 'priests' around the world were actually dramatically exposed their 'findings' or fully documented and dated evidence by the plucky Boston Globe in 2002. The movie ended by everyone shamefully agreeing that the explosive exposure could have been done at least five years earlier than suited the calculating newspaper shareholders.

I've also noticed a certain sycophancy of those in the 5% Negative club as they tip toe around each other's different criminal money-making schemes, always aware that if and when they are caught, red-handed, on the wrong side of the criminal law, the head man must go to jail as ignorance of H&S law is absolutely not a reasonable defence even when the head man, who is supposed to know what's going on, is probably on several million dollars a year.

So we seem to have 5% of good guys who are trying to do good, along with 90% who would mostly want good to be done - but it's all messed up by the small minority of 5% who seem to enjoy the bad and mucking up the majority (including themselves), which is just plain stupid and weird.

Gaslighting is a form of psychological manipulation. A person or a group sows the seeds of doubt in an individual or a group making them question themselves or their understanding of a situation. It can result in the victim or victims suffering from low self-esteem, in some cases, becoming dependent on the gas lighter.

We who have experienced Aerotoxic Syndrome do not think we have it; we know we have it.

Why do others not believe those who one minute operated multimillion dollar jets, like Captain Lee Trenchard (whose great uncle founded the RAF in 1918), but who are treated with contempt when they report inconvenient evidence to the authorities? It just does not add up. One person's belief is another person's doubt and that has been and remains the battle ground of discrimination, prejudice and bigotry of the 5 % Negatives as they worship money.

Whether gaslighting is being used in Aerotoxic Syndrome is for others to judge yet it does appear that poisonous gas is definitely causing difficulties for many innocent people who are over controlled by those who seem to enjoy belittling and bullying by treating with utter contempt professional reports written by those who have had enough of seven decades of madness, as the public are cheated of their fundamental rights.

I've often wondered if it would be more successful if an Aerotoxic organisation was established as a quasi-religion, as at least then we might be accorded a bit more understanding and may experience less openly hostile discrimination, exclusion and outright persecution.

To summarise, the flying public are indeed ‘self-loading freight’ and they are deliberately and mischievously kept in the dark, like mushrooms, about the mostly invisible air they breathe. They put their total trust not only in their invisible pilots and visible cabin crew, but also in the engineering principles of the past 100 years, and in the airlines who claim that ‘they would never harm anyone deliberately’ but who, for decades, have been ‘economical with the truth’ despite the many signs of recognition that visible oil fumes create visible injuries – now.

Chapter 3

The Cover-up – Public Servants - Lawyers, Media & Government Policy?

I was very pleased, on reflection, that on 22nd May 2006 I recorded in my first statement that what I had found out over the previous five months since early January, as an ever sceptical scientist requiring 100% proof, was a criminal cover-up. This was further helpfully confirmed by The Daily Telegraph’s brave journalist, Christopher Booker, fourteen years ago on the 24th of June 2007, in a detailed article in which he recommended that ‘the cover-up be blown wide open’.

12:01AM BST 24 Jun 2007

Pilots disabled by poisoned air. A few years back Susan Michaelis, Tristan Loraine and John Hoyte were successful airline pilots, earning up to £100,000 a year. Last Monday, with health and livelihood destroyed, they joined forces with some 20 other similarly disabled pilots, to launch a campaign to alert the public to what should be seen as one of the most alarming scandals of our time.

Yet two days later came further evidence of how the regulatory authorities, in alliance with the airline industry itself, have stopped at nothing to cover up a health disaster whose financial costs for the industry could run to many billions.

The essence of the problem is that the air supply to the cockpits and cabins of many modern airliners is bled off from their engines, where it becomes contaminated with carcinogens, immunosuppressants and highly toxic organo-phosphorus (OP) chemicals, especially a compound known as tricresol phosphate (TCP) used as an anti-wear additive. Both crew and passengers are thus exposed to small amounts of OPs and a cocktail of other nasties. OPs, more commonly used as pesticides, cumulatively attack the nervous system, causing disorders ranging from nausea, headaches and dizziness to, eventually, serious mental and physical breakdown.

Although this problem was first identified 30 years ago, following a near-fatal incident in the US, it was kept so quiet that when hundreds of pilots in the 1980s began to experience adverse reactions they had no idea why. One of the first to track down the cause was Susan Michaelis, flying BA146s in Australia, when in 1997 she was permanently grounded by severe illness. Two

years later, at her instigation, an official inquiry by the Australian Senate heard enough expert evidence to confirm that the cause of so many pilots and cabin crew suffering ill-health was contamination of cabin air by TCP and other chemicals.

In 2001 the cause was taken up in Britain by Captain Loraine, a senior member of the British Air Line Pilots Association (BALPA), who flew Boeing 757s. But from the industry and regulators, such as the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA), they met with a wall of denials. Although more pilots were suffering from "Aerotoxic Syndrome" every year, there began a cover-up which uncannily paralleled the methods used by government in the 1990s when the health of thousands of farmers was destroyed by OPs in sheep dip.

Ironically, in 2005, just after he had organised a BALPA conference of leading scientists and other experts from all over the world, Captain Loraine himself became seriously affected. Initially doctors for his airline saw no reason why he should not continue flying, but in 2006, following further exposure to contaminated air, he was permanently grounded by the CAA.

The career of Captain Hoyte, an experienced BA146 pilot, ended the same year for the same reason, although he was repeatedly told by doctors for his airline and the CAA that his only problem was "stress".

Tests run on both pilots by the leading medical experts on OP poisoning, including Professor Mohamed Abou-Donia, of Duke University, North Carolina, and neuropsychologist Dr Sarah Mackenzie-Ross of University College, London, confirmed brain cell death, cognitive problems and exposure to TCP, explaining why both had become textbook cases of OP-induced chronic neurotoxicity.

Dr Mackenzie-Ross, who since 2003 has been carrying out an extensive study of sheep farmers and airline pilots, has estimated that, in 2004, 197,000 airline passengers in Britain alone could have been exposed to contaminated fumes. The evidence suggests that a great many people have been made ill while flying without having any idea why. One of the scientists studying this problem, Professor Chris van Netten, a Canadian epidemiologist, has analysed swabs taken from many different airliners, finding traces of TCP in more than 80 per cent of the aircraft tested.

Yet, despite the overwhelming weight of evidence, the regulators and the industry have continued to deny that the TCP problem exists. For three years now, as with the sheep farmers before, the British Government has relied on its Committee on Toxicity (CoT) to conduct a seemingly interminable investigation into "cabin air quality", marked by a conspicuous reluctance to address the problem of TCP.

Last week, Michaelis, Loraine and Hoyte joined forces at Portcullis House, Westminster, to launch the Aerotoxic Association, backed by 110 MPs and many peers, including those veterans of the battle to expose the scandal of OP poisoning, the Countess of Mar and Lord (Paul) Tyler. On Wednesday, however, the CoT produced the minutes of yet another of its meetings. As

official obfuscation, they were almost self-parodic. They referred to BALPA submitting "data relating to organo-phosphates", but this was the only reference to OPs in the document. The remaining 20 pages, dealing with anything from carbon monoxide to the need to review pilot-training procedures, showed that the committee had no interest in whether airline crews and passengers were being poisoned by TCP from engine oil. It is high time this particular cover-up was blown wide open.

Christopher Booker

What is a cover-up? Can we all agree that it is when inconvenient evidence is deliberately kept out of the public domain for fear of causing trouble mainly for industry and that those involved in the cover-up are coordinated by many different sectors including the government, the medical industry, science, universities and the media in order to stop the public from finding out inconvenient secrets?

But all cover-ups are exposed eventually, as the number of people knowing outstrips those not knowing until the tipping point of exposure is reached. Talking about tipping points, at the annual September Cabin Air conference of 2017, Michael Rawlinson QC stood up talked of the then unpublished red herring term, 'Aerotoxic' (not dissimilar to Chemtrails), which was created by cunning 'lawyers'. During his passionless speech he announced that 'Aerotoxic' was at its tipping point, which meant that anytime now (in the past four years) - the public would finally find out the truth and the cover-up would be exposed.

It is probably important to state here that Aerotoxic Syndrome is purely involved with public health and that is always alleged by corrupt organisations and governments to be the MOST important aspect of life above making money and all other activities human activities.

Public health is always claimed to be the number one priority of governments, politicians and public servants so as to, in theory anyway, sound good and to protect the weak and less able, to defend children, unborn babies, pregnant mothers and all of those people in society who require protection.

So whose job is it to protect the public? The public servants who are paid with public funds to do the job and should always verge on the side of caution and not take any risks. Any money paid to them is exclusively meant to be for the public good in line with the Nolan Report of 1995 which clearly stated the seven terms of public duty as follows:

The Seven Principles of Public Life

The Seven Principles of Public Life (also known as the Nolan Principles) apply to anyone who works as a public office-holder. This includes all those who are elected or appointed to public office, nationally and locally, and all people appointed to work in the Civil Service, local government, the police, courts and probation services, non-departmental public bodies (NDPBs),

and in the health, education, social and care services. All public office-holders are both servants of the public and stewards of public resources. The principles also apply to all those in other sectors delivering public services.

1.1 Selflessness

Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest.

1.2 Integrity

Holders of public office must avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work. They should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships.

1.3 Objectivity

Holders of public office must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.

1.4 Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and must submit themselves to the scrutiny necessary to ensure this.

1.5 Openness

Holders of public office should act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for so doing.

1.6 Honesty

Holders of public office should be truthful.

1.7 Leadership

Holders of public office should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.

Politicians have a key role as they rely on votes to keep them in office and they should respond to their constituents fears and worries but when, over 6 years, constituents don't know about the issue then it's hard for the politician to represent something which is covered up the doctors who have to swear an oath to do no harm when they take their medical degree. Yet many people could

argue that they are harming people by the ignorance of not understanding something which has been there for many decades.

Scientists are supposed to 'follow the science' and be balanced and rational with their discoveries but sometimes they get paid by industry to print what the airlines or aircraft manufacturers want—he who pays the piper has always played the tune.

The media are supposed to commentate on what's going on and blow the whistle when foul play is suspected or proved and yet all of these groups are essentially making money out of 'the Goose which lays the Golden egg', as we have already seen with the Boston Globe and Spotlight in 2002 but if they go a bit too far then suddenly they cause a bit too much trouble for themselves. It threatens the whole structure of the establishment of what they like to do from day to day, which is to NEVER fully expose anything, but just to make money from it, to milk it which is all very well if you're not directly affected, but if your life has been impacted by Aerotoxic Syndrome or anything else it's rather frustrating to be used or never to be believed. At least other groups rely on the public Courts to define what is 'right or wrong' or what is or isn't happening and, despite many public Courts coming to very clear conclusions about individuals over the last seventy years, there is an inability to understand that if one claimant is affected by Aerotoxicity on a flight with 300 people the remaining 299 people are likely to be affected too.

That is exactly what occurred on Thursday 1st February 2007 when around forty British passengers were all affected on a single 'non fume event' flight and the evidence was quickly recorded in government and Parliamentary papers in 2007. Then the BBC took an interest and consulted Stuart Calwell, US attorney, about their strong case and recorded their ill health on film for posterity, which included children coughing their guts up.

But then the hated UK lawyers ran their case and, of course, if the passengers won that would be seriously bad news for Boeing and their 767 aircraft, which caused the mass group illness in the first place. So, after a few years, despite claiming 'a great victory' for the case, in 2010, it was quietly overlooked and covered up in 2012 and that's just one legal case. But there is a mass of evidence of other poisoning cases, which have had exactly the same treatment and it's worrying to think that there are some people whose life's work is to do the covering up. Not only is their raison d'être in life to actively cover up something and stop it getting out but they are also very well funded with endless amounts of money which they use very effectively. They can also pay people off; they can pay newspapers off; they can pay the media and radio stations off; they can make sure that documentary films are not seen by the masses; and, even if they have been affected, they don't care as it's all about Following the Money.

Around 10 years ago I asked an academic village friend 'How can they get away with it?' and exactly 'How is it all managed?' because there's no paper trail to show what's going on and he explained to me that it's all done verbally and off the record. OK, got it, thank you for

explaining. So it doesn't matter how hard you look, you'll never find the BBC Aerotoxic banning memos written down or logged in anyway and any public C

court would take a very dim view of such evidence.

By definition, it must be government policy to ban certain inconvenient words and phrases. 'Aerotoxic Syndrome' definitely qualifies as a banned phrase now, especially over the last twelve months since the so called new pandemic has taken hold.

For somebody like me, who has been running the Aerotoxic Association for fourteen years, it's been virtually impossible to get any publicity or public understanding of something which isn't allowed. It's all banned, but common sense says it must be written down somewhere - there must be a policy somewhere about Aerotoxic Syndrome and this must go out to all the media and the various people who are supposed to be covering it up..

It's a D notice - it's prohibited.

It's impossible to report and that's where we are now in the United Kingdom, particularly, and in America - the health and safety issues are not able to be talked about or openly, publicly debated. It's secretly covered up and that's the way it is in the key countries of the world. France is different; France has a socialist background of egalitarian brotherhood and intelligence where they eventually do dramatic things to achieve justice and so when I went to France in October 2019 I stayed with captain Eric Bailet, formerly of EasyJet, and over several weeks we talked and he told me then that the Union lawyers had 100% evidence of Aerotoxic Syndrome and because of that Aerotoxic Syndrome would be formally accepted within two years as an occupational disease which would be by October 2021. This was not a local case, it wasn't just for the Union, it was France, the nation, accepting Aerotoxic Syndrome as an occupational disease. EasyJet, being a British airline, was implicated as many of the crews had Aerotoxic Syndrome, but apparently the winning case for France was that of Marie Pierre Raffaele of Air Corsica after she was permanently injured in two separate oil fume event flights in 2014 on an Airbus 320 of Air Corsica. Now she is about forty years old and is completely wrecked for the rest of her life due to flying those two flights

Based on that information the Global Cabin Air Quality Executive decided to hold an annual conference in March 2021. Now, these recurring Cabin Air conferences are normally held annually in September but for some reason the GCAQE brought the annual conference forward by six months to March. Usually the conference lasted just two days because what they do is just update everybody on what has happened in the past year but the March conference of 2021 was allocated four days and this would not be at Imperial College in London or some posh University but online on Zoom due to the pandemic, so anybody could attend. So there was considerable excitement in early December 2020, as all of a sudden the key nation in the world - France - would be formally accepting Aerotoxic Syndrome. So it was communicated in early January 2021 that Saturday the 20th March 2021 would be the day when France would formally accept that

Aerotoxic Syndrome was an occupational disease and that made sense as the conference was the previous four days leading up to the formal date.

I joked that it was a Saturday, as everyone in the world would have forgotten the momentous date by the following Monday... 22nd March 2021. A dark sense of humour is never far away for aircrew.

So a lot of activity took place in early 2021 in anticipation of the domino effect that would be caused by Aerotoxic Syndrome being accepted in one key, vital country. The Airbus aircraft in question is made in France but is flown all over the world and especially in the United States of America where numerous people are affected on perhaps five 'fume events' flights daily each aircraft with maybe an average of 100 people on board each of these aircraft. Statistically around 500 people a day are being exposed and a percentage of these people will be affected and the aircrew, who fly every day, will be particularly badly affected especially after several fume exposures. The other group who will be affected are the frequent flyers who pay to be poisoned and often fly far more than pilots and cabin crew - many people are continually in the air!

In 2015 Harvard University conducted a study on US Air Marshals, a federal law enforcement agency, trained to protect the flying public. Harvard University studied them in great detail over a couple of years and concluded that many of them were chronically sick and, since the nature of their job meant that the air marshals flew more often than aircrew, this could be due to the number of hours they spent flying - the evidence was pretty much overwhelming in 2015.

It was with great personal excitement that the 20th March approached. The annual conference itself was mostly a predictable rerun of all the previous sixteen annual conferences going back to 2005 - so what we were looking for were 'differences' to the ways the previous conferences had been held and one key different aspect of the 2021 four day conference was that, on the very last day, John Martin of the Boston law company, KJC Law, agreed to appear at the conference for \$7,500 sponsorship (which in the great scheme of things of a multibillion dollar scandal, was chickenfeed) and this bought this mighty law company the opportunity to put their website on the conference website as the official sponsors.

Another lawyer from Texas, Zoe Littlepage, also attended for a friendly free, public 'chat' so that's how the 2021 conference differed from previous sixteen conferences. We witnessed American lawyers chit chatting in public about how to represent Aerotoxic Syndrome, which has been known about for at least twenty years and how best to deal with their few cases, but of course they not interested in representing the masses of people there - they only wanted to win black and white obvious cases which they could predictably run and win without killing the Golden Goose!

I make no money from helping and supporting others - I am only interested in closing down the issue or in 'Killing the Goose' or in individuals' particular health issues. Interestingly, one of the key people who attended the 2021 conference was Captain Andrew Myers, formerly of Jet Blue,

as his legal case had been won on the 31st July 2020 in the American Compensation Court. This is where it gets ridiculous, because it depends on the public Court it's heard in, the judge and the jury and all the different variable elements such whether it's an employee or a passenger or what they had for breakfast so there is an endless struggling redefining of cases.

I'm trying to find the best case as an example and Captain Andrew Myers' is an absolutely clear case of somebody who was gassed and then poisoned on the ground in a fume event in A320 jet for JetBlue is an employee and he was one of the guest speakers at the 2021 conference. The scary thing was that where there's one person or victim, that could be one of a million other people and that's the really disturbing part of this scandal.

Just looking at samples of the whole, you would never be able to interview a million people, but just listening to one case in great detail is pretty upsetting.

So the key conference went ahead but irritatingly it was mainly only for the benefit of BASF and Pall Aerospace. GCAQE, for some political reason of disguise by 'Trojan Horse', didn't want the victims and survivors there. We injured professional aircrew really don't like being called 'victims' or 'campaigners' - we're professional aircrew trying to report an issue. We don't mind being called 'survivors' because that's how we feel, but we weren't at all welcome at this 17th annual Cabin Air conference and that was pretty clear from early in 2021.

That's a great shame really, because you never want to see masses of people ranting and raging as some people tend to do but without them it was nothing and there was a great missed opportunity there as GCAQE kept the Aerotoxic Association away as well as all the other groups who represent the survivors and that was annoying and irritating after fifteen years of maximum effort.

Of course there were other groups of people who weren't at the conference but these were the people who absolutely should have been there as these were the previously mentioned public servants as it was their job to be aware of what was going on. For example, were the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) or the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) even asked? But then, chillingly, the media weren't present either - the BBC, The Daily Telegraph, The Times - they all knew about it well in advance but the conference was absolutely not reported to the public.

Remember this key conference was leading up to the big announcement on the 20th March and none of this was allowed to be in the public domain.

And because the conference was going to go ahead anyway from the 15th to 18th March, the Aerotoxic Association and I decided to have two independent, separate workshops and these were set up for Sunday 14th March and Friday 19th March, either side of the conference, so that we could have a before and after the ground breaking conference.

These would ONLY be for the benefit of any passengers (even children), pilots or cabin crew who wanted to tell their story. The workshops should have gone ahead but it was quite hard to arrange them at such short notice and the media cover-up was complete. The Sunday Times was going to cover them but because we couldn't provide the newspaper with a critical piece of paper from the French confirming that they would definitely announce the occupational disease on 20th March 2021, they chose not to cover us. As the cover-up dictated that nobody was allowed to talk about the conference it was impossible to get any public awareness for the 14th March workshop so I decided to cancel that one.

It's important to state that this was the second 'alternative' workshop. The story behind the first alternative workshop was as follows. In November 2007 it was suggested to Cranfield University that a professional airline pilot could easily generate a visible oil 'fume event' in a worst offending BAe 146 jet on the ground for testing and measuring both the chemicals and the doses or concentrations. The identities of chemicals in 'normal' cabin air were finally published in 2011 by Cranfield University, but the concentrations have never been published as that would immediately explain the ill health found in human beings who have been exposed to oil fumes for seventy years. As they only identified the chemicals, this was severely criticised by everybody as being the first major very public lapse of the UK government in their way of presenting evidence to the public. At that time, Professor Jeremy Ramsden of Cranfield University bravely put his head above the parapet and severely criticised his colleagues at the university, explaining that they hadn't done the testing properly; they hadn't published the truth; they had deliberately covered up the concentrations of the chemicals. This made him very unpopular with Cranfield and he had to leave later in 2011 but, before, he left, he decided to hold an alternative conference or 'workshop' on 11th October 2011 at the University, just to rub it in and I became part of the organising committee for that. It was attended by sixty or seventy members of the public and many people flew in from the United States and Canada. Captain David Zaharik of Air Canada was in uniform and presented a paper. Professor Clem Furlong and Dr Byron Hyde attended. Many of the key expert doctors including Sarah Mackenzie Ross of University College, London openly criticised the government and CAA for preventing any further research. It was a great event which was opened by Professor Ramsden and it confirmed what we all already knew. The formal workshop stopped after seven when we adjourned to the local pub and carried on until about 23.00. That was a most memorable first alternative conference in 2011.

I wanted the same sort of feeling for this next workshop in 2021, but we missed out on Sunday 14th March only because of the lack of any media coverage and because we weren't fully prepared. We wanted to listen to the conference and hear what the big shot US lawyers had to say with the latest evidence - so we relaxed and didn't do anything until 19th March and in reality nobody with any experience bothered to waste their time listening to the same record going round and round at the 'new' conference with very little new news or progress to report but of course that was to come on the 20th March, with the key French announcement.

The French weren't even at the conference and there was no representation from the French unions or an AVSA <https://www.syndrome-aerotoxique.com/> or any of these key French parties, so they were playing their own game and not taking part at all.

It's common in this sort of political game to have different factions and different ways of doing things- so the French kept well away and by the 19th March we gathered together an assortment of example survivors, mainly aircrew because cabin crew are particularly voluble compared to pilots and want to know about it whilst pilots are generally quieter and take a more measured, selfish economic approach and don't want to rock the boat. So there are always many more cabin crew than pilots present, but this is also true in real life because there is probably a ratio 1:5 pilots to cabin crew.

Anybody was allowed to have their say and explain what happened to them.. I felt that the passenger content was by far the most important as was shown by a passenger, Karen Isherwood, from a Ryanair flight 10 years ago. She had her words read out because she couldn't be there on the day.

Aerotoxic event

Date: 11 August 2011

Event: Holiday with the family to Tenerife.

We boarded the Ryanair flight, no unusual circumstances at the beginning of the flight apart from a crisp packet which exploded following take off. I was seated on row 11 in the centre with my daughter with part of the family who were one row behind to the left side. I remember the flight attendant knelt down to speak with me which I considered unusually friendly but nothing else suspicious about the flight. No strange odour or smoke identified that I was aware of but then I wouldn't have known to be aware of this at the time. When disembarking from the plane I felt nauseous was aware of the strong smell of the fuel. As I exited the airport I felt a sudden lightness in my body, my head felt strange, a feeling I hadn't experienced before, I felt unsteady and fearful of falling. I needed to sit down and was grateful that a friend had arrived to collect us from the airport. I sat in the car and reported how I felt but it was difficult to describe. On arrival to the complex I needed to lie down immediately as my head was feeling 'woozy', 'drowsy'. I started to feel a strangeness in my feet which I can only explain as worm like feelings in the soles of my feet. It is very difficult to explain these unknown symptoms I was experiencing. I felt constant nausea and had heart palpitations, pains behind my eyes, around my nose, painful headaches in my frontal/side lobe. I encouraged the family to meet up with friends who were waiting to greet us; they had their own private apartment, I was renting one on the same complex which we had done for the previous few years. Our holiday we anticipated with excitement was now feeling like a nightmare. I was so unwell I didn't know what to do. I slept that night hoping

I would feel better the following day. I attempted to meet up with others but I had to excuse myself and go back to the apartment as I couldn't shake off the awful feeling I had in my head. A friend suggested that I might be experiencing a panic attack but I explained I'd had these years ago and definitely not the same. I asked my husband to accompany me to see the local doctor which was a short distance away. I was able to get an appointment where I was observed and advised to attend the hospital due to my concerns. I attended the hospital in Costa Adeje, and vital signs appeared normal. I had a CT scan and bloods taken. It was difficult to communicate due to the language barrier however my husband spoke some basic Spanish to assist with some translation. I was diagnosed with migraine and sinusitis and prescribed medication, Tegretol. The medication did not relieve my symptoms. I spent the holiday resting. I was anxious about the flight home, concerned if I was well enough to fly. Once home, I felt depressed, I felt my brain function was operating on 3 cylinders instead of 10. I made an appointment with my GP who sent me to see a neurological consultant at the hospital. The diagnosis was migraine however no investigations were carried out at that time. I was frustrated as I knew this was more than a migraine as I just didn't feel back to my normal self. I couldn't continue my post grad studies as I was unable to concentrate. Friends and family were supportive but I knew they were sceptical when I was trying to explain that I was suffering a strange illness. I felt isolated from others. A few weeks later I visited my dad some 300 miles away. The journey was difficult as the children were noisy most of the way and I was extremely irritable. When we arrived I needed to drive somewhere on my own to have some space as the journey had exhausted me mentally. I was upset and frustrated and parked up at a nearby park to sit alone. I'm a solutions person and I felt determined to find out what was happening to me. At that point of feeling so frustrated and angry I decided to google 'symptoms following a flight' on my phone device and was shocked and relieved when I came across Aerotoxic Syndrome as this was finally the diagnosis I was searching for and which made some sense finally. All the symptoms I was experiencing was clear on the website. I felt a huge sense of relief as I knew there were others like me. I got in touch with John and explained my story and he was very interested to learn more. We arranged a meeting with my then local MP, Andy Burnham to discuss what I had experienced and asked what support he could offer. Andy Burnham listened with empathy and made an enquiry to the Department of Health regarding the toxic exposure who transferred this to colleagues in the Department for Transport. I then received a reply from the Rt.Hon. Theresa Villers who concluded that there was no accepted medical condition called Aerotoxic Syndrome and no established symptoms reported by cabin crew or passengers that were caused by cabin air. Theresa also reported that a substantial review conducted by the independent committee on toxicity recommended further work be carried out on exposures with no evidence of pollutants in cabin air (27/02/12). I contacted a Teresa Hughes a person affected by a flight passed on to me by John. We shared our stories. She advised she was being represented by a solicitor Avril Scally at Lavell Coleman, Dublin. I decided to contact Avril and she would represent my case. I wouldn't be able to meet the costs and decided to decline her services. Still remaining fatigued, not able to function at the level as before, feeling lost, I contacted my GP who referred my case to the chronic fatigue

service, who reported I was high level of fatigue suggesting spreading out activities to a manageable level, explained that professional persons with high drivers suffer worse. I was not comfortable with this diagnosis and declined further treatment. A few years later I was diagnosed with a chronic lung disease, permanent scarring of the lungs following multiple infections.

Where I am now.

I have retrained as an occupational therapist, struggled to attain a 2:2 however this was excellent for me as my concentration levels are not as before. I work full time, keep fit and active. I have no longer suffered with depression/anxiety. I felt that I had to put the past behind me as no one believed my plight, it caused more stress when people around me just pacified me. It is difficult challenging things alone. I have felt supported by John in the past, and forever grateful that he has spoken to the world about fume events, constantly enabling others to see the truth. I hope the safety of others is paramount ensuring future flights are free from toxic fume events which are life debilitating and life threatening. Nobody understands until they walk in that person's shoes.

I am grateful to John and congratulate him for all of his hard work. I would be happy to speak further about the subject although no formal diagnosis of Aerotoxic Syndrome has been recorded on my medical records.

Kind regards and thank you for taking the time to listen.

Karen Isherwood.

The key testimonies were just from ordinary people talking about what had happened to them and 19th March was a relative success and the conference organiser, Capt. Tristan Loraine was put on the spot when he couldn't answer very simple questions about the absence of FAA and CAA or the BBC and why any media hadn't been able to attend his big conference. That was pretty worrying and it ended up with him walking off in disgust and anger with me when I called him a fraud – just like in the scene from the film, *A Dark Reflection*, which he had directed himself....

That was a difficult time, but it was unsurprising as many people were not at all happy at the way the conference was run over four days and how they treated the survivors particularly badly. Then on 19th March, Olivia Kerr, a former injured BA cabin crew who lives in France, reported that the French legal action had been appealed and there wouldn't be any announcement on 20th March. Of course this wasn't a great surprise as any announcement would have been ground breaking and I don't think anybody was too surprised when this was explained to everybody but there was a deathly silence the next day on 20th March. You are in a situation where you can't talk about what is happening but you know that the announcement has just been delayed until later in 2021 or whenever the date is decided by the French authorities and lawyers.

So now to return to the point about government policy and how things are written down which are meant to be followed by certain people in everyday life. One can imagine a BBC manager in

Norwich, Norfolk, United Kingdom having a bit of paper or a memo saying that this Aerotoxic Syndrome public disease does exist, but on no account are you to mention it on the airwaves. It's a banned word. It would be absolutely fascinating to see that policy written down in the memo which these servant people have to go by, because it flies in the face of freedom of speech and of what the Nolan committee reported in 1995. It is absolutely the opposite of what should be happening and it would be really great to have a copy of that government policy or the memos these BBC journalists are using to not do something.

It's worrying, but we should forget the United Kingdom and United States and look only towards France because this is the country which will win it eventually as previously reasoned and explained. We don't have to fret about what the British or the Americans are doing – it is the French who Will Win it.

This is absolutely true because the Frenchman, Jean Christophe Balouet, first identified Aerotoxic Syndrome in a paper published in 1999 so France had a key stake in the whole H&S issue from early on and the French unions and French aircrew have become very militant over the issue. So there's no question that France is the key nation and these people will, with their strict social laws, ultimately win the Aerotoxic battle on some unknown date in the future. Other countries will then have no choice but to follow in France's footsteps because of the Airbus connection and the domino effect.

Chapter 4

Survivors and the 100-year evidence dated timeline

I described earlier how professional aircrew do not like being called victims or campaigners as this smacks of emotional language and these are words which we don't like to be associated with when all we're trying to do is report a cause of mass public ill health. We prefer the term 'survivors' to victims – a bit like the concentration camp survivors who have survived adversity in the past and dealt with it, come through it and put it behind them.

The Global Cabin Air Quality Executive did a series of free webinars leading up to the 2021 conference and these were mostly about the history of contaminated air and about the last 100 years, as allegedly the first aircraft with a pressurised cabin was constructed in 1921 in America where it was realised that aircraft had to fly high to avoid possible enemy action, to avoid gunfire from the ground, to be able to fly over enemy territory safely and to get above the weather. There are lots of advantages in flying high as engines work better at a higher level, by using less fuel as there is less air. So it wasn't surprising that at the end of the Great War aircraft manufacturers looked at pressurising aircraft cabins. 100 years ago can be taken as the date of the first pressurised aircraft and so we have had 100 years of development. In those very early days, in the pressurised cabin of an old biplane, the last thing they would have worried about was a few bits of oil floating around in the air.

In 1921 they just used a mechanical air pump to pressurise a cabin, and soon they found they had problems with people being exposed to any sort of contaminant in the air with watering eyes and other physical difficulties. The body is delicate at 20,000 feet without pressurisation due to lack of oxygen and the cold and so on and if you then put a little bit of oil into the air or any other contaminant then human body will react adversely and this was all documented at the time. The GCAQE's webinars were repeated over and over again explaining in very simple baby language the evolution of pressurisation from 1921 onwards.

The Second World War produced huge technical advantages with jet aircraft appearing in the middle of the war and towards the end of the war, unmanned Boeing B.17 drone aircraft were being experimented with showing what could be done 80 years ago.

Soon after the war, the way ahead was only with jet aircraft. It should be noted that before the Second World War the airship era very quickly came to a shuddering halt with some dramatic accidents but also these airships were white elephants in the new world and they were very quickly destroyed and within a few years they had disappeared from public consciousness.

The future was with pressurising cabins and the GCAQE did a great job of presenting the history of this issue and how pilots in the 1950s were made sick in military jets and reported their symptoms to doctors at that time. It's all recorded and written down in simple words. Anybody doubting it, well how exactly are we meant to cover anything if they don't believe what's written by pilots seventy years ago?

The rate of change of evolution and technology throughout the 1950s and 60s was particularly urgent, acute and spectacular as it was driven by the Cold War and they learned, with a personal concern and understanding about chemicals because I've been trained in their use and didn't want to be affected by them so I did everything in my power to avoid being contaminated whilst using them, while, at the same time, enjoying flying. Life is a balance - you do something but you accept the risks and you attempt to minimize the risks.

During the first half of my flying career in unpressurised aircraft, I was an aerial crop spraying pilot and used organophosphates. This is all recorded - it's dated, named evidence that I have in my possession..

The advantage that professional pilots have is that we keep log books and this is drummed into us from a very early time and indeed it is a legal requirement to record every aspect of your flight: the date; the type of aircraft; the registration; where you flew from and to; the times of brake release & application; and who you might be flying with and any other details. I always put a BIG black mark in the margin when I nearly 'bought the farm', which happened twice on 19th June!

This isn't an optional thing to do. It's a legal requirement of the system and it's by mistakes but were always influenced by money. The cheapest always wins and the accountants were desperate

for a cheap way of supplying pressurised air to passengers in jet aircraft and the mechanical pumps of the 1950s were regularly failing as they were just not built to last.

The Boeing 707, which used turbo compressors to mechanically pressurise the cabin air, despite being fantastic aircraft, were quickly superseded by the Boeing 727 which used unfiltered bleed air. They didn't filter the bleed air in the cabin, but bear in mind that in those days many people were smoking cigarettes so the air in the cabin was probably full of secondary smoke from tobacco. So who would care about a bit of oil in the air? Tobacco smoke was far more prominent in those days and that, of course, was outlawed in the mid-1980s. When I started flying jets in 1989, Captains were still smoking the odd cigarette on board, but within a few months smoking was outlawed - no more smoking in flight because of the health risks from secondary smoke. So for 30 years, during the whole tobacco period, smoking would have masked the toxic oil and then from 1962 onwards Boeing took charge. They were the key manufacturer at the time and created the Boeing 727 with three jets and this would be the first American jet to use bleed air and it was deemed a success at the time because it was free. It was just too easy and it worked beautifully and pressurised cabins and suddenly the problem of pressurisation was sorted out. I was born on 17th October 1955 and just a few days before I was born an American scientist by the name of Riddell published a paper explaining about the dangers of bleed air, because it contains oil particles. This is all fully documented as published evidence in the public domain.

So what we're describing now is 100 years of history which you can look back at it and can agree that it is prima facie evidence. My story is from 1955 with early flying and, later required all over the world so we all have dated log books and every last detail of what actually happened can be correlated with somebody else's log book. You accumulate several log books in your life - I've got five log books and they are matters of history really. They recall what happened and when. At the beginning of 2021 an Aerotoxic pilot colleague was going to a Scottish public Court over his claim for compensation and he was to be represented by a Queen's Counsel who would need to know everything about his case. The QC asked him innocently if this well-established pilot had any evidence of his flying career because he knew that such evidence would be crucial to prove his case. When the professional pilot showed the QC his log books with all the details the QC just couldn't believe his eyes; he knew all about the law; he knew about the Courts; he knew all about justice; but he had no idea about this fundamental aspect of flying - that ALL pilots keep log books, and he was overjoyed when he saw them. Of course they won their case based mostly on these log books which the QC didn't even know existed a few weeks before the case. This is the sort of example of where lawyers and the outside world find out what's been there all the time right under their noses, just waiting to be used. They know the law well but many of them still won't know this simple fact and that's a bit worrying.

As a student of history and knowing what's happened in detail in the past from evidence which is dated and missed in the public domain, you can quite quickly build up a pretty accurate picture of what's been going on over the last 100 years. You can generalise and see the big overall picture

and the key developments, the key dates of various events and can understand it in a complete and balanced way. There are also good things and positive things which come out and unbalanced flying has probably been good for the human race in the last 100 years but we were concerned with another aspect of it and that is public health. So it's important to understand the history of anything and then, of course, now it is the present so we know what happened and when as even yesterday is history - so that's all recorded and in any public Court that would be excellent evidence for any judge and jury to consider and that's what's going on at the moment. All of this evidence is slowly being produced and examined in a public Court where they go through it meticulously and in great detail and that's where we are.

Then, of course, the next thing is you can project into the future and you can look at what happened with tobacco or asbestos or mercury or any of those other toxic substances and you can understand how they finally want them in the Courts. You can see a similar way of judging toxic substances in the future and that's exactly what's going on at the moment. Obviously, as some of the details become clearer and clearer over the years, that gives you the ability to project into the future and that makes the French decision to not adopt Aerotoxic Syndrome as a formal occupational disease on the 20th March very disappointing.

In 1992 Joanne Turner was affected on a British Aerospace 146 jet I used to fly. She went to law over the issue in a case known as Joanne Turner versus East West Airlines. It took her 18 long years to get from the date of the poisoning to the final decision in the Australian High Court. The case was initially heard in 2010 in a lower Court in Australia where she was awarded compensation in April of that year. Then, quite predictably, like the French case of March 2021, they 'appealed' it at the last possible minute and the case ended up in the High Court, the highest possible Court, and there it took a few days or perhaps only half a day to agree a win for Joanne Turner against East West Airlines. That was on the 3rd September 2010 and now anyone can see the details of a single cabin crew (who was pregnant at the time and 'positioning' as an 'ordinary' passenger) being affected by one flight in a case that took eighteen years to win. So that's what we're dealing with - a system which specialises in delaying tactics and wasting time.

That's understood and you know it has to be that way - otherwise everything would just fall down overnight, but equally you can project ahead so the French case has probably been already pencilled in for a date in September or October 2021 or it could be earlier; it could be tomorrow. Nobody knows this date but it is sometime in the future. But if you go into the future and come back to where we are now you could perhaps say, 'OK it was on the 15th of September 2021 - at precisely 01.46 Zulu. That's the day that France formally accepted Aerotoxic Syndrome as an occupational disease.' We can predict that now, but we don't know the exact details until the future but that's the great thing about being able to make predictions. You know precisely what's going to happen and approximately when and you know that within a certain time it will be accepted, no question, so that's the great thing of being able to have a 'helicopter view' and see the whole thing. You have this overview, you have this helicopter view of what's going on and when and why.

Then you can see the little movements; you can also see the quick movements and by coming back from the future to the present you can see that the gap is closing down - this is true for anything, not just Aerotoxic Syndrome. Climate change, for example, and all sorts of very serious, ongoing issues which you know it will have a beginning, a middle and an end. But they will finish at some point and that is what is happening with this long running Health and Safety issue and the timeline is pretty much agreed by everybody by now. If you don't agree with the timeline perhaps you have a reason for not agreeing it and that's fair enough, but where public health and general common sense are involved it's not unreasonable to accept it now as an occupational disease and perhaps it makes sense to conditionally accept it. When I was at school in the 70s it was drummed into us in physics lesson that efficiency was work done divided by time.

So everything efficient has to be done as quickly as possible and that's been a key part of my flying life. With all the work I've been doing you know that every extra minute adds to the cost of petrol which costs money. Costing money is not good so you get the job done as quickly as possible and as efficiently as possible and nobody in their right mind would waste money or do things which cause you to be in the air a minute longer than you have to be. So it's all about getting the job done as quickly as possible but one has a horrible feeling that these lawyers work in completely the opposite way and that every hour they spend or day they spend extending the issue will create more money for them and that's what they enjoy, that's what they are all about – money.

They don't give a damn about anything to do with public health or the injured people actually involved - very rarely do they actually have any sort of empathy for the people affected, they are mostly concerned with their own lives and making money and have created this system to do that.

Here is a quotation from US attorney, Stuart Calwell, from the British Airline Pilot Association (Balpa) Cabin Air conference held in London over two days in April 2005. It was noted that injured humans were being treated with 'contempt' as they tried to explain their invisible illness and Stuart Calwell observed that:

“Throughout these experiences, I have become accustomed to the sing song mantra of the large corporation's response to those bold enough to complain of injuries caused by exposure to toxins: “Well you might feel sick now, but it won't hurt you in the long run”; and, “You've probably been eating too many tomatoes, they're full of acid”; and, “We see a lot of this, but it's mostly in your head, you feel a little sick, someone suggests it's caused by something or other and pretty soon you think you're sick.”; and, “You just can't get exposed (in an airplane for example) to enough of this stuff to hurt you. You'd have to drink a gallon of it”; and, my personal favorite, “Look, we've studied and studied this chemical. It's safe. [† Prof Abou-Donia, Dr Howard, Prof Furlong, Dr Jamal and others have been most patient and extraordinarily instructive in preparing me to present cases involving nervous system injuries and exposures to

organophosphates. Without their expertise and guidance through the difficult scientific issues I would have enjoyed little or no success in my endeavors on behalf of persons injured by these toxins. There's no reason for you to be worried about a little bit of this stuff leaking out into the air. It just won't cause any long term or permanent injury or disease. We've studied it." I call statements like these: "the flying saucer defense". Here's how it works. The company creates its own junk science (they call them internal studies), takes advantage of its position as an important business providing jobs and convinces people that chemical diseases don't exist.

Then when someone claims to have a chemically related disease he's made to feel as though he or she is crazy. The injured person begins to feel as though he or she is trying to convince "sane" people that a flying saucer really did land in the back garden. The more insistent the injured person becomes, the crazier he or she is made to feel or seem by "proper persons" who know there are no flying saucers. In point of fact, the injuries and illnesses that people suffer from these toxins in the workplace are real. They actually do land in the back garden, and I've spent the better part of my career successfully proving it. You who fly the skies in these large contraptions full of contaminated air can prove it also.

By way of this introduction, I also point out that one must be sensitive to the "politics" of lawsuits. My law firm and I represent a number of trade unions. It is most always in the best interest of the union to promote, protect and work for the success of the industry in which its members work. Destroying the industry the union serves is obviously "killing the goose that lays the golden egg". With that overriding principle in mind, however, it is necessary from time to time to find ways of protecting the membership from the industry it serves. The art in this is to find ways of achieving justice without shooting one's self in the foot."

Chapter 5

The pantomime – goodies, baddies & sheeple – the players 5/5/90

We talked in the previous chapter about how the different parties deal with AerotoxicSyndrome - the lawyers, the politicians, the public servants, the survivors, the media, the doctors, scientists and the deliberately clueless public - all involved in a battle or war of attrition where the inevitable will happen at some point in the future. Although it involves serious ill health of people being harmed and death there is a dark humour attached to it.

This is familiar to aircrews as we work our way through long days and nights laughing our way through difficulties and challenges as we tussle with day to day flying.

The best way to do it is to just to laugh your way through it as one can't afford to get angry - least of all with yourco-pilot or the captain you're flying with because anger isnot good for a good day out. So you goout of your way to resolve issues as easily as possible and generally agree to talk about things openly and then have a plan which you follow. You become quite good at that

without exception and we're trying to do the same here, we're trying to get people to agree to an understanding, to get the job done and then move on to the next one.

Any pilot going off before a 4 sector day just wants to get through those sectors as quickly as possible and get back home; they do not welcome being at work and being delayed and having angry passengers, it's not enjoyable. So you're always trying to pacify people and keep them onside and get the job done as swiftly as possible.

This brings into the equation the whole business of humour and how important it is, as everybody knows about laughing your way through difficulties and that's a key part of this issue and it certainly has been for me for the last years.

Initially, in 2006, I was very angry when I worked out the cause of sixteen years of chronic and disabling ill health. I was also, maybe justifiably, angry that those who were qualified knew about it and nobody was doing anything about it.

It just fills me with despair that other people can be like that, so I was angry in 2006 & 2007 – but then I started to get over it like one gets over any loss. My wife left me in 2007 and I experienced various other difficulties which didn't help and I lost my support system. It's been a tricky fifteen years dealing with one thing after another but it really all started in 1990. That's where the origins of it are and it's all written down and understood from my point of view anyway. Now the humour has returned and I have started to think that this pantomime is quite funny in a way, as people from both sides are fighting it out over money in the middle.

It's all only ever about money really - nothing to do with health and it's kind of amusing to think that money can often buy people and be so important to some people. The money side is the absolute driver of this whole issue and then you realise who's taking the money and how they use it and that's for them to deal with and for them to sleep at night and so on. But I sleep well at night and I haven't gone down that road as there's 'clean' money and 'dirty' money.

Anyone touching dirty money is going to cause endless trouble for the rest of their lives as they will have to deal with the consequences when they are found out.

So the players in this whole issue are the goodies, the baddies or the neutrals. We have already looked at the percentages so the 5% positives are the goodies in my book; but the bad are the other side. I'm a Libran so I suppose I can look on and can really see both sides.

The 5% negative are definitely the baddies from our point of view but they may be the goodies from the government's point of view and of course the 90%, the neutrals, are the innocent mass who have absolutely no knowledge of the issue and are left in the middle.

I think it's important to state that when you first tell somebody about a complex issue their initial understanding of it, like mine in 2006, is just total disbelief. You think no, that can't be happening, that can't be so. I mean that's ridiculous that this is going on, everybody knowing about it but not

really facing up to it, that's too fantastic, I can't believe that, so the initial reaction is one of disbelief. You wrestle with the evidence and wonder what's going on. You wonder what are the basic issues that are being debated and then, of course, you begin to think, 'Hang on - there is something here in this little bit of evidence.' After that you take it seriously - that's the mid part where you start to dig deep and try to validate everything that comes in and wonder what's going on but you are still not sure exactly what is happening.

Then the final stage is acceptance or understanding something completely and that's what happened to me on the 22nd May 2006 when I made a statement and absolutely nailed it because it was all written down and I had experienced it for sixteen years so it wasn't difficult to write down and qualify. That was the acceptance stage where you think well that's 99%, that's near enough.

Don't forget that in law one is looking for at least 51% as the 'balance of probability' although, in criminal law where the perpetrator will really suffer for committing their deliberate crime, there is a higher threshold and that is 'beyond reasonable doubt'.

Some people are asking for 99% evidence of the cause of ill health but that's not necessary. All the health and safety manuals state that if something is probably going on - then you actually have to take some action, you don't have to wait for people to be killed and maimed. You know to take action and you actually have to take action early and deal with it. It's what is described as 'the precautionary principle' in health and safety manuals and I have written about in previous books. If something is thought to be going on, then it's probably quite a good idea to do something about it.

This whole thing is very important in the commercial world because, whilst it is commercially inconvenient, all of these companies have this spectre of cockpit and cabin poisoning of customers and staff. The really bright airlines will stop and think, 'We've got to do something about this in the future because if we keep going on like this, we are never going to get away with it in the long term; we need to address this issue otherwise we're going to face closure. Then we won't make any money, so it actually might be a good idea to put the solutions in place or at least plan to put them in place. Because when ordered by a Court or by a national government to solve the problem it's the first who always wins and the 'early bird who always gets the worm'. The first people to embrace change will do financially well out of it and that's where EasyJet are well placed as they have been in the Paris Criminal Court for the last five years and know exactly what's going on and although they don't talk about it publicly they will have a plan in hand and will be the first people to benefit from this.

It's probable that Michael O'Leary, the chief of Ryanair, doesn't know about it whilst British Airways knows all about it but are way behind EasyJet, but it just needs one enterprising company to go out in front.

Airlines are going to go for it, and will put the solutions in place and will clean up without shadow of doubt, and will advertise that they are flying with clean air. There will be a whole lot of people saying, 'Yes please, we don't mind paying another couple of dollars for that' and airlines will take a short term hit and it will be inconvenient for a little while whilst the public are not very happy. But the public have got short memories and will forgive the airlines..

EasyJet have got plans in hand to filter and monitor the air and I think most will agree that those buying EasyJet shares for the 'A' day in the future rather than Ryanair shares, should make a killing. The shareholders will quickly grasp the significance of EasyJet being the first airline to market the cleanest, monitored air in the world. Great news for customers and a selling point for any marketing department.

That's what is happening at the moment and you can imagine that things will change very swiftly as and when they are ordered to do so by Courts; so the overall situation can be likened to a pantomime or fictional drama which is going on with roles being given to the goodies and the baddies.

It's no different to anything else as the humour of how the cover-up is taking place on the money side is about the people who haven't got any money who are desperately trying to battle with the people who have got all the money. So it is quite amusing and a pantomime could be written about the history of the issue, and how it finally got sorted out.

I'm just basing this on good old fashioned humour which is a good way to get a point across to other people who don't know about it - it's often a pertinent way to share information and the film that was made in 2014, *A Dark Reflection*, is a good example of that. This is a cooperative film produced by Tristan Lorraine of Fact not Fiction Films. The film demonstrated the issue very carefully to the public so that they could understand the seriousness of people being harmed or even dying as a result of bleed air in commercial jets. Towards the end of the film the flying company realises that if they adopt the solutions to the possible problem then, even though there isn't necessarily a problem, they can just say in the future that they've done something and the passengers will be even safer. So this is how it's going to be - they will never, ever, ever accept liability because if they ever do well, the numbers just defy imagination as there will be millions of claims, as this has happened in the past and in the future and they just can't afford to pay everybody compensation as there's not enough money in the world to go around. So that's not going to happen, it has to be done for the good of the people and not for financial gain so the film absolutely nailed that in 2014. I invested £75,000 in it because I realised that it would be a really ground breaking film.

It will become a classic film. We were all in the film in 2014. We went to Jordan in 2013 and made the film's first five minutes happen and my name is attached to it. The £75,000 I invested in it was part of my house in Warwickshire and I'm quite proud to have done that now. I'm not sure that I would have done the same again looking at how the films were marketed and how the

name was changed to Flight 313: the conspiracy for the American market - that was madness a few years ago. That just demonstrates the inability of us to market this issue and to manage the money side because we will always be outmanoeuvred by those 5% negatives with their unlimited money who can play with us. But anyway, it's all part of the game and now it's on record. The film can be seen for free if you've got an Amazon Prime account. On reflection, it tells the story of how it ends up pretty well, but it is very much an amateur sort of production using professional actors but also the crew in cameo roles. I was mischievously cast as an airline CEO and my son and girlfriend were part of it and my daughter was the political advisor. The film was made on a tight budget and in a short space of time and I'm proud of it. I really think it's a great movie but it has been like a pantomime really, it was just one tiny aspect of the whole thing but it was a part I've been involved in and just one of the many parts.

I think that the hardest part now after, all these years, is to put a finger on anyone part because, as I've said so far in this book, there have been countless parts day after day and they are all true and they all happened, but I wouldn't want to put my finger on any one part. It's kind of the big picture which is important, rather anyone part but you do get judged on individual things and the mistakes you make and the silly things you do or the poor investments you make which didn't work out, so we all get judged on failures rather than wins but that's just a feature of life, I suppose.

Chapter 6

Movie genres: Spotlight, Erin Brockovich, Dark Waters, Flight, The Winslow Boy, The Hudson River Miracle, Battle of Britain, A Matter of Life and Death, A Dark Reflection.

We have already noted how humour is very important to aircrew to help get through difficult times and this isn't any different to any other job like medical, and legal jobs, I'm sure, but there is also a key place here, not for the humour of pantomime, but for the subject matter of well-known classic films and the actors who portray real issues in the cinema.

I've identified a few key films which have a special meaning for me and which bring something to the Aerotoxic resolution.

Spotlight was made in 2015 and this film is very important as it highlights the very dark issue in the Roman Catholic Church of paedophiles in America and how the Boston Globe in 2002 decided to fully investigate and expose the scandal and over some months they got right to the bottom of it. This is, of course, a real-life issue and was made several years later using brilliant actors who brought to life the whole drama and at the end of the film everyone asks why this scandal was only investigated in 2002 and not five years earlier when all the information, all the evidence, all the data was staring people in the face and they didn't do anything about it?

One heard from the survivors and victims, the people who had grown up with damaged lives, knowing for many years what was going on while society chose to look away and ignore it and

pretend not to know what was going on. This is an important film which shows the reality of ignoring something that is happening and the famous phrase of 'cottage industry' which applies to the lawyers who are making money out of the crimes like the Mafia; it is like a little game to them. They didn't want to 'kill the goose' which would kill the source of the money, so they just milked it over many years and everybody was paid off and just kept out of the Public Courts. There were no judgments in the Court. It was all done by money, without the public ever knowing about the crimes and that enabled the issue to concurrently continue and it did so for many years until finally the Boston Globe decided to blow it out and one editor in particular who did it. And then, of course, it had worldwide implications. So what was going on in Boston was happening elsewhere in the States and then overseas in New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Germany, everywhere, so it all came tumbling out because of a single newspaper deciding to bring it to an end and this could be the same for Aerotoxic as many know it's going on and they just need to write about it - it's hypocrisy. But it's too big for any one newspaper to take it on and especially not the BBC or any sort of public service broadcasting who are forbidden from even reporting Aerotoxic. You would think the commercial media may have a way of reporting Aerotoxic but it probably requires somebody who's been directly impacted like a well-known celebrity on a flight with his family being poisoned by air and then tweeting about it and it is getting out on social media and then the celebrity using the Aerotoxic word.

But with few planes now flying and everyone desperate to fly – it all gets forgotten. That might be the way it will be exposed by a Social Media savvy youngster, a rap artist maybe in their 20s or 30s, who casually Tweets about it and suddenly it's all over Social Media so that's potentially what could happen at any time now. Do watch Spotlight. It's a very well observed film. It tackles an adult subject that is a bit too close to the truth and it deals with total exposure, which is where we are now.

Erin Brockovich is a film from the 80s which starred Julia Roberts and Albert Finney as an attorney and is again a film based on a true story. It's about how one person took a minor local issue to the top against major chemical companies and against huge odds just by using simple techniques and not by overcomplicating the issue. It shows the wonderful relationship between Albert Finney a lawyer, who can actually exercise the law when given the right evidence, and Julia Roberts who plays Erin Brockovich. She presents all of the evidence to the lawyer and helps him. Subsequently, of course, she becomes a global hero for exposing an issue back in the 80s and then she's asked by other people to help them with their individual legal issues - so these people develop a persona of dealing with difficult issues so that's a great, amusing film to watch and not dissimilar to what we're also doing.

Dark Waters is a more recent film also with an actor from Spotlight, Mark Ruffalo, takes the lead role in another true story which shows how an American lawyer, who defends chemical companies, actually changes sides and ends up defending and helping a family friend whose water on his farm has become contaminated by a nearby industrial plant.

It's a more up to date version of Erin Brockovich and shows how the lawyer goes about getting justice for not only this farmer but for all of his colleagues in the same area - it's the little man against the big chemical giant. He takes on the bullies, the people who claim to not know what they're doing, and the film ends with him fighting in the Courts to this day - so even though one person is vilified there are thousands of others who have to go through the same process to make their personal claims and this, apparently, is still going on. Perhaps it would help our cause if one of these top American actors got home poisoned in an aircraft and then presumably they would get angry and do something about it?

Flight is a movie with Denzel Washington playing an airline captain who is used to using alcohol and drugs and eventually gets involved in a major incident where he has to fly the aircraft inverted and saves the passengers and again it is based loosely on a true story. It is probably overdramatised to the point where what happens is almost unbelievable, but it's a remarkable story and excellently portrayed because it looks at the aircrew's side and how pilots tick, work and function and the pressures they are under to do their jobs and how we work together to get the job done. The film ends with the captain making a dramatic confession in a public Court saying yes, that he did it, he was drunk and then of course the full weight of the law is held against him as he gets put into prison for a few years. But this is the way he sorts his life out because after he's done that, he struggles to live with himself and he is in denial really. It's a great story in that it shows how pilots deliberately take drugs to deal with stuff in their lives. Our story, of course, is of pilots who get poisoned against their will and there's no way that we want to get poisoned, but then who in their right mind would be poisoned for many years and then have the nerve to complain about it? It's just extraordinary really that this is allowed to continue to involve substance misuse or recognition of certain substances like alcohol, tobacco, drugs etc and then denial or cognitive dissonance of other substances or poisons and that is the whole point of Flight and what should now feature in future Human Performance Limitations (HPL) along with drugs and alcohol. It's a key film which highlights these issues and it's extremely well acted by Denzel Washington, who absolutely aced it. Again, if this film star got affected on a flight by toxic oil fumes presumably his Tweets on social media would be noticed and that would make some difference?

The Winslow Boy was a B&W film made in the 1940s and it reflects an earlier time in Edwardian days before World War One, when a young boy at boarding school is accused of stealing a postal order and his bank managing father who has just retired, becomes embroiled in proving his innocence. But as the boy has been attached to the Royal Navy, the case quickly becomes heard in parliament in the House of Commons where it is used as a vehicle for a top lawyer to get eventual justice for the schoolboy and prove that the Navy were wrong to accuse him of theft. It's a very powerful film as it demonstrates that absolutely nobody is above the law and this rare, good lawyer uses all of his skills to prove the young boy's innocence.

The Miracle of the Hudson River is another true story about an incident where a jet airliner has taken off, hits a flock of birds and then the captain, Sully Sullenberger, saves everybody on

board by landing his jet on the Hudson River. The point behind this film is that it demonstrates the professionalism of the crew in executing a very extreme manoeuvre, but one which every other pilot or at least 99 out of 100 would also do to save lives - as nobody in their right mind would land a jet in the middle of New York – everybody, but everybody would land on a long river in preference.

The clever part about this film is how the actions of the crew have to be accounted for in a public Court and many other pilots try the same manoeuvre in the simulator and actually get back to the airfield and land successfully because they make the decision instantly to return to the airfield, whereas in the film or in the actual incident in real life about half a minute went past before anybody did anything.

This is true in our situation, where time is on pause and the longer it goes on the more certain it is to end in a certain way. Captain Sullenberger eventually gets proven right that he did exactly the right thing by landing on the river and saving everybody. Again, Captain Sullenberger is a real life airline captain and he will know all about toxic cabin air and being an advocate for safety he wouldn't have any trouble at all in agreeing that the solutions are essential - now.

Battle of Britain an epic film produced in 1969 and a favourite of mine which covers the air fight between the RAF and the German Luftwaffe and has the best aeroplanes, actors and lines – ever. “That was unforgivable, I nearly lost my temper...”; “We either stand down or blow up, which do you want?”&“They got the Rose & Crown...” I recall watching the movie for the first time in Shrewsbury whilst on summer CCF camp at RAF Shawbury in 1970. It’s a familiar story of a few trained pilots doing their jobs daily to stop the mighty German war machine, but one can’t help thinking that the English Channel was never going to be successfully crossed by the Germans but the confrontation has been developed into a good story which covered those few months in 1940. The war changed over the next five years into a total mess with nuclear bombs. The incredible developments in aviation of the war years were driven by the will to survive and outwit the other side – technically.

A Matter of Life and Death is another 1940s film starring David Niven who is a shot down pilot during the Second World War and is half dead and half alive as he is judged by others on where he should be – carrying on his life or going to heaven. This is an excellent film in that it ends with a jury of common men and women, not lawyers deciding on the dated evidence. QED.

A Dark Reflection was produced by us all in 2014 and has been mentioned elsewhere but this film WILL be a classic one day as it foretells the future – just show the film to intelligent 10 year olds, who will work it out...

Chapter 7

Junk, paid for published science. AS v's Covid-19.

Ever since 1989 when I became involved with the issue of contaminated air and jet aircraft we have been presented by silence from both sides of the argument and as the issue nearly killed me I have a bias towards one side and I'm criticised by both sides. Initially I trained as a chemist in the 1970s. I didn't particularly want to be a chemist it's just that I couldn't train to be a pilot when I wanted to at the age of seventeen or eighteen so I took a job at Phillips petroleum at Bacton, Norfolk at the North Sea gas terminal and was on £1,500 a year. My job was to measure the North Sea gas in terms of density, pressure calorific value and that's what I did for three years. I was trained by experienced, clever chemists, people who knew what they were doing, for free and I was sent to Norwich City college to learn more about chemistry, physics and maths. Measuring gas was my specific job and I had to have a bit more knowledge than I gained at school. At the same time my parents' marriage fell apart and this caused my life to fall apart too so even though I was going there part time once a week I failed the first year because of the disruption at home and that was difficult but I reapplied myself the next year and went back and eventually got an Ordinary National Certificate in chemistry, physics and maths with a special mention for elective chemistry.

I really didn't enjoy it as it was all too complicated and too theoretical but it was all part of the job and I was being paid to do it and I just thought I might as well do it so I must have learnt a bit in those days. My work at the North Sea gas terminal also involved pollution control because the gas being brought ashore had sulphur in it, not all of it, but some of it and this gas had to have the sulphur taken out and this is a beautiful yellow chemical which was extracted from the North Sea gas, but by doing so sulphur dioxide was released into the atmosphere all around the terminal and this might affect the local population so even in the 70s we had five air sampling sites around the east, south and west of the terminal and so could pick up the wind direction from any direction and analyse the air. This was done by pumping the air through hydrogen peroxide and this changed the hydrogen peroxide that diluted hydrogen peroxide into hydrogen sulphide which could be measured. That was my job once a week to go round rather like a milkman in my blue Mini van. Each bottle was for a different day and when tested with another chemical we built up a record of the sulphur dioxide in the air from different directions. I recorded it and then reported it and that was my job for three years doing the rounds every Friday. That was really good fun and I thoroughly enjoyed it and the rest of the time was you know measuring the gas, the North Sea gas, and calibrating the instruments and gas chromatography.

Once a week I collected a sample of condensate or heavy hydrocarbon fluid from two of the massive steel tanks where it was stored which involved walking up these steps and then down into the bowels and taking a sample on your own – this wouldn't have been allowed today but that was all part of the job to find out what was in the gas and everybody knew but it had to be done; you had to sort of check exactly what the North Sea gas was made up of so this again was

my job so that I got very used to testing gas all of the time and then the calorific value was important because that's how we got paid and in those days the calorific value was pretty constant but you know it was called a 'therm' and the customer was paid for the amount of heat value in the gas and that's how Phillips got paid by British Gas who are on the other side of the road. There were three companies at Bacton - BP Shell, Amoco and Philips petroleum.

I really enjoyed the work as it was with a small group of other scientists and gas measurement people officers and you got to know everybody on the site. There may have been 100 people working there and we became really good friends with these people because we were all part of a team and you know it was an easy job but even then you could see the gas pressure tailing off. I think when I started there was some 1030 PSI but it was 1020 PSI or so even within three years. Whilst I was there the pressure went down by a few pounds and you could predict what was eventually going to happen - that this was not going to last forever. You know that this is like just a snapshot of production really so I've got to think ahead - do I want to be here for the rest of my life? probably not.

I never actually got to a North Sea oil rig which was a great frustration because it's what I wanted to do as a young man, I wanted to fly out to a rig but that never happened and there was a helipad at Bacton, but it was rarely used.

Then one summer's day in 1975, as I was driving around the site, this crop spraying aircraft turned up and sprayed the field just to the west of the terminal and he or she was going up and down north to south obviously aware of the prime target right next to the field, but it was just an amazing sight to see this person enjoying themselves spraying this field, probably for aphids, in the summer of 1975. I thought, my goodness, that looks fun - that looks really great fun and I'd remembered all the times my father was involved with aerial spraying in the late 1950s and I thought well I could do that, that's something I could do easily so I set about flying. You know that was when my mind was made up in the summer of 1975 and then my New Year's resolution of 1976 was to get a pilot's licence and when you make a resolution that's what you do, you don't mess around. So on 4th January 1976 I went with my good friend Peter Dawson in support to RAF Swanton Morley and booked a trial flying lesson with Mike McCarthy. I was completely and utterly hooked. We flew in a snow storm, I recall it was sleet, but it was just mind blowing and really exciting.

I thought, 'Wow, this is what I want to do - flying,' and that's when I got the bug but I'd already got the bug from the age four but this was just absolute confirmation, this one flight in 1976 so from that date on anyone can see it in my log. I just went back to wanting more as quickly as I could. I was earning quite good money of £1,500 a year so I could quite easily afford to fly occasionally at around £17 an hour - it's always relatively quite expensive but worth it.

Then I got to know the most brilliant people, my instructor Norman Rhodes, Mac McCarthy, Dick Francis and Al Bason - all flying instructors at the North Norwich Aero Club

(NNAC) and flying gradually, it just became a complete obsession and a total distraction from Phillips petroleum.

I got my private pilot's licence in 1977. It took eighteen months or so. I very quickly realised that there was a possible job at the NNAC as operations manager and general dog's body, but of course, I'd have to take a pay reduction because they only paid a small amount of money and I'd have to live on a bit less, but the great thing about the job at the club was that I got fifteen minutes a day free flying as I had to go up and assess the cloud base and invariably it was either 2,500 feet or 2,000 feet or 800 feet but that was my job, just to go up, check and tell the flying instructors who knew perfectly well what the cloud base was.

Any pilot will tell you that you never stop learning. You are constantly learning new stuff and even today any pilot will tell you that, so that's what I've been doing for the last fifty years really and I'm still learning new stuff. The great thing is that you can sort of get totally immersed in flying and get completely hooked.

I know a bit about science, basically I'm a scientist you know. I know what gas chromatography is, I know what compounds are, but what electrons are bore me rigid, but I know all about them and that's where I've got a slight advantage in the work I'm doing now as can speak on equal terms with most scientists and understand their lingo really, whilst never fully understanding the subject at their level. Yet I claim to be a scientist, I've got the qualifications to say so and the experience of the three years working at Phillips.

So in 2006 I made the extraordinary discovery of Aerotoxic Syndrome and how it all works and whether you have been affected by carbon monoxide or organophosphates didn't really matter you know, as I was half dead in 2006 so I really wasn't interested in arguing over all the details. I'd experienced it at first hand and I didn't really want to argue any longer. I just wanted to bring the solutions in and have some care for the people who had been poisoned - that was to me the most important thing.

I looked at the other side of science but when they said they couldn't measure the air I thought well why not, because I could and you can if you try. It was just ridiculous when they said they were not able to measure a fume event. I can actually create a fume event in five minutes if you give me a BAe 146 on the ground. I can start the APU (Auxiliary Power Unit) and miss-set the controls a bit and minutes later the whole cabin is full of white smoke. So if I can do it after sixteen years, why can't you?

This was the anomaly right from the beginning - that these people with all the money, the Negative 5%, were claiming that they couldn't do some very simple things and you kind of think, 'Wow, that's just not honest, that's just devious, awful, they're just lying through their teeth.' It's junk science that's what it is; the worst type of science is paid science which is being paid for convenient results and ignoring all the data with which they are being presented. I'd seen it close

up and the worst part is it's all published so all these liars from the other side are publishing a pack of lies and that's as bad as it gets really.

Then of course the other side of all the science which was published from 1955 onwards is good science, published and presented by very clever doctors but of course it's terribly inconvenient. So it's all directed and argued over, endlessly, and it's just a great shame really that that's the case but it's like all the other things in life - it's no different to tobacco, asbestos or mercury. There are huge amounts of money involved, so they will argue until they are blue in the face.

You can understand what is happening and really it's not too surprising but then, of course, something like COVID-19 comes along at short notice twelvemonths ago or slightly longer and of course it's the same people who are arguing that everyone should wear face masks and take extreme precautions to avoid an aggressive virus which affects a few people, but in the great scheme of things is quite sudden and compared to the Aerotoxic issue it's relatively new and insignificant. So that's been the difficulty because the scientists who have been publicly claiming allsorts of things and denying allsorts of other things and that's the are the same scientists.

Incidentally, I thought of using activated charcoal face masks in 2008 to protect passengers in commercial jets from organophosphates and other toxic chemicals and sold around 1,000 in the next few years but could never convince others of the future potential market. I've got a history of pioneering things which I inherited from my ancestors from developing aerial firefighting in Australia in the 1980s to what is now a multimilliondollar industry; trying to develop My Jet whilst still flying where a few premium class of passenger would try and outfly the crew up front on flight simulators; my Revo Art clocks, just before I failed safe in 2005; my Dassett Bomber Dambuster model Avro Lancaster – all mostly to do with aeroplanes and fun.

But now these people have names, faces and titles and you can write to these people and present the new evidence and put them on the spot, expect intelligent measured answers and that's where we are at the moment as they struggle with all the other different scientific problems of the moment.

One is constantly reminded by other people that there are other issues to consider and that your massive issue really isn't that important and you should wait a bit longer for it to be sorted out because the other things are even more important. You think, 'OK, well I'll just wait until other people have managed to do it,' and you never work on your own, you always wait for the big guys in France to publish their evidence and then you jump on the end of it.

Dr David Megson of Manchester University and these people will publish their evidence that cover up the real science so the huge numbers game of Aerotoxic Syndrome is worth repeating because in October 2019 I went to a talk in Belgium by Doctor Michel Mulder who stood up and stated that there are 1,000,000 people in Europe with Aerotoxic Syndrome.

That was the first time I'd heard that such a huge number was calculated using careful research from 2016 with replies from frequent flyers who were asked how their symptoms were after flying and they reported the many symptoms they were experiencing and this all got researched and tabulated into a published article in 2017. Using a percentage calculation it was estimated that there are 27,000 people in The Netherlands with Aerotoxic Syndrome, and in the UK maybe 150,000 frequent Flyers with Aerotoxic Syndrome.

It's got nothing to do with the being a 'pilots' disease but obviously the pilots and cabin crew fly continually but these passengers are really wealthy people who sometimes fly more than aircrew but they also suffer the consequences of Aerotoxic Syndrome on a percentage basis. Around 30% of people cannot detox organophosphates and then a lesser percentage, maybe 5% are severely affected, which included me in that bracket, that's me Lee Trenchard, Bea Beaumont etc and then there's a smaller fraction of people like Richard Westgate and Matt Bass etc. and they die.

The smaller percentage can't talk for themselves at all and they very quickly lose it and there are about 800 cabin crew and pilots from British Airways in the last 10 years who've lost their lives in their 20s, 30s 40s and 50s - these are young people who died prematurely from organophosphate poisoning and Aerotoxic Syndrome.

We've also calculated the numbers for the world based on the same percentages and worked out that there are many, many millions of people sick from toxic cabin air - it's become normal over the last seventy years.

Obviously the chronic poisoning is very subtly being introduced as a result of design flaws in the 50s and 60s and then before you know it it's become normal now. It's just everywhere and part of everyday life. Remember that people are making money out of it so the very people who have poisoned you are also making money out of the cures - the little blue pills and red pills of the pharmaceutical industry which make you 'better', so that's Big Pharma really. They are quite used to injuring you first and then making money out of treating you later and that's the way this has turned out. It's not deliberately so, but just the way it is but you do wonder how such a big thing can be so easily missed by so many clever people in so many different countries all scratching their heads trying to work out why people get sick?

It is extraordinary how it can happen, how it can all be covered up so comprehensively and it's all fundamentally to do with not believing the reports from the canaries at the coalface, the very people who are telling you about their sickness and their illness symptoms and who are just not believed.

It's extraordinary that all the words of the past 100 years aren't believed. My eye pupils were like dots for fifteen years, as the pupils tried to stop the sunlight coming in and were affected. My pupils were photographed in 1980 by the CAA doctor, so that's a physical action. Also erratic temperature control - that's another physical problem of sweating or coldness and then the other physical symptoms such as coughing ones guts up after a fume event, heart disease - all of these

things are physical problems, not the mental problems of feeling terrible the whole time, but physical difficulties. Stiff limbs, no feeling in your fingertips and legs or that sort of thing, which I haven't ever had as I've been very lucky, but countless people report them and they're not making it up.

They are actually reporting their symptoms in simple words to scientists but the paid scientists are blind to their words, they can't even understand them. They are paid not to understand the words, and many other people don't understand the words either for some reason which is pretty frightening really but it's always the 5% negative against the 5% positive and these two groups actually hate each other for their positions. They cancel each other out with their hatred because they really don't like one another.

The only way to really test these negative attitudes would be if someone from the 5% negative group had to suffer being placed in a confined space which is then pumped full of visible white oil fumes. If they are there for at least a couple of hours, with no personal protection, they would be fully exposed to the poison, and then if that exercise is repeated the next day and the next day and the next day, the result would be obvious. Would it affect them? Maybe 70% of people wouldn't be affected; they could stand the exposure everyday for a while, but I think most people would agree that, after a certain amount of time, even they might begin to show some symptoms. When they begin to experience symptoms similar to the ones I and many others had, that's when they would understand the problem, because they experienced it for themselves. Of course such an experiment is unlikely to happen but many frequent fliers and aircrew experience exposure to toxic substances over a long period of time.

If the people who sit in judgement, the judges and the juries, believe that the visible oil fumes are totally harmless and not likely to cause any problems at all, then they themselves should be willing to breathe in the oil fumes in a public Court for a test period. This is the only way to prove how noxious these fumes are.

So that's the challenge for these faceless lawmakers and judges - they should volunteer to be to be exposed to prove their confidence in their science and laws.

It's tempting to see oneself after fifteen years as just one of the 1,000,000 people in Europe with Aerotoxic Syndrome, you couldn't rationalise that I'm the leader of all those people in Europe or their representative but I have experienced it all at first hand. I'm representing the sick who don't know why they are sick. I know why they are sick but many other people don't want them to know why they are sick. It's shocking that they do not want them to know why - that in itself is a sickness.

Chapter 8

Exactly how they all got away with it

So the big question is how they get away with it all, for so long and that's the mystery in a way, because if we knew the answer we could resolve it.

It's just extraordinary that something so big, that has been happening for so long, that is so obvious and so detailed and that has been written about in published pieces is so difficult for me to describe now. Words fail me, I am so close to this issue, I understand it completely but I just can't understand why other people don't get it.

It's a bit like religion really, where you spend your whole life coming to terms with an invisible God and trying to rationalise it, make sense of it all while not quite understanding what's going on and but there is a difference and that is that with this issue, this Aerotoxic Syndrome, it's all so well defined by published science, by so many people, by simple logic.

It's an enigma (a thing that is mysterious, puzzling, or difficult to understand), really.

Chapter 9

Media, politicians & being economical with truth...

It's fascinating to inspect each of the many groups involved in this issue in some detail from the media, politicians, lawyers, scientists, doctors who are generally in the negative 5% and then the victims or survivors (the positive 5%) and those who can't speak for themselves - the unborn, they all have their stories, their part in this issue - the 90% do not qualify as they have no awareness of any problem, at all.....

Starting with the victims or survivors - it's probably obvious to point out that no one wants to be injured or disabled by toxic cabin air.

Proving that you've been affected by poisonous gas in a confined space by using words to describe the effect is something that guinea pigs and animals can't do, but humans (especially professional pilots) can, they can give their sworn statements with their hand on the Bible. These people are critical to the story and then of course you could argue that passengers who get on a flight unsuspecting of what's going to happen become the ultimate witnesses to something which then happens on one flight and can destroy their health for the rest of their lives and is documented over the years.

In recent times, we've always used passenger testimonies and single flights to demonstrate something which can happen (like a car crash or any other accident in life) and they pay for the tickets and vote for whether the solutions are put in place. So really the passengers will always be the key to this whole issue, where of course they have to pay to fly the airliners and it's all controlled by money. Professional aircrew are actually in a very weak position as if they speak

out about it, they'll instantly lose their job and any future earning capacity and that was the situation before the pandemic, but during the pandemic it's even more so and it must be said that cabin crew are more vocal as they are largely female and maybe talk more freely and perhaps have less to lose. They don't have any formal qualifications as pilots do, so they don't care so much if they lose their jobs as they might find it easier to redeploy, whereas a pilot has to invest everything in their flying career and it's very difficult to change horses mid-stream. They can't so easily retrain or get off the rotating hamster wheel of their careers, which I know to my cost. I just couldn't get off the wheel for sixteen years as it went faster and faster and you just have to keep up until eventually you are thrown off and you quit. The aircrew angle has been very well documented and it is not difficult to understand as it is all about psychology and the relief of having a decent, stable job which pays.

Many pilots seem to have bad luck and numerous jobs as the skin tight margins of flying test even the biggest companies. Personally, I never once lost my flying job and was always first out in the hunt for that perfect combination and balance as airline flying is probably one of the most anti-social jobs ever, but also the least understood by the ever trusting public.

Why you are flying and what is going on in the flying world when we are in a double crisis with a 'virus' pandemic, means that the Aerotoxic pandemic is suddenly a super sensitive issue and 'they' just go silent and 'they' don't even want to talk about it.

It's an invisible problem as far as they're concerned, which is understandable so how about the media?

Well, they appear to be agents of the government especially the BBC, and I know that over the last year or so I've been sending American public Court wins (including one of a respected Captain) to the Daily Telegraph, The Times, The Guardian, The Mail and my former local newspaper in Norfolk, the Eastern Daily Press and they either don't want to publish them or they put lots of doubts in their articles.

The usual thing is that they just blandly report the facts but they never write about all the zillions of other people who will also be suffering. It's just a one off and they are more interested in making money from it, with the mantra of 'Don't kill off the Goose which lays the Golden egg'. The media just quietly report it and, unlike the Boston Globe who reported the paedophile scandal in 2003, they're not blowing it out of the water.

They just milk the stories and make money out of them and always introduce some new doubt by suggesting that there just might be a problem; might not – we will tell you in a few years' time when we've worked it out 100%.

It's understandable that that's the situation, but it's a bit more sinister than that because there appears to be a total ban on the 'A', word especially in the BBC, and then one recognises the same thing in the rest of the media and you think OK, well, that requires a lot of coordination to

ban a single word. That must come from central government, where they send out the message, 'Don't touch it - don't even talk about it - it's too sensitive' and that's where we are now with the BBC. There is certainly no open public debate from those who dutifully pay their licence fees.

There's no chance of bringing in the known and available solutions because it's been off the agenda for awhile whilst flying is curtailed by the pandemic.

There was half an excuse when we tried to bring it to the attention of the UK government over two years ago at time of the election in the UK and they said, 'No, no you can't cover it because we are busy re-electing our politicians.'

That was exactly the right time to do it, long before the viral pandemic, but they weren't interested in reporting that a first class passenger plus husband and three cabin crew with acute Aerotoxic poisoning symptoms had been taken off a Boeing 747 flight at JFK in America, which had a bad 'Fume event' on the ground. That just defined and reinforced the cover-up.

That there's never a good time to close this cover-up down, there is always an excuse. Let's just milk it a bit longer.

When the French were about to formally accept Aerotoxic Syndrome as an occupational disease but changed their minds at the last moment, the media were not allowed to report about this so the public just continued in perfect ignorance.

So the media don't come out of this at all well because they know exactly what's really going on as journalists are not stupid but they don't want to break the establishment system. Even the 'alternative' media hesitate over it. Just recently a new 'truth' newspaper started up and we sent them information about the BBC blackout but they didn't grasp it - they probably think it's too big to - so it's quite hard to get into the media.

We are left with social media and justice, chatting amongst our friends. Everybody really knows what's going on, but nobody is powerful enough to stop it, they just join in with the unintended cover-up.

So what about the politicians? Well they are especially reprehensible because they just listen with one ear and do nothing to resolve the issue; they know about it like everybody else but it's just too big for them. They don't feel they can take on an impossible task, they prefer to deal with little things which they can deal with and, so, get re-elected, but not on big issues, which nobody is going to lead on..

Politicians will know about it over the years in America, Britain, France and everywhere because it's on television, they can follow the principle and logic of the science but they're not going to risk their jobs and their incomes over something so big. That's why I moved away from Norwich on 23rd March 2021 as my Labour MP, Clive Lewis, failed to answer any formal Aerotoxic

Association correspondence over six years. He didn't even acknowledge any news of the first ever public Court wins in America and you just get the feeling that he's not doing his job.

It's a large weight to carry on and I moved away from Norwich and back to the Midlands live as there seems to be more of a 'Can Do' attitude around here as well as the ability to have a public debate.

It's a matter of fact that Her Majesty the Queen was sent a letter in 2016 and after a few months her office kindly replied with a rational, good response. Her ministers were onto the poisoning and that's how bad it is when I got a reply from HM Queen but not from your own paid representative in Parliament.

In 2007 I had an amazing Conservative MP, John Maples, who initiated debates in the House of Commons and introduced the Aerotoxic Association, and what was done fourteen years ago is all on record; but now there's nothing, absolute zero... That in itself is evidence of a cover-up, you know there is nothing, it doesn't exist so if anybody is looking for evidence but there's nothing, it's kind of hard to report something, it doesn't even get talked about.

That's the situation at the moment with these dreadful politicians, but as ever they always get nailed eventually - so it's just a matter of getting somebody to do it and that's what we're trying to do at the moment and we will succeed.

But it won't be in the UK or the US - it'll be in France because the French unions are strong and the French politicians got so close to accepting AS as an occupational disease on 20th March 2021. It's just a matter of days or weeks or months or years before they finally accept it and that's where we reverse engineer it and we come back from the future, from the final acceptance date to where we are today and sometime between then and now we will be directing when it's accepted. The sad fact is that it will go from 0% to 100% evidence overnight and it will be really tricky to explain to the poisoned, duped public how they suddenly went from nothing to something in one day. The public will say but how can that be? Where was the open public debate? What did you do in the meantime? Those questions will take some difficult explaining by the politicians and the media.

The situation now is to put in place the known fixes so that people aren't continued to be poisoned en masse in aircraft. One aspect that all of the 5% negative people enjoy is that of belittling or having hatred and contempt for those other folks and this has expressed itself by always downplaying the issue and trivialising it so that what is an absolute 'elephant in the room' becomes a mouse and unworthy of any comment.

Why try to sort something out which is so big and impossible? We become very familiar with the yawning amongst the media and politicians, as they haven't wanted to engage in any debate about a familiar aspect of this issue for the past fifteen years. Professional aircrew desperately trying to

report a very serious danger is a bit irritating really and one can easily run out of words to describe it.

That's not good after so many years of desperately trying to explain something - it's very, very frustrating, but also predictable. You know exactly what people are going to say when you give less better news. You think OK, I'm preparing for no progress here and that's the old expression of 'expect absolutely nothing and anything else is a bonus' so you go through your life just thinking, 'OK well, what's the point in even telling something new because they ain't going to do anything' or you just wonder what would actually FINALLY change their minds?

What single bit of evidence might change their perspective? The French decision in the near future will change it because that decision will have a huge impact within the aviation industry as Airbus come to terms with their aircraft flying around the world, mainly in the USA, whilst poisoning people en masse every day.

Eventually they'll face the future, on 'A' (Aerotoxic) day, and if you look back from that unknown date in the future, you'll come back to where we are now. That date – this special day could be this week, month, year - it could be next year, who knows, but it will be just an absolute French date in the future.

Doctors are considered the first point of call for most people after being injured. They go to see a doctor, whether it be in the hospital or in a GP's surgery, and they describe their symptoms, 'Well, I was in this jet aeroplane and suddenly the cabin filled with white visible oil fumes which made me cough and splutter and immediately I was acutely ill and it was very unpleasant at the time, it was rather like being in a gas chamber really and then in the flight the fumes went away so that it was slightly better, but I was still coughing and spluttering and that's how I am now and I'm presenting with my physical symptoms.'

Then of course, the chemicals get to work on your body chemistry and they create all sorts of horrible effects over the next few days and weeks. It has been reported many times that the worst symptoms appear a few weeks later and of course you don't connect your symptoms with the flight you were on two to three weeks previously so you don't go to the doctor with your new symptoms. You don't know what's caused these symptoms until perhaps the flight is mentioned by someone who may say 'Well there's no positive evidence of any illness being caused by flying because it's on Wikipedia that there is no concrete evidence - it's yet to be proved and it never will be proved.'

I didn't report my symptoms when I first experienced them in the spring of 1990. I knew that as soon as I told any doctor he'd say, 'Sorry, John, you can't fly with those symptoms, you've got to stop flying now' and I thought, 'But what about my income and paying for my family?' 'Oh well, that's your problem.' 'OK well maybe I won't stop...'

I won't even bother to report them' and that's what happened. I didn't explain to my wife, family or any doctor at any time in those sixteen years—I kept a total silence and lived with the Syndrome's subtle, gradual effect. If you're exposed daily over sixteen years, when should you report your symptoms? It's always tomorrow because, 'I've gotta fly, you know— I've no time to report them.'

Then there are consequences if you report them, so you just keep flying and then, one day, your cup 'overflows' and that's when you have to stop flying. Ok, you think, 'I'm going to kill someone if I keep flying,' so then you have to deal with all the difficulties of not flying. You look perfectly OK but you think, 'I just can't explain it - there is something wrong.... there's something that they are not telling me about.'

That is where I was in the latter half of 2005 and then you get suicidal because you have let your family down and you still don't know what's wrong. This is horrible to live with and nobody is telling you what is already known by 2005. It's all written down and understood, but the doctors know that they've got their money stream to consider, they get paid by you, by the State and it's just too inconvenient to tell you what is wrong with you.

That's still really where we are now – there is a terrible ignorance in the medical community and that's deliberate because they don't want them to know. So doctors are in a bit of a bind really because they're paid by the NHS or the system and it's not worth their while to rock the boat. So they just sort of manage you with your Aerotoxic symptoms and you end up in this mess. The doctors allegedly learn to 'do no harm' from their early training yet in reality that's all they do. They do harm misdiagnosing you, then they mistreat you with the wrong solutions. I was offered antidepressants in 2004 - I actually asked for them as I didn't know what was going on. I said, 'Please can you give me something to deal with this, whatever it is?' so antidepressants were offered but when I read the instructions for use I saw that the side effects can cause death. 'OK' I thought, 'Well I'm not that bad! I won't take these' So you don't take the antidepressants, you just put them aside and think that you'll have a little bit more whisky or a bit more orange juice because that seems the right thing to do.

As a matter of fact, in 2004, I developed an uncontrollable physical nervous twitch in my left upper cheek and I thought everybody could see it and it's not nice to be thought of as 'twitchy' so on my own initiative I booked into the local acupuncture centre in Banbury because by then I thought mainstream medicine wasn't going to help me and I naively thought that having needles stuck in me might sort it all out. So I went along for a couple of treatments and it did no good at all. Obviously because they or I didn't know what they were treating - they didn't realise it was organophosphate poisoning - so it wasn't likely to work, but I've still got this report written in Chinese. I'd like to have it translated into English, just to see what they thought it was sixteen years ago. I didn't really trust the NHS or the GP who worked 100 metres away from my house and who, in 2006, I got very angry with. I told him that everything about my symptoms was written down. 'You can read for yourself what's going on and why,' I said, 'You should be

helping me by intelligently managing my situation. Why do you insist on following the NHS line on this issue?' and it made me very angry at the time. I remember storming out of the surgery and going to another surgery ten miles away. I hoped to find a doctor who would be a bit more understanding but the new one said that he couldn't do anything either because he was in the NHS system, but at least he listened and wasn't obstructive. So that's the way it has been for the last fifteen years.

It doesn't seem very intelligent to me but I must admit that looking back now I think that these doctors are really not helping their patients but they take their cue from the high up doctors.

Professor Bagshaw and I had words in 2006, as he grounded me formally in January 2006 with my 'loss of licence payment' which was great as suddenly I had a big chunk of money and I thought, 'Wow, this is good!'

So now I could do something. It was like a treat as I felt as if I had gone from being seriously ill to suddenly getting a large payout - just for feeling age forty nine. Part of me felt quite excited to have a chunk of money because I could do something with that money. I could become a driving instructor or a health and safety official which is what I tried to do in 2004.

I thought I'll do something else with the rest of my life but I was still completely oblivious of what caused me to stop flying and that oblivion wasn't good. So, yes, the games that all the doctors play are absolutely shameful really.

Professor Gordon Turnbull diagnosed me with PTSD in 2004 and subsequently saw many other pilots like Bob Millichap and Len Lawrence. Many of my friends went to see him and he is a very clever man and he put two and two together. He knows that toxic air is a huge problem, but he's not going to risk all of his hard won reputation by going out alone to say that the airlines are poisoning masses of people. But in a public Court of law Gordon Turnbull would be there because what he has written is all documented so a public Court of law is the way ahead for all of us. But being realistic, this couldn't happen because a successful Court case would shut down aviation and that's not possible.

The top doctors have a lot to explain and Dr Sarah Mackenzie Ross of University College London in particular as she was onto this issue twenty years ago due to the sheep-dip that farmers were using. She became very knowledgeable about the poisoning and she attended the 2005 Balpa conference in London and presented a paper and wrote it all down and then signed the declaration of 21st April 2005. In early 2006, Dr Mackenzie Ross tested me along with 26 other Balpa pilots and we all had a consistent presentation of the same problem over and over again which she identified very clearly. But she was in a difficult position as she couldn't be 100% sure what caused the problem - she could just say what it wasn't. It was just a tangle of words to describe what she'd found, but here we are fifteen years later and she's seen a lot more of it and it's become more and more obvious what has been going on for all these years.

Now Dr Mackenzie Ross is very senior in the medical world so when it finally goes public she will be asked, 'What did you do in 2006? Did you publish this paper in 2008 and is this your name on the document and do you swear by it?' and so on.

There are many other doctors, including Dr Michel Mulder, who are quite unique in this whole story. Dr Mulder qualified as a doctor in the 1970s in the Netherlands and then, just like me, he thought that that he wanted a bit of excitement so took a change of direction and qualified as a pilot to work for KLM for twenty years but then he became sick at the same time as me. He did not know why he was unwell but then, by reading an article in The Independent, a UK newspaper, in about 2006 or 2007 he latched onto the possible issue of exposure in the aircraft and this was news to him as a medical doctor.

He got really sick, angry and depressed like us all and then he slowly began to work it all out and, over fourteen years or so, he became a complete expert on the issue. He has co-authored many papers, along with other international doctors and skilled physicians. Dr Mulder is a rare example, as he has actually experienced the poisoning himself, whereas doctors like Mackenzie Ross and Bagshaw have never actually experienced the poisoning themselves.

There is a list of doctors who have 'worked it out' – Dr Sarah Myhill, Dr Jenny Goodman, Dr Jerry Thompson, Dr Jamal, Dr Julu, Dr Jonathan Burdon, Dr Moira Somers in Australia, Dr Harrison in America and then, of course, Dr Harry Hoffman who contributed to the Aerotoxic paper in 1999 - as it was always important to have an American doctor on board and he was a key doctor who would help Dr Jean Christophe Balouet of France in the late 1990s. He just listened to their listed their symptoms and connected their symptoms with other people's symptoms.

So we come to the scientists - these clever people who learn the science but always rely on raw data information from the guinea pigs or the canaries and human beings by using everyday practical experiences to make hard and fast future conclusions.

The university system has to be the most baffling, whilst countless professors and highly qualified people chase their tails in ever decreasing circles trying to work out why people are sick. Then there are the bosses and airlines' owners who are now faced with criminal proceedings as their airlines are taken through the Courts as with the case of EasyJet who have been in the Paris Criminal Court since 2016 and when these three cases are finally finished the well paid owners and so called 'businessmen' will have to face the cost of their deliberate actions. They knew what they were doing and recent health and safety law states that they must take the good with the bad and face the consequences of their actions, which are mostly deliberate, intentional and premeditated and covered up in a criminal way.

The engineers are in a difficult position because they too are party to the known design flaw which they have created and sanctioned and turned a blind eye to but they are not affected in the same way as they never get exposed to oil fumes but only hear, read and listen to others' tales

of woe. They are divorced from the action but, having spoken to many engineers over the years, I know that they know what they're doing; it's not like they don't know, it's just best kept secret.

I was telephoned on 29th September 2009 by a former Rolls Royce engineer, Mr Cyril Barcham, after the issue had been aired on BBC Radio 4's Today programme and he explained that Italian pilots had reported getting dizzy from the bleed air system so Mr Barcham went down to the local DIY store and bought some filters, fitted them and the problem went away. So here's just one example of an engineer in the past addressing the problem and dealing with it and then being considerably surprised forty years later to find it still going on. How does this happen?

Chapter 10

When and how will the lies end? Reverse engineering, closing the gap. 'A' day.

I've kept the last chapter for the last word on this issue and it's some matter of reverse engineering from a time in the future and I'm writing in May/June 2021 - so there's a date sometime in the future, which nobody knows except for a few privileged people in France, when the French will formally and finally accept Aerotoxic Syndrome as an occupational disease.

We know that last date was set in early December 2020 for 20th March 2021 which came and went due to a last minute appeal by lawyers, but that simply put the date into the future so we will call the unknown date 'A' day.

When Aerotoxic Syndrome is formally accepted as an occupational disease in France, any lawyer worthy of their job will be able to tell anybody who's been injured by toxic cabin air in any jet that they have been injured knowingly and deliberately due to the fundamental design flaw which has been well understood and documented for 100 years and therefore the airline or manufacturer responsible will be taken to a public court and they will suffer financially for the injury caused.

This, should, in turn lead to all bleed air aircraft being grounded, because effectively nobody will risk being sued in a court by lawyers who are anxious to represent their clients who have been knowingly injured.

This domino effect is all going to happen in the future after the date which we don't yet know but that date could be tomorrow, it could be next week, it could be next month, it could be next year, it could be in ten years' time.

The precedent for this is the previously mentioned case in Australia where Joanne Turner won her case in April 2010, but it was immediately appealed which sent it into the highest public court in Australia and the case couldn't go any higher but it took another few months before it

was finally won on the 3rd September 2010. Turner got her modest payout but she immediately explained that she did not run the case for the money, that was the last thing she did it for - the point of the case was to prove the principle that she got poisoned from that flight in 1992, eighteen years earlier. Exactly the same legal logic applies to the next French date.

People now say, but we knew about it, we knew exactly what was going to happen in March 2021 and the fact that the media weren't allowed to explain the recurring legal situation to the public or that it wasn't explained to the politicians or understood was a function of the cover-up and nothing else. It definitely happened and that's why the conference was held over four days (normally two days) in March (normally September) 2021 leading up to the BIG announcement.

So with all these issues, you have to see the bigger picture and it's like a jigsaw where you put the border pieces in around the sides, build up the whole border and then start filling the inside as you put your pieces down the big picture starts to make sense and you end up with one key missing piece of evidence. It's obvious where it is, you just put it in the missing slot and the jigsaw is completed and that's where we are at the moment. We've just got this one piece to go in and it's got a future date written on it which nobody knows, but like all things - it will be put in and then they'll be a massive navel gazing exercise or period of who knew what, when and why and people will ask why, exactly, wasn't it picked up in 1999 or 2005? That's when it gets nasty.

The reverse engineering principle states that we set our lives for what we want to do at a time when we don't have anything else to do. We just decide to relax, enjoy our lives and that's what I've decided to do so I know exactly what I'm going to do in the future by getting back into teaching flying in flight simulators and the real thing, living on a canal boat on the Oxford canal, hopefully with an understanding soul-mate female partner and a dog and cat.

I'll face my life, expecting to be able to make some 'clean' money from my Aerotoxic expertise, my flying knowledge and I'll publish what I knew before it even happened - so that people won't tread it and think 'my goodness how did he know, that's amazing.' Well because I could do jigsaws that's why; a good friend of mine is a former medical practitioner and I've asked him about how to forget nasty stuff that has happened in your life previously and whether you can be hypnotised to forget previous nasty memories? That would be nice, to just dump it all and live in the future and deal with present day to day stuff and recall about what happened in the past and just put it all behind you.

A spot of hypnotism might work, but all of this domino effect of course impacts on the real world, on real jobs, on people's lives and it's obviously not very popular because it's destroying many people's livings - the Negative 5% who continue to make money out of the other 95%, they're not at all amused but are unable to make the necessary changes.

It's not a win as far as they are concerned, it's a terrible loss and there are consequences which have to be faced, but one always hopes that you're on the winning side, as there will

always be people who hate you for what you've done and that's just a fact of life and that shouldn't stop you from doing what you're going to do.

Many people ask me 'what is the date of the French new decision?' but it's not just a matter of ringing up the French pilots and Union and asking. No one can tell me the next date, it must now be a sudden announcement.

If the date were known, it would be a very serious piece of information and, frankly, I don't really want to know it now having had the last date completely trivialised and forgotten at the last minute. Why would you want to know a future date? You might as well just wait and see and know that it is going to happen. There's no advantage in knowing it in advance.

It can be especially frustrating and disappointing when it gets trashed by so-called lawyers at the last minute.

I'm quite a visual person and we can all draw graphs of our lives in yearly intervals showing how much money or assets we had. For example, I think most people start off with nothing and then they gradually increase their wealth over the years until they die and then they give it all away and it can't be taken with them, so that's kind of the normal. But if you look at my graph it's a classic case of making some money in the early days as a flying instructor and then getting better and better paid as I got more seniority and did harder and more demanding jobs including a decrease as I went part-time in 2005. Then you lose it all as you 'fail safe', then it increases a bit as you get your 'loss of licence payment' and then you get through all of that money trying to help other poisoned people and then you sell your house and use that money to finance films and publish books and so on.

But all the money goes because that's how the Negative 5% work - they relieve you of any funds - and then of course you end up with nothing or less than nothing and that's what they want, so you can draw a diagram showing the ups and downs of the last sixty five years.

Then I could also draw a diagram or graph of my health which would show how my health went from 100% when I was born to around 40% suddenly in 1990 and deteriorated, as measured by the NHS, in 2011 to 1/2 / 10. I would have been around zero in June 2005 whilst a BAe 146 Training Captain. Then it would show how my health was restored by ignoring NHS advice until I am more or less back to the same state of health, or maybe an even better state, than before I started flying jets in 1989. It's an impactful way of showing one's life. I went to the House of Lords in 2006 to see Margaret Mar and I showed her the coloured health graph I had drawn of how my life had been and she was very interested but the really scary thing is that everybody else has got their own graph. It's an impactful way of showing one's life's trajectory.

One fact that occurred in the last few weeks was that I was expecting Jean Christophe Balouet, the doctor who coined the term 'Aerotoxic Syndrome' in 1999, to take part in the workshop we held on the 19th March 2021. We had invited him but he didn't even reply because

he was a Judicial Expert and wasn't allowed to come and he couldn't speak out or take sides as he had to be unbiased.

I was slightly surprised on the 22nd March 2021 when I had a phone call out of the blue which my mother answered and it was Chris Balouet asking to speak with me please, so my mother handed me the phone and I said, 'How can I help, what do you want Chris?' and in a thirty one minute talk on Skype he really shocked me as he poured his heart out to me. He said, 'I've got no money, I'm very depressed and need help.' It turned out that he's younger than me at sixty four and I was really concerned and I thought, 'Well so am I broke too, but you know you sound even more depressed and I'm not depressed - so I need to try and help you.' It was all about money and Chris had somehow built up a debt of 100,000 euros, but just bear in mind that this is the doctor who persuaded Boeing to change the architecture of their new jets in 1999 from the bleed air system to the electrical pump system of the Boeing 787.

1999 is when it all happened, and when I first visited him at his village home in France in around 2011 Chris explained it all to me. He had said to Boeing, 'Look we've got all the evidence, you must do this, it's a no-brainer, you can't keep poisoning people, it's not a reasonable thing to do, if you know how to get around it, you must' and I agreed with him, who wouldn't? So probably, together with Professor Chris Winder of Australia, Boeing listened to him and then changed the entire architecture of their next jet which was the Boeing 787 Dreamliner. But, as has been written about elsewhere, Boeing marketing very cleverly changed lots of other systems – so they didn't just change the architecture of the air system, they also accounted for it by saying the fuel savings would be significant, so it was all to do with 'fuel burns' or money.

Due to a composite, lighter but stronger fuselage, Boeing was also able to increase the cabin pressure from 8,000 feet normally to 5 or 6,000 feet which is much easier for the human body as so they could electrically pump more air into it and make for more comfortable flying conditions.

Then, of course, Boeing made lots of other lesser cosmetic changes like the lights which changed from purple to green to yellow to blue and this was all very soothing for the passengers. What they did and why is all written down so they very cleverly marketed all these many new changes all at once in the B.787 with 'smoke and mirrors'.

But the main and the now understated chief change was the complete change around the architecture of the air system by no longer using unfiltered, unmonitored bleed air which is what Chris persuaded Boeing to do in 1999. So here's a Frenchman going to America and telling them exactly what to do and it is a great credit to him especially as he'd never flown or ever actually experienced Aerotoxic Syndrome in any way.

He just listened to the people with Aerotoxic Syndrome whom he was studying, and he believed them when they told him about their symptoms, so that, and the fact that he had never

experienced Aerotoxic Syndrome himself, is to his great credit. He was a great man in the early days.

I believe Chris was with Jacques Cousteau the oceanographer on the Calypso in the early days and was an environmentalist in France and he got involved in some really fascinating work in the 70s and 80s and then from about 1995 onwards he got involved with the cabin air issue. Then within three or four years he had worked it all out and got some help from Australia and America and published a paper on 20th October 1999.

From that point on he would have got bored because once you've worked something out and published it - well you can't keep revisiting it, you've worked it out, so from there on having persuaded Boeing to change their architecture, he decided to do something else. He got distracted by the interesting scientific issues of trees which soak up nutrients from the ground and if you spill chemicals onto the ground the chemicals show up in the bark rings. By testing with complex systems one can see the exact date of the chemical spillage. Chris told me that he had spent ten years on this science and turned it into an accepted judicial procedure, where the date of any chemical spillage could be proved in a French public Court using his tree analysis. This is called Dendrology and Chris spent many years doing that. He was just fascinated by all sorts of unusual forensic problems and how to get round them and like any intelligent human being he dedicated his life but then he took his eye off the ball a bit and he didn't make so much money out of some aspects of it and maybe wasn't advised properly or perhaps wasn't helped so then he got into slight financial difficulties and this came to a head during the pandemic of the last twelve months, when all the contracts he had set up to help airlines established their Aerotoxic principles fell apart and his income suddenly disappeared overnight.

This left him with a debt so that's what he explained to me on the 22nd March on the Skype call and I was very concerned because I haven't got any money either so there's two of us suddenly in sort of financial difficulties, but he is by far the most famous with his amazing claims to have changed the Boeing 787 technology.

I contacted two medical friends of mine and explained his predicament and they decided to do a bit to help which was good as at the time I was about to move away from Norwich as my MP of six years hadn't replied to a single formal letter so I decided to bail out from Norwich; nor had the BBC taken any interest in the Aerotoxic issue and I was effectively banned from appearing on radio or TV; nor had my local paper, The Eastern Daily Press shown any interest; so I decided to move away from Norfolk and return to near where I used to live. So I was really quite busy collecting my few remaining bits and pieces together and hiring a van and so I didn't have a lot of time to worry about Chris's money problems, but I felt I'd helped by putting him in touch with other friendly retired doctors who could maybe do something to help.

I was considerably surprised later that afternoon on 22nd March when Chris suddenly sent me his valuable data of the last fifteen years which he had been working on and which accounted

for 340 different toxic compounds in the cabin air of all jet aircraft. I just couldn't believe it - I thought, 'Wow!' Then he added a note saying on no account was I to share this information with anybody. It was private and for my eyes only and I respected that because I thought that was fair enough, but I was quite shocked that he trusted me with it and was a bit surprised and worried in a way that he had because what was I meant to do with it?

Then I wondered what was going to happen next and later that week he sent me more emails and Word documents - some of which were in French and he continued to pour his heart out in emails saying that he was very depressed and confirmed what he had told me when I'd been talking to him on Skype. He had also been smoking and I know he liked a drop or two of red wine so that probably was not good for him. I was really quite concerned by his emails as they got more and more desperate as the week went on but I was also quite pleased that he had shared them with me, but slightly worried about him too.

Then my move happened over to the Midlands on 23rd March 2021 and again I was very busy myself so I couldn't really get too involved but the emails from Chris Balouet are there for everybody to see from the 22nd March onwards.

I started to have some time off in the evening and I put his French documents into Google Translate and they came out in English so then I sent them back to him and asked Chris how they looked in English. As there were some words I didn't understand I asked him to please change them because only he knew what he was trying to say.

On Saturday 27th March Chris said to me, 'Slow down as you're going too fast' and I said I would as I always respected his position and I was just trying to help him. So I then backed off a bit as I was going too fast.

During the week of 22nd March Chris had put me in touch with Dr David Megson at Manchester University and we had a phone chat and I was overjoyed to know that David Megson had been working with Chris for five or six years. This 'new' scientist is in his mid-30s. I thought that's the sort of generation we want on board - people of my daughter and son's age - to take it on the cause because we are all in our 60s and 70s and we need younger people to understand what has been published previously. I was really relieved to know that David Megson was well into Chris Balouet's work and knowing that a younger top scientist in the UK was working on the issue was the best thing that happened that week. For some reason I didn't even know about David Megson, but there he was as large as life at Manchester University and really up to date with everything, so that was great.

The next week I was still backing off and not doing anything with Chris Balouet as I organised my own life with few resources. Then late on Thursday night 1st April 1992 I got a brief message from my great friend Bea Beaumont in Switzerland saying that Jean Christophe had died of a sudden stroke.

I just couldn't believe it. He had died the previous day, on the 31st March 2021, of a massive stroke and this was just totally shocking news. I immediately thought, 'Wow that was not due to drink or tobacco but mostly due to financial stress as detailed in his emails and verbal explanation on 22nd March.'

I had settled down back in the Midlands by then and immediately thought his death was suspicious, although he'd died of a sudden stroke, because he was only sixty four years old and younger than me. I quickly looked up 'stress symptoms' on the NHS website and that's what stress does. I contacted Dr Michel Mulder in The Netherlands as he was one of the people I'd contacted to try to help Christen days earlier and he told me that Chris had had a stroke seven years ago and this was just more of the same which made sense as Chris was not in great shape health wise.

But I still think his death suspicious because of the whole situation of being sent his valuable data on the 22nd March and all of the emails he sent me. It didn't seem right to me so that's why I contacted the police as I'd already been in touch with them through the Norfolk police since 2015 because when I moved to the Midlands I'd notified the Norfolk police that I'd left and then notified the Oxford police in Banbury that I'd settled in Oxfordshire on Saturday 27th March. They started filling in a form and I said, 'What are you doing?' and they said all this was for the 'sex register'. I said, 'No no, no - I'm a good boy! That's nothing to do with me, I'm just advising the police that I'm living in Oxfordshire now rather than Norfolk.' They said that was fine so I had already told him that I was in Oxfordshire. When Chris died I thought, 'Well I don't really want to deal with people I don't know' so I contacted a friend in the Thames Valley Police, Detective Inspector Chris Whitwell. I just contacted him for a chat which we had on 3rd April 2021 and I explained to Chris about the suspicious death, that Chris had lost his life due to money problems – that was what killed him. If he had had 100,000 euros last week he would likely still be alive now. So this was a money related death and I and ALL other Aerotoxic 5% Positives are in the same situation. Chris Whitwell took the situation seriously but he didn't really do a lot as it was a Bank Holiday at the time and he said, 'Just go and enjoy the sun and don't worry about it.'

No, Chris, this is a serious issue which needs to be fully investigated and to this day it hasn't been, they've just paid lip service to it because they know how serious it is but they don't want to investigate inconvenient evidence like that.

I made a written statement on the 3rd April 2021 when I wrote down in my words what happened leading to Chris's death and matters surrounding it so it's a formal statement and I emailed it to Chris and then sent it to a few other people just to cover myself. On the 10th April, because nothing was happening with the police who were just not interested, I took my statement to a solicitor in Banbury and they witnessed it officially so that made me feel better, but then I thought that I hadn't put my hand on a Bible as I was humiliatingly forced to do at Banbury Police station for my unwanted divorce paperwork in around 2009. So then I wondered whether

I'd done it all properly and the loss of Chris Balouet, the doctor who almost single handed discovered Aerotoxic Syndrome in 1999, died because the illness doesn't officially exist.

His death is of no interest to anybody apart from those who are directly involved in the issue so 'the establishment' have great ways of belittling you, even in death. They just ignore you which is not very funny.

I can draw a parallel with my financial situation as equally precarious or much worse as I have few assets as Chris Balouet or Captain Tristan Loraine - everybody on the Aerotoxic mission has no money, that's how it is - it's just a way of life, you learn to live on nothing and that's a feature of life over the last fifteen years really and then you're criticised severely for any way money you spend to try and get the word out.

At the moment, you have to actually pay newspapers to publish your news information or pay PR people to do it - they won't do it for nothing. It does not matter how good the story is and that seems a bit bizarre, that you have to pay them to tell the public a good story really, but that's exactly how it is now.

It's 'follow the money' that's how it is, as the 5% Negative people with the money win until the gap closes. The gap is defined by coming back from the future to today's date.

Only our children and grandchildren will be able to know how the gap finally disappeared such that Aerotoxic Syndrome was changed from being a taboo, secretive, forbidden for the BBC and media to even mention to a well-known accepted, regular medical term, like all of the other hard fought over medical labels such as asbestosis.

We have been dealing with 'The Asbestos of the Skies' for 100 years.

But this word is clearly pointing the finger at bleed air jets which use unfiltered, unmonitored air from jet engines.

Perhaps the greatest mistake that those three Aerotoxic pioneers made in 1999 was to blame commercial jets in the title of their paper? But the board of Boeing believed Chris Balouet in 1999 – so why don't their successors?

I was personally in Welcome aboard Toxic Airlines of 2007 which was produced by Capt Tristan Loraine and told our story fourteen years ago and anyone can now see how I was in 2007. I naively thought it would be a matter of two years before we sorted it all out, as anyone who could read plain English could follow the science or watch a free movie documentary.

There are some quite big egos in the Aerotoxic story - those who have done the most. But these egos are also maybe trying to single handedly to win the war, which can never happen.

After Chris Balouet, who was first onto the scandal in around 1995, came Dr Susan Michaelis who has turned her search for the truth into a lifetime's work since she got sick as a

BAe 146 pilot in around 1997 and has since outqualified most of her opposite numbers with her countless published papers and efforts. Next would be Captain Tristan Loraine, formerly of BA & Balpa,,who has also dedicated the last twenty years of his life to this issue and saved my life in 2006 with his excellent advice. In recent years it would appear that many professionals work is more about finding the last piece of the jigsaw puzzle at the expense of just helping those who need it, which is what I've dedicated my life to doing.

Perhaps the most comprehensive documentary of recent times has been the 2015 German film by the intrepid and fearless aviation journalist Tim van Beveren,Unfiltered breathed in air – the truth about AerotoxicSyndrome. Critically, TVB has never been affected by AerotoxicSyndrome himself and is therefore as sceptical and unbiased as the next person. This film demonstrates the chronic ill health on cabin crew, pilots and passengers – again, why do we label humans who have been injured, for life?

Yet another Aerotoxic film was premiered in early March 2020 by Captain Tristan Loraine called Everybody Flies which ironically was again poorly named as everybody suddenly wasn't flying but this film was a repeat of all others but confusingly only mentioned the word Aerotoxic in passing as the Aerotoxic Association and QCAQE were both causing the authorities trouble back in 2007/8 time and this fact is recorded. This was a strange and unforgivable omission given that Aerotoxic is the key word which has described the cause of mass public illness for twenty two years.

If you have got money, you can either pay to have stories told or pay to have them covered up and that's exactly where we are now in a 'pandemic' which is understandable. But it's just a sadness for those people who have got AerotoxicSyndrome. You are constantly thinking of the 1,000,000 people in Europe who have got AerotoxicSyndrome, who are struggling with the disease - the Negative 5% don't want them to know but ironically may have the disease themselves. On the other hand, Aerotoxic most certainly will be accepted in France and the rest of the world – sooner or later.

So why fret over the date, which is sometime in the future and is absolutely inevitable, as previously discussed?

What will happen after 'A' day?

Well as previously touched upon, on 'A' day + 1 ALL 'bleed air' jet planes (including turboprops) will be technically and legally unairworthy. Any lawyer can claim that their client suffered a known injury as AerotoxicSyndrome will be a cause of an occupational disease in France and by simple logic – everywhere else. That's why the date is constantly appealed – not because AS doesn't exist because the law will change overnight.

How will the media cover their own fifteen year cover-up, as that will become the real story which the public will find hard to swallow as the evidence goes from zero to 100% - overnight?

Anyone who can write the present memo describing government policy for this present cover-up should also be given a prize, as it appears to be criminal in intent.

I decided the title of this series of books as it's definitely the last book about the issue of Aerotoxicity and only deals with the last few months of the closure and waiting for 'A' day, as the previous three books dealt with my horror of the issue over the last 30 years.

I have had the great good fortune to have on a scale of 0-10 gone from 0 to 9 and back to plus 1 – whilst many including Richard and his sister Pam Westgate have paid the ultimate price as their elderly parents outlive them.

My personal interest has always been the forty plus strong passenger group of flight XLA 120 who were gassed in a single non fume event in a Boeing 767 on 1st February 2007 as their legal case is by far the best documented over five years in the UK by the House of Lords, BBC and 60 minutes in Australia – the so called US & UK lawyers - all failed.

And because we've been in a 'pandemic' in the last eighteen months I've decided to call this book "Aerotoxic Pandemic 1921-202? - My Part in its Establishment." But only to point the finger at the same scientists and doctors who have been responsible for the recent debacle and now all have faces and names as they defend their 'science'.

Epilogue

Exposure of a massive cover-up lasting over 100 years feels a bit like a balloon being inflated in that same period of time which gets bigger and bigger to the point where it finally explodes (it can never quietly deflate) on its own with free social media and karma, as a return to the bad old days is not an option.

Many German crews are calling for ALL bleed air jet planes to be grounded before being modified with filters and monitors – this is always a sticking plaster solution rather like a filter in a cigarette, but much better than Players Rough Cut cigarettes of the present.

It becomes more obvious, more visible, more well-known and, if you think about it, it only takes a key person or an issue or a big incident to prick it and it'll just go Bang, so that's where we are at the moment and the next important thing is to step back from it and just get on with your own life and disassociate from it because it's not good to be involved in something which you're not really suffering from in anyway and so that's what I'm planning to do and will do and you can maybe understand that silence is the only way for the future except in a public Court of law.

Then I'll talk and talk and talk and share the evidence. You can use different ways to easily get into a public Court but until then - silence.

The psychological scars left from this campaign are significant due to close relationships wrecked, misunderstandings over common words and selfishness. Following my last book I got

to the point where I formally changed my name to Jack Grahame Hay (my mother's maiden name) on 1st May 2020 by Deed Poll in an effort to escape my past and begin again, but even this failed as my mother kept calling me John and the paperwork was too complicated with Covid-19, so I quickly reverted to my original name.

As stated earlier, just like Solomon, the only way to prove that visible white toxic oil fumes are not dangerous is for those who deny it to be physically exposed in a public Court, so that they can demonstrate their personal faith in their science. Maybe they are right but they have to demonstrate this publicly.

The 5% Negatives insist on 100% evidence and on providing the last tiny shreds of evidence that the issue exists or whether it's in a published paper; the testimony from a passenger in 2003; whistle discontented politicians.

We will also run a competition with the first paid public servant in any country to find any positive evidence of Aerotoxic Syndrome as we all know that competition between airlines is the only way to win, where an airline boss and board cleverly decide to stop poisoning their customers and staff, as it's a great business message! That's how it'll be finally exposed and it will be the subject for a fifth reflective book after its been finally exposed, about the next stage of my life, but not now.

After founding the Aerotoxic Association Ltd. The Charity in 2007 (AeA) and ploughing around £300K over fourteen years into what was essentially a 'non-profit' organisation as it was dealing with human health, I realised that I had to make use of my extensive knowledge of AS in anticipation of it being accepted on 20th March 2021 so I founded Aerotoxic Solutions Consultancy Ltd. (ASC) on 24th March 2021 to mainly make a profit and rebuild my crippled finances. Most will agree that the known and available solutions are worth many billions of dollars.

I had cashed in my pension in early 2018, after QC Rawlinson's 'Tipping point' speech of September 2017, to finance my projects of Sim-Fly Norfolk, the Aerotoxic Association and Pilot Press, rather than corporations but within a short space of time - my money pot had gone and I've been on Universal Credit for the past two years and back on the bread line.

But I was also tested by the NHS in 2019 who measured me at 7-8/10, so one can't put a price on health and I consider myself fully recovered now, but always with a weakness in finances as I was simply never taught the basics with my cushy, non-financial boarding school existence.

So to go from ½ - 8/10 was spectacular, but most importantly I knew how to recover and want to pass that knowledge on to others.

What will one fill one's time with in the future having predicted the date in the future for acceptance of Aerotoxic Syndrome?

Anyone who has known me over the past sixteen years - including Captain Julian Soddy, Professor Michael Bagshaw, David Powles, the editor of the EDP etc since I first worked out the cause of my ill health on 22nd May 2006 -hassome understanding of a ‘problem’ in the airline industry as from the time I gave a talk to the WI in my village in Warwickshire in 2007 until now I have declared an interest in human health as a priority. But to somehow make up all of the dated evidence is way beyond any one’s ability – therefore which is THE key piece of dated evidence of the past 100 years? That is the big unanswered question.

But to claim no positive evidence is verging on being nut\$.

Less CO OP in Jets!

However, be warned - as no single person or manufacturer or organisation controls this Health & Safety issue as has already been found at, as many egos rest on the eventual outcome which will be official soon.

The academics laughable analysis paralysis which stops them reaching rational conclusions which could be arrived at by an intelligent 10-year-old was demonstrated admirably by Cranfield University from 2007-2011 in their inability and eventual failure to measure the concentrations or dose of highly toxic compounds in ‘normal air’ and failure to measure a single visible fume event.

To say that Cranfield set out to fail would be an understatement, and I suggested to Professor Helen Muir of Cranfield University on 6th November 2007 at 08.37 that any BAe 146 pilot could easily regenerate a familiar, highly visible (like a pre smokingban pub) oil ‘fume event’ on the ground from the APU for convenience of testing – within about 5 minutes – so Cranfield and countless other Universities get null points for effort, skill and honesty as a government and industry funded manufacturer of junk science.

UCL, Buckingham, Amsterdam, Seattle, Harvard, Gottingen, Stirling, New South Wales and now Oxford Universities have all worked it out at some stage in the past 25 years – perhaps they should talk to one another by using the internet?

But regardless of the University, some important scientist, such as the late epidemiologist, Sir Richard Doll who discovered that smoking causes lung cancer, needs to put their name to this ‘discovery’, make a conclusion and then move swiftly on to ‘Further’ research.

Why can’t it be the youthful Dr David Megson – after all it is his generation’s problem?

It is a fact, that in just ten years the present super jets will look relatively ‘old’ as the seventy-year designs slowly evolve. Any expert looking back to the 90s will see massive changes and yet the principles largely remain exactly the same. The diameters of the jets are now the size of a Boeing 737 fuselage and have the power of 4 B.747 jet engines – bigger and bigger – just like

the huge dinosaurs, airships and Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction - we all know what happened to them.

But if there is still a fundamental design flaw in a big jet engine of using unfiltered, unmonitored contaminated bleed air as breathing air for humans, it will still poison around 30% of people, just as the jets in the 1950s did.

It is this total, irrational inability to understand this particular error of the engineering work around the Boeing 787 architecture which makes the future look very dodgy as it will take a global policy change following 'A' day and then much honest engineering effort and morality to change anything.

I will go back to flying non pressurised aeroplanes by taking up the first passion I had as a four-year-old and then just concentrate on getting back to a relatively normal life of flying with a loving, understanding partner and a dog and cat.

An agreed "Air Magna Charter" will be drawn up of common intent – to be actioned within a set time frame.

As a Christian I'm a great acceptor in forgiving one's 'enemies' or the Negative 5% and in Jesus turning over the money changers' tables –and I care absolutely nothing for what anyone else thinks, sorry!

The last words of this Aerotoxic book?

Embarrassing, Embarrassing & Embarrassing.