

## RETHINKING THE LETTER TO SCIENCE

Claus Jensen

**The so-called Letter to Science has been touted as a great success by its authors, Janine Roberts and David Crowe, and it is generally considered one of Rethinking AIDS's success stories. Following is an alternative account.**

The official story of the Letter to Science is summarised by Janine Roberts, the person who came up with the initiative, on her website:

### **Many Scientists Endorse Book's Findings of Fraud**

*37 senior professors, scientists and top experts have reviewed the newly discovered documentary evidence in 'Fear of the Invisible' and conclude that there is serious scientific fraud in the scientific papers held for over 24 years to prove HIV the cause of AIDS. (://fearoftheinvisible.com/w) [For the full Letter, see Annexure 1 below]*

The truth of the matter is that the “documentary evidence” is anything but “newly discovered”. It might also come as a surprise to some of the Signatories that they have reviewed such evidence in Roberts’ book *Fear of the Invisible*. The Letter itself says:

*What prompts our communication today is the **recent revelation of an astonishing number of previously unreported deletions and unjustified alterations made by Gallo to the lead paper. There are several documents originating from Gallo's laboratory that, while available for some time, have only recently been fully analyzed.** These include a draft of the lead paper typewritten by Popovic which contains handwritten changes made to it by Gallo.[7] This draft was the key evidence used in the above described inquiries to establish that Gallo had concealed his laboratory's use of a cell culture sample (known as LAV) which it received from the Institut Pasteur.*

This is backed up by an RA Press Release:

*“With new findings that undermine the scientific integrity and veracity of Gallo's four papers, the entire basis of the theory that HIV causes AIDS may now be questioned,” says Rethinking AIDS president David Crowe.*

In sum, questioning the scientific integrity and veracity of Gallo’s early papers on HIV is by this inspired turn of phrase hitched irreparably on the “new findings”. Further the “full analysis” and “investigative conclusion” that the “37 senior professors, scientists and top experts” have signed on to is by another fine choice of words attributed to Janine Roberts – a lay person:

*The investigative conclusion prompting the letter to Science was made by journalist Janine Roberts, author of Fear of the Invisible, a book that examines the origin of several disease theories. “I was shocked when I read the original draft of the key scientific paper now widely cited as proving HIV causes AIDS,” says Roberts. “Gallo's handwritten last-minute changes had reversed what the scientists in his lab had originally concluded. This demonstrates a stunning disregard for the scientific process and a very disturbing breach of public trust.”*

There was at least one real scientist who received the “evidence” for review, namely Dr. Andrew Maniotis. This is his appraisal:

*Are you part of our little effort to submit a request to Science to retract Gallo's 1st 4 papers because the first was "changed" by Gallo's hand editing Papovic's manuscript 4 days before it was submitted, to read that the probable cause of AIDS is "HIV?" I don't think this will work. I read the critiqued paper word for word, and think the Gonda letter is a much better way to go (I have attached both). The RT activity table sucks, and that can be brought to their attention, but the other cross-outs, rewrites, additions aren't going to get the editors of Science too excited.*

*The Gonda letter, however, is a smoking gun, and should be validated before it is presented as evidence of wrong-doing on Gallo's part. Whaddaya think?*

*Read them and respond quickly, Janine Roberts is waiting for my response to David Crowe's letter asking for retraction. She wants me to get high profile credentialed scientists to sign the letter, but I know they won't for the same reasons I find the evidence weak. (E-mail correspondence 11/6/08)*

In another mail, Dr. Maniotis expanded on his arguments:

*As far as the Jainine Robert's documents, I finally received them, read the Papovic "undated draft" word for word the day before yesterday, as well as the Gonda letter of course, and I have some bad feelings regarding the impact that these documents will have on the Science Editors, or any other journal editor for a whole list of reasons. Some of these reasons, in part, were painfully revealed to me last summer when Gallo came after me and with his AIDSTRUTH Nazi's Bergman and Moore and Wainberg and Natrass cabal. After they wrote letters to every professor, dean, Provost, and my University President at UIC, asking specifically to get me fired (which they failed to do because of my teaching record, and the good faith of one chairman who appreciated my contributions as an Adjunct Assistant Professor since 2003, and who has given me the time and position title), I learned a lot about the wiggle room of a corrupt PI like Gallo, or indeed any PI like myself, which is considerable. My impression of the potential impact of the Roberts documents, and the potential impact they could have on retracting any paper(s), is that, as a lab director and scientific paper reviewer for many years, what isn't appreciated perhaps by Janine and David (my dear friends), is that there is much wiggle room allotted to PIs (principal investigators of labs) to waffle or reject sentences, paragraphs, or entire directions of research on drafts, pre-drafts, or pre-grants, or even in the first journal submission drafts of scientific papers, as well as to dismiss contributions or protests of lab support personnel such as Gonda. In other words, regarding changing Papovic's intended statements, it can be argued that these Papovic statements simply detracted from the focus of the paper, and therefore should be deleted. The paper sets out to prove they have a culture model, and this is exactly, using that day's technology, what they did. And Gallo is a good, if not great, editor. The real crime is in Table 2, and the entire reliance on RT as evidence of retrovirus, HTLV-III, which Eleni, Val, John Papadraou, me, and others, have published extensively about and raised issue with in the peer reviewed literature, and of course in numerous RA websites, blogs, etc, for many years. My fear is that if your expectation or request is to retract the Papovic work, the Science editors, especially given the history of the Dingell investigation, and because of all of the bad feelings that went and still go with the Dingell-OSI outcome(s), the Editor(s) will say, the crossings out of Gallo of Papovic are within the right(s) of any Principal Investigator, and in fact, if this process does not occur at least half a dozen to dozens of times before submission, and even especially hours*

before submission (when many edits of mine and others still happens precisely on the 11th hour before submission because we don't want to get caught with our pants down or believe we have short-changed a possible important direction others could follow in the even we get hit by a bus on the way to the mailbox), the Science editors might say that such a non-edited paper shouldn't even be considered for publication. The allusions and cross-outs obscuring or drawing attention to the fact that virus x does or does not cause AIDS can be considered peripheral to this paper, and the principal author (Gallo) isn't obliged to prove that case here. In the Papovic paper, they set out to prove the usefulness of their new virus production system, which, in itself is a joke because it didn't kill (the cancer) cells in their demonstration. As Eugene eloquently said yesterday, the real crime is in the title of the paper, which is true. My feeling is that we should be emphasizing not Gallo at this point, but the nature of Montagnier's Patient One sample. The theft issue or concealment of the source of the Gallo lab "LAV-HTLV-III-HIV- sample, was debunked when Gallo and Montagnier co-published in NEMJ their recollections of their early experiences in I think it was 2001, and his willingness on the phone with me last summer to have a 3-way with himself, me and Montagnier to demonstrate there was no theft (that would be a sight for a porno movie wouldn't it-a 3-way with me, Gallo and Luc) so why beat a dead horse, because there is no mileage in the who stole whose fake diamonds issue? The real issue here, again is scientific, in my opinion. Sinoussi and Luc's Nobel prize is based on a sample from a man who had been treated for syphilis, had 2 bouts of gonorrhea, had had herpes I and II, Epstein-Bar virus, and of course CMV. This is what the Nobel is based upon, as proving that "HIV" causes AIDS? Patient One never had AIDS in the first place. He had lymphadenopathy, and a long history of STD's. Gallo thought he had the first AIDS patient survey, in which only 1/3. to perhaps slightly less than 1/2 of the patients tested "HIV-positive" using a culture system employing a slight amplification of the "LAV" signal using cancer cells that don't show any evidence of being infected by "an AIDS T-cell-killing virus. That's it!

The Gonda admission, in my humble opinion, is more powerful than all of the edits on the Papovic "undated" draft (used for a grant submission-I was told there is evidence that it is the 4 day harbinger of the final Science draft????????). Eugene Semon has some interesting historical issues regarding this document that aren't apparently new insights or criticisms, but which were discussed, considered, and then dismissed he indicated, by the Dingell commission and the OSI as being evidence of wrong doing. I would need to look into this more, before I can suggest that it could make a difference and even get the Science editors to consider without laughing at us, our request to retract any of the 4 papers. Gallo could (and will) simply claim that those samples photographed by Gonda weren't the ones he used in the papers, that thousands of photos of "HIV" have been published since and that we are nit-and cherry-picking old science, or even that he had a different EM scientist do the work other than Gonda, whose name currently escapes him (after all he is in his 70's and needs a lot of rest). Given the latitude(s) of a PI's power, how can anyone say he is wrong, or lying, since the event happened in 1983?

The only way would be for Gonda to sign an affidavit, have document(s) showing his recruitment by Gallo to photograph the samples IN THAT PAPER, and then I'd think there might be a case. Sure the goddamn "particles" are too small according to Gonda, but this misses the entire issue of the far more important issue in the paper of RT, and its use as a surrogate marker for "HIV" or any other retrovirus, which again, Eleni and others have written extensively about in the past.

*In my humble opinion, we should focus not on what "HIV" isn't, but what it is. And apparently even the likes of Brian Foley, Eugene Semon, and I would like to press forward on defining what "HIV" is, not what it ain't. It is present as p24 as  $\leq 30$  pg/ml in an "uninfected DIADS cell sample, and  $> 30$  pg/ml in an "infected" person. Its sequences are present in the normal human genome database, healthy flies, monkeys, chimps, humans, rabbits, dogs, children stimulated by caprine milk, etc.*  
(E-mail Correspondence 11/6/08)

In view of this, it might be possible to claim that at least one scientist endorsed the Letter to Science after finally receiving the documents for review, but it is clear that it was not his letter, and that he was not impressed with the case.

The Gonda Letter Dr. Maniotis hoped would provide a much needed smoking gun was never validated (see David Crowe's answers to Dr. Brown and Dr. Turner below).

Dr. Maniotis mentions Eugene Semon, a biochemist and longtime student of the early Gallo papers. Eugene Semon later went on the record again, attempting to change the focus of the Letter back to the relevant science, particularly the virus detection and counting issues. Two weeks after Dr. Maniotis appraisal, Eugene Semon sent following comprehensive list of facts and analyses for Dr. Maniotis' consideration:

***For what it's worth, here are excerpts from blog posts with important facts missed by all those scientific committees that vindicated Gallo:***

*11/1/08 at AME (edited) Let's focus on some key elements of the HIV isolation fraud. The point here is to confirm the quite brilliant swindle\* independently from primary source materials or reviews of such materials by court qualified experts in the subject being reviewed. (I'm merely a chemical engineer with a knack for untangling complex reactions based on professional experience in hazard assessments for the process industries.)*

*Even if Papovic were to deny IMO that he ever told Gallo that no virus was "continuously produced" by the H4 (or H9) culture, it would not change the "legal truth" evident from "Popovic ... Gallo et al; Detection, Isolation and Continuous Production of Cytopathic Retroviruses (HTLV-III) from Patients with AIDS and Pre-AIDS. Science V224, (4 May 1984), pg 499" that the total number and characterizations of specifically (what would later be said to be) HIV proteins" were not extracted from that particular experiment, that "fraction number 8, Figure 2". The caption describes how the "peak fraction" was measured for maximum "reverse transcriptase activity" - incorporating nucleotides into a growing polymer chain - in the "1.16 g/ml sucrose density band". Details on the expedient use of synthetic templates are also described in Figure 3's caption (1).*

*Now here's where the fun starts because by no means should a careful investigator overlook the nature of the synthetic template or poly(A)-oligo dT [15] described in these captions. It is "the adenylate-containing strand" or the "synthetic homopolymer" polyriboadenylate annealed with oligothymidylate (2). What does the dash mean? That a chemical polymer not a biomolecule\*\* has a "primer" (15 Ts) hydrogen-bonded at its end to kick start and maintain a polymerase reaction that's roughly 3 orders of magnitude higher than an "endogenous"\*\*\* RT reaction where true "information transduction" or "transcription" takes place. The template is referred to as a "homopolymer" meaning it's a Johnny-one-note as far as other molecules are concerned. Numerous kinetic comparisons were made by 70's RNA tumor virus researchers with "endogenous" RT experiments which produces the fact of much greater RT "activity" with synthetic templates.*

*In summary, the only reasonable conclusion from this paper is that a vast quantity of polythymidylate was produced and certainly there's no virus production documented in the experiments described. (see also second post below)*

*Nonetheless, Judge Sulan was quite impressed with Gallo's accomplishment and stated in his Opinion, "Professor Gallo considered that the suggestion that the virus had not been isolated is completely wrong. He made the point that he and his team had succeeded in mass producing the virus in a continuous culture with little amount of cellular material. He said that the genes of the virus have been cloned and all the proteins purified. The proteins are encoded by the genes of the virus."*

*One is tempted at this point by how trivial the debunking really is once all the "players" in the experiments are clearly identified. Of course, the clonings and protein purifications came later derived from the H9 culture. I believe that a "convenient accident" resulted in a chimeric HTLV with 3 prime half from LAV (especially important its U3 region added), used to justify the "cytopathic variant" classification of HTLV III/LAV.*

*To all would-be experimenters entering this field, the following random quotes from the "Wildes" Internet Book linked below may be helpful. The point is they can define points of a minimal expertise that meets the legal standard:*

*Nucleic acid species (of RNA Tumor Viruses) that sediment as RNA (1.68 g/ml) in a Cs<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> equilibrium density gradient. (Watson, Molling and Bauer)*

*Identity of this DNA polymerase (putative RT) with the R-DNA polymerase from HeLa cells is unlikely, in that their primer-template, ion and temperature requirements are quite different.*

*This level of activity with (C)<sup>n</sup>, dG 12-1 8 has previously been observed only with true viral reverse transcriptase.*

*We have screened a variety of viruses, cells, and tissues for an enzyme activity able to synthesize poly(dG) in response to poly(C) oligo(dG)<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>. Such activity is demonstrable in virions of **all RNA** tumor viruses we have tested . It is also present in all cells known to be infected by, and producing oncogenic RNA viruses. Ref 2, pg 249*

END QUOTES

1. Poiesz ... Gallo et al; Detection and isolation of Type C retrovirus particles from fresh and cultured lymphocytes of a patient with cutaneous T-cell lymphoma. PNAS, V77 (December 1980), pg 7417.

2. McCaffrey, Smoling and Baltimore; DNA POLYMERASES IN LYMPHOID CELLS  
<http://www.wilsede-science-connections.com/books/moderntrends/trends1/005%20%20Nucleic%20Acid%20Metabolism%20in%20Leukemic%20Cells/247%20-%20DNA%20Polymerases%20in%20Lymphoid%20Cells.pdf>, pg 247

\* Here we enter the realm of biotechnology and how its recognized artifacts are produced and consumed.

\*\* Because the polymer contains no information.

\*\*\* Means according to convention RNA template "directed".

\*\*\*\* the other synthetic template!

## **Was a virion counting procedure fraudulently stated and referenced?**

(Posted 11/14/08 at NAR)

11/14/08 Thanks to the now available Toplin paper (Spectra 1973: 225-235; linked at Perth Group's site - Nobel Critique), we can better understand the "working standards" of retroviral isolation that guided experiments 1970 to 1986. More details of the great AIDS-virus swindle in May of 1984 can be gleaned from by comparing two primary-source publications: Toplin and Papovic/Gallo.

From Papovic/Gallo (ibid, pg 499) : "As shown in Fig. 2b, the highest RT activity was shown at a density of 1.16g/ml, which is similar to other retroviruses. The highest RT activity was found in the fractions with the largest amount of virus, AS DETERMINED BY ELECTRON MICROSCOPY\*. The actual number of viral particles determined by this method was estimated to be about  $10^{11}$  per liter of culture fluid."

The reference of Papovic/Gallo and Toplin for viral particle count is the SAME (1). Alas, Toplin gives more precision in description: "We adjust the viral level to  $2 \times 10^{11}$  particles per ml using rapid quantitative negative stain electron microscopy to MEASURE\* the concentration". The Toplin paper includes type of EM (Fig 6, pg 231) that can be used to determine particle count based on "double sucrose zonal centrifugation".

Thus, the EM Papovic/Gallo refer to is clearly not Fig 1 (pg 498) which includes "cells". Thanks to the Gonda letter, this fraudulent misrepresentation of virus "continuing production" is confirmed. Nothing else in the paper justifies that particle number.

### **AN ATTEMPT TO ELIMINATE CONFUSION FOR TWO TRUTHSEEKERS INTERPRETING ORIGINAL ISOLATION EXPERIMENTS**

Additionally, it helps and is constructive, I think; to answer Mr. Houston's reasonable question of 7/24/07 with primary sources - more on-the-record stuff finally brought to bear. He said, "But surely in the laboratory mass production was achieved. Or are "viral stocks containing  $10^9$  to  $10^{10}$  [1 billion to 10 billion] physical particles per milliliter" too little to qualify?" He means, surely Mr. Naylor this is mass production.

The point here is, just like with the retroviral "kits" sold to experimenters, Moore, Layne et al were using "viral stocks", by 1990 a standard Biotech product thanks to the earlier efforts of Gallo and the American crew. This has nothing to do with the original experiments which included "detection" of putative virions and they did not start with clones as Layne et al did. Of course technologists can mass produce viral titers with cell "packaging lines" (2) such as H9 and inoculating of clones in the culture. In his eagerness to demolish me, Mr Houston ignores the very common sense he's wisecracking about: the H9:HTLV III/LAV clone was produced at the end of a chain of experiments and therefore could not be used to inoculate cultures at the beginning of a series.

1. Monroe and Brandt; 1970. Rapid semiquantitative method for screening large numbers of virus samples by negative staining electron microscopy. Appl. Microbiol. 20: 259 -262

2. System Bio: <http://www.systembio.com/express/?gclid=Cl3p54yuypYCFQNaFQod5W2tzq>  
Clontech: [http://www.clontech.com/products/detail.asp?product\\_id=10526&tabno=2](http://www.clontech.com/products/detail.asp?product_id=10526&tabno=2)  
\*emphasis added, Gallo's ref 36, Toplin's ref 2 (E-mail correspondence 11/20/08)

[See also Eugene Semon's New Letter to Science, Annexure 2]

Dr. Maniotis answered the same day:

*Dear Eugene,*

*Brilliant! All of this should be submitted, as you have written it, in addition to the Gonda letter, and the Gallo's marked up pre-submission, for context. (E-mail correspondence 11/20/08)*

Eugene Semon also wrote to David Crowe personally, questioning the wisdom of a strategy that had already backfired:

*David,*

*I just read Val's response to you requesting his signature ["Val's response", see below]. I must wonder what's in the damn letter - if you're simply repeating the Parenzee mistake of going after Gallo still based on that OSI BS that he so roundly refuted in his testimony. Why do you think I "put Gallo up" at Liversidge's so-called science-guardian site?*

*I hope you realize my suggested basis for that letter came with no strings attached. The inference I draw from Val's response is my recommendations for content and basis-of-withdrawal were ignored. Too bad for the "movement". (E-mail correspondence 11/30/2008)*

Eugene Semon was referring to another potential signatory, Dr. Val Turner, who apparently was overlooked for the "review" round, but was still asked to sign the Letter authored for him by lay people. Here is his answer:

*Dear Mr. Crowe,*

*Thank you for your invitation, albeit at the last moment, to sign your letter to Science in which you and others request the withdrawal of the first Gallo/Popovic paper published on May 4th 1984.*

*I decline to sign because I do not think your letter will be of any help to what you call the dissident movement. As Andrew Maniotis previously advised, there are no reasons for Science to withdraw the Popovic/Gallo paper. In fact, in my view, this strategy will backfire. Not only will the letter be rejected, it will find its way to the HIV protagonists who will delight in yet another opportunity to ridicule the dissidents.*

*Unless you have published scientific papers you may not be aware that when writing such papers, especially those with co-authors, alterations are commonplace. In my opinion, Gallo's alteration "That a retrovirus of the HTLV family might be an etiologic agent of AIDS was suggested by the findings", is not "practically the opposite" of what Popovic wrote.*

*The fact that Gonda said he did not find any particles four days before Gallo's submission does not mean he did not find them in the remaining days before submission. Or after submission but before publication. Many authors introduce changes between submission and publication. Editors write to authors specifically asking about alterations and additions. Just ask Harvey Bialy. Do you realise that after the May 1984 Science papers were published Gonda and Gallo published papers, also in Science, where they went even a step further? They claimed they proved the HIV particles are Lentiviral particles.*

*You claim "This document provided the important evidence that established the basis for awarding Dr. Luc Montagnier and Dr. Françoise Barré-Sinoussi the 2008 Nobel Prize in Medicine for the discovery of the AIDS virus by proving it was their samples of LAV that Popovic used in his key experiment". How do you know this? Have you been communicating with the Nobel committee? In both the press release and the advance information the Nobel*

committee announced the prize was given for “the discovery of the human immunodeficiency virus”. Concluding their précis of the Montagnier and Barre-Sinoussi research the committee wrote: “The discovery [of HIV by Montagnier and Barre-Sinoussi] was accepted by the research community and resulted in an explosion of scientific breakthroughs as illustrated below”. Then they describe subsequent research, some of which was published by Gallo and his colleagues.

Let us assume against all odds that Science agrees to withdraw the Popovic paper. I cannot see any consequences for the debate. If Gallo was working with Montagnier’s LAV, so what? Gallo could not have been using Montagnier’s LAV if Montagnier had not already found it. And the Nobel committee said this is why they awarded him the prize.

I assume your letter is motivated by good intentions but good intentions are not sufficient. As the saying goes, the road to hell is paved with good intentions. On the other hand, from my point of view, this letter is yet another reason to ponder your motivation. Your interference in the Parenzee case was highly counter productive to say the least. Recently you proposed the same tactics for a forthcoming Canadian court case which, if implemented, in my opinion, will also result in failure. And now, instead of addressing the issue of whether Montagnier and Barre-Sinoussi discovered a retrovirus, you are running an obtuse and irrelevant campaign against Gallo. What is your aim and what do you represent?

Regards,

Val Turner

PS Your email was addressed to me and invited me to sign the letter to Science. No other member of the Perth group received such an email including its founder and leader, who contributes the lion’s share of the research and writing. She is also one of small number of people who instigated the Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of AIDS. Is the omission of other members of the Perth Group merely an oversight or are you deliberately excluding my colleagues and the Perth Group from the HIV/AIDS debate? If so, for what purpose? I also note that no one from the Perth Group is included in your list of witnesses for the Canadian court case. Again, what is your purpose? (E-mail correspondence 11/29/08)

When he was belatedly presented with Dr. Turner’s objections, co-signatory Dr. Harvey Bialy had this to say:

Val is correct and I did not read the letter with proper attention before signing ...*mea culpa*. Since you are following this...IF or When you think I need to distance my name...please do it for me...thanks. (E-mail correspondence 12/29/08)

Dr. Bialy wishes it to be known that his “real words” on the topic of the initial Gallo papers can be found in his *Fast Food Etiology* piece:

[http://www.reviewingaids.com/awiki/index.php/Document:Fast Food Etiology](http://www.reviewingaids.com/awiki/index.php/Document:Fast_Food_Etiology)

Another co-signatory, Dr. Darin Brown, commented more fully:

I had not read the press release nor Janine’s posts at [change.org](http://change.org) until a few minutes ago. There’s a lot I haven’t read recently. Here is the email I received, with an attachment of the letter in its final form:

“Attached you will find a letter to ‘Science’ calling for the withdrawal of the four seminal papers on HIV/AIDS by Gallo et al published on May 4, 1984. The letter should be self-explanatory.

If you wish to add your signature to the request in this letter, please respond to this email indicating your consent AND send me your written



signature.

*You can scan (or photograph) and email your signature or, alternatively, you can fax it to me at +1-403-206-7717. Please also print your name on the piece of paper to ensure no mixup. We will include your signature in the letter to Science.*

*Please do this BEFORE December 1st so we can submit this letter on 'World AIDS Day'. The sooner the better!*

Regards,

David Crowe”

*Nowhere is there mention of Janine in either the email or the attached letter. I was never made aware that I had been personally “sent evidence” by anyone, let alone by Janine. I was simply sent the letter to read, along with the specific links to Crewdson’s website. While I was vaguely aware of Janine’s new book, I had no idea the letter was “prompted” by a conclusion made by Janine, nor that I might be somehow endorsing conclusions in Janine’s book by signing it.*

*While it is true that the letter contains links to documents collected by Crewdson, they are not presented as “new findings” in the letter.*

*I gave it a cursory reading and signed based on (1) a take of the claims in the letter at face value and (2) (frankly) the (then-)existing signatures of several people whose scientific and biological judgment exceed mine and whom I (thought I) trusted on these matters.*

*I wish I had been made aware of the misgivings from Andy and Val, especially if Val is correct that Andy “previously advised there are no reasons... to withdraw... the paper.” (Then why did he sign???) I only became aware of the aforementioned misgivings a week or so later.*

*Clearly, the only thing that’s not VERY old news is the Gonda letter, which I trusted was some kind of smoking gun. Then I found Janine’s actual writings and read incredulously as she admitted she had no certain proof the EM’s mentioned in Gonda’s letter were the same EM’s that appear in the Science papers. I asked David point-blank about this, and he confirmed this was the case -- “So, it’s a theoretical possibility, but I think it’s extremely unlikely... So the proof is not 100%, I felt it was worth taking a bit of a risk.”*

*It bothers me that this email from Val, or misgivings by Andy, weren’t made available to me, even if it was just a couple days before being sent. I feel blindsided, given no hint that there was internal disagreement going on between players at that level.*

*No doubt “mea culpa” in this case for my not reading closely, but I didn’t know I was signing on to this [Roberts’ and Crowe’s] interpretation of the [Popovic - Gallo] alterations. And I feel a bit left out from interactions and discussions among what (should be) friendly quarters. In any case, it certainly wasn’t “self-explanatory” as described.*

(E-mail correspondence 12/30/08)

Obviously Dr. Brown had not been sent any evidence for review, or even been presented with the review that had been carried out by Dr. Maniotis. But he did learn

that David Crowe “felt it was worth taking a bit of a risk” on behalf of himself as well as others.

A third co-signatory, Prof. Henry Bauer, has likewise stated for the record that, although he was not inclined to make an issue of it at the time, “I share his (*Dr. Bialy’s*) second thoughts re the SCIENCE letter, the “nicer” side of my nature got the better of my rational side, never a good idea”.

Despite these serious objections to the Letter to Science from Dr Maniotis, Dr. Turner and Eugene Semon, objections which were seconded by 3 out of 3 co-signatories whom I have contacted so far, David Crowe remained as carefree as ever. This is his reply to Dr. Turner’s detailed reasons for refusing to sign (see e-mail above):

Turner:

*I decline to sign because I do not think your letter will be of any help to what you call the dissident movement. As Andrew Maniotis previously advised, there are no reasons for Science to withdraw the Popovic/Gallo paper. In fact, in my view, this strategy will backfire. Not only will the letter be rejected, it will find its way to the HIV protagonists who will delight in yet another opportunity to ridicule the dissidents.*

Crowe answers:

*I disagree. When you see the list of almost 40 highly credentialed scientists, doctors and lawyers, I think you will be very impressed.*

*And I think “Science” will be a little bit concerned that their Titanic is perhaps in icy waters.*

*I agree that Science will not withdraw the papers. There is fully a zero chance of this happening. However, that’s not the end of this letter, which will be made public in many different ways.*

*Perhaps it’s not perfect, but I’m sure you agree that the papers should be withdrawn. This letter is, among other things, a signal. A signal that a major movement of experts is building, and that more people are willing to put their names forward in public against one of the pillars of AIDS science. That alone is worth doing.*

Later in Crowe’s reply:

*My opinion is that most actions that have the potential to raise public attention are good things even if they are not perfect.*

To sum up, David Crowe answers substantive objections put forth by experienced scientists via the following steps.

1. “A lot of people have signed, isn’t that impressive?”
2. “*Science* will feel itself to be in icy waters” – a classic example of RA’s wishful overestimation of its own impact, **even when they miss the target.**
3. Crowe euphemistically concedes that the Letter might not be “perfect”, “but at least we can all agree that HIV does not cause AIDS (and therefore that the Gallo papers should be retracted)”.

4. “We are sending a signal, so who gives a shit what kind of crap people are endorsing as long as we can coax them into signing.”

Further:

Turner: *In my opinion, Gallo’s alteration “That a retrovirus of the HTLV family might be an etiologic agent of AIDS was suggested by the findings”, is not “practically the opposite” of what Popovic wrote.*

Crowe: *Perhaps not “practically the opposite” but certainly very much different*

Turner: *that Gonda said he did not find any particles four days before Gallo’s submission does not mean he did not find them in the remaining days before submission.*

Crowe: *This seems like a very slim chance. If “Science” can provide this evidence I guess I will be embarrassed. I’m willing to take the risk. Certainly Gallo did not have the time to generate new samples through culturing. Even sending new samples from the existing cultures to Gonda and getting a positive result would seem to be a long shot. (E-mail correspondence 11/30/08)*

David Crowe once more expresses his willingness to take a risk on behalf of others, whose professional judgments apparently are not to be taken seriously. He also seems to think that precision of language is irrelevant, even regarding key aspects. One can only conclude that, in the matter of the Letter to Science, an exceedingly nonchalant, bordering on patronizing attitude towards the “eminent scientists” and their misgivings was displayed: As long as the scientists could be made to sign, one way or another, the half-baked PR flash of the day, their role was fulfilled. Sadly, many of these well-intentioned and trusting senior professors, scientists and top experts seemed only too eager to comply before fully familiarising themselves with the situation and the possible consequences the Letter might have for their credibility.

David Crowe’s interspersed answers to Dr. Turner can be read in full below:

*Dear Val;*

*I really hope that one day we will be able to work together without ill feelings. I would just emphasize that I hold you in the highest regard, and that I believe your mistrust of me is misplaced.*

*My main concern is the fact that you are putting so much effort into questioning my motivations, effort that surely would be better spent plotting the downfall of the evil empire. I have less of an issue with you questioning my tactics, I just wish it was done in a less confrontational way.*

*I will address all your questions and challenges below...*

Dear Mr. Crowe,

*I think we know each other enough well enough now that you can call me simply “David”.*

Thank you for your invitation, albeit at the last moment, to sign your letter to Science in which you and others request the withdrawal of the first Gallo/Popovic paper published on May 4th 1984.

*I apologize for not including you on the first round of invitations. This was an oversight on my part. I have a database of over 900 email addresses based on*

<http://rethinkingaids.com/quotes/rethinkers.htm> and in my initial scan I missed some obvious candidates, including yourself.

I decline to sign because I do not think your letter will be of any help to what you call the dissident movement. As Andrew Maniotis previously advised, there are no reasons for Science to withdraw the Popovic/Gallo paper. In fact, in my view, this strategy will backfire. Not only will the letter be rejected, it will find its way to the HIV protagonists who will delight in yet another opportunity to ridicule the dissidents.

*I disagree. When you see the list of almost 40 highly credentialed scientists, doctors and lawyers, I think you will be very impressed.*

*And I think "Science" will be a little bit concerned that their Titanic is perhaps in icy waters. I agree that Science will not withdraw the papers. There is fully a zero chance of this happening. However, that's not the end of this letter, which will be made public in many different ways.*

*Perhaps it's not perfect, but I'm sure you agree that the papers should be withdrawn.*

*This letter is, among other things, a signal. A signal that a major movement of experts is building, and that more people are willing to put their names forward in public against one of the pillars of AIDS science. That alone is worth doing.*

Unless you have published scientific papers you may not be aware that when writing such papers, especially those with co-authors, alterations are commonplace.

*I have published some scientific papers and attempted to publish others, so I am aware of how many alterations are made in the course of development.*

In my opinion, Gallo's alteration "That a retrovirus of the HTLV family might be an etiologic agent of AIDS was suggested by the findings", is not "practically the opposite" of what Popovic wrote.

*Perhaps not "practically the opposite" but certainly very much different.*

The fact that Gonda said he did not find any particles four days before Gallo's submission does not mean he did not find them in the remaining days before submission.

*This seems like a very slim chance. If "Science" can provide this evidence I guess I will be embarrassed. I'm willing to take the risk. Certainly Gallo did not have the time to generate new samples through culturing. Even sending new samples from the existing cultures to Gonda and getting a positive result would seem to be a long shot.*

*And given what we know about the corruption of Gallo's science, I think it's a safe bet that they just decided to wing it.*

Or after submission but before publication. Many authors introduce changes between submission and publication. Editors write to authors specifically asking about alterations and additions. Just ask Harvey Bialy. Do you realise that after the May 1984 Science papers were published Gonda and Gallo published papers, also in Science, where they went even a step further? They claimed they proved the HIV particles are Lentiviral particles.

*Yes, I am aware of this. I'm also aware that when Dr. de Harven contacted Gonda he declined to communicate with him.*

You claim "This document provided the important evidence that established the basis for awarding Dr. Luc Montagnier and Dr. Françoise Barré-Sinoussi the 2008 Nobel Prize in Medicine for the discovery of the AIDS virus by proving it was their samples of LAV that Popovic used in his key experiment". How do you know this? Have you been communicating with the Nobel committee? In both the press release and the advance information the Nobel

committee announced the prize was given for “the discovery of the human immunodeficiency virus”. Concluding their précis of the Montagnier and Barre-Sinoussi research the committee wrote: “The discovery [of HIV by Montagnier and Barre-Sinoussi] was accepted by the research community and resulted in an explosion of scientific breakthroughs as illustrated below”. Then they describe subsequent research, some of which was published by Gallo and his colleagues.

Let us assume against all odds that Science agrees to withdraw the Popovic paper. I cannot see any consequences for the debate. If Gallo was working with Montagnier's LAV, so what? Gallo could not have been using Montagnier's LAV if Montagnier had not already found it. And the Nobel committee said this is why they awarded him the prize.

*Definitely we need a concerted effort to deconstruct and discredit Montagnier's papers as well (and I'm aware that you have already done some of this work). They have not received as much attention in the past as they have not previously been taken as seriously. I see this is an important, but separate effort.*

*This letter was not, by the way, stimulated by the Nobel prize. We were working on it before then. If the announcement had been known, perhaps we would have included Montagnier as well, but I think that this would have made the effort too complex. This can be done separately. I agree it should be done.*

I assume your letter is motivated by good intentions but good intentions are not sufficient. As the saying goes, the road to hell is paved with good intentions.

*My opinion is that most actions that have the potential to raise public attention are good things even if they are not perfect.*

On the other hand, from my point of view, this letter is yet another reason to ponder your motivation. Your interference in the Parenzee case was highly counter productive to say the least. Recently you proposed the same tactics for a forthcoming Canadian court case which, if implemented, in my opinion, will also result in failure.

*I'm only now developing a detailed report for the lawyer in this case, so I'm not sure how you can say this. Definitely the report will cover a lot more than just whether HIV exists, perhaps this is your concern. Clearly we disagree on many strategic issues related to court cases. If you'd like to see the report and critique it, let me know.*

*I would love for someone to develop sure-fire legal tactics which is why I spend a lot of time communicating with lawyers. But so far everyone agrees this is an uphill battle. But still worth the struggle!*

And now, instead of addressing the issue of whether Montagnier and Barre-Sinoussi discovered a retrovirus, you are running an obtuse and irrelevant campaign against Gallo. What is your aim and what do you represent?

*My aim is to overturn the HIV=AIDS=Death dogma. I believe that's the same as yours. I've been doing this for well over 10 years. Nowhere near as long as you, but I think long enough that it does not make much sense to question my motivations.*

*My tactics, yes. Given that none of us have yet been successful in overturning the paradigm one could either assume that none of us have the right tactics, or that it's impossible, or that it's very difficult and we have not achieved our goals yet.*

*I guess there's no way to prove that I'm not a CIA or AIDS Truth plant. Nor can I prove that I'm not an alien from outer space. It just seems simpler to look at what I've written and done over the past 10 or so years and conclude that I'm just very committed to trying to organize the rethinking movement into a cohesive force. Some of the things I've done I'm very proud of. Some I just hope everyone's forgotten because they fell flat or in retrospect just seemed*

*dumb. But sometimes you have to do something before you know whether it's going to be effective.*

Regards,  
Val Turner

PS Your email was addressed to me and invited me to sign the letter to Science. No other member of the Perth group received such an email including its founder and leader, who contributes the lion's share of the research and writing. She is also one of small number of people who instigated the Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of AIDS. Is the omission of other members of the Perth Group merely an oversight or are you deliberately excluding my colleagues and the Perth Group from the HIV/AIDS debate?

*I have never had email addresses for any member of the Perth Group except yourself largely because no core member except yourself has ever communicated with me. If I receive email addresses then I will be able to include them in efforts such as this.*

If so, for what purpose? I also note that no one from the Perth Group is included in your list of witnesses for the Canadian court case. Again, what is your purpose?

*The list of witnesses that I have provided to the lawyer includes both you and Eleni.*

*I did not write to you about this for a number of reasons:*

- *I once raised the possibility of you travelling to America for a conference, and you indicated that you would be very unlikely to travel so far.*
- *It would be very much more expensive to get you to Victoria than most other US and Canadian dissidents.*
- *You have been very outspoken against my approach to the Parenzee case and therefore I assumed that you would probably not want to be involved in any court case in which I was involved.*

*If you are genuinely interested in testifying I will definitely send my draft report to you, indicate your interest to the lawyer and, if the lawyer should choose you as a potential expert, work to obtain funding to bring this to reality.*

*I am sincere in this offer.*

*I am glad to see that you are closely following my efforts in the Charles Mzite case. I just had word today that the lawyer in the Johnson Aziga first degree murder case may also be willing to talk. I would be very appreciative of advice or information from you on either case or any more in the future. This is due to the efforts of a newly identified dissident who is currently a doctor, soon to be studying law.*

*In addition, if any member of the Perth Group wishes to add their name to the letter to Science, I will unreservedly accept the offer. Please send your facsimile signature via email or fax to +1-403-206-7717 and include your credentials as you would like them printed also.*

Regards,  
David Crowe (E-mail correspondence 12/11/08)

The ridiculous overestimation of the potentially damaging impact of the newly “fully analyzed discoveries” is even more egregious because Robert Gallo himself was clearly unimpressed. Janine Roberts has published a mail from Robert Gallo on her website, on which she comments:

*I was not only amazed to receive this - I was astonished by what Gallo had chosen to object to. He did not object to what I wrote about the last minute changes he made to the Popovic paper, nor did he object to my citations from the devastating conclusions of the*

ORI or from the Inspector General's investigations into his work, but only to my mention of what the Secret Service had discovered in his papers. (fearoftheinvisible.com/g)

### **Letter Robert Gallo – Janine Roberts**

Dear Ms. Roberts,

*Since you obviously have a built-in bias about the causative role of HIV in AIDS and about me, I am not surprised that you didn't interview me nor find out what in the end happened to S. Hadley's report. Even Congressman Dingell 'disavowed it', and he was going after numerous scientists during that period, and clearly not trying to find anyone free of wrong doing. Even though I'm sure you won't read it I suggest you should take a look at the history myself and Montagnier did (The discovery of HIV as the cause of AIDS. New England Journal of Medicine. 349:2283-2285, 2003.).*

*I'm sure it also doesn't bother you that Montagnier and I have written the history of these events twice, the last being in the New England Journal of Medicine in 2003. We have zero differences of views in the history, not even one comma. I think we are the ones who know the facts and not you and Ms. Hadley who had fed a reporter and some others the nonsense you willingly and I think eagerly swallow. You may not understand that Ms. Hadley is not a scientist, was bent on finding wrong doing, (note there were hundreds of millions of dollars involved in the patent we won for the U.S., and much of that money went to U.S. lawyers representing the French group). I have my thoughts about Ms. Hadley's relationships with these people. Most of us also find Ms. Hadley to be a quite unusual person. Let me leave it at that and the fact that she was ultimately disqualified as a 'qualified' witness.*

*Of all your libelous, vicious untruths the most bizarre is that the Secret Service found evidence of 'forgery' in our books. This is a Hadley fantasy. The Secret Service openly denied any significance of Hadley's putative 'findings'. Moreover, if we were of that kind of people who would do forgery, do you believe we would be stupid enough to then hand over our books? Be aware that in those days no one was even required to keep such records, and if one did, holding on to the books was usually not longer than three years. Hadley was doing her unprofessional work some 6-7 years after those events.*

*I'm sure you do not care but people suffered a great deal in that period. Scientists like Nobelist David Baltimore and his associates and collaborators; the great cancer physician - Bernie Fisher; Popovic, myself, and many many more scientists during Hadley's witch hunts and, of course, our families. Needless to say medical research from many groups was stopped for 4-6 years. This is the true scandal - not the issues you consciously or unconsciously have so distorted. Your writing is as vicious and slanderous as anything I have witnessed. One hopes in vain that if you do not understand the issues or history, you would at least have some human decency and correct what you wrote. (Robert Gallo 27 April 2006)*

The simple explanation to why Gallo does not mention the Popovic Draft in his mail to Janine Roberts is that as a scientist and old fox he knew it was a non-issue all along. The Popovic remark about the missing cause of HIV was not a conclusion. It was clearly directed at previous papers as a dramatic introduction to the success story of the paper he was in the process of co-authoring. The remark was redundant, potentially confusing (obviously) and correctly edited out by Gallo. This was subsequently confirmed to those who were given the chance to read Dr. Maniotis' and Dr. Turner's appraisals.

The Letter's scientific afterthought; that HIV is only expressed when grown in culture, which makes it possible that it could be a lab artifact, has apparently been included because Janine Roberts had "discovered" a letter from Gallo in which he explains that "cell culture seems to be necessary to induce virus". This statement could possibly appear suspect to someone who does not know that this is frequently the case also with viruses unrelated to "HIV", but it is hardly going to enhance the scientific credibility of the Letter's writers and Signatories to spend ink on it when in fact that which was "induced" and "mass produced" was RT activity.  
<http://fearoftheinvisible.com/fraud-in-key-hiv-research-background>

In conclusion: The Roberts-Crowe Letter to Science has indeed caused damage, but not to Gallo or *Science*. It has served to redirect focus from the real scientific issues to peripheral and largely irrelevant questions of editorial practices in Gallo's lab, as well as made the Signatories the laughing stock of the scientific establishment.



## ANNEXURE 1: LETTER TO SCIENCE

### Science/AAAS

1200 New York Avenue NW Washington, DC, 20005  
+1-202-326-6400

December 1, 2008

To: **Bruce Alberts, Editor in Chief, Science:**  
cc: **Alan Lechner, CEO, AAAS**

On May 4, 1984 your journal published four papers by a group led by Dr. Robert Gallo. We are writing to express our serious concerns with regard to the integrity and veracity of the lead paper among these four of which Dr. Mikulas Popovic is the lead author.[1] The other three are also of concern because they rely upon the conclusions of the lead paper.[2][3][4]

In the early 1990s, several highly critical reports on the research underlying these papers were produced as a result of governmental inquiries working under the supervision of scientists nominated by the National Academy of Sciences and the Institute of Medicine. The Office of Research Integrity of the US Department of Health and Human Services concluded that the lead paper was "fraught with false and erroneous statements," and that the "ORI believes that the careless and unacceptable keeping of research records...reflects irresponsible laboratory management that has permanently impaired the ability to retrace the important steps taken." [5] Further, a Congressional Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations led by US Representative John D. Dingell of Michigan produced a staff report on the papers which contains scathing criticisms of their integrity.[6]

Despite the publically available record of challenges to their veracity, these papers have remained uncorrected and continue to be part of the scientific record.

What prompts our communication today is the recent revelation of an astonishing number of previously unreported deletions and unjustified alterations made by Gallo to the lead paper. There are several documents originating from Gallo's laboratory that, while available for some time, have only recently been fully analyzed. These include a draft of the lead paper typewritten by Popovic which contains handwritten changes made to it by Gallo.[7] This draft was the key evidence used in the above described inquiries to establish that Gallo had concealed his laboratory's use of a cell culture sample (known as LAV) which it received from the Institut Pasteur.

These earlier inquiries verified that the typed manuscript draft was produced by Popovic who had carried out the recorded experiment while his laboratory chief, Gallo, was in Europe and that, upon his return, Gallo changed the document by hand a few days before it was submitted to Science on March 30, 1984. According to the ORI investigation, "Dr. Gallo systematically rewrote the manuscript for what would become a renowned LTCB [Gallo's laboratory at the National Cancer Institute] paper." [5]

This document provided the important evidence that established the basis for awarding Dr. Luc Montagnier and Dr. Françoise Barré-Sinoussi the 2008 Nobel Prize in Medicine for the discovery of the AIDS virus by proving it was their samples of LAV that Popovic used in his key experiment. The draft reveals that Popovic had forthrightly admitted using the French samples of LAV renamed as Gallo's virus, HTLV-III, and that Gallo had deleted this admission, concealing their use of LAV. However, it has not been previously reported that on page three of this same document Gallo had also deleted Popovic's unambiguous statement that, "Despite intensive research efforts, the causative agent of AIDS has not yet been identified," replacing it in the published paper with a statement that said practically the opposite, namely, "That a retrovirus of the HTLV family might be an etiologic agent of

AIDS was suggested by the findings.”

It is clear that the rest of Popovic's typed paper is entirely consistent with his statement that the cause of AIDS had not been found, despite his use of the French LAV. Popovic's final conclusion was that the culture he produced “provides the possibility” for detailed studies. He claimed to have achieved nothing more. At no point in his paper did Popovic attempt to prove that any virus caused AIDS, and it is evident that Gallo concealed these key elements in Popovic's experimental findings.

It is astonishing now to discover these unreported changes to such a seminal document. We can only assume that Gallo's alterations of Popovic's conclusions were not highlighted by earlier inquiries because the focus at the time was on establishing that the sample used by Gallo's lab came from Montagnier and was not independently collected by Gallo. In fact, the only attention paid to the deletions made by Gallo pertains to his effort to hide the identity of the sample. The questions of whether Gallo and Popovic's research proved that LAV or any other virus was the cause of AIDS were clearly not considered.

Related to these questions are other long overlooked documents that merit your attention. One of these is a letter from Dr. Matthew A. Gonda, then Head of the Electron Microscopy Laboratory at the National Cancer Institute, which is addressed to Popovic, copied to Gallo and dated just four days prior to Gallo's submission to Science.[8] In this letter, Gonda remarks on samples he had been sent for imaging because “Dr Gallo wanted these micrographs for publication because they contain HTLV.” He states, “I do not believe any of the particles photographed are of HTLV-I, II or III.” According to Gonda, one sample contained cellular debris, while another had no particles near the size of a retrovirus. Despite Gonda's clearly worded statement, Science published on May 4, 1984 papers attributed to Gallo et al with micrographs attributed to Gonda and described unequivocally as HTLV-III.

In another letter by Gallo, dated one day before he submitted his papers to Science, Gallo states, “It's extremely rare to find fresh cells [from AIDS patients] expressing the virus... cell culture seems to be necessary to induce virus,” a statement which raises the possibility he was working with a laboratory artifact. [9]

Included here are copies of these documents and links to the same. The very serious flaws they reveal in the preparation of the lead paper published in your journal in 1984 prompts our request that this paper be withdrawn. It appears that key experimental findings have been concealed. We further request that the three associated papers published on the same date also be withdrawn as they depend on the accuracy of this paper.

For the scientific record to be reliable, it is vital that papers shown to be flawed, or falsified be retracted. Because a very public record now exists showing that the Gallo papers drew unjustified conclusions, their withdrawal from Science is all the more important to maintain integrity. Future researchers must also understand they cannot rely on the 1984 Gallo papers for statements about HIV and AIDS, and all authors of papers that previously relied on this set of four papers should have the opportunity to consider whether their own conclusions are weakened by these revelations.

**Respectfully,**

- **Mohammed A. Al-Bayati**, PhD, DABT, DABVT. Toxicologist & Pathologist, Toxi-Health International, Dixon, CA.
- **David A. Ballok**, PhD, Department of Surgery, Division of Neurosurgery and Neurosciences, McMaster University, Canada.
- **Henry H. Bauer**, PhD, Dean Emeritus of Arts & Sciences, Professor Emeritus of Chemistry & Science Studies, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University.
- **André-Pierre Benguerel**, PhD, Professor Emeritus, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

- **Terry Bennett**, MD, MPH.
- **Harvey Bialy**, PhD, founding scientific editor of Nature Biotechnology, author of Oncogenes, Aneuploidy and AIDS: A Scientific Life & Times of Peter H. Duesberg.
- **Christopher Black**, Barrister, International Criminal Lawyer, Lead Counsel, Rwanda War Crimes Tribunal.
- **Kelly Brennan-Jones**, PhD, Associate Professor of Psychology, SUNY Brockport, New York, USA.
- **Darin Brown**, PhD, Mathematics.
- **Gordon Burns**, PhD, Professor of Cancer Research, The University of Newcastle, Australia.
- **Jennifer L. Craig**, BSN, MA, PhD.
- **Etienne de Harven**, MD, Professor Emeritus, University of Toronto. Signature available on request.
- **Andrea G. Drusini**, MD, PhD, Medical Anthropologist, Professor of Anthropology, Department of Medico-Diagnostic Sciences and Special Therapies, University of Padova, Italy.
- **Charles Geshekter**, PhD, Professor Emeritus of History, Chair, History of Science Section, AAAS/Pacific Division (1990-95). California State University, Chico. Signature available on request.
- **Roberto Giraldo**, MD, Specialist in internal medicine, infectious and tropical diseases. Member of the Department of Integral Psychosomatic Medicine, International Society of Analytical Trilogy, São Paulo, Brazil. Signature available on request.
- **Pablo L. E. Idahosa**, PhD, Professor, Social Science Program Director, African Studies Graduate Program, International Development Studies Founders College, York University, Canada. Signature available on request.
- **Matt Irwin**, MD, MSW, Private practice, Alexandria, Virginia.
- **Joel M. Kauffman**, Professor of Chemistry Emeritus, University of the Sciences in Philadelphia, Medical Writer.
- **Claus Koehnlein**, MD, Specialist in internal medicine, Dept. of Oncology, Univ. of Kiel, Germany (1983 -1993). Since 1993, in private practice increasingly treating HIV-positive people who decline antiviral drugs. Member of South Africa Presidential AIDS Advisory Panel.
- **Hans J. Kugler**, PhD, President, International Academy of Anti-Aging Medicine.
- **Helen Lauer**, PhD, Associate Professor, Philosophy Department Head, University of Ghana.
- **Herbert G. Leberherz**, PhD, Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry (Emeritus). San Diego State University, USA.
- **Stoffer Loman**, BSc, MSc, PhD.
- **Ahmed Makata**, Dip (clin medicine–TZ), MD (USSR), certificate (Tropical pathology–Japan), PhD (Path–Japan), DFM (Path–RCPA– Australia), Forensic Consultant, Histopathologist, Head of Forensic Unit, Ministry of Health, Tanzania. Signature available on request.
- **Andrew Maniotis**, PhD, University of Illinois at Chicago. Signature available on request.
- **Jonas Moses**, PhD, PA, Former US Army clinician (in Ophthalmology), cancer biologist in the Dept. of Pathology, Univ. of Illinois – Chicago (2002-2007), and consulting cell and tissue engineer.
- **Paul Olisa Adaka Ojeih**, PhD, MD, Medical Director, Iris Medical Foundation, Lagos, Nigeria.
- **Nikitah Okembe-RA Imani**, Associate Professor of Sociology and African Studies, James Madison University. Signature available on request.
- **Philippe Packard**, PhD, MPH. Signature available on request.
- **David Rasnick**, PhD, Biochemist, Protease Inhibitor Developer, Chief Scientific Officer, Chromosome Diagnostics, LLC.
- **Prof. Dr. med. Jochen Schaefer**, Director, International Institute for Theoretical Cardiology, Kiel, Germany.
- **Hugo Stenström**, MD, Senior interventional radiologist, Department of Radiology, Linköping University Hospital, Sweden.

- **Gordon T. Stewart**, MD. Emeritus Professor of Public Health, University of Glasgow, and consultant physician (epidemiology and preventive medicine), NHS, UK. Former consultant to New York City, WHO and to other health authorities in Europe, North America, Africa and Asia on AIDS and related matters. Emeritus Fellow, Infectious Diseases Society of America and former member of the editorial board of the Journal of Infectious Diseases. Signature available on request.
- **Roberto P. Stock**, PhD. Research Scientist Instituto de Biotecnología – UNAM, Mexico.
- **Jean Umber**, Professeur agrégé (Organic Chemistry), Académie de Nancy-Metz, Lorraine, France.
- **Rudolf Werner**, Professor, Dept. of Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Univ. of Miami School of Medicine.
- **Chun Xu**, MD, PhD, VP Global Clinical Services, Venturepharm Lab. Beijing, China.

#### Signatures Added After December 1<sup>st</sup> 2008:

- **Gary Null**, PhD, syndicated host of “Natural Living with Gary Null,” author ( “AIDS, A Second Opinion” ), and a producer of PBS special programs. His “Deconstructing the Myth of AIDS” won the Audience Award for Best Documentary at both the New York and Los Angeles International Independent Film and Video Festivals.
- **Robert Scott Bell**, D.A. Hom. (Diplomate American Academy of Clinical Homeopathy); Board Member, American Association of Homeopathic Pharmacists 1999–2001; Nationally Syndicated Health Talk Radio Show, Talk Radio Network.
- **Donald W. Miller. Jr.**, MD (Harvard, 1965), BMS (Dartmouth, 1963), Professor of Surgery, University of Washington School of Medicine. Author of “The Practice of Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery” (1977), co–author of “Atlas of Cardiac Surgery” (1983, Japanese version 1985), author of “Heart in Hand” (1999).
- **Georg Frhr. von Wintzingerode**, Director Technology Alliances, Aachen, Germany.
- **Frantz Andre**, JD, LLM, SJD. Medical Law & Ethics Professor, Taylor Business Institute, Loyola University, Chicago.

#### References:

- [1] Popovic M et al. Detection, Isolation, and Continuous Production of Cytopathic Retroviruses (HTLV-III) from Patients with AIDS and Pre-AIDS. *Science*. 1984 May 4; 224: 497-500.
- [2] Sarngadharan MG et al. Antibodies Reactive with Human TLymphotropic Retroviruses (HTLV-III in the Serum of Patients with AIDS). *Science*. 1984 May 4; 224: 506-8.
- [3] Gallo RC et al. Frequent Detection and Isolation of Cytopathic Retroviruses (HTLV-III) from Patients with AIDS and at Risk for AIDS. *Science*. 1984 May 4; 224: 500-3.
- [4] Schüpbach J et al. Serological Analysis of a Subgroup of Human TLymphotropic Retroviruses (HTLV-III) Associated with AIDS. *Science*. 1984 May 4; 224: 503-505.
- [5] “Offer of Proof”, Office of Research Integrity, US Department of Health and Human Services, 1993. [http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/ori\\_op\\_part1.pdf](http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/ori_op_part1.pdf), [http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/ori\\_op\\_part2.pdf](http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/ori_op_part2.pdf), [http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/ori\\_op\\_part3.pdf](http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/ori_op_part3.pdf), [http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/ori\\_op\\_part4.pdf](http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/ori_op_part4.pdf)

[6] Staff Report. Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. Dingell Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives. 1994. Archived at: <http://healtoronto.com/gallodocs.html>

[7] Draft of M. Popovic's May 4 1984 Science article.  
[http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/draft\\_of\\_m\\_popovic\\_05.04.84\\_science\\_article\\_undated.pdf](http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/draft_of_m_popovic_05.04.84_science_article_undated.pdf)

[8] Letter from Dr. M. Gonda to Dr. M. Popovic (cc R. Gallo). 1984 Mar 26.  
[http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/Letter\\_from\\_M\\_Gonda\\_to\\_M\\_Popovic\\_03.26.84.pdf](http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/Letter_from_M_Gonda_to_M_Popovic_03.26.84.pdf)

[9] Gallo RC. Letter to Jun Minowada, MD. Personal Correspondence. 1984 Mar 29.  
[http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/Letter\\_from\\_R\\_Gallo\\_to\\_J\\_Minowada\\_03.29.84.pdf](http://sciencefictions.net/pdfdocs/Letter_from_R_Gallo_to_J_Minowada_03.29.84.pdf)

## ANNEXURE 2: EUGENE SEMON'S LETTER TO SCIENCE

NEW LETTER TO SCIENCE

<http://www.submit2science.org/ws/begin.asp>

Science/AAAS  
1200 New York Avenue NW  
Washington, DC, 20005

To: Bruce Alberts, Editor-in-Chief, *Science*

Cc: Alan Leschner, CEO, AAAS

*"Frankly speaking, I never relied on electron microscopy. I don't think electron microscopy does much, except for the person who's a structural biologist and wants to look at real structure. No one uses electron microscopy [in] virology any more – nobody. It is as rare as hen's teeth." Robert C Gallo (6)*

The following "fresh look" at Gallo et al is derived from heightened scrutiny of *Science* V224, 497-508. Their claims leading to the classification of a human retrovirus originally known as HTLV III/LAV (1) as a "unique cytopathic variant" were not adequately peer-reviewed.

It was their and your rush to publish and run past crucial details that weakened its conclusion: Detection, Isolation and Continuous Production of Cytopathic Retroviruses (HTLV-III) from Patients with AIDS and Pre-AIDS. (2)

No "continuous production of cytopathic retroviruses" was demonstrated.

### **Is reverse transcriptase activity a valid surrogate for "continuous HTLV III production"?**

The caption to Figure 2 (2, 499) describes how the "peak fraction" was measured for maximum "reverse transcriptase (RT) activity" - incorporating nucleotides into a growing polymer chain - in the "1.16 g/ml sucrose density band". Apparently, Peer review overlooked the nature of the synthetic template (poly(A)-oligo dT [15]) described in these captions. It is "the adenylate-containing strand" or the "synthetic homopolymer" polyriboadenylate annealed with oligothymidylate (3).

What does the dash before "oligo" mean? That a chemical polymer not a biomolecule (a) has a "primer" (15 T's) hydrogen-bonded at its end to kick start and maintain a polymerase reaction that's roughly 3 orders of magnitude higher than an "endogenous" RT reaction (b) where true "information transduction" or "transcription" takes place. The template is referred to as a "homopolymer", meaning it's a "Johnny-one-note" not recognized as RNA by living organisms.

Numerous kinetic comparisons made by 70's RNA "tumor virus" researchers with "endogenous" RT experiments produce the fact of much greater RT "activity" with synthetic templates.

### **Was a virion counting procedure fraudulently stated and referenced?**

This is answered by commenting on two items from 2, page 499:

(1) "Both virus production and cell viability of the infected clone H4 (H4/HTLV III) were monitored for several months. Although virus production fluctuated (Fig 2a), culture fluids harvested and assayed at approximately 14 day intervals consistently showed **particulate RT activity** which has been followed for over 5 months... Thus, the data show that the permanently growing T-cell population can continuously produce HTLV-III."

The reference to “particulate RT activity” is not proven because no “endogenous” assays are documented. According to “working standards” of retrovirology, the evidence from synthetic template reactions was based on reverse transcription being unique to retroviruses. In retrospect, this was an assumption not recognized as an “article of faith” by the lights of current science.

(2) “As shown in Fig. 2b, the highest RT activity was shown at a density of 1.16g/ml, which is similar to other retroviruses. The highest RT activity was found in the fractions with the largest amount of virus, AS DETERMINED BY ELECTRON MICROSCOPY (c). The actual number of viral particles determined by this method was estimated to be about  $10^{11}$  per liter of culture fluid.”

Thanks to the now available I. Toplin paper (Tumor Virus Purification Using Zonal Rotors; Spectra 1973: 225-235), we can better understand the working standards of retroviral isolation that guided experiments 1970 to 1986.

The reference of Popovic/Gallo and Toplin for viral particle count is the SAME (4). Toplin gives more precision in description: “We adjust the viral level to  $2 \times 10^{11}$  particles per ml using rapid quantitative negative stain electron microscopy to MEASURE the concentration”. (c) The Toplin paper includes type of EM (Fig 6, pg 231) that can be used to determine particle count based on “double sucrose zonal centrifugation”.

Thus, the EM Popovic/Gallo refer to is clearly not Fig 1 (pg 498), Fig 2 (pg 501) or Fig 4 (pg 504) which include “cells”.

The March 26, 1984 Gonda to Popovic letter - “I do not believe any of these particles are HTLV I, II, or III” – implies missing “micrographs for publication” that “Dr Gallo wanted”. (8) **Is there a deceptively NOT presented or missing EM for the required back-up of the particle count?**

Thus, nothing in the four papers published in V224, 497-508 validates that particle number. We know from this letter that Gonda looked at EMs sent to him by Popovic.

Was Gonda’s examination to check the particle count?

**Finally, subsequent publications did not verify a singular isolation by unique-sequence method completed by three groups (Gallo - Levy - Montagnier) in 1985. (5)**

**Conclusion: there is an initial misrepresentation in V224 of “HIV” = unique cytopathic retrovirus “isolation and continuing production” for your consideration.**

Eugene Semon, BChE, PE (retired)  
160 Bergen Avenue, Apt 4  
Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660  
[genesemon@hotmail.com](mailto:genesemon@hotmail.com)

## NOTES

- a. Because the polymer contains no information.
- b. Means, according to convention, RNA template directed.
- c. emphasis added, Gallo’s ref 36, Toplin’s ref 2 and reference 4 below

## REFERENCES

1. Hahn et al; Science V232 (20 June 1986) 1548 – 1553: “Genetic heterogeneity has been firmly established as a prominent characteristic of the AIDS virus, HTLV-III/LAV.”
2. Popovic, Sarngadharan, Read, Gallo; Detection, Isolation and Continuous Production of Cytopathic Retroviruses (HTLV-III) from Patients with AIDS and Pre-AIDS. Science V224, (4 May 1984), 497-500

3. McCaffrey, Smoling and Baltimore; DNA POLYMERASES IN LYMPHOID CELLS, pg 247-255, in Rolf Neth, Robert C Gallo, Sol Spiegelman, Frederick Stohlman, eds: Modern Trends in Human Leukemia, J.F. Lehrnanns Verla München 1974. <http://www.wilsede-science-connections.com/books/moderntrends/trends1/>

4. Monroe and Brandt; 1970. Rapid semiquantitative method for screening large numbers of virus samples by negative staining electron microscopy. Appl. Microbiol. 20: 259 –262

5. Leitner et al; Yet Another Subtype of HIV-1? AIDS Research and Human Retroviruses, V11, Number 8, 1995, 995-997:

"The growth of unclassified sequences indicates that it is becoming increasingly difficult to categorize the HIV-1 sequences by the proposed criteria (env/gag "star phylogeny") ... (W)e may eventually be faced with a continuum of genetic variants."

"(I)t is possible that future studies will reveal important immunological and biological differences between genetic subtypes." (NB, see 7)

6. Gallo Testimony at Parenzee, 1306;  
<http://garlan.rethinkingaids.info/Cases/Parenzee/Gallo.html>

7. Henderson et al, Direct Identification of Class II Histocompatibility DR Proteins in Preparations of Human T-Cell Lymphotropic Virus Type III, JOURNAL OF VIROLOGY, 61, 2, Feb. 1987, p. 629-632; Kolegraff et al, Characterization and Role of Lentivirus-Associated Host Proteins, Experimental Biology and Medicine 231:252-263 (2006); Gurer et al, Specific Incorporation of Heat Shock Protein 70 Family Members into Primate Lentiviral Virions, J. Virol. (2002) 76, 4666-4670: "Hsp70 was roughly equimolar with *pol*-encoded proteins in virions".

8. Cited Documents, M. Gonda to M. Popovic (March 26, 1984)  
<http://www.sciencefictions.net/documents.html>