

Comments

Last fall (2004) the City Editor of the *Daily Californian* Adeel Iqbal offered me the opportunity of an op-ed piece of 750 words concerning "HIV/AIDS" and a Daily Cal article which would eventually appear. I was happy to accept, and thank *Adeel Iqbal*. *Following a first rejection* by the Opinion Editor, *I revised the text and submitted a second version. This version was also rejected, so I am including it below as an extra page of the four page advertisement*, which I originally took out to provide documentation for the op-ed piece.

For readers wanting more documentation, see the chapter on HIV/AIDS in my book *Challenges* (pp. 600-714), my *Yale Scientific* articles [Lan 94], [Lan 95], [Lan 99], the Duesberg-Kohnlein-Rasnack article [DueKR 03] and its extensive bibliography, and the multiple references I give throughout the ad.

My Rejected Op-Ed: CHALLENGING THE "HIV/AIDS" ORTHODOXY

by **Serge Lang**

Most people are unaware that there exists a growing (although still marginalized) dissent against the orthodox position on "HIV/AIDS" that you read about in most newspapers, most of the time. As a Miller Professor in Berkeley last summer and fall (for which I thank the Berkeley Math Department and the Miller Institute), I thought I would take this opportunity to inform the Berkeley academic community of some items concerning the dissent.

Many factors are involved. I have gathered documentation for 12 years, and the bottom line is this.

1. There isn't even a consistent definition of "AIDS" or "HIV/AIDS", nationally or world wide. On the basis of inconsistencies and other defects in such definitions (to the extent any definition is given at all), a challenge already exists against applying the same name to whatever is happening in Africa and the United States, whatever it is, called "HIV/AIDS".

2. The hypothesis that what is called Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) is a harmless passenger virus is compatible with all the documentation I have studied.

3. The hypothesis that HIV is pathogenic (i.e. disease causing) leads to "paradoxes".

4. The so-called statistics issued by official organizations such as UNAIDS, WHO (World Health Organization), CDC (Centers for Disease Control) are inconsistent. They are based on invalid estimates. They confuse actual deaths with deaths predicted by computer modeling, which is itself based on statistically biased improperly interpreted samples as well as on false assumptions.

Aside from the scientific issues of HIV pathogenesis and the validity of the official so-called statistics, there are:

- Issues of Credibility
- Issues of Journalism
- Issues of Education

that are not independent of each other. *How does one challenge a mindset conditioned in the population at large over 20 years?*

The establishment - medical, scientific, journalistic - has functioned in a way which transformed what might have remained a scientific question (is HIV pathogenic?) into a question concerning the credibility of the establishment itself. And "they" know it! On 28 April 1987, after Professor Peter Duesberg published his first paper challenging the HIV pathogenesis hypothesis (*Cancer Research*, 1 March 1987), a "MEDIA ALERT" from HHS (Health and Human Services) Chuck Kline (cc'ed to the HHS Secretary, Under Secretary, Chief of Staff, Assistant Secretary for Health, Surgeon General, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, The White House) stated in part:

"Dr. Duesberg has been an NCI grantee doing research in retroviruses and oncogenes for 17 years and is highly regarded. He is the recipient of an "outstanding researcher" award from this Department [NIH]. The article apparently went through the normal pre-publication process and should have been flagged at NIH. Failing that, it should have caused a splash on publication nearly two months ago...

This obviously has the potential to raise a lot of controversy (If it isn't the virus, how do we know the blood supply is safe? How do we know anything about transmission? How could you all be so stupid and why should we ever believe you again?) and we need to be prepared to respond. I have already asked NIH public affairs to start digging into this."

The full document is in the Duesberg archives of the UCB library.

Subsequently, Duesberg lost his funding. People from inside the establishment who speak publicly against the orthodoxy are ostracized, personally, scientifically, and financially. It's tough and repressive out there.

During my stay in Berkeley (summer and fall 2004), I distributed an inch-high packet of HIV/AIDS documentation to students and faculty. I got to meet various colleagues who trust the establishment, or are part of it. I raised some questions with some faculty members about the validity of some scientific papers and the way they have been interpreted. No answers.

Aside from the validity of the purported science, questions arise about the journalistic treatment of the so-called "HIV/AIDS" question, internationally, nationally, in Berkeley, and at UC. I gave the inch-high documentation to the *Daily Cal* early in the fall term. Peter Duesberg was subsequently interviewed by a *Daily Cal* reporter (I was not). The article appeared on the next to last day of publication for the fall term (9 December). Although the *Daily Cal* article properly described the ostracism to which Duesberg has been subjected, it did not properly describe his scientific claims, and made no mention of the documentation contained in the one-inch packet that I gave to the editors.

How does one make up for defective reporting over two decades?

Serge Lang
Math Dept Yale Box 20-8283
10 Hillhouse Ave
New Haven CT 06520-8283

Posted: March 1, 2005
Scienza e Democrazia/Science and Democracy
www.dipmat.unipg.it/~mamone/sci-dem