On 25 September 1995, *Chemical and Engineering News* published a “Science Insights” column by Rudy Baum, in which he claimed that an epidemiological study by Sarah C. Darby *et al* in *Nature* “should, but almost certainly won’t, lay to rest the irresponsible [sic] argument that HIV does not cause AIDS, an idea that has been championed by Peter H. Duesberg”. Duesberg submitted a response for publication. This file documents how *Chemical and Engineering News* handled Duesberg's response.
Jerome Berson
209 SCL
Yale University
New Haven CT 06520

Dear Berson,

Last fall, you brought to my attention an editorial piece in Chemical and Engineering News, "HIV link to AIDS strengthened by epidemiological study", by Rudy Baum (25 September 1995). In this piece, Baum brought up several points in a particularly defective way. Duesberg contacted Baum, who replied that C&EN "would be happy to entertain a concise letter to the editor". On 15 November, Duesberg sent a letter for publication. That letter was rather short, and in particular, it was much shorter than the editorial. I want to inform you that this letter has not been published.

I want you to know the standards followed by a professional publication in your field. I also want a number of others to know, including the Council of the NAS, the editor of Science, as well as the usual cc list. As for myself, I object to the defective way C&EN has attacked Duesberg, both in the editorial and also for not having printed his letter.

Unfortunately, with journals such as Science and C&EN engaging in improper journalism, individual scientists are reduced to have individual mailings if correct information is to be disseminated. I object.

With best regards,

Serge Lang

Enclosure: The C&EN "Science Insight", Baum's letter to Duesberg, and Duesberg's letter to the editor

HIV link to AIDS strengthened by epidemiological study

Earlier this month, Nature published a paper titled “Mortality Before and After HIV Infection in the Complete U.K. Population of Haemophiliacs” [377, 79 (1995)]. The paper should, but almost certainly won’t, lay to rest the irresponsible argument that HIV does not cause AIDS, an idea that has been championed by Peter H. Duesberg, a professor of molecular and cell biology at the University of California, Berkeley.

The paper reports an epidemiological study of the 6,278 men in the U.K. diagnosed with hemophilia between 1977 and 1991. In particular, the study focuses on 1,227 of those individuals who were infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV-1) between 1979 and 1986 through treatment with blood products contaminated with the virus.

Sarah C. Darby and her coworkers at the University of Oxford and the Oxford Haemophilia Centre found that, among 2,448 men with severe hemophilia, the annual death rate was stable at eight per 1,000 during 1977 to 1984. During 1985 to 1992, the rate remained at eight per 1,000 among those men not infected with HIV-1, but rose steeply in patients infected with the virus, reaching 81 per 1,000 in 1991–92.

The researchers found a similar pattern among 3,830 men with mild or moderate hemophilia. Most of the excess deaths in both groups were due to AIDS or conditions recognized as being associated with AIDS.

“The are the first data to document that, in a large and complete population, mortality among those who by chance were infected with HIV increased more than 10-fold while remaining unchanged over time in those who escaped infection,” the researchers report.

Nowhere in the Oxford epidemiologists’ report is there mention of Duesberg. But the paper is aimed squarely at Duesberg and his supporters. As surely as epidemiology can demonstrate causality, the work on hemophiliacs in the U.K. demonstrates that HIV-1 causes AIDS.

Duesberg has credentials: He is a professor at a prestigious university, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and he has published widely on retroviruses.

Duesberg argues that HIV-1 does not meet what are known as Koch’s postulates for causing disease. Essentially, these three postulates state that in patients who have a disease, the virus is present; that the virus is not present in people who don’t have the disease; and that, after the virus is isolated and grown in culture, it can induce the disease.

AIDS researchers long ago dismissed Duesberg’s arguments. HIV-1 satisfies Koch’s first two postulates, these researchers maintain, and, of course, the third cannot ethically be tested in humans. The third postulate can, however, be tested in animals and has been: Simian immunodeficiency viruses (SIVs) that are closely related to HIV-1 rapidly induce AIDS-like diseases in a variety of monkey species.

Unfortunately, many nonscientists, especially some AIDS activists, have seized upon Duesberg’s arguments, which continue to be treated with respect in the popular press. Duesberg maintains that recreational drug use and, perversely, anti-HIV therapy with zidovudine and other drugs are the principal causes of AIDS. He holds out the hope that individuals infected with HIV-1 aren’t really sick. His arguments undermine the rationale behind and support for desperately needed research.

Shortly after Duesberg first published his hypothesis, I spent an hour and a half interviewing him about it in his office at UC Berkeley. It was a deeply unsatisfactory interview. I had reviewed his 21-page paper in Cancer Research carefully, and I was very troubled by it. I had been covering AIDS for three years, and I knew that Duesberg had used a highly selective reading of the AIDS literature to bolster his argument. During our conversation, Duesberg was articulate and convincing—so long as the interview was framed in his terms. He was not, however, receptive to arguments that contravened his point of view. “What about experiments at Harvard that show that SIV causes AIDS in monkeys?” I asked. “Irrelevant,” he replied with a wave of his hand.

“If you are right,” I asked, “why hasn’t some young AIDS researcher challenged the accepted wisdom?” The AIDS research establishment was monolithic, Duesberg replied, and then he launched into an ad hominem attack on the character of such prominent AIDS researchers as Robert C. Gallo, Anthony S. Fauci, and William A. Haseltine. Those researchers stood to make millions of dollars off the idea that HIV-1 causes AIDS, Duesberg claimed, and they would not allow anyone to deny them such windfalls.

Duesberg has never changed his attitude—persecuted outsider railing against incorrect dogma and establishment scientists. But Duesberg continually has shifted the terms of his critique, never allowing accumulating evidence of the links between HIV-1 and AIDS to dislodge his faith in his position. Research won’t shift him from his convictions.

AIDS researchers believe they have answered all of Duesberg’s complaints about the link between HIV-1 and AIDS, and most aren’t willing to devote any more time to him. The most recent epidemiological study from the U.K. strongly supports that position. Duesberg maintains that AIDS researchers must prove him wrong. They have.

Rudy Baum
October 11, 1995

To: Peter Duesberg

Subject: C&EN Science Insights

Dear Prof. Duesberg:

I am sorry that I have not responded more promptly to your voice-mail message of Monday, October 9. I have been out of town the past two days.

My Science Insights essay, "HIV link to AIDS strengthened by epidemiological study," accurately portrays my recollection of the interview I conducted with you six or seven years ago. On at least two occasions during that interview, I asked you about experiments with SIVs and various monkey species. On both occasions, you evaded the question by dismissing its relevance to the AIDS issue. To my knowledge, you have never adequately addressed this work.

As I stated in my essay, during our interview, you insisted that prominent AIDS researchers would not accept alternatives to the HIV hypothesis of AIDS causation because they stood to lose millions of dollars if the hypothesis were discredited. Suggesting that cupidity is the primary motivation for a scientist defines an ad hominem attack to my way of thinking.

If you would like to respond to my essay, we would be happy to entertain publication of a concise letter to the editor. Please address it to C&EN's Editor, Madeleine Jacobs. She can also be reached by e-mail at edit.cen@acs.org.

Sincerely,

Rudy M. Baum
Managing Editor
November 15, 1995

To: Madeleine Jacobs, Editor, Chemical and Engineering News, Washington DC
From: Peter Duesberg, UC Berkeley

Re: C&EN Science Insights

Dear Ms. Jacobs,

as per my correspondence with Rudy Baum, I submit the enclosed letter for publication in C&EN.

Sincerely,

Peter Duesberg (faxed)
Letter for Chemical and Engineering News

Peter H. Duesberg, PhD
Department of Molecular and Cell Biology
Stanley Hall
UC Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720, USA
Tel. (510) 642-6549  Fax (510) 643-6455
According to C&EN's Rudy Baum the 10-year old hypothesis that HIV causes AIDS has now been “cemented” by yet another epidemiological study. By correlating HIV antibodies, years and death that study claims to “demonstrate particularly clearly the enormity and the specificity of the effect of HIV-1 infection on mortality”, because the mortality of HIV-antibody positive British hemophiliacs has increased ten-fold since 1987. However, Darby et al. do not describe which “specificity” of death sets apart hemophiliacs with antibodies from those without.

On the basis of this new study Baum moves to (i) “lay to rest the irresponsible argument that HIV does not cause AIDS... by Peter Duesberg” and (ii) Duesberg's argument that “perversely, anti-HIV therapy with [the DNA chain terminator] zidovudine and other drugs are the principal causes of AIDS.” But in his rush to judgement Baum leaves many questions unanswered:

1) Why was my hypothesis that HIV does not cause AIDS “irresponsible”, before the study was published that, according to Baum, had layed it to rest? Are scientific hypotheses “irresponsible” before they are disproven? Or are they ever irresponsible?

2) Why is immunodeficiency in hemophiliacs directly proportional to the lifetime dosage of commercial factor VIII (over 99% foreign proteins) received – regardless of antibodies against HIV?

3) Why are only antibodies against HIV, rather than HIV, found in hemophilia AIDS patients?

4) Why have the wives of 15,000 HIV-positive American hemophiliacs not contracted AIDS in over 10 years from a “sexually transmitted AIDS virus”?

5) Why has the median life of American hemophiliacs increased from 11 years in 1972 to 27 years in 1987, a period during which 75% (15,000) got infected by HIV?

6) Why did the mortality of American and now British HIV-positive hemophiliacs increase 10-fold – right after cytotoxic DNA chain terminators like AZT and other toxic anti-HIV drugs became standard treatment in the US and Great Britain in 1987? According to Darby et al. “treatment, by prophylaxis against Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia or with zidovudine, has been widespread for HIV-infected haemophiliacs since about 1989”.

7) Why is the mortality of AZT-treated, HIV-positive American hemophiliacs 2.4 times higher and their risk of AIDS 4.5 times higher than that of untreated HIV-positive controls?

8) Is it even credible that the mortality of Darby's British HIV-positive hemophiliacs was only 0.8% before 1987 – the equivalent of a biblical lifetime of 125 (100/0.8) years?

9) Why do hemophiliacs almost only develop pneumonia and candidiasis from a virus said to cause Kaposi’s sarcoma and dementia in homosexuals?
10) Why do the T-cells of HIV-positive haemophiliacs increase up to 30% over 2-3 years, if they are treated with purified factor VIII, and not with AZT – despite the presence of the hypothetical T-cell killer HIV 5, 6?

To demonstrate that "HIV infection is associated with a dramatic increase in death", the following two studies need to be done:
1. Compare two groups of haemophiliacs, that differ only in antibody to HIV, but are matched for the lifetime consumption of factor VIII and all medications. Predicted outcome: identical AIDS risk.
2) Compare two groups of HIV-positive haemophiliacs matched for lifetime dosage of factor VIII, one treated with AZT and other anti-AIDS drugs, the other untreated. Predicted outcome: the AZT group will have 10-fold higher mortality than the untreated group.

References:
Dear Professor Duesberg:

Thank you for your most recent fax. I am not about to enter into a debate with you on the merits of Rudy Baum's Science Insights piece published in the September 25, 1995, issue of Chemical & Engineering News. Nor am I going to enter into an open-ended correspondence with you on this article.

I am willing to consider for publication in C&EN a concise (four to six paragraph) letter from you responding to Rudy's essay. The letter must conform to the following criteria:

1. It must be confined to a response to the points raised in Rudy's essay. It must not raise extraneous issues related to your ideas about HIV and AIDS but not addressed in Rudy's essay.

2. It cannot contain footnotes. It may contain a limited (two to three) number of relevant literature references to support specific points made in your letter.

3. It cannot consist of a series of open questions. If you have a point to make, please make it. Do not simply pose provocative questions for readers to ponder.

As I have stated before, you do not have a right to publish a letter in C&EN. It you provide a letter that conforms to the above criteria, I will give it serious and prompt consideration for publication.

Sincerely yours,

Madeleine Jacobs
To: Madeleine Jacobs, Editor, Chemical and Engineering News, Washington D.C.

From: Dr. Peter Duesberg, U.C. Berkeley (faxed)

Re: Publication of my letter of November 15, 1995

January 18, 1996

Dear Ms. Jacobs,

Thank you for your letter of January 15, 1996. On October 11, 1995, Rudy Baum, managing editor of C&EN, wrote me: "We would be happy to consider publication of a concise letter to the editor." After careful consideration, I accepted Baum's invitation and wrote the letter I sent to your office on November 15, 1995.

I never received an acknowledgment that you received this letter. Now two months later, you set three ex post facto criteria to which my "letter should conform" in order to be published, but you still do not acknowledge that I have already written to C&EN as per its managing editor's specification.

I). My letter of November 15 was in accordance with your criterion No. 1, namely it was "confined to a response to the points raised in Rudy's essay."

II). Your criterion No. 2 specifies that my letter "may contain a limited (two or three) number of relevant literature references." Actually, my letter of November 15 contains six such references. However, unlike Rudy Baum who made sweeping statements without references in his editorial essay, I do not want to take responsibility vis-a-vis the scientific community for a piece which does not provide appropriate documentation for my statements. Therefore I stand by my list of six references.

III). Of course my letter of November 15 did not meet your criterion No. 3: "It cannot consist of a series of open questions. If you have a point to make, please make it. Do not simply pose provocative questions for readers to ponder." Actually, I made several points in my letter of November 15. In making these points, I chose to ask questions deliberately in order to avoid the controversial style of disagreeing with some of Baum's points on HIV and AIDS, and in order to revert to a more scientific framework, by asking scientific questions which deserve to be tested by scientific experiments and studies. Furthermore, I do not only ask questions. After suggesting such experiments and studies, I also do what scientists ordinarily do, namely I make two predictive hypotheses which are to be tested. Thus unlike you, I want "the readers to ponder."
Quite generally, I want an analysis and solution of the HIV/AIDS situation to be carried out according to ordinary scientific standards and scientific norms of discourse, which involve asking questions, making hypotheses, and testing these by experiments or studies. As Einstein used to say, "The important thing is to keep questioning."

I am therefore confirming the submission of my letter of November 15, 1995 for publication. I would appreciate an acknowledgment of receipt of that letter, as well as a clear response whether you accept that letter or not for publication.

Sincerely,
Peter H. Duesberg, Ph.D.

Dear cc list for the C&EN Subfile:

This is a follow up to my previous mailings since last fall. These mailings recently included an editorial in Chemical and Engineering News, a reply by Peter Duesberg, and my letter to Jerome Berson about the editorial. The editor Madeleine Jacobs then wrote him on 15 January and he replied on 18 January, copies enclosed. I fully endorse Duesberg's response to Jacobs, but I also want to make some additional comments.

I. QUESTIONS OF JOURNALISTIC RESPONSIBILITY

1. The "right" of reply. Jacobs wrote to Duesberg: "You do not have a right to publish a letter in C&EN." What does "right" mean? Of course, the editors of C&EN have the statutory power to determine what goes into their magazine, so if "have a right" means to have a statutory (legal) entitlement, she is correct, but tautologically so. No one that I know has raised any doubts about the statutory power of the editors. On the other hand, to "have a right" may also refer ambiguously to an unspecified ethical system, but that is not what I wish to deal with.

2. Questions about journalistic responsibility. However, several questions arise from the exchange between C&EN and Duesberg, besides the questions raised by Duesberg himself in the letter he submitted for publication.

(a) Providing correct information. One of them is to what extent readers of C&EN are correctly informed of various points of view and scientific results or purported results.

(b) Manipulation of letters to the editor. Another is how the editors manipulate letters to the editors. Jacobs' letter to Duesberg documents one way which I think deserves being brought to the attention of the scientific community, so this community can evaluate the journalism of C&EN. I think it is very valuable to have documented the extent to which the editor of a major scientific journal asserts control over the terms of discourse in this journal.

(c) Influence and responsibility of the grass roots. Thirdly, although the scientific community does not have statutory power over a scientific magazine, it does have influence -- which is something else. Will the scientific community now exert its influence? The editors of a scientific magazine are accountable in some sense to the scientific constituency; conversely the scientific grass roots can let the editors know their evaluations of the editors' journalism. The editors may be able to operate in darkness almost all the time, but I am now throwing the klieg lights on the way they are currently handling the HIV/AIDS/Duesberg situation. Other scientists besides myself may think that the editors of C&EN are failing in their responsibilities to the scientific community, some scientists may think C&EN is doing a great job, and others may be indifferent or may have various other reactions. We shall see. It is for the grass roots to choose whether to speak out, once they are provided with appropriate documentation which they are not getting from C&E News, any more than from the New York Times or Science, as I have documented systematically. Arthur Gottlieb's unpublished letter to the New York Times shows that some scientists are indeed attempting to speak out on the issue of HIV. I sent you this letter in my last mailing, immediately after he notified me of its existence.

II. QUESTIONS OF SCIENTIFIC RESPONSIBILITY

3. Do "Duesberg's arguments undermine support for desperately needed research"? This quote is the displayed, boxed, statement around which Rudy Baum's editorial in C&EN (25 September 1995) was written. But as Duesberg himself has asked: Which research is undermined by his rationale? Can Baum explain what research undermined by Duesberg is desperately needed? What I see as desperately needed are research and studies to test hypotheses and questions about the role of HIV, as a marker, or as a cause, or as one of many harmless viruses; and about the role of AZT or other drugs. Duesberg proposed two such studies at the end of his letter to the editors of C&EN. Baum's editorial and C&EN's refusal so far to publish Duesberg's letter to the editor are undermining support for such studies.

Baum claimed further: "AIDS researchers believe [sic] they have answered all of Duesberg's complaints about the link between HIV-1 and AIDS...The most recent epidemiological study from the U.K. strongly supports that position. Duesberg maintains that AIDS researchers must prove him wrong. They have." However, Duesberg's questions in his letter to the editor raise a number of scientific points. At the moment C&EN is obstructing the possibility of its readers pondering these points. Furthermore, some scientists do not agree that questions about the relationship of HIV and AIDS (whatever AIDS is, besides the CDC's circular definition) have been properly answered in the past. In a number of mailings, I have analyzed specific ways answers from various sources have been defective, for example: The Ascher et al. study, some of Jon Cohen's articles in Science, Shalala's answer to the questions raised by Rep. Gutknecht, etc. More generally, as Arthur Gottlieb wrote in his unpublished letter to the New York Times criticizing Jon Cohen's review of Burkett's book: "Notwithstanding some inaccuracies of detail, the critical questions raised by so-called AIDS dissidents which Burkett describes have not been answered. These questions deserve thoughtful and objective consideration by the medical-scientific community..."1

In his editorial, Baum referred to what unspecified "AIDS researchers believe". But beliefs have to do more with religion than science. Science and Government Report once improperly attributed to me to have "embraced" the hypothesis that "recreational drugs rather than HIV are the dominant cause of AIDS" (15 October 1994). As for embraces, I am reminded of the exchange between Gladstone and Disraeli (if I remember correctly), when one of them told the other: "A pox on you, Sir!" and the other replied: "Sir, this will depend on whether I embrace your mistor or your politics." I do not believe or disbelieve or "embrace" any hypothesis concerning what may or may not cause any single one of the 29 previously known autonomous diseases listed by the CDC to define AIDS in the presence of a positive HIV antibodies blood test. These different diseases may have different causes under different circumstances. In the present context of questions concerning HIV/AIDS, I, find beliefs or embraces inappropriate to scientific discourse focused on testing hypotheses. However, I have documented:

- the way information has been suppressed or manipulated in the mainstream press;
- the way some establishment scientists and journalists have given evidence that with respect to HIV they cannot tell the difference between a fact, an opinion, a hypothesis, and a hole in the ground;
- the way data have been improperly gathered and reported;
- the way funding has been unavailable to carry out research which goes against the dominant paradigm of the scientific establishment.

1Several scientists have complained about inappropriate responses to questions they have raised concerning the role of HIV, for instance Harry Rubin at the meeting sponsored by the Pacific Division of AAAS on 21 June 1994. This meeting was not covered by Science or the New York Times. Do readers of C&EN know about this meeting? As far as I know, it was not covered by C&EN either. Baum's flat assertion that AIDS researchers have proved Duesberg wrong is documentally false. I give a brief account of this AAAS meeting in my article: "HIV and AIDS -- Have we been misled? Questions of scientific and journalistic responsibility." (Yale Scientific, Fall 1994, pp. 8-23) Copies of this article are available on request.
4. Cutting off funding. At this stage of the HIV/AIDS/Duesberg situation, I want to remind the cc list of one fact which I find important. Duesberg has been unable to get funding for his lab for more than four years. At a time when the State of Maryland seriously considers providing a lab for Gallo, with the expectation that Gallo’s lab will bring in substantial funds, some of them from the federal government, I find it very objectionable that funding is not available to do the experiments Duesberg has proposed to check various hypotheses which run counter to the establishment line on HIV and AIDS. Of course one cannot do certain experiments on human beings, but as Duesberg has proposed, one can do some experiments on animals.\(^2\) One could also do epidemiological studies, with standards of accuracy and completeness going beyond those of certain past studies which are still subject to criticisms. For instance, epidemiological studies would have to junk the circular CDC definition of AIDS; they would have to determine without bias the natural coincidence between any single one of the 29 CDC AIDS-defining diseases (for instance tuberculosis, dementia, Kaposi’s sarcoma), and antibodies against HIV, that is compare how many instances of a given disease occur in a given group, both in the presence and absence of HIV; for the purpose of evaluating effects of drugs, they would have to quantify the amounts of drugs and the length of time certain drugs (recreational or medical) have been used; and they also would have to involve appropriate control groups. The questions Duesberg asks in his letter to the editors of C&EN deserve consideration by readers of C&EN, by scientists at large, and by the public at large. As far as I am concerned, studies to test his hypotheses-predictions deserve funding.

The bottom line. What do you say, about the handling of Duesberg’s letter to the editors, and/or about funding for his proposed experiments?

Serge Lang

Enclosures: Letter from Jacobs to Duesberg, and Duesberg’s response

cc list for the C&EN Subfile, 22 January 1996

Ex officio: Madeleine Jacobs (editor, C&EN), Rudy Baum, Peter Duesberg

In the press:

New York Times: Nicholas Wade, Gina Kolata, Philip Boffey

Science: Floyd Bloom, Ellis Rubinstein, Elliot Marshall, Christine Gilbert

John Crewdson, Dan Greenberg, Barbara Spector, Bob Silvers, Neenah Ostrom, Anthony Liversidge

In the political arena:

Representatives Gil Gutknecht, Bob Filner, Christopher Shays; Donna Shalala

In science:


---

\(^2\) I have discussed in detail the non-funding of Duesberg’s proposed experiments, and I analyzed concretely the reports of referees on Duesberg’s proposals, in my article: “To fund or not to fund, that is the question. To inform or not to inform, that is another question. Proposed experiments on the drug-AIDS hypothesis.” (Yale Scientific, Winter 1995, pp. 15-21) Copies of this article are available on request.
TO: Ms. Madeleine Jacobs, Editor, Chemical and Engineering News
FROM: Prof. H. Wu, Mathematics Department, UC Berkeley (faxed)


Dear Ms. Jacobs,

I would like to make a few comments concerning your extraordinary letter of January 15 to Duesberg.

I do not understand the peremptory tone of this letter. You dictated conditions under which Duesberg must compose his letter and you decreed that he did not “have the right to publish a letter in C & EN.”

May I remind you that C & EN is responsible to its readers for correct scientific information? In his letter of November 15, Duesberg clearly pointed out that Rudy Baum was presumptuous in trying to pass judgment on a Scientific matter over which Baum did not have full command. Such being the case, there was really nothing left for C & EN to do except to expedite the delivery of this information to its readers.

You ignored the existence of the afores-mentioned letter of Duesberg. To this day, the damage done to basic journalistic integrity by the Baum editorial has yet to be redressed. I strongly urge you to put aside your own letter of January 15 and, instead, rush to publish the Duesberg letter of November 15 in C & EN.

You owe it to your readers to meet this primary journalistic obligation.

Sincerely yours,

H. Wu

Ilung-Hsi Wu
Professor of Mathematics

cc: Peter Duesberg, Serge Lang, Jerome Berson
Ms. Madeleine Jacobs, Editor
Chemical and Engineering News
1155 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Ms. Jacobs:

This letter is not for publication at this time but is sent to you as a set of suggestions on the journalistic practices of C & EN. The September 25 issue contained a “Science Insights” article by Rudy Baum headed “HIV link to AIDS strengthened by epidemiological study,” which described results of research in Britain and used them as the basis for a critique of the scientific position of Professor Peter Duesberg relative to the causative mechanism of AIDS. I write to urge the swift publication of Duesberg’s letter of response, dated November 15, 1995.

What struck me about the article was the degree to which Rudy Baum inserted his own opinions, for example:

as surely as epidemiology can demonstrate causality, the work on hemophiliacs in the UK demonstrates that HIV-1 causes AIDS.

His (Duesberg’s) arguments undermine the rationale behind and support for desperately needed research.

I spent an hour and a half interviewing him (Duesberg) about it...It was a deeply unsatisfactory interview.

Duesberg maintains that AIDS researchers must prove him wrong. They have.

I do not know either Baum or Duesberg. Moreover, although I have no expertise in virology or the other disciplines needed to offer an informed opinion on the scientific merits of the AIDS debate, I am a scientist, and I do feel qualified to comment on the process of scientific discussion. I also feel it is proper for me to offer opinions on the minimum standards the press should impose upon itself in order to inform its readership with some degree of objectivity.
It has been called to my attention that this article was published without a prior option of comment being offered to Duesberg, and that Duesberg’s subsequent letter of response (mentioned above), which was invited by Baum, has not been published by C & EN. In the popular press, even an accused embezzler, inside stock manipulator, or subornor of arson gets a chance to respond in print to damaging allegations.

C & EN provides a valuable service as a medium in which scientific advances and even controversies can be aired. However, along with the privilege of choosing what subjects to cover and how to treat the issues goes a large capacity to do harm by irresponsible journalism. Careers and reputations hang in the balance. For example, to a degree that might surprise you, faculty appointments and promotions can be influenced by whether or not a candidate has been written up favorably in C & EN.

In the scientific literature, the goal of fairness is supposed to be achieved by the process of peer review. The process may fail from time to time because of human frailty, but at least the ideal and the machinery are there for all of us to use. In science journalism, the journalist is rarely a “peer” in the sense of having expert knowledge on the subject at issue. Perhaps Rudy Baum has such special qualifications, but if that is true, the proper forum for his opinions of the science involved in the controversy is a scientific journal, rather than C & EN, a magazine to whose columns he has privileged (that is, not peer reviewed) access. A rough-and-ready equivalent in science journalism of the fairness component of the peer review process is the resolve of the press to offer the opportunity of rebuttal, preferably before publication, but if that is missed for some reason, then surely after publication.

I hope that C & EN really does strive to adhere to these criteria. A way of demonstrating such adherence would be to publish Duesberg’s letter of response as quickly as possible.

Sincerely yours,

Jerome A. Berson

[Note by Serge Lang: At Berson’s suggestion, I have deleted one paragraph which had to do with a more personal experience of Berson, and is not especially relevant to the current problems. Berson’s letter was given to me by Berson on 19 February 1996, and was sent to the cc list with the deletion on this date. As of this date, Berson had not received a reply from Madeleine Jacobs.]
Dear cc list:

I remind you that Duesberg wrote a letter to the editors of Chemical and Engineering "News" on 15 November 1995. He wrote again to Madeleine Jacobs on 18 January 1996, confirming the submission of that letter for publication, and asking for a clear statement whether that letter had been received, and whether it was accepted for publication or not. I inform you that Duesberg has not had a reply to his letter of 18 January. I enclose:


I also enclose:

2. A letter to the editors of The Lancet by Gordon Stewart, the reply from Stephanie Clark, senior editor of The Lancet, refusing to publish Stewart's letter, as well as Stewart's and Duesberg's subsequent brief letters to Richard Horton, editor in chief of The Lancet, questioning Stephanie Clark's editorial decision. Thus The Lancet joins Science, the New York Times, and Chemical and Engineering "News" in suppressing points of view opposed to those of the HIV/AIDS establishment. Stephanie Clark wrote to Stewart: "No doubt in time Duesberg will be proved wrong." How does a senior editor of The Lancet know what history will prove before appropriate scientific experiments are made?

Furthermore, the phrase "no doubt...will be proved" implies that according to Clark, he hasn't been "proved wrong" yet. C&E"N"-Rudy Baum take note. Baum's editorial of 25 September 1995 ended: "Duesberg maintains that AIDS researchers must prove him wrong. They have." Rudy Baum and Stephanie Clark ought to get together to get their stories straight.

Clark's reply to Stewart gives one more example of unscientific dealings by one of those who control the flow of information in top scientific publications throughout the world. As Gordon Stewart wrote to Clark, "...how can you close a debate which you have never opened?"

3. A copy of one brief article by Mark Craddock "HIV: Science by press conference". This article is in a collection which is published by Kluwer (see the list as per item 4), and appeared this month. Craddock's systematic and concrete criticisms concern among others the article by Wei et al. published in Nature, 12 January 1995. Craddock also mentions that he sent a letter to the editors of Nature, with some of his criticisms. The editors never published Craddock's letter. If you are surprised, come to the front of the class because you haven't been paying attention.

In the present file, I have documented the way information and certain points of view are currently suppressed by the quartet constituted by Science, Chemical and Engineering "News", the Lancet, and the New York Times. Nature is in a class of its own. I dealt with it in previous files. For an example, of Nature's journalism, cf. the exchange between Maddox and Duesberg-Bialy reproduced in the Kluwer collection, pp. 111-125.

Incidentally, my two articles from the Yale Scientific (fall 1994, winter 1995) are also reproduced in this collection.
4. A list of four books authored, co-authored, or edited by Duesberg. Three have appeared (including the Kluwe collection), and the fourth, published by Regnery, is to appear next month.

The book from Regnery is intended for a broad audience. Pre-publication reviews and various activities indicate that this book will have very extensive sales, and will be very widely reviewed. As a result, it is now likely that the issue of HIV's role will be widely discussed, nation wide and world wide. Such a development will have dynamics which are way beyond those of my cc list. So the time has come to close the current file.

Serge Lang

Enclosures

cc list 19 February 1996

In the press:

New York Times: Nicholas Wade, Gina Kolata, Philip Boffey
Science: Floyd Bloom, Ellis Rubinstein, Elliot Marshall, Christine Gilbert, Steve Lapham
Chemical and Engineering "News": Madeleine Jacobs, Rudy Baum
The Lancet: Richard Horton
Nature: Philip Campbell
John Crewdson, Dan Greenberg, Barbara Spector, Bob Silvers, Neenyah Ostrom, Anthony Liversidge

In the political arena:

Representatives Gil Gutknecht, Bob Filner, Christopher Shays; Donna Shalala

In science:

IS HIV THE CAUSE OF AIDS?

Sir - In an issue endorsed editorially by the Lancet (1) and Nature (2) as critical, I am amazed that some of Duesberg's ubiquitous critics have not yet rushed into your columns to respond to if not negate the challenge of the ten questions and two predictions raised in his letter of November 18 (3). His ten questions are highly relevant to the claims made Darby et al, and Goedert et al in references 3 and 4 of his letter, and should be easily answerable from the "Complete cohort" and other experiences in the comprehensive national data on haemophilia available exclusively to them. His two predictions are widely and, may I say, courageously open to falsification by any who care to dare.

As you know, I differ amicably from Duesberg on several points, one of which is that I do not reject a role for HIV in the complex and variable pathogenesis of some of the diseases loosely classified as AIDS in conventional surveillance (4). So I have two further questions which he might deem redundant: I - from how many pre-1992 concentrates and samples of donor and recipient seropositive blood did Darby et al culture and directly identify HIV itself? and II - what were the AIDS-related and opportunistic diseases in the haemophiliacs? Answers to these questions and to Duesberg's ten are essential for understanding not only the transmission and management of AIDS but also the status and peace of mind of spouses or partners, and children. If the AIDS orthodoxy cannot answer these basic questions after twelve years of intensive research, it is they who should now concede defeat.

Glenavon, 
Clifton Down, 
Bristol BS8 3HT. Tel/Fax 0117 973 6532.

Gordon T. Stewart, M.D.

REFERENCES.

1 Horton R. Will Duesberg now concede defeat? Lancet 1995; 346; 656.
4 Stewart GT. The epidemiology and transmission of AIDS: a hypothesis linking behavioural and biological determinants to time, person and place. Genetica 1995; 95; 173-193.
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15 January 1996

Prof G T Stewart
Glenavon
Clifton Down
BRISTOL BS8 3HT

Dear Professor Stewart

Thank you for your letter entitled “Is HIV the cause of AIDS?”. We have decided against publication, I am afraid. We have received many letters on this topic and after an initial round have decided to close this debate in the pages of The Lancet for now. No doubt in time Duesberg will be proved wrong.

Yours sincerely

Stephanie Clark

Stephanie Clark PhD
Senior Editor

26/1/96 Dear Peter -

How about all this?

Best wishes

[Handwritten note]
Dr Richard Horton,
Editor, the Lancet,
42 Bedford Square,
London WC1B 3SL.

Dear Dr Horton,

This is in reply to Stephanie Clark's letter of 15th January. If the Lancet is so keen to prove Duesberg wrong, surely the best way to do so would be to publish some of the many letters to which she refers instead of leaving Duesberg's legitimate questions unanswered.

I realise that this subject is making disproportionate demands upon your space as indeed it is upon almost everything. Even so, how can you close a debate which you have never opened?

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

G T Stewart.
February 8, 1996

To: Richard C. Horton, Editor-in-chief, *The Lancet*
From: Peter Duesberg

Dear Richard,

Are you aware that a Senior Editor of *The Lancet*, Dr. Stephanie Clark, wrote to a contributing scientist on Jan 15, 1996, on *Lancet* letter head: "No doubt in time Duesberg will be proved wrong." (copy enclosed)? Does she express an editorial policy?

Best,

Peter Duesberg

cc Gordon Stewart
RH/JC

1 March 1996

Dr P Duesberg
Dept. of Molecular and Cell Biology
c/o Stanley/Donner Administrative Services Unit
229 Stanley Hall # 3206
Berkeley CA 94720-3206
USA

Dear Peter

The Lancet always tries to be perfect but sometimes we don't quite succeed. I suspect that my colleague, Dr Stephanie Clark, was writing out of enthusiasm. As you know we do not have an "editorial policy" on this matter. Many thanks for sending over all those articles to me. I am building up a huge file and will try and do something about it soon.

With best wishes

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Richard Horton
Editor
Duesberg’s questions

According to Rudy Baum (C&EN, Sept. 25, 1995, page 26), the 10-year-old hypothesis that HIV causes AIDS has now been “cemented” by yet another epidemiological study [Nature, 377, 79 (1995)]. By correlating HIV antibodies, years, and death, that study claims to “demonstrate particularly clearly the enormity and the specificity of the effect of HIV-1 infection on mortality,” because the mortality of HIV-antibody-positive British hemophiliacs has increased 10-fold since 1987. However, S. C. Darby and coauthors do not describe which “specificity” of death sets apart hemophiliacs with antibodies from those without.

On the basis of this new study, Baum moves to “lay to rest the irresponsible argument that HIV does not cause AIDS ... by Peter Duesberg” and Duesberg’s argument that “perverse, anti-HIV therapy with [the DNA chain terminator] zidovudine and other drugs are the principal causes of AIDS.” But in his rush to judgment, Baum leaves many questions unanswered:

1. Why was my hypothesis that HIV does not cause AIDS “irresponsible” even before the study was published that, according to Baum, had laid it to rest? Are scientific hypotheses “irresponsible” before they are disproven? Or are they ever irresponsible?

2. Why is immunodeficiency in hemophiliacs directly proportional to the lifetime dosage of commercial Factor VIII (over 99% foreign proteins) received—regardless of antibodies against HIV [Genetica, 95, 51, (1995)]?

3. Why are only antibodies against HIV, rather than HIV itself, found in hemophiliac AIDS patients?

4. Why have the wives of 15,000 HIV-positive American hemophiliacs not contracted AIDS in more than 10 years from a “sexually transmitted AIDS virus”?

5. Why has the median life of American hemophiliacs increased from 11 years in 1972 to 27 years in 1987, a period during which 75% (15,000) got infected by HIV?


7. Why is the mortality of AZT-treated, HIV-positive American hemophiliacs 2.4 times higher and their risk of developing AIDS 4.5 times higher than that of untreated HIV-positive controls [Lancet, 344, 791, (1994)]?

8. Is it even credible that the mortality of Darby’s British HIV-positive hemophiliacs was only 0.8% before 1987—the equivalent of a biblical lifetime of 125 (100/0.8) years?

9. Why do hemophiliacs develop pneumonia and candidiasis almost exclusively from a virus said to cause Kaposi’s sarcoma and dementia in homosexuals?

10. Why do the T-cells of HIV-positive hemophiliacs increase up to 30% over two to three years if they are treated with purified Factor VIII and not with AZT—despite the presence of the hypothetical T-cell killer HIV [Blood, 76, 1919 (1991) and Lancet, 342, 700 (1993)]?

To demonstrate that “HIV infection is associated with a dramatic increase in death,” two studies need to be completed. First, compare two groups of hemophiliacs that differ only in antibody to HIV but are matched for the lifetime consumption of Factor VIII and all medications. Predicted outcome: identical AIDS risk. Second, compare two groups of HIV-positive hemophiliacs matched for lifetime dosage of Factor VIII—one group treated with AZT and other anti-AIDS drugs, the other group untreated. Predicted outcome: The AZT group will have 10-fold higher mortality than the untreated group.

Peter H. Duesberg
University of California, Berkeley

Rudy Baum replies:

Answers to all of the questions raised by Peter Duesberg over the past 10 years about HIV as the cause of AIDS can be found in Continued on page 40
To the cc list

Update for the Journalistic Suppression & Manipulation File

I wrote you to close this file on 19 February. Since then, there have been two developments which you are entitled to know.

1. A reply from The Lancet's editor Richard Horton. Horton replied to Duesberg on 1 March 1996, that "The Lancet always tries to be perfect but sometimes we don't quite succeed. As you know, we do not have an 'editorial policy' on this matter." The "matter" is Senior Editor Stephanie Clark's assertion to Gordon Stewart: "No doubt in time Duesberg will be proved wrong." However, Horton's letter did not address the continuing editorial policy not to publish various letters to the editors, especially Gordon Stewart's letter. As of the present date, this letter has not been published.

2. Duesberg's letter to C&E"N". Following grass roots activism (my mailings, letters from Professors Wu and Berson to C&E"N" editor Madeleine Jacobs, and whatever else), Duesberg's letter of 15 November 1995 to C&E"N" was published (date deleted) on 25 March 1996. It was followed by a brief commentary from Rudy Baum (copy enclosed), stating that "answers to all of the questions raised by Peter Duesberg over the past 10 years about HIV as the cause of AIDS can be found in...a 62 page booklet" published by the National Institute of Allergy & Infectious Diseases. Baum calls it an "excellent publication...with more than 400 literature references".

(a) To what extent is Baum engaging in rhetorical hype? How does he know "all of the questions raised" by Duesberg over a decade, including specific questions about specific publications whose defects Duesberg analyzed in a specific way? Does Baum know the eight questions raised by Duesberg in his letter to Harold Jaffe (Director of HIV/AIDS Division, CDC) dated 11 February 1993? Are these answered in the NIAID booklet? Does Baum know Jaffe's answer dated 5 March 1993?1

If Baum has indeed verified that Duesberg's questions now published in C&E"N" are answered in that booklet, it would have been appropriate for him to inform C&E"N" readers of these specific answers. I object to his not doing so.

---

1For example, Question 6: Are there any known documented cases of persons having irreversible immunodeficiency symptoms or a disease in the second category who have not also: (a) subjected themselves to recreational drugs...(b) been subjected to intravenous and other recreational drugs prior to their birth; (c) depended for years on transfusions with factor VIII contaminated by many other immunosuppressive foreign proteins; (d) previously developed life threatening illnesses that necessitated treatment with transfusions; (e) been treated with the cytotoxic DNA chain terminator AZT for months or years? If there are such cases, how many are there (both in totality and as percentage of all Americans), and what is the documentation? Does their number exceed the normal, low incidence of these diseases in the general population?

The closest Jaffe comes to answering the above question is: "As part of its surveillance activities, CDC does not routinely collect behavioral or medical data on persons with AIDS beyond what is necessary to classify them into HIV transmission categories." In other words, Jaffe's answer to Question 6 is that the CDC doesn't have the data Duesberg asks for. What, if any, is the answer in the NIAID booklet? Is it the same as Jaffe's? What of answers to the other questions from Duesberg's letter to Jaffe?
(b) I know of the NIAID booklet, which is becoming increasingly invoked. *Science* already drew attention to it (270, 10 November 1995, "RANDOM SAMPLES - All About AIDS"). Even if some "answers...can be found" in the NIAID booklet, how valid or significant are these answers? Truth squads are required to determine which of the many questions about HIV/AIDS it answers properly. Are the NIAID booklet answers similar to those given by Harold Jaffe (see footnote 1)? Can one do a job on those answers as I (and others) have done a job on some other answers in the past?

(c) Indeed, I have documented defects in answers to questions about HIV and also defects in published papers about HIV, in several places. For example, in my *Yale Scientific* article on HIV/AIDS, I dealt (among other things) with some specific defects of Jaffe's answer to Duesberg. I also dealt with the Ascher, Sheppard, Vittinghoff, and Winkelstein paper (*Nature*, 11 March 1993), and I referred readers to the critical analysis by Ellison, Duesberg and Downey: "HIV as a surrogate marker for drug use: a reanalysis of the San Francisco Men's Health Study". This analysis finally appeared in *Genetica* (95, 1995), and was reprinted in the Kluwer collection *AIDS: Virus- or Drug Induced?* (1996). I enclose here one easily documented item concerning that paper, namely a graph as published by Ascher et al. and widely reprinted in the press, and a graph representing the actual data points (not given in the Ascher et al. paper). Draw your own conclusions about the scientific validity of Ascher et al.'s averaging process, and the fact that they did not explain the averaging process in their *Nature* paper.

In the file from September 1995 to February 1996, I provided further documentation, for example about Shalala's answer to Gutknecht (which I first sent you on 6 September 1995), and about papers such as Ho, Shaw, et al. (cf. the critical analysis by Mark Craddock which I sent you on 19 February).

I have provided enough such documentation in the past not to reopen the file at this time. On the other hand, specific documented criticisms which I (and others) have provided are not reported in the official scientific media such as C&EN, *Science* or *Nature*. Editors such as Baum ignore this documentation, but refer to and endorse "a 62-page booklet...with more than 400 literature references".

We are at an impasse.

Sincerely yours,

Serge Lang

cc

In the press:
- *Chemical and Engineering News*: Madeleine Jacobs, Rudy Baum
- *The Lancet*: Richard Horton
- *New York Times*: Nicholas Wade, Gina Kolata, Philip Boffey
- *Science*: Floyd Bloom, Ellis Rubinstein, Elliot Marshall, Christine Gilbert, Steve Lapham
- *Nature*: Philip Campbell
- John Crewdson, Dan Greenberg, Barbara Spector, Bob Silvers, Neenayah Ostrom, Anthony Liversidge

In the political arena:
- Representatives Gil Gutknecht, Bob Filner, Christopher Shays; Donna Shalala

In science:
April 15, 1996

Mr. Serge Lang
Department of Mathematics
Yale University
10 Hillhouse Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06520-8283

Dear Mr. Lang:

Your letter of April 8, 1996, and a number of attachments, which you broadly disseminated, contains selected Letters to the Editor from the March 25, 1996 issue of Chemical & Engineering News. Letters to the Editor are protected by copyright and you should obtain appropriate permissions from the individual authors (or their employers in the case of works made for hire) prior to your copying and disseminating such materials.

Our records indicate that you did not obtain permission to use Mr. Baum's response in your mini-newsletter and appropriate credit was not given. In the future, please submit a written request to the ACS Copyright Office, attention Arleen Courtney, prior to your use of any ACS copyrighted materials from Chemical & Engineering News.

Sincerely,

Barbara F. Polansky
Administrator, Copyright & Special Projects

C: Madeleine Jacobs w/a
Rudy Baum w/a
C. Arleen Courtney w/a
Dear Berson,

I just received the enclosed letter from the Publications Division of the American Chemical Society. This letter gives rise to serious questions in scientific, educational and journalistic responsibilities.

(a) I provide direct information to my cc list, just as professors provide information to a class. Scientific and educational material is routinely duplicated for distribution to a class, which lies outside commercial use. Providing original documents in my mailings gives an immediate possibility for readers to verify the accuracy of what I am reporting, and to verify that I am not quoting out of context, or improperly paraphrasing, or otherwise misrepresenting. By providing readers with such easy access to information, I am scientifically and educationally responsible in a way that others are not when they fail to provide such access. For instance, if Rudy Baum had followed proper scientific standards, and if Madeleine Jacobs had handled Duesberg’s letter properly in the first place, there would have been no need to expose the editorial manipulations of C&EN by publicizing Rudy Baum’s editorial, Duesberg’s letters to C&EN, and Jacobs’ answers, as I did. Only after this publicizing, which included your letter to Jacobs, lecturing her on scientific-journalistic responsibilities, did C&EN print Duesberg’s letter, which was by then a public document. But Baum-Jacobs continued their manipulations by printing Baum’s purportedly scientific comments of 25 March along with it (see (b)).

(b) Rudy Baum is accountable to the scientific community for his publicly expressed scientific positions in his first editorial, and later for his endorsement of the NIAID pamphlet on 25 March. As you pointed out in your letter to Madeleine Jacobs, Baum's purported scientific evaluations were made in C&N, "a magazine to whose columns he has privileged (that is, not peer reviewed) access". Considering the way C&EN has manipulated its own forum for purportedly scientific discourse, I find it inappropriate for them to object when I provide a more open forum not subject to their direct control. I object to the shift of scientific responsibility from Baum to legal responsibility from the Copyright Division of the ACS, which is running interference for him in its letter to me.

(c) I have distributed material for years, involving letters to the editors, scientific articles, and the like, from Science, Nature, The Scientist, and other publications, without ever encountering the suggestion that I was going against the copyright laws. I find it flabbergasting and objectionable that an Office of the American Chemical Society could write as they did. Indeed, instead of facing and answering the substantial scientific questions raised in the mailing of 8 April and previous ones, Madeleine Jacobs and Rudy Baum introduce legalistic considerations via the Copyright Office of the Publications Division of the ACS. Thus they deflect the focus of attention from scientific and educational questions to legal questions and legal control. I object. Since the ACS is your professional organization, since you first brought the Rudy Baum editorial to my attention last fall, and since you made a major contribution to the current file in your letter to Madeleine Jacobs, I am addressing this letter to you. Thanks for everything.

All the best,

Serge Lang

cc: Rudy Baum, Madeleine Jacobs, Council National Academy of Sciences, Bob Shulman, and the rest of the cc list for the Journalistic Suppression and Manipulation File