

Rethinking AIDS and the Perth Group – irreconcilable differences

The Perth Group
September 18th 2009

Conference

Roberto Giraldo is wrong. The only member “of the so called Perth Group” invited to the conference was Eleni Papadopulos-Eleopulos who was asked by David Rasnick to talk on the antibody tests. We made it clear even before the invitation the only way we could justify the time and expense demanded by our participation was to have a debate with Peter Duesberg regarding our scientific differences. Since David Crowe ruled this out, Eleni regrettably declined the invitation and proposed Anthony Brink to present our views on the “HIV” isolation problem on our behalf, as he ably did in May 2008 at the All Russia Parents Assembly AIDS dissident conference held in Ekaterinburg. Celia Farber and Crowe claim our proposal of Anthony was rejected because they wanted “to have the pre-eminent expert”, “the highest scientific authority on each matter”, address each topic. All “perfectly reasonable”. Now it appears there will be talks on “HIV” isolation and the speakers will be Etienne de Harven and Crowe.

It will be interesting and revealing to see if de Harven will:

1. Continue to claim he was the only person to conduct a proper analysis of the Montagnier *et al* 1983 paper;
2. Produce evidence which will prove that the particles Montagnier saw in his umbilical cord culture are indeed retroviral particles (exogenous or endogenous);
3. Explain what were the particles (if not “HIV”) subsequently seen by Gallo, Levy and Weiss, whose cultures did not contain umbilical cord lymphocytes;
4. Explain what, in his view, is the significant difference for the dissident movement between his interpretation of the Montagnier study and that of a retrovirologist from the Karolinska Institute, who also claims that in his 1983 paper Montagnier did have a retrovirus, but did not have proof for “HIV” isolation;
5. Explain, if Montagnier’s particles are endogenous placenta retroviruses, what are the antibodies in gay men which react with Montagnier’s “retrovirus”;
6. Produce evidence to prove his claim that the idea that “HIV does not exist...was that of Stefan Lanka, in 1994(?). And the PG swiftly appropriated it!!!”

It will be even more interesting to see at last Crowe’s original analysis and interpretation of the presently available evidence regarding the existence of “HIV”. For Crowe to tell us how it is possible, on the one hand, he claims both he and de Harven after reading the HIV literature came to the conclusion that “HIV” has not been proven to exist, while on the other hand, convince a lawyer in a criminal court it is only the loony Perth Group who believes that “HIV” has not been proven to exist. It will be even better if on this occasion Crowe finds time to respond to two questions

repeatedly put to him more than a year ago (20/3/08) but which, although he “plan[s] to respond comprehensively to this”, he has so far not managed to do.

“Our questions are:

1. Since the “HIV” experts, including Montagnier and Gallo, admit:
 - (a) to prove the existence of a virus, it is necessary to purify the particles and to show that they have unique RNA;
 - (b) to date, no “HIV” experts including Montagnier and Gallo, have proof of purification and admit that there is no unique RNA;

why should the dissidents give to the “HIV” experts that which they admit they do not have and debate with half-truths?

2. Is it possible for the dissidents to be proven correct by debating with half-truths?”

After we questioned his silence regarding Montagnier’s Nobel Prize, Crowe responded: “Definitely we need a concerted effort to deconstruct and discredit Montagnier’s papers...You have already done some of this work”. He did not tell us what “work” we missed out. Neither has he told us what is wrong with our repeated analysis of the Montagnier 1983 paper which is foundational to his Nobel Prize, not to mention the HIV theory of AIDS. Maybe he will tell us what is wrong with our analysis and why he is still not taking Montagnier’s papers seriously.

In a recent email to us from Luis Botinas he wrote: “AIDS is a construct which has to be dismantled”. According to Peter “The epidemiological correlation between these antibodies [“HIV” antibodies] and AIDS is the primary basis for the hypothesis that AIDS is caused by this virus...and antibodies to HIV became part of the definition of AIDS”. In other words, “HIV” is the foundation of the AIDS construct. Maybe at this conference Crowe or some other member of the RA Board of Directors, while accepting the existence of “HIV”, will come up with 10-15 detailed and irrefutable scientific arguments which will lead to the deconstruction of the HIV theory of AIDS more effectively than by deconstructing “HIV”.

The Rethinking AIDS (RA) Group and its first President

Recently Celia wrote: “We had a formal split around 1990 between those who wished to condemn Peter Duesberg for saying AIDS was non-infectious (Callen, Root-Bernstein, Sonnabend and others) and those of us who felt his contributions were clear, ethical, and scientifically sound, (Me, Joan Shenton, and John Lauritsen).

They wrote a manifesto, and we wrote a counter-manifesto, at the conference in Amsterdam. And that was that. It was an important fork in the road and so we forked”.

The fact is that from the very beginning there have been significant scientific differences between the dissidents. This became obvious to us in 1991 when Peter Duesberg commented on Eleni’s Reappraisal of AIDS paper, published in *Medical Hypotheses*: “I think it makes numerous excellent points. I wonder whether an old substance like semen could be pathogenic in any way – surely men and women have

been exposed to it for millions of years”. One such difference, the role of sex in AIDS, came into the open in Amsterdam.

Eleni wanted to sign John Lauritsen’s “manifesto” but with one condition. To change ‘AIDS is not sexually transmitted’ to ‘AIDS is not sexually transmitted but is sexually acquired’. John could not see the difference and there was no time to explain. Hence Eleni signed neither.

This difference and many others, which are natural among scientists, were kept under wraps but they did not prevent:

- (a) collaboration amongst all of us;
- (b) our different viewpoints being published in *Reappraising AIDS*;
- (c) Harvey Bialy personally helping us;
- (d) Peter doing a great job with the 1995 *Genetica* special edition;
- (e) Celia writing about the Perth Group’s views. (Now she says she does not write about our work anymore because we asked her not to!)

The differences came into the open and were obvious to anybody who wanted to see them, including the “HIV” experts, when Peter applied for the *Continuum* prize. It is interesting that at that time Peter still appeared willing to debate. In an interview Peter gave Mark Conlan, published in *Reappraising AIDS*, February/March 1997, regarding the conference in Colombia, he stated: “A negative highlight, in my opinion, was that Stefan Lanka from Germany was there to defend the idea that HIV doesn’t exist at all, or its existence has not been proved. Frankly, I think he did a very poor job on that. It was almost embarrassing, in my opinion, to have him there. Eleni didn’t come, unfortunately – or fortunately, I don’t know which you would call it. If she had come, then at least there would have been a debate”.

Rasnick was also all for debate. In an email sent to *Continuum*, December 1996, he wrote: “...thanks for sending me 3 recent issues of *Continuum*. I just finished reading them. That makes two times now that I’ve read Peter’s arguments for both the existence and isolation of HIV, and Eleni et al’s thorough arguments against. There’s real drama there. We may be able to exploit that to generate media interest in the DC conference. That is, if we’re able to put one together.

As I [David Rasnick] mentioned, I’m not satisfied that HIV has ever been isolated from primary human tissues. However, the production of infectious viral particles in vitro is another story, even if they are a Frankenstein monster. I’m not a virologist but I have worked with a number of them that seem to know what they are doing, at least in vitro. For now, I accept that they can reproducibly generate infectious particles, they call HIV, in vitro. I am prepared to change my mind given strong enough data and arguments disputing this issue”.

Two significant events took place in the second half of the 1990s and early 2000s.

- (a) Some of the best dissidents, including Charles Thomas, the founder of the Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of the HIV/AIDS Hypothesis, withdrew. As a

consequence, the Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of AIDS disintegrated and the group's monthly publication *Reappraising AIDS* ceased publication.

(b) Many new people, including Rasnick, Crowe and de Harven joined the dissidents.

It was obvious things were not the way they used to be. Nonetheless, it came as a disconcerting surprise to us when in Johannesburg, Peter and Rasnick declined to talk to Eleni, or even acknowledge her greetings or presence. Even more so when Harvey told us "We did everything possible for you not to be invited to this meeting" (somebody did the same thing regarding our participation in the 2003 European Parliament meeting and succeeded. Maybe de Harven and Giraldo can shed some light on this). More importantly, at the 2000 Johannesburg Presidential AIDS Panel meeting, when it was announced our proposed experiments (the pre-absorption and isolation) were going to be accepted, Peter walked out and did not return despite several pleas by Harvey and the South African Health Minister. When it became obvious what Harvey intended to do with our pre-absorption experiment, Rasnick wrote us an email in which he stated: "That is indeed disturbing news. I suggest that you contact Harvey Bialy and William Makgoba directly and see what they have to say about it". That is why, when we found out that Rasnick joined Harvey behind our backs to discuss the pre-absorption experiment with the "HIV" experts at a meeting in Johannesburg, the disappointment was double.

At about the same time it appears another significant event was taking place. Again, all behind our backs. In a posting to the HIVAIDSPARADIGM forum on 28th July 2009, de Harven wrote: "Rasnick nominated me as president [of the Rethinking AIDS group] in 2004 and I was appointed by the Board soon thereafter, my term started on March 1st, 2005. The composition of the Board [which included Crowe] was transmitted to me without any modification". Now Celia and many others may say: "All seems perfectly reasonable". And we agree. We live in free countries and anybody can organise any group he or she desires.

If Rethinking AIDS was a new dissident group created by Rasnick, de Harven and Crowe, then obviously there was no need for any other dissident apart from them and the handful of others which collaborated with them to be aware of it. However, they claim that Rethinking AIDS is a reincarnation of Charlie's group. Neither Rasnick nor de Harven nor Crowe were inaugural members of that group. Yet, Rethinking AIDS claim otherwise, at least for de Harven at their website and in their press releases.

Charlie's group was named "The Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of the HIV/AIDS Hypothesis". For reasons to which we are not privy, Rasnick, Crowe and de Harven removed the words "Scientific Reappraisal" when framing their "new" name. The "new" name does not convey what Rethinking AIDS is about. To someone not in the know, including newcomers, Rethinking AIDS could just as well belong to a group of "HIV" advocates. The informative and unambiguous title of Charlie's group was demoted to small print (which appears at the RA website but is rarely seen elsewhere) below the "new" name. Were these changes because on one hand they sought originality and on the other, to legitimise the group by connecting it to Charlie's? Or was it because the "new" movement was intent on science playing second fiddle to politics? And to promote "thinking" as a softer option to scientific re-evaluation?

Perhaps nothing speaks better of the RA Board of Directors than the Rethinking AIDS History at the RA website.

<http://www.rethinkingaids.com/Content/AboutRA/tabid/59/Default.aspx>

“In 1987, Dr. Peter Duesberg published a paper on cancer research in which he made the case, almost as an aside, that HIV (a retrovirus, the same class of virus suspected at the time to cause cancer) cannot be the cause of AIDS.

Four years later, in 1991, after mounting criticism over Duesberg’s position, and simultaneous support from a growing number of scientists who felt that HIV science just didn’t add up, a number of scientists formed “The Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of the HIV/AIDS Hypothesis” (usually shortened to simply “The Group”), and crafted a letter for submission to the editors of *Nature*, *Science*, *The Lancet*, and *The New England Journal of Medicine*, all of whom refused to publish the letter.

Yet another four years later, The Group was able to have this statement, signed by 32 scientists with advanced medical degrees, published in *Science* (17 Feb. 1995, vol. 267, pp. 945-946):

“It is widely believed by the general public that a retrovirus called HIV causes the group of diseases called AIDS. Many biochemical scientists now question this hypothesis. We propose that a thorough reappraisal of the existing evidence for and against this hypothesis be conducted by a suitable independent group. We further propose that critical epidemiological studies be devised and undertaken.”“.

Facts:

1. The Group was founded in 1991 by a handful of people which included Eleni.
2. At no time was the group made by just scientists “with advanced medical degrees” or “Many biochemical scientists”. In fact at all times the Group included people who had neither scientific nor medical qualifications.
3. The letter published in *Science* was not “signed by 32 scientists with advanced medical degrees” but by 12 people which included Celia but not Eleni.
4. More than a quarter of the text of the letter called for a scientific evaluation of the antibody tests. Not one of the signatories had published scientific papers questioning the validity of the antibody tests. The only individuals to have done so was the Perth Group who, by 1995, had published six such papers, the first in 1988 and two others in 1993. Yet no member of the Perth Group was asked to sign this letter. And worse, Eleni was excluded.
5. The text at the RA website (above) does not exist in the cited letter to *Science* [2]. How can dissidents be led by a Board that cannot correctly cite its own material? Or substitutes fact with fiction? Furthermore, the founders of the Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of the HIV/AIDS Hypothesis never proposed “critical epidemiological studies be devised and undertaken”.
6. A more factual history of the dissident movement can be found in a recent addition to Wikipedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AIDS_denialism

Charles Thomas consulted every dissident as how best to proceed. In choosing a name for the group he went as far as asking Eleni for permission to use the word

“Reappraisal” because she had used this word in the title of her 1988 *Medical Hypotheses* paper. Rasnick, Crowe and de Harven limited themselves to a few dissidents. At the first meeting of Rethinking AIDS only two original members were present, Peter and Harvey. Even now, only two members of the original group are on the “Board of Directors of Rethinking AIDS” namely Peter and Gordon Stewart. Two members of the original group, including Eleni, are not considered suitable to belong to the “new” Board. Charlie did everything possible to unite the dissidents. Crowe openly admits Rethinking AIDS is biased in favour of Peter’s view. In other words, the creation of Rethinking AIDS took up one side of the dissident movement and yet claims to represent all of us.

Instead of accepting our offer for a member of the Perth Group to be included in the Rethinking AIDS Board, in 2006 they voted to give us what Anthony has called “a royal kiss-off, a gold watch goodbye”, and to get rid of us. In fact, they went as far as to not provide a link to the Perth Group website.

Recently, Celia and other dissidents asked for details as to what happened at the 2006 RA Board meeting in regard to the Perth Group. The vast majority of the Directors of the RA Board remained silent. Crowe said that Christine Maggiore proposed to thank the Perth Group for their work, but gave no details as to why or for what, which was what Celia and others were asking. De Harven once again repeated how hard he had worked as President of RA, and that all he “wanted to consolidate” was a “united RA front” under the only correct dissident science, his. Peter is wrong (there is no HIV), the Perth Group is wrong (Montagnier had a “TYPICAL RETROVIRUS”). But then he clarified matters even further, for which Celia thanked him, pointing out that the “HIV does not exist” idea is not the Perth Group’s “it was that of Stefan Lanka, in 1994 (?). And the PG swiftly appropriated it!!!” Obviously the RA Board of Directors could not have had a thief among themselves. De Harven’s claim that we stole the “HIV does not exist” idea may have come as a surprise to some dissidents, but not to us. However, it was surprising to us that this time de Harven attributed the idea to Stefan Lanka and not himself.

In 1995 when Stefan Lanka joined the dissidents he wrote in *Continuum*, the great dissident publication for which we will always be thankful to Jody Wells, Huw Christie, Alex Russell, Michael Verney-Elliott, Michael Baumgartner and many others: “In 1993 a research group from Perth, Australia succeeded in publishing a paper on the HIV test. Since then anybody could have read for him or herself that no AIDS test could ever work, because HIV has never been isolated nor even shown to exist. Since AIDS research and the media have largely ignored any critique of HIV=AIDS, especially the essential question of whether HIV really does exist, it is time to call again for a reappraisal of the HIV/AIDS hypothesis”. (The story as to how Stefan came to claim that no retrovirus exists is too long to be told here).

In 1998 when de Harven became a dissident (12 years after Eleni submitted her paper “Reappraisal of AIDS: Is the oxidation induced by the risk factors the primary cause?” to *Nature*, and 10 years after its publication in *Medical Hypotheses*) de Harven wrote: “In conclusion, and after extensive reviewing of the current aids research literature, the following statement appears inescapable: neither electron microscopy nor molecular markers have so far permitted a scientifically sound demonstration of retrovirus isolation directly from AIDS patients. This conclusion

fully confirms the recent reports published in *Continuum* by E Papadopoulos and S Lanka”.

This is the first and last time that de Harven ever gave us credit, or half credit, for the idea that “HIV does not exist”. When we drew his attention that anybody who reads the interview he gave to Paul Philpott in the same year, 1998, and does not know our work could only conclude the idea “HIV does not exist” was his, he replied: “He [Paul] puts in my mouth definite ideas I never had and final statements I never made”.

When we drew de Harven’s attention to the abstract of a presentation he made at a dissident meeting held in India, where he implied he was the first person to question the existence of “HIV”, he wrote to us: “As far as the abstract you received from the meeting in Napur, India, is concerned, I am afraid there is a misunderstanding of one scenario I wrote there...I apologise if my writing was perhaps ambiguous on that point”.

When the experiments proposed by us were accepted by the Presidential AIDS Advisory Panel, de Harven expressed repeatedly his desire for us to include him. Many times we told him we would welcome any dissident taking part in their execution and although one of the members of our group is a pathologist, with long standing experience in EM, he too would be welcome. Incredibly, after the meeting he wrote to Dr Mokhele and told him that our proposals “are extremely vague and uninformative...and should therefore be deleted”. In a subsequent email he sent to the late Sam Mhlongo, de Harven wrote: “As I told you several times, we should not exclude the possibility (for the sake of speed) that the sampling from “high viral count” patients [now we know he does not know what viral load is and what tissue is used to determine it], the viral isolation/purification procedures, and the preparation of EM samples (plastic embossed blocks) to be done is SA under my direct supervision....”

In 2000 de Harven sent us a manuscript, offered our participation as co-authors and asked us to try and find a scientific journal in which his paper could be published. The article was nothing more than our work on the existence of “HIV”. However, anybody reading the article who did not know our work (he did not cite even one of our papers) would have thought this is something new, first brought to light by de Harven and his co-authors. We wrote to him: “Perhaps this saga is caused by a misunderstanding, that is, you are not aware of all our work. There is a lot of it! It’s been going on day after day for nearly twenty years...We agree it is important for us all to present a united front. But for this to happen we have to be many things but most importantly fair, well informed and consistent. If we fail the latter two tests, we will be lucky to last one round. We agree that our best strategy is to collaborate. However, as far as the draft sent to us is concerned, this will not be possible with the draft in its current form. This is not just a matter tidying up a few loose ends. If we are to be co-authors it will require extensive revision”.

It would be too time consuming to describe all the efforts de Harven has put in, behind our backs, to convince any dissident he could find that:

(a) we are wrong;

(b) he is the eminent scientist who is an accomplished retrovirologist;

(c) he was a dissident as far back as 1965. (At that time he was isolating “retrovirus-like particles” from mice with leukaemia and was claiming that they were retrovirus particles because they were found only in them, the leukaemic mice. Yet when he found the same particles in healthy and even “germ-free” mice he decided the particles in these mice were also retroviruses because they were also found in leukaemic mice. He also asserted at this time that the absence of retroviral particles in cases of human leukaemia does not mean the leukaemia is not caused by a retrovirus);

In an email de Harven wrote to Claus Jensen and Celia (c.c. Bauer, Brink, Crowe, Ely, Gesheker and Giraldo) he attached two documents: one his talk to the European Parliament, and the other entitled HIV+, HIV-? and addressed “To: All RA Board of Director Members”. In the latter he wrote: “I am writing to all of you today, to express my deeply rooted opinion according to which this divisive argument makes no sense at all. To state, “HIV exists but is a harmless passenger” is not logical, because if it is harmless it cannot be called HIV... On the opposite side of the fence, some argue, “HIV does not exist”. This does not make any sense either! Primary because, scientifically speaking, it is not possible to demonstrate that something does NOT exist. [On the one hand de Harven says the Perth Group was not the first to say that “HIV” does not exist while on the other he says it is wrong to say “HIV” does not exist]. One can state that HIV has never been observed under the electron microscope in the blood of patients having supposedly a “high viral load” (de Harven, 2000); one can also state that HIV has never been satisfactorily purified (Tahi/Montagnier, 1997); or one can stress the fact that all the electron microscope pictures of the so-called HIV originate from highly complex cell culture systems, never directly from one single AIDS patient (Gelderblom, 1997). And when we put these three facts together, it becomes difficult to avoid raising a major question: “does HIV really exist?” That critical question was formally raised during the European parliament debate on “AIDS in Africa”, held in Brussels in 2003 (de Harven, 2003)”.

Here all is revealed. It was not even Lanka who put the critical question regarding the existence of “HIV”. It was de Harven in 2003. Furthermore, it was de Harven who gave the correct answer and proved what “HIV” is. It is a Human Endogenous Retrovirus! (It does not matter that to date nobody has proven the existence of such endogenous retroviruses).

According to Janine Roberts it was Lanka who first made the claim in 1995 that “HIV does not exist”, because in Eleni’s 1988 *Medical Hypotheses* paper “There is no assertion that it does not exist at all. At that time she then left open several possibilities”.

It is true that in this paper Eleni did not state “HIV does not exist”. Neither have we made such a statement since. The reason is simple. As de Harven correctly pointed out it “does not make sense” to make such a claim because “it is not possible to demonstrate that something does NOT exist”. It is also true that in the conclusion referring to the role “HIV” plays in AIDS “she left open several possibilities”, but she ended by saying: “Be that as it may the one major significant variable is the concurrent exposure of the patients to oxidising agents including sperm, nitrites, opiates and factor VIII. If this is true the prevention, and possibly even cure, may be achieved with the use of appropriate antioxidants”.

The conclusion in the original draft started with the sentence: “The presently available data does not prove the existence of a unique retrovirus LAV/HTLV-III”. John Papadimitriou advised against it, and Eleni totally agreed with him. In fact John rewrote the whole conclusion. The main reasons were:

- (1) Many people read only the abstract and the conclusion.
- (2) Since at that time (beginning of 1986) the world and especially *Nature* was hailing Montagnier and Gallo, the paper would have had zero chance of being published.
- (3) In John’s view, the evidence should speak for itself.

Indeed, this has been our guiding light since then.

For example, in our writing we talk about oxidation and hardly ever mention mitochondrial toxicity. However, anybody who knows anything about mitochondrial function will know that oxidation will result in “mitochondrial poisoning”.

Anybody reading the 1988 *Medical Hypotheses* paper will find evidence which proves, among many other things, the following:

- (1) By HIV isolation (proof for its existence) Gallo and Montagnier meant: detection of reverse transcriptase activity; virus like particles; and antibody-antigen reactions;
- (2) RT activity is not specific for HIV or even retroviruses. “It has not been excluded that viral reverse transcriptases are cellular enzymes”;
- (3) The antibody-antigen reaction (positive antibody tests) is not specific. The antigens may be cellular proteins, and the antibodies may be nothing else but “natural” antibodies, the reaction (specificity) being determined by the redox state. “The only sensible conclusion is therefore that seropositivity does not mean virus positivity”;
- (4) The virus-like particles “may be normal organelles not HTLV-III/LAV viruses. Furthermore, particle aggregation and budding have been proposed to be determined by actin-myosin interaction. It is of interest to note that actin-myosin interaction, particle aggregation and budding can be all induced by oxidising agents”.
- (5) “It must be emphasised that unlike other viruses HTLV-III/LAV has never been isolated as an independent stable particle...Unlike the above viruses, HTLV-III/LAV has never been isolated from fresh AIDS tissues”.

When Anthony asked de Harven to apologise to Eleni, he responded: “I spent late hours, last night to, reviewing, in “Virusmyth” all the long papers by the PG. I found many papers, mostly in *Continuum*, in the 1996-1998, explaining in extreme details how difficult, close to impossible it has been to isolate and purify HIV. And I could never find, in PG’s papers, a statement to the non-existence of HIV. I found that statement in Lanka’s 1995 paper in *Continuum*. If you can give me a PG reference (1995 or earlier) that you feel I missed, sent it to me right away!”

And Celia who, despite warnings by Robert Root-Bernstein that Eleni wanted a biological revolution, had published interviews with Eleni long before de Harven or even Lanka became dissidents, had nothing to say to de Harven or the dissident community, in our defence.

RA and its second president

Celia, however, is very positive about what we must do. We “should have spoken up, disciplined Anthony Brink and defended David Crowe”. And all this without taking any notice of what has been said in the “Duesberg’s soft spot” email discussion or reading our memorandum “The Andre Parenzee Case, David Crowe and RA”. Perhaps because she does not “give a shit about him [Andre Parenzee] any more. I don’t give a shit about the tortured question of why the defence failed”. So do we have to discipline Anthony (what right do we have to do such a thing?) because he cares? Or is it because she does not like the facts he put forward or the language which Anthony has used?

Celia knows both Anthony and Peter very well. She must appreciate that both are extremely charming, intelligent, witty, fun loving and at times, very direct. What stands out about Anthony is that although he is not a scientist he has extensive scientific knowledge. Anthony is his own man and does not need to be someone’s “mouthpiece”. He has ample knowledge and the ability to speak for himself. The adjectives which Peter uses to describe the “HIV” experts are at least as colourful as those used by Anthony to describe David Crowe. Anyone studying Celia’s emails and postings at HIVAIDSPARADIGM could not fail to notice that she too can be remarkably feisty and is not averse to throwing sticks and stones at Anthony or the Perth Group.

Celia went one step further when she asked us to correct the footnotes to her *Harper’s* article. If Celia looks through her emails she will realise that it did not take the Perth Group two months to respond to her. It is true that there were many mistakes. However, they were of a basic nature, and in fact surprisingly simple, which meant there was no need for us to give Celia any evidence to support our corrections. So we responded straight away. When she sought our help she sent us only her “story”. When she asked us for a final check, in addition to the story, she sent us the “dissident science” as well (by mistake?).

Since there were still mistakes in the footnotes, Eleni rung her to hurry things up. Discussing the antibodies, Eleni mentioned the gold standard. Although Eleni did not ask her to introduce the term in her footnotes, or anywhere else, just the mention of gold standard and purification was sufficient to upset Celia so much that she hung up.

The manuscript implied it was presenting the definitive dissident science. The only reference to our work was a letter on nevirapine by Val Turner published in *Nature*. In our view the inclusion of this reference could have been interpreted that we agreed with all the science in her article, which was very far from the truth. So we asked Celia not to include this reference. We never asked Celia not to write about our work.

Despite her repeated claims to the contrary Celia did not comply. Anyone wishing confirmation of this fact is advised to read Gallo’s response to Celia’s *Harper’s* article.

We wonder who asked her to remove the Perth Group from her book “*Serious Adverse Events: The Uncensored History of AIDS*”.

Out of frustration we can say many things, and Anthony has had plenty of reason to be frustrated. The focus on AIDS is in South Africa and Anthony knows more about this and the drugs used there than anybody else. However, while all of us respect Peter, and rightly so, Rethinking AIDS does not take any notice of Anthony. As a result of his training, intellect, interest, hard work and burning desire to help his people Anthony was able, more than anybody else, to see the harm that Crowe has done to the dissident movement. Without any effort to find out the facts or even to read the summaries put in front of them in *The Perth Group Response To David Crowe Re The Parenzee Hearing* document <http://www.tig.org.za/DavidCroweApril-7-2009.pdf>, Celia and others, including the RA Board of Directors, expressed full support for Crowe’s interference in the Parenzee case.

Since we sent “The Andre Parenzee Case, David Crowe and RA” to many of you, a few more facts have come to light which further clarify what happened during this hearing.

In his response to “The Andre Parenzee Case, David Crowe and RA” Crowe wrote “I never wrote cross-examination text for him [Kevin Borick]”. Obviously he is not aware that his trusted “intermediary” and collaborator, Trudy Pfeiffer (Andre’s step-sister), sent us Gallo’s commentary (instead of submitting sworn affidavits, the “HIV” experts wrote commentaries) with Crowe’s questions for Gallo’s cross-examination inserted within. Crowe’s questions for Gallo represent the only direct evidence we have for Crowe writing questions for Kevin Borick to use in the cross-examination of the prosecution experts. However, it is obvious he was writing question for everybody, right from the very beginning. Professor David Cooper was the first prosecution expert to be cross-examined. All one has to do to know where Borick’s questions came from is to know a little about our scientific publications and read Cooper’s cross-examination. It is characterised by questions which are mostly inconsequential, irrelevant, unconnected with the agreed defence strategy and harmful, even to a “HIV exists but not cause AIDS” strategy. (In fact, the only questions which originated from us for the cross-examination of the “HIV” experts were taken from our affidavit).

Crowe wrote “Regarding Trudy, apart from chit chat, especially related to her pregnancy, we communicated mostly regarding transfers of funds. I believe I also asked her for Andre’s address in jail so I could write to him. I don’t remember ever discussing details of the trial with her, certainly not strategy or expert witnesses. In fact, I was informed that it was “the family” siding with Val and Eleni that persuaded Borick that no other experts for the defence would be called. It is true that Borick was considering some of the experts who I had identified. But clearly I had no clout with the family as they refused to accept this idea”.

As far as we (the PG) knew, the Parenzee family (Andre, his mother, and his wife) trusted us. Crowe went behind our backs all the way. He says he “talked to Borick” only twice. If he did not talk to Trudy, who acted as Borick’s assistant, how did he communicate so much, that is, the identity, CVs and commentaries of the other experts to Borick? How did he advise the defence on strategy? How was he able to “provide information” to Borick? Who were the people involved in this case apart

from Borick, Trudy and us to whom he was talking? Is he protecting Trudy or himself? Does Trudy know things about Crowe that we don't, and that he does not want anybody else to know?

After Judge Sulan found against us we bombarded Borick with telephone calls trying to convince him that despite:

- (a) his superficial cross-examination of the "HIV" experts;
- (b) his failure to use the many questions we provided for cross-examination purposes based on the prosecution experts' pre-hearing, written reports;

nonetheless, by using our affidavit for questioning, the prosecution experts themselves had provided him with ample information to support the "fresh evidence" for a retrial he had introduced on the very first day of the hearing and which he could use for an appeal to the Board of Criminal Appeal. Namely:

- (1) "Firstly that viruses are proven to exist by a procedure virologists refer to as virus isolation. The presently available evidence does not prove a virus known as HIV has been isolated", that is, purified.

During the hearing the prosecution experts admitted that to prove the existence of a retrovirus the particles must be purified. The Australian retrovirologist and Montagnier collaborator, Professor Dominic Dwyer, stated:

"The general principles of what that textbook [1] says are quite true. The purification, as far as one can go, is important in analysis of any virus, or bacteria for that matter as well." (T1199) And: "Well, in the diagnostic sort of situation what that really is looking for is looking for presence of those conserved bits of genetic material that you know to be the pathogen, be it HIV or flu or whatever, you then use that technology to see whether those sequences or those bits are present in something else, in another clinical sample, for example. And that really now has become, you know, the main method of diagnosis of many, many pathogens in a laboratory now...I mean with genetic testing – I guess the upside of course is you can do it on everybody, it's pretty cheap, it's extremely reliable and robust, the downside is that you have to know the genetic structure to begin with, you have to have the genetic sequence of what you are after. So when a new virus emerges, like SARS, you can't necessarily use, reliably, nucleic acid testing until you get the sequence of that new virus for the first time. So then in fact you are in a first identifier, you are required to use these more traditional methods of virus culture and microscopy and so on", that is, purification. (T963).

In his evidence Robert Gallo stated: "You have to purify". (T1257).

The prosecution expert witnesses also testified that purification is necessary to prove the existence of a unique molecular entity. Professor David Cooper: "Once the virus is purified, it's then genetically sequenced..." (T673)

Yet no prosecution expert could come up with evidence for purification. And all admitted the "HIV" genome varies by up to 35%. Although she admitted she is not an electron microscopist and knows very little about "HIV" particles, for some unknown reason(s) Professor Elizabeth Dax was chosen to give evidence on the

particles. She showed some EMs which she said were taken from some website (but she did not know which one), which did not even include magnification bars! The most incredible thing about her evidence was that she talked at length about the “green dots” inside the cell being “HIV” particles. In other words the prosecution expert for “HIV” particles did not know that retroviruses (apart from type A-particles) are assembled at the cellular membrane, and thus it is not possible to find them inside the cells. Furthermore, Gallo admitted that one can find particles with the morphology of retroviruses, containing reverse transcriptase, and yet are not retroviruses;

(2) “that the tests used to in effect diagnose HIV do not do that”.

No expert could provide any evidence the antibody tests are specific for a retroviral, “HIV”, infection. Suffice it to say here that all the “HIV” experts questioned about the antibodies expressed the view that such questions should be addressed to Professor Elizabeth Dax as the internationally renowned expert on antibody testing. Yet, she did not know what a gold standard was and that without a gold standard it is not possible to prove the specificity of the antibody tests. She also gave incorrect definitions of positive and negative predictive value. These parameters are defined as the ability of a test to correctly identify the presence or absence of infection. Dax defined them as the ability to detect the presence or absence of antibodies using a test kit.

(3) “no evidence for sexual transmission of HIV can be found even in the best conducted studies published from the United Kingdom, Europe, United States of America and Africa”.

Here it suffices to say that the prosecution expert on “HIV” transmission agreed with our interpretation of the Padian and the Rakai studies, that is, there is no evidence for heterosexual transmission. They skilfully avoided discussing our evidence from the numerous prospective studies in gay men. The expert could not, and still cannot, cite even one prospective study for sexual transmission of “HIV”.

Imagine our reaction when one day, out of the blue, we read in the Australian press that in the appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal, the Parenzee defence admitted the two witnesses they used in the hearing before Judge Sulan “were not experts”. These two witnesses “take a very fixed stance: it is the virus has never been isolated and never been proven to exist”, which, implicitly, is wrong. (Note the new evidence (reason) on the basis of which the defence asked for a retrial was: “firstly, that viruses are proven to exhibit [exist] by a procedure virology refers to as virus isolation. The presently available evidence does not prove a virus known as HIV has been isolated”).

The defence also accepted that their two witnesses lacked objectivity: “And the Perth Group gave a lot of evidence about that. It took up quite a lot of time. Their evidence has been rejected because in part, they lacked objectivity because they didn’t explain to the court Padian’s explanations.” In fact we analysed Padian’s scientific data in detail and the “HIV” experts agreed with our analysis and conclusions. Responding to a question by Judge Sulan, John Kaldor, the Australian epidemiologist on “HIV” transmission, said: “I haven’t replicated all the calculations but it comes from a reputable source, and you could debate some of the assumptions and come up with

somewhat variable numbers, but the general practice is fairly reasonable.” (We made no “assumptions”. All our analysis was based on Padian’s own data).

We explained to the court that:

(1) Padian’s “explanations” were posted on a website AIDSTruth.org. Why should these explanations be admissible as evidence while the prosecution insisted our scientific publications are hearsay?;

(2) we are interested in scientific data not “explanations” or interpretations, no matter where or by whom they are presented;

Although we repeatedly drew Borick’s attention to this, incredibly he never objected, and Padian’s AIDSTruth comments became Padian’s main evidence for sexual transmission.

We were never sent the written submission to the Court of Criminal Appeal. However, reading Borick’s outline to the Court we were more sorry than angry with him. How was it possible for such an “an experienced, no-nonsense defence lawyer”, as Crowe calls him, to make such a submission which would obviously fail? What made him do it? Who made him? We came across the answer in an email exchange between Andrew Maniotis and David Crowe.

“David,

Find my CV attached.

I would be willing to be interviewed remotely, or, if necessary, would love to go to Adelaide on my own dime. Give me time to make arrangements, and it would help to know when this might happen.

If you look at my CV, you will notice I have updated it with info regarding test-kit patents I have procured in recent years. I feel most comfortable discussing testing, as I have been through the process several times for my own test kits, including the recently published most sensitive RILA assay (Rapid Infectivity and Lysis Assay) that I sent to Gallo recently, with of course no response. It is viral lytic and chromatin assay.

Anyway, any way I can help, David.

Cheers,

Andy.

Andy;

Thanks, this is great. **I’m currently helping Kevin write some of his arguments for the appeal request.** Hopefully there are no problems with permission to appeal. I believe he’s requesting that the judges authorise a commission which would then pay for our side to send witnesses etc. Feel like a free trip to Australia.

I will forward this bio to Kevin and keep it on file for future reference.

Thanks and have a great weekend.

David” (emphasis ours).

At the time of Eleni’s second day of cross-examination, two journalists, including a reporter for Australia’s national daily newspaper, *The Australian*, told Eleni she had “scared” the prosecution. That may or not be true but judging from a posting by Michael Geiger it appears we did scare some dissidents: “This was not just Crowe, it was many of us who even interacted with Crowe, in a flurry of nonstop desperate emails and messages all marked as being of dire importance to convey to the court... There were 100 times more strategies and comments then were being fed to Borick that were being thrown at David and discussed all over the net, including at Harvey’s site and Liversidges site, with David being urged by dozens to get their own words to Borick. If any of those 100s of desperate words and strategies ever got to Borick, I have no clue”.

Why this wilful rush to interfere in the Parenzee case behind our backs?

Since we put “HIV” on trial, obviously Harvey and Liversidge, “the Guardian of Science” or whatever he calls himself, did not rush to help us. In fact Liversidge celebrated Sulan’s decision and claimed that “HIV” was found to exist even legally. (Interestingly, the only website Crowe could find to post his comments on Sulan’s finding was Liversidge’s).

(1) Anybody who is aware that:

- (a) Borick let us, and everybody else involved in the hearing, know he would introduce, at Crowe’s advice, Peter as his star witness. Yet in all our debates with Crowe regarding his interference in the case, he never mentioned Peter. To the contrary, he did his best to avoid mentioning Peter and talked non-stop about his witness with great “status”, de Harven. This means that he was fully aware that by recommending Peter as his expert witness, especially after our evidence-in-chief and cross-examination, he could do nothing but harm the case;
- (b) Crowe interfered only when he realised the hearing was going well;
- (c) Crowe interfered behind our backs;

will have no choice but to conclude whatever reasons he had for interfering, helping the Perth Group, the dissident movement, Borick, the Parenzee family or even his trusted “intermediary” Trudy, was not one of them.

The Directors of the RA Board are backing Crowe in his interference in the Parenzee case. The question is, are they protecting him or are they protecting themselves? Does Crowe know something which we do not, and RA does not want anybody else to know?

Why did so many dissidents and especially RA go against us, the dissident movement, Borick and the Parenzee family? We do not know. So far, only Andrew Maniotis has

had the courage to state his reason. “But I felt sure that if anyone could make the case for Parenzee and our cause under the difficult circumstances of a case of “criminal transmission”, it would be Eleni and Val. On the other hand, I also was aware that if they won a criminalisation case, it would have been a coup against all of the AIDS shills and promoters. To be honest, I didn’t think they would LOSE, and was jealous of the extreme nature of the case, and that they were to be the ones that finally ended “HIV”!”

There is no doubt that the Parenzee case has done us a lot of harm, both personally and professionally, and has been marked by much disunity. Ironically at the hands of many who espouse the exact opposite. Now Celia suggests making it official but, being the eternal pacifist, suggests how it can be done peacefully. The Directors of the RA Board and others should get rid of us: “divorce!” And she is seconded by members of the RA Board of Directors.

Over many years the Perth Group has made every effort to sort out scientific differences between ourselves and other dissidents. We have made many attempts to engender debate with a view to ultimately presenting a united front. And thereby to win. However, since others think the movement will be better off without us – a divorce – then so be it. Let us divorce and go our separate ways.

ENDNOTES

1. During our cross-examination, the prosecution claimed that to prove the existence of a new virus purification is not necessary and submitted a copy of the first chapter of a textbook called *Medical Virology* written by David O White and Frank Fenner to support their claim. This backfired. It appears the prosecution experts either did not read the book or did not understand what the authors of the book were saying. According to the authors, the only way to analyse the proteins and the RNA of a new retrovirus and thus to prove its existence, is to purify the viral particles. They wrote:

“CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF VIRUSES

Methods of Purification

An essential prerequisite for the chemical analysis of viruses has been the development of adequate methods of purification. Special problems are created by the close association of viruses with the cells they parasitize; it is not an easy matter to free virions of associated cell debris, or even from viral proteins synthesized in excess in the infected cell...

Physical Methods of Purification. After partial purification and concentration by chemical methods, or even without any preliminary treatment, virus particles can be separated from soluble contaminants by centrifugation...Equilibrium (isopycnic) [density] gradient centrifugation in dense solutes such as caesium chloride or potassium tartrate (or sucrose in the case of enveloped viruses of low density), on the other hand, separates virions from contaminants according to their buoyant density. After prolonged ultracentrifugation at very high gravitational forces the virions will come to rest in a sharp band in that part of the tube where the solution has the same density as the virions, usually within the range 1.15 – 1.4”.

When we pointed out that the authors of the book support our claim, the prosecution submitted a paper entitled “Sequence-Based Identification of Microbial Pathogens: a

Reconsideration of Koch's Postulates" as evidence that purification is not necessary, a virus can be proven to exist by genetic methods. Again, we pointed out in court, that according to the authors of this particular article: "...with only amplified sequence available, the biological role or even **existence** of these inferred micro-organisms remains unclear"¹¹ (emphasis ours). Ultimately, the prosecution "HIV" expert witnesses admitted that to identify the viral genome, RNA, (this is also the case for the viral proteins), the virus must be purified.

See <http://www.theperthgroup.com/LATEST/PGRevisitHIVExistence.pdf>

2. "AIDS Proposal

In 1991, we, the Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of the HIV/AIDS Hypothesis, became dissatisfied with the state of the evidence that the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) did, in fact, cause AIDS. Specifically, we have proposed that researchers independent of the HIV establishment should audit the Centers for Disease Control's records of AIDS cases, bearing in mind that the correlation of HIV with AIDS, upon which the case for HIV causation rests, is itself an artifact of the definition of AIDS. Since 1985, exactly the same diseases or conditions have been defined as "AIDS" when antibodies are present or presumed to be present, and as "non-AIDS" when HIV and antibodies are absent. Independent professional groups such as the Society of Actuaries should be invited to nominate members for an independent commission to investigate the following question: How frequently do AIDS-defining diseases (or low T cell counts) occur in the absence of HIV? Until we have a definition of AIDS that is independent of HIV, the supposed correlation of HIV and AIDS is a mere tautology. Other independent researchers should examine the validity of the so-called "AIDS tests," especially when these tests are used in Africa and Southern Asia, to see if they reliably record the presence of antibodies, let alone live and replicating virus. The bottom line is this: the skeptics are eager to see the results of independent scientific testing. Those who uphold the HIV "party line" have so far refused. We object.

Eleen Baumann Tom Bethell Harvey Bialy Peter H. Duesberg Celia Farber
Charles L. Geshekter Phillip E. Johnson Robert W. Maver Russell Schoch Gordon
T. Stewart Richard C. Strohman Charles A. Thomas Jr. For the Group for the
Scientific Reappraisal of the HIV/AIDS Hypothesis".