

## **The Tony Fauci Hour: A Daily Internet Program that Educates & Entertains**

**This week : A Conversation between Harvey Bialy (aka/eccles the idiot) Anthony Fauci (aka daf9/Dale) and a few other real or imaginary cyber personalities, held at Dean's World between 17 – 20 October 2005**

Harvey Bialy :: (addressing in midstream what he and Dean have perceived to be multiple writing and thinking styles on the part of "daf9/Dale, a staunch supporter of orthodox HIV/AIDS wisdom, who often appears to them to abruptly switch from a pure rhetorical debater (and not a particularly skilled one) to a very slick sounding, medically qualified Englishman encountered in previous DW HIV/AIDS discussions and named Nicholas Bennett, who was banned some months ago by Dean from participating in discussions on his weblog because Dean found him out to be a blatant and malicious liar.

This discussion began many posts, and days, previous to where this radio play does ostensibly as a discussion concerning the release of an educational CD described here (<http://deanesmay.com/posts/1128845313.shtml>). Until the entry of daf9, it was a simple collection of *Thanks* from various people. However, here is how Anthony Fauci decided the news of the CD's release should be greeted. I quote the first post he directed daf9 to make:

daf9 (www):

Dean,

Both you and Harvey have at various times stated that ANYONE reading Dr. Duesberg's papers and the literature he cites can see clearly for themselves that accusing him of ignoring or citing literature in a deliberately misleading way is a scurrilous (your word) accusation. But as soon as I post what I see are three examples of Duesberg doing just that, all of a sudden it becomes about me and my credentials and/or lack of them. Harvey accuses me of having multiple personalities, all of them idiotic and all of a sudden it is no longer ANYONE who can read Dr. Duesberg's papers but only those with a CV they are willing to post on the net.

I wouldn't bother with this if I didn't find it slightly offensive every

time you state that doctors and scientists and the vast majority of the public believe in HIV/AIDS for no better reason than they are "told" to. I personally have spent a lot of time reading the literature critically and coming to my own conclusions.

As I asked Harvey in another thread, if my criticisms are so laughably ignorant, then why don't you or Harvey just point out the flaws in my reasoning?

Dale

10.13.2005 8:49am

### The show begins:

([www](#)):

Gertrude Stein wrote a play called *Four Saints in Three Acts* in which the line *How many acts are there in it?* is repeated almost as many times as the bald-faced lie that Duesberg has 'been amply refuted by the 'scientific community', or 'the evidence that hiv causes aids is overwhelming'.

After reading the most recent comments, i am tempted to ask the question, "How many dafs are there in it?" because we now have another voice heard from, and this one quotes his cousin "daf9/Dale/Dale" from the other thread - only incompletely.

That one wrote:

*I have no doubt he's a lot smarter and certainly a lot more scientifically productive than I've been or ever will be. He has made seminal contributions to retrovirology, he asked a lot of very relevant questions about HIV and AIDS back in the 80s, he deserves to be a National Academy member and he's doing some very interesting work right now with aneuploidy and cancer. But that doesn't change the fact that I think his 2003 J. Biosci. paper includes a lot of sloppy scientific reasoning.*

*Dale*

*Dale*

Now me, i generally withhold such off the cuff remarks about members of the national academy (except Bob Gallo and maybe Pope David in more recent years), lest i be taken for an arrogant moron, but the new "daf9/Dale" above appears to have not even the faux-grace of his alphabetically related, relation. This one admits flat out he is ignorant of the history and then goes and says, no matter, I think Duesberg can't reason ..Ta. Ta. No matter that the editorial board and reviewers of the *J. Biosci.* didn't think so, and no matter

that I wrote in the post that began this thread:

*Of all the accusations that have been leveled against my friend, Peter Duesberg, over the many years he has been challenging conventional wisdom in cancer genetics and 'deadly'- disease etiology, the one that is most frequently heard in scientific circles, and one that is impossible to counter except by extended debate, either at a scientific forum or in the journals (something that for some reason has never occurred) is that "Peter abuses the literature"*

Duh...does this not IMPLY that MOST scientists i have talked to about this in 20+ years (which i think probably number close to 500) have not too many problems with the reasoning. In fact the reasoning is SO good, they must challenge his citations -- the very reason for the CD project.

No matter, all that because **this** faceless entity with no CV "thinks" something is so. Case closed.

But then again 'daf9/Dale' both does/doesn't claim to be a scientist of some kind, although not an hiv/virological type one. (At least i don't think so. There are so many dafs i am becoming daffy.)

"How many dafs are there in it?"

Scene iii, act ix

Another one enters stage left ...he insists that he needs **no** authority for his statements other than their own brilliant, self-consistent logic (that idiot me can never quite follow to their various conclusions) and doesn't expect **anyone** to take him seriously only go and read the literature and decide for themselves.

AND he **cannot** be the one who makes overblown claims of sufficient personal authority to read the papers of someone who is his scientific better by a Google or more and dismiss them in a hand wave, who writes above.

They are all related, clearly, because not one of them has the *cojones* to stand up and identify himself, and of course i still am crazy to know which one wrote that he had no desire to publish anything related to hiv?

So, how many dafs are there in it?

Aunt Gertrude also wrote, even more famously, another line that applies perfectly to this 'collective'. She was writing about

Oakland...."There's no there there."

P.S. I'm very comfortably retired, and spend my days doing pretty much exactly what I want. What do you do Dale?

10.17.2005 10:35am

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

P.P.S.

please do not write that Duesberg's (or my) reasoning is like "a rose is a rose is a rose."

That would be too pathetic a repost, even from "you", and i have no desire to be simply sadistic in my comments to "you" here. Others who are actually reading them will have noted that they ALL relate to the MATTER AT HAND on the CD.

10.17.2005 11:16am

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

P.P.P.S.

In fact, it is the HIV=AIDS equation that is a perfect example of auntie G's immortal line.

10.17.2005 11:19am

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

waiting for the coffee to brew and Carlos to arrive for our carambola tres bandes monday morning match, i think to write more of dafs lines for him:

daf9/dale: But I have given at least 3 reasons why I think Duesberg's logic is faulty, and you, Harvey (whoever *you* are!) have consistently dodged and played fancy footwork and avoided answering any of them. Put up or shut up. So there! And besides I will not post my CV because of what happened to my good friend and alter ego Nick Bennett when he had the temerity to do so in your not so famous

**Free Book.**

(<http://www.deanesmay.com/files/ThinkingTheUnthinkable.pdf>)

bialy: i wrote a book that took me 4 years to complete that answers every single one of your 'logical arguments' in sufficient detail that the scientific illuminati, including Sir. Henry Harris (who wrote me that he read it in one sitting, as did Charles Cantor) have no problems understanding.

Am i an absolutely shameless promoter of my work? rhetorical pregunta, but why not, neither *nature* nor *Science* will do me the

favor of trashing it in very public so that it can sell 50,000 copies and the [Virtual Library of Biotechnology for the Americas](http://www.ibt.unam.mx/virtual.cgi) (<http://www.ibt.unam.mx/virtual.cgi>) that gets all the profits of my book and the CD will be able to multiply its free distribution of scientific literature online to 20,000 instead of 4000 scientists in Latin America and the Caribbean who have very limited access to the scientific literature on which their work so vitally depends.

10.17.2005 12:12pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Harvey,

I dismiss nothing without an explanation. Anyone following this discussion will see that you are the one dismissing arguments with handwaves and calling on authority to bolster statements that anyone who reads the J.Biosci. article critically can see are flawed.

I'm not saying that Duesberg's ability to reason is flawed but that the reasoning presented in that article is flawed.

Gallo may be an a-hole and Duesberg may be a saint wrongly persecuted. Having never met either of them, I couldn't judge. In any case, personalities don't make scientific data true or false. I note however that if Gallo is indeed an a-hole, I would think that would make the scientific community all the more eager to prove him wrong. Yet 20 years later, the majority of scientists appear to have bought the causal relationship between HIV and AIDS.

If Duesberg's arguments themselves are so straightforwardly impeccable, they should be obvious to any moderately intelligent person. If the arguments are sufficiently sophisticated that they require an extensive background education in virology and medical science to understand, then it's disingenous to present them to a lay audience who lack that background as if they are obvious.

In fact, you want to dismiss any audience who isn't willing to uncritically accept Duesberg's conclusions because you say they should.

Elizabeth writes stuff and nonsense because she isn't a scientist and I write stuff and nonsense because I claim to be a scientist but refuse to provide a CV. Jeremy writes stuff and nonsense because he's just starting out as a scientist. Caltechgirl and Nick Bennett wrote stuff and nonsense for reasons I've forgotten now.

So I have to wonder as Elizabeth does, if the quality of the arguments boils down to credentials, what makes Duesberg's, or yours for that

matter, so much better than those of the vast majority of the scientific community?

Dale

10.17.2005 12:12pm

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

Not too shabby, even i do say so myself.

10.17.2005 12:33pm

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

EXCEPT of course **i** never would or did call Gallo an "a-hole". All i ever wrote about him was that he as only slightly smarter than daf9/Dale. i wonder how Bob will react when he discovers how you are possibly inclined to regard him? Got a promotion coming up somewhere? i would be nervous.

10.17.2005 12:45pm

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

O...and i certainly have **never** written **anywhere** that Peter is a saint, only that he is one of the smartest scientists on the planet, and my good freind.

10.17.2005 12:50pm

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

O...and i certainly have **never** written **anywhere** that Peter is a saint, only that he is one of the smartest scientists on the planet, and my good friend.

10.17.2005 12:50pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Harvey,

So now what you appear to be saying is that the arguments supporting any one of the three statements of Duesberg's that I questioned or the fourth statement that you raised as an example; well those arguments are so complex they can't be articulated in a simple sentence or two but require the reading of a book of over 270 pages. A book whose title and description, by the way, would suggest that the focus the book isn't HIV and AIDS at all.

All I can say is that is a mighty convenient argument for you.

Dale

10.17.2005 12:52pm

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

more real time cyber drama..Carlos is here

i can't wait to see what daf9/dale has written in the two hours it will take to play our best 2 out of 3 to 20 match

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

O dear, i had the affrontery to suggest you read a book to educate yourself about a subject that you know almost nothing about, and have no problems in demonstrating that (as well as a few other personality traits) to all the cyberworlds.

OMG! Now i know who you are!You are really the president of the United States.

But don't you have better things to do than play around on this weblog with someone who so obviously has as little respect for you as the president of my 'real' country of the corazon? (I mean of course the great Thabo Mbeki.)

[Here is a picture of me \(disguised\) &Carlos in the most wonderful salon de carambola in all of Cuernavaca \(and environs.\)](#)  
(<http://bialystocker.net/files/Me, Atilla & Carlos.jpg>)

[And here are some disguised pictures of the mesa itself.](#)  
(<http://bialystocker.net/posts/1116286171.shtml>)

10.17.2005 4:40pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Harvey,

If you last comment was addressed to me, I am willing to read all sorts of things to educate myself. If they are relevant. If you are saying that your book is better able to explain how the scientific data supports Duesberg's hypothesis than is articulated by Duesberg in his scientific writing ... if that's what you're saying then I would indeed be interested in reading your book. But I would like some evidence that is the case before I shell out the \$13.97 +S/H that amazon.com will charge me.

Dale

10.17.2005 5:42pm

daf9 ([www](#)):

Harvey,

As well you know, nothing in science is ever proved beyond any doubt. But in 1992 HIV causes AIDS was the hypothesis best

supported by the available data. Still is.

Dale

10.17.2005 9:01pm

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

*As well you know, nothing in science is ever proved beyond any doubt. really?*

*But in 1992 HIV causes AIDS was the hypothesis best supported by the available data. Still is how would "you" know?*

but ok, i ammend my sentence:

the contents of the cd demolish what was the hypohteis CLAIMED to be best supported by the data.

and once more correction daf...**in 1992 the nih/cdc and all the world health organizations and major medical and scientific journals declared that the evidence in favor of the hiv/aids hypothesis was so overwhelming that no more questions need be asked.**

aren't facts uncomfortable things to deal with daffy?

10.17.2005 9:20pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Harvey,

So I did a PubMed search of HIV and AIDS. 1992 and before - ~40,000 articles. 1993 to the present ~ 55000 articles. So I am compelled to ask ... if all the world health organizations and major medical and scientific journals declared the evidence was so overwhelming in 1992 that no more questions need be asked ... if that was rEALLY the case, then why did eveyone keep asking questions?

Dale

10.17.2005 9:47pm

([link](#))

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

just saw daffy's great question...z. is going to kill me, but this is quick

daffy: these papers do not ask questions that addresss the validity of the hypothesis, they are all bells and whistles by the scientists etc who are making their livings from it.

the sheer number of papers on hiv and aids should tell you

something!

check the number against cancer!

howq many dead from each yearly int he us?

damn it man...read my book...you know so little it is really impossible to write anything to you

10.17.2005 9:52pm

Harvey Bialy ([www](#)):

my last post in this discussion...i know many of you are overjoyed.

i stop now because of the following reasons, in no particular order

1. z. says i am spending too much time at the computer typing instead of making beautiful images

2. the sole thing i wished to accomplish, namely the launch of what i call the wmd cd of truth has been accomplished now for several days. DW is **not** the only or even the major way the CD has been launched. o no. emails containing the text and hyperlinks of my original brief essay entitled "tools for finding the truth about hiv andf aids" have begun circulating to the entire 35,000 membership of the faseb, and a number of other lists of important scientific societies and journals, as well as the private lists of more than 100 well respected biologists around the world. this cd is not a blog event, although dw is the place and the medium that made it possible, especially in its torrential form.

3. all my pedagogical tricks have been exhausted for the moment, and insulting daf9/Dale is no longer even slightly enjoyable

4. jonny and celia have taken these discussions to an entirely new and really high level that do not need to be interrupted by me at all

5. elizabeth will still review my book, and i can look forward (as can you) to another weblog first (and reasonably soon i hope). maybe even jonny will join in with a review of his own..but the offer does not depend on that. (jonny...you wrote some really stunning prose above...only one little thing with which i would take any issue at all...you wrote "also drove them to the pharmacist to procure more AZT even though its *side effects* were practically unbearable." those are not side effects, those are THE effects.)

so i wish everyone who uses the cd profitable use, and thank dean as always for his more than gracious hosting of me, and bid this thread a fond and final adios.

10.17.2005 11:13pm

daf9 ([www](#)):

Celia writes : IN CONCLUSION (CAPS MINE), ALTHOUGH THE MORTALITY RATE DUE TO MANY HIV OR AIDS RELATED CONDITIONS HAS DECLINED, THE MORTALITY RATE DUE TO NON-AIDS DEFINING MALIGNANCIES (ED NOTE: **AND THESE ARE CAUSED BY DRUGS,**)CHRONIC DISEASES, AND COMPLICATIONS OF INJECTION DRUG USE HAS REMAINED STABLE, ALTHOUGH THESE CAUSES NOW MAKE UP A HIGHER PROPORTION OF OVERALL DEATHS AMONG PERSONS WITH AIDS. THE SMALL BUT INCREASING TREND FOR DEATHS DUE TO PANCREATITIS SUGGEST THAT ADVERSE EFFECTS FROM HAART MAY BE CONTRIBUTING TO INCREASED MORTALITY."

Where is the evidence that non-AIDS defining malignancies are caused by drugs rather than by HIV infection?

Dale

10.18.2005 12:49pm

([link](#))

Celia Farber:

I just answered that, Dale, but the gremlins erased it. I'll start over, but let me ask you: How can a "non-AIDS defining" malignancy be caused by HIV infection?

I was referring to the vast increases in lymphomas attributed to some of the ARVs, but indeed, cancers are hard to prove, causally, so better to stick to those deaths that the AIDS literature itself attributes to HAART, when discussing this, and those are mainly: heart attacks, strokes, and liver failure.

Shall I reference that? I am terrified of taking up too much space now with what could easily become a torrent of references about each sentence. HAART drugs have evidently "saved" (extended) as well as ended lives, abruptly. At least that is how it looks to me.

My beef with HAART was focused on the Hit Hard Hit Early regimens of the early Ho-dominated years, late 1990s.

As for Jonny's point about how pathogenesis plays into HAART, I will return to that. Got some work to finish first.

10.18.2005 1:06pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Celia writes: How can a "non-AIDS defining" malignancy be caused by HIV infection?

Two reasons

1. Because when you keep people with certain types of chronic illnesses alive longer (as HAART does for at least some HIV/AIDS

patients), sometimes you start to see the emergence of late symptoms of the illness. Polio is a prime example. Patients who developed polio associated paralysis died before the invention of the iron lung. But years after apparently recovering from polio many of the ones who were saved by the iron lung developed symptoms directly related to their original polio infection. The iron lung didn't cause those symptoms it just kept patients alive long enough for those symptoms to manifest themselves. The same is likely true for some of the symptoms appearing in patients on HAART because it can be difficult in many cases to separate out late symptoms from drug effects. For HAART the best evidence that some of the symptoms are drug related is the observation that certain drug combinations are more likely to result in certain symptoms. But for the increases that occur with all drug combinations, some of those are probably related to the virus and not the drug.

2. The other thing you have to keep in mind is that some increases like in lymphomas are not necessarily absolute increases but relative increases. Far fewer AIDS patients are developing PCP or KS because the treatments for preventing those problems have gotten pretty good. So other AIDS related problems like certain classes of lymphoma become proportionally a bigger problem, not because HAART causes them but because HAART and other medications don't prevent them. Look at mortality rates for women over the last century. Among the leading causes of death at the turn of the 20th century were infections and childbirth. Heart disease and cancer were relatively minor. Big reductions in infections and death in childbirth made heart disease and cancer relatively a lot more important.

Dale

10.18.2005 1:36pm

([link](#))

jonny ([mail](#)):

"Far fewer AIDS patients are developing PCP or KS because the treatments for preventing those problems have gotten pretty good."

Dale, do you have a citation for this point? What are doctors doing now to prevent KS? Prescribing HAART? I don't think so; my understanding is that KS cases began to decline before the introduction of HAART therapy. And, as I'm sure you're aware, scientists now attribute KS to a separate virus that, to my knowledge, is not linked to immunosuppression. Are you claiming, then, that HIV causes AIDS in the same way that, for example, Herpes Zoster causes shingles? I don't think there's evidence for that. And, to repeat myself, don't respond by saying that HIV destroys the immune system, thereby rendering the patient susceptible to KS, because I don't think there's evidence for that claim either. That said, if you have such evidence, I'd love to see it.

Also, where's the evidence for your other claim that HIV in its late stages--late stages we've never seen before, you argue, because in the past people died earlier of pcp, cmv and so forth--causes liver problems, heart disease and so forth? You sure do seem to attribute a high degree of versatility to HIV. Is there anything it can't do?

10.18.2005 2:08pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

jonny,

If you look at Celia Farber's citation to the San Francisco study you will see what I mean. To summarize briefly with data taken from Table 1. These authors reviewed mortality records in San Francisco for the years 1994 (pre HAART) through 1998 (HAART) and divided the deaths of HIV positive individuals into diseases considered AIDS defining and those not considered AIDS defining. To try to avoid biasing their results they didn't just look at what the cause of death on the death certificate said but what other conditions the dead person had been diagnosed with.

In 1994 there were a total of 1573 deaths among HIV+ individuals of which all but 356 occurred in individuals with AIDS defining symptoms. 67 of those non AIDS defining deaths occurred in HIV positive individuals with chronic liver disease. That makes liver disease  $67/1573 = 4\%$  of all deaths for that year and non AIDS defining conditions  $=356/1573 = 22\%$  of all deaths.

In 1998 only 448 deaths occurred in HIV positive individuals of which 256 were in patients with non AIDS defining conditions. So non AIDS defining conditions have gone from being 22% of all deaths in HIV positive individuals to being  $256/448 = 57\%$  of all deaths and chronic liver disease from 4% to  $58/448 = 13\%$  of all deaths. Not because more people are dying with non AIDS defining conditions such as liver disease (if you look at the absolute numbers you'll see in both years deaths from liver disease were about the same 67 and 58) but because in 1998 a lot fewer people were dying with the AIDS defining conditions. To see whether HAART is causing specific increases in some non AIDS diseases, it would be necessary to do this study for a much longer period of time.

As far as KS and PCP, no HIV doesn't directly cause either of them but both are caused indirectly by HIV because HIV makes people more prone to infection by other viruses. An analogy - if I'm on crutches and fall and break my neck what is my cause of death? The broken neck. But being on crutches likely increased my chances of falling.

Some of the viruses that HIV appears to make people more prone to

becoming infected with are hepatitis viruses that on their own over many years cause liver disease. So the longer individuals coinfectd with HIV and a hepatitis virus live, the more likely they are to develop liver disease regardless of medications they are taking for the HIV.

Dale

10.18.2005 3:33pm

([link](#))

Celia Farber:

Holy cow.

10.18.2005 4:27pm

([link](#))

Celia Farber:

Where to begin?

One becomes so exhausted.

HIV is now inspiring hepatitis viruses to become more malevolent? As Jonny said, is there anything it can't do? Can it promote US interests in the Middle East?

I can't really tell what daf9's point is. Are we arguing about whether HAART has killed people? Accidentally? inadvertantly? at all?

That last post about HAART and causes of death went over my eyes like a shaken snowglobe but let me comb back over and see if I can figure out what you're saying, and what I'm saying, and what the remaining differences of opinion or interpretation are. We could also just save a lot of time and read quotes documented here and elsewhere, by myself and many others, of professionals who work with AIDS and HAART drugs. They have been abundantly clear that they have witnessed many sudden deaths as well as what was once called the Lazarus effect.

I will return and post the articles I cited and everybody can see for themselves what the mainstream literature says about HAART at this point. Is this what people want to talk about?

10.18.2005 5:01pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Celia,

You raised the issue of HAART and whether or not it was killing people and how HIV could cause a "non AIDS related malignancy". So I attempted to answer your question and jonny's subsequent question.

As far as HIV and hepatitis virus, yeah, HIV coinfection does seem to make the progression of hepatitis faster and less easy to treat. I don't know if all the reasons for that are known but there are certainly things known about viral diseases in general that could be at least part of an explanation. The progression of any viral disease is determined by the interaction of the virus and the infected individual because the immune system responds when a virus invades a human being. Long term HIV infection screws up the immune system - single disease. The symptoms of that disease can be many because a screwed up immune system makes a person more susceptible to all sorts of things.

As far as the last post about HAART and causes of death. You were the one who cited the San Francisco study. I assumed that meant that you read it and thought about what the numbers in it meant. Just because people die while taking a drug doesn't mean the drug killed them.

Dale

10.18.2005 5:17pm

([link](#))

jonny ([mail](#)):

Dale--

It seems to me that you're advancing a radically orthodox position to which not even Duesberg's mainstream critics would subscribe. Instead of arguing that HAART therapies prevent/treat pcp, cmv and so on, but have the unfortunate effects of causing liver problems and heart disease, you suggest that HIV causes all of these things, even though--as Celia and others have documented exhaustively in their reporting-- HIV's strongest defenders, including Ho, now admit that hit early and hit hard is an unwise approach precisely because of HAART toxicity. One needn't be an AIDS dissident to concede this point. Do you have a citation for your earlier contention that the only reason we're seeing a spike in liver and heart disease among HIV patients is because these patients now survive long enough to experience more long-term effects--as opposed to the 10-year short-term effects of pcp, cmv and ks--than their HIV forbears did?

I suspect not, because this makes little sense. Dale, think about it. Why would HIV cause liver disease and not pcp in the presence of HAART if the medicine is keeping the viral count down and the CD4 count high? Are you suggesting that HAART disables only that part of HIV that causes KS and pcp, but not the part (assuming it's this complex virus you say it is) that causes liver and heart disease? Do we need more meds? Remember, you said that HIV causes immunological collapse, which makes the patient more vulnerable to range of diseases including pcp and liver disease. But Dale, the

reasoning behind "drug vacations" is precisely that even when a patient is immunologically solid--when viral levels are undetectable and CD4 counts are through the roof--he nevertheless faces the threat of drug toxicity: liver problems, heart disease, high cholesterol and fat redistribution.

Now, bear in mind, I'm not suggesting that HAART hasn't been helpful--or that it's worse than HIV unchecked. I've never maintained that position. But you appear to be taking orthodoxy to a new level, and I'm not certain why.

As for KS, your argument once again doesn't hold up, because in the early years of the epidemic it was noticed that individuals suffering from KS appeared to live longer--leading the writers of *The Joy of Gay Sex* to impute supernatural powers to this clever cancer--than individuals without it. Eventually it was realized that KS is probably attributable to a virus unrelated to HIV. Now of course you'll respond that it's a virus that capitalizes upon a weakened immune system; but that's precisely my point. The reason KS became so contested is that it was found in individuals who were otherwise quite healthy, whose bodies quite successfully fended off pcp, cmv and other AIDS-defining conditions.

Celia, I'll let you take it from there.

10.18.2005 5:56pm

daf9 ([www](#)):

jonny, I think you're mixing up a number of unrelated points. "hit early and hit hard" was initially proposed because it was hoped that by hitting early and hitting hard you could actually eliminate the virus completely. that didn't happen. so hitting early and hitting hard not only didn't eliminate the virus but it led to viral resistance. the virus became resistant to the HAART drugs and so when the virus started to increase in those people treated early they didn't get the same benefit from HAART that people who weren't treated until symptoms started to develop got.

I'm not saying that HIV causes everything, I'm saying that when you reduce the deaths due to some things the proportion of deaths due to others may increase even though the absolute number of deaths due to those things doesn't. there is nothing unorthodox about this position. I'm paraphrasing what's in the study that Celia cited.

If it's easier to think about it in terms of a simple analogy, try this. You go to a party and there are 16 women in the room. 8 are wearing black, 4 are dressed in red, 2 in blue and 2 in white. Most of the women are wearing black, just like pre HAART most of the dead HIV infected patients in that SF study had AIDS related conditions. Back to the party. 6 of the women in black leave the room (like HAART

reduced the number of AIDS related deaths). There are now 10 women in the room and although the number of women in red hasn't changed any, there are now more women in the room wearing red than any other color. In the SF study, that was your spike in liver disease.

Now other studies have suggested that there may be a genuine increase in some diseases but it is still difficult to tease out what is due to virus and what is due to treatment. I'm not saying the drugs aren't toxic but that the disease is even more toxic. As with a lot of diseases and their treatments, the idea is to trade off drug toxicity with efficacy. Ideally of course medical science will find a cure for HIV infection or at least drugs with less toxic side effects.

But it's hard to find drugs to treat viruses that aren't going to have some level of toxicity because viruses live within the cells of the body and the only way to kill the virus is to kill the cell it's in.

You're right I was trying to simplify KS. Co infections are complicated because not all HIV infected individuals are exposed to the same other opportunistic infections. Still, to say KS was found in otherwise healthy individuals is still a bit misleading. These were individuals who were HIV positive.

Dale

10.18.2005 6:21pm

Celia Farber:

I still cannot decipher what exactly I stand accused of being distortionist *about*. I have several unmet deadlines, and lots of pressing work to do but will try to disentangle this best I can. Is this about journalism? About what I wrote and when I wrote it and what was accurate and what was exaggerated?

Jonny and I made some headway yesterday in declaring AIDS journalism since 1984 a disaster area, slipping through such white elephants as The Heterosexual AIDS Explosion, AZT saving lives, Africa being wiped off the map, etc etc. Might McKiernan want to address some of THOSE press wizards in his oompah journalism class?

OK. Back to the HAART fight, (though I still do not know exactly where its fulcrum is:)

Below is a graph from an article I wrote a few months ago, in New York Press, having been invited to address AIDS drugs, in a cover story that pitted me against a 'longtime human rights activist' named Jeanne Bergman, who wrote in frothy defense of the NIH sponsored experiments on black and hispanic foster kids at Incarnation

Children's Center (Had I known her focus, I could have addressed it, having worked for five months on a British documentary about ICC.)

But one thing at a time.

Here is a sample paragraph, from that piece, in which I (amidst other points, quoting various people who stated that HAART regimens have absolutely sand-bagged against death, etc) lay out some fairly damning toxicity data, and make clear how I "feel" about it, which McKiernan calls "propaganda." Must I start quoting Muggeridge, Orwell, Thompson, about the perils of ostensible "objectivity?"

I am a journalist, a writer. I write for lay media. I write essays and I write reportage based pieces. Here, (NY Press)I was asked to take a position. My "position" in this case was actually a crystal of several perspectives and voices, but here is one shard I would like to submit as a nut-graph for what I think we are fighting about:

Excerpt:

Each of the 26 anti-HIV drugs currently on the market, combined in infinite combinations, or "cocktails," is, by admission of the manufacturers, potentially lethal. (I said "potentially.") One of the unexpected effects of Protease Inhibitors, or so-called HAART therapy (Highly Active Antiretroviral Therapy) seen in recent years was a disruption of the body's fat-distribution mechanisms. This in turn (in addition to the fatty deposits on the upper neck and various parts of the body) has caused strokes and heart attacks in many patients, at the very moment when the drugs were theoretically "working," meaning so-called surrogate markers (cd4 cells and viral load) were going the right way. The other significant danger of HAART proved to be liver and kidney failure, which, according to a study done at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, "surpassed deaths due to advanced HIV," in 2002. In 2005 the Wall Street Journal reported that, according to a Danish study, AIDS drug cocktails "may double the risk of heart attacks." In 2004, the journal AIDS reported, with characteristic lack of alarm, "All 4 classes of antiretrovirals (ARVs) and all 19 FDA approved ARVs have been directly or indirectly associated with life-threatening events and death." The paper was titled "Grade 4 Events Are as Important as AIDS Events in the Era of HAART," and "grade 4 events" referred to "serious or life-threatening events."

The conclusion: More than twice as many people (675) had a drug-related (grade 4) life-threatening event as an "AIDS event" (332). The most common causes of grade 4 events (drug toxicities) were "liver related." The greatest risk of death was not an AIDS "event"

but a drug event—heart attacks (“cardiovascular events”). The authors wrote: “Our finding is that the rate of grade 4 events is greater than the rate of AIDS events, and that the risk of death associated with these grade 4 events was very high for many events. Thus the incidence of AIDS fails to capture most of the morbidity experienced by patients with HIV infection prescribed HAART.”

Forgive me but...is this argument about whether the admitted (above) "cardiovascular events," liver and kidney failure, etc, are caused by a) the drugs, or b)the virus (but the authors distinguished them as NOT being "AIDS events) or c) the fact that the drugs are prolonging life enough that heart attacks etc start to manifest? In men who are generally in their 30s and 40s?

Just tell me EXACTLY what it is that you, daf9 and McKiernan are arguing, and leave out everything about what a vile propagandist you think I am and how I lack scholarship.

I utterly agree with Jonny that you two are taking the orthodox position to new levels. I wind up feeling like the mugger breaking up a fight between three cops. (Except I find Jonny to be utterly lucid; Does that mean he is a denialist?)

The orthodox position is that people should NOT start HAART unless and until they are actually sick, and/or have shifting surrogate markers. Is it not? The orthodox position is also that the drugs are causing many unexpected "side effects" and even deaths, and that they should therefore be used with great caution. Is it not?

Can we establish what we agree on before we start swinging wildly to get punches in? I accept that McKiernan thinks I am a propagandist, because he feels that my reportorial slant is too sharp. That doesn't phase me or interest me. Journalism is not stenography; It is a medium that is intended to reflect human conscience-- disturbed, perplexed, elated, or whatever it may be-- but a conscience where something is happening.

The journalist rings a bell, an alarm, that is his/her role. It is DIFFERENT from the scholar, and from the scientist. But that is another tar-baby for another time (on journalism good and bad.)

Good journalism is prescient and correct, bad journalism is the opposite. So let's stick to the facts. Please be clear about what I am perceived to have been 'wrong' about.

I re-submit two articles that address this, written by me, and ask that any mistakes that suggest I got the BIG PICTURE STORY utterly wrong be pointed out, and ideally without venom or condescension.

<http://www.virusmyth.net/aids/data/cffiction.htm> (GEAR 2000)

<http://www.nypress.com/18/25/news&columns/farber.cfm> (NYP 2005)

For contrast, class, Bergman's piece. Does it pass McKiernan's objective journalism sniff test?

<http://www.nypress.com/18/25/news&columns/bergman.cfm>

(Note that I could not persuade NYP editors to include: Bergman has for years worked for an outfit that receives millions of dollars in pharmaceutical AIDS drug funding, Housing Works.)

10.18.2005 8:00pm

([link](#))

jonny ([mail](#)):

Dale--

Just as Harvey did--or initially threatened to do--I'm ending this exchange, because you're shifting the terms of the discussion and waffling in ways only seasoned politicians know how to do. Earlier you defended HIV as the cause of liver and heart disease; now you're admitting that it's only one cause, and that HAART might be another. But in my last post I explained why HIV shouldn't be causing liver or heart disease if in fact HAART is doing its job--that is, keeping T-Cell counts high and viral loads low. You ignored the largest part of my post, so I'm signing off.

10.18.2005 8:05pm

([link](#))

Celia Farber:

Now what can I do about the fact that Mckiernan and Daf9 et al will continue to split molecules and unlike Jonny, refuse to concede REALITY, and move on? I cannot find the time to do this, argue like this, all the time and yet if I excuse myself I will be told I am not even able to answer my accusers about DATA INTERPRETATIONS ON THE HEAD OF AN NIH PIN!

I am surprised that with what has come to light in the past year about the culture of AIDS research that you men would risk your moral hides defending the indefensible. What do I mean?

You'll see.

May I be granted an official hiatus to get some work done??

If I must continue to defend my (21 year)body of work on HIV/AIDS, could the corrections officers please be VERY specific?

Thanks.

Have a pleasant evening everybody.

10.18.2005 8:11pm

([link](#))

Celia Farber:

Jonny,

I am with you. Leaving a shifty, inprecise, wooly fight like this is honorable. I am leaving too. I hope our paths cross again some time. You I can really learn from.

10.18.2005 8:13pm

([link](#))

Celia Farber:

But wait, before I leave, I want to impart one last piece of propaganda, for McKiernan's Sound Journalism Class:

<http://deanesmay.com/posts/1129287879.shtml>

10.18.2005 8:17pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Celia,

1. I have never said a single word against your journalism.
2. You asked a question and I answered it. Clearly it was a rhetorical question based on your response to my answer.
3. Yes, in the era of HAART, AIDS defining events are lessened. That's what the data says.
4. The orthodox position is that people should wait to start HAART because that way one can avoid the side effects while still reaping the benefits.
5. By all means withdraw. That's what you dissidents do the minute someone actually tries to engage you in polite argument.

Dale

10.18.2005 9:07pm

Celia Farber:

Dale,

I am sorry, I conflated your two email names. I meant to refer to you as Dale. The journalism stuff was directed at "McKiernan."

What do you mean "you dissidents," and praise God, what do you mean by "polite argument?" We have been HAVING an extended argument here and I HAVE been polite but for the love of Christ I have to get back to WORK. I have a child to take care of, also. I have to earn a living. I DID DEFEND MY ARGUMENTS SO DON'T YOU DARE SAY I AM BACKING OUT OF A POLITE ARGUMENT LIKE DISSIDENTS ALWAYS DO WHEN I JUST ASKED SO CLEARLY TO BE DISMISSED BECAUSE I MUST GET OTHER WORK DONE.

How can anybody be so manipulative? Is 21 years NOT ENOUGH TIME??? Where were you and your "polite arguments" when as Jonny pointed out we were trying to stand between a generation of AIDS patients and their AZT graves?? You cannot POSSIBLY be serious that YOU have been trying to have a debate with US all this time!

Jesus.

No wonder Harvey is driven even crazier than he is in this place.

10.18.2005 9:48pm

daf9 ([www](#)):

Celia,

By all means return to what you were doing. Have a nice day.

Dale

10.18.2005 10:18pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

jonny writes: But in my last post I explained why HIV shouldn't be causing liver or heart disease if in fact HAART is doing its job--that is, keeping T-Cell counts high and viral loads low. You ignored the largest part of my post, so I'm signing off.

Bye jonny

There is an answer to your question of why HIV infection might cause liver or heart disease even if HAART is doing its job -- but you obviously don't want to hear it so I won't bore you. have a nice day.

10.18.2005 10:40pm

Celia Farber:

Dale,

Do you work for David Ho? Jonny is quite right to throw in the towel here. This is as bad as 1988, when Glaxo Wellcome seriously marketed AZT as a miracle pancea that could even improve the *intelligence* of children. I want the Lord to take me if I'm lying. I remember the posters...featuring blond children under study lamps doing homework... on AZT posters.

You cannot be serious that "HIV infection" is causing the very same

heart disease that is a clear and predictable effect of (note the name) Protease Inhibitors inhibiting the proteases of the body, including those which regulate fat metabolism.

Are you serious?

This reminds me of a Soviet journalist I met in Moscow in 1988 who insisted (for the benefit of the microphones) that a Buddah statue we passed was no ordinary Buddah but rather...look at his face...he is *thinking* about Lenin!

10.18.2005 10:50pm

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Duh..I'm only a [Goonish, but world famous, idiot](#), (<http://www.thegoonshow.co.uk/scripts/>) but I want to know who the F. gave Daf9/Dale a medical degree?

The answer is...nobody, because even I recognize the more recent style of 'daf9/Dale' as that of the even more idiotic, shame of Cambrdige, Nicholas Bennett.

A quick 'search' through the [Free Book](#), (<http://www.deanesmay.com/files/ThinkingTheUnthinkable.pdf>) will prove my point.

Anyone who wants to see a relativistically time-warped collage of Harvey giving the zen finger to Nick Bennett can click [here](#) ([http://bialystocker.net/files/Ra\\_manujan\\_Zen.jpg](http://bialystocker.net/files/Ra_manujan_Zen.jpg)).

10.18.2005 11:39pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

"jonny"

you asked to be shown one so here is one chosen at random ....

Cardiac involvement in HIV-infected people living in Africa: a review. Magula NP, Mayosi BM.

Infectious Disease Unit, Department of Medicine, Nelson R. Mandela School of Medicine, University of Natal, Durban, South Africa.

The primary objective of this study was to review and summarise the literature on the spectrum and management of cardiac disease in HIV-infected people living in Africa. We searched MEDLINE (January 1980 to February 2003), reference lists of papers, and reviews on the subject, and contacted experts working in the field for information on relevant references. The review was limited to papers that were published in peer-reviewed journals and indexed on MEDLINE.

Seventeen of the 21 studies identified met the inclusion criteria for analysis. The studies confirmed that cardiac abnormalities are more common in HIV-infected people, compare to normal controls, and

that about half of hospitalized patients and a significant proportion of patients followed up over several years develop cardiac abnormalities. The commonest HIV-related cardiac abnormalities were cardiomyopathy and pericardial disease. Tuberculosis was the major cause of large pericardial effusion in Africa. Myocarditis was the commonest pathological abnormality in HIV-associated cardiomyopathy, and non-viral opportunistic infections such as toxoplasmosis and cryptococcosis may account for up to 50% of cases of HIV-associated cardiomyopathy in Africa. Echocardiography is indicated in HIV-positive patients with cardiac symptoms or signs. If cardiomyopathy or pericardial disease is identified, further investigation must be considered to exclude potentially treatable opportunistic infections. Further research in large numbers of patients is needed to determine the value of endomyocardial biopsy in the management of patients with HIV-associated cardiomyopathy, and to establish the place of adjuvant steroids in the treatment of HIV-associated tuberculous pericarditis.

And what I said was that in the particular paper that Celia cited it appeared that HAART was not increasing cardiac or liver disease. Read the paper. We've already established that you know how to access the medical literature.

As far as conceding points. I'm happy to concede what I agree with.

Dale

10.18.2005 11:44pm

([link](#))  
daf9 ([www](#)):

Harvey,

There you go. I agree that between you and I (I hesitate to use the term 'we' remembering what happened last time I did) but between you and I there is not a single medical degree. And yet you and I continue argue interpretation of the medical literature. Isn't life grand?!

Dale

10.18.2005 11:49pm

([link](#))  
Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Daffy duckling...don't you ever get anything?

Rx: Please have some cells cultured straightaway and have them karyotyped, I think you for sure suffer from an excess or deficiency of the *Homo sapiens* euploid number of chromosomes. (And remember, **I** am NOT as you once thought, and wrote bialyzebub was, "**casting aspersions on your species**". **No.** I, Eccles the World Famous Idiot, are questioning your membership in it.

And also remember, 'how many daf's are there in it' daffy, that if you write again to Harvey, the only one who will possibly answer you is this cyber-persona that unlike Harvey has no doctoral degrees in molecular biology, nor edited the premier journal of peer reviewed biotechnology in the world for 15 or so years, but as far as anybody who has been reading this blog, YOU, "daf9/dale" have never done anything, except CLAIM to be able to read the literature, yet to anybody (even idiot's like me) have failed to make a single, solitary point that is defensible in anything except an anon internet forum.

10.19.2005 12:10am

daf9 ([www](#)):

Harvey,  
Funny you should mention it but I have been karyotyped and my ploidy is just fine, thank you.

Dale

10.19.2005 8:03am

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

OOOOOH...Dat's good Daf. Was it at a young age because your parents also suspected there was something not quite right with the way your CNS functioned?

10.19.2005 10:32am

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Jonny,

I hope you do not mind being written to by a self-declared (but World Famous) idiot.

Since you write so well, as both Harvey and Elizabeth have noted, and you think pretty good too (especially when you are in possession of data and facts), I hope you either download the torrent or acquire the CD, and that you will read the **definitive** falsification of the whole megillah that is in the [Free Book](#) (<http://www.deanesmay.com/files/ThinkingTheUnthinkable.pdf>), and which Dean has noted here **numerous** times, has never been refuted by anybody except Catch 22 (McK) or the daffy twins. Nick (aka daf9/Dale) cast themselves in that show as the pompous bloviators who were excellent at covering people who knew not too much, but as here, ran like chicken littles whenever they were called out on any of the rubbish they wrote or misquoted or misinterpreted or just plain made up (all of Babbadge's sins of science that Samba so eloquently condensed above somewhere).

All the scientific literature on Haart is contained in the J. Biosci. 2003 review. Have you read it? If you have questions about that presentation, write Bialy through Dean. He will be happy to discuss them with you.

En fin, why don't you ask the credential-less, and clueless, and possibly euploid (depends when the k-typing was done and on which cells)

how is it he (Nick in this instance) can have the *cojones* to claim HIV causes heart and liver ailments when no one can tell you with authority how it kills T cells after 20+ years and 50 billion spent trying to figure it out?

Eccles (The idiot)

10.19.2005 10:58am

daf9 ([www](#)):

"jonny" writes: Dale, the study you pasted in earlier doesn't address this claim. Why? Because the patients described aren't on HAART. Consequently, they've succumbed to a range of infections which, I concede to you, can indeed cause heart and liver problems (though I would add that tuberculosis, even among the young, continues to plague African nations, sometimes in tandem with, but frequently independently of, HIV), but which, presumably, would not, were they taking HAART and keeping their viral counts low and CD4's high.

In part, this is a problem of comparing American and African AIDS. Earlier you commented that it is difficult to tease out which problems are caused by HIV and which by HIV medications (the popular literature, I think you'll agree, often conflates these two things). But in the study you provided, HAART is absent (correct me if I'm wrong), and thus the study is unhelpful in determining, in a HAART patient, whether his liver/heart disease is attributable to HIV or to the meds.

"jonny", you've answered your own question! When an HIV+ individual is first identified they are often already co-infected with some of those other viruses that you acknowledge can cause heart and liver problems. What do you suppose happens to those pre existing viruses when a patient goes on HAART? They don't all magically disappear just because HIV viral loads are reduced and CD4+ counts are restored. Which is why as I said it is difficult to determine in any given HAART patient whether his liver/heart disease is attributable to HIV or to the meds or even to a combination of both.

Eccles,  
Have you ever been karyotyped?

Dale

10.19.2005 11:26am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Duh....what's a karyotype? Don't you know I am an idiot, and a cyber-entity with no protoplasmic 'slef' at all?

Why are you writing to *me*?

Methinks you be more confused than even Bialy concluded when he left this 'discussion'. But while waiting with my good friend for the results of the second biopsy of the tissue after his surgery last week, I'm having a good time writing to you nitwits.

10.19.2005 11:36am

([link](#))  
daf9 ([www](#)):  
Eccles,

I simply thought that since you seem to believe idiocy or suspected idiocy to be grounds for karyotyping that perhaps you might have been cyber-karyotyped in some manner?

As far as your friend Harvey goes; in spite of his insulting cyber-demeanor, I hope the results of his biopsy indicate an excellent prognosis.

Dale

10.19.2005 11:56am

([link](#))  
Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

OOOOH. This is very good to know. I am sure Harvey will be happy to learn as well that you do not regard spiffy, internet rapartee (if that's how you spell it, it is a Frog word, and we Brits don't take to frog too well)on which you are mostly the receiver (catcher is a technical term, not only in baseball but in the gay subculture)as sufficient grounds to wish someone a permanent facial disfiguration, even though they were nothing special to look at before.

Very patrician of you old man.

Here is a dialog from "[bially/s](#)" (<http://bialystocker.net>) that perfectly sums the present situation in *this* cyber-comedy/tragedy.

*The curtain might open anywhere on a single speaker*

ecclesthe idiot (mail):  
hey bialyze..it is obvious that [the titulo](#) (<http://bialystocker.net/posts/1113212658.shtml>) is meant to suggest monk's straight, no chaser.

but what this cosmic idiot wants to know is - was the smoke that

condensed to burnished copper of the habana puro or lavalou variety or don't you remember?

4.14.2005 1:29pm

(link)Richard Miller (mail):

So? Is your posted assurance that "all questions will be cheerfully answered" another example of smoke, no mirrors? Eccles's question has been twisting slowly, slowly in the void for more than 24 hours now ? do you intend to answer it?

4.15.2005 11:00am

(link)bialy:

richard,

i am not so crazy as to begin internet discussions with eccles the cosmic idiot, no matter what.

however, since it is you who are asking (presumably you are not eccles in cyberguise), allow me to provide a cheerful, experimental answer of exactly the same sort i once provided a ny highway patrol officer who had pulled over my 83 saab 900 for a defective tail-light and inquired about the nature of the handrolled cigaros on the dash.

in this case though, you will need to print it before you smoke it to find out.

4.15.2005 11:21am

(link)bialy:

but richard,

may i inquire as to what you might be fumigating, since according to the time signatures i just noticed on these posts, it will not have been 24 hours for a while.

or maybe your horological devices are set for jupiter time as well?

4.15.2005 11:26am

(link)Richard Miller (mail):

I find you not the least bit humorous Dr. Bialy, anymore than I found your "falsification" of HIV/AIDS that received, and continues to receive so much attention on the blog thanks to the popular but misguided Dean Esmay, the least bit convincing.

In any event, I shall not be returning, as I also find your so-called "art work" as intellectually empty as Duesberg's "theories" about HIV.

Richard Miller, Ph.D.

4.15.2005 4:06pm

(link)bialy:  
dick

as the old jewish man on the subway said to the wall street investment banker who was telling his friend that he couldn't wait for the taxi strike to be over so he wouldn't have to ride with the riff raff....

'vill miss you'  
4.15.2005 4:13pm

(link)Dean Esmay (www):  
It's good to know that Richard is such an open-minded liberal...  
4.15.2005 5:08pm

(link)bialy:  
yeah...and he writes pretty spiffy too.

is he correct abt the attention our aids insurgency effort has gotten in the blogosphere because liberal though he may be, he appears to be the type of phd whose initials represent piled higher and deeper and who would not think that translation of the abbreviation the 'least bit humorous'.

i ask you this because it sure as shit ain't gotten falso fathead fauci's attention...and i thought the blog brought down dan rather! what gives?  
4.16.2005 12:27pm

(link)bialy:

AND NOW FOR SOMETHING (almost) COMPLETELY DIFFERENT

this can only be of interest to:

(me and other v. xxx hiv/aids insurgents)

(anybody wanting to know the most in-depth, insider, hardcore details of the deliberations of Thabo Mbeki's Presidential AIDS Advisory Panel)

(anyone interested in a candid look at the 'best minds' in South African aids, inc --- the ones who are pulling the African strings in the currently unveiling jonathan fishbein outs-the-nazi- docs-at-the-nih godzilla of a show that will soon ... remember you read it first here... burst forth with even more disgusting revelations in a major media outlet near you)

the piece here, although very long, speaks very clearly for itself, and it can be appreciated at many levels by skipping ALL the technical-sounding parts.

[ETC....](#)

Are you sure Richard Miller is not one of your identities daf?

10.19.2005 12:29pm

jonny ([mail](#)):

Dale--

I'm short on time today--and as always, on patience--but I must point out that once again you've changed your position. Earlier you insisted that HIV weakens the immune system to such a point that Hepatitis B is able to seize control and destroy the liver. Now you're suggesting that this happens independently of HIV. But earlier you claimed that HIV causes heart and liver disease.

I'll repeat my point once more. If HIV does indeed destroy the liver and heart through first destroying the immune system, why does it cause liver and heart disease in patients for whom HAART provides immunological health and protection from such opportunistic infections as pcp and cmv? You can't wiggle out of this.

10.19.2005 2:04pm

daf9 ([www](#)):

jonny wrote: Consequently, they've succumbed to a range of infections which, I concede to you, can indeed cause heart and liver problems ... but which, presumably, would not, were they taking HAART and keeping their viral counts low and CD4's high.

So again I ask you jonny, where do you think the agents causing that "range of infections" that are already present in an HIV+ person go once that person starts taking HAART? Hepatitis C for example does not replicate using reverse transcriptase so why would inhibitors of reverse transcriptase have any effect on it?

And partial reconstitution of the immune system (which is the best HAART ever does) may reduce the chances of new infections but isn't necessarily going to eliminate the old ones that are already established.

jonny further writes: If HIV does indeed destroy the liver and heart through first destroying the immune system, why does it cause liver and heart disease in patients for whom HAART provides immunological health and protection from such opportunistic infections as pcp and cmv? You can't wiggle out of this.

As far as I can tell from the literature, why it happens isn't completely understood but the studies continue to show that some AIDS defining conditions appear to be more responsive to HAART than others. Presumably because the interplay between HIV, other viral infections and the immune system isn't nearly as simple as how many CD4+ cells can be counted in the blood.

Dale

10.19.2005 3:12pm

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Daf,

This time I am really perplexed, and there is no sarcasm whatsoever in anything below.

Bialy has written here, as plainly as possible for someone with 46 chromosomes, that he is blissfully retired in a city known as the Paradise of Eternal Spring, and has all the time in the world to fool around, and NOT fool around on the internet in different forms. The TORRENT/CD and his own website being two prime examples in the NOT set, as is the Free Book (to which "you" contributed in so many ways, including allowing "us" to write your lines for you before you wrote them, just as Harvey did here, and which confused "you" enough to reply to the bialy invented character...read arriba you'll see, as well as many of the posts here, although not all obviously.

But "you" are presumably at least somewhat gainfully employed somewhere, and surely have better things to do even if you are not the president of the United States (as Bialy called you once because of your (ahem) reluctance to read a book of OMG "more than 270 pages" (in big type, too, as you could have seen on Amazon's "Search Inside").

So why in the world do you persist in these discussions that are maybe read by 20 people who actually can follow them, or have any interest in doing so? Even Hank the Tank has disappeared.

And don't write it is because you love it, because 'you' obviously have no sense of humor and enjoy this not the least little bit. Nor can it be because you might learn something, since you never admit to being the least bit in error about anything and have no desire to read something that has not been predigested for you, nor can it be because you are a passionate and highly qualified individual who feels obligated to correct the misconceptions of a few misguided dissidents for the benefit of the countless few who might actually be reading this for more than its meagre entertainment value.

Bialy is one of the oddest people I have ever known, but he is transparent compared to you daf.

10.19.2005 3:42pm

([link](#))

jonny ([mail](#)):

Dale--

It seems you want it both ways (and this isn't a pun on Harvey's earlier joke about your being a catcher, I swear). You claim sometimes that HIV causes liver disease and heart disease--even in the presence of HAART--while at other moments you suggest that immunosuppression is necessary for these conditions. I repeat: if HAART is keeping the immune system strong and infections like pcp and cmv away, why would liver and heart disease occur, if, as you claimed previously, HIV leads to immunosuppression which in turn leads to liver and heart disease?

You've once again, I see, tweaked your position. You're now suggesting that the "range of infections" to which I gestured in an earlier post don't necessarily disappear in the face of HAART therapy. But if HAART is indeed doing its job--keeping CD4 counts high and viral counts low--then presumably these "other infections" aren't related to immunosuppression, and are thus, logically, unrelated to HIV--unless, that is, you're claiming that HIV leads to liver and heart disease by a route independent of immunosuppression, in which case I would love-hypocritically, I realize, dear Elizabeth--a citation?

I'm willing to concede that an AIDS patient who's being treated with HAART might die of hepatitis-B-induced liver disease, but I'm not willing to concede that HIV caused the liver disease--or that it would be at all appropriate to term this death an AIDS death--if, that is, the HAART was doing its job.

Elizabeth, I promise a citation shortly, and thanks for your polite digital demeanor.

10.19.2005 3:55pm

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

jonny,

That was ME Eccles THE WORLD FAMOUS Idiot who was making the joke. Harvey is not that clever.

Please see [my website](http://www.thegoonshow.co.uk/scripts/) (<http://www.thegoonshow.co.uk/scripts/>) for some really funny stuff.

10.19.2005 4:

([link](#))

Elizabeth Reid:

Linda,

I don't think anyone has ever argued that HIV is the only cause of immune system dysfunction. I actually think AIDS is a somewhat unfortunate acronym, because it seems to encompass all acquired immune deficiency and of course it doesn't. I'm completely confident that there were people who had what I'll call lower-case-aids (for lack of a better term) before 1980 and continuing on through the upper-case-AIDS years to the present.

I think Duesberg and the establishment would be in agreement that what was being seen in gay men in the 1980s was a new syndrome above and beyond the base rate of cases of idiopathic immune system deficiency Root-Bernstein is talking about, so something new was going on. No one was doing poppers in 1872, and no one had HIV so far as we know, and yet a few younger men had Kaposi's. I don't think the existence of these cases tells us much about what was causing a much larger number of men to acquire immune system deficiency a century later.

10.19.2005 5:38pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

AIO Beth,

I hope you also do not mind being addressed by an idiot, but your hunch about the acronym is even more right on than you indicate.

Have you ever wondered, why, if AIDS is the kind of immunodeficiency that is acquired by acquiring HIV that the acronym and name were was not changed in 1984 to *IIDS*, the infectious immunodeficiency syndrome?

This idiot has, and more than once?

10.19.2005 6:51pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

jonny writes: I'm willing to concede that an AIDS patient who's being treated with HAART might die of hepatitis-B-induced liver disease, but I'm not willing to concede that HIV caused the liver disease--or that it would be at all appropriate to term this death an AIDS death--if, that is, the HAART was doing its job.

And I agree that if an AIDS patient who's being treated with HAART dies of hepB (or hepC) induced liver disease, HIV did not necessarily cause the liver disease but NOR DID THE HAART!

As far as the rest of what you write, I will try once again.

Even if HAART does its job, the resulting immune system is not just like the immune system before HIV infection and it's not normal. Restoring CD4+ T cells numbers doesn't make a normal immune system and doesn't undo damage that's already been done. What HAART does appear to do for HIV infected people is make them less prone to certain infections than untreated HIV infected individuals are.

Dale

10.19.2005 7:22pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Eccles writes: Have you ever wondered, why, if AIDS is the kind of immunodeficiency that is acquired by acquiring HIV that the acronym and name were not changed in 1984 to IIDS, the infectious immunodeficiency syndrome?

This idiot has, and more than once?

Dale writes: If I had a sense of humor I would be tempted to retort "Guess that's what makes you an idiot"

But I suppose since Eccles has decreed that I lack a sense of humor, I won't say it.

10.19.2005 7:37pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

O...Thank you for pointing that out to me.

As I often brought the canned house down by saying for many years on the BBC

"Who's holding the ladder?"

Do you know what a catcher is Daf9/Dale/Nick?

10.19.2005 7:58pm

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

O Daffiest

Alo again:

Do "you" know, btw, how HIV got its name? "We" was there at the highly scientific forum at which it occurred.

Would you like to know the real story? It is a bit different than the sanitized version in the editorial pages of Science (if you were old enough to read when it appeared.) It is one of the many things that is NOT in the book.

"We" was also sitting next to Sam Broder on the very same day they cancelled the first AZT trials because the *end point of death* (as the Dr. Mengele of NCI/AIDS liked to call it) was so dramatically in favor of the AZT takers that it was unethical to continue the trial for more than the few weeks it had been going on. Sam kept leaving his sit while Simple Simon Wain-Hobson (that is how Luc Montagnier referred to him in front of a lot of people at a cocktail party during the SA panel meetings, I am just reporting) was giving one of his interminable sequence talks to run down to the phone banks in the basement of the auditorium at CSH to find out "how many were dead", and each time he returned to the seat next to me, he was smiling even more broadly.

10.19.2005 9:00pm

Elizabeth Reid:  
Eccles,

I agree that IIDS is a much better fit.

10.19.2005 10:26pm

daf9 ([www](#)):

Dean writes: "I note that in the comments to earlier threads on this, people who haven't even looked at it have attempted to declare it invalid and irrelevant.

If I am one of the people included in that comment, I would like to point out that I never declared that it was either invalid or irrelevant to someone who might not have access to a college or university library. I had already tracked down many of the references Duesberg cites using such a library. So any comments I made regarding Duesberg's interpretation of published data were not made without having read and thought about it. Putting the information on a CD didn't alter the information itself.

Dale

10.20.2005 8:31am

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Dale

YOU lie, and Everyway possible. This post is baldfaced. Nobody with any professional competence in biology can possibly believe that you have even looked at the abstracts, let alone read 25% of the references in the 92 review. It is doubtful you even read the monograph.

You have not even read J. Biosci. 2003, according to what you write here.

And why should you. YOU have told us time and again that you are

NOT HIV virologists, or even microbiologists. So why would anyone go through the trouble of finding those papers in a library and xeroxing and reading them,them? No way, Jose.

You also demonstrate **profound** ignorance when you write the cd is useful to someone who has no access to a library. No NO NO NO moron, the CD is useful exactly to the professors and grad students and investigators who have full library access, but do not have 6 months to track the papers down.

You are impossibly arrogant, and like all arrogant jerks you are made of sand. Or in your case, electrons.

Why am I so angry. Because your continued pretense at being a scholar (a professor, a doctor, whatever you are pretending at the moment) of any kind is infuriating and you "sir" can go to the deepest hell.

10.20.2005 9:25am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

YOU did NOT even read THIS

"Of all the accusations that have been leveled against my friend, Peter Duesberg, over the many years he has been challenging conventional wisdom in cancer genetics and 'deadly'- disease etiology, the one that is most frequently heard **in scientific circles**, and one that is impossible to counter except by extended debate, either at a scientific forum or in the journals (something that for some reason has never occurred) is that "Peter abuses the literature". **Either he cites so many papers that no one can read them all** (*except Daffy*), or, and much worse, he misquotes and draws inferences that are not appropriate from the data in the papers he cites. The latter, as I said, has been a damning accusation, impossible to refute — until now."

THIS IS A TOOL FOR **SERIOUS SCIENTISTS**, AND INTELLIGENT LAYPERSONS

NOT FOR YOU

10.20.2005 9:36am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

TRY THIS THAT I AM SURE YOU GLOSSED OVER PREVIOUSLY

([link](#))Samba Diallo ([mail](#)) ([www](#)):

I actually have been in possession of the said CD since 1996 (courtesy of HB) and have circulated it to a few orthodox but

relatively open-minded colleagues (we could call them jesuits of science) and students here and there. I have thoroughly read (and re-read) it and laughed heartily at some of Duesberg's marginal comments on the papers he CAREFULLY READ, my favorite being the one on mathematical models of the aids epidemic talking about the use of math in the absence of data: "cute" was his comment. Check some of them out when you have the time, but keep in mind what Igancio Ramonet concluded in his excellent book "La tyrannie de la communication": "S'informer fatigue" - informing oneself is tiresome. Don't expect predigested notions: if you REALLY want to know, and you have doubts about the relayers of info, go to the sources, which is exactly what you'll find in Harvey's CD. But, of course, if you lack stamina to actually read the info on which knowledge is based, then stick to reviews of your preferred stance. An amazing tool, but only if people actually use it.

Just remember what Sir Charles Babbage commented, long ago, on scientific fraud ("Reflections on the Decline of Science in England", 1830), which can be boiled down to three major forms of lying:

Trimming, which consists in the smoothing of irregularities to make the data look extremely accurate and precise.

Cooking, which refers to the practice of retaining only those results that fit the theory and discarding others that may weaken/limit its range of application (generalizability).

Forging, which means inventing some or all of the research data that are reported, and even reporting experiments to obtain those data that were never performed.

You decide, folks,

Samba

10.12.2005 12:14pm

10.20.2005 9:40am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Last question from ONE world famous idiot to another (thanks to the Blog):

The Balz. citation in the Sample

(<http://bialystocker.net/files/Sample.pdf>) is a fine paper except for two misleading words in the title, and what are they?

10.20.2005 9:44am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

The Balz. citation in the Sample is a fine paper except for two misleading words in the title. What are they?

10.20.2005 9:56am

([link](#))

Elizabeth Reid:  
Eccles,

I can't believe I'm prolonging this thread, but...

I did have one question for you to pass on to Harvey if you get a chance. I agree that tracking down all the citations and checking them for the Duesberg paper would be a substantial undertaking, hence my gratitude for having all the cited works in one place. However, Dean has repeatedly said that if the citations aren't good, it means the reviewers of this paper didn't do their job, huge scandal, etc. Is it generally customary for reviewers to go obtain each cited paper and read it to ensure that the cite is good, and to search the literature to make sure the cite is not cherry-picked for an unusual or non-representative result? For a big review article it seems as though the time required would be prohibitive.

Honest question, I've never done the job. I tried to call my graduate advisor yesterday to ask her what she does as a reviewer, but apparently she's out of the country.

10.20.2005 10:02am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):  
Alo Beth,

Your confusions, I think, arise because you do not yet appreciate the following.

Neither Dean, nor I nor anybody every implied that the papers themselves to which Peter refers were not good, or should not have passed peer review. Not at all. Certainly some of them fall into those categories (and the third and most damning of the Babbage classes too) but it is never Duesberg's intention to criticise those papers. He merely cites them for what they say in their own words and tables and figures. Duesberg's critics charge him with 'abusing' this peer-reviewed literature by citing it inappropriately. It is that charge that the CD is meant to refute. Every time you check a Duesberg ref this is what you should be looking at. Does the ref match what he *uses* it for? In the case of the *exam* question of last week, the *ONLY* point Peter was making via his citation was that Goedert et al et al et al (there were many authors (ahem) of this study as you know since you went to the trouble and expense of obtaining and reading it pretty carefully) reported the following data (and then he essentially (I repeat this) quoted a single line from a table filled with numbers

and fancy shmancy terms like "relative risk hazard" etc. *He* never said the paper was bad in any way (I did), nor did he cite it as a proof that AZT caused AIDS symptoms. You got carried away with the tree and lost the forest. This is not a faulting of you, Beth. It is just what happened, and it actually does you a LOT of credit that you stuck with the actual paper so long.

I hope this has helped.

Eccles writing on behalf of his friend and close companion, Harvey

I am not going to even rproof this once, because I want to maximize the chance of this being contiguous with your post.

P.S. Do not try and answer today's question. As you probably already know Balzini is a very technical paper, and the question is really a tricky one meant for someone with first hand knowledge of cell culture and biochemistry.

10.20.2005 10:26am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

A quick bit more as I see I idiotically neglected to answer your specific question and myself went off only in this case with the forest and left the tree behind.

A reviewer of a mss like the 92 one, would be someone who was really familiar with the literature already. An expert. That is what peer review means. Thus the reviewer is in a position to evaluate whether the ref in general match the arguments. If three independent experts agree that the final mss. is worthy of publication and consideration by the general scientific community they say so. The editor then decides what to do.

10.20.2005 10:31am

([link](#))

Elizabeth Reid:

Eccles,

Thanks, and thanks to Harvey (which of you is the invisible rabbit?). Just to clarify, I didn't mean at all either that a 'bad cite' meant the cited paper was itself bad and inferior in some way, just that it did not in fact provide support for the assertion.

10.20.2005 11:02am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Beth,

You are most welcome, and the final point you make is unarguable. That is precisely what the CD is meant to provide, sufficient data so

that everybody can come to an independent (in so far as that is possible ever) determination about ANY point in the monograph where there appears to be a contradiction between the citation and the context in which Duerberg uses it.

BTW if you go to <http://bialystocker.net/posts/1113212677.shtml> and search "Uncle Ray", you will find a surprisingly precise answer to your q. abt "Harvey, The Invisible Rabbit", or more accurately *pookah*.

I can't wait to read your review.

And neither can Harvey.

Saludos

10.20.2005 11:24am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

P.S.

I know you are tempted (if you do not have to occupy yourself all day with making money) to answer the question to daf above.

This one time, please, take my advice, after you have had your eyes glazed by the reference, do not go further. It really is a deeply tricky question, that only an expert cell biologist and journal editor and retrovirologist and biochemist could possibly answer.

But please help me goad Daf9/Dale/Nick into trying, if you want, as I am sure you do want to see my answer publically.

Besides, look at what he implied you were, and not even world famous, like me!

10.20.2005 11:32am

([link](#))

Elizabeth Reid:

Eccles,

Thanks, but I had no intention of pursuing that one. As I said, I have a personal project planned having to do with Duesberg's 2003 paper, so I'm concentrating on that. I've been pretty much ignoring the exchange between you and Dale; not enough signal.

10.20.2005 11:43am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

We can't wait to discover the form and content of your project, but we hope your review will appear first.

Until either, as some say down here in paradise

*padre y cheverisimo*

10.20.2005 11:49am

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

P.S.

i have to say 'shucks' to you declination because it was only by cribbing from you that Daf9/Dale/Nick were even able to give a partially decent 'sounding' answer to the last 'exam' question. **(ed note: the 'exam' question and other refs to 'the related, or other thread' are here:**

**<http://deanesmay.com/posts/1128845313.shtml>)**

This one they have no chance at all on.  
None.

Don't you want to have the mystery revealed?

"A simple yes or no will do" as daf might write, only I am poking him now, not you at all, as you perfectly well know because you can read.

10.20.2005 11:58am

([link](#))

Elizabeth Reid:

Eccles,

Can't review the book! Don't have the book yet! At this rate, Jonny is going to scoop me.

10.20.2005 12:48pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Beth: Rats!

Daf9/Dale/Nick/Richard Miller et al:

Bialy just posted this:

"Casey, and anyone else interested in my comments above.

Go [here](#) ([http://dbk.ch.umist.ac.uk/mca\\_home.htm](http://dbk.ch.umist.ac.uk/mca_home.htm)) and then, if you want the real beef go [here](http://http-server.carleton.ca/~kbstorey/mca_page.htm) ([http://http-server.carleton.ca/~kbstorey/mca\\_page.htm](http://http-server.carleton.ca/~kbstorey/mca_page.htm))

I would really like to carry on *this* conversation but unfortunately today is one of the few times I need be far away from a terminal all day.

But Casey, I will check much later in the tardes to see if you have

written me.

Saludos todos, y un muy buen dia a todos tambien

Harvey  
10.20.2005 12:47pm"

The comment is [here](#)  
(<http://deanesmay.com/posts/1129801735.shtml>), and as of a few moments ago it was at the top of the homepage.

So, you have until 7PM Fubalo time to answer the new exam question or suffer major net redface, and as well to fumigate this discussion with your deep understanding of biology

10.20.2005 1:04pm

([link](#))  
McKiernan:

Eccles,

I go crazy always haunted by [Eccles, Eccles](#).

Have you been to Glengarrif, Cork ?

Tis lovely peaceful country and great place for an international meeting.

Now not traveling time: "[The howling gale force winds...](#)" and all.

Have a pleasant day,

10.20.2005 1:06pm

([link](#))  
Elizabeth Reid:  
Eccles,

The project involves reference checking. However, because I am such a fair-minded soul (I have actually been accused, and not jokingly, of being too open-minded more than once) I've decided that the only good way to approach the project involves applying the same standards to both the Duesberg paper and the Durban declaration.

Should be fun. :-)

10.20.2005 1:50pm

([link](#))  
daf9 ([www](#)):

Eccles writes: The Balz. citation in the Sample is a fine paper except for two misleading words in the title, and what are they?

I have no idea Eccles. But I'm sure you or Harvey are just itching to tell me.

As far as some of your other comments. I have certainly never claimed to have read every paper that Duesberg cites. I said I had read many of them.

Dale

10.20.2005 2:55pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Well, well, well, and Alo again Daf et. al

The drive from Cuernavaca to the main University campus on the southern part of Mexico City took the normal 45 minutes (The campus entrance on the "Avenue of the Insurgents" is only a short drive from the end of the autopista between Mexico City and Acapulco, which runs right past the edge of Cuernavaca, and is, btw, the most expensive toll road in the world per km.) And since my reunion(that's a Spanish word) began at 1:00, everybody was eager to end in time for the 2PM get the kids from school and have lunch break, Bialy returned home not long ago to see your amazing 'reposte' (a Frog word) above.

Do you think he is going to let you off that easy, after the way you have boasted all over this blog how YOU are more than capable of evaluating Duesberg's monographs?

Everybody is pausing to chuckle now)

I continue: NO siree ree ree (in my best Goon Show voice).

This question as Bialy said, involves having actual knowledge of the subject. This is a paper in a biochemical journal, not some medical weekly where almost anything can fly (as you proved many times here). I know you never claimed to read all of Peter's refs, but you did claim, more than thrice, to have read sufficient of them, with sufficient penetration, to dismiss his entire critique and hypothesis.

Now his monograph is filled with references like this, to papers in specialized biochemistry, virology, cell biology etc journals. If you cannot, which you admit, answer Bialy's simple, but deep, question, and have consistently been afraid to provide a CV (or CVs, even to Dean, privately) so that we can know you have at least a piece of paper that says you should be able to read papers, there is no reason on god's good earth that anything you have written here (whoever you happen to be at the moment) should be taken at all seriously by anyone.

Here is part 1 of the answer:

The two words are "immunodeficiency virus". Is Bialy being 'idiotic' like he was when he suggested to Elizabeth that IIDS was in fact a better acronym than AIDS if HIV was the agent of AIDS?

Bialy says to tell you that if he was the editor of this paper at *Nature Biotechnology* he would be able, in about an hour or less, to write a letter to the first author, saying exactly this (only more politely), and that he bets you his *casa* that the author would write him back saying, "Thank you, your suggestions have greatly improved the manuscript".

So how bout it Daf et al. Got any problems with deciding if the paper would be improved by the deletion of those words, even in the eyes of the first author? (The senior author is another matter: Bialy would not be so polite to him, but to pursue that would take us far into the deepest weeds. Bialy deliberately avoids all 'personality' issues in his splendid book that covers the entire scientific history of HIV/AIDS)

And for that matter, got any problems with Duesberg citing it as one example of the extreme toxicity of AZT on human cells?

So you have *noooo* idea? Good. Now you will shut up, and Bialy does not have to spend the time to compose the letter, and your face is redder than the reddest rose.

You have a couple more horas to meet the exam deadline this time, Prof.

10.20.2005 4:46pm

([link](#))

Michael D. Harold:

Although I have been visiting Dean's World on and off for some time, it has always been as a reader, not a writer. I just sent this email to Bialy and I suddenly thought to share it with D'sW.

Harvey and I met and became acquainted through the poetry of Jack Spicer, specifically his prescient poem about HIV/AIDS that can be found in the terrific screenplay that Bialy and Eccles keep referring to as *The Free Book*. Although Harvey and I have yet to meet in person, we share our art and our thoughts on a regular basis.

I have been flipping the Dean's World channel back and forth all week. It is weirdly entertaining. It reminds me of the story of Einstein and Bohr, who constantly argued over who's theory was or was not crazy enough. To paraphrase, the Bohr side said, "Stop it with all that causality nonsense!" The Einstein side said, "I don't think that word

means what you think it means," to which the Bohr side responded, "Which word?" Please do not think I am comparing any of the individuals writing here to either Einstein or Bohr.

Two things in particular stand out. One is the unremitting rigor of Duesberg's method which is apparent even to me, a lay person. It seems just the thing to stop the majority of detractors dead in their tracks. The less gracious among them are quickly reduced to ho-hum name calling. The other is how hilarious the conversations get as a result. Eccles has no mercy or perhaps he is most merciful since he seems able to chop the head off almost any disingenuous argument with a single stroke.

Harvey -- on a completely related note, I have been looking at your pictures. The dominoes threw me. I would never have guessed. I almost never guess anyway. Your methods are too creative to be guessed correctly. I know you are a world-renown scientist and I have great respect for science, but I wish you would spend more time on your pictures. They are quite wonderful, and, unlike these posts, I can look at them for hours without getting a headache.

P.S. I am so very pleased to hear of your clean biopsy.

10.20.2005 5:15pm

([link](#))  
daf9 ([www](#)):  
Eccles,

Just so we're clear here since there is no citation in the J.Biosci. paper with a first author Balz, are we discussing Balzarini, J., Herdewijn, P. and De Clercq, E. (1989) Differential patterns of intracellular metabolism of 2',3'-didehydro-2',3'-dideoxythymidine and 3'-azido-2',3'-dideoxythymidine, two potent anti-human immunodeficiency virus compounds. J. Biol. Chem. 264: 6127-6133. from the 1992 Duesberg review?

Dale

10.20.2005 6:09pm

([link](#))  
Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):  
clock winding down

You do know of course daf et al. that the key *patent* cited paper for the Gallo/Chang/NIH "aids test" was published in *Bio/Technology (Nature Biotechnology)*?

Who do you think edited it?

/Just in case you were going to suggest that Bialy was, or could have

gotten away for 15 years, with being less than even-handed in dealing with HIV-related manuscripts.

10.20.2005 6:14pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

of course. the pdf is named Balz.

10.20.2005 6:16pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

I wrote quite plainly here:

([link](#))Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

The Balz. citation in the Sample is a fine paper except for two misleading words in the title. What are they?

10.20.2005 9:56am

and then you quoted it to me (almost, but close enuf for molecular biology) here:

daf9 ([www](#)):

Eccles writes: The Balz. citation in the Sample is a fine paper except for two misleading words in the title, and what are they?

I have no idea Eccles. But I'm sure you or Harvey are just itching to tell me.

As far as some of your other comments. I have certainly never claimed to have read every paper that Duesberg cites. I said I had read many of them.

Dale

10.20.2005 2:55pm

and now you write me:

daf9 ([www](#)):

Eccles,

Just so we're clear here since there is no citation in the J.Biosci. paper with a first author Balz, are we discussing Balzarini, J., Herdewijn, P. and De Clercq, E. (1989) Differential patterns of intracellular metabolism of 2',3'-didehydro-2',3'-dideoxythymidine and 3'-azido-2',3'-dideoxythymidine, two potent anti-human immunodeficiency virus compounds.

J. Biol. Chem. 264: 6127-6133. from the 1992 Duesberg review?

Dale

-----

When was your k-typing done?

Now when Nick Bennett writes your answer complete with numbers and micromoles, do not expect that it was "you" writing will be believed by anybody since you cannot even properly find a citation that all you had to do was click on. And besides, it will at best be waffle of a high order. If it is of sufficient quality to call for more than off-the-cuff dismissal, Bialy will indeed write the letter, and Elizabeth and Jonny can be the judges.

What will you put up if they vote against you? Bialy is not seriously betting his half a million dollar house on their judgment, but he is putting his rep. on a *certain* kind of line.

.

10.20.2005 6:32pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

there is one winning tactic

admit bialy is right for once.

10.20.2005 6:34pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

&you don't even have to say why. in fact, it is probaly wiser no to try.

10.20.2005 6:46pm

([link](#))

daf9 ([www](#)):

Eccles,

The message I quoted from (10.20.2005 9:44am) does not show up with a link in my browser. I assume either there was another message with the link provided or it's a problem with my outdated software. Or you're deliberately messing with me.

But if the paper I mentioned is indeed the paper you are talking about and you are suggesting that Bialy as an editor would have taken exception to describing these compounds as potent anti-HIV

compounds because that is not what is shown in this particular paper - then I might well agree with him. My only caveat at this point would be that I was unable to look up the papers describing in more detail the authors methodology for measuring HIV inhibition, cytotoxicity and cytostaticity.

Dale

10.20.2005 7:03pm

([link](#))

Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):

Well done old chap. Well done.

But how in the world did that particular edit not get made by the editorial board and reviewers?

Let me answer my own question by quoting some of the notes Bialy was making in case you wanted to debate this point...

They are just that..some notes for a letter that there was never any need to compose.

This is not to rub your nose or redden your face at all. It is purely for the benefit of others not privvy to the inside world of journal publication, who might be interested in why you capitulated on this particular point, which sounds so odd when you first read it.

-----

intro to jan...quote mjc's review (the nicest part)

here are the imaginary reviewers, describe them to dw but make it clear that would not be divulges to an author, although as with many thing in the j's this is hardly ever the case, esp with really import papers, like nature and science publish...sarcasm quite intentional)

rev 1 michael j. chamberlain, a world expert in nucleic acid metabolism, as hard nosed as they come and a member of the board of editors of jbc)jc

rev2

dani bolognesi..an orthodox retrovirologist with credentials going back to the old nih tumor virus lab...former buddy of duesberg who by 1988 had become a high ranking field officer in the hiv army...as peter once referred to him "wears uniform to bed"

3 duesberg, the balance to bolognesi

the descriptions like this would not normally be included, but i put them here to give you an idea of how most good and not

**overburdened** editors go about choosing reviewers. of course the more prestigious the journal, like jbc, the better in general the quality of the reviewers and their reviews. nbt is prestigious enuf, as is nature, but neither carry the serious scientific weight of jbc)

suggestion is to accept warmly but: remove the words from the end and reinsert them in the beginning as "..., two potential anti HIV/AIDS pharmaceuticals", or even "promising" if they insisted, and delete the one or two sentences at the beginning of the abstract

mjc synopsis

definitive study of the intermediary metabolism of these compounds, of apparently promising clinical potential. should definitely be published. my only reservation is that the virological biochemistry is considerably weaker than all the other experiments, which comprise the majority of the paper. since aids is so popular, i am not sure how to resolve this but the paper would be improved if it didn't appear to say it was about 2 things, when in fact it is a super paper about one, and a so so paper about the other. notice that the single table that gives the data from their general retroviral rt inhibition assays is a composite of their work and work from ref. 3. however you decide to deal with this, good luck. mjc.

bolognesi ...fine paper. publish.

peter: essentially the same comments as mjc, except with more details like the composite table and a few zingers at eric trying to piggyback his lousy retrovirology/biochemistry onto a splendid piece of work, and that jan was probably pissed but what could he do. which i would have deleted from the copy of the comments sent to the author.

end of letter:

"If you think that my suggestion is unreasonable, I offer the alternative of leaving the title as it is, but inserting "and the Moloney murine sarcoma virus (MSV)" to avoid the unintended implication that your study was also a comparative one between the activity of these compounds against several different retroviral activities, or that these compounds have any particular specificity to the RT of HIV, or as you refer to in the M&M HTLV-III.

Finally, I am very glad that you chose Bio/Technology as a place of first choice to publish this fine work instead of JBC or J.Biochem., where I am sure you realized it would certainly be accepted but read by many fewer scientists directly involved in this important biotechnological and medical area, and who are the real audience for

these data.

I look forward to your prompt reply.

With all good wishes,

Harvey Bialy, Ph.D.  
Research Editor  
Bio/Technology

tel: 212-646-9200  
fax: 212-646-9201

(Since it is 1988, there is no email, and the letter and attachments were faxed. A fantastic invention that revolutionized journals almost as much as the desktop computer and the internet.)

10.20.2005 7:21pm

([link](#))  
daf9 ([www](#)):  
Eccles,

I'm still not certain what your point was with respect to the question of whether Duesberg miscites the literature. **This was a case of authors overstating their own data. (emphasis is the editor's)**

Dale

10.20.2005 8:44pm

([link](#))  
Eccles the Idiot ([www](#)):  
Dale,

This is a paper that appeared in THE JBC. It is often cited in papers by the orthodoxy in proof of some claim about the HIV specific RT activity of these chain-terminating analogs. It is but one example out of many that the CD presents. To almost anybody reading the literature on whatever back and forth has ever gone on about Duesberg's ideas, it would appear as though Peter is fudging something when he cites a paper with this title as evidence for the human cell toxicity of the compounds. It is also an example of the senior author getting away with something a bit shady because the paper came from his lab and he is a bigshot in Europe, and the editors of the JBC are not paid, but do their job in the middle of a million other things that burden the daily life of such well thought of scientists, and do not have the time to read every paper as critically as they might, especially in 1988, when AZT and HIV/AIDS were so much in the news and views pages of Nature and Science. (See Samba above) A perfectly excusable oversight on the journal's part, so I am not pointing any blame fingers. It is just an example of the shoe on

the other foot. Now what else is a critic of the hypothesis, who cannot receive a dollar to test his own hypothesis, to do except build *his* case on the best data that the best laboratories working on the problem publish, and often in the best journals. Therefore his use of references is often suspicious looking at first glance. The CD is meant to allow anybody to test their suspicions at any point as they read the monograph.

I sincerely hope that the above addresses your concerns adequately and in a completely neutral way, and that it in no way provokes any further argument or discussion on these matters between "us".

Because Michael Harold is not the only one who wants bialy to be done with aids blogging for a few weeks at least.

Gracias.

Eccles (bows deeply to the studio canned audience and gracefully trips over the microphone cord exiting stage right...bialy went stage left a while ago.

10.20.2005 9:44pm

In the now immortal words of Samba Diallo of Dakar, Senegal: "You decide, folks."