

Janine Roberts has raised several points in answer to our Critique of the Letter to Science. We have attempted to answer most of them below. Please note that our numbered replies do not correspond to Janine's numbered questions.

---

**1. You say this is about the 'So Called' letter to Science? Was it not a letter? Did it not go to Science? Not a very good start.**

We agree with Janine Roberts that the Letter to Science was a real letter, and that it was sent to *Science* journal.

**2. You cite my website where I tell how I discovered these documents and you object. I suggest you are interpreting 'discover' as if it meant finding a new species. We all 'discover' research documents when we search libraries or other sources – it does not mean that no one knew of their existence beforehand. 'Discovery' is, for example, a right that allows legal parties to 'discover' what the other party holds that is relevant.**

We agree that the documents were discovered by Janine Roberts the same way anybody can go to her website and discover them for him or herself.

**3. Was the letter to Science based on newly analysed documents, as it claimed? – I (...) discovered them among a large number (Crewdson) made available, and was the first to analyse and publish them in print in 2008. They were thus 'newly analysed,' just as the 2008 letter to Science stated.**

We have not disputed the claim that the documents were newly analysed by Janine Roberts. We *implicitly* dispute the claim that the documents were *fully* analysed by Janine Roberts. Although we have not stated it, we doubt she was the first to discover the many deletions made by Robert Gallo. She was unquestionably the first to attach such vital significance to them.

**4. David and I drafted the accompanying letter asking for their signatures, and this letter expressly told them that my book had made these available. I had insisted on this. They thus all should have known – if David sent them the agreed text. They also all received copies of the relevant documents so they could judge them for themselves.**

We are not privy to the agreement between Janine Roberts and David Crowe. Darin Brown and Harvey Bialy were not aware that the contents of the documents had been published in Janine Roberts' book. Darin Brown explicitly states that:

*Nowhere is there mention of Janine in either the email or the attached letter. I was never made aware that I had been personally "sent evidence" by anyone, let alone by Janine. I was simply sent the letter to read, along with the specific links to Crewdson's website. While I was vaguely aware of Janine's new book, I had no idea*

the letter was "prompted" by a conclusion made by Janine, nor that I might be somehow endorsing conclusions in Janine's book by signing it.

Janine Roberts states that:

*David Crowe took responsibility for sending the relevant documents and requests out to possible signatories.*

And:

*David denied me the email addresses of the signatories, thus maintaining control over most communications.*

If that is the case, how can she be confident that all Signatories "received copies of the relevant documents so they could judge them for themselves"?

**5. The letter to Science was not amended overly away from what I wanted to see in it, but it is not perfect. I settled for the best that was achievable.**

In a mail to the hivaidsparadigm group, describing at length the collaboration between herself and David Crowe, Janine Roberts wrote that:

*(We) co-drafted the proposed letter. As it happened, I rewrote much of it as we worked on. David more or less accepted my version. (7/31/09)*

She mentions nothing about David Crowe altering the text after this. We are not interested in who wrote what when. What interests us is that David Crowe reviewed and endorsed the final version.

**6. Re Comments by Dr Andrew Maniotis cited against the letter.**

**(...) you are out-of-date. True Dr. Maniotis had misgivings at first but that was before he had discussed them with me (...) After this he agreed to send the above letter again to Science in April 2009, attaching to it an endorsing letter from himself (...) His endorsement is especially significant, as several of the scientists whose emails you cite say they were influenced by Andy's original posting.**

Dr. Maniotis' comments stand regardless of whether he later agreed to sign and endorse the Letter. We have acknowledged his endorsement in our Critique thusly:

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

None of the 3 Signatories we quote claim to have been influenced by Dr. Maniotis' comments before or after they signed the Letter. Dr. Brown states he would have liked to have been made aware of Dr. Maniotis' misgivings. Nothing more.

**7. Re Comments cited made by Robert Gallo. Claus, you wrongly present this as if it is a response by Gallo to the Letter to Science.**

We have not presented Robert Gallo's comments as a response to the Letter to Science. We have presented them as non-response to Janine Roberts' analysis of Gallo's editing of the Popovic draft. So has Janine Roberts:

*– I was astonished by what Gallo had chosen to object to. He did not object to what I wrote about the last minute changes he made to the Popovic paper, nor did he object to my citations from the devastating conclusions of the ORI or from the Inspector General's investigations into his work, but only to my mention of what the Secret Service had discovered in his papers. (Janine Roberts)*

**8. Val Turner's letter – which I am now seeing for the first time – I will reply separately (...) As these emails were not addressed to myself, or shared with me, I was not aware of their concerns and thus have not been able to address them.**

We cannot say when Janine Roberts first saw Val Turner's mail regarding Letter to Science. She was on the recipient list when it was sent on 11/29/08. The second mail by Dr. Maniotis was sent to the hivaidsparadigm group on 11/6/08. Janine Roberts and David Crowe were both members of the group at that time.

Furthermore, posting to hivaidsparadigm guarantees wide distribution. If Dr. Maniotis posted his comments there and nobody, including the Letters co-author, David Crowe, discussed this with Janine Roberts, this fact alone proves our point that RA is deeply dysfunctional.

**9. In the whole of your presentation Claude (sic), you miss the major point in the Letter to Science – it is central to the letter, and you do not even cite it, let alone contradict it. The central premise of the Letter to Science is that; at no point in the Popovic et al paper that is widely cited as proving a virus causes AIDS (ie in Nature in 1984), is there any experiment designed to prove any virus pathogenic, let alone the cause of AIDS.**

We are all aware of this. Those who believe otherwise are by definition not dissidents. However, we believe that the focus and wording of the Letter to Science obscures and distracts from its basic premise.

**10. Claus, as I have said before, you should think seriously about also sending your research on the Popovic et al paper to Science if you have not already. You have constructed a very different argument for vital flaws in the Popovic paper, looking at other aspects than myself. The Editor of Science should see it.**

It is Eugene Semon who has constructed the argument in question. He has already sent his letter to the Editor of Science.

**11. I am astonished that you have posted this as an attempt to discredit the letter to Science that I initiated and coauthored – for there is scarcely any direct critique of our letter's contents in this at all.**

We disagree.