



Dear Friends and Fellow Dissidents,

6 November, 2009

I am writing as an individual who has held a central place among AIDS dissidents since 1982 (since even before there were “AIDS dissidents”) and as one who has more direct experience than most in working with “HIV+” people and people with AIDS related fears and conditions. With this letter, I feel I am speaking among friends and from within my own camp. And yet I have chosen not to attend the Rethinking AIDS 2009 conference. Why?

I have chosen not to attend because I believe this gathering will not help the cause. I sincerely believe that it will not do anything to help either dissidents or anyone else to either recognize or rectify the real threats that we are dealing with – the social, political and academic risk factors that originally gave, and continue to give, life to the Infectious AIDS fraud. I’ve said it before and I’ll say it again: a social and political construct like “Infectious AIDS” cannot be stopped with academic science – especially if the scientists themselves remain loyal to the social, political and academic agendas that gave rise to it.

We’re this many years into this movement and it seems many dissidents still refuse to acknowledge or factor into their theories the central risk factor for AIDS: susceptibility to a belief in HIV. Although many of us now realize that “HIV” is a figment of virology, few of us acknowledge the fact that “HIV Voodoo” is both real and deadly - to both HIV believers and “HIV+” dissidents! It is a cold hard fact: academic knowledge alone is insufficient to prevent an “emotional infection”. Like a physical infection, an “emotional infection” can only take within a susceptible host. But unlike its physical counterpart, emotional susceptibility is predicated upon preexisting socio-emotional factors, not intellectual (let alone physiological) factors. This is proven by the premature death of many dissidents who, having publicly rejected the HIV=AIDS=Death model, privately raced to take AIDS meds after the onset of either mild clinical symptoms or during difficult, emotionally challenging circumstances (like testing “HIV+”).

Then there is the question of the existence of HIV.

The social function of the HIV/AIDS doctrine is to evade the truly relevant issues in life: physical, mental and emotional health, loving sexual expression and the destructive consequences of the socio-emotional, political, economic and environmental burdens on the people at risk. Academic science has shown that it cannot and will not productively contribute to these issues and therefore cannot and will not contribute to ending the murderous HIV fraud. It pains me that most dissidents continue to turn to academicians for salvation. What will it take for people to understand that no matter how much you educate somebody, if a person is told that they are infected with “HIV” there remains a constant social, medical and mainstream media bombardment that reinforces the idea that they are sick. Telling someone that they’re infected with a harmless passenger virus cannot alleviate this stress. I believe that many folk, both dissident and non-dissident alike, would be alive today if it could.

Further, the “harmless passenger virus” claim doesn’t change the “HIV+” person’s second-class status and, most important of all, it does not change their emotional, physical and sexual isolation, an isolation

that in and of itself can kill them. Quite frankly, after 25 years of urging people to question, challenge and when necessary fire their doctors, I feel our movement is doomed to fail unless we begin to question, challenge and start sacking academic scientists who refuse to responsibly discuss the absolutely vital, scientifically valid question of the existence of HIV.

When The Group for the Reappraisal of the HIV/AIDS Hypothesis first came on the scene, it was enthusiastically received by the early dissidents as a body of academic allies who were taking up the cause. We thought they shared the same goal – to end AIDS. After the Group’s transmutation into Rethinking AIDS, however, their loyalty shifted to the basic presuppositions of conventional science, medicine and retrovirology. But why does RA want to continue to endorse retrovirology? Why does it support Professor Duesberg's claim that “HIV tests” work? That’s what their silence is saying! Their silence is saying that these tests do what the AIDS establishment claims these tests do. But not so from where I sit! My experience and the Perth Group’s research bear out time and again that these tests are proof of neither active nor prior or latent infection and that the tests themselves are therefore dangerous. And that too is why I’m not at the conference.

To hear all of this may be shocking to some of you but this is the central issue, isn’t it? The whole spirit of this conference is, “this is the best science; these are the best scientists.” However, in the one place where academic science COULD help, namely, in debating the existence of HIV, RA stands on the sidelines with their backs to the field. So I guess they represent the best scientists like AIDS tests represent the best science? When someone of Professor Duesberg’s stature claims that “HIV is a harmless passenger virus”, someone has to stand up! And when a group of supporters keep quiet to either evade the issue or make sure that no one’s feelings get hurt, then they are not acting as scientists and activists, they are acting as politicians. How many times do we have to point out that the most important piece of the HIV puzzle is the psycho-emotional component, the silent terror in the face of an “HIV+” diagnosis?

Some may ask, how can I say all of this without even attending the conference? Easy. I’ve attended this conference many times before. I look at the abstract of the Keynote lecture – the KEYNOTE lecture – and I see a typical, confused equation of the AIDS fraud with rational fears. Politically, here is a speaker who describes beautifully the shortcomings of the Left and then reflexively projects them onto the Right. Perfect. Perhaps, for starters, the speaker ought to focus his attention on ACT-UP and TAG and their early role as the primary obstacle to the truth about AIDS. If you think ACT-UP, GMHC, TAG and Larry Kramer were greedy, capitalistic, conservative church-going Christian Republican nut-jobs, think again!

In closing, I offer you a brief statement from the Perth Group. It was sent to David Crowe with a request that he make their disassociation from RA public.

Perth Group: “Because of irreconcilable scientific and ethical differences we wish to formally disassociate ourselves from the Rethinking AIDS Group. Signed: The Perth Group”.

David Crowe: “Dear Val, no, I will not read this statement at the conference. It is not true, for example, to state that differences are irreconcilable when there has been no attempt to reconcile or even to determine whether differences do actually exist.”

I wish all of you well.

Michael Ellner,
President, HEAL-NYC