

# Confession of an “AIDS Denialist”

How I Became a Crank Because We’re Being Lied to About HIV/AIDS  
Henry H. Bauer

Originally published in

***You Are Still Being Lied To: The REMIXED Disinformation Guide to Media Distortion, Historical Whitewashes and Cultural Myths***

(The Disinformation Company, 2009)

For decades I had taken an interest in scientific unorthodoxies. I had written books about them.<sup>1</sup> I had learned from Bernard Barber<sup>2</sup> that scientists always vigorously resist the great discoveries—almost every nineteenth-century advance in understanding electricity, for example—before accepting them. I had learned from Gunther Stent<sup>3</sup> that some discoveries come “before their time” and are long ignored—Mendel’s genetics, Wegener’s continental drift. I had learned from Thomas Kuhn<sup>4</sup> that science progresses by paradigm shifts in which the old worldview is overturned by one that seemed heretical or incredible just before the revolution—light as particles, or quantum mechanics.

I also learned that the history of science is largely silent about all the claimed discoveries that turned out to be spurious. Most unorthodox claims come to naught in the end, and so they were very properly ignored or resisted.

Geniuses are cranks who happen to be right, and cranks are geniuses who happen to be wrong, and they all behave in the same way.

I learned much about heretics. I learned that one cannot easily or quickly distinguish cranks from geniuses. Geniuses are cranks who happen to be right, and cranks are geniuses who happen to be wrong, and they all behave in the same way. They stubbornly believe themselves right, no matter what others think. They know that their discovery is the most important thing under the sun, and they believe everyone should appreciate that. They so misunderstand the ways of the world that they are their own worst enemies. They press their ideas in ways that give them the least possible chance of being taken seriously. Failing to get favorable attention from the experts, heretics often fall into the company of other people who have

ideas that everyone else thinks absurd. Finding appreciative attention there, the heretics come to see more and more substance in all those other rejected ideas; whereby, little by little, a perfectly competent scientist may become progressively more and more gullible, forgetting the necessity of always being critical, always skeptical, of always checking theories against facts.

I understood all that, yet still I found myself going the same way, becoming a crank.



Contrary to what just about everyone knows, HIV doesn’t cause AIDS. Billions of dollars are being misspent on misguided research and misguided aid; untold thousands of well-intentioned people are misled and are actively misleading others; and, what most haunts me, healthy people (including babies) who test positive on an “HIV” test are being made unhealthy by toxic “antiretroviral” drugs.

Here’s what made me a crank: fully believing that I had stumbled upon *the proof* that HIV doesn’t cause AIDS; proof so absolutely clear and decisive that everyone who looks at it is bound to concede to it, yet at the same time a proof that everyone else had somehow been overlooking, even the many competent people who have been arguing for twenty years that HIV doesn’t cause AIDS.

Shades of Immanuel Velikovsky. He was the first crank whose story I looked into in any detail. One day he had been struck by a stunning insight: The ancients had described, in masked fashion—in legends and myths about the gods—actual events they saw taking place in the skies. Being a psychoanalyst, Velikovsky could decode these stories. The Red Sea’s parting was owing to a comet passing close to earth; so were the plagues of Egypt; and so on, and so forth. Velikovsky had

uncovered the hidden, repressed memories that cause human beings to lapse into traumas and behave badly toward one another. He could correct ancient history and save the world from itself, through the obviously correct insights that had evaded everyone else.

## To ignore us cranks is to go very sensibly with the overwhelming odds.

One day I was struck by a stunning insight: Data from HIV tests prove that HIV is not a sexually transmitted virus. Somehow, everyone else had overlooked this for twenty years. Yet the proof is so absolutely clear and decisive that everyone who looks at it is bound to agree.

All I had to do was to get people to pay attention.

When I shared my insights with the US Military HIV Research Program, they ignored me.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention were more courteous. They acknowledged the great time and effort I had put in, agreed that I had the data right, agreed that the trends I saw really are there—but insisted they are compatible with orthodox HIV = AIDS theory.

That was my first great surprise. I had expected to be told that I had the data wrong, or that there were other sources that vitiated the trends I thought I had seen. I had expected denial, stonewalling, not the defending of insupportable inferences. Yet

I shouldn't have been surprised; that's par for the course. For reasons of human psychology and sociology and material self-interest, astronomers and other scientists didn't accept Velikovsky's insights. For reasons of human psychology and sociology and material self-interest, the HIV/AIDS Establishment couldn't accept my insights.



To doubt that HIV causes AIDS is not merely to doubt a claim made by a few clinicians; it's to deny the authority of the

National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the World Health Organization, UNAIDS, the World Bank, and other powerful organizations. It is to question pledges by governments to spend billions of dollars in the fight against HIV/AIDS in Africa. It is to threaten the research grants needed by innumerable individuals and coveted by innumerable institutions. It is to suggest that the host of AIDS charities have been misled and misguided—charities established, supported, and advertised by such celebrities as Princess Diana, Nelson Mandela, Bill Gates, Sir Elton John, and many others.

Those institutions and those eminences are not going to admit they've been wrong before they absolutely have to. You don't have to be a conspiracy buff to suspect that they will find all manner of ways to prevent it from happening.

Paranoia comes readily to us cranks. It's a well-earned paranoia, as a friend and colleague remarked recently in connection with how the media treat us. Tell someone—almost anyone—that HIV doesn't cause AIDS, and you're immediately and automatically labeled a kook, not to be taken seriously. I've understood that for a long time, of course, and the seemingly good and ample justification for it: Out of all the many such claims—pyramid power, homeopathy, extrasensory perception, etc., etc.—only a very few will ever turn out to have

My "Eureka!" moment, my *satori*, had been the realization that the argument over HIV/AIDS could be settled by looking solely at the epidemiology of positive HIV-tests—no need to get into intricate technicalities of molecular biology.

real substance to them; that's what the history of science teaches. To ignore us cranks is to go very sensibly with the overwhelming odds.

Understanding that, I had acknowledged it when I approached the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Military HIV Research Program: I noted that this sort of communication, from someone not known to them and making so startling a claim, would normally be the sign of a crank; but, please, just look at the data.

I was telling them, in other words, “I am *not* a crank.” Just as convincing, no doubt, as when a president assured the nation, “I am not a crook.”

I realized how unconvinced they were when I read that brief but courteous letter from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. I recognized the style, because I’d written letters like that myself, as editor of the *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, responding to obvious cranks who wanted their stuff published and for whom I felt sympathy—nice old fellows

## Why are male babies infected about 25 percent more often than female babies?

lapsing into their dotage who wanted to do something really important before they passed on. I had observed the syndrome years earlier. Analogous to the mid-life crisis, it’s the end-of-career crisis. It’s seen, for example, in those Nobel-winners who then behave like all-purpose world-saving gurus, the physicist who discovers eugenics and reinvents the old erroneous wheels, the professor not of biology or anthropology or medicine who comes up with a new theory of human social evolution. Less kindly, the phenomenon has been described not as the end-of-career crisis but as the “old-man last-gasp syndrome.”

I had understood all this for quite a while, yet here I was, exemplifying it. Having been retired for half-a-dozen years, I had now achieved the most important, the most consequential insight of my life. I could set straight what thousands of others, tens of thousands, had gotten wrong.



I’d been haranguing friends and acquaintances to look at the data, to read my analyses, to tell me where I’d gone wrong or where I was unconvincing. I couldn’t help being surprised—even as I ought to have known better—when they didn’t think it all that world-shattering. To them, after all, HIV/AIDS is just another tsunami, earthquake, massacre, famine—the sort of thing that goes on all the time in some other part of the world. AIDS is devastating Africa, not the United States—or at least here it only affects those “others” who don’t behave as responsibly as we ourselves do.



Cranks suffer from a lack of constructive critiquing. Every researcher and every writer soon learns to value disinterested criticism—it helps in avoiding error and in enhancing the persuasiveness of what one later publishes. Heretics receive at best only cursory comments, so what we then publish tends to be anything but professionally polished, and that provides yet further ready excuse for not taking us seriously.

We cranks are also pushed into presenting ourselves as know-it-alls. My “Eureka!” moment, my *satori*, had been the realization that the argument over HIV/AIDS could be settled by looking solely at the epidemiology of positive HIV-tests—no need to get into intricate technicalities of molecular biology. But as I sought reactions from various people, I was constantly asked, “But then what *does* cause AIDS? What *is* HIV? How could everyone have been so wrong for so long?”

Those are red herrings. They’re beside the point. The data show conclusively that “HIV” is not sexually transmitted, and didn’t spread from the AIDS epicenters. Case closed.

But those questions are red herrings only intellectually, whereas the task is a matter of psychology, of how to persuade people to shed their beliefs, preconceptions, prejudices. People who have imbibed the standard view of HIV/AIDS *cannot* accept my analysis of the data. That’s what Kuhn meant by “incommensurability”—radically unorthodox claims are not even understood by those vested in the conventional wisdom. Psychology calls it “cognitive dissonance.” In Festinger’s classic study,<sup>5</sup> the beliefs of cult members grew stronger rather than weaker when evidence contradicted their belief.

So, in order to be persuasive, I prepared answers to those red-herring questions: I explained what HIV really is, what really causes AIDS, how everyone could indeed have been so wrong for so long. I’ve got an answer to everything, in other words. I present myself as not just an iconoclast on a single point—the epidemiology of HIV, showing it isn’t sexually transmitted—I present myself as a know-it-all about matters of medicine and about the history and sociology of science and medicine. One of the marks of the crank that I had identified in the Velikovsky affair is the brazen willingness to speak like an expert in any number of disciplines. Now here I am, doing that myself.



Yet it's not only the questions raised by individuals that make it necessary to offer answers to those red-herring questions, it's also in the nature of how science works. A theory is never abandoned just because of accumulated conundrums that it can't explain; change comes only when it's seen that an alternative theory does the job better. To displace current beliefs about HIV/AIDS, there has to be offered a comprehensive framework for explaining what AIDS is, what HIV is, and how a wrong interpretation came about and persisted for so long. One who seeks to displace the current theory *must* act as a know-it-all.



So there we are. I have to behave like a crank even though I recognize that's what I'm doing and how counterproductive that is. We cranks are *incurably* naïve: We believe that the truth speaks for itself, and that therefore the truth will out. No matter how much we know about the ways of human beings and human groups, we continue to regard self-interested behavior as aberrant instead of recognizing it as the norm. No matter how much we've learned about the other cranks who were sure they were right, each one of us knows that he is different, unique—I know I'm different, because unlike all those other cranks, I *really* am right.



Time to cut to the chase: Could I perhaps interest you in looking into the data I've put together, just looking at it? No obligation to think about it, or to comment, let alone to buy into it. (Though secretly I know, if I can just get you to look, you're bound to get hooked, just as I was.)

Here's just a taste.

Since 1985, tens of millions of HIV tests have been done, mostly on people not really thought to be at risk of infection: blood donors, military personnel, women giving birth, many others.

Whenever and wherever tests were done, anywhere in the US, some HIV-positive people were found. Not many, just a few in every thousand or every ten thousand or so. But all over the place. If HIV started out—as the experts tell us it did—in San Francisco and New York and Los Angeles no earlier than the 1970s, then it couldn't have become so widely distributed by

1985. That's not enough time for a sexually transmitted bug to go from ghettos of gay men in a few big cities to become so widespread that some teenage Army recruits, males and females equally, from all over the country, turn up infected. But that's what the facts are. Among teenage applicants for military service between 1985 and 1989, equal numbers of males and females tested positive. And yet AIDS victims then were 95 percent males.<sup>6</sup>

The sex ratio for "HIV infection" is nothing like that, rarely more than two men for each woman, 65 percent against 95 percent—among blood donors and Army recruits, at hospitals and clinics. Among young teenagers, "HIV"-positive females often outnumber the males.

## Why is it that drug addicts who shared needles showed *less* infection than those who used clean needles—at the same clinics and in two countries?

How do babies get infected? Through their mothers, of course. But why are male babies infected about 25 percent more often than female babies?

Infection by HIV is supposed to be permanent. Once you've got it, you never get rid of it. The prevalence of HIV can't go down; it can only increase in the population, under the accepted view. Yet the data show that it *did* decrease during the 1980s, in every state and in every tested group—blood donors, active-duty soldiers, applicants for military service, members of the Job Corps, people tested at all sorts of public clinics.

Drug addicts typically have a high rate of testing "HIV"-positive. But among those who stopped taking drugs, the rate was lower; and it was lower the longer the tested group had been off drugs. How did they become disinfected?

Babies test "HIV"-positive about four to ten times more often than children between about one and teenage years. How do those babies become disinfected?

Why is it that drug addicts who shared needles showed *less* infection than those who used clean needles—at the same clinics and in two countries? And why did those who *smoked* crack cocaine have a higher level of infection than those who

injected cocaine? And why did those who injected cocaine show a higher level of infection than those who injected heroin, who in turn had a higher rate of infection than those who injected amphetamine? Does amphetamine sterilize the needles?

In June 2005, a press release from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention announced that the number of HIV-infected Americans had surpassed a million “for the first time.” But two decades earlier, in 1986, their estimate had been

## Why would patients at TB clinics and at clinics for sexually transmitted diseases be equally infected with HIV? Why would psychiatric patients be even more infected?

between a million and a million-and-a-half, refined a few months later to between 945,000 and 1,410,000. Those are rather precise figures, so they must have been rather sure of them. In 1990, they estimated that about 1 million Americans were infected but that at the beginning of 1986 there had been only about 750,000. In 1993, the flagship journal *Science* gave the estimate of >1 million. Now, a dozen years later, here we were again at about 1 million...“for the first time”?!

Whichever way you look at it, this is not a spreading, increasing epidemic. The numbers of infected haven’t changed appreciably. But neither have the hysteria and fear-mongering changed, the propaganda that insists everyone is at risk and that sex isn’t safe.

Nothing about HIV makes sense if you regard it as a sexually transmitted infection. Why would patients at TB clinics and at clinics for sexually transmitted diseases be equally infected with HIV? Why would psychiatric patients be even more infected?

How could HIV have remained distributed around the United States in exactly the same way for 20 years? And why is it distributed like that, anyway—more prevalent in the Atlantic Coast and Southern regions than in North-Central locales? In every group—Army recruits, the Job Corps, women having children, people getting tested at all sorts of clinics! What’s so specially dangerous sexually about the Southeast and the Atlantic Coast?

Why are Asians always less infected than white people, who

are always less infected than Latinos, who are always less infected than black Americans? No matter what group you look at—soldiers, sailors, Marines, blood donors, women who have just given birth—always that same sequence! What sort of virus discriminates by race?

The reason is *not* that the minorities have been so long discriminated against that sexual diseases are naturally more common among them. Native Americans, who have been discriminated against as much as anyone, are less infected than Latinos, and much less infected than black Americans.

And why are Latinos on the West Coast infected about as little as Anglo Americans, while on the East Coast they are infected nearly as much as black Americans?



As I’ve confessed, I’m a crank; and another crank characteristic is that we can’t stop talking. I said I was going to give a taste, and here I am, spilling bean after bean.

Please, do just look at the data. They are in articles in respectable, peer-reviewed journals and official reports from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Department of Defense, all unclassified, all no further away than an Internet terminal.<sup>7</sup>

## Nothing about HIV makes sense if you regard it as a sexually transmitted infection.

But be warned: If you do look at the data, you may stop thinking I’m a crank. You’ll be well on the way to becoming one yourself.

### Endnotes

1. *Beyond Velikovsky: The history of a public controversy* (1984); *The enigma of Loch Ness: Making sense of a mystery* (1986); *Science or pseudoscience: Magnetic healing, psychic phenomena, and other heterodoxies* (1992); all from University of Illinois Press.
2. Barber, Bernard. (1961). Resistance by scientists to scientific discovery. *Science* 134, pp 596–602.
3. Stent, Gunther. (1972). Prematurity and uniqueness in scientific discovery. *Scientific American*, December, pp 84–93.
4. Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (2nd ed., enlarged; 1st ed. 1962).
5. Festinger, Leon, Henry Riecken & Stanley Schachter. (1956). *When prophecy fails: A social and psychological study of a modern group that predicted the destruction of the world*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
6. All the following assertions are fully supported by original sources in the mainstream medical-scientific literature. Those sources are cited in Bauer, Henry H. (2007). *The origin, persistence and failings of HIV/AIDS theory*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland. See <failingsofhivaidstheory.homestead.com>.
7. A large number of these sources is also cited in the book mentioned in the previous endnote.

## CONTRIBUTORS & INTERVIEWEES

**Henry Bauer** is Austrian by birth, Australian by education, and American by choice. He is now Dean Emeritus of Arts and Sciences and Professor Emeritus of Chemistry and Science Studies at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech), where he had also been a founding member of the Center for the Study of Science in Society. Earlier, Bauer had taught at the Universities of Sydney (Australia) and Kentucky, and held visiting appointments at the Universities of Michigan and Southampton (England) and at Rikagaku Kenkyusho (Tokyo). Since the 1970s, his chief interest has been the role of heterodoxy in the progress of science and the "demarcation problem": what differentiates topics considered properly part of science from other topics—UFOs, psychic phenomena, and the like—that are shunned by mainstream science. Bauer founded and edited (1993–1999) *Virginia Scholar*, the newsletter of the Virginia Association of Scholars, and later served as editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Scientific Exploration* (2000–2007). Bauer's books range over chemistry, academic administration, the nature of mainstream science, and the critical assessment of scientific unorthodoxies (details at <[www.henrybauer.homestead.com](http://www.henrybauer.homestead.com)>). His latest book is *The Origin, Persistence and Failings of HIV/AIDS Theory* (2007), which shows that official data about HIV prove that it is not contagious and doesn't correlate with the incidence of AIDS. For more on that, see Bauer's blog <<http://hivskeptic.wordpress.com>>.

## A NOTE TO READERS

The beliefs (political, religious, etc.) of any contributor cannot be assumed simply because he or she appears in this anthology. If a contributor reveals his or her beliefs in the course of an article, that's obviously a different matter, but simply appearing here is not an indication of affiliation.

Similarly, bear in mind that no contributor necessarily agrees with the other contributors. In fact, I'm sure some would get into arguments if invited to the same dinner party. So, inclusion is not an indication of collusion.

**YOU ARE STILL BEING LIED TO**

The **REMIXED** Disinformation Guide to Media Distortion,  
Historical Whitewashes and Cultural Myths

edited by **Russ Kick**

**disinformation**<sup>®</sup>

This anthology Copyright © 2009 The Disinformation Company Ltd.

All of the articles in this book are subject to copyright by, and are printed here under license from, their respective authors and/or original publishers, except as specified herein, and we note and thank them for their kind permission.

Published by The Disinformation Company Ltd.  
163 Third Avenue, Suite 108  
New York, NY 10003  
Tel.: +1.212.691.1605  
Fax: +1.212.691.1606  
[www.disinfo.com](http://www.disinfo.com)

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a database or other retrieval system, or transmitted in any form, by any means now existing or later discovered, including without limitation mechanical, electronic, photographic or otherwise, without the express prior written permission of the publisher.

Designed by Greg Stadnyk

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Control Number: 2008942907

ISBN: 978-1-934708-07-1

Distributed in the U.S. and Canada by:  
Consortium Book Sales and Distribution  
34 Thirteenth Avenue NE, Suite 101  
Minneapolis MN 55413-1007  
Tel.: +1.800.283.3572 Fax: +1.612.746.2606  
[www.cbsd.com](http://www.cbsd.com)

Distributed in the United Kingdom and Eire by:  
Turnaround Publisher Services Ltd.  
Unit 3, Olympia Trading Estate  
Coburg Road  
London, N22 6TZ  
Tel.: +44.(0)20 8829.3000 Fax: +44.(0)20.8881.5088  
[www.turnaround-uk.com](http://www.turnaround-uk.com)

Distributed in Australia by:  
Tower Books  
Unit 2/17 Rodborough Road  
Frenchs Forest NSW 2086  
Tel.: +61.2.9975.5566 Fax: +61.2.9975.5599  
Email: [info@towerbooks.com.au](mailto:info@towerbooks.com.au)

The opinions and statements made in this book are those of the authors concerned. The Disinformation Company Ltd. has not verified and neither confirms nor denies any of the foregoing and no warranty or fitness is implied. The reader is encouraged to keep an open mind and to independently judge for him or herself whether or not he or she is still being lied to. The Disinformation Company Ltd. shall have no liability or responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage arising from the information contained in this book or from the use thereof or reliance thereon.

*Disinformation*® is a registered trademark of The Disinformation Company Ltd.



# CONTENTS

Introduction 6

## KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Reality Is a Shared Hallucination | Howard Bloom 10

## THE NEWS MEDIA AND OTHER MANIPULATORS

What Makes Mainstream Media Mainstream | Noam Chomsky 19

We Were Silenced by the Drums of War | Jeff Cohen 25

The Puppets of Pandemonium | Howard Bloom 28

New Rules for the New Millennium | Garv Webb 39

Digital Seductions | Norman Solomon 42

The Media and Their Atrocities | Michael Parenti 45

The Martin Luther King You Don't See on TV | Jeff Cohen and Norman Solomon 51

Treacherous Words | Normand Ballarçon 53

School Textbooks | Earl Lee 64

The Information Arms Race | Douglas Rushkoff 76

## ONE NATION, UNDER THE CORPORATION

The Truth About Corporations | Agent J 84

Chemicals Are Killing You | Terri Mitchell 98

Cheap, Crappy Food = A Fat Population

Steven Greenstreet, Bryan Young, and Elias Pate 107

Fields of Fuel | Josh Tickell 112

Why Did the Iraqi Government Want Blackwater Banned? | Jim Marrs 115

The War on Bugs: Pesticide Spray Devices, Household Poisons, and Dr. Seuss

Will Allen 119

Pharmaceutical Crimes and Misdemeanors | Peter Rost, M.D. 124

## POLITRICKS

John McCain and the POW Cover-up | Sydney H. Schanberg 130

Mission Rejected: Clifton Hicks | Peter Laufer 143

Dear Deluded Mass Media, North American Union Agenda Exists

Alex Jones and Steve Watson 148

Colony Kosovo | Christian Parenti 154

Moral Imperialism and the Iron Logic of War | Stan Goff 157

Bedouin Blues | Seth Tobocman 164

## OFFICIAL VERSIONS

How the People Seldom Catch Intelligence | Preston Peet 170

Reassessing OKC | Cletus Nelson 187

The Rabin Murder Cover-up | Barry Chamish 195

What's Missing from This Picture? | Jim Marrs 201

## **THE SOCIAL FABRICATION**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Don't Blame Your Parents   interview with Judith Rich Harris | 214 |
| The Unkindest Cut   Tristan Taormino                         | 220 |
| Art and the Eroticism of Puberty   David Steinberg           | 222 |
| "A World That Hates Gays"   Philip Jenkins                   | 227 |
| Media Violence Studies Put Reason on a Rack   Paul McMasters | 240 |
| The Man in the Bushes   interview with Philip Jenkins        | 243 |
| From Untouchables to Conscientious Objectors   Daniel Grego  | 249 |

## **CONDEMNED TO REPEAT IT**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| The Constitution, War, and the Draft   Ron Paul                | 255 |
| Amnesia in America   James W. Loewen                           | 259 |
| Columbus and Western Civilization   Howard Zinn                | 263 |
| Saving Private Power   Michael Zezima                          | 274 |
| What I Didn't Know About the Communist Conspiracy   Jim Martin | 283 |
| Dreaming Up America, Reel One   Russell Banks                  | 289 |

## **TRIPPING**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Drug War Mythology   Paul Armentano                 | 295 |
| Crushing Butterflies With Iron Boots   Peter Gorman | 303 |
| Toad-Licking Blues   Thomas Lyttle                  | 310 |
| The War on Consciousness   Graham Hancock           | 315 |
| AA Lies   Charles Bufe                              | 321 |
| The Unconscious Roots of the Drug War   Dan Russell | 329 |

## **HOLY ROLLING**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| The Eurabian Revolution   Gregory M. Davis            | 340 |
| The Bible Code   David Thomas                         | 347 |
| Fear and Lying in 2012-Land   John Major Jenkins      | 357 |
| Mystics and Messiahs   interview with Philip Jenkins  | 367 |
| Who's Who in Hell   interview with Warren Allen Smith | 371 |

## **BLINDED BY SCIENCE**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Confession of an "AIDS Denialist"   Henry H. Bauer               | 378 |
| NutraFear & NutraLoathing in Augusta, Georgia   Alex Constantine | 383 |
| Forbidden Archaeology   Michael A. Cremo                         | 388 |
| There Is So Much That We Don't Know   William R. Corliss         | 394 |

## **THE BIG PICTURE**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Will the Real Human Being Please Stand Up?   Riane Eisler | 408 |
| New Thought vs. Holism   Alexandra Bruce                  | 416 |
| The Religious Experience of Phillip K. Dick   R. Crumb    | 420 |
| A Sentient Universe   Peter Russell                       | 428 |
| A Lost Theory?   David Loye                               | 431 |

|                               |     |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Contributors and Interviewees | 437 |
| Article Histories             | 446 |