

STRANGE CASE OF DR JEKYLL-KALICHMAN AND MR HYDE-NEWTON

as told by Henry H. Bauer

Chapter 1

It's a common enough experience, to wake up in the morning with the answer to a troubling problem or at least a fresh insight: when one's conscious, systematic, objective, scientific mind is asleep, the subconscious seems better able to exert its creative powers. I've benefited from it when I was doing electrochemistry, and when I was an administrator, and when I was writing about science studies, and when I was analyzing "HIV"-test data. And it's still happening. The other morning I woke to another Eureka moment:

The reason that I was reminded of "Joe Newton" so often while working my way through Kalichman's book was because the persona of Newton, which at first Kalichman could summon and dispense with almost at will, had at last taken him over irrevocably, just as Robert Louis Stevenson's Dr. Jekyll had succumbed to Mr. Hyde after he had summoned him up once too often. That's why Kalichman's book attributes to me and other Rethinkers and Skeptics things said by "Newton", not by us; and why the book finds it necessary to use so many "!" to emphasize what it regards as telling points; and why there are as many untruths in the book as there were lies in "Newton's" e-mails and deceptions in his personal interactions with us.

The first fateful step, it's obvious by hindsight, was to the top of a very steep as well as slippery slope. Professor Kalichman, perfectly well versed in the rules of conduct that govern his profession (<http://www.apa.org/ethics/code2002.html>), would never dream of deceiving the subjects of his research; or if he did dream of it, he would have obtained advice and approval from the Human Subjects Board or Institutional Review Board at the University of Connecticut before actually doing so.

But a little imp seems to have whispered to Professor Kalichman: "Wouldn't it be interesting, maybe even a bit exciting, to find out from the inside what those so-evil-seeming denialists are really thinking and doing? Why not pose as someone sympathetic or at least open to denialism? What harm could it possibly do, just to try a little experiment? Anonymously, no one need ever know."

So Kalichman gave birth to an alter ego, "Joseph C Newton", who registered in August 2007 as an HIV-positive individual on a website maintained by Stephen Davis.

At about the same time, "Newton" in very different guise was requesting information from the new Rethinking AIDS website:

"From: Joseph Newton <jocnewton@gmail.com>
To: "correspondence@rethinkingaids.com" <correspondence@rethinkingaids.com>
Date: Thursday, August 9, 2007, 9:28:31 AM
Subject: Questions

I have visited your website and I am keenly interested in your views. As a medical professional I have often questioned the AIDS establishment as we stand by and see people get sicker from the highly toxic medications we use. Can you direct me to other information so I can learn more about alternative theories of AIDS.
Thank you
JCP"

Perhaps the "Newton" persona had not been well thought out (Kalichman evidently lacks a novelist's understanding of human psychology, as earlier noted – "How not to create a persona: Kalichman's Komical Kaper #4", <http://hivskeptik.wordpress.com/2009/03/29/how-not-to-create-a-persona-kalichman-s-komical-kaper-4/>), or Kalichman was not keeping track of what he was doing, or perhaps he had designated several people to chase information under "Newton's" name, or he thought foolishly that the several contacts being made by "Newton" would never compare notes; for no sooner had he signed up as an "HIV-positive", and then told the RA website that he was a medical professional, than he described himself, again to the RA website, as a mere student:

"From: Joseph Newton <jocnewton@gmail.com>
To: correspondence@rethinkingaids.com
Date: Friday, August 10, 2007, 9:18:02 PM
Subject: joining you

Hello
I have been reading quite a bit about alternative theories of AIDS and as a student of Public Health in the USA, I would like to join your list of Rethinkers. Can you tell me how I might apply?
Thank you!
Joseph C. Newton, Connecticut, USA"

On the same day, "Newton" started an e-mail correspondence with Henry Bauer, who had just published the latest denialist book (see How not to create a persona: Kalichman's Komical Kaper #4, <http://hivskeptic.wordpress.com/2009/03/29/how-not-to-create-a-persona-kalichman-s-komical-kaper-4/>). And five days later, Joseph Newton, "student in public health, Bridgeton, USA", signed as a member of the original Group for the Scientific Reappraisal of the HIV-AIDS Hypothesis (<http://www.virusmyth.com/statement/thegroup>).

Although "Newton's" professional and "HIV-positive" status was so varied in these different approaches, what was constant was a predilection for typos and a rather unnatural or stilted style. My guess is that the imp suggested that typos would create an image of hurriedness, lack of concentration perhaps, at any rate of someone with whom one could safely let one's guard down.

Some weeks later, things at last seemed to become more productive. "Newton" queried Bauer about a supposed HIV-positive friend, and was introduced to Tony Lance and his theory of intestinal dysbiosis.

Now temptations began to multiply for Hyde-Newton. Instead of merely observing, perhaps he could inveigle some of the denialists into delivering up words with which they could later be thoroughly discredited – for example, if they could be enticed into advocating unsafe sex:

2 October 2007, "Newton" to Tony Lance:

"But my question has to do with safer sex. If my friend believes that he has tested positive because of intestinal spewing of antibodies, should he even care about using condoms or serosorting??

I appreciate your sharing this with me and your insights."

[Notice, by the way, not only "Newton's" trademark of frequent mis-spellings and exclamation marks, sometimes multiplied, and question marks that often come in duplicate, but also his odd, unconvincing mixture of feigned naivety and simultaneous familiarity with such rather uncommon phenomena as "serosorting"; I've commented before on the inept choice of a graduate-student persona that types like a rather hysterical elementary-school pupil – "How not to create a persona: Kalichman's Komical Kaper #4", <http://hivskeptic.wordpress.com/2009/03/29/how-not-to-create-a-persona-kalichman-s-komical-kaper-4/>]

Huge disappointment. 2 October 2007, Tony Lance to "Newton":

"As for your question about safer sex, I think condoms are a good idea regardless of what you believe about HIV's relationship to AIDS. To put it simply, until any alternative theory of AIDS causation wins out the smart thing to do is cover your ass (and your cock!) and play it safe."

But maybe there's still something to be ferreted out from Lance:

20 October 2007, "Newton" to Lance:

> Hi Tony

> I just saw on the Alive and Well website that you are heading up

> an Alive and Well support group in NYC. True?

> I would like to know more about it.

> Thanks!!

> Joe

[Only one "typo" this time, but another doubled !!]

[As I was reviewing the exchanges by "Newton" with Bauer and with Lance, I experienced once more the comforting reassurance that if one has nothing to hide, and tells the truth, then one is not likely to put one's foot in it. That always reminds me of the time when I, as Dean of Arts & Sciences, had rejected a request for a large salary raise from a faculty member who was waving offers from Elsewhere as a threat. A little later, I heard from his Department Head, whom he had approached in similar fashion. Chortled the Head: "When I told him we don't bargain like that, he was stunned, and said, 'But that's exactly what the Dean said!' Isn't life simple when you just tell the truth? You don't have to keep trying to remember what you said to whom".] 28 October 2007, "Newton" to Lance:

"Hi Tony

I am actually in Connecticut, but I come to the city now and then. Maybe I can come to a meeting. When and where are they held?"

A dilemma. "Connecticut" was a natural, to make plausible the possibility of visits to NYC. But "Connecticut" was also an unfortunate slip, because Professor Kalichman wanted no connection to be known between himself and "Newton"; so when he first posted his "review" of Bauer's book on Amazon.com, he showed his location as "New York" (Kalichman's Komical Kapers – 1: Introducing the author, 8 March 2009, <http://hivskeptic.wordpress.com/2009/03/08/introducing-seth-kalichman-kalichman-s-komical-kaper-1/>).

By now, the apparent opportunity to glean from Lance information for the Kalichman opus was just too much to resist. So “Newton” continued with some \$64K questions:

“Tony, I am also wondering if you might know anyone who was of dissident thinking and then changed to accept the orthodoxy??

I would like to know mor about the cycles that people may go through, between questioning HIV=AIDS and taking HAART??”

But Lance’s group was for “HIV-positives” only, so “Newton” couldn’t attend meetings.

29 October 2007, at 10:09 AM, Joseph Newton wrote:

“Hi Tony.

I do not have HIV, so I fully understand not being welcome to the group. I do not think it is good to have people who are negative in an HIV support group.

But I am interested and I have a close freind who is HIV positive.

It sounds like your group may not differ from most. I know support groups require members to respect each other’s choices and beliefs. They are not usually dogmatic, are they?”

By this point, “Newton” was perhaps wishing that he had kept to his original idea of “being” “HIV-positive”, for “Newton’s” increasing inquisitiveness about Lance’s group and its members brought an obvious query:

“Joe, What is your personal motivation in this matter?”

Whereupon “Newton” prevaricated once again; lying was becoming easier all the time:

“I am just trying to understand.

If the one thing you have in common is that the HIV/ AIDS hypothesis flawed...how is it that some of the members are currently taking the meds or are consdiering taking them?

I understand that people can have ambivalent feelings and the openness of your group surely will allow for that.

But like using condoms, if you guys believe that the HIV = AIDS hypothesis is flawed, why take the meds??

If it possible that there are more extreme groups? Like barebackers are sort of the extreme condom rejectors — is there an extreme dissident group and you guys are sort of moderate??”

But Lance persisted:

“From: Tony Lance <tonylance@mac.com>

Date: October 30, 2007 11:35:27 AM CDT

To: Joseph Newton <joeconewton@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Hello again

Joe,

Why is condom usage amongst dissidents important to you personally if you are negative? Why are you asking me if there exist other dissident groups that are more extreme than ours?”

and “Newton” just kept on lying:

“On Oct 29, 2007, at 4:17 PM, Joseph Newton wrote:

First and foremost I am someone who cares about AIDS.

I am an HIV- person who is trying to understand both sides of the issue.

I have freind who are positive and I know taking treatments can be hard going.

I am personally motivated, I do not have a political agenda. Just trying to understand.”

What Dr. Jekyll discovered too late was that indulging too often in “Hyde” was the same as morphing into Hyde, and apparently Kalichman was morphing into “Newton” and becoming increasingly prone to prevarication. This is how Kalichman describes his interactions — which of course were actually “Newton’s” interactions — with the AIDS Rethinkers and HIV Sceptics who were the subjects of his research (p. xiv):

“So I started corresponding, conversing, and visiting the insiders of HIV/ AIDS denialism. I posed questions and gained insight into the inner workings of denialism. . . . Not really knowing who I am, they took me under their wing to enlighten me about the truth about AIDS. . . . It is through these cordial and inquisitive exchanges that I learned most about this problem. My relationships with denialists created some complicated arrangements that allowed me to experience denialism face-to-face.”

Despite the strange “Not really knowing who I am”, the unwary reader would hardly gather from this that Kalichman deliberately tried to deceive several of those with whom he corresponded, that he tempted them to make self-incriminating statements, and that he even posed as “Newton” in person in some of his meetings with “denialists”. More examples of these distasteful Kalichmanian-Newtonian doings will be documented in future chapters of this cautionary tale.

Chapter 2
"Joseph C Newton" shows himself a liar & agent provocateur

"Joseph C Newton" is an habitual liar, representing himself variously as an "HIV-positive" person, or having an "HIV-positive" friend, or as a medical professional dismayed at the use of toxic medications, or as an enthusiastic supporter of Rethinking. For example, when Rethinking AIDS was revivifying itself and its mailing list,

"From: Joseph Newton <jocnewton@gmail.com>
To: "Rethinking AIDS" <Signatories@rethinkingaids.com>
Date: Monday, November 26, 2007, 11:03:42 PM
Subject: Dear Rethinking AIDS Signatory

Hello

I am very happy to see things moving along!! Will look forward to more good news!

...

Joseph C. Newton, Student of Public Health, Connecticut"

Most often, though, "Newton" was a student just interested in HIV/AIDS matters:

"On Oct 29, 2007, at 10:09 AM, Joseph Newton wrote:

Hi Tony.

.... I hope I am not being too forward, just trying to understand."

repeated a little later:

"On Oct 29, 2007, at 12:20 PM, Joseph Newton wrote:

Thanks Tony

I am just trying to understand"

and again, since his protestations were correctly perceived as so hollow:

"On Oct 29, 2007, at 4:17 PM, Joseph Newton wrote:

First and foremost I am someone who cares about AIDS.

I am an HIV- person who is trying to understand both sides of the issue.

I have freind who are positive and I know taking treatments can be hard going.

I am personally motivated, I do not have a political agenda. Just trying to understand."

and a little later,

"See Tony, I am a student of public health and I am interested in dissidents from a that perspective."

Like Dickens' Uriah Heep, "Newton" evidently believes that flattery and obsequiousness can disarm those at whom they are directed, because his e-mails are lavishly larded with that sort of stuff, from as mild as "it would still be great to meet some day" (Oct 29, 2007, at 10:09 AM to Lance) to over-the-top like "I am reading your book and I am just glued to it!" or "It would be great to hear you speak!" (see Chapter 1).

It would obviously be useful to Kalichman-Newton to ferret out discord among "denialists", so (to David Crowe):

"On Oct 3, 2007, at 10:45 AM, Joseph Newton wrote:

.....

Did you know the Perth Group 'scientists' were recently not accepted as AIDS experts by an Australian court because they did not every work with HIV or HIV infected people?

And I know Peter Duesberg says HIV is harmless, but I also know he has been discredited by AIDS scientists who work with HIV – he has not."

and later that day,

"Seems like you dismiss Duesberg more than you suggest? No?"

"Newton" tempted me, as he had Lance, into making recommendations about medical treatment for an imaginary HIV-positive friend:

"On Sat, 29 Sep 2007 10:11:53 -0400, Joseph Newton <jocnewton@gmail.com> wrote:

I have a friend who has recently tested HIV positive. Mr. Crowe suggested that in the US where people have good nutrition diet supplements may not even be necessary to avoid AIDS. My friend is thinking about taking HIV medications but I am trying to teach him that they are toxic. You do not really get into this in your book much, although Dr. Culshaw does. Do you think I should really try to get him to avoid the drugs or just leave him to decide on his own?"

I replied safely with the truth:

"I believe in giving people info and then letting them make their own decision—especially when there are so many unknowns. A positive HIV test *MIGHT* indicate some sort of potential illness (but not immunodeficiency or AIDS!!) so I suggest to HIV-positive people that they have a thorough physical exam from a doctor who is not dogmatic about HIV, HIV tests, and antiretrovirals.

As far as toxicity of the antiretrovirals, someone recently pointed me to the latest revision, October 2006, of the OFFICIAL NIH STATEMENT:

'the use of antiretroviral therapy is now associated with a series of serious side effects and long-term complications that may have a negative impact on mortality rates. More deaths occurring from liver failure, kidney disease, and cardiovascular complications are being observed in this patient population'

National Institutes of Health. HIV/AIDS Fact Sheet, updated October 2006;

www.nih.gov/about/researchresultsforthepublic/HIV-AIDS.pdf, accessed 26 September 2007.

There are also many groups, HEAL in various cities, Alive & Well, of HIV-positive people who refuse or avoid antiretrovirals, and your friend might do well to get in touch with one or more of them."

So "Newton" never did harvest anything from Rethinkers that we would not have cheerfully responded openly to Kalichman or to anyone else. We were not swayed by "Newton's" trademark Uriah-Heep-like obsequiousness:

"... you are so right... My best of luck to you and may you always be and feel healthy!" (to Lance)

and a bit later,

"I have been giving what you have said a lot of thought. I understand that you care feeling well and it would be nuts to mess with that! But do you see an ID doc who monitors the usual? Or do you go by how you feel? Do you figure the meds are toxic beyond any benefit and just figure you won't take 'em, or if you have a doc who says start you will start? God Forbid you should ever stop feeling well...but hypothetically, what happens then?"

I suppose "Newton" had to persist with lots of typos and lack of syntax, given that he had presented himself like that originally, but it certainly becomes tiresome very quickly; and if you're trying to suck information for someone, you really don't want them to get irritated by your style of inquiry. As previously noted ("How not to create a persona: Kalichman's Komical Kaper #4", 29 March 2009, <http://hivskeptic.wordpress.com/2009/03/29/how-not-to-create-a-persona-kalichman-s-komical-kaper-4/>), you don't want to arouse attention when you're masquerading as someone else, and irritation is likely to stimulate attention. So why on Earth would "Newton" go to the not only absurd and annoying, but also insulting length of even mistyping the name of the person he's writing to?

"Date: Tue, 29 Jan 2008 08:32:20 -0500

From: "Joseph Newton" <jocnewton@gmail.com>

To: "David Crowe" <David.Crowe@aras.ab.ca>

Subject: Re: Update from Alberta Reappraising AIDS Society

Hello Mr. Crowe!!

Cool update! The website looks great! If you still have that email form he Body with the numbered list of devotions I would love to see that!"

or

"On Sat, Mar 1, 2008 at 5:01 AM, Joseph Newton >jocnewton@gmail.com< wrote:

Thank you Mr. Cowe...very much!"

At any rate, "Newton" tried to trap David Crowe, too, into potentially damaging remarks (February 2008):

"Thanks Mr. Crowe

You once told me that Dr. Bialy has serious mental health problems"

"Mr. Crowe. I find it concerning to me personally that Dr. Bialy, who wrote Dr. Duesberg's biography, wrote so much influential thought on AIDS, and recently wrote the forward to Dr. Culshaw's book is so disturbed that he cannot even explain himself and laces such emphasis on silly labels. How can those like yourself who are serious about AIDS be taken seriously by others when we have Dr. Bialy and other emotionally unstable voices out there. Any way, I am sure you have dealt with these same concerns."

Concerning The Body's attempt to have AIDS Rethinkers ask to be removed from the list (e-mails signed by : Rebecca Erenrich, Editorial Assistant, <http://body.com>):

"Thank you Mr. Crowe...really amazing stuff!!

Did they really create a list of people who were intimidated and asked to be removed the directory of Rethinkers??"

It probably deserves more comment, but for the moment let me just emphasize that none of these “cordial and inquisitive” exchanges with “denialists”, as Kalichman-Newton describes them (xiv), brought him more or better information than could have been gained by an open, honest, straightforward approach to “denialists” by Professor Seth Kalichman, clinical-social psychologist, enquiring into why some people don’t accept the mainstream view as to HIV/AIDS. We AIDS Rethinkers and HIV Skeptics have persistently called for substantive exchanges with HIV/AIDS believers, and we would have welcomed an opportunity for civil discourse with someone who is actually interested in our views and why we hold them. That Kalichman believed from the outset that he couldn’t get authentic information by direct enquiry reveals that his mind was made up about us before he started.

He did, however, record what he viewed apparently as a noteworthy discovery: “the denialists who interacted with me did not seem evil” (xiv).

That this seemed to Kalichman worthy of attention says quite a lot about him.

On the other hand, this revelation applied only to those “denialists” about whom Kalichman actually knows something: “Of course, those I have come to see as malevolent – the vitamin pushers, con men, and angry academics are the ones who did not respond to my [sic] attempts to contact them.”

It’s not clear, however, that “malevolence” would be a reason why “denialists” would fail to respond to sympathetic-with-Rethinkers graduate-student Joseph C Newton. Evidently they remain malevolent in Kalichman’s opinion just because he knows nothing about them. If he did, he might not be able to maintain his preconceived judgment.

Chapter 3
A “complicated arrangement”

“Kalichman’s” book describes his interactions with “denialists” as involving “complicated arrangements” (p. xiv), the nature of which he failed to explain to his readers (How not to create a persona: Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #4, 29 March 2009, <http://hivskeptical.wordpress.com/2009/03/29/how-not-to-create-a-persona-kalichman-s-komical-kaper-4/>). Once one knows that the interactions were with “Newton” and not with Kalichman, it becomes clear why things were complicated: Kalichman-Newton had to bear in mind what they had said to whom, and in which persona (Newton was sometimes “HIV-positive”, sometimes negative but with an “HIV-positive” “friend”, sometimes “just wanting to understand”, other times an enthusiastic supporter of Rethinking). Kalichman appeared never to suspect that the “Newton” personas were skating on implausibly thin ice because “Newton” was so untrue to life. One thing that made him so unnatural was an odd mixture of specialized knowledge and feigned ignorance; while he generally tried to appear naïve and gullible, at other times he revealed some of his anti-denialist prejudices:

“I am concerned that the dissidents are discrediting Rethinking with such confused and mixed messages. It looks amateur. Very internally inconsistent.

Maybe you should form a task force to get the Rethinking act together, on the same page. Maybe a blue ribbon (not red ribbon) panel??

Maybe Dr. Bauer should head it up.... I would not have the meeting in Germany, maybe hold a meeting in Loch Ness??
ha ha.

I dont know Mr. Crowe...seems like Rethinking needs to do some Re-Rethinking” (June 2008).

Did Kalichman-as-Newton imagine that we “denialists” were not in touch with one another? At the same time as he was sneering to Crowe about my interest in Nessies, he was writing to me:

“On Thu, 03 Jul 2008 08:29:54 -0400, Joseph Newton <joeconewton@gmail.com> wrote:

.....I suggested to Mr. Crowe that you lead a Blue Ribbon Panel to get the confusion out of Rethinking AIDS...like maybe Rethinking Straight about AIDS. I suggested a meeting, perhaps in the lovely setting of Loch Ness, which I know you know so well.”

“Thursday, July 03, 2008 10:36:23 PM

By the way, I have attached a picture of a Nessie. I think it is a classic picture. Are you familiar with this specific image and who is credited taking the picture?”

The attached picture was the one most commonly reproduced in the media, significant enough to “AIDS denialism” to warrant inclusion in Kalichman’s book at p. 72. Again this ridiculous mixture of feigned naivety and inside knowledge: He knew of my interest in Loch Ness, yet asked me about something that I’ve answered publicly on my website. I remain uncomprehending as to how he could think he was fooling me into treating him as someone making genuine inquiries.

This was around the time that “Newton’s” e-mails had been traced to the University of Connecticut, and Crowe couldn’t resist needling Kalichman-Newton:

“To: “Joseph Newton” <joeconewton@gmail.com>

From: David Crowe <David.Crowe@aras.ab.ca>

...
Joseph;

.....
Perhaps you could investigate whether Seth C. Kalichman has any conflicts of interest. He has published a lot of papers recently, he must be well-funded, and stands to lose all that.

Nice picture of him with Treatment Activist Nicoli Natrass at:

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/booksa/1466876047/>

For example, Kalichman is on the paid staff of the ‘AIDS Survival Project’ which lists among its sponsors Boehringer-Ingelheim, GlaxoSmithKline, Gilead, Abbott, Roche, Pfizer, even the CDC. Of course, they don’t say if the drug companies contributed more than perhaps Best Cleaners.

<http://www.aidsurvivalproject.org/aboutus/AnnualReport2006.pdf>

- David”

We also gave "Newton" the opportunity to come clean, on more than one occasion:

"Sat, Jul 19, 2008 at 8:00 PM

From: David Crowe <David.Crowe@aras.ab.ca>

Subject: verification...

Bcc: Henry Bauer <hhbauer@fan.cc.vt.edu>

Joseph;

I know this is going to sound weird, but we have been having a problem recently with infiltration, people posing as dissidents who are actually gathering information for groups like "The Body" and aidstruth.

I would like you to provide me with some proof of your existence. A scan of a utility bill, school registration, or other official forms with your name and address. Also tell me whether you've ever been HIV tested, and what kinds of tests, I have some information on this that I can verify.

This is all voluntary of course, but it would help raise my level of confidence that you're being straight with me.

Regards,

David Crowe"

But lying was "Newton's" life blood, so it seems:

"Date: Sun, 20 Jul 2008 01:29:22 -0400

From: "Joseph Newton" <jocnewton@gmail.com>

To: "David Crowe" <David.Crowe@aras.ab.ca>

Subject: Re: verification...

Geeze Mr. Crowe. You are right, that does sound weird. Sort or paranoid actually. But I think I understand.

I can assure that I have always been straight with you. As I told you from the start, I am a student of public health interested in alternative views on AIDS. I am not from The Body and I am not with AIDStruth.com

You make it sound like a war between the dissidents and the orthodoxy. I can understand that too given some of the nasty exchanges on the blogosphere that I have observed.

But still, verifying me? I mean, is there anything that you have emailed me that you would not have if I were not a dissident? It seems that you have only told me the way you see it. I cannot think of anything you have said that I have not seen on the Rethinking AIDS. Or do I have that wrong? Have you indeed disclosed secrets to me?

I suppose if you have disclosed things to me that you would not have if I were not a dissident then I should do the verification.

But I would be interested to know what I have been privy to that you would not have shared with me otherwise.

Best regards and will be back in touch soon.

Joseph"

[Absolutely no doubt, of course, that "Newton" was interested in finding out whether he had actually gleaned some secret information without realizing it. In point of fact, an e-mail marked as confidential had been distributed among some Rethinkers in order to be "shared" with suspected "moles", of whom "Newton" was one.]

As it happens, Professor Seth C Kalichman had sometimes been openly in touch with David Crowe, President of Rethinking AIDS, as well as surreptitiously as "Newton", and he renewed this correspondence at almost this time:

"Date: Wed, 23 Jul 2008 09:34:31 -0400

....

From: "Kalichman, Seth" <seth.k@uconn.edu>

To: <David.Crowe@aras.ab.ca>

....

Hello David Crowe. We have corresponded in the past and you were really quite helpful.

I am writing to see if you can help me identify whether a couple images on the Rethinking AIDS website (for which I know you are President) are copyrighted? The images concern AZT, the 'deadguy' and 'deadgal' images. If they in the public domain or if whoever holds copyright gives permission, I am interested in using them in some of my work on HIV treatment beliefs and treatment perceptions.

Can you help me with this information?

Thank you.

Seth C. Kalichman

Professor"

Perhaps he was checking to see whether "Newton's" protestations of innocence had been accepted. But if he wanted to disavow a connection, he should have deployed better syntax and fewer typos. Indeed, this e-mail from Prof Seth C Kalichman makes me wonder whether I was wrong in inferring that he deliberately had "Newton" commit typos and non-syntactical language to induce a lowering of guards; perhaps these infelicities are inherently characteristic of Kalichman himself?!?!

At any rate, Kalichman and "Newton" were apparently reassured that the secret of their identity was safe, for some months later Bauer heard from — ?him ?them — again. This time he was — they were? — shedding crocodile tears:

"From: "Joseph Newton" <jocnewton@gmail.com>

To: hhbauer@vt.edu

...

Date: Fri, 10 Oct 2008 12:40:03 -0400

Hello Dr. Bauer

I hope you are well

I just learned that Rebecca Culshaw has lost her job. I saw a web posting saying something about how she has terminated.

This makes me so sad I cannot believe it! What is happening, with her being fired, Andrew Maniotis being fired, President Mbeki being fired...I mean you and Dr. Duesberg are so lucky be professors with tenure, I guess.

Anyway, was not sure you knew about this I am sure you would want to know because she has been so supportive of your wor.

Fired! I just cannot believe it is true!

Best regards

Joe"

Chapter 4
"Newton" ghost-writes Kalichman's book

At the end of Chapter 3, we left "Joe Newton" shedding crocodile tears over the report that Rebecca Culshaw had lost her job. On a later occasion, he was perhaps hoping that her fate and similar experiences of others might cause me to worry about my own position:

10 October 2008, Newton to Bauer:

"It is true what you say about Dr. Duesberg and his being treated badly.

How about you Dr. Bauer? How have your colleagues treated you? I mean with your interests in scientific explorations and all. Do they call you a pseudoscientist and other such names? I know you have been a Dean, do your colleagues respect you? I figure you must have a back like a duck to repel all that water."

I enjoyed needling a little:

"Very decently. There aren't any Wainbergs or Moores around here. I've given talks at the local medical school, to student groups, at departmental seminars, about my scholarly interests in Loch Ness, anomalies in general, HIV/AIDS, never a hint of trouble.

Maybe it's partly owing to what I noticed when I moved from Michigan to Kentucky, and perhaps even more so in Virginia: there's a tradition of courtesy that is not so generally found in the north and northeastern US."

"Newton" was relieved: "I am glad to hear that. Really."

[“Really” was another of “Newton’s” trademarks. For obviously good reason, he knew or suspected that people were unlikely to believe what he said.]

The more "Newton" lied, the more lying became habitual also to his creator, Kalichman. So when it came to writing a book, Kalichman-Newton attributed, to those he was writing about, things they had never said. Many parts of "Denying AIDS" are plagiarized from the e-mails "Newton" exchanged with "denialists"; or rather, from the e-mails that "Newton" sent to "denialists", for the book attributes to us things that we didn't say but "he" did. For example, Kalichman-Newton espied a connection between views on cancer, AIDS, and the environment:

"Newton" to Crowe:

"I noticed you are founding memembr of the Green Party.... That is so cool. I see the connection between your views on the cancer, AIDS and the environment. You are a naturalist, yes?

It seems true for Dr. Duesberg as well.... environmental causes of AIDS and Cancer.

So neat to make these connections."

But Crowe made no such connection:

"I'm a founding member of the Green Party ... in the province of Alberta only. . . . I'm not really a naturalist, although I'm very interested in the natural world. . . ."

Nevertheless, the point appears in "Denying AIDS" (e.g., p. 30 ff.), where Duesberg's views on aneuploidy as cause of cancer and HIV as not the cause of AIDS are somehow traced to an overarching belief in environmental causes (!!!, Kalichman-Newton would doubtless add).

"Newton" tried desperately to get someone to agree with his discovery that AIDS dissidence could be traced to German roots:

"The book that just came off press [Engelbrecht & Köhnlein, "Virus Mania", <http://www.amazon.com/Virus-Mania-Continually-Epidemics-Billion-Dollar/dp/1425114679>] looks interesting...but I have never heard of the author. A German journalist? I note some time back that most dissidents are German...even D. Bauer was born in Austria! I am wondering what the German connection is?? Is Dr. Duesberg that influential?" (to Crowe)

and later, when Christian Fiala published a comment about inflated HIV/AIDS numbers from WHO:

"At 9:05 PM -0400 7/8/08, Joseph Newton wrote:

Mr. Crowe

Did you see this?

Why is the first letter that is supportive from Austria?? What is this Gernan - Austrian thing and Dissidence?

Best to you

JCN"

Crowe didn't take the bait, yet "Newton's" wacky "dissidence is German-associated" idea found its way into Kalichman's "Denying AIDS" (pp. 54, 145; see "The German Connection: Kalichman's not-so-Komical Kaper #3", 21 March 2009, <http://hivskeptic.wordpress.com/2009/03/21/the-german-connection-kalichman's-not-so-komical-kaper-3-2/>).

Again, my eyebrows shot toward the roof when I read (p. 74):
"Bauer had hoped that his book would land him an interview on the Today Show and change the course of AIDS research and treatments."

Anyone who knows me even slightly would not recognize me as the fellow Kalichman writes about. If I were to dream about interviews on TV, it would be in terms of Bill Moyer, Gwen Ifill, maybe Tavis Smiley — a conversation, in other words, with intelligent people, not pseudo-substantive "entertainment" get-togethers interrupted every 5 minutes by commercial breaks (I was frankly shocked that President Obama was willing to sit through a couple of commercial breaks when talking with Jay Leno). At any rate, something like the Today Show would be a nightmare for me, not a hope or a dream; and if I were ever persuaded to do it, it would be a grit-teeth-and-endure-it experience. I don't even recall whether I've ever watched the Today Show, Good Morning America, or others of that ilk; and if I did, it was because someone like Obama was on. So where did Kalichman get that from? Why, from "Newton's" suggestions to Bauer:

14 October 2007, Newton to Bauer:

"Dr. Bauer, ...

Why has there not been BIG media on your book? I would think there should be.

Has Peter Duesberg had contact with you? . . . He could probably get you on the Today Show and Fox News!

If I knew of a way to help I surely would."

and 3 February 2008:

"...I have been watching for you on the Today Show...but I guess they have not zeroed in on you yet!..."

15 October:

"I have been wondering what your goals are? I mean what would you like to see happen as a result of your book? I suspect you do not expect the orthodoxy to reverse course and refute the idea that HIV causes AIDS? It also does not sound like you expect your book to vindicate Peter Deusberg and salvage his image.

What would you like to see happen??"

After a while, having learned that Crowe had traced Newton to Kalichman, I grew tired of the cat-and-mouse and hinted as much by making my responses shorter and curter, and by giving Newton-Hyde-Kalichman the opportunity to realize his ineptness. He had (10 October 2008, 12:40:03 PM) shed his crocodile tears for Culshaw:

"I just learned that Rebecca Culshaw has lost her job. I saw a web posting saying something about how she has terminated."

Naturally I asked (10:30:48 PM): "I hadn't seen this, do you have a URL?"

OOPS! Of course he didn't, as I well knew, for I have Google Alerts that would pick up anything like that. All Kalichman knew was that J P Moore had been harassing high-level administrators to fire Rebecca Culshaw, Andy Maniotis, and perhaps others as well ("Questioning HIV/AIDS: Morally Reprehensible or Scientifically Warranted?", J. Amer. Physicians & Surgeons, 12 [#4, Winter 2007] 116- 120, <http://www.jpands.org/jpands1204.htm>). So, "Newton" replied lamely (11:04:47 PM): "I cannot find the URL now. But it was pretty clear that she did not get her tenure and was asked to depart."

Likely story. Graduate student "Newton" finds something on the Web but can't find it again a few hours later.

Chapter 5
The final transformation: Kalichman has become Newton

When Dr. Jekyll first sampled his transformative potion, it caused his behavior to change, increasingly toward lack of civility and disdain of others. In time, these behavioral changes left their physical mark in a progressively increasing grossness of his fleshly features. At first these were seen only “under the influence”, whenever Jekyll deliberately, willfully assumed the persona of Hyde. But in the end, the process became irreversible, and Jekyll became Hyde physically as well as behaviorally.

A similar sad fate eventually overtook Kalichman. Having e-mailed as “Newton” for well over a year and with half-a-dozen dissidents, Kalichman became “Newton” in bodily reality as, in 2008, he registered for the Aneuploidy Conference organized in Berkeley by Peter Duesberg:

Jan 22 08 08:51a Share Project 8604868706 p.1

Society for Chromosomal Cancer
Research
2nd CONFERENCE ON ANEUPLOIDY AND CANCER: CLINICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL ASPECTS
January 31-February 3, 2008. Waterfront Plaza Hotel, Oakland California, USA

Registration Form

(Please return this form to the Conference Bureau by January 15, 2008)

Family Name: Newton First Name: Joe
Address: 406 Raggio Rd
Company: _____
City: Stocks Postal Code: 96268 Country: USA
Tel: 8602683706 Fax: 8604868706 Email: Joe Newton@QCC1911.CC

Accompanied by: _____

I will attend the following sessions:

Thursday, January 31, 2008 Opening Lecture
Friday, February 1, 2008 Morning Session Afternoon Session
Saturday, February 2, 2008 Morning Session Afternoon session
Sunday, February 3, 2008 Morning Session

Welcome Cocktail (free of charge) yes () No. of persons
(Thursday, January 31, 2008)

Farewell Dinner (free of charge) yes () No. of persons
(Saturday, February 2, 2008)

Conference Bureau
SCCR, Attn. Sigrid Duesberg, 5373 Thomas Avenue, Oakland, CA 94618, USA
Fax: (510) 594-8635 Tel.: (510) 594-8635
Email: sccr2008@berkeley.edu

Having registered, Newton also attended. On p. 27 of “Denying AIDS”, he is seen with Peter Duesberg himself:



Photo 2.1 Meeting Peter Duesberg, Oakland California, February 2008

A closer examination of this picture shows that the identification on the name-tag of the person with Duesberg has been washed or blurred out. However, since Newton had registered and Kalichman didn't, the inference is plain enough, this is Duesberg with Joseph C Newton. As Sadun Kal pointed out, Kalichman's photo gallery at picasa has another photo of the same person with Duesberg at the same meeting, but there the name tag does not have the name blurred out:



From the same meeting, yet another picture in this photo collection shows the same person with David Rasnick, with the name again clearly visible in the middle line of the name tag (though not readable at this resolution):



Once again, it seems, Kalichman/Newton are/is ignorant of how they/he leave(s) trails on the Internet ; in this case, a trail that demonstrates what appears to be a deliberate attempt, by blurring out the identifying name, to deceive readers of "Denying AIDS" about who Duesberg thought he was with in the photograph published in the book.

I was curious about how “cordial and inquisitive” (“Denying AIDS”, p. xiv) Kalichman/Newton had been with Duesberg:

10 March 2009, Bauer to Duesberg:

“Kalichman’s book has a photo with you, dated February 2008. When he talked with you, did he reveal that he was researching for a book criticizing ‘AIDS denialism’?”

18 March 2009, Duesberg to Bauer:

“.... I really overlooked your note about the Newton alias Kalichman case. So, certainly he didn’t say a word about/against ‘denialists’ at the Oakland cancer conference.

From the little I remember about him, he seemed rather obsequious re. the topic and proceedings of the aneuploidy-cancer meeting.”

So there’s another little confirmation of the transformation of Professor Kalichman into the Uriah-Heep-like persona of Newton: Duesberg recalled in the actual physical person of Newton the same obsequiousness that I’ve pointed to in so many of his e-mails, not to speak of his perpetual prevarication about his interests and intentions. It may be, of course, that the impression of obsequiousness was based in part on earlier e-mails by Newton to Duesberg, for example:

“Date: Fri, 10 Aug 2007 22:44:54 -0400

From: “Joseph Newton” <joeNewton@gmail.com>

To: duesberg@berkeley.edu

Subject: Asking for help

....

Hello Dr. Duesberg

I know you must be very busy and you must receive thousands of messages. I am hoping you can very quickly answer a question for me. I am a great admirer of your courage and scholarship on AIDS. I have become aware of some new thinking on alternative theories on AIDS set forth by Professor Henry Bauer at Virginia Tech. Are you familiar with his work and would see him as in line with your views? I want to know before taking too much in.

Thank you again.

Joe Newton, CT, USA”

or

“Date: Fri, 2 Nov 2007 23:33:35 -0400

From: “Joseph Newton” <joeNewton@gmail.com>

To: duesberg@berkeley.edu

Subject: Note from an Admirer

Cc: david.crowe@aras.ab.ca

...

Hello Dr. Duesberg

I hope this note finds you well.

Mr. Crowe suggested that you may respond to my email. I am a student of Public Health following the developments in AIDS. It would appear to me that with recent events such as the publication of the Rodriguez paper in JAMA and the continued failings of treatments as well as the pile of failed vaccines, the HIV tower may be ready to fall. I am curious if this is how you see it and whether you are working on any new papers or books? Also, will you be speaking publicly anytime soon? My dream is to see you talk on AIDS.

My best to you and thank you for your time!!

Joseph C. Newton”

“Date: Sat, 10 Nov 2007 14:03:28 -0500

From: “Joseph Newton” <joeNewton@gmail.com>

To: “peter duesberg” <duesberg@berkeley.edu>

Subject: Re: Note from an Admirer

...

Thank you so much for writing me back Dr. Duesberg. I know you must be very busy and I did not really expect you to have time.

I am in Connecticut and I would travel if I had the chance to see you.

I have so many questions. I would love the chance to talk with you - anytime any place.

One question that I am just burning to ask you is about whether there is a connection between your views on AIDS resulting from toxins (such as poppers, AZT, and unclean water) and cancer - where Aneuploidy also results from environmental hazards. Is there a connection there or I am just reading too much into your writings and your biography that Dr. Bialy wrote? Again, thank you Dr. Duesberg, and anything that you can think of that someone like me can do to help shift the course of AIDS to the truth, please tell me.

All the best to you.

Joseph”

Not only obsequious, not only replete with fake typos, not only pretending to support “denialism”, but also looking for confirmation of Kalichman-Newton’s wacky attempt to see an “environment-causal” connection between Duesberg’s work on cancer and his views on AIDS.

“Date: Sat, 17 Nov 2007 11:01:09 -0500
From: “Joseph Newton” <jocnewton@gmail.com>
To: “peter duesberg” <duesberg@berkeley.edu>
Subject: Re: Note from an Admirer

...
Hello again Dr. Duesberg. I am following up.
I have a cousin who lives in San Francisco and I may come out a visit. If I came to Berkely, can we have coffee?
Best to you Dr. Duesberg,
JCN”

After the Aneuploidy conference in Berkeley, February 2008, Newton resumed his e-mail correspondence with Duesberg:

“Date: Mon, 5 May 2008 13:16:13 -0400
From: “Joseph Newton” <jocnewton@gmail.com>
To: “peter duesberg” <duesberg@berkeley.edu>
Subject: Re: SCCR Conference - best way to reach us

...
Hello Dr. Duesberg
I hope you are doing well.
You may remember me from your Aneuploidy Conference.
I just saw this blub online, and I cannot tell if it is authentic. Will you really be in Washington on May 13?
See blub below. Thank you! Joseph

http://www.nypost.com/seven/04252008/gossip/pagesix/hands_not_so_bloody_108001.htm

April 25, 2008 - CELIA Farber, the maverick journalist vilified by the AIDS establishment for her controversial reporting, will be honored by the Semmelweis Society on May 13 in Washington, DC, with its Clean Hands Award — ‘which is an amazing irony, considering I am always accused of having blood on my hands,’ she laughed. Farber — whose story in Harper’s, ‘Out of Control: AIDS and the Corruption of Science,’ caused an uproar two years ago — will address Congress along with Berkeley professor Peter Duesberg, who claims the HIV virus doesn’t cause AIDS. They’ll sign books after a screening of ‘The Constant Gardener,’ about a pharmaceutical company making a killing off AIDS drugs in Africa.”

“Date: Fri, 16 May 2008 08:28:45 -0400
From: “Joseph Newton” <jocnewton@gmail.com>
To: “Peter DUESBERG” <duesberg@berkeley.edu>
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Semmelweis Society Revised Mtn agenda for CME credit 5-5-08]

...
Hello Dr. Duesberg
I was hoping to go to DC to see you and Ms. Farber recv the awards. I had heard that in fact the tribunal was cancelled and that you and Ms. Farber experienced some negative responses. I suspect that is to be expected in such a forum. So I did not go. I did read the article in Discover about you. That was simply wonderful.
Are you currently trying to get NIH funding again? I am so curious about that process. I have read Dr. Lang’s commentaries of your previous biased reviews.
I am surprised you havenot posted that grant proposal and the reviews on your website.
Are they available to learn from?
Thank you again and I hope to see you again soon.
Joseph”

Those e-mails would seem to provide the ultimate confirmation that it is indeed Joseph Newton who is pictured in Kalichman’s book with Duesberg at the Aneuploidy Conference.

Yet the photo of Kalichman in his profile on amazon.com bears an uncanny likeness to the Newton pictured with Duesberg. Evidently, by the beginning of 2008 the physical transformation of Kalichman into Newton was complete and irrevocable, warts and all.

Not only was Kalichman-Newton deceitful with the people about whom he was seeking information, he continues the deceitfulness with readers of "Denying AIDS" by not letting them know that he never talked openly with any of his subjects. More than that, by publishing a photo of himself with Duesberg, he implies that author Kalichman spoke with Duesberg even though he didn't, it was Joseph Newton with whom Duesberg was interacting.

I've pointed out that the Code of Ethics of the psychological profession bars deceit in research, unless it has been approved by an Institutional Review Board; in which case the deceived subjects are to be debriefed as soon as the research is finished, and given the opportunity to withdraw any information gleaned from them. None of that happened.

It's also rather troubling that Joseph Newton's registration for the Aneuploidy Conference gives his contact information (street address and phone number) as Kalichman's Social Psychology Department at the University of Connecticut. That suggests there were people in that Department who were aware of the continuing deception and colluded in it.

It's perhaps even more troubling that Kalichman mentors graduate students, at least one of whom appears to have been aware of the deception he was practicing, since she attempted to become my "friend" on Facebook.

Epilogue
Flaws and mistakes in the Kalichman/Newton book

The Kalichman/Newton deception all went for naught, because it uncovered nothing about “denialism” that isn’t obvious from the public record. The resulting book reflects Kalichman/Newton’s preconceptions and lack of understanding, among other things about science and about human nature, as also ineptness in attempting to impersonate a graduate student [How not to create a persona: Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #4, 29 March 2009] and ignorance about book copyrights and the impossibility of removing once-posted material from the Internet [Internet illiteracy: Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #5, 9 April 2009]. As to preconceptions, Kalichman notes as one of his discoveries that not all “denialists” are actually evil (p. xiv).

Perhaps the most blatant transgression in the Kalichman book is the placing inside quotation marks material that is not in the cited source [Caveat lector! – Kalichman’s less-than-Komical Kaper #7, 3 May 2009]. It is then merely funny that the book uses the term “refute” in a manner that appears to refute the author’s whole case by crediting the “denialists” with having refuted HIV/AIDS theory [HIV/AIDS refuted, according to Kalichman! – Kalichman’s very-Komical Kaper #8, 7 May 2009]. Not funny are the many ad hominem comments in the book, and frequent and drastic misrepresentation in addition to the misquotations [Kalichman disclaims and makes AD HOMONYM attacks (Does illiteracy matter? – Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #9), 14 May 2009; Kalichman re-writes Bauer’s book – Kalichman’s disgracefully un-Komical Kaper #10, 26 May 2009; Kalichman disrespects Bauer; Bauer blows his own trumpet – Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #11, 31 May 2009].

One of the most obvious facts about human beings is that they can be right about some things while being wrong about others; yet professor of psychology Kalichman believes that one’s views about Loch Ness monsters are relevant to one’s views about HIV/AIDS [Henry Bauer and the Loch Ness monsters, 16 February 2009].

Before Kalichman’s book was published, he had posted on amazon.com a nasty piece about my book, trying at that time to hide his identity by giving his residence as “New York” [Introducing Seth Kalichman (Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #1), 8 March 2009].

Kalichman’s ignorance about science is illustrated by his claim that work on HIV/AIDS prior to 2000 is so dated as perhaps to be ignored. As to the proof that HIV does cause AIDS, he asserts that it is the 31,000 articles published since 2004 that contain this proof, thereby acknowledging – no doubt inadvertently – that earlier publications do *not*; and that the “HIV tests” were based on false premises. Thereby Kalichman pronounces justified all the “denialism” from those earlier years, including that of the much-maligned Peter Duesberg, and implies that HIV/AIDS “scientists” were able to infer the proof by prescient extrasensory (or extra-evidentiary) perception.

The claim that “pseudo-science” can be identified without even defining what real science is supposed to be is obviously absurd, and provides yet another illustration of Kalichman’s ignorance, in this case that philosophers of science long ago abandoned the quest for such formulaic *ab initio* demarcation [Pots and kettles: Is ignorance an excuse? – Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #6, 20 April 2009].

The book is replete with such unsupported claims as that HIV/AIDS science is progressing faster than any other topic in medical research except perhaps cancer; when it is still not understood, how “HIV” could bring about destruction of the immune system [Proving HIV/AIDS – Kalichman’s blunders, in a nutshell, 11 March 2009].

Another illustration of ignorance about science is the assertion that “Scientists are by their nature and training systematic and objective” (p. 112) [Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #2: The Social Psychology of Scientists, 14 March 2009]. Kalichman fails then to explain, let alone address, the obvious question, how did so many objective and systematic scientists become “denialists”? [The Social Psychology of “Denialist” Scientists – Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #2, part 2, 18 March 2009]. By implication, it has something to do with being German, or being born during the Nazi era, which Kalichman supports by naming eight people; which if true would actually indicate that Germans are under-represented among denialists, apart from the fact that, two of those eight happen not to be German or even of German parentage [The German Connection: Kalichman’s not-so-Komical Kaper #3, 21 March 2009; The German Connection, contd.: How not to test an hypothesis (Kalichman’s Komical Kaper #3, part 2), 25 March 2009; Kalichman and Nazis – K’s anything-but-Komical self-revealing Kaper (#12), 7 June 2009].

At least one absurdity of this book cannot be blamed on the author, however: The blurbs on the book’s jacket reveal that they were written by people who have not actually read the book [Kalichman on “Denying AIDS”: an answer to Job’s prayer, 5 March 2009], a phenomenon with which editors and the sales departments of book publishers will be familiar.