

AIDS and GLOBAL WARMING

These issues are complex and not to be resolved by a paragraph. Anyone truly interested in either should be willing to dig hard into the scientific literature of the last 20 years, realizing that most of it is uninformative, but it is all we've got. Climatologists have recently adopted their own language, which resembles English heavily laced with far too many ad hoc acronyms, which makes the reader immediately suspicious. The AIDS literature has generally avoided important issues in favor of endless inconsequential details.

A nice place to start on this mess of big issues, in a general way, is a very readable book by Daniel Gardner called The Science of Fear. This book is fascinating and reminds us of a few of the ways we come to believe, or not to believe, in important postulates. You might call it pop psychology; I think it is Mass Psychology 101.

On AIDS

Regarding AIDS I have published a hypothesis wherein the Retroviridae in general, rather than a particular species, is the problem. This was published in *Genetica 95:195-197, 1995*. It offers a mechanism for how the disease develops, and importantly makes predictions that can be experimentally confirmed or falsified easily in rodents. This hypothesis may or may not be true but it illustrates the nature of a useful scientific hypothesis. This is in contrast to the current AIDS establishment's "It's the virus, stupid!" No experiments were ever done or even suggested to test the HIV hypothesis. The fact that antiretroviral therapies may prolong the lives of some people infected with retroviruses says nothing more than the fact, that, in other cases they are not at all useful. Something is going on here that we don't understand. Scientists have to keep that in mind.

Global Warming

It should be understood by anyone professing an interest in climatology that the object of study has been around longer than man and the climate here has varied radically in the last 40 million years. In the Eocene carbon dioxide levels were several times higher than they are currently. The temperature was quite compatible with life from pole to pole. Until we can understand that, or how Earth moved from there to the Miocene, then the Pliocene and then the Holocene, each with its own climate, flora and fauna, we have no good reason to think we understand climate. To make predictions about what follows from here and when, and to audaciously begin the discussion by implicating our humble species in the whole thing is worse than audacious, it's pathetic.