Gallop, Leaving NCI, Speaks His Mind

Bethesda, Md.

Retrovirologist Robert Gallo, M.D., has for a long time refused to comment on the record about his critics and prosecutors, and their case against him (PROBE, Dec. '93). Last month, he announced he is leaving the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and government service to head a new Institute of Human Virology being built for him at the University of Maryland, in Baltimore. A few days later, Gallo spoke with PROBE, in a private setting here, about the ordeal he and his colleagues and family have been through — and the people who put them through it.

PROBE: You have been very reticent in discussing events of the last several years that have involved much of your time and effort. Why?

GALLO: Fear.

Fear that speaking out would rekindle the interest of people trying to hurt us. Psychologically, it would not have been helpful to me and my family. It’s been bizarre. I’m alive and well. But it’s like we’ve been living in some remnant of World War II. The bottom line: fear.

PROBE: What are the issues that NCI officials, and others, higher up, told you to remain silent on?

GALLO: Basically, not to ever talk about [Rep. John D.] Dingell [ex-chairman of the House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations], or the patent for the HIV blood test. Basically, in the last few years [I was told] not to talk to the press, period. [NCI director Samuel] Broder, said, ‘You can make it worse. You can’t win!’ There was one courageous person here, [ex-NIH director Bernadine] Healy — and she didn’t last!

In these cases, I suspect, people may not always want to find out the facts. Because, if they did, they might have had to fight it, or spend much time on complex issues, without gain. They might even have had to be willing to give up their jobs.

I don’t know if I can blame anybody. I don’t know if I would do any better.

PROBE: Looking back, how — and why — did the present hostile climate for AIDS research and other science develop?

GALLO: The Constitution does very well in protecting the People from the misuse of the President’s power, but not from Congress’s. So a powerful, misguided congressman can scare people, withhold money, and may stay in power forever. . . . I don’t know whether the founding fathers would have permitted that. On the Dingell subcommittee, every staffer had to bring in a scalp — and the bigger the scalp, the better.

One hundred percent of the problems we went through were due to Dingell and his staff. Without him, there would still have been [Chicago Tribune investigative reporter John] Crewdson. But he wouldn’t have had any teeth if he hadn’t gotten all of the documents ahead of time, leaked from the Subcommittee . . . . Everything that Dingell’s staff got, Crewdson got immediately. Often, of course, if not always, the material was selectively presented. I think he’s just a tool.

PROBE: Looking back, how — and why — did the present hostile climate for AIDS research and other science develop?

GALLO: That is a big question. . . .
Follow-Up . . .

Juiced: We don't often find ourselves in agreement with O.J. Simpson's legal Dream Team. But we do concur with their insistence that PCR (polymerase chain reaction) discoverer Karry Mullis's boorishness, bad manners, and drinking habits do not detract from his scientific achievement (PROBE, Jan.). Mullis also now turns out to be a dope head, according to the trial record.

We agree with the defense that his bad habits do not warrant cancellation of the Nobel prize that he won for his great discovery. On the other hand, Mullis's current state of mind certainly is relevant to his assessment of PCR's present forensic value, which is the issue at hand. Inventing a technology, what is more, does not make one an expert on its use.

No one would think of asking Orville Wright, were he still with us, to testify on the de-icing mechanism on the commuter airplane that crashed in an Indiana cornfield last year. Mullis, similarly, will have to show that he is an expert on the forensic use of PCR if his testimony on its imperfections are to mean very much. We doubt that he can, since by his own admission he's been spending his time and Nobel prize money surfing, screwing, boozing, and doing dope.

Mullis gives every evidence of being a very loose cannon. We wonder if the defense is going to take the risk that he'll explode in court.

Passing the buck: The acting director of the National Cancer Institute, biologist Edward Sondik, Ph.D., and the departing head of the agency's cancer treatment division, oncologist Bruce Chabner, M.D., spoke recently before their cancer-care colleagues. They discussed the trying times that public have lived through, due to press and congressional attacks on Fisher and the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast Project.

But, Oncology Times (May) reports, "neither [official] addressed NCI's role in Dr. Fisher's firing, or the events that followed."

Chabner later told the cancer newspaper: "I think some apologies are due. But I can't make those apologies..."

"Some of the things that happened were very unfortunate and unnecessary. But I wasn't responsible for that."

Still to be heard from: ex-NCI chief Samuel Broder, M.D., now lucratively ensconced in a $1 million-per-anum pharmaceutical job, in Florida.

Kudo: Two years ago we reported links between the nonprofit Fetzer Institute, of Kalamazoo, Mich., Bill Moyers' TV special "Healing and the Mind," and Consumers Union, the nonprofit publisher of Consumer Reports. We followed this with an article in Priorities (Nov. '94), published by the American Council on Science and Health. Now, the National Council Against Health Fraud comments in its newsletter

Where's the Shinola?

"If [the Internet bulletin board called] SciFraud [PROBE, Feb.] is about the concentration of shits among scientists, fine: Say so, and let us by all means deal with the evidence and with comparative densities! The time has long passed when even the brainwashed believe that some men are mortal but some are immortal.

"But: If SciFraud is about the end-product of science, the protean body of theory, fact, prediction, and applications thereof, then it is a failure—so far. It has not shown that this unique product of fallible persons is as fallible, itself, as they are.

"If science, as opposed, say, to revelation, has some epistemic distinction over time, then that is its value; and to conflate that with the peccadillos of the mortals who do it for a living is among the most primitive of logical failurces."

—Biologist Paul R. Gross of the University of Virginia, on SciFraud. (April 17).

Budgetary Foolishness Is Foreseen in Congress

Current budgetary projections show a one-third reduction in real spending on government supported research in the next several years. Scientists and their advocates understandably are appalled. Rep. George E. Brown, Jr. (D-Cal.), former chairman of the House Science Committee says (N.Y. Times, May 22):

"Any sensible person knows you have to make prudent investments to get ahead. But the Government doesn't. "We're dominated by fools!"
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Institutional ‘Cooperation’ Claimed By Alternativists, Causing Surprise

The program announcement for what was billed as the First Annual International Congress on Alternative & Complementary Medicine — held late in May, in Arlington, Va. — lists several dozen “cooperating organizations.”

Some of these “cooperating” groups represent holistic healers, naturopaths, herbologists, and aromatherapists, who are clearly part of the alternativist movement. Others listed, however, include several of the National Institutes of Health, nearby in Maryland, and five state universities that rarely if ever identify themselves as alternativist supporters.

The Congress was sponsored by Mary Ann Liebert, Inc., a New York publisher of two alternativist journals. Its ostensible purpose was to help propel alternativism into the health care mainstream; the opening session was called: “From the Flexner Report to Healthcare Reform: How Will Alternative Medicine be Integrated with Mainstream Practice?”

The organizers’ list of “cooperating organizations” suggests that this integration — and its mainstream acceptance — is rapidly becoming a fait accompli. So PROBE phoned nine of these “organizations” to ask if they were “cooperating” with Liebert’s company, and if so, how and why.

Staffers Participate

It turned out that each federal agency and university contacted had a staff or faculty member scheduled to speak at the conference. For every one of them, what is more, this was the only cooperation they were providing. Several spokesmen and women said that they and their institutions had not been aware that they were “cooperating” until PROBE brought it to their attention.

The strongest reaction came from the federal Food and Drug Administration; a high FDA official, Peter Rheinstein, M.D., was listed on the program. Asked if FDA was “cooperating” with the conference sponsors, FDA spokesman Brad Stone said by phone from Washington: No.

The presence of an FDA staffer on the program does “not necessarily” constitute “cooperation,” in the agency’s view, Stone said. He added that FDA had not given permission for the use of its name, and had not even been aware that its name was being used until after the program was printed. Neither, Stone said, was FDA aware of Liebert having asked to use its name.

Invitation Declined

Citing “some confusion,” Stone said the FDA was not cooperating with the Congress, and, in fact, Rheinstein was not scheduled to speak there because of a “scheduling” problem.

The University of Maryland Medical School, nearby in Baltimore, also is listed as “cooperating.” The school’s director of media relations, Jill Bloom said, by phone:

“We did not lend our name as a cooperating institution.”

She said the school was not asked, and didn’t know its name was being used. She said that the faculty member who planned to speak at the Congress was phoning the organizers to tell them to stop using the university’s name in that way.

Publisher Liebert, reached by phone in Arlington during the Congress, said there had been a “misunderstanding,” and the university’s name had been “used erroneously.” She said it was the only case of its kind that she was aware of.

Academic Freedom Is Protected

At the University of Arizona, by contrast, spokesman George Humphrey said the school was “aware” that its name was being used, and said: “That’s not a problem.” He said the university’s participation consisted solely of a faculty member’s participation — which, he added, fits the university’s definition of cooperation.

The National Institute of Mental Health, in Bethesda, Mary-

Definition Offered

Publisher Liebert, speaking by phone from Arlington, Va. said that “cooperating” meant “helping us get information that we could consider for the Congress.” She declined to be more specific, but did say that many “cooperating organizations” listed in the announcement did not provide speakers.

Asked if she had asked the various organizations if their names could be used, Liebert said, “No, I did not personally ask.” But, she said, “I’m assuming that my staff did.”

The cooperating organizations were not the “real story” of the Congress, Liebert said. Rather: This was the first time an alternativist conference was conducted professionally, in the way other medical and scientific meetings are.

The Congress was a great success, she added. Liebert, who publishes other journals as well as the two new alternativist ones, said her goal is to provide “substantial, solid, and high-quality publications” to which alternativists will feel comfortable submitting their scientific findings for peer review and publication.

“I was encouraged by the responsiveness of this community to the need for research methodology,” Liebert said. “They respect the idea that this needs to be done.”

# # #

We’re from Missouri (on this issue): We’ll believe it when we see it.

Our impression is that alternativists become alternativists because they can’t, or don’t want to become scientists, or practice scientifically grounded medicine.

— D.Z.
University of Maryland, in Baltimore. This means, among other things, that he can continue to live in Bethesda, and commute to work, without uprooting his life and his family to move to South Carolina or Hawaii or one of the other places that has recently wooed him.

No longer a hostage to Dingell, or Congress, or the frightened bureaucrats and administrators who allowed his reputation to be savaged, Gallo can — and is — beginning to speak out on his own behalf to try to repair the damage. He had been under orders, for years, not to do so.

Gallo sees his troubles as a scape-goating attack, led by Dingell, and orchestrated by his staff and hangers on. He equates this attack with Sen. Joseph McCarthy's anti-subversive witch hunts a half century ago.

Power Play Suspected

Gallo professed, over lunch, that he does not wholly understand why he was chosen, other than his scientific prominence. He notes, however, that Dingell and his operatives have struck wide, deep fear in the research community.

Biotechnology, Gallo said, between bites of spaghetti with white clam sauce and sips of red wine, is one of America's outstanding products for the new millennium — and, he suggests, Dingell's investigations may have been a power move to feed on and control it.

Gallo said he is a sentimental person, who finds it hard to let go — and so he will miss NIH. But, freed of his federal fetters, he foresees significant productivity at the University of Maryland, when space is ready for him to move in later this year. Meanwhile, he is continuing his work at NIH.

Gallo is hurt and angered by the attack on his work and his character, and the effect that these attacks have had on his reputation and on his family.

He admits mistakes — everybody has some "warts" he says — but, as in the past, Gallo vigorously denies any intentional wrongdoing. He noted with pride that he continues to collaborate with AIDS researchers around the globe — including the French company Merieux. It is linked to the Pasteur Institute, where French researcher Luc Montaigner, M.D. directs the AIDS research program. Montaigner, like Gallo, claims credit for discovering HIV, the virus that causes AIDS.

Gallo is forgiving of some, but by no means all of his interlocutors; he sees Dingell and his staff director Peter Stockton and some of their associates as pure and simple bad news. He is more forgiving of some of the other investigators, with whom he has stayed in contact in his quixotic effort — thus far unsuccessful — to persuade them that he's not a bad guy. One of them, he says, baked him cookies, but continued to press him to admit being a rogue and a cheat.

Kafka Is Revisited

Gallo clearly was drawn into a Kafkaesque mind game from which, he believes, he finally has begun to fight free. He sees some of his most persistent public critics as both ignorant of science and more or less deranged. Having studied psychiatry in medical school, Gallo has developed diagnoses for some of the most persistent of them — but declines to state them for the record.

Gallo has done some soul-searching in the years he's been under attack. He is contrite about the way he treated some of his colleagues and competitors. He is more contrite about some of the life-and-death skirmishes he's been in, but failed to win.

For example, he recently met a French hemophilia patient who is dying of AIDS. The Frenchman thanked him profusely for his work in identifying the AIDS virus and developing the test to detect it. Gallo asked him when he became infected; it was after the virus's discovery.

In retrospect, Gallo says, if he had — or had asked for — three more technicians during that chaotic period in 1984-85, his laboratory might have developed a Factor VIII in time to have saved the Frenchman and many others. He says these tragedies weigh on his mind.

Gallo says he is trying to bury the last half-dozen years' agony, and get on with his life and career.

He swallowed the last of his double espresso, and, with a wide smile on his face, headed out of the restaurant.

Progress Foreseen

"AIDS is a soluble medical problem. It will be solved. A preventive vaccine is a more difficult problem. We need cooperation — money — from the world because the drug companies may not fund that research."
— Robert Gallo, M.D., in interview, May 26
Leaving...

continued from page 1

a pathetic man who needs help.

In their agonol breath the [Dingell] investigators went through my personnel file, all the way back to high school, and even tried to make me guilty of 'mail fraud' for using government stationery to seek support from some scientists.

No one in our [NCI] laboratory [of Tumor Cell Biology] did anything deliberately wrong. There was no intentional wrongdoing. Sometimes we should have been more careful about our aggressiveness, and about giving credit. But there was no intentional wrongdoing.

PROBE: Then why did it keep going?

GALLO: Inadequate strength at NIH and in the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). And lack of understanding. Science has no mechanism for understanding this kind of attack, or dealing with it. Scientists are a little naive, and preoccupied with their own work. They have no understanding of the power that Dingell’s staff had — and they have no ability to confront it.

PROBE: How have these investigations impinged on your work, and your lab’s?

GALLO: It meant essentially losing six years of AIDS and cancer research. I was operating at thirty or forty percent capacity. The frustrating thing is I’ll never get those years back.

PROBE: Could we have been further along with AIDS than we are now?

GALLO: I’ll never know what we could have done. We were semi-paralyzed. It was a nightmare. I don’t know how others were affected. The people in my lab were demoralized.

An Israeli in my lab said, ‘Those [Dingell] guys are behaving like Nazis. You’ve got to get out!’ My Eastern European colleague, Mikulas Popovic said: ‘They’re like the KGB!’

PROBE: Is progress being made against AIDS?

GALLO: Sure. For example, a new herpes virus has been discovered at Columbia University that is linked to Kaposi’s sarcoma (KS). We’ve just published on a hormonal therapy for KS in *Nature* [May 9]. A clinical report is forthcoming from us and others — hopefully in the *New England Journal* — that is related to this work, and of practical benefit to patients.

PROBE: What has been your research focus in recent years?

GALLO: Therapy for AIDS. KS — how it develops, how to treat it. Anti-sense molecules against human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) antibodies. We’re also working on the cellular factors that HIV needs. Also, vaccines against HIV. We continue to discover and report on new viruses. We found five in the last 18 years.

PROBE: You’ve been characterized unflatteringly by government employees and consultants, by the press, and in a Home Box Office docudrama. You said 18 months ago that you were contemplating legal action.

GALLO: Yes. But I also have had more than my appropriate share of awards, rewards, and positive press. The harsh treatment has been by a select few in the media, usually being, or wanting to be manipulated. However, what can I do?

If I fight back, and I sue, I [have to] relive the nightmare. I’ve had a lot of advice to sue, and offers to help. But I’ve taken the advice of a New York playwright whom I met, a friend of [author and playwright] Larry Kramer. He said: ‘We need you where you are. Concentrate on your work — we need you!’

The real problem in this is at the level of [Dingell’s staff director Peter] Stockton, and [investigator] Suzanne Hadley [who could claim they are protected by congressional immunity].

PROBE: Is the current atmosphere at NCI conducive to strong research progress?

GALLO: It’s in some turmoil now, because of changes. I can’t say anything for sure — and I don’t want to question the wisdom of its directors. Change is necessary, due to changes in the budget, needs outside NIH, and competition.

When I came, in 1965, there was expansion, and support from Congress and the media. A young clinical researcher had come to NIH in those years.

Since then, NIH has created its own competition, in the academic health centers of excellence around the country. A young doctor no longer has to come to NIH to train — and congressmen now may be more interested in the centers closer to home. The press may be jaded.

I suspect that [NIH director Harold] Varmus can make NIH a very excellent place for molecular and cellular biology, with less clinical research. Varmus has superb instincts.

As I see it, this was and is the National Institutes of Health, not the National Institutes of Science. But there may be no alternative for Dr. Varmus because of the changes I mentioned.

PROBE: What do you think Dingell wanted?

GALLO: I don’t know.

PROBE: Did your relationship with [ex-NCI director Samuel] Broder deteriorate?

GALLO: The answer is very complex. He is my friend, and I like him. Also, I think he is very smart. He invited six colleagues to his farewell dinner; I was one of them. We parted good friends.

He would have done anything that he could to help, I think. But Sam had a profound concern about, and fear of Dingell’s staff — and with good reason! However, in retrospect, it would have been so nice if he had spit in their eye, and resigned.

PROBE: If you had it to do over, would you do anything differently?

GALLO: I sometimes say that I would never have patented the blood test. But I had no choice.

I wish we’d invited the French to the press conference [on April 26, 1984], where the discovery of the cause of AIDS was announced. I had said that we would. I wish I had said forcefully that the French group had to be there, as I had agreed with them that they would be.

I’ve gained a lot of empathy for others in all of this. I wish I had come to it earlier. I am a workaholic, and I claim credit for my work. I should have erred on the side of generosity.

PROBE: And your new job?

GALLO: I’ve got everything I’ve been aiming for!
Attorney Labels 'Integrity' Panel Naive and Illogical

The federal Commission on Research Integrity, which is staffed and guided by the Public Health Service’s Office of Research Integrity (ORI), grinds dutifully forward on its congressionally mandated task: to tell the fed how to tighten its policing of scientific misconduct.

Earlier this year — and months behind schedule — the Commission, headed by Harvard ob-gyn Kenneth Ryan, M.D., filed a thin, five-page interim report that, as one critic calculated, has cost U.S. taxpayers $50,000 per page.

In the view of this critic, attorney Robert Charrow, Esq., of the Washington firm of Crowell & Moring, the Commission’s tentative recommendations are “internally inconsistent, ignore the fundamental principles of the regulatory process, and could lead to federally mandated norms for the practice of science.”

Danger Foreseen

Charrow adds, in analysis in the Journal of NIH Research

Imanishi-Kari Confronts Her Accusers this Month

Immunologist Thereza Imanishi-Kari, Ph.D., the central figure in the controversial “David Baltimore case,” faces her accusers at an administrative law hearing scheduled to start on June 12, in Washington, D.C.

The hearing is being conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The agency appointed a three-judge Departmental Appeals Board (DAB) to hear Imanishi-Kari’s case. She is appealing a 19-count finding of scientific misconduct handed down against her last year by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI), which is a part of HHS.

Imanishi-Kari and her lawyers will challenge the ORI findings — which bar her from federal research funding for 10 years, and thus may well terminate her research career. The ORI will defend its findings before the DAB, which is made up of two lawyers and one scientist.

Imanishi-Kari is senior author of a disputed research report published in Cell, in 1986; Nobel Laureate David Baltimore is a co-author. A post-doc in Imanishi-Kari’s lab, Margot O’Toole, complained that the findings were erroneous — and, later, charged they were fraudulent. The celebrated scientific misconduct case was pursued through two congressional hearings by Rep. John D. Dingell (D-Mich).

The DAB hearing, coming after eight years of controversy, will be Imanishi-Kari’s first chance to cross examine her accusers.

The hearing is in the Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Ave., S.W. Phone (202) 690-6012 for times and place.
"A modest genetic change might enable Ebola to spread rapidly through the air..." — N.Y. Times editorial (May 12)

We are First Amendment absolutists.

We also believe that some thinking and some speech are dangerous — and that people should be held responsible. So, we think the President was both right, and within his rights in attacking the lies and hate-speak of the right-wing militias and the National Rifle Association.

Novelists and other creative writers must induce readers and viewers to suspend their disbelief. Telling a lie or a frightening tall tale is one way to do this. Oliver Stone predicates his film "J.F.K." on the widely accepted — but wholly undocumented — belief that there was a conspiracy to kill President Kennedy. Producer Stone thus taps — and feeds — the powerful wellsprings of paranoia that be-devil many Americans. Stone is dangerous because he promotes ungrounded fear.

Threat Grows

The same is true for the currently hot topic of epidemics. The film "Outbreak" focuses on the deadly Ebola virus, which recently reappeared in Zaire. The disbelief-suspending (and guilt promoting) idea in "Outbreak" — as well as in Michael Crichton's The Andromeda Strain and other works of this genre — is that terror has been loosed on the world because of a humanly-induced genetic mutation. Specifically:

A deadly virus with a naturally-stricted mode of spread — through physical contact with blood or other body fluids — suddenly mutates. It becomes airborne. Now all are menaced.

This was the scenario suggested initially, and in ignorance, for the emergence and spread of AIDS. It always was improbable, even before HIV was identified as the cause of AIDS.

The reason is that a blood-borne virus and an airborne one are very different organisms. To exist in and spread through their quite different media, the viruses must differ in many respects, not just one or two. They are not separated by a single mutation, or even as few as a dozen. Hundreds of mutations, over thousands of years, might be needed to transform a blood-borne pathogen into a flyer.

Early in the AIDS epidemic we questioned several virologists on this point. We can't recall the specific examples they used. But they said, in effect, that the notion that a blood-borne pathogen can suddenly mutate into an airborne one makes as much sense as worrying that giraffes will suddenly mutate into cobras.

You can't say categorically that it can't happen. But it almost certainly won't.

The press has the responsibility to explain this reassuring fact clearly — and for the most part, from what we have seen and read, it has (see box). For this reason, the New York Times' Ebola editorial (May 12) was particularly unfortunate.

Wide Threat Seen

"It is not hard to imagine an outbreak that could threaten the globe," the Grey Lady opined. "A modest genetic change might enable Ebola to spread rapidly through the air, and infected travelers could spread the virus widely before any-one realized they were sick."

This is trash talk. It breeds hysteria. It is particularly surprising in light of the fact that the Times' deputy editorial page editor is a former science editor — and clearly knows better.

The Times is widely respected. What it says matters. So it is distressing that it would lend credence to a dangerous scare scenario.

The press should help extinguish, not hype, baseless hysteria.

*Times' Phantasy Stokes Ebola Fears*

Physicians v. Healers: How They Differ

The writer of this essay is a physician, medical educator — and our better half.

Health practitioners, including alternative healers, nurses, nurse practitioners, and physicians assistants, are taught pattern recognition — which is what computers do. Physicians, on the contrary, are trained in science. The reason is that physicians must cultivate a neutral, information-seeking posture, as unbiased observers, in order to serve their patients wisely and well.

Physicians must be prepared to collect information that does not fit a pattern: disparate information.

Physicians do not practice as scientists. Illness, and the human being are too complex. But they do — and they must — approach information as scientists, without preconceptions.

This is the central skill we try to teach medical students. We say:

You must approach the information that you gather in the patient's history and medical examination without any preconception. You must listen to patients in a neutral mode, and not rush to judgment. You may need to hear the same information over and over again, not making any decisions, until you clearly understand what is going on.

This, of course, drives away some patients, who want un-continued on next page
Healers... continued from preceding page

swears now. (Who doesn’t?) This also is what makes alternative healers so appealing: With them, it’s all very personable.

They listen intently. Then they lay on the hand. So, neither they nor the patient has to deal with uncertainty.

Patients may not care if this help later is found to be worthless. People don’t approach health care — especially their own — as an intellectual problem.

But sooner or later, and often it’s sooner, the practitioner’s patterned responses will fail the patient, perhaps fatally. The hope for a correct diagnosis and for specific medical interventions lies with a scientific approach to the patient and his illness.

Only a physician can provide it.

— Veva Zimmerman, M.D.

‘Fraud’ Is Passed at FDA

The FDA until recently had a Health Fraud Branch. This name has been changed to Nontraditional Drugs Compliance Branch. A staffer said recently by phone: “ ‘Health Fraud’ is not politically correct around here any more.”

Candor of this nature probably isn’t politically correct either. So we’re withholding the FDAer’s name.

# # #

We think we now know how the Republicans plan to eliminate health fraud!

These science definitions and comments were collected from kids of all ages through college by teachers. We plucked them from the Internet (SciFraud May 24):

"H2O is hot water, and CO2 is cold water."
"TO COLLECT FUMES of sulphur, hold a deacon over a flame in a test tube."
"WHEN you smell an odorless gas, it is probably carbon monoxide."
"WATER is composed of two gins, Oxygin and Hydrogin. Oxygin is pure gin. Hydrogin is gin and water."
"THREE kinds of blood vessels are arteries, vanes and caterpillars."
"BLOOD flows down one leg and up the other."
"RESPIRATION is composed of two acts, first inspiration, and then expectoration."
"THE MOON is a planet just like the earth, only it is even deader."
"ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION is when the farmer does it to the cow instead of the bull."
"DEW IS FORMED on leaves when the sun shines down on them and makes them perspire."
"MUSHROOMS always grow in damp places, and so they look like umbrellas."
"THE PISTOL of a flower is its only protection against insects."
"THE SKELETON is what is left after the insides have been taken out and the outsides have been taken off. The purpose of the skeleton is something to hitch meat to."
"A PERMANENT set of teeth consists of eight canines, eight cuspids, two molars, and eight cuspidors."
"THE TIDES are a fight between the Earth and moon. All water tends towards the moon, because there is no water in the moon and nature abhors a vacuum. I forget where the sun joins in this fight."
"A FOSSIL is an extinct animal. The older it is, the more extinct it is."
"GERMINATE: To become a naturalized German."