

LAW OFFICES OF

**CARLOS F. NEGRETE**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

27422 CALLE ARROYO  
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CALIFORNIA 92675-2747  
Telephone (949) 493-8115  
Fax (949) 493-8170

E-MAIL:  
cnegrete1@hotmail.com

---

**VIA TELEFAX ONLY**

December 6, 2001

Ms. Penni Crabtree  
**SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIBUNE**  
P.O. BOX 120191  
San Diego, CA 92112-0191

**RE: DR. HULDA CLARK**  
Responses to Questions

Dear Ms. Crabtree:

As you are aware, our office represents Dr. Hulda Clark, Century Nutrition S. DER.L.DE.C.V. and New Century Press.

It is our understanding that you are preparing to write a newspaper article concerning my clients and/or their various business and professional interests.

For the purposes of your forthcoming article, my clients have designated me as spokesperson for the matters set forth in this letter. Notwithstanding this, both Dr. Clark and Geoff Clark have spoken on their own behalf.

As you also know, last Wednesday, November 28, 2001, you interviewed Geoff Clark concerning Self Health Resource Center, Grandma's Pantry and various other entities in a very frank and forthright interview that lasted almost three hours. During the interview, Mr. Clark openly responded to the many questions that you posed. The interview was recorded both by you and me. It took place at the corporate offices of Self Health Resource Center of which you were granted open access and provided with a tour.

At this time, Dr. Clark has agreed to respond, in writing, to the questions that you sent me by e-mail messages on November 20, 2001.

Pursuant to your request, I have also herein provided a copy of the order concerning the reopening of the clinic in Tijuana.

Accordingly, please find the responses from Dr. Clark accompanying this letter.

As you may recall, at the time of our initial telephone conversations, I pointed out to you that my clients were reluctant to be interviewed because of past misinformations that were reported by you and printed in your newspaper. You indicated that you were not aware of the inaccuracies, but represented to me that you would correct any errors in reporting and make appropriate retractions. On this basis, both Dr. Clark and Geoff Clark agreed to “go on the record” and cooperate with your investigative report.

Every effort has been made by my clients to provide you with as much information as possible without violating physician/patient confidentiality or matters which were either trade secret or private.

In addition, you were provided with several names of individuals to contact and provided with references upon which you could verify the testimonials of successes of people that have followed the information that Dr. Clark has provided in her various publications. Indeed, you were provided with Dr. Clark’s books and a video. We trust that you read the books as they contain most of the technical references that you were given when you asked technical questions.

It is also our understanding that you were contacted by several individuals that wanted to share the benefits that they have enjoyed from Dr. Clark, Century Nutrition and Dr. Clark’s books.

Notwithstanding all of these positive and good faith efforts, frankly I have some concerns of my own with respect to the demeanor upon which you conducted the interview of Mr. Clark and the phrasing which you have consistently used in your various messages. My concerns are outlined herein.

**Refusal to acknowledge and identify Dr. Clark as “Dr.”**

First of all, you seem to have an inexplicable reluctance to identify Dr. Clark by her professional title, even though she has earned a *Doctorate* degree. Why you elect to adopt this style underscores your obsession with casting Dr. Clark in a false light and degrading her professional status by minimizing the professional degrees that she worked so hard to earn.

When this issue was raised to you in one of my e-mail messages, you responded by stating that you are following the standards of the *AP Stylebook* in not identifying Dr. Clark by her professional title. You also stated that it was Union-Tribune “policy” to not identify PhDs’ as *Dr.*

December 6, 2001  
Ms. Penni Crabtree  
Page 3

While you were silent to state which edition you were relying upon, I discovered that such is not the case.

The *Associated Press 2001-Stylebook and Briefing on Media* specifically sets forth at Page 76 as follows:

**“Doctor** *Dr.* in first reference as a formal title before the name of an individual who holds a doctor of dental surgery, doctor of medicine, doctor of osteopathy, or doctor of podiatric medicine degree: *Dr. Jonas Salk.*

The form *Dr.*, or *Drs.*, in a plural construction, applies to all first-reference uses before a name, including direct quotations.

If appropriate in the context, *Dr.* also may be used on first reference before the names of individuals who hold other types of doctoral degrees. However, because the public frequently identifies *Dr.* only with physicians, care should be taken to assure that the individual’s specialty is stated in the first or second reference. The only exception would be a story in which the context left no doubt that the person was a dentist, psychologist, chemist, historian, etc.

In some instances it also is necessary to specify that an individual identified as *Dr.* is a physician. One frequent case is a story reporting on joint research by physicians, biologists, etc. ...”

Accordingly, there can be no ambiguity that Dr. Clark should be referred as “*Dr. Clark, a cellular biologist*” or Dr. Hulda Clark, Ph.D. in cellular biology.

As Geoff Clark pointed out in his November 27, 2001 e-mail message to you, your position is even inconsistent with your own newspaper’s past practice. As Mr. Clark set forth in his e-mail, as recently as November 21, 2001, in an article written by Justin Pope for the Union-Tribune, Dr. Nathan Marsh Pusey, was referred to as *Dr.* throughout the article even though he too earned a *PhD* in “ancient history.” Throughout the article, and not just at the first instance, each time that reference was made to Dr. Pusey, the title *Dr.* was used.

Accordingly, we request that you be consistent with the Union-Tribune’s own policy and refer to Dr. Clark in each instance, wherever her name is used in your article, as *Dr. Hulda Clark* or *Dr. Hulda Clark, a cellular biologist.*

### **Misuse of the term “Franchise”**

You have made several references to the term “franchise” when referring to the businesses owned by either Geoff Clark or Dr. Clark. There can be no question that the use of this term is misleading and pejorative. The term “franchise” has no application with respect to the businesses that you have inquired about. You have been told so on the record.

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines a **franchise** as follows:

1: freedom and immunity from some burden and restriction vested in a person or group; 2a: a special privilege granted to an individual or group; *especially*: the right to be and exercise the powers of a corporation.  
b: a constitution or a statutory right or privilege; *especially*: the right to vote.  
c(1): the right or license granted to an individual or group to market a company’s goods or services in a particular territory; *also*: a business granted such a right or license (2): the territory involved in such a right; 3a: the right of membership in a professional sports league; b: a team and its operating organization having such memberships.

Accordingly, it has been clearly set forth, on the record, that no “franchise” has existed, or presently exists, between Dr. Clark, Geoff Clark, or any of the businesses that they operate or own. For the record, there have been no franchises conferred on third parties by any of the individuals or companies that you have interviewed.

### **Use of derogatory and Pejorative words to cast false light**

Moreover, we would ask that you refrain from consistent and persistent use of pejorative language in your reporting. As an example, you have consistently used the term “reap” when referring to money. This language is clearly pejorative and is intended to place my client in a false light.

## Retractions

Based upon your own representations and agreement, we now formally request that you, and the Union-Tribune, take this opportunity to clarify and retract various wrong statements that were printed in the articles that appeared in the July 27, 2001 and August 18, 2001 articles that were written by you and published by the Union-Tribune.

In the July 27, 2001 article, you incorrectly report that "Century Nutrition.. [was] allowed to reopen this month but have been forbidden to practice alternative medicine." There was no such order by the Mexican health department nor was there such restriction.

In the same article, you report that "Century Nutrition is contesting its \$166,000 fine." This statement is incorrect to the extent that there was no fine imposed that was over \$100 thousand U.S. dollars. The fine imposed by SALUD was for 166 thousand pesos, which equals approximately 18 thousand U.S. dollars based upon the current exchange rates. More importantly, you failed to report that the fines were ordered stayed by a Mexican federal court and have been disputed by Century Nutrition as being unconstitutional and unlawful. You were certainly aware of this, but instead attempt to grandstand.

Of more significance is the fact that you fail to report that the very same government officials that caused Century Nutrition to be closed are, themselves, being investigated and accused of attempting to extort money from Mexican based alternative medicine clinics by threats of closure, such as what happened to Century Nutrition. Dr. Clark has steadfastly refused to pay any money to governments officials and, instead, sought the protection of the Mexican federal court system. I know you are aware of this, because we discussed it.

In your August 18, 2001 letter, you again incorrectly report that "Century Nutrition— [was]...controlled by San Diego parent companies. Both have been allowed to reopen but can offer only conventional care, not alternative medicine." Both of these statements are untrue.

As you were certainly aware, you had absolutely no evidence or information that indicated that Century Nutrition was "controlled by San Diego parent companies." The reason for lack of proof of this is that it is simply not true.

And, again you repeat the false information that the clinic was restricted from practicing alternative medicine. There is no such order. As you should have been aware, had you made a diligent investigation, various forms of "alternative medicine" are welcomed and accepted by the country of Mexico as a standard of care in the medical community. Its broad acceptance of

alternative medicine has, in fact, encouraged many advances in this field to proliferate and prosper. We are not even sure what you intend to mean by the use of the term "alternative medicine." Certainly, you appear to be using it in a pejorative manner.

It is clear that you are not convinced that there are other forms of nutritional health or treatment that will satisfy your seemingly biased personal beliefs and personal monetary ties with the pharmaceutical industry.

### **Misleading questions and interview tactics**

Furthermore, you consistently and persistently insisted on putting words into interviewees' mouths to suggest that Dr. Clark "treats and/or diagnoses" individuals for medical conditions. You have been repeatedly told, on the record, that she does not "treat or diagnose" patients. Dr. Clark is a nutritional consultant and provides such nutritional consultation within the framework of the laws of the country of Mexico. As you should be aware, Naturopathy specifically teaches not to diagnose for anything because naming symptoms is a wrong concept.

What is more important, we are greatly concerned by your harassment and bias demonstrated when interviewing individuals that have sought out either consultation by Dr. Clark or treatment by Century Nutrition. As an example, it is our understanding that Ms. Margorie Fritz contacted you in order to provide you with a positive testimonial of her experience with Century Nutrition. We have been advised that you attempted to place words into her mouth suggesting that Dr. Clark "treated and diagnosed" her in the past. We have also found that she specifically told you that she was not "treated or diagnosed" by Dr. Clark. Evidently, when she kept on insisting this, you refused to take this down for the record and instead became combative and challenged her on the record statements. Faced with this situation, Ms. Fritz felt intimidated by you and felt that there was no other alternative but to terminate the interview. We have also received several other examples of your intimidating and misleading interviews, which apparently include the two subjects, which you have interviewed in your article. It is clear that rather than allowing the interviewees to provide their own statements, you have only allowed them to respond to your leading "misleading" statements.

These distortions cast Dr. Clark in a false light and characterize her as a criminal by making leading questions and putting words into interviewees mouths. Please be advised that we do not feel that this practice is either objective, ethical or unbiased reporting within the standards of your industry.

**Lack of objectivity and personal bias coupled with conflict of interests**

Finally, we are very concerned with the general bias in your reporting in light of the personal relationship that you have with the pharmaceutical and bio-technical industry. We are informed that your husband, Mr. Richard Pittner, works for Amylin Pharmaceuticals as a Senior Director of Cell Biology.

The operations and research performed by Amylin, which are supervised by your husband, are in direct conflict with much of the research performed by Dr. Clark and her publications and positions on diabetes, metabolic disorders, and the harmful effects of pollutants and toxins in one's body.

We find this to be both an ethical and legal conflict that should be avoided in this newspaper article.

It is our belief that by reason of your association with such pharmaceutical companies, you do not possess the objectivity necessary to provide a balanced report.

Accordingly, it is respectfully and formally requested that the San Diego Union-Tribune remove you as reporter in this story. A copy of this letter is being forwarded to the Business Editor and Senior Editor of the San Diego Union-Tribune in order to formalize this request and place both you and the San Diego Union-Tribune on notice as to the conflicts that are set forth in this letter.

Quite frankly, it is unfortunate that we must make this request, but we are confident that the San Diego Union-Tribune and Copely Press, Inc. (its parent company) would like to maintain its reputation for fair and unbiased reporting of story subjects.

However, please be advised that in the event that corrective measures are not made with respect to the issues set forth in this letter, and a newspaper article is published in defiance of the information that we have provided, my clients will consider such conduct to be actionable and will certainly take any measures available to them to seek redress for economic losses and damages to their reputation that may be suffered. Hopefully, this will not be necessary.

December 6, 2001  
Ms. Penni Crabtree  
Page 8

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation and courtesy.

Very truly yours,  
**LAW OFFICES OF CARLOS F. NEGRETE**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Carlos F. Negrete', enclosed within a large, hand-drawn oval.

**CARLOS F. NEGRETE**  
Attorney at Law

CFN/me

cc: Dr. Hulda Clark  
Mr. Geoff Clark  
Mr. Todd Merriman, Senior Editor  
Mr. James Watters, Business Editor