

# Dialectical analysis of the Nobel Prize awarding to the false discovery of HIV

*Jesús García Blanca, Independent researcher*

<http://saludypoder.blogspot.com>. [keffet@gmail.com](mailto:keffet@gmail.com).

November 15, 2008

## Placing the analysis

After fourteen years of work in this field, I begin with the following statements:

1. Nobody has carried out procedures scientifically established that allow us to announce the discovery of the HIV virus. In particular, Montagnier, has recognized that he didn't.
2. This information is common knowledge and sufficiently well-known, if not for the general public, for scientists, doctors, activists, journalists, victims and public authorities... including by all means the Nobel Foundation.
3. HIV/AIDS is not a scientific-medical issue, but a problem of Power.

The scientific work that disassembly the viral theory and gets an explanation to the health problems that have been classified under the "AIDS" label is done. Also, there are treatment proposals that have benefited only a few people but could help many more, once the appropriate political decisions are taken (1).

Therefore, this is not an argument from the scientific or medical point of view. We part from the base that the concession of the Nobel Prize in Medicine 2008 to Barré-Sinoussi and Montagnier has not been an error nor has been done out of lack of information; the decision was taken with the knowledge that they had not discovered any virus and this fact must be contemplated from the standpoint of the power relations and they should be discussed in a political, financial and dialectical level.

That approach will allow us to answer the apparent paradox: how is it possible that a totally erroneous or false idea prevails, and it is accepted, in spite of the serious and even mortal consequences that it has?

Schopenhauer (2) warns: "it is necessary to separate with clarity the discovery of the objective truth, from the art of making its own thesis an accepted truth".

That is, we must part from the idea that those who build up the HIV/AIDS Fake, did not try to prove the truth, but force the majority to accept their approach as true. In other words: those placed in the group called "officialist" do not try to convince the other group known as "dissident", but try convincing the public who observes the dispute. This distinction is crucial because the response must be totally different.

In fact, we should answer the first option approaching the proposal from the BOTTOM: arguing to prove that its exposition is false and, eventually suggest other alternatives. Nevertheless, we are going to respond the second option approaching the FORM on how the proposal is done: putting in evidence that is a dialectic trap to make us believe something independently of its veracity. Schopenhauer: “the main task of the scientific dialectic is to explore and to analyze the strategies of the disloyalty when discussing, so in the real controversies, we are immediately able to recognize it and annihilate it”.

So, we are going to leave the first task to those who normally do it with exhaustive rigor, and we are going to pay attention to the second one, which it is the one that concerns directly to Power.

### **Fist stratagem: reinforce the argument of authority**

The concession of the Nobel Prize in Medicine 2008 to Barré-Sinoussi and Montagnier clearly enters the area described by Schopenhauer in its Stratagem number 30: *Argumentum ad Verecundiam*. The Latin term means “argument directed to respect” which indicates clearly that it does not appeal to reasons, but to the respect that people have to an authority in the matter. It is like the *Magister dixit* –that means “the teacher said it”- an argument of authority, used to refute, in other words, to resist an argument –in that case: the dissidents arguments- showing –to the public of course, that they are against what an authority said.

And what a better form to reinforce an authority that giving him the Nobel Prize with the enormous symbolic load that this action implies, and therefore with the enormous Power that exerts on the public?

Schopenhauer: “there will be more valid authorities when their knowledge and their capacities are limited [...] common people have deep respect before experts of all kinds”.

The more ignorance about one matter, the more respect by the authority. Concerning HIV/AIDS, people know –hardly- the official version essentials, which is almost a equivalent to absolute ignorance; so the majority lower their heads and obey before any doctors indications. If who emits his verdict is the “discoverer of the HIV virus” himself, invested with the Nobel Prize in Medicine, his word will make a million people bend their cervix, then the critic voices will cry out in the desert –at least, that what they expect.

The most evident proof that this is the way the concession of this prize has been done, it is on the declarations that, professor Bjorn Vennstrom, who is a member of the jury, made immediately after the candidates were announced: “we hope that this ends the theories of conspiracy and stops others who defend ideas that are not based on investigation”. The power that authority has is so great, that they do not even try to hide that it is a manoeuvre to appeal to peoples’ feelings and that has nothing to do with the reasoning, the scientific debate or the search of the truth.

We are then in the dialectics terrain, or more accurately, of what Schopenhauer proposes to denominate Eristic dialectics, in which it is important that what it is said is accepted. But we need more: it has to be accepted by the majority. Aristotle said: “things that seem just to many, we say they are”. And the brief manual we have been mentioning on the art of being right, abounds in it: “any opinion, as absurd as it may be, men will try to make their own as soon they are convinced, that that opinion is universally accepted. It’s easier to die than to think”.

In consequence, the “logic” of the majority turns the reasoning inside out. Instead of thinking that since somebody has isolated a new virus, they have been granted with the Nobel Prize, the watchword –it can’t be called reasoning- is the opposite: They are granted with the Nobel prize, so we can be sure the virus has been discovered.

### **Second stratagem: appeal to ignorance**

The other recurrent strategy used by the group called “pro-government” appears in the manual of Schopenhauer with number 28: The Latin term says Argumentum ad auditors, which means, “directed to whom may hear”, and its use is advised “when an educated person disputes before an uneducated audience”.

Applied to our case, when a person who has knowledge on a matter, disputes before an audience –public opinion- without this knowledge or it consist on a handful of prejudices and empty slogans. The mechanism of this strategy is as follows: “a non valid objection is mentioned, which inconsistency only an expert can catch. And although the adversary is an expert, the listeners are not. To the eyes of these, it will be defeated, [...] To show that the objection is unacceptable, the adversary will have to enter on a long discussion and going back to the principles of science or any other resource”. A public who ignores a matter is easy to accept simple or simplified arguments that repeat established topics, but if somebody wants to enter in a multitude of details to be able to disassemble the falsifications, that public no longer can follow it - nor is the least bothered with it.

In order to finalize, let’s see what our author says about those topics, prejudices, empty slogans, or –as he denominates “Hoaxes”. I quote the text in spite of its extension by the absolute precision whereupon it describes what happens to the HIV/AIDS Fake.

“The universality of an opinion, if we speak seriously, is not a proof nor is an indicator of its veracity. [...] What it is called general opinion is reduced, if well examined, to the opinion of two or three people; and we will be convinced of it if we could see the way that such universally valid opinion is born. Then we would discover that, at first, they were two or three people who assumed and presented or affirmed for the first time, and everybody was so benevolent with them that it was thought that they had examined them thoroughly, prejudging these people competence, some others accepted this opinion as well and they were believed by many others too. People

whom their mental laziness pushed to believe, rather than examining the things with rigor. Therefore, the number of such sluggish and credulous followers grew day by day.

In fact, once the opinion had a good number of voices that accepted it, those that came later supposed that the others could only have so many followers by the conclusive weight of its arguments. The rest, not to be considered anxious spirits who fight against opinions universally accepted, giving the idea they were a kind of "Know-all" who want to be cleverer than the entire world, were forced to admit what everybody already accepted. At his point, the approval becomes a duty. In the future, a few people who have a critical sense, will be forced to be silent, and those who are incapable to have their own opinion will be able to speak, even when they are just the echo of other people's opinions. In addition they are the most enthusiastic and intransigent defenders of those opinions.

Actually, what they hate most about people who think on a different way, is the fact that they want to judge on their own, something that they are not able to do, and they know it inside without confessing [...] what is the worth of hundreds of million people's voice? As much, for example, as a historical fact that is told by hundred historians, when it is well known that all have been copying each other, and so, finally, everything is reduced to a single testimony ".

---

NOTES:

(1) [www.thepertgroup.com](http://www.thepertgroup.com). KREMER, Heinrich. *Die stille Revolution der Krebs- und AIDS- Therapie*. Ehlers Verlag Wolfratshausen, 2001 ([www.ehlersverlag.de](http://www.ehlersverlag.de)).

(2) SCHOPENHAUER, Arthur. *El arte de tener razón expuesto en 38 estratagemas. Dialéctica erística*. Madrid, Edad, 1996. All Schopenhauer quotes are referred to that book.