Proving the existence of HIV

It appears many dissidents think questioning the existence of HIV is not a good strategy for attacking the HIV theory of AIDS. They claim it is too arcane and too technical. This is not the case and in fact this is a very valuable lesson to be learnt from the Parenzee case.

Viruses are microscopic particles which *inter alia* consist of proteins and nucleic acids. In retroviruses the nucleic acid is RNA rather than DNA.

According to the WHO in excess of 30 million people are infected with such particles claimed to be a retrovirus called HIV.

Infection (and transmission) of such particles is diagnosed using antibody tests. That is, HIV experts claim that infection leads to the production of antibodies which can be detected and distinguished from all other antibodies by the fact they react with the proteins that constitute the viral particle. If a reaction between test kit proteins and antibodies in serum is detected, this is considered proof that the antibodies are HIV which can only arise because of HIV infection. Hence a positive antibody test is deemed proof, albeit indirect, of infection with HIV.

To perform an antibody test first one must obtain the viral proteins, also known as antigens, to use in the HIV test kits.

By definition, HIV proteins are those present in the HIV particle. This is no different from what defines your kidney, your blood or your proteins. And, if you are a woman, your baby. These are yours because they are obtained from your body. If a pathologist is handed a kidney and finds it contains a cancer, it is your cancer because of a forensic system of recording that begins with a surgical team identifying your body as that upon which the surgeon has operated. Likewise if a police officer suspects you are driving under the influence of alcohol you are obliged to undergo a compulsory blood alcohol test. Without such documentation there would be utter chaos.

Unlike the human body, a single virus particle is far too small to manipulate. Even if a single virus particle could be plucked from a cell culture, and its protein could be extracted, the amount per particle is infinitesimal. It could not be used for analysis or an antibody test.

Hence to obtain a useable amount of protein a mass of viral particles must be obtained. Since viruses can only be cultivated in cell cultures and cells contain thousands of different proteins, the viral particles must be obtained in a pure form. That is, they must be separated from everything else that is not virus particles or, at the very least, from all other entities that contain proteins. (Since cells also contain RNA the same need for purification applies to obtaining the viral RNA).

That is, the virus must be purified. In the Parenzee trial the Perth Group testified this was an absolute requirement. The prosecution witnesses, that is, the HIV experts agreed.

Here are some data extracted from the Parenzee hearing.

At the beginning of EPE's cross-examination the prosecution claimed that purification was not necessary to prove the existence of a new virus. They supported this claim by submitting to the court a copy of the first chapter of a textbook called *Medical Virology* written by David O White and Frank Fenner. Either the prosecution experts either did not read this material or they failed to understand what the authors had written. This is what was written:

"**CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF VIRUSES**

Methods of Purification

An essential prerequisite for the chemical analysis of viruses has been the development of adequate methods of purification. Special problems are created by the close association of viruses with the cells they parasitize; it is not an easy matter to free virions [virus particles] of associated cell debris, or even from viral proteins synthesized in excess in the infected cell…

Physical Methods of Purification. After partial purification and concentration by chemical methods, or even without any preliminary treatment, virus particles can be separated from soluble contaminants

by centrifugation…Equilibrium (isopycnic) [density] gradient centrifugation in dense solutes such as caesium chloride or potassium tartrate (or sucrose in the case of enveloped viruses of low density), on the other hand, separates virions from contaminants according to their buoyant density. After prolonged ultracentrifugation at very high gravitational forces the virions will come to rest in a sharp band in that part of the tube where the solution has the same density as the virions, usually within the range 1.15 – 1.4."

When EPE pointed out the authors of the book support our claim, the prosecution submitted a paper entitled "Sequence-Based Identification of Microbial Pathogens: a Reconsideration of Koch's Postulates" as evidence that purification is not necessary—a virus can be proven to exist by genetic methods. Again, we pointed out in court, that according to the authors of this particular article: "…with only amplified sequence available, the biological role or even **existence** of these inferred micro-organisms remains unclear"[11] (emphasis ours).

Much later in the proceedings, when the prosecution witnesses were cross-examined, they all agreed that purification is necessary. They admitted that to identify the viral genome, RNA, (this is also the case for the viral proteins), the virus must be purified. Below is some of the evidence given by the prosecution experts:

Professor David Cooper: "Once that virus is purified, it's then genetically sequenced and those sequences are

unique, just like every organism on the planet has unique sequences and markers.” (T673).

Professor David Gordon: “I’m not sure he did or didn’t. [if Montagnier purified]. I mean it’s highly likely that he attempted to separate out the virus to purify the virus because purification of virus is then very useful for further studies for the nature of the virus and the nature of the immune response against the virus.” (T1032).

“It’s a natural step from obtaining the virus in cell culture to then obtain purified virus”. (T1034).

Professor Dominic Dwyer was cross-examined regarding Montagnier’s 1997 admission that he did not purify “HIV”. The following exchange took place between him and Kevin Borick, the lawyer for the defence.

“Q. You accept that that’s the first time, after 1983, that he admitted that he had not purified the virus.

A: I’ve got no idea if he has said that on any other occasion.

Q: It’s a significant fact, don’t you think.

A: No I don’t think so because I’m not quite sure what was meant by the journalist and Montagnier when talking about purifying. If they want to go on and do further studies with the virus, yes like everybody else they would be purifying large amounts of virus and extracting protein and genetic material, doing the

analyses and so on. He may not have purified that particular virus as described in his paper but that's because it wasn't required for the scientific evidence he was producing." (T1002)

Further on: "The general principles of what that textbook says are quite true. The purification, as far as one can go, is important in analysis of any virus or bacteria, for that matter as well." (T1199)

And: "Well, in the diagnostic sort of situation what that really is looking for is looking for presence of those conserved bits of genetic material that you know to be the pathogen, be it HIV or flu or whatever, you then use that technology to see whether those sequences or those bits are present in something else, in another clinical sample, for example. And that really now has become, you know, the main method of diagnosis of many, many pathogens in a laboratory now… I mean with genetic testing – I guess the upside of course is you can do it on everybody, it's pretty cheap, it's extremely reliable and robust, the downside is that you have to know the genetic structure to begin with, you have to have the genetic sequence of what you are after. So when a new virus emerges, like SARS, you can't necessarily use, reliably, nucleic acid testing until you get the sequence of that new virus for the first time. So then in fact you are in a first identifier, you are required to use these more traditional methods of virus culture and microscopy and so on", that is, purification. (T963)

Robert Gallo: "You have to purify." (T1257).

To this list of experts we can add Montagnier. In his July 1997 interview Djamel Tahi put to him: “But there comes a point when one must do the characterisation of the virus. This means: what are the proteins of which it’s composed?” Montagnier replied, “…analysis of the proteins of the virus demands mass production and purification. It is necessary to do that”.

Hence Montagnier and the prosecution HIV experts agree with White and Fenner and with the Perth Group. The only way to analyse the proteins and the RNA of a new retrovirus and thus to prove its existence is to purify the viral particles.

Hence the question is: is there any evidence for the purification of the particles claimed to be HIV? The only way to answer this question is by taking electron micrographs to show that the putative purified material consists of nothing else but particles which all look the same and each bearing all the morphological features of retroviruses. This seems patently obvious to everyone except the HIV experts. Apparently the 1983 Nobel Laureate Barre-Sinossi and her colleague Chermann forgot the paper they published in 1972 following a meeting they organised at the Pasteur Institute. Their paper dealt with the purification of retrovirus particles using density gradient centrifugation of cell culture supernatants and described how electron micrographs must be obtained to prove this material consists of particles with the morphology of retroviruses with “No apparent differences in physical appearances”. That is, to prove

there are retroviral particles and they are pure. No such electron micrographs have ever been published. Hence the answer to the question is a resounding no. The Perth Group claim that HIV has not been purified was proven in 1997 by Montagnier's admission to Djamel Tahi and the electron micrographs published in two papers by Bess and Gluschankof respectively the March issue of *Virology*. Hence there is no evidence that the proteins (or RNA) said to be HIV are retroviral. In the absence of such evidence there can be no proof for the existence of HIV antibodies, HIV tests or HIV itself.

In 1997 the Bess *et al* and Gluschankof *et al* teams were worried that the RNA and proteins "used for biochemical and serological analyses or as immunogens" originated from material whose purity has not "been verified". Today, like in 1984 and 1997, we are still using PCR primers and antigens originating from a material in which there is no proof that it contains particles having the morphological characteristics of retroviruses, let alone purified particles, to test for a unique retrovirus "HIV", whose existence nobody has proven.