

# ...CHAPTER SIX

## The role of viruses in disease

Having made the assumption that inflammatory reactions, the formation of rashes and the production of mucus and other discharges, were the definitive signs of 'infection', scientists then discovered that exactly those symptoms could be produced without bacteria.

Before modern scientific techniques were able to isolate, characterise and photograph minute particles, it was initially inferred that these illnesses were caused by microscopic elements called viruses, which eventually lead to the search and characterisation for these new pathogens. These viruses quickly became the new physiological enemy, the definitive bio-terrorist, and many so-called infectious illnesses were defined by the specific virus that were thought to be the cause of the illness; measles, rubella, chickenpox, AIDS, polio, etc.

However the issue of viral causation in disease is far from clear; remember that Koch defined the basic criteria by which scientists could determine whether an illness could be defined as being caused by a microbe (mainly for bacteria and protozoa single-cell organisms ).

- The bacteria must be present in every case of the disease.
- The bacteria must be isolated from the host with the disease and grown in pure culture.
- The specific disease must be reproduced when a pure culture of the bacteria is inoculated into a healthy susceptible host.

These Koch's Postulates were however redefined in 1937 and 1982 in an attempt to accommodate the new diseases that were thought to be caused by viruses.

Redefined because, many viruses could easily exist in humans that do not cause disease; many could not be isolated and identified in cases of disease; many could not cause illness through skin contact, breathed in or ingested through the digestive tract but only if injected in large quantities directly into the body, which of course is not the method by which most of these illnesses are contracted.

### **What are viruses?**

Viruses are effectively small packets of genes, chemically composed of DNA or RNA. Genes are the information that the cell uses to reproduce exact copies of itself and they also provide a blue-print for the production of proteins that determine the structure and function of each cell.

## Viruses are not alive

A virus is a very small amount of this genetic material covered in a protective coat, viruses are much smaller than bacteria and although we talk of 'live vaccines' implying the virus is still alive, viruses themselves are not living things. 'Live' from the point of view of vaccine manufacturers really means 'not destroyed' or 'not chemically annihilated' or not a genetically engineered chemical copy.

A virus contains **only** genetic information and has no other elements capable of digesting, eliminating, reproducing, moving, etc. It can carry out **none** of the functions requisite for life; a virus is basically a sophisticated chemical. However, the genetic information from the virus can be taken in by a host cell and in some instances they can be reproduced by that host cell producing more viral copies. There are in fact many kinds of viruses in almost all forms of life; plants, animals and bacteria.

The controversy lies in the significance of viruses in disease and therefore the **viral disease theory**. As with other microbes, we have been told that:

The virus is the cause of many viral illnesses and can only infect from outside of the host or cell. Once within the host cell, the host reproduces the virus in great number, very rapidly, (the virus is not capable of doing this on its own), and consequently the host cell dies, bursts open and releases many more viruses into the tissue of the body, whereupon they are able to infect more cells. These infected cells are then hijacked to reproduce more viruses in the same manner as before, thereby causing symptoms of disease and in severe cases the eventual death of the host.

However, there are considerable problems with this theory, problems that in many ways mirror the situation with bacteria.

- Most viruses that infect bacteria, plants, and animals (including humans) do not cause disease. In fact, scientists have studied viruses at length and have found those that infect bacteria may be helpful, in that they rapidly transfer genetic information from one bacterium to another. Viruses of plants and animals may convey genetic information among similar species, aiding the survival of their hosts in hostile environments.

**Encyclopedia Britannica, Macropaedia (1990) p507:  
Recited in "Images of Polio" – by Jim West**

- This method of acquiring genes is not in doubt. Bacteria as well as higher animal cells including humans are known to acquire viral genes, and the phenomenon is not rare. Endogenous viruses and viral elements have been found in all vertebrates investigated. As a general rule, the number of groups of viral sequences found within a given vertebrate species is proportional to the effort spent searching that species, i.e. whenever we look we find them and the more we look the more we find.

- The supposed AIDS virus, HIV, is said to be responsible for the immune breakdown of a patient with symptoms of AIDS, by the insertion of viral genetic information into the genes of patient's T-cells. It is very difficult to conceive how such a small amount of nucleic acid that is supposed to be found in only 1% of T-cells can account for the range of pathology seen in AIDS. Recently it has become known that approximately 3,000 times that amount of viral DNA already exists in normal cells. (Eleni Papadopulos-Eleopulos, in Continuum, Autumn 1997). The connection between AIDS and HIV is extremely controversial many of the original researchers do not even accept that the HIV is responsible for AIDS.
- Scientists have also demonstrated the ability of **cells to produce viruses** when under threat from external poisons and radiation, it is known as the SOS response in bacteria. This is in fact part of the reaction to poisons that is used to find out how toxic a chemical is, it is a standard chemical test used in the pharmaceutical industry and agrochemical industry to assess the toxicity of additives, drugs and insecticides called the 'Ames' test. The production of viruses under such circumstances could be:
  - ◇ A method of informing or warning other cells of the danger
  - ◇ Instructing other cells how to affect the required response to the trauma, just as genetic resistance to antibiotics can be transferred to other bacteria in this manner.
  - ◇ The packaging of the DNA codes as with other cell components to be recycled and used by other cells.
- Therefore, rather than the cause of cell breakdown, we know that viruses are caused by the poisoning of cells, the cell effectively breaks up and packages tiny amounts of its genetic material in protective membranes, these are in fact viruses. A poisoned cell effectively produces viruses, therefore it is very likely that the reason why so much viral DNA/RNA is found in normal cellular DNA is because that is where the viral DNA actually came from, viruses are in fact broken up pieces of our own cellular DNA.
- We also know that viruses transfer useful genetic information from cell to cell and to other individuals in healthy cells, yet surprisingly we have **never** been able to show a virus infecting a host cell from the outside to create a diseased cell. In the decades of viral research using electron microscopes able to detect small particles such as viruses, we have never been able to show what is known as 'infectosomes' in diseased cells, i.e. viruses being incorporated in the membrane of a host cell transferring genetic information into the cell causing its disease and destruction.
- All examples of supposed viral elements in disease seem to corroborate the fact that these elements are caused by poisoning cells first and they are in fact the breakdown products of the cell. Dying cells will often breakdown internally, packaging up its molecular components in membrane bound portions. In programmed cell death this process is called apoptosis. The

transfer of these supposed viruses to other cells although they can be incorporated in healthy cells does not subsequently create disease in those cells.

- Additionally, because the normal products of cells follow a line of activity from genes in the nucleus to outside of the nucleus, scientists naturally assumed that any 'back-flow' was pathological. There was an assumption that activity should not flow back into the nucleus affecting the genes. This 'Reverse Transcription' as it is called, was deemed pathology, a mal-function, a cause of disease, and was assumed to be caused by a virus that was changing the patients DNA or inserting its own viral DNA in the patient. However we have since learnt that this activity often occurs when the cell is carrying out normal DNA repair, it is more likely to be occurring as a result of disease rather than causing a disease.

In fact many illnesses that are diagnosed as viral have never had a positive identification of such; it is usually a diagnosis by default, if nothing else can be found then it's probably viral.

Expensive lab tests involve characterising the DNA of assumed viruses; this is rarely performed on patients that are ill. Very occasionally a clinical test for the antibodies to a virus is used which infers the presence of a virus but again this is subject to interpretation. There isn't a reliable clinical test for the viruses themselves, so the actual virus is not tested for, just the presence of antibodies to the virus. It is therefore highly probable that viruses may be present but with undetectable levels of antibody to them. As such, not only are there inherent problems in ascertaining whether a virus is the cause of an illness, but additional problems in ascertaining whether a virus is actually there or not and if it is present, whether it has 'infected' the host or always been there.

The HIV test is in fact a test for an antibody to a protein that has been assumed to be from the virus, but the virus has never been isolated. In addition most people will in fact test positive for the presence of this antibody, but there has been an agreed concentration of antibody that suddenly defines whether you are HIV positive or not. Below that concentration you are considered negative; above that you are considered positive, therefore this does not state that someone who is HIV positive has the antibody and someone who is HIV negative does not. Those testing negative could and often do have lower levels of these antibodies.

Dr Stefan Lanka a German research scientist having studied molecular biology and ecology started viral research in 1986. Then as the public became aware of AIDS and its connection with a virus (HIV), he was automatically considered an expert on AIDS. However when checking the literature of previous research on AIDS he found that scientists were not providing proof of a virus. Dr Lanka was deeply shocked but wanted to be sure...

"Well, I'm not experienced enough. I have overlooked something. On the other side, those people are absolutely sure. Then I was afraid that speaking about this with my friends, or even my family, they would think is absolutely mad and crazy. So for a long time I studied virology, from the end to the beginning, from the beginning to the end, to be absolutely sure that there was no such thing as HIV. And it was easy for me to be sure about this because I realized that the whole group of viruses to which HIV is said to belong, the retroviruses -- as well as other viruses which are claimed to be very dangerous -- in fact do not exist at all."...

"For almost one year we have been asking authorities, politicians and medical institutes after the scientific evidence for the existence of such viruses that are said to cause disease and therefore require "immunization". After almost one year we have not received even one concrete answer which provides evidence for the existence of those "vaccination viruses". The conclusion is inevitable that our children are still vaccinated on the basis of scientific standards of the 18th and 19<sup>th</sup> century. In the 19th century Robert Koch demanded in his generally accepted postulates evidence of the virus in order to prove infection; at Koch's time this evidence couldn't be achieved directly by visualization and characterization of the viruses, because adequate technology wasn't available at that time. Methods of modern medicine have profoundly changed over the past 60 years, in particular by the invention of the electron microscope. And still all these viruses we get immunized against have never been re-examined using this technology?"...

Regarding the available photographic proof of viruses studied by Dr Lanka:

"All these photos have in common that they, (the authors), can't claim that they present a virus, as long as they do not also provide the original publications which describe how and what from the virus has been isolated. Such original publications are cited **nowhere**. Indeed, in the entire scientific literature there's not even one publication, where "viruses in the disease" the fulfillment of Koch's first postulate is even claimed. That means that there is no proof that from humans with certain diseases the viruses - which are held responsible for these diseases - have been isolated. Nevertheless, this is precisely what they publicly claim."

[www.klein-klein-aktion.de](http://www.klein-klein-aktion.de)

The role of microbes as causative agents of disease is indeed sketchy; in fact techniques in most of the alternative therapies have focused on detoxification, immune building, adding friendly bacteria and working with the elimination procedures of the body, etc. None of which have ever required a positive identification of a microbe that has needed to be killed.

## **Summary**

Let us now be clear about these issues, bacteria and fungus are living micro-organisms (unlike viruses), what is in question is their role in the 'causation' of disease, and more particularly infectious disease. Bacteria and fungus can be utilised by the body to digest toxins even though this process of digestion can produce other toxic byproducts some of which can also cause symptoms, the disease causation would have been the initial toxicity and cellular breakdown. As such you cannot catch these diseases from someone else unless your cellular environment is the same as the next person, in which case you are reacting to your circumstances, eliminating toxins, and thereby cultivating microbes, you do not have a disease that was caused by catching a microbe.

Bacteria and fungus can also contaminate the body from an external source if for example you were to ingest decayed and contaminated food these germs would add to your toxicity; as such we have an issue of food/water poisoning, not an infectious disease, even if you could irradiate and kill microbes from such contaminated food, the food quality itself would still cause illness because it is no longer nutritious but poisonous.

Additionally, an injury to one part of our body can allow microbes to enter and therefore contaminate other parts of our body that are ordinarily relatively microbe free, thus causing symptoms of disease, again this is a special case caused by injury and not an infectious disease.

Viruses on the other hand are not living microbes, they have not been demonstrated as the cause of disease, they are mostly present in stable relationships with certain host cells and have only been isolated, characterised and electron-micrographed (i.e. photographed) in primitive cells. Rather than a demonstrable cause of disease, viruses have been verified as being caused by the poisoning of cells and have never been found to infect cells in disease tissue, furthermore none have ever been characterised by the techniques currently available in modern virology. Their presence is by inference by indirect supposition, but what is particularly damning is that the technology to isolate, characterise and electron micrograph viruses is in fact now readily available but has so far not been able to demonstrate the presence or causation of viruses in disease tissue.

The viral story is quite an incredible tale going back to the days of Edward Jenner and the imagined smallpox virus to the present day, with virus classifications apparently based on membrane proteins, enzymes and genetic material. But here the perspective of virologist Stefan Lanka is quite instructive, he shows how in fact the viral disease theories are based on belief systems creating hypothesis, leading to assumption and more supposition, inferred from very limited biological experiments,

none of which has been verified using the techniques we now have available in modern science.

*“If ever a virus coming from a specific body or a body fluid, for instance from birds, has been proven, then any average scientist can verify, in any average laboratory, within a day, whether this virus is present in for instance a dead animal. This has however never occurred, and on the contrary, indirect test methods which tell absolutely nothing are being used.”*

Stefan Lanka

