

HIV ON TRIAL IN AUSTRALIA OR IS IT LOYALTY THAT IS ON TRIAL? Beldeu Singh

Andre Parenzee was tested HIV–positive. He was convicted and sentenced to years in jail for having consensual sex with HIV-negative people. In the Court Of Appeal, things were different. The appeal was grounded in the very existence of HIV. Robert Gallo testified at the trial of Andre Parenzee in the Court Of Appeal in Adelaide, South Australia for the prosecution. Here we look at selected questions and reflect on them ... to see if the truth is hidden in the answers provided by Gallo (see: The Gallo Philes: HIV on Trial, © Copyright March, 2007 by Garlan).

People think that a scientific theory on HIV is being tested in a court of law when in fact what is on trial is a scientific hoax and what is being tested are the loyalties of scientists – loyalty to science and scientific investigation or to the dogma that created the AIDS industry. Let's examine some aspects of the case with special regard to the statement by a big gun who appeared for the prosecution.

“...and the biggest gun of all, Sir Gustav Nossal himself, who said outside the court this week that in his opinion people who claim HIV does not exist are "a considerable embarrassment to the scientific community". People are in jails the world over because their fingerprints have been found at the scene of the crime. Courts regard fingerprints as incontrovertible proof. They are no longer in debate” (Adelaide’s Independent Weekly:online).

I have a paper in a peer review journal on dermatoglyphics – yes fingerprints – they have an underlying genetic basis and they are used in identification of people because no two persons have identical dermatoglyphics or fingerprints. The case rests on that and people can be sent to jail on the basis of fingerprint evidence. And people can be exonerated or sent to jail in the basis of DNA tests, too, simply because of the scientifically proven idea of genetic specificity. **Viral tests are viral specific.** That is basic science. So, if the HIV tests are not specific and if the disclaimers on these test kits say they are not to be used for testing or diagnosing AIDS, why are they actually being used to diagnose the disease, more specifically a virus infection which said virus has not been isolated? Sir Gustav may have an answer to that and the fact of false positives.

The fact of false positives and the conflicting lab to lab results when taken together are sufficient to indicate in the mind of an ordinary person of ordinary intelligence that **the HIV test kits are not diagnostic tools that can be used in hospital labs for arriving at a diagnosis.** It is thus, not surprising to note the disclaimers on these test kits stating that "these tests are **NOT to be used for the purpose of diagnosing or treating AIDS**". **But that is exactly what is happening.**

The test kits have a disclaimer saying these tests are NOT to be used for the purpose of diagnosing AIDS. Those offered the tests are rarely, if ever, shown these disclaimers which is violative in nature – violative to the ethics of testing and are legally violative because they are used to establish a diagnosis and then those diagnosed are treated with toxic drugs like AZT which is “toxic by inhalation” and can cause the very same symptoms of AIDS (see: The AZT Label).

An editorial in the New England Journal of Medicine states that the tests were unreliable because of so many conflicting results from lab to lab, country to country and differences in interpretations. And that is because over 80 different conditions - including pregnancy, the flu and Hepatitis B shots, multiple sclerosis, measles, and pregnancy - could cause a false positive. This has been reported by other researchers and a Russian study proves the fact of false positives. That is an amazing crater in AIDS science. And there is sufficient research on this extremely interesting field of false positives which of course blows a hole in any notion on the viral specificity of the HIV tests which is an integral part of the AIDS dogma and the AIDS industry. [The fact of false positives is a settled issue.](#) But we are supposed to overlook all of that, otherwise we risk being called "AIDS Denialists".

On page 1285 Gallo states in his testimony:

The ELISA is very sensitive, [it gives too much false positives](#) ... we in our papers told the scientific world screen with the [ELISA but confirm with the western blot](#) ... there would be too many false positives with ELISA alone. Very sensitive. So yes, you get some cellular debris and you make it from antibodies [reacting and you think that person is positive when the person won't be positive](#). Having said that, nonetheless, ELISA alone isn't bad ... it just gives too many false positives.

The AIDS posse does not understand the difference between ‘very sensitive’ and inaccurate. Gallo testified that ELISA gives “too many false positives” and cannot be used to diagnose AIDS as stated in the disclaimer on the test kit. And it cannot be confirmed by the western blot either because that test kit carries the same disclaimer. Expert witnesses for the Prosecution told the Court that it tests for proteins specific to the HIV and it is like using fingerprints to identify! Fingerprints like DNA testing leads to a match and it is specific to that individual.

Antibody testing is sensitive and it is specific to the virus because the antibody is an immune response to that virus or that viral genome. It truly represents genetic fingerprinting.

[If the cellular proteins are virus encoded it must be viral specific. Why is the indirect test for HIV that is based on these proteins not specific to HIV? Why false positives? Gallo could not explain it. Perhaps Sir Gustav can explain this embarrassment.](#)

And the trial gets extremely interesting on page 1294.

Putting to you ... : (p1294): “What we are putting to you is that the only evidence you had that HIV causes AIDS was two things, firstly isolation of HIV from 48 out of 119 patients, that is, 40%. Second, the finding of positive antibody tests in 88% of the patients in the Science papers and 10% in the Lancet papers. Do you agree with that proposition?”

The evidence on p1294 tends to show that HIV was isolated from only 40% of patients but the finding of positive antibody was in 88% of the patients! That shows that there are people who test positive without an “infection”.

What about the remaining 12%?

Question on p 1300 : In that same paper...you say 'For each of the following categories for AIDS, the number positive [for] HTLV3, the number tested and percent positive are listed. For juvenile AIDS the percentage positive was 37.5%, for adult AIDS with Kaposi's sarcoma, 30.2%, and for adult AIDS with opportunistic infections 47.6%'. Would you accept those figures, that's what you reported?

Answer By Gallo...: “I don't remember but, okay, I accept the figures.

The evidence on p 1300 proves that for adults AIDS with Kaposi's sarcoma was only 30.2% while for adult AIDS with opportunistic infections was only 47.6%. So, between 52.4% and 69.8% of people with Kaposi's sarcoma and opportunistic infections are not linked to AIDS, and HIV could be isolated as a supernatant in only 40% of AIDS patients, yet Gallo insists that HIV causes AIDS.

The whole truth and nothing but the truth...on page 1297. And in his testimony Gallo states that,

“in and of itself 40% isolation of a new virus I wouldn't say is the cause”

While that is the truth of the matter when it comes to the statistical cause and effect relationship between pathogen and disease, the question posed by the lawyer on p 1297 hits the nail on the head. It destroys the concept of viral pathogenicity and kills the dogma that HIV causes AIDS. And that confirms why the HIV tests are not viral specific. May be Sir Gustav has an answer to this embarrassment, too.

So, Gallo's testimony confirms two critical facts. Firstly, he confirms that the ELISA test gives "too many false positives" And secondly, he confirms a very fundamental fact of virology – that "in and of itself 40% isolation of a new virus cannot be said to be the cause." To be the cause of a viral infection, it must infect every person and it must be isolated from every infected person – not just a percentage and certainly not from 40% of "patients".

While Gallo's created the doubt in the existence of a HIV and destroyed the HIV as the virus that causes AIDS, it confirmed a doubt beyond a reasonable doubt that Andre was in fact infected with the deadly and virulent virus that is supposed to target the cells of the immune system and if there are "too many false positives" then Andre could in fact be a false positive. To convict Andre, the legal and scientific test is to prove for a fact that Andre is not a false positive. To be infected and to have infected other women, it must be shown for a fact that Andre has the HIV as a matter of certainty before he can infect others. Then it must be shown with certainty that HIV is in fact transmitted through vaginal sex and it must then be proven for a fact that the three infected women are not false positives themselves. It is not a matter of probabilities.

Science requires that a sensitive test ... to detect antibodies to the virus or viral encoded proteins in blood samples must, to the satisfaction of science, show that there is first a virus and that the virus is the cause of AIDS and only when the test can be used specifically to that virus and not any other proteins, it can be administered for establishing a diagnosis. It is a strict rule of science.

Gallo destroyed the hope of the Prosecution to show the existence of a virus called the HIV on page 1277 when he said:

"All retrovirus particles that form, form from lifting off the cell membrane, pulling out of the cell ... All such viruses carry within them, right within the virus, if you purify you see it is all over, cellular proteins that are not virus encoded".

Retroviruses form by budding off of the cell membrane of host cells. They have an outer layering and are consequently described as enveloped viruses. And while Gallo claims that "all retrovirus particles that form, form from lifting off the cell membrane, pulling out of the cell" forming an envelope in his immortal line of T cells, he has not shown an electronmicroscope picture of the budding process in his immortal line of T cells. The electronmicroscopy evidence of the budding process is pretty much a standard evidence that does not exist even after 26 years. He has been growing his HIV in an immortal line of T-cells that are supposed to be targeted by a pathogenic virus and killed off and the decline of T-cells in the blood is part of the diagnosis of AIDS!

HOW DO YOU EXPLAIN THAT INHERENT CONTRADICTION?

Well there is some very revealing information in the **GALLO REPORT: INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO THE HIV BLOOD TEST PATENT DISPUTE AND RELATED MATTERS**, *U.S. House of Representatives: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Committee on Energy and Commerce* ? (see: **REFLECTING ON GALLO'S TESTIMONY AT THE TRIAL OF ANDRE PARENZEE**)

“The investigation touches on matters of scientific truth, of institutional integrity, and of national honor.” And above all it shows there were supposed to be two types of viruses with a big difference as follows;-

1. One type, called the HTLV-1, **immortalizes the cells in which it grows, and**
2. The other type was found to be **strongly "cytopathic," - it kills the cells in which it grows.**

The product developed for testing and “diagnosing” AIDS is made through mass production from “a line of line of T cells established from a leukemia patient could be infected with virus from the cells of AIDS patients and go on producing virus indefinitely.” So, in all probability, Gallo developed a process and registered a patent to produce retroviruses in an immortal line of T cells, the very cells that are supposed to be killed by the infecting virus. That could only be possible if the HTLV-1 was used. It is not the killer of T cells of the immune system. How can that be used to develop test kits for diagnosing HIV and treating AIDS? Perhaps Sir Gustav can say if that is the real cause of “too many false positives” and the lack of viral specificity before it becomes a real embarrassment to science.

So, what is on trial here is the integrity of men of science. HIV is not on trial. Gallo's testimony is plain and clear on that matter of a virus as the cause of AIDS - which really is caused or associated with oxidative stress that weakens and impairs the antioxidant defense mechanism that leads to the impairment in the healthy functioning of the immune system. It is essentially a biochemical cause arising from excess free radicals from chemical stressors and/or malnutrition that can, in the event of chronic oxidative stress lead to severe impairment in the body's ability to scavenge free radicals that can lead to the establishment of opportunistic infections. More accurately it is the formation of protein carbonyls in the mitochondria of cells of the immune system and the depletion of mDNA in these mitochondria through severe/chronic oxidative stress.