REFLECTING ON GALLO'S TESTIMONY AT THE TRIAL OF ANDRE PARENZEE

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. 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 Files – HIV on Trial, © Copyright March, 2007 by Garlan).

On page 1257-8, Gallo says…"a sucrose gradient barely purifies…when we succeeded in mass producing the virus in a continuous culture, you have got an enormous purification far beyond the sucrose gradient alone because you are now producing loads of virus with little amounts of cell."

He wants the scientific world to accept his method of "purification" based simply on mass production in a continuous culture (in T4 cells). He is changing the standard when he says that the "mass production in a continuous culture" is in fact an enormous purification! Mass production is not purification. After mass production it is necessary for purification but Gallo and the AIDS posse think, purification is not necessary and that "producing loads of virus" in a continuous culture equals purification.

According to a November 1985 article in *Science* magazine, Gallo realized that the new retrovirus he had detected was,

> "... killing the cells it infected, he began to look for cells that would resist its cytopathic effects. He found what he was looking for in early November."

The article went on to say that:

> "Popovic discovered that clones developed from a 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 ... Because virus from some patients appeared to infect the cell line more readily than others, Popovic ... pooled virus isolates from 10 patients and used the mixture to infect the cells. *By December, Gallo's lab was mass-producing virus from a cell line, called H9, infected with virus from the pooled samples"* (emphasis added; *Science,* **230,** November 1985, Page 521).

The November 1985 *Science* article continued:

> "This breakthrough enabled Gallo's group to characterize the virus ... Equally important, mass production of the virus opened the way for development of a sensitive test ... to detect antibodies to the virus in blood samples. The test nailed down, to almost everybody's satisfaction, that the virus was the cause of AIDS."

The article then quoted Dr. Gallo directly:

> "The data poured *in December and by January we had solved the problem* [of the cause of AIDS]," says Gallo" (emphasis added; op cit., Page 521).

Gallo also notes that his group had several virus isolates before Montagnier's sample arrived. 'It was no big deal to get supernatant. We got that from many patients for a long, long time before he sent us this virus,' Gallo says. 'Am I going to throw away [my reputation] for a virus that is simple to isolate, and then publish its sequence with multiple collaborators? It just doesn't make sense.'"(see: INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE TO THE HIV BLOOD TEST PATENT DISPUTE AND RELATED MATTERS, Staff Report).

Please note that no one actually had isolated or purified HIV – only supernatants obtained from the blood of patients existed. And it is interesting to note that mass production opened the way for a sensitive test…to detect antibodies to the virus in blood samples. If there were in fact antibodies, the tests would be specific, not just sensitive.

The phenomena which Montagnier and his colleagues considered proof for the existence of HIV are detection of reverse transcriptase activity; the presence of retrovirus-like particles in the culture; immunological reactivity between proteins from the culture supernatant which, in sucrose density gradients, banded at the density of 1.16 g/ml ("purified virus") and antibodies in a patient's (BRU) serum. Reverse transcriptase activity can be found in viruses other than retroviruses and in all normal cells. Reverse transcription can be brought about not only by the enzyme reverse transcriptase but also by normal, cellular DNA polymerases. Retrovirus-like particles are ubiquitous in cultures not infected with retroviruses…(A critique of the Montagnier evidence for the HIV/AIDS hypothesis, Eleni Papadopulos-Eleopulos, 16 March 2004).

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.

Gallo does not understand the difference between 'very sensitive' and inaccurate. What he means here is that the 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. The funny thing in this testimony is that he keeps insisting he is testing for antibodies as he did in the November 1985 article in Science. Yet others testified for the Prosecution and 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. Everyone knows that. And it is not about probabilities. Too many false positives can mean that Andre Parenzee could be a false positive.

On page 1277 Gallo blows three holes in the Prosecution case 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"

Other Prosecution witnesses tried to say that the proteins are specific to the HIV and therefore it is like fingerprinting but here Gallo confirms that the proteins, if you purify, are not virus encoded! How can purification change a protein that is virus encoded to one that is not virus encoded?

Next, all virologists will tell you that the viral envelopes are formed during the "budding process" when the virus particle "invaginates", the cell membrane closes around the virus particle forming an envelope or coat. As **Dr. Etienne de Harven** explains "the viral envelopes derive directly from the plasma membrane of the infected cells." Gallo says the same thing in his own words on p1277 but to date no one has observed the budding process in HIV. If the HIV is an enveloped virus it can be subject to purification like all other enveloped viruses. Why is HIV the exception?

Thirdly, if the cellular proteins are virus encoded to start with, why is the indirect test for HIV that is based on these proteins not specific to HIV? Why false positives? The only possible answer is that there are no viral encoded proteins but some proteins, perhaps proteins that may have an antioxidant function or role, that are produced in response to the oxidative stress exerted by the agent that they use to "stimulate" the mass production of the 'retrovirus' which is the same protein that is produced by white blood cells or T4 cells under oxidative stress and that in turn explains why people in a host of conditions including those recovering from malaria or flu also test positive.

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.

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.

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%? The evidence on p1300 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. It drills a hole in the concept of viral pathogenicity.

And while Gallo's testimony as a whole creates doubt in the existence of a HIV and the HIV as a virus that causes AIDS, it confirms 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 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.

If it all boils down to a matter of probability, the four probabilities that come into question are;

1. How a sensitive test ... to detect antibodies to the virus in blood samples could turn out to be the test that nailed down, to almost everybody's satisfaction, that the virus was the cause of AIDS when science requires that the detection of antibodies is specific for establishing a diagnosis.

2. The probability of shifting from detecting antibodies to viral encoded proteins which are the then used as an indirect way of testing the HIV but which same viral proteins become not encoded viral proteins upon purification, a test that rather confirms that it was not a whole enveloped virus and which is supported by the absence of the budding evidence by electronmicroscopy. And that tends to prove there is instead no virus.
3. Computing the probabilities of 60% of AIDS patients from whom the HIV could be procured as a supernatant with 88% who tested positive and procuring the HIV as a supernatant from only 30.2% of adult AIDS patients with Kaposi's sarcoma and in only 47.6% for adult AIDS patients with opportunistic infections creates a very blurry picture for the proposition that HIV causes AIDS and tips it in favor of oxidative stress that suppresses the immune system.
4. The confounding probability of a line of T cells established from a leukemia patient that could be infected with virus from the cells of AIDS patients and go on producing virus indefinitely when the retrovirus was killing the cells it infected, especially targeting cells of the immune system, like the T cells. Dr. Gallo frequently asserted it was he who first proposed the idea to look for a retrovirus as the cause of AIDS. The AIDS virus, unlike the other human retroviruses known in 1983, is strongly "cytopathic," i.e., it kills the cells in which it grows. The IP scientists recognized the cytopathicity of the virus and kept their virus cultures alive by adding fresh cells to the cultures or by "passaging" the virus to fresh cell cultures (see e.g., Barre-Sinoussi et al., 1983; Montagnier et al., 1984; Barre-Sinoussi et al., 1984).
5. 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.
6. Viruses contain only a single type of nucleic acid. This viral genome may be composed of one of the following: ss(+)DNA, ss(-)DNA, dsDNA, ss(+)RNA, ss(-)RNA, dsRNA.. Viruses contain protein coat surrounding nucleic acid...may sometimes be surrounded by envelope of lipids, proteins, and carbohydrates from membrane of previous host. After a virulent virus attaches to a host cell and penetrates it, the expression of the viral genes are regulated so as to redirect the host synthetic machinery to the reproduction of viral nucleic acid and protein. These are viral encoded proteins but what is the probability of false positives. Zero. And what would "too many false positives" mean?

In Gallo's 1984 publication he states "we found HTLV-III [HIV] [by 'isolation'] in...13 of 43 of adult AIDS patients with Kaposi's sarcoma, and 10 of 21 adult AIDS patients with opportunistic infections" (Gallo RC et al. Frequent Detection and Isolation of Cytopathic Retroviruses (HTLV-III) from Patients with AIDS and at Risk for AIDS, Science, 1984 May 4; 224: 500-3). 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. The question:-

Why isn't HTLV[-I] the cause of AIDS?

Does the answer lie somewhere in the following passages taken from 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* ?

"The investigation touches on matters of scientific truth, of institutional integrity, and of national honor."

In early 1983, scientists at both the IP (Montagnier et al.) and the LTCB (Gallo et al.), searching for the cause of AIDS, attempted to isolate a retrovirus (a virus that reproduces itself using RNA as well as DNA) from AIDS and pre-AIDS patients. Dr. Gallo frequently asserted it was he who first proposed the idea to look for a retrovirus as the cause of AIDS. But Dr. Gallo's early theorizing about the AIDS virus mistakenly placed that virus in the "HTLV" (for "human T-leukemia virus," later changed to "human T-lymphotropic virus") family (see, e.g., Medical World News, August 14, 1982, p. 9).

During the first critical months of research on HIV, the work of the LTCB scientists was far behind that of the scientists at the IP. The reason the LTCB scientists lagged behind was a misplaced focus on the "HTLV" (human T-cell leukemia virus) family as the probable source of the cause of AIDS. Not only did this incorrect focus misdirect the work of the LTCB scientists, for a time it misdirected the work of much of the scientific community, due to Dr. Gallo's preeminent position vis-a-vis human retrovirus research.

By Dr. Gallo's own admission, his misunderstanding of the fundamental nature of the AIDS virus associated with the mistaken belief that HIV was an "HTLV" resulted in significant confusion and delay in the work of the LTCB scientists. Even for years after HIV had been discovered and its true defining features identified, Dr. Gallo fought a losing battle to keep the AIDS virus in the "HTLV" family by retaining the name "HTLV-III," rather than HIV.

The IP scientists recognized early on that their virus, first called "LAV" for "lymphadenopathy-associated virus" (lymphadenopathy is a pre-AIDS condition) appeared to be distinctly different from the known human retroviruses, HTLV-I and II. The AIDS virus, unlike the other human retroviruses known in 1983, is strongly "cytopathic," i.e., it kills the cells in which it grows. The IP scientists recognized the

cytopathicity of the virus and kept their virus cultures alive by adding fresh cells to the cultures or by "passaging" the virus to fresh cell cultures (see e.g., Barre-Sinoussi et al.,1983; Montagnier et al., 1984; Barre-Sinoussi et al., 1984).

By contrast, the LTCB scientists, because they were looking for a variant of HTLV-I (the human T-cell leukemia virus), **which immortalizes the cells in which it grows**, did not comprehend that the virus they occasionally detected in AIDS patients' samples actually was killing the cells. Consequently, the LTCB scientists, for a prolonged period of time, were unable to keep their AIDS patients' virus cultures alive. Consequently, by their own accounts, the LTCB scientists repeatedly discarded AIDS patient cultures, when the cultures died out or failed to grow. Again and again the LTCB scientists unsuccessfully attempted to grow an AIDS virus using methods suitable for an "HTLV" -- not an HIV-type virus.

So, ladies and gentlemen here is an interesting note. 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.

And we have a product for testing that 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 and treating AIDS?

One of the things that comes to my mind that could possibly immortalize cells is the supply of energy and antioxidants that can continuously scavenge free radicals as soon as they are formed. And the T cells in the Gallo process may actually be producing antioxidant actins that help keep the “infected” T cells immortal through continuous free radical scavenging activity – which is an antiaging activity! That explains why there is no budding process and the absence of antigenic specificity and explains why when you purify, you only get cellular proteins (see: Are Malnutrition and Oxidative Stress the Cause of gp41, gp120 and gp160 in Robert Gallo's HIV Isolate?).

Gallo may have come across something without knowing and that is certainly not a viral encoded protein. The probabilities are stacked against it in astronomical proportions. Imagine ANDRE PARANZEE wrapped up in the centre of such an exciting riddle!