

You're All Well About Contagion

SECTION IV

AIDS and Contagion

1

You're All Wet About Contagion

Despite what you say that we can't catch diseases from each other, how do you explain that diseases seem to hit everybody at the same time? It is difficult to accept your explanation when the facts of contagion are rather obvious.

—Harold Babbington

RESPONSE: Did it ever occur to you that you cannot give anyone your diseases any more than you can give them your health?

Contagion was born from demonology. In olden times diseases meant that we were possessed by demons. Those with "demons" were shunned lest they take up residence in those who came in contact. We have made progress! Demons have progressed to evil spirits to bacteria and fungi and now, to viruses!

But the diseases which we can catch are so few as not to merit concern anyway! Do we catch cancer? Asthma? Arthritis? Psoriasis? Canker sores? Heart disease? Diabetes? High blood pressure? Itch? Athlete's foot? In fact, you are hard put to name more than a few "transmissible" or "communicable" diseases. And even these are not contagious despite "obvious" appearances and all the confirmation of medical "science."

Colds are said to be very contagious. How is it baby has colds about eight times a year and the parents only once or twice? How is it that an isolated man in the Antarctic who manned an observation post "caught" four colds during his stay? Medical scientists were baffled and that caused quite a flap.

How was it that in 1965-67 the great cold laboratories conducted in Bethesda, Maryland, by the National Institutes of Health showed everything but contagion? In those experiments volunteers were swabbed daily with the cold viruses from those suffering with colds. Those swabbed did not come down with colds! Colds did not occur in greater number than among a control group. But, lo and behold, the day following Thanksgiving feasts begot an unusual

number of colds in both control groups! How do you suppose that came about? Does that not give you any clue about what colds really are?

If I lined up one hundred people, gave them all an emetic, and all vomited, you might conclude that vomiting is quite contagious. But this only proves that: Similar organisms that are exposed to similar substances have similar reactions.

So why should it surprise you that similar affections seem to run rampant, when all who suffer them are indulging similar bad habits? Keep in mind that similar bad habits beget similar bad results.

In truth, colds and other acute sicknesses are but the body's way of disposing of more body wastes and ingested materials than it could dispose of through the ordinary channels of elimination.

In nature we were not gluttons. In nature we did not eat foods contrary to our biological adaptations. Like other animals, we ate only what our instincts disposed us to eat. In short, in nature we did not intoxicate our systems nor suffer diseases, the same as animals don't. (In nature, mind you!)

We have a propensity for believing what the establishment wants us to believe, and they trade liberally upon the cultivated myth of contagion. This makes more customers for their drug/medical/hospital trades.

If you live healthfully, you never suffer disease! Hygienic children never suffer "the usual childhood diseases." Diseases must be caused and only unhealthful practices cause them.

2

Contagion— An Ancient Myth Resurrected!

Medical practitioners are held in awe and deeply respected,
Therefore their pronouncements, as might be expected,
Are regarded as if divinely perfected.

Upon their authority there is erected
a belief that disease floats about until a victim is selected,
To be wretchedly and grievously affected.

Called contagion, the belief holds that we are infected,
By malevolent microbes that invade us quite unsuspected,
To wreak destruction upon us unless we are by vaccines
protected.

Hence we hie to the medic we've elected,
To inoculate us with vaccine from a needle injected,
That we might henceforth by evil microbes be neglected.
Though of voodooistic origin contagion has been medically
resurrected,

To ensnare a populace that invariably becomes dejected,
Because cures through medicine are never effected.
Until the sublime truth that similar organisms from nature
defected,

Suffer similarly when life's laws are in like manner
disrespected,
Disease will remain as long as bad life habits are uncorrected.

crises of detoxification and repair in response to impairing influences—usually poisons or hampered elimination due to heavy stress—no disease can be transmitted by the normal and ordinary acts of life.

— What is contagious are the stress factors and poison habits that most Americans are subjected to or subject themselves to. It is estimated that—what with cigarettes, alcohol, condiments, cooked foods, soft drinks, drugs, etc.—the average American suffers about 20 to 40 poison events daily.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that with this impairing common denominator, many humans develop the same type of crises of detoxification and repair? Is it any wonder that many have their faculties impaired or injured as in the case of so-called AIDS?

3

AIDS is Positively NOT Contagious!

The Wednesday, February 5, 1986, issue of the *New England Journal of Medicine* published a study that, in effect, says AIDS is not contagious! Not by any of the criteria of contagion!

A landmark study, very thorough in its scope, provides conclusive evidence that the disease called AIDS does not spread through close, day-to-day personal contact. Headed by Dr. Gerald Friedland of the Montefiore Medical Center in New York City, the research team negated the results of much of the hysteria churned up by the medical establishment through its captive sister the media consisting of the nation's newspapers, TV, magazines, etc.

Hugging, kissing, using the same toothbrushes, beds, towels, toilets, drinking glasses and a host of other high-contact familial practices did not result in a single case of AIDS in families where there was an AIDS sufferer.

Blood tests showed that the "virus" infected none of the families after years of exposure. This led the research team to declare that contagion was virtually nonexistent with AIDS.

The research team further noted that those dying from the disease are mostly homosexuals who are intravenous drug users.

Remember all the school children barred from school? The isolation and quarantining of those thought to have AIDS?

Remember those wild statements about one to two million Americans being infected with the "AIDS virus" designated by the forbidding, but believably inscrutable, HTLV-III?

This study not only casts grave doubts about this big hoax, but brings into question just how contagious any so-called virus disease is, including colds, herpes, measles, etc.

Don't get into a quandary, dear reader. We have been publishing the truth all along. A "deficiency" simply is not transmittable. In short, you cannot pass your sleep deficiency, your vitamin deficiency or your white blood cell deficiency on to someone else. Further, inasmuch as illnesses are body initiated and conducted

4

The Great AIDS Hoax

Find Out the Real Reasons Behind the AIDS "Epidemic"

The following articles were written from 1982-85 and published in the Healthful Living magazine in a response to the overwhelming media coverage of AIDS. They were compiled in booklet form in 1985. This booklet has been opening eyes to the AIDS fraud that has been foisted upon us since its publication. We share it in this book with you in its entirety.

AIDS A Political and Social Disease, Not a Physical One

AIDS is so new it's not yet in the latest published medical reference books. However, there's no shortage of "erudite" information about it, even in the so-called science magazines.

AIDS was sprung on the scene directed at homosexuals just as herpes genitalis was directed against sex swingers. AIDS has proven a most potent weapon. As reported in the *Spotlight* of August 15, 1983, the furor is having an inhibitory effect on gay people. Other reports reflect that heterosexuals are beginning to treat homosexuals of their acquaintance as if they had a plague. Nonhomosexuals are supposed to be catching the disease now too—from gays, of course, in most cases.

What Is AIDS and Its Causes?

Exactly what is this disease called AIDS? What are its symptoms? How does it manifest? What causes it? Is it really contagious? How many people have it?

The symptoms of AIDS are said to be fever, diarrhea, weight loss, "infections," pneumonia, rare forms of cancer, fungi, bacteria and "viruses."

If you reflect, you'll note carefully all the diseases listed above (except fungi, bacteria and "viruses") are diseases in their own right and are evidence of no other disease except themselves. If

they represent "immune" deficiency, then all diseases represent "immune" deficiency. The idea that we have diseases due to "immune" deficiency is pure tommyrot.

If you've mastered the knowledge that all diseases are body instituted for purposes of detoxiciation, you know immediately there can be no AIDS. Deficiencies manifest as inability—for instance, scurvy, beri beri, pellagra and kwashiokor are deficiency diseases. If we had an "immune deficiency," we'd have an inability to defend against toxic substances, for the medical profession means defensive ability by the word immune. But they mean immune to such diseases as pneumonia, fever, diarrhea, "infections," etc. This puts their ascription, called AIDS for short, into the realm of absurdity, for these sicknesses are body-remedial actions. Thus if we said that all sufferers from pneumonia, cancer, fever, diarrhea and weight loss were victims of AIDS, it would be just as accurate as describing AIDS as manifesting under the camouflage of these diseases. It's all fabricated and doesn't sit well with the most elementary logic.

Are Deficiencies Contagious?

If someone suffered osteoporosis due to calcium deficiency, do you think anyone can acquire this deficiency by associating intimately with the osteoporotic sufferer? Do you think anyone's defensive mechanisms (miscalled immunity) that are impaired can pass their shortcomings on to others?

AIDS stands for "acquired immune deficiency syndrome." The word *acquired* is an odd way of saying "you caught it" or "it caught you." *Immune* derives from the word *immuno* which means that we are exempt from consequences if we transgress the laws of life. Of course, we can't be made "immune" to anything. Vitality can be suppressed so that the body cannot act, but this is debility rather than immunity. If lack of body action is to be labelled immunity, then death makes us immune to all diseases. For, to the extent we have been devitalized by drugs, vaccines, etc., to that extent have we died—our body faculties have been destroyed to that extent.

Deficiency means lack of a needed faculty. *Syndrome* means a pattern of symptoms characteristic of a disease. If we add all this

together, AIDS means we have a sickness or disease because our defenses are down. It's sort of like a boxer who no longer has the strength or energy to parry his opponent's blows.

Of course, this is not the case at all. It bears repeating that all diseases other than degenerative ones are body initiated and conducted for purposes of body cleansing/healing. Degenerative diseases include deficiency diseases, for the body suffers loss of faculties as well as function during deficiencies. But acute diseases manifest *because* the body has vitality, not because it has a lack of it. Acute diseases such as fever, diarrhea, pneumonia, etc., are exhibitions of body vitality in expelling toxic substances from its domain. I emphasize that symptoms of pneumonia, fever, diarrhea and so on are evidences of body efforts to purify and remedy a problem, not a lack of "immunity."

Immunity Is a Medical Myth

Let's look at immunity another way. If you give a jigger of liquor to a three-year-old, the child will spit and sputter until it frees itself of the vile stuff. Give it to an alcoholic, and there is absolutely no resistance. The alcoholic has lost the vital powers of resistance. The medical community would say that the alcoholic has immunity because he is not affected, whereas the healthy, vital child does not have immunity!

The vitality or lack of vitality of the body's defensive mechanisms is not something that can be acquired by intimate contact with someone else. Vitality is a characteristic of health, and its lack is a characteristic of someone who has lost their health due to unwholesome practices. Thus, in the case of the alcoholic, he has not "acquired" his "immunity." Nor is it "immunity." The alcoholic is a "boxer" who no longer can defend himself due to exhaustion of vital energies and faculties. He's had too many bouts with alcohol—he's slowly poisoned himself into insensibility and functional debility.

AIDS is a Medical/Political Fabrication

So you see that AIDS is really a "nothing" disease. It is a big scare officially and medically invented and directed at homosexuals. They are the intended victims of this hoax. Its touted

"contagion" and its supposed transmissibility to nonhomosexuals is a cruel tactic to isolate the homosexual community—why it might even drive them underground as they were a mere twenty years ago.

First, the medical profession hasn't gotten around to even ascribing a cause to the disease. They have set no symptoms as yet. They haven't even attributed it to "viruses" as yet, but they undoubtedly will. Further, the modus operandi of AIDS contagion remains wholly untouched in all releases to date. AIDS is some mysterious ogre out there, and those who unthinkingly subscribe to voodoo scares readily fall for the line.

A Dr. Paul Cameron of the Institute for the Scientific Investigation of Sexuality in Lincoln, Nebraska, says the disease is caused simply by lack of sanitation. He says that innocent, normal people get AIDS simply for this reason. If his statement is true, then its contagion or transmissibility is pure myth. It's nothing to be feared at all. Diseases of filth are controllable by everyone—cleanliness and nonbody-polluting practices are all that are needed. But, if filth is the cause, and we contend that filth (internal filth or body pollution) is the cause of all sicknesses, then almost everyone has AIDS! Almost every American is so polluted inside that s/he will smell strongly of internal filth after 24 to 60 hours without food! Some of us smell strongly even without abstaining from food. Anyone who begins a body cleansing (exemplified as symptoms of sickness such as fevers, diarrhea, etc.) has AIDS! This is true because they have lost the "immunity" and cannot "resist" a disease.

A little logic and a little knowledge applied to this "new disease" shows it to be so much poppycock.

Exploiting AIDS

Drug concerns and medical practitioners seize upon the fears of people as possible avenues for profit. These special interests often create the publicity, and the furor to generate fear. Of course they orchestrate fear through the Centers for Disease Control which is hardly more than an official agency that works in behalf of medical/drug interests. If you totally ignore all the medical scare-'em-into-our-offices tactics and live healthfully, you need fear no disease. You won't have it because you are not causing it.

AIDS Is a Product of Our Drug Culture, Not a Virus

The drug industry has a hefty business going. They advertise heavily on TV, in newspapers and other media. Most drugs, such as over-the-counter nostrums, cigarettes, coffee, condiments, alcoholic beverages, herbs, soft drinks, etc., are readily procurable. Many drugs are available by prescription; and the illegal drugs are procurable for many.

However, one of the effects of all drugs are so-called side effects; but, in reality, effects from all drugs are poisonous including even the deranged debris from foods subjected to heat. Americans are so betaken with drugs and drugged products (preservatives, including salt, are drugs) that they each, on the average, commit about 40 poisoning acts daily.

What is called AIDS is really only drug destruction of our white blood cell procreative faculties.

The Symptoms of AIDS

You're likely to be diagnosed as having AIDS if you get any, some or all of these symptoms:

1. Swollen lymph glands
2. Abnormal weight loss
3. Diarrhea
4. Aplastic anemia
5. Liver problems
6. Pneumonia or lung problems
7. In short, nearly any problem that is attributed to loss of defensive or "immune" mechanisms.

Lymph glands are not only procreative of T and B cell lymphocytes which are miscalled "immune" system faculties, but they are organs of detoxification. Among these organs are the spleen, lymph nodes, adenoids, etc. Their inflammation means they have been overwhelmed by poisons, either exogenous or endogenous (such as uneliminated body wastes) or both.

Diarrhea means that the body has toxic substances in the intestinal tract which the body is endeavoring to expel with the greatest haste possible.

Aplastic anemia is failure to produce sufficient red blood cells.

These are produced in the bone marrow just as are leukocytes. What destroys the productive faculties of one can also affect the other.

The liver has problems with any poisons the body selects it to detoxify. Especially does it have problems with alien proteins such as are injected in blood transfusions, vaccines, etc. Hepatitis and other hepatic problems arise from transfusions, drug injections and drugs otherwise taken, even if they are in the form of salt, alcoholic beverages, preservatives, caffeine, etc.

Pneumonia is an inflammation of the lungs. When the body selects the lungs to expel poisons, it can be overwhelmed and become inflamed as in pneumonia.

Examples of the lungs being selected to eliminate poisons is bad breath, alcoholic breath, garlic breath, etc.

Weight loss occurs in cancer and many other affections where poisoning of either the faculties of metabolism or assimilation or both occur.

The Great AIDS Hysteria

***How a Successful Conspiracy Destroyed
the Gay Rights Movement
and Alienated Homosexuals***

***How This Phony Disease Is Now Used
by the Medical/Drug Complex as a Vehicle
to Scare and Exploit All Americans***

Healthful Living Magazine, Oct./Nov./Dec. 1985

Newspapers, TV, radio—in short, the media has been and is whipping the American populace into a frenzy about the new non-disease called Acquired Immune-Deficiency Syndrome, popularly known by its acronym, AIDS. And the American people are buying this commercial propaganda hook, line and sinker, including a lot of people who should know better.

This frightful and terrible new “disease” is said to kill half its victims. Indeed, half the reported diagnoses are of deaths—much of the diagnoses are postmortem. In fact, that’s the way the Centers for Disease Control sprang this dreadful new disease upon the American people—as a detective story delving into the deaths of homosexual Haitians.

That the whole fabric was a contrived tool to alienate homosexuals from the community at large and destroy the gay rights movement was palpably evident almost from the beginning. Since its introduction, this “disease” has been diagnosed as having hit 12,500 “victims,” mostly homosexuals.

At this point, let’s reflect a bit. In 1983, when I published my article, only 2,000 cases had been diagnosed into existence. Since then, as more and more physicians “get with it,” 10,500 more cases have been diagnosed. Of course, they’ll be diagnosing more and more to fulfill the predictions made for this disease—you can’t scare people much unless you have a specter of a rampant new disease that’s going to destroy them or their well-being.

What are your odds of being diagnosed as having AIDS?

If you're a homosexual and submit to a physician who knows this, your chances at this time are about a tenth of 1% in any given year. However, as this new drug/medical tool is now being aimed at the American people in general, your chances are about one in 200,000 or one 2,000th of one percent. Or, in a lifetime of 80 years, your chances are only about one twenty-fifth of one percent. Even if AIDS was for real, would you let those odds worry you? If you live healthfully, your chances are zero percent.

How does that compare with some very real odds against you? Your chance of having cancer is nearly 30%! Your odds of having deadly heart/cardiovascular disease is about 50%! Aren't these the kind of odds that you should concern yourself with?

This media-generated hysteria on behalf of the medical/drug industries is laying the groundwork for new areas of exploitation. You can expect to see a lot of "preventive" drugs and new courses of treatment. Especially will you see new vaccines to combat this raging enemy.

You can be sure that this will be parlayed into a multi-billion dollar affair. Already researchers are importuning the government for grants to investigate this so-called disease. That could turn into a billion-dollar boondoggle all by itself. The government has poured in excess of ten billion dollars down the cancer research rathole and, as you know, there's no solution in sight. And there won't be. To find the answers would end the field for the research windfall. The technique is to shower the press with "findings and promises" and let them be eclipsed among a new welter of "findings and promises."

When the Centers for Disease Control orchestrates the media to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to publicize such a myth—as AIDS, you can be sure there are ulterior motives—that there is something heavy in the offing.

We know, from publicity, that some pharmaceutical firm, probably one from the Rockefeller complex, will be presented in shining armor as humanity's savior with a new vaccine that will end the horrible scourge of AIDS. Of course it's going to be easy to save America from a disease that never existed in the first place. When the AIDS vaccine hits, you can be sure AIDS will

disappear from the scene as polio did—CDC will orchestrate a return to diagnosis of AIDS as cirrhosis of the liver, pneumonia, diarrhea, leukocytopenia, fever, abnormal weight loss, “infection,” etc. Only we’ll continue the vaccine as the polio vaccine continues “to make sure AIDS stays wiped out.”

You probably think I’m off my rocker telling you AIDS is phony. It’s a hundred times easier to create fears and play upon them than to generate knowledge and the confidence it begets. So why should you accept the obvious truth elucidated in this issue about AIDS? After all, isn’t this disease killing thousands? Didn’t Rock Hudson die from AIDS?

Let’s examine the disease and appellation called AIDS—it is rather obvious the name was conjured up with this acronym in mind. Actually, Acquired Immune-Deficiency Syndrome is an absurd name. Acquired means something you obtain or get through effort or office. In this case it is used as something you inadvertently catch as the price for iniquity. This was meant to apply to homosexuals. Just as herpes genitalis is ballyhooed as the badge of iniquity for being a swinger, so, too, homosexuals must bear the iniquity of AIDS as a badge for the aberrancy.

As to what was acquired, AIDS existed three years before anyone bothered to ask what was being acquired. At first the modus operandi of acquisition was said to be homosexual acts or contact. As homosexuality is obnoxious to the general population, we didn’t ask serious questions—we bought the evil fruit aspect of the thing. We were horrified, and we condemned homosexuality. But, to give some credence to the disease, a culprit had to be found. So, in 1984, an “elusive” virus was blamed as the cause. That’s like saying “evil spirit,” for, as malevolent entities, viruses are pure myth. Those particles of DNA called viruses are nothing more than mitochondrial debris from expired body cells—daily we lose hundreds of billions of cells from our organism of 75 trillion—most of this cellular loss is replaced.

Now that a destructive and malevolent enemy has been pronounced the villain—an enemy that transcends all and afflicts the moral as well as the immoral, the stage is set for general public hysteria as a buildup for the entry of all sorts of products on the scene, especially vaccines.

The media has been orchestrated by the CDC, an agency that is little more than the prostitute of the drug/medical/hospital monster, to create the preparatory hysteria for this heinous sales campaign. With an atmosphere of little AIDS beasts on the loose that can get anyone, it'll soon be time for the arrival of a vaccine which hordes of Americans will rush to "acquire" just to be "safe and sure."

Because of the nature of the role of disease, it is impossible that it be passed along or "acquired" through common practices. (Oh yes, you can be injected or transfused with toxic substances which will result in untoward symptomology.) Contagion is popularly subscribed to even though it is pure superstition from the dark ages. The medical/drug establishment uses this voodooistic belief as a lever to make us customers for their life-sapping products.

Let's now get to the word immune as employed in the term. The word immunity means: Exempt; not liable; safe from prosecution, reprieve, etc. It means having special privilege or dispensation for acts of wrongdoing. That any such freedom from acts of transgression exists in all nature is pure absurdity. That we can be made "not liable" for wrong acts in the physiological domain is sheer voodooism.

In the case of AIDS the word immune is employed to mean our defensive mechanisms, foremost of which are lymphocytes and leukocytes. Prior to AIDS, a subnormal count of white blood corpuscles was called leukocytopenia or lymphocytopenia. Now, four years after its debut, this is one of the primary symptoms of AIDS. A virus is said to destroy our ability to create these defensive faculties. But this is all fancy. A bumbling M.D. recently investigated a number of AIDS victims and said that most were on drugs, including medically prescribed ones. He merely highlighted what we already know—drugs are highly destructive of human faculties, especially defensive faculties such as lymphocytes, leukocytes and their generative faculties in bones and the lymphatics. It is the role of these defensive mechanisms to proliferate when poisons are present in the bloodstream and lymph. They surround and capture the offending substance and carry it to the nearest expulsion point which may be lungs, skin,

kidneys or bowels or all. Before being expelled, the poisons may be further broken down by lymph nodes or the liver.

Those who regularly take drugs, especially heroin and other injected drugs, are likely to suffer white blood cell deficiency, medically called lymphocytopenia or leukocytopenia, but now called AIDS.

Let's proceed to a consideration of the word "deficiency." As you know this also means insufficiency, a shortage, or simply, not enough. What the medical/drug establishment has erected as a deficiency is a low white blood corpuscle count or deranged white blood corpuscles. Until AIDS was catapulted onto the scene, a low count—that is, 5,000 per cubic milliliter or less—was diagnosed as leukocytopenia or lymphocytopenia.

To assert that a deficiency can be acquired is, of course, ridiculous. You can't acquire anyone else's deficiency by any means you can name—not by any act normal or abnormal in our society.

To overcome this deficiency in their phony disease, the medical/drug establishment via the CDC (Centers for Disease Control headquartered in Atlanta), has added that universal scapegoat to the fabrication, the myth of malevolent viruses. The virus is credited with attacking the white blood cells and destroying them and of attacking the bone marrow and lymph glands which create them, thus causing a deficiency. There are other criteria that relate to the deteriorated and dying condition of T lymphocytes that can trigger a diagnosis of AIDS by current guidelines (which can be changed and modified at any time to suit the drug establishment); but these cells, as well as leukocytes, are subject to poisoning either from drugs, from poisonous by-products such as isothiocyanate from garlic, horseradish, etc.

The establishment has billions of dollars of clout, and no mere little voice like ours will make much difference—it takes millions of dollars just to spread a message minimally and even then, if it's contrary to the establishment brainwashing of the moment, will more than likely be rejected out of hand.

Now let's look at the word syndrome. It means a symptom complex. In this case it originally referred to a group of symptoms peculiar to terminal drug addicts or others poisoned as

noted above. Because one finds evidence of drug use among some homosexuals, it is only reasonable to expect to find the ravages of drugs among them.

There you have it—a disease made originally for political purposes against homosexuals and now being turned to commercial account against the general population.

Commentaries on the AIDS Farce

Of the 3,246 nonhomosexual cases diagnosed as AIDS, 2,082 were confirmed intravenous drug users; 75 were hemophiliacs; 184 had blood transfusions; 785 were diagnosed without etiology being determined; and 120 were said to have contact with others diagnosed as having AIDS.

Do not these statistics tell you something? AIDS, far from being a contagious disease (which is impossible anyway when you look at the problem), is a drug user's disease. The average American indulges about 40 poisoning (drugging) acts daily through soft drinks, alcoholic beverages, caffeine drinks, chocolates, cigarettes, cooked foods, condiments, protein putrefaction by-products, toxic foods (such as meat, wheat and eggs which also cause the most "allergic" or poison reactions) and use of illegal drugs such as heroin, cocaine, marijuana and hundreds of other drugs that are available over the counter or prescribed.

All poisons destroy our organs and tissues, our faculties and functions, slowly in some cases, speedily in others.

Our defensive faculties within the blood and lymph consist of lymphocytes and leukocytes. When these become deranged or have a count lower than 5,000 per cubic milliliter, this means a diagnosis of AIDS by today's guidelines. Lymph cells are created by the lymphatic glands such as the spleen, and leukocytes are created in the bone marrow. Drugs can destroy the powers of propagation of these cells as, indeed, any poison can. Destroying procreative faculties in the lymphatics and bone marrow is the equivalent of drug destruction of the Isles of Langerhans in the pancreas. In the one case white blood cell production is interfered with, whereas in the other, insulin production is decreased or ceases.

That AIDS is said to be a contagious disease is to promote drugs and vaccines that will curb it. And these drugs and vaccines will succeed too! After all, with an incidence rate of about one in 200,000 per annum, they can be declared a success, and the condition diagnosed as it was of old, either lymphocytopenia or leukocytopenia. But, in fact, those drugs and vaccines will contribute to the very problem they are said to cure.

Do Viruses Cause AIDS?

In 1984 the rap for what has been called AIDS was pinned on several viruses, so-called, by researchers in this country and France. Now the number of viruses said to be responsible has soared to 100 which is about the gamut of all the viruses ever identified. In fact, a cold is said to be virus-caused and about 120 so-called viruses have been blamed. So, the drug/medical complex must obviously be hanging the blame on the same "viruses" that are said to cause other diseases.

When you prove too much, you prove nothing! Most Americans are not sophisticated enough in their knowledge and thinking to know or even suspect the fraud involved. But, as far as so-called viruses are concerned, it is impossible that anything be caused by such cellular debris except that its presence as a body waste is pathogenic. However, the body is eliminating wastes 24 hours a day; and only when the body is being toxified faster than it can detoxify, does toxicosis in its myriad of acute and degenerative forms occur.

What was begun as a simple campaign to wipe out the gay rights movement has become a monster directed against the whole population by the medical/drug establishment. You'd think they would direct their energies to the eradication of cardiovascular problems and cancer, but they have all that business snugly in their pocket. These two diseases account for over 70% of all deaths, whereas, so far, what has been called AIDS has been blamed for 1/15th of 1% of the deaths since its debut. What the medical/drug establishment is really doing is staking out a new area for increased business.

Do "viruses" really cause the symptom complexes called AIDS? Let's examine this body waste material on which it is blamed.

Every virologist and microbiologist of note will tell you that what are called viruses are dead material, having no life at all. No metabolism. No means of movement. No life properties whatsoever. Just as lifeless as a stone, though, obviously, they are organic material. However, "viruses" are credited with such actions as "lurking," "injecting themselves," "incubating," "reactivating," "commanding," "laying in wait," "invading," "disguising" themselves, "infecting," having an "active stage," of being "devastating" and "deadly," of conducting "sieges" and having a lot of other life traits and villainous actions.

I think we can do nothing better than getting down to the nitty gritty of just what so-called viruses really are. We have created a 12-cassette master health series at Life Science Institute. On one of these cassettes the following exchange took place between me, a dietitian and a nurse.

DIETITIAN: Do you seriously believe that diseases are caused by food intake as you imply? I work in a hospital and most of our diseases are caused by bacteria, fungi and viruses.

MR. FRY: I feel you're not aware of the situation that is right before your eyes. Most of the diseases you're working with aren't even said to be caused by these agencies. How many diabetics, asthmatics, arthritics, cardiovascular patients, cancer patients, allergic individuals, persons with back problems, hemorrhoid patients, psoriatics and mental patients do you get over there? Will you tell me that?

DIETITIAN: Actually, these are almost all our cases. I had never looked at it this way before.

MR. FRY: So you see, the problems aren't viruses, germs and fungi very often, if at all. Most problems arise from dietary perversions which poison and clog up the system. We maintain that our sicknesses, diseases and degenerative problems arise from toxicosis or toxemia. Acute sicknesses are body-initiated and conducted crises of extraordinary detoxification. Degenerative diseases are the derangement of organs and tissues due to chronic poisoning. The average American indulges about 40 poison acts daily. Is it any wonder that most Americans suffer frequent

illnesses and degenerative problems such as those just cited? That bacteria, so-called viruses and fungi do not cause disease is evident. These so-called causes of diseases are with us all the time. Take streptococci for instance. They're normal residents of the throat and are blamed for sore throat when that occurs. Almost everyone has so-called strep throat at some time or another. But, you ask a physician, if streptococci cause sore throat and if they're normal to the throat, why we don't have sore throats all the time and he'll answer that most of the time you're "not susceptible" or have a "high resistance." That is a copout that tells the perceptive that germs don't cause sore throat, but that the criterion of what constitutes susceptibility is responsible. We Life Scientists know that mucus is the inner skin secretion that is produced as needed to transport poisons exuded through the mucous membranes out of the body. When the body selects the throat area for elimination, it becomes inflamed and painful. Bacteria proliferate after the fact, not before, because the exudations are the dead organic matter they feed on. They're there because their food is there. If you want to get rid of fruit flies in your kitchen, just remove all fruits. If you want to get rid of flies that feed on your garbage, just remove the garbage.

Does that explain our position to your satisfaction?

DIETITIAN: I can't say I'm thoroughly satisfied, but this sounds very logical. In fact, I've bumped up against similar observations before, but I have never given them serious consideration.

NURSE: If sicknesses are caused as you say, then what causes viral diseases like influenza, colds, measles, herpes and AIDS?

MR. FRY: Indeed, all these diseases and a lot more are blamed on viruses. Colds, influenzas, measles and certain forms of so-called herpes are said to be self-limited. Actually, they're limited to how long it takes for the body to rid itself of the toxic materials that it can't tolerate, and repair the damages done. The causes are not viruses, for that is like blaming evil spirits, as I shall demonstrate. These diseases, including all so-called herpes affections, are nothing more than detoxification and healing processes. They are initiated, directed and terminated by the body, not by some malevolent little beastly. The body is always master of its domain, and only death ends this coherent control. As you

know, simple logic tells you that if microbial organisms can get a healthy person down and proliferate by the billions, they become more numerous and stronger while sapping more and more of the vitality and resources of their victim. That this process can be reversed by a much-weakened organism, is absurd on the face of it. When minute organisms start decomposing a body, only complete exhaustion of all organic materials ends their course—only when the bones are picked clean, so to speak. I repeat, the whole concept of being laid low by microbes and then having the tables turned on them sounds very much like cops and robbers tales. In nature, once dominance is established, it's a downhill trip for the weakened organism. Zebras, once overwhelmed by carnivores, rarely if ever survive. Once bacteria start decomposing organic matter, they do so as long as there is organic matter.

Have you ever studied microbiology?

NURSE: Yes, it was part of my studies in college. And, of course, I've boned up on it as you asked me to.

MR. FRY: Are viruses living entities or dead genetic material?

NURSE: They are always dead. It's always been known they were dead bits of DNA in a protein/lipid coat.

MR. FRY: Then how can it be said to cause anything? How can they act in any way, if they're dead? How can dead stuff be referred to as "live" viruses and "killed" viruses? How can dead viruses *cause* disease or anything else?

NURSE: Well, the term "live" viruses means only those that are created from living tissue cultures. I know well enough that dead things don't act, and that which can't act can't cause anything. But we know that, when in vitro, trillions of them result from live tissue.

MR. FRY: You mean dying tissue, don't you?

NURSE: Yes, I suppose so, for even though some cultures are kept alive, there's lots of cell turnover and it's from these dying cells that viruses are obtained. But the viruses are always dead and inactive because they have no metabolism or life, except, of course, being DNA and protein.

MR. FRY: What do you suppose created these viruses, so-called?

NURSE: Well, it's obvious they're coming out of those dying cells which have been infected with it. The virus has injected itself into the cell and commanded it to reproduce itself. This occurs until the cell explodes from the burden.

MR. FRY: That's the rationale now, isn't it?

NURSE: Yes, that's the explanation that I was taught.

MR. FRY: Do you know cell structure?

NURSE: Yes, I've studied that too. I had a course in cytology.

MR. FRY: What are the greatest number of life forms within a cell?

NURSE: The mitochondria. They are the creators of our energy. I've seen cells called protozoa that have, I'm told, up to a half million of them. Humans have very few of them, from a few hundred in blood cells to 30,000 or more in our larger cells in the muscle tissue.

MR. FRY: Can you describe a mitochondrion for us?

NURSE: Well, it's about the size of a bacterium. It has its own metabolism and DNA. It metabolizes glucose and from that results ATP which is ready energy when called upon. Mitochondria are living organisms called organelles or little organs.

MR. FRY: How many of these organelles are in the human body?

NURSE: I really don't know. I've learned there are seventy-five trillion cells in the body, more or less, and if there are thousands of mitochondria in each cell, then there must be quadrillions or quintillions of them in the body.

MR. FRY: I think we're getting somewhere. Can you tell us what happens when a cell dies?

NURSE: Well, first, it's replaced by a daughter cell created by mitosis of another cell. But a cell, upon death, is disintegrated by a body enzyme called lysosome. It breaks up the cell into ultra-minute particles so that the body can deal with it, that is, excrete it as a waste.

MR. FRY: What happens to the mitochondria upon cellular death?

NURSE: They're broken down too.

MR. FRY: What happens to all those thousands of bits of DNA which the mitochondria protected with a double membrane?

NURSE: Well, I really did not learn the disposition made of the genetic material of mitochondria particularly, but I suppose that it's broken up too by the lysosomes.

MR. FRY: If lysosomes could break up the genetic material of mitochondria or organelles, could it not also break up the presumed genetic material the body supposedly created for the virus?

NURSE: Yes, now that you mention it, it certainly could. As a matter of fact, the photos made of viruses through electron microscopes show the membranes to be rough and jagged, sometimes only part of one layer, sometimes one layer and part of another. I would say that a lot of the virus just doesn't make it on account of the lysosomes.

MR. FRY: Doesn't the story of dead viruses injecting themselves into a cell and then taking over that cell and commanding it to reproduce it until the cell explodes sound like a far-fetched tale out of fairyland? Isn't it just possible that the lysosomes would spare the heavily-sheathed mitochondrial genetic material just as readily as it would the so-called reproduced viruses? Is not the genetic material of a mitochondrion identical with the genetic material of a so-called virus? Isn't it not only possible, but more than likely that what we're calling viruses is readily incompletely broken up genetic material from the cell's mitochondrial population? What are your thoughts on this?

NURSE: That sounds a lot more logical to me. When I learned that a virus is only about a billionth the size of a cell, I wondered how something that small could take control of a cell. That's like a flea injecting itself into an elephant and commanding the elephant to reproduce the flea until it explodes with fleas. Yes, I've thought about that, and I tell you what we've been taught here is very suspect. Just like a lot of other things physicians are imposing upon us nurses. We know better, but we have to follow their orders anyway.

That ends the excerpt. But isn't it very revealing?

What really causes AIDS, so-called, is outright poisons that destroy white blood cell generative faculties in both the bone marrow and the lymph glands. The body is capable of doubling, even tripling and quadrupling its white blood cell count in an hour or two normally if need be. When it can't even keep a normal

count or the cells are defective and unable to surround and carry out poisons from blood and lymph normally, then, indeed, degeneration of the bone marrow and lymph glands is death dealing.

But to lay the blame on body wastes which are with us 24 hours a day including so-called viruses, is wide of the mark, especially when almost every AIDS victim to date has been a heavy user of drugs, whether these be medicines, chemical food additives or recreational drugs. All this won't hold water under simple inquiry such as was conducted on our cassette. The AIDS scare is perpetrated by our ignorance, not by any such disease as we've been frightened into believing.

Ignore this business about AIDS, and live healthfully. Healthful living creates health and freedom from all sicknesses and diseases. Hygienists are living testimony to that.

Did You Hear of Acquired Syphilis?

If you look in *The Merck Manual*, the handbook heavily relied upon by physicians, you will find an entry under the heading "Acquired Syphilis."

The interesting thing is that, in the same manual is an entry called immunodeficiency disorders which uses the same word "acquired." But, in this case, the word acquired merely means developed after birth rather than being congenital. Acquired syphilis means you caught it by having sex with someone else who passed their *treponema pallida* bacteria on to you.

Also very interesting is the note about the epidemiology of syphilis: "Promiscuous homosexual men are at the greatest risk." This means that homosexuals had the highest rate of sufferers of any given group.

The first stage of syphilis is called early infectious syphilis, primary stage. In this stage there is chancre (canker sores, papillae or pustular vesicles with subsequent lesions, ulcers, etc.) and local lymphadenopathy. This is no longer called syphilis, but herpes genitalis.

The significance of this is to confirm that the Centers for Disease Control do, indeed, redesignate diseases to suit their purposes.

6

Contagion Is Difficult to Understand

I find it difficult to understand the incidence of "epidemics, contagion, outbreaks, etc.," of different diseases. If it is true that measles and all other such affections are body efforts to eliminate extraordinary morbid materials as you say, then why do they seem to strike all at once?

—Kay Levinson, Brooklyn, NY

RESPONSE: The medically perpetuated myth that diseases are contagious is about as hard to erase from our minds as to swallow something equally as ridiculous: Health is very contagious. Be careful about associating with healthy people lest you catch health.

If a hundred people are given an emetic and they all vomit, we might conclude that vomiting is very contagious. A thinking person would invoke this observation: Similar organisms are affected similarly by similar substances and influences.

Talking about striking all at once, consider this:

Over 90% of our people have plaque in their arteries! Yet this is not considered an epidemic. How does that compare with AIDS which is declared to be an epidemic when it affects only 1/10,000th the number of people?

Would you say that obesity is contagious? It affects one out of three. Would you characterize constipation as a real outbreak? It affects about 90% of our people. What about bad eyesight, which affects 2 out of 3? That really must be contagious, mustn't it? What about bad teeth, high blood pressure, arthritis, asthma, cancer, headaches, or lower back pains? Wouldn't you say these diseases are very contagious inasmuch as they are so widespread?

Does not this really confirm that: Similar organisms subjected to similar bad influences and substances and which indulge similar bad practices suffer similar bad results.

Do you see that acute diseases are body initiated and conducted processes of detoxification and healing? The body stops these processes when its objectives are achieved as in colds, flus, fevers,

measles and other acute illnesses. Were the medical rationale true, those germs and viruses which could waylay us would not stop until our bones were picked clean.

The only thing that is contagious is the practice of bad habits which cause the body to react in many similar ways so that many similar bad results are suffered.

Self-evidence that germs do not cause disease are Koch's postulates which say, that, if any agency causes a disease, it must be present during the disease and its presence must always occasion the disease. For instance, in so-called AIDS the HIV virus is present in less than 50% of the cases. On the other hand, 1,500,000 are said to have the virus and only about 27,000 have had AIDS in seven years. So you see the inconsistency.

Everyone has trillions upon trillions of fungi, bacteria and viruses in their bodies, even those proclaimed to be in perfect health who have no diseases at all, past, present or incipient. When confronted with facts like this, a physician will tell you that you do not come down with a disease from these agencies simply because you are not susceptible or your resistance is high.

This copout actually confirms that bacteria, viruses and fungi do not cause disease. And they are supposed to be the contagious agency.

You see, whatever causes susceptibility or low resistance is obviously the cause of diseases, not the agencies which are practically perpetually present—agencies that are said to cause disease.

It bears repeating that the body itself causes the detoxification/healing crisis called disease. The manner in which the body elects to extraordinarily eliminate its toxic and morbid accumulations determines the name of the disease. For instance, if it elects the respiratory tract, it may be called a cold, flu, sinusitis, bronchitis, etc. *Only* the body has the power, intelligence, resources and unity of purpose to accomplish this. It is absurd to say that bacteria can communicate, act in concert with or conduct the processes of disease. The same goes for fungi and so-called viruses. If they cannot do this, they cannot cause sicknesses and diseases.

In actuality, only a small fraction of our some 20,000 catalogued ailments are attributed to these agencies anyway. As healthful living always produces health and only unhealthful practices lead to

disease, it is sheer superstition to picture microbes and "viruses" as causative of disease.

If you cannot get over the belief in contagion, I know your difficulty. Almost everyone's mind has been infected similarly by exploitive industries that have a vested interest in disease and suffering. Only vested interests have a stake in perpetrating and perpetuating such absurd beliefs. Only these vampire industries have a vested interest in teaching that health can be recovered by the administration of poisonous drugs. These industries are drug, hospital and medical enterprises.

X The next time you have one of these irrational doubts that prompt you to believe in contagion, assure yourself that you can associate with people who have fever (or any other illness), and you won't catch the fever. You see, you have been manipulated all along by the medical propagandists to believe a lot of malarkey which drives you into the medical corral.

7

Pity the Poor Hospital Workers Who Must Tend AIDS Patients

We have read many tear-jerking accounts of the Damocles sword hanging over the heads of those who so courageously devote themselves to working with AIDS sufferers.

What is the reality of the situation?

As published in the May/June issue of *Hippocrates*, a survey was made of 351 physicians, nurses and technicians who had suffered accidental needle sticks or puncture wounds from needles that had first been injected into AIDS sufferers. That sounds deadly, doesn't it?

Of the 351 with documented needle sticks or puncture wounds that involved the blood of AIDS patients, only three—less than one percent—developed antibodies to the so-called AIDS virus.

How many of these in all these years developed AIDS?

Not one!

Sounds like AIDS is a raging epidemic, doesn't it?

AIDS is a deficiency disease caused by immunodestructive drugs. All poisons are immunodestructive inasmuch as white blood cells are killed by the very poisons they suicidally try to remove from body fluids. To cause what is called AIDS, the drugs must be taken frequently and in quantities that destroy the white blood cell complement faster than bone marrow and lymph organs can replace them. As almost all drugs, prescribed, nonprescribed and recreational are immunosuppressive, immunodeficiency is really quite widespread in this country.

AIDS is, therefore, positively not contagious. And nothing indicates this more than this survey.

The Vaccine Safety Disease Problem?

SECTION V

About Vaccines, Antibodies and Immunity

How do we know that the vaccine is safe?

The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body. The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body. The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body.

The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body.

The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body. The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body. The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body.

The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body. The vaccine is made from the cells of the virus, which are killed and then injected into the body.

1 Do Vaccines Solve Disease Problems?

Some tragic and startling revelations are surfacing about a new vaccine the drug establishment is pushing. The vaccine, called Hib for *Haemophilus influenzae* type b, is administered to "prevent meningitis."

Meningitis is an inflammation of the membranes that cover the spine and brain. Inflammation is occasioned by irritating toxic substances. In response the body creates a fever to intensify efforts to deal with these substances which are usually ingested and absorbed from the intestinal tract. When these permeate certain tissues, the body undertakes defensive reactions, such as fevers, to facilitate and accelerate their elimination.

Meningitis is said to kill about one thousand children annually in the U.S.A.

New Vaccine Worse Than No Vaccine At All!

A large controversy is brewing about the use of this newly introduced vaccine. In certain states, Minnesota being the main one, more children are developing meningitis and dying of the vaccine than were affected before its introduction!

Why the Polio Hoax Was Perpetrated

Let us review the hoaxes frequently foisted upon our people.

In the late 1940s a new disease was foisted upon the American people. It was called polio. Several then-current diseases were renamed as polio. Among them were infantile paralysis, viral meningitis and aseptic meningitis. A hysteria and panic was created amongst our populace as was done in the case of what is called AIDS, and also a lumping together of several diseases, some of which have been in medical literature for well over one hundred years.

After the panic was built into a furor and an orchestrated hysterical demand for a vaccine that would prevent the problem,

lo and behold, along comes Dr. Salk who developed a vaccine that would wipe out polio. And it did!

Simultaneous to the introduction of the vaccine the Centers for Disease Control introduced new diagnostic guidelines that relegated what would have been polio diagnoses back to the meningitis of pre-polio days. Only infantile paralysis remained as polio. However, Dr. Salk's vaccine was quickly dropped, for it caused up to ten times the "polio" in those receiving the shots than was occurring in the unvaccinated. While Dr. Salk remained a hero despite the disastrous failure, the Sabine oral vaccine was quietly substituted in its stead.

The object of this commercial game is to market drugs, vaccines or whatever by creating a panic or hysteria around a "new" disease and then getting the populace to buy this drug forever after lest they contract the disease. As you can see the restitution of the diseases' original names effectively "wipes them out."

It is doubtful if even one thousand children per year were dying of meningitis. They, like so-called AIDS victims, are drugged and dosed with highly toxic drugs when they become sick. That these drugs do kill is self-evident for, when physicians go on strike, death rates plummet by up to 60%!

Our message is: Do not get caught up in these commercial voodoo games. They are deadly as well as costly. Healthful living always produces health. Vaccines and drugs are always disease-producing and deadly. When your child becomes ill, a little fasting and a nontoxic diet of raw fruits, vegetables, nuts and seeds will restore high-level health. There is no need for your child to suffer or die at the hands of a voodoo commercial monster with a voracious appetite for your dollars.

2

Do Antibodies Make Us Immune or Susceptible to Disease?

Why are vaccines and immunization shots given?

According to medical thinking, vaccines are an attenuated version of the viruses or germs that cause a given disease. By their rationale, the body uses the vaccinia as a training ground to fortify itself for an assault by the real thing. Antibodies are formed, that is, configurations are formed which are said to be evidence of the body's preparedness for an assault by the disease germs or viruses.

Whether these configurations are evidence of the scars of battle or readily developed recognition devices is open to question. Rationally, we should wonder if a body that can defend against a vaccine that is a newcomer could not also defend against the real thing when it came for the first time. This question hinges, of course, on whether germs or so-called viruses are capable of causing disease in humans in the first place.

Vaccines are supposed to cause the body to form antibodies which protect it from the disease. This is the rationale for injecting attenuated germs or viruses into the body. We are thus led to believe that the antibodies are protection against the disease for which the vaccine that caused their formation was given.

The Medical Rationale for AIDS Antibodies is Opposite to That for Vaccinations!

We now have a major panic over a disease called AIDS. The medical establishment, contrary to their immunization rationale, has done an about face. In their AIDS promotion campaign, they proclaim what they call antibodies to a so-called human immunodeficiency virus as indicative of imminent infection with AIDS. Antibodies are said to protect us against disease in the case of vaccinations, and they are said to indicate the presence of AIDS!

Does that make sense?

If we have active antibody immunity to a disease because of vaccination, then why don't the antibodies said to be evidence of the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) protect us from AIDS rather than dispose us to it?

It is twisted logic like this that makes us realize more than ever that the drug establishment is treating us like unthinking ignoramuses. In foisting upon us terror and hysteria about a disease called AIDS, they are really promoting another hoax which they have conjured up to promote the economic well-being of drug firms, hospitals, medical personnel, research groups and government agencies.

The antibody rationale used in AIDS contradicts the rationale used to promote vaccinations. This is self-evidence of the error of one of the rationales and leads us to suspect both rationales.

3

Is There Such a Thing As Immunity?

This is a word used by the medical system to denote that you are made exempt from a certain disease. The word means "exempt from the consequences of wrong acts." Synonyms for the word are "invulnerable," "privileged," "exempt," "unsusceptible," "protected," "safe" and others.

In nature there is no such thing as being immune. All acts have consequences. All causes have effects. Nothing that humans do will suspend the laws of our existence. The idea of immunity in the physiological world is pure myth.

America's drug makers and purveyors, a part of the cartel that effectively controls our country and its institutions, can force or buy anything they want, including intellectual prostitution. And the invention and "scientific" sanctification of outright hoaxes is part of the game they play to control, manipulate, rip off and, the way it works out, to despoil us!

The word immune was given medical currency as an adjunct to the vaccination game which has long been a big moneymaker for pharmaceutical interests. The fact that a body can be progressively devitalized and does not often repeat a disease as it sometimes does with the flu or colds does not mean there is immunity. Saying that an act or vaccination ritual confers immunity is on the same order as claiming that the sun rises faithfully because prayers are faithfully offered up.

Our populace is constantly urged to be immunized for flu, measles, whooping cough, tetanus, diphtheria, polio and other diseases. The FDA, CDC, NIH, NCI and other government agencies, as well as medical practitioners under their thumb, are used as "errand boys" to give credence and clout to the drug cartel.

Remember, in nature there is no such thing as immunity. Just as wrong acts of mechanics will cause an airplane to malfunction, even crash, so, too, your wrong acts will cause your body to malfunction and "crash" with some debilitating illness.

Throughout this book you will find evidence that discredits the drug cartel's rationale for contagion, immunity and related concepts upon which they have structured the drug industry.

The AIDS Vaccine is Now Being Tested

As reported in the *American Family Physician* in 1987, there are now 81 volunteers receiving shots of the first AIDS vaccine.

If these volunteers do not show extraordinarily adverse reactions, the tests will be broadened.

The objective of the test is to determine side effects and to see if the AIDS vaccine will prevent infection by the AIDS virus.

I venture that these tests will "prove" extremely satisfactory and will in the near future cause the vaccine to be pronounced safe and needed. And the vaccine will proceed to add billions of revenues into the drug/medical coffers.

It is said that the antibodies the human body has already produced relative to the AIDS virus will not prevent the disease of AIDS. But the antibody in this vaccine will, of course, destroy the AIDS virus. This sort of telegraphs to us that the tests are just routine as part of the game. It seems a foregone conclusion the vaccine will be available in the future.

So you see that whether the virus, so-called, is vanquished or not, it really does not matter. The drug industry builds a strawman and imbues him with fiendish destructive powers. Everybody believes you and begs to be saved from the strawman. No matter what you do, you win over the strawman. Humanity is saved. And the drug saviors are hailed as heroes!

What is called AIDS is the lumping together of a lot of old immunodeficiency diseases. When the vaccines are introduced, they will be hailed and celebrated. There will be new Salks to be idolized as saints. The new post-vaccinal diagnosis guidelines will call for classifying what is presently called AIDS as what they once were—lymphocytopenia, leukocytopenia, agammaglobulinemia, neutropenia and other appellations!

Do not lament. That is the way things are done. Remove yourself and help others remove themselves from this vicious drug/medical racket.

5 An Article on the AIDS Virus from *Spin* Magazine

In early 1988, Spin magazine undertook a series of articles on the supposed cause of AIDS, the HIV virus. We are happy to reproduce one in its entirety. Spin was gracious enough to grant permission for its use.

A.I.D.

by Celia Farber

The HIV virus is thought to be the cause of AIDS, but there's strong evidence that it isn't. The frightening truth is that no one knows for sure, and few scientists are admitting it. Are precious time, money and lives being lost while we fight a harmless virus?

HIV is called "the AIDS virus," and medical experts have made it the keystone of their battle against AIDS, building all their efforts to fight the disease around it. But what if they're wrong? According to Professor Peter Duesberg of UC-Berkeley, years of time and millions in research dollars have been wasted on the belief that the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) is the cause of AIDS. The real cause of AIDS, Duesberg says, is still unknown, and HIV is just a latent, and perfectly harmless, retrovirus that most but not all AIDS patients happen to carry.

"To say that HIV is the cause of AIDS is to cast aside everything we know about retroviruses," says Duesberg, a member of the National Academy of Sciences who has been studying retroviruses for twenty years. The HIV theory, he says, is inconsistent, paradoxical and absurd—little more than a by-product of a decade-old search for a retrovirus that could be called the cause of cancer.

HIV was hastily postulated as the cause of AIDS in 1984, when a National Institute of Health (NIH) scientist named Robert Gallo identified it as HTLV-III, the third strain in a family of viruses believed to have originated in Africa. Gallo, who was made director of the National Cancer Institute's search for the cause of AIDS in 1982, was propelled by several provocative links between HTLV-III and the disease. Most strikingly, something was

stripping AIDS patients of their protective white blood cells, known as T-cells, and HTLV-III was found to attack these cells.

Gallo was unable to isolate the virus, however, because once it destroys a T-cell it mysteriously disappears. So he measured its presence by testing for HTLV-III's antibodies. Antibodies were detected in 80 to 90 percent of the AIDS patients tested. With no other plausible cause in sight, Gallo's virus, later called HIV, became "the AIDS virus" and Gallo was soon entangled in a lawsuit filed by the Pasteur Institute in Paris who also claimed to be the first to isolate it. While scientists raced to develop a test that would detect HIV, and people all over the world worried about whether they had been infected, important scientific rules and standards were completely ignored.

One such standard measure, used to determine whether a particular micro-organism is the cause of a disease, is a set of three laws known as Koch's postulates.

The first law says that the suspected micro-organism has to be present in all cases of the disease. HIV is not. Between ten and twenty percent of all AIDS patients show no traces of HIV whatsoever, not even its antibodies. Another law says that the micro-organism must be able to be taken from a host, animal or human, and further spread in pure culture. This cultivation can only be done in 50 percent of all AIDS patients. The third law says that inoculations of pure cultures of the micro-organism into animals must produce in them the same disease. HIV has been injected into thousands of laboratory animals, and not one has developed AIDS.

Peter Duesberg is so convinced that HIV alone cannot cause AIDS, that he told his old friend Gallo that he wouldn't mind being injected with it. His argument is compelling, and he has been waiting for almost a year for anyone in the scientific community to come forward and refute it. No one has. Many won't even speak with him. *Spin* did.

SPIN: You have defied the entire medical establishment by claiming that HIV is not the cause of AIDS. What convinces you?

DUESBERG: Koch's postulates were postulated at a time when we couldn't do what we can do now. Now we can detect things at lower concentrations and activities, and we are falling into a

trap where we are saying that they are critically relevant. The incidence of the virus HIV is so low that Koch would never have seen it. This is what they [today's scientists] are overlooking. That the "AIDS virus" is at incredibly low concentrations and activity. That's why I am saying that HIV can't be the cause of a fatal disease, because it is so inactive. In fact, HIV is found in far more healthy humans than sick humans. This is very embarrassing to many people. They'd rather ignore it.

For a parasite or a virus to be pathogenic, it has to meet three criteria:

One. It must be biochemically active. In other words it must do something to get something done.

Two. It would have to affect or intoxicate more cells of a host, an animal or a human, than the host can spare or regenerate. Stated otherwise, you would only suffer from influenza virus if it kills or infects a significant portion of your lung cells, the polio virus if it gets into your nervous system, or if the hepatitis virus takes hold of a large part of your liver. You wouldn't notice an infection that involves 0.01 percent of your cells. That would be what you would call a latent infection. We all get them. Most of us have a latent tuberculosis infection, for example.

Three. The host must be genetically and immunologically permissive. It has to let it happen, so to speak. It has to accept the pathogen. It cannot be immune to it.

The HIV virus, the so-called AIDS virus, does not meet one of those criteria. For instance, the virus is never active—not only in those who have no symptoms, but also in those who develop full-blown AIDS and die from it. Even in people who are dying of AIDS, the virus is hardly detectable, measured only by locating its antibody. An antibody to a virus is like a vaccination; it has been traditionally, and still is, the ultimate weapon against a virus. It is an indication of a past disease, not of a future disease. If you have antibodies, you should be congratulated. You are safe. You don't have to worry about it anymore. But somehow, they have convinced the public to believe that the disease is yet to come, which really makes no sense; it's absurd. Once the antibody is made, the show for the virus is over. The time for the virus to strike and cause disease is before immunity, not after immunity.

That's why vaccination works. Now, that's what we find in the patients. If you look for direct evidence of the virus, there is very little. It is only possible to isolate the virus in 50 percent of the patients.

SPIN: What is the difference between isolating the virus and detecting it?

DUESBERG: Detecting the antibody to the virus is what you can do in 80 to 90 percent of all cases. So, 10 to 20 percent don't even have antibodies. With polio or hepatitis, you can isolate copious amounts of virus. Here, it is different. You have to use techniques which were developed to detect or activate so-called latent viruses, viruses that are not active. It involves taking millions of cells from a host, in the form of tissue culture, an expensive method, and then when they are removed from the immune system of the host, you add some uninfected cells. Then you wait a couple of weeks and hope that during that time, something kisses awake the sleeping beauty, the resting AIDS virus. If one of them in that time becomes active, the whole culture will become infected, because now there is no immune system. By then you have amplified or multiplied the tissue culture enough to detect it in a cell culture, and then you can say "Aha! I have isolated the virus." All you have really done is, out of billions of cells, you have activated at least one virus. But in 50 percent of all AIDS patients, not even that much can be done. Even in millions of cells, you cannot activate one virus. That's how low the viral content is.

For direct biochemical evidence of the virus, we look for the so-called pro-virus, a DNA copy. Biotechnology has developed a technique of detecting one gene in a billion cellular genes. By this method, you find HIV in no more than 15 percent of the AIDS patients. And whatever virus is there is mostly inactive.

So then, HIV is only found in one of hundreds of thousands of cells. And even if the virus does kill those cells, its impact is minimal. The virus takes one or two days to infect one T-cell out of tens of thousands. That's 0.1 to 0.01 of your T-cells. But you normally regenerate about five percent of your T-cells every two days. They die and you get new ones. So the effect of HIV killing the T-cells is like poking a needle in your finger and losing a minute amount of blood every day. It's just totally inconsistent with what

we know about that virus that it could possibly explain the depletion of T-helper cells.

There's one more inconsistency—retroviruses need a division in order to replicate. Unlike all other viruses which kill cells when they replicate, retroviruses need the mitosis—the living cell. That makes it very difficult to explain how this virus could be responsible for the loss of T-cells. It is impossible already, on the basis of its inactivity, and the low numbers of cells it infects. Retroviruses like HIV need living cells in order to replicate.

SPIN: How is it possible for the entire scientific community, in the face of a serious epidemic, to turn their backs on scientific dogma and accept, without scrutiny, that this is the AIDS virus?

DUESBERG: It gives a lot of comfort to say here's the virus and this is the cause. If you say who's done it you'll feel much better, even if it's a monster. If you really want to talk about it, there is more behind it. There is a lot of vested interest behind it. Retrovirologists have generated a whole reserve army of people, thanks to the so-called virus cancer program which was generated in the Nixon era. Like polio, we thought, now we'll get rid of cancer.

There is a reservoir of people who have been looking for cancer viruses for the last couple of years and haven't found them. But they really have made names and careers for themselves, and have developed tremendous skills—and I'm one of them. We are the veterans of the virus cancer program, and we are looking for a cause—but we haven't really found one. So you show us a new windmill and we are marching. And that's what's happening with the AIDS virus. I have worked with retroviruses for twenty years and I came more and more to the realization that they are not quite as important as the retrovirologists would have liked them to be.

SPIN: How has your theory been received—or I should say not received—by the scientific community?

DUESBERG: Those who are really direct targets of this—who are working closely with it and making these major claims that HIV is what causes AIDS—have not responded at all directly. And indirectly, well, I know them. Like Bob Gallo, for instance, we are old friends. I spoke to him two weeks ago, and he said “With friends like you, who needs enemies?” And he literally runs away

from me. Usually when you challenge a major hypothesis, you get a rebuttal, but here it's total avoidance. They don't want to talk, they don't want to be seen by me. A few examples: I was at the National Institute of Health (NIH) two months ago, in the same building where Gallo works. We went to the movies, and I said "Look Bob, I really don't believe these claims. I am really convinced now that it can't be so. You have to find another explanation." He's certainly not a shy person, but ever since, he just doesn't want to be seen arguing or talking about it with me, not even at a party. There was a party with mutual friends of ours who invited us because they wanted to see us debate it, and he refused to come. We were both invited to a memorial meeting for a colleague. Gallo said, "Is Peter Duesberg coming? Because if he comes, I don't want to come on the same day." It's very strange.

SPIN: If it is not the virus, do you have a theory about what causes AIDS?

DUESBERG: First of all, when we say, what could cause AIDS, we should say, what could cause the multiple symptoms that are now all called AIDS? I think we are doing a major disservice by using that catchy word AIDS. Such divergent symptoms are all disguised under this one term. A lot of things can go wrong when you lose your immune system. They say that the AIDS virus kills the immune system and then you get all these opportunistic diseases. But one of the symptoms of AIDS is dementia, one is Kaposi's sarcoma, another one is lymphoma, or leukemia, or *pneumocystis carinii* or diarrhea. Some of these are consistent with immune deficiencies. But dementia is not caused by an immune deficiency, and certainly not lymphoma or Kaposi's sarcoma. Tumors are not known to be consequences of an immune deficiency. So, the first thing I would say is that I don't think we are looking at a disease entity. We are not looking at polio, or pneumonia, or hepatitis, or surgical cancer—all defined diseases. We are looking at a bank of old symptoms. Not one of them is new. And I think it is highly unlikely that they are all caused by this virus, particularly in view of how inactive it is.

So, I think we have to go back from the bench to the patient and see what AIDS is in the first place. And once we have a

better picture of what AIDS is, we can go back and figure out whether it is caused by a virus or even a germ. I for one doubt that it is even a germ, that is, a contagious agent—something that can be transmitted. Casual contact is not enough to cause this disease. To get AIDS, you need intimate contact, that is, contact that involves the exchange of human cells. Once you have exchanged human cells, you have exchanged as much as you can possibly exchange. And also, it has to be done many, many times before the disease is transmitted. This exchange excludes almost nothing, and it certainly doesn't prove the germ theory. A virus, by definition, is a "cell-free infection," something that can be transmitted without transmitting cells—from sneezing or towels or whatever.

SPIN: Has there ever before been a virus that depended on the transfer of cells?

DUESBERG: No. All viruses can be transmitted cell-free. The virus can sit and wait somewhere, on a toilet seat or something, or whatever you touch. Some are more difficult than others to transmit, like herpes virus, which you can get by kissing, or Epstein-Barr virus. But that is still not enough for AIDS. Other viruses, like polio, measles, or flu, can be transmitted in a swimming pool—highly cell-free.

SPIN: Do you think AIDS could be caused by environmental factors?

DUESBERG: I think lifestyle has a lot to do with it. AIDS stands for acquired immune deficiency syndrome, and most of us, being so trained to think in biological terms, immediately jump to the conclusion that it must be a virus or a bacteria. But "acquired" doesn't mean it is biologically transmitted. You can acquire lung cancer from smoking cigarettes, and a number of diseases, as well as immune deficiencies, from shooting up heroin, and even from anal intercourse. It's not great for your health to do that every day.

SPIN: But the puzzling question is, why so suddenly? Why are so many people getting sick and dying now?

DUESBERG: There are a few things that can make it look like all of a sudden you have a disease, but it may not be as new as it sounds. One thing is that homosexuality has become acceptable

and highly visible. Certainly in places where they concentrate and gain a lot of confidence, like New York or LA, it becomes more obvious. Fifteen years ago, they could have died, and the cause of death would be pneumonia or Kaposi's sarcoma or whatever. Now it is called AIDS. Whatever they were doing, the frequency went up. The drugs had become chic and much more readily available, the bathhouses had become more accessible and the whole lifestyle more concentrated. Once you concentrate it, you see things that you wouldn't see had they been scattered around. The definition of AIDS keeps widening, and now they count almost all infections as AIDS. You see, there is no such thing as a germ that would prefer Rock Hudson over Cheryl Tiegs. I think for a virus, they certainly would look exactly the same. But there is an absolute preference for boys here. [Female] prostitutes have the same number of dates as promiscuous homosexuals, I assume, but they're not getting it [from sexual contact]. There must be something else, something related to that lifestyle.

SPIN: Are there other scientists who are working with theories similar to yours, or are you the first?

DUESBERG: Well, judging from the letters I received, which were mostly from other scientists, there are many who agree.

I did not get one letter that said, "You are full of it," or "You're crazy." And I am waiting for it. I would welcome it. I would like to debate somebody who would be willing to challenge me. The editor of *Bio-Technology* called me and said, "I have read your work and heard about you, and I am beginning to believe now that you might be right. Write me an editorial. I really want to bring this out, and see whether or not anybody has a rebuttal." He had spoken to a number of people and never gotten an answer to my question. It's a funny situation. There are a lot of vested interests here. It's very difficult to move once you have such a huge machine going.

SPIN: And imagine the consequences of admitting that it was the wrong virus, or the wrong cause, after all these years. Everything would go right back to zero.

DUESBERG: Not only back to zero, we would also be at a considerable deficit of time and money. That is a very real contributing factor—money.

Scientists researching AIDS are much less inclined to ask scrutinizing questions about the etiology [cause] of AIDS when they have invested huge sums of money in companies that make money on the hypothesis that HIV is the AIDS virus. William Haseltine and Max Essex, for example, who are two of the top five AIDS researchers in the country, have millions in stocks in a company they founded that has developed and will sell AIDS kits that test for HIV. How could they be objective? Gallo stands to make a lot of money from patent rights on the virus. His entire reputation depends on this virus. If HIV is not the cause of AIDS, there's nothing left for Gallo. If it's not a retrovirus, Gallo would become irrelevant.

The stakes are too high now. Ten years ago, when they were lower, theories could be exchanged and examined more rationally. This cannot be done now. Gallo's lab works so closely with the news media. Every progress report from their laboratories is discussed by Dan Rather and Barbara Walters, *Newsweek*, and *Time* magazine. Every little observation is in all newspapers. To say that now, maybe, the antibody wasn't worth committing suicide for or burning houses for, would be very embarrassing.

SPIN: Obviously, you must consider the mass testing for HIV antibodies to be an absolute farce.

DUESBERG: Oh yes, of course. The whole thing is a hoax. A group of reporters from England came here to do a documentary about dissenting AIDS theories, and they were told that Gallo would not discuss HIV.

SPIN: Did you really tell Gallo that you wouldn't mind being injected with HIV? Has anyone tried to take you up on that?

DUESBERG: Oh yes, we joke about it, and I say, "Give it to me. As long as it's not from Gallo's lab, I'll take it."

Despite *SPIN*'s repeated attempts to reach Gallo, he was unavailable to respond to comments by Duesberg and others concerning his research and personal ambitions. A research associate in his office, who asked not to be named, said that Duesberg's

statements regarding Gallo's royalties are unwarranted, and that claims that Dr. Gallo was avoiding Duesberg are "ridiculous."

Researchers like William Haseltine and Max Essex are angered by Duesberg's insinuation that their objectivity might be swayed by their financial enterprise. "I deeply resent the implication that my business investments have affected my work," says Haseltine, although he confirms his and Essex's business arrangement with Cambridge Bio-Science, a company that sells HIV testing kits.

"Clearly HIV causes AIDS," Gallo has said. "Anyone who says it doesn't, doesn't know the facts."

The question is, whose facts? And why are certain facts integrated and others ignored?

A recent study published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* showed that of all AIDS cases registered in New York and San Francisco after 1985, 93 percent were never confirmed to be HIV positive.

(The above article has been reprinted with permission from *SPIN* magazine, Volume 3, Number 8, published by Camouflage Publishing Inc., 6 W. 18th St., New York, NY 10011-4608; (212) 576-1010.)