

DISMANTLING THE VIRUS THEORY

The “measles virus” as an example

Why should we doubt the existence of viruses? What are viruses and what are they not? How are viruses being scientifically demonstrated to exist?

Author: Dr. Stefan Lanka

Scientists must question everything and especially what they love the most, i.e. their own discoveries and ideas. This basic rule of scientific research helps avoid erroneous developments and reveals the ones that already exist. Also, we must all be allowed to question the status quo, otherwise we would live in a dictatorship. Moreover, science cannot be limited to a selected number of institutions and experts. Science can and must be conducted by anyone who has the necessary knowledge and the appropriate methods.

Science can be considered science only if its claims are verifiable, reproducible and if they allow predictions. Science also needs external control, because, as we will see, a part of the medical sciences has lost touch with reality for quite some time. Anyone who has knowledge of biology and the genesis of life, of

the development and functions of the tissue, of the body and of the brain, will automatically question the assumptions about viruses.

In the reality of the body and of its mechanisms, there is no place for hypothetical malignant processes. All biological processes, including those that can end in suffering, pain and death, are originally meant to be useful.

A different approach to the virus phenomenon is possible and necessary: any layman with some background knowledge reading scientific papers about pathogenic viruses can realize that such viruses do not exist and what is being described are only typical components and characteristics of cells. This background knowledge will be provided in this article.

The origins of the idea

The present notion of a virus is based on the ancient ideas that all diseases were caused by poisons (“toxins”) and that people would regain their health by producing “antitoxins” as an “antidote”. Indeed, a few diseases are caused by poisons. The subsequent idea, that the body can restore its health by producing or being given “antidotes”, was born when it was observed that people survived bigger amounts of poison (such as alcohol) when their body was trained by consuming slowly increasing amounts of that poison. However, in reality there are no an-

tidotes, instead the body produces enzymes, which neutralize and eliminate the poisons (alcohol).

In 1858, Rudolf Virchow, the founder of modern medicine, plagiarized the findings of other scientists, suppressed their essential discoveries and thus a false view on the cause of diseases was born and imposed as a dogma, which is in fact still in effect to date. According to this dogma, all diseases supposedly originate inside the cells¹ Virchow’s cellular pathology re-introduced into medicine the ancient and refuted the humoral doctrine and claimed that diseases develop from pathogenic poisons (in Latin: virus).

The search for these pathogenic poisons remains to date fruitless, however, when bacteria were discovered, it was assumed that they were producing the pathogenic poisons. This supposition, called “the germ theory”, was immediately accepted and remains very successful up to the present time. This theory is so successful that the majority of the people are still not aware of the fact that the so-called bacterial toxins are actually normal enzymes, which either cannot appear in a human being, or, if they do, they never appear in such an amount as to make them dangerous.

Then it was discovered that, when they slowly begin to die, bacteria create tiny, apparently lifeless forms of survival, the so-called spores. It was then suspected that these spores were toxic and that they were the so-called pathogenic poisons. This was then refuted, since the spores are rapidly developing into bacteria when their vital resources are being restored. When scientists in the laboratory observed that the weak, highly inbred bacteria perished very quickly while turning into much smaller structures than the spores, it was first believed that the bacteria were being killed by the alleged pathogenic poisons, called viruses, and that the viruses were thereby replicating.

Due to the belief that these -at the time of their discovery still invisible- structures were killing the bacteria, they were called phages/bacteriophages, “eaters of bacteria”. Only later it was determined that merely highly inbred and therefore almost non-viable bacteria can be made to turn into phages, or bacteria which are being destroyed so fast that they do not have time to form spores.

The introduction of the electron microscopy led to the discovery of the structures resulting from the transformation of bacteria when these were suddenly dying or when the metabolism of the highly inbred germs was overwhelmed by processes triggered by the adding of “phages”. It was also discovered that there are hundreds of types of different-looking “phages”. The discovery of phages, the so-called bacterial “viruses”, reinforced the wrong

assumption and the belief that there were human and animal viruses that looked the same and had the same structure. This is not and cannot be the case, for several different reasons.

After introducing chemical examination techniques in biology, it was discovered that there are thousands of types of phages and that phages of one type always have the same structure. They consist of a particular molecule, made of nucleic acid, which is covered in a shell of proteins of a given number and composition. It was only later discovered that merely the bacteria which had been highly inbred in the test tube could turn into phages themselves, by contact with phages, but this never applied to natural bacteria or bacteria which had just been isolated from their natural environment. In this process, it was discovered that these “bacterial viruses” actually serve to provide other bacteria with important molecules and proteins, and that the bacteria themselves emerged from such structures.

Before it could be established that the “bacterial viruses” cannot kill natural bacteria, but they are instead helping them to live and that bacteria themselves emerge from such structures, these “phages” were already used as models for the alleged human and animal viruses. It was assumed that the human and animal viruses looked like the “phages”, were allegedly killing cells and thereby causing diseases, while at the same time producing new disease poisons and in this way transmitting the diseases. To date, many new or apparently new diseases have been attributed to viruses if their origin is unknown or not acknowledged. This reflex found an apparent confirmation in the discovery of the “bacterial viruses”.

It is important to note that the theories of fight and infection were accepted and highly praised by a majority of the specialists only if and when the countries or regions where they lived were also suffering from war and adversity. In times of peace, other concepts dominated the world of science.² It is very important to note that the theory of ►



infection – starting from Germany – has only been globalized through the third Reich, when the Jewish researchers, most of which had opposed and refuted the politically exploited theories of infection, were removed from their positions.³

On the detection of phages

The existence of phages can be proved rapidly. First step: their presence is confirmed through an effect, namely the transformation of bacteria into phages, and also through an electron micrograph of those phages. The control experiments show that phages do not appear if bacteria do not change or if bacteria randomly start decomposing due to extrinsic sudden annihilation, without forming phages.

Second step: the liquid containing the phages is concentrated and applied on another liquid, which has a high concentration at the bottom of the test tube and a low concentration at the top of the test tube. The test tube with the phages is then powerfully spun (centrifuged) and all the particles gather according to their mass and weight to the place of their own density. The density is the ratio of weight (mass) per unit of volume, expressed as Kg/l or g/mg, respectively. That is why this concentration and purification step for particles with the same density is called density gradient centrifugation.

The layer where many particles of the same density gather becomes “cloudy”, which is called a “band”. This step is being documented, then the particles concentrated, purified and sedimented in a “band” are removed with a syringe needle. The extracted concentrated amount of particles is called an isolate. A fast and simple electron micrograph will confirm the presence of phages in the isolate, which at the same time is an indication for the purity of the isolate, if the micrograph shows no other particles but the phages. The appearance and the diameter of the phages will also be established with the help of this

micrograph. The control experiment performed for this step consists in treating and centrifuging the liquid from bacteria which did not form any phages, where no phages appear at the end of the procedure.

After the step of successfully isolating the phages, the decisive biochemical characterization of the phages follows. The biochemical characterization of their composition is essential for identifying the specific type of phage, since different types of phages often appear to be similar. The isolate obtained through the density gradient centrifugation is now divided in two parts. One part is used to determine the size, type and composition of the nucleic acid; in a separate procedure, the other part is used to determine the amount, size and morphology of the proteins of the phages. Since the 1970s, these tests have been simple standard techniques that are learned by every biology student in his first semesters.


These tests represent the biochemical characterization of the phages. In almost every case, these results have been and are being published in only one publication, since a phage has a very simple structure which is very easy to analyse. The control experiments for these tests use liquid from bacteria which do not form phages and thus cannot present any biochemical proof. The existence of approximately two thousand different types of phages was scientifically demonstrated this way.

About the alleged proof of pathogenic viruses

The “bacteriophages”, correctly defined as incomplete mini spores and building blocks of the bacteria, have been scientifically isolated, while the supposed pathogenic viruses have never been observed in humans or animals or in their body fluids and have never been isolated and subsequently biochemically analysed. To date, none of the researchers involved in this kind of work seems to have realised this.

The density gradient centrifugation is the scientifically required standard technique for the demonstration of the existence of a virus.

Despite the fact that this method is described in all microbiology manuals as the “virus isolation technique”, it is never applied in experiments meant to demonstrate the existence of pathogenic viruses.



The use of the electron microscope and the biochemistry were very slowly returning to normal after 1945 and no one had realised that not one pathogenic virus had ever been isolated in humans or animals; thus, as of 1949 researchers started applying the same idea used for the (bacterio) phages, in order to replicate the human and animal “viruses”. John Franklin Enders, born in 1897 in the family of a rich financier, was active in various fraternities after having finished his studies, then he worked as a real estate agent and studied foreign languages for four years before turning to bacterial virology, which fascinated him.

He then simply transferred the ideas and concepts that he learned in this area of research to the supposed pathogenic viruses in humans. With his unscientific experiments and interpretations that he had never confirmed through negative controls, Enders brought the entire “viral” infectious medicine to a dead end. It is important to note at this point that Enders, like many infectious diseases specialists, worked for the U.S. military, which had always been and remains to date a huge victim of the fear of contagion. It was mainly the U.S. military which spread its erroneous belief that besides

chemical weapons there were also biological weapons in the form of bacteria and viruses.

In 1949, Enders announced that he had managed to cultivate and grow the alleged polio virus in vitro on various tissues. The American expert opinion believed everything immediately. What Enders did was to add fluids from patients with poliomyelitis to tissue cultures which he claimed to have had sterilized, then he alleged that the cells were dying because of the virus, that the virus was replicating in this way and that a vaccine could be harvested from the respective culture. At that time, summer polio epidemics (polio = flaccid paralysis) were very frequent during summer and they were believed to be caused by polio viruses. A vaccine was to help eradicate the alleged virus. After the polio vaccine was introduced, the symptoms were then re-diagnosed among other things as multiple sclerosis, flaccid acute paralysis, aseptic meningitis etc. and later polio was claimed to have been eradicated.

During his experiments, Enders et al. sterilised the tissue cultures in order to exclude the possibility of bacteria killing the cells. What he didn't take into consideration was that the sterilisation and the ►



treatment of the cell culture when preparing it for the alleged infection was exactly what was killing the cells. Instead, he interpreted the cytopathic effects as the existence and the action of polio viruses, without ever having isolated a single virus and described its biochemistry. The necessary negative control experiments, which would have shown that the sterilisation and the treatment of the cells prior to the “infection” in the test tube was killing the cells, have never been performed. However, for this “performance” Enders received the Nobel prize in 1954.

1954 is also the year in which Enders applied and introduced the same technique in order to allegedly replicate the measles virus. As he had been awarded the Nobel prize for the alleged polio virus the same year, all researchers believed his technique to be scientifically valid. Thus, to date, the entire concept of measles has been based upon this technique. Thus, the measles vaccines do not contain viruses, but particles of dead monkey kidney tissue or human cancer cells.

To date, no negative control experiments have been done with respect to the so-called measles virus either, which would have shown that it is the laboratory procedures that lead to the cytopathic effects on the cells. Additionally, all claims and experiments made by Enders et al. and the subsequent researchers lead to the only objective conclusion that in fact they were observing and analyzing dying cellular particles and the activity thereof in the test tube, misinterpreting these as particles and characteristics of the alleged measles virus.

The measles virus as an example

The following explanations apply to all the so-called (human or animal) “pathogenic viruses”.

The six papers provided by Dr Bardens in the course of the “measles trial” as proof for the existence of the measles virus describe in a didac-

tically ideal way the various steps of the chain of misinterpretations up to the belief in the existence of a measles virus.

The first paper was published in 1954 by Enders et al.: “Propagation in tissue cultures of cytopathogenic agents from patients with measles” (Proc Soc Exp Biol Med. 1954 Jun; 86 (2): 277–286). This publication can be found on the internet, like all the other publications presented at the measles trial.

In that experiment, Enders et al. cut down dramatically on the nutrient solution and added cell-destroying antibiotics to the cell culture before introducing the allegedly infected fluid. The subsequent dying of the cells was then misinterpreted as presence and also isolation of the measles virus. No control experiments were performed to exclude the possibility that it was the deprivation of nutrients as well as the antibiotics which led to the cytopathic effects. Enders’ and his colleagues’ blindness can be explained by the fact that he truly wanted to help people, while the virus hysteria was intensifying after the war and during the cold war. It can also be explained by the fact that Enders and many of his colleagues had no idea about medicine and they were competing with the Soviet Union for the development of the first measles vaccine.

Such a pressure for success can also explain why Enders and his colleagues ignored their own reservations and cautions expressed in 1954, when they had observed and noted that many cells also died after being treated normally (i.e. without being “infected”), which they thought to have been caused by unknown viruses and factors. All these facts and cautions were subsequently disregarded.

The second paper presented by the claimant in the measles trial was published in 1959⁴ and, for the reasons presented above, the authors concluded that the technique introduced by Enders was not appropriate for the isolation of a virus. This rebuttal is not only NOT being discussed by all the other researchers, but it is being ignored.

In the third paper⁵, the authors photographed typical cellular particles inside the cells and misinterpreted these as measles virus. They did not isolate any virus. For unexplained reasons, they failed to determine and describe the biochemical structure of what they were presenting as a virus in a separate experiment. In the short description of the methods used, one can read that the authors did not apply the standard isolation technique for viruses, i.e. the density gradient centrifugation. They simply centrifuged fragments of dead cells at the bottom of a test tube and then, without describing their biochemical structure, they misinterpreted the cellular debris as viruses. From the way the experiments were performed, one can only conclude that cellular particles were misinterpreted as viruses. We find the same situation in the fourth⁶ and the sixth⁷ publication put forward by the claimant as proof of the existence of a measles virus.

The fifth publication⁸ is a review describing the consensus process as to which nucleic acid molecules from the dead cells would represent the so-called genome of the measles virus. The result is that dozens of researchers teams work with short pieces of cell-specific molecules, after which -following a given model – they put all the pieces together on paper. However, this jigsaw puzzle made of so many pieces was never scientifically proven to exist as a whole and was never isolated from a virus, for a measles virus has never been seen, neither in humans nor in a test tube.

Referring to this publication, the court-appointed expert stated that it described the gold standard, i.e. the entire virus genome. It is obvious that the expert did not read this paper, whose authors stated that the exact molecular composition and functions of the measles virus genome will have to be the object of further research, which is why they had to rely on other virus models in order to achieve a consensus on the structure and functions of the measles virus genome.

The easiest thing for anyone to notice is that in all these publications, as well as in all other

publications on the “measles virus” and other pathogenic viruses, no control experiments were ever performed. No researchers used the density gradient centrifugation technique; instead, they only centrifuged cellular debris at the bottom of a test tube. This technique, used to collect all the particles from a fluid, is called pelleting. From a logical and scientific perspective, it can be said that in all publications on so-called “pathogenic viruses”, the researchers demonstrated in fact only particles and characteristics of cells.

In our next issue of WissenschaftPlus, we will publish the scientific rebuttal of the claim that the measles virus exists, which applies to all so-called pathogenic viruses.

We would also like to point out another article, in which we described the so-called giant viruses⁹, i.e. an unwrapped nucleic acid that can be found everywhere in the sea and in basic organisms. Like all bacterial phages, not only they are harmless, but they have beneficial functions. They can be also isolated by using the density gradient centrifugation, which proves their existence (see the graphics above).

We also recommend Prof Lütke’s relevant review (1999).¹⁰ He noted that at the early beginnings of virology, the majority of virologists always concluded that the structures they had mistaken for viruses turned out to be components of the cells and thus, they were only the result of the experiment and not the cause of the changes observed. After the discovery and characterization of the phages and after introducing the dogma that the nucleic acid was the genome of all cells and viruses, the consensus was born, according to which such viruses must exist in humans and animals as well.

In 1992, the dogma stating that the nucleic acid is the genotype of all cells was retracted in the scientific community. In 2008, it was also retracted for a part of the German public community.¹¹ The dogma of pathogenic viruses, however, is still being promoted. ►



The Australian Perth Group (led by Eleni Papadopoulos-Eleopoulos, Val Turner and John Papadimitriou)¹² proved with scientific arguments that HIV has not been demonstrated to exist. It was Eleni Papadopoulos-Eleopoulos who as early as in 1992 encouraged and offered me scientific support to accept the reality about HIV, to study the facts and share the knowledge that there are no pathogenic viruses. I am very thankful to her and her team.

Quellen:

¹ Siehe Ausführungen zu Virchows Leben und Wirkung in WissenschaftPlus Nr. 5/2015 und Nr. 6/2015.

² Anticontagionism between 1821 and 1867. Aufsatz von Erwin H. Ackerknecht in der Zeitschrift Bulletin of the History of Medicine, Volume XXII, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1948.

³ Das Robert Koch-Institut im Nationalsozialismus. Buch von Annette Hinz-Wessels, 192 Seiten, 2008. Kulturverlag Kadmos Berlin.

⁴ Bech V, Magnus Pv. Studies on measles virus in monkey kidney tissue cultures. Acta Pathol Microbiol Scand. 1959; 42 (1): 75–85.

⁵ Nakai M, Imagawa DT. Electron microscopy of measles virus replication. J. Virol. 1969 Feb; 3v (2): 187–97.

⁶ Lund GA, Tyrell, DL, Bradley RD, Scraba DG. The molecular length of measles virus RNA and the structural organization of measles nucleocapsids. J. Gen. Virol. 1984 Sep; 65 (Pt 9): 1535–42.

⁷ Daikoku E, Morita C, Kohno T, Sano K. Analysis of Morphology and Infectivity of Measles Virus Particles. Bulletin of the Osaka Medical College. 2007; 53 (2): 107–14.

⁸ Horikami SM, Moyer SA. Structure, Transcription, and Replication of Measles Virus. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol. 1995; 191: 35–50.

⁹ Siehe WissenschaftPlus Nr. 1/2014.

¹⁰ Zur Geschichte der frühen Virusforschung. Übersichtsarbeit von Prof. Karlheinz Lüttke. Reprint 125 des MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTSGESCHICHTE, 89 Seiten, 1999.

¹¹ Erbgut in Auflösung. Die ZEIT vom 16.6.2008. Siehe zu diesem Thema die Beiträge in WissenschaftPlus seit 2003.

¹² <http://www.theperthgroup.com>

MAUNAWAI
my Water




MAUNAWAI® PIPRIME® Water filter system



+ Long term studies prove

- Removes pollutants
- Eliminates arrears of drugs and hormones
- Very good results also for uranium, fluoride and chlorine
- Tastes like spring water

Dimensions:
30 x 55 cm (WxH)
Price:
from 399,- Euro



before
unfiltered
tap water



after
going through
a MAUNAWAI®
filter



Information and Sale

Telephone: +49 3327 5708926

www.wissenschaftplus.maunawai.com

Razotkrivanje teorije virusa

"Virus ospica" kao primjer

Zašto bismo sumnjali u postojanje virusa? Što su virusi a što nisu? Kako se znanstveno pokazuje da virusi postoje?

Autor: dr. Stefan Lanka

Preuzeto iz časopisa WISSENSCHAFTPLUS - Das Magazin
6/2015

Znanstvenici moraju preispitivati sve, a posebno ono što najviše vole, tj. vlastita otkrića i ideje. Ovo osnovno pravilo znanstvenog istraživanja pomaže u izbjegavanju pogrešnih događaja i otkriva one koji već postoje. Također, svima mora biti dopušteno preispitivanje statusa quo, inače bismo živjeli u diktaturi. Štoviše, znanost se ne može ograničiti na odabrani broj institucija i stručnjaka. Znanost može i mora provoditi svatko tko ima potrebno znanje i odgovarajuće metode. Znanost se može smatrati znanostu samo ako su njezine tvrdnje provjerljive, ponovljive i ako dopuštaju predviđanja. Znanost također treba vanjsku kontrolu, jer, kao što ćemo vidjeti, dio medicinskih znanosti već je prilično izgubio vezu sa stvarnošću. Svatko tko ima znanje o biologiji i genezi života, razvoju i funkcijama tkiva i tijela i mozga, automatski će dovesti u pitanje pretpostavke o virusima. U stvarnosti tijela i njegovih mehanizama nema mjesta hipotetskim malignim procesima. Sve biološke procese, uključujući one koji mogu završiti patnjom, boli i smrću, izvorno trebaju biti korisni. Moguć je i potreban drugačiji pristup pojavi virusa: bilo koji laik koji čita neko znanje iz pozadine znanstvenih radova o patogenim virusima mogu shvatiti da takvi virusi ne postoje i da su opisane samo tipične komponente i karakteristike stanica. Ovo osnovno znanje pružit će se u ovom članku.

Poreklo ideje

Sadašnji pojam virusa temelji se na drevnim idejama da su sve bolesti uzrokovane otrovima („toksinima“) i da bi ljudi povratili svoje zdravlje proizvodeći "antitoksine" kao "protuotrov". Doista, nekoliko bolesti uzrokuju otrovi. Naknadna ideja da tijelo može obnoviti svoje zdravlje proizvodnjom ili davanjem "protuotrova" rodila se kad je to primijećeno da su ljudi preživjeli veće količine otrova (poput alkohola) kad im se tijelo treniralo polaganim konzumiranjem količine tog otrova. Međutim, u stvarnosti ne postoje protuotrovi, već tijelo proizvodi enzime, koji neutraliziraju i eliminirati otrove (alkohol).

1858. godine Rudolf Virchow, utemeljitelj moderne medicine, plagirao je nalaze drugih znanstvenika, potiskujući njihove bitna otkrića i time se rodio i nametnuo lažni pogled na uzrok bolesti kao dogma, koja je zapravo još uvijek djelotvorna do danas. Prema ovoj dogmi, sve bolesti navodno potječu iz stanica.¹ Virchowova stanična patologija je uvedena u medicinu i ona pobija drevnu humoralnu doktrinu tvrdeći da se bolesti razvijaju od patogenih otrova (na latinskom: virus). Potraga za tim patogenim otrovima i danas je ostala bez ploda, međutim, kada su otkrivene bakterije, pretpostavljalo se da su one proizvodile patogene otrove. Ova pretpostavka, nazvana "teorija klica", odmah je prihvaćena i ostaje vrlo uspješna do danas. Ova je teorija toliko uspješna da je većina ljudi još uvijek nije svjesna činjenica da su takozvani bakterijski toksini zapravo normalni enzimi, koji se ili ne mogu pojaviti u čovjeku, ili ako to čine, nikad se ne pojavljuju u tolikoj količini da bi ih učinili opasnim. Tada je otkriveno da, kad polako počnu umirati, bakterije stvaraju male, naoko beživotne oblike preživljavanja takozvane spore. Tada se sumnjalo da su te spore

otrovne i da su to takozvani patogeni otrovi. Ovo je tada opovrgnuto, budući da se spore brzo razvijaju u bakterije kada se obnavljaju njihovi vitalni resursi. Kada su znanstvenici u laboratorijama primijetili da su slabe visokooplodne bakterije vrlo brzo stradale, i pretvorile se u puno manje strukture od spora, prvo se vjerovalo da je navodni patogen ubio otrovnu bakteriju, zvani virusi, i da su se virusi time replicirali. Zbog vjerovanja da su ove - u vrijeme njihovog otkrića još uvijek nevidljive - strukture ubijale bakterije, one su to i činile nazvani su fagi / bakteriofagi, "izjedači bakterija". Tek kasnije utvrđeno je da su samooplodne i stoga gotovo od neživih bakterija može se napraviti da se pretvore u fage ili bakterije koje se uništavaju tako brzo da nemaju vremena da tvore spore.

Uvođenje elektronske mikroskopije dovelo je do otkrića struktura koje su rezultat transformacije bakterija kad su iznenada umirale ili kada je metabolizam visokooplodnih klica bio preplavljen procesima pokrenutim dodavanjem "faga". Otkriveno je i da postoje stotine vrsta "faga" različitog izgleda. Otkriće faga, takozvanih bakterijskih "virusa", ojačalo je pogrešnu pretpostavku i uvjerenje da postoje ljudski i životinjski virusi koji su izgledali isto i imali istu strukturu. To nije i ne može biti slučaj iz nekoliko različitih razloga. Nakon uvođenja tehnika kemijskog ispitivanja u biologiji, otkriveno je da postoje tisuće vrsta faga te da fagi jednog tipa imaju uvijek istu strukturu. Sastoje se od određene molekule, načinjene od nukleinske kiseline, koja je prekrivena ljuskom bjelančevina određenog broja i sastava. Tek kasnije otkriveno je da bakterije koje su bile rođene u epruveti, mogu se i same pretvoriti u fage, dodikom s fagovima, ali to nikada nije primijenjeno na prirodne bakterije već samo na bakterije koje su upravo izolirane iz svog prirodnog okoliša. U ovom je procesu je otkriveno da ti "bakterijski virusi" zapravo služe za opskrbu drugih bakterija važnim molekulama i proteinima, i da su same bakterije nastale iz takvih struktura. Prije nego što se moglo ustanoviti da

"bakterijski virusi" ne mogu ubiti prirodne bakterije, ali im umjesto toga pomažu da žive i da same bakterije izlaze iz takvih struktura, ti su "fagi" već korišteni kao modeli za navodne viruse ljudi i životinja. Pretpostavljalo se da su ljudski i životinjski virusi izgledali poput "faga", koji su navodno ubijali stanice i da na taj način uzrokuju bolesti, istodobno stvarajući nove otrove i na taj način prenoseći bolesti.

Do danas su virusima pripisane mnoge nove ili naizgled nove bolesti iako je njihovo podrijetlo nepoznato ili nepotvrđeno. Ovaj je refleks našao očitu potvrdu u otkriću "bakterijskih virusa". Važno je napomenuti da je teorija borbe i zaraze prihvaćena i visoko hvaljena od strane većine stručnjaka samo ako i kada su zemlje ili regije u kojima su živjeli također patili od rata i nedaća. U doba mira, drugi su koncepti dominirali svijetom znanosti. 2

Vrlo je važno napomenuti da teorija infekcije - započinje iz Njemačke - globalizirana je tek kroz treći Reich, kada su židovski istraživači, od kojih se većina protivila i pobijali politički iskorištene teorije zaraze, uklonjeni sa svojih položaja.3

O otkrivanju faga

Postojanje faga može se brzo dokazati. Prvi korak: njihova prisutnost potvrđuje se putem učinka, naime transformacija bakterija u fage, a također i elektronskom mikrografijom tih faga. Kontrolni eksperimenti pokazuju da se fagi ne pojavljuju ako se bakterije ne promijene ili ako se bakterije slučajno počnu raspadati zbog vanjskog iznenadnog uništavanja, bez stvaranja faga.

Drugi korak: tekućina koja sadrži fage koncentrira se i nanosi na drugu tekućinu koja ima visoku koncentraciju pri dnu epruvete i nisku koncentraciju na vrhu epruvete. Epruveta s fagovima se tada snažno centrifugira i sve se čestice skupljaju prema svojoj masi i težini na svoje mjesto gustoća. Gustoća je omjer mase po

jedinici volumena, izražen kao Kg / l odnosno g / mg. Iz tog razloga ovaj korak koncentracije i pročišćavanja za čestice iste gustoće naziva se centrifugiranje s gradijentom gustoće. Sloj u kojem se skupi mnogo čestica iste gustoće postaje "oblačan", što se naziva "traka". Ovaj korak se dokumentira, zatim se čestice koncentrirane, pročišćene i taložene u "traci" uklanjaju iglom šprica. Izvučena koncentrirana količina čestica naziva se izolat. Brz i jednostavan elektronski mikrograf potvrdit će prisutnost faga u izolatu, što je istodobno pokazatelj čistoće izolata, ako mikrograf ne pokazuje druge čestice osim faga. Izgled i promjer faga također će se utvrditi uz pomoć ove mikrografije. Kontrolni pokus izveden za ovaj korak sastoji se u obradi i centrifugiranju tekućine iz bakterije koje nisu stvorile nikakve fage, gdje se na kraju postupka ne pojavljuju fagi. Nakon koraka uspješne izolacije faga, slijedi odlučujuća biokemijska karakterizacija faga. Biokemijska karakterizacija njihova sastava bitna je za prepoznavanje specifične vrste faga, budući da se različite vrste fage često čine sličnima. Izolat dobiven centrifugiranjem s gradijentom gustoće sada je podijeljen u dva dijela. Jedan dio koristi se za određivanje veličine, vrste i sastava nukleinske kiseline; u zasebnom postupku, drugi dio se koristi za određivanje količine, veličine i morfologije proteina faga. Od 1970-ih, ovi testovi su jednostavne standardne tehnike koje uči svaki student biologije u prvim semestrima. Ovi testovi predstavljaju biokemijsku karakterizaciju faga. U gotovo svakom slučaju ti su rezultati bili i jesu objavljeni u samo jednoj publikaciji, jer fag ima vrlo jednostavnu strukturu koju je vrlo lako analizirati. Kontrolni eksperimenti za ove testove koriste tekućinu iz bakterija koje ne tvore fage i stoga ne mogu predstavljati nikakav biokemijski dokaz. Na taj je način znanstveno dokazano postojanje otprilike dvije tisuće različitih vrsta faga.

O navodnom dokazu patogenih virusa

"Bakteriofagi", ispravno su definirani kao nečelovite mini spore i građevinski blokovi bakterija, znanstveno su izolirani, *dok navodni patogeni virusi nikada nisu primijećeni u ljudima ili životinjama ili u njihovim tjelesnim tekućinama i nikada nisu izolirani i naknadno biokemijski analizirani*. Čini se da do danas nijedan istraživač uključen u ovu vrstu posla nije to shvatio. Korištenje elektronskog mikroskopa i biokemije vrlo su se polako vraćali u normalu nakon 1945. godine, ali ni tada nitko nije shvatao da niti jedan „patogeni virus“ nije nikada bio izoliran kod ljudi ili životinja; tako su od 1949. istraživači započeli primjenjujući istu ideju koja se koristi za (bakterio) fage, kako bi se replicirali ljudski i životinjski „virusi“. John Franklin Enders, rođen 1897. godine u obitelji bogatog financijera, bio je aktivan u raznim bratstvima nakon završetka studija, zatim je radio kao agent za nekretnine i četiri godine proučavao strane jezike prije nego što se okrenuo bakterijskoj virusologiji, koja ga je opčinila. Zatim je ideje i koncepte koje je naučio u ovom području istraživanja jednostavno prenio na pretpostavljene patogene viruse u ljudima. Svojim neznanstvenim eksperimentima i interpretacijama koje nikada nije potvrdio negativnim kontrolama, Enders je doveo čitavu "virusnu" zaraznu medicinu u slijepu ulicu. Važno je napomenuti u ovom trenutku da je Enders, poput mnogih stručnjaka za zarazne bolesti, radio za američku vojsku, koja je uvijek bila i ostala do danas ogromna žrtva straha od zaraze. Osim toga, uglavnom je američka vojska širila svoje pogrešno

uvjerenje da je kemijsko oružje bilo i biološko oružje u obliku bakterija i virusa. Enders je 1949. objavio da su uspjeli in vitro kultivirati i uzgojiti navodni virus dječje paralize na raznim tkivima. Američko stručno mišljenje je sve odmah povjerovalo. Ono što je Enders učinio bilo je dodavanje tekućine pacijentima s dječjom paralizom u tkivne kulture za koje je tvrdio da su bile sterilizirane, tada je tvrdio da stanice umiru zbog virusa, da se virus replicira na ovaj način i da se cjepivo može dobiti iz odgovarajuće kulture. U to vrijeme ljetne epidemije dječje paralize (dječja paraliza = mlitava paraliza) bile su vrlo česte tijekom ljeta i vjerovalo se da ih uzrokuju virusi dječje paralize. Cjepivo je trebalo pomoći iskorijeniti navodni virus. Nakon uvođenja cjepiva protiv dječje paralize, simptomi su samo dijagnosticirani drugačije, između ostalog kao: multipla skleroza, mlitava akutna paraliza, aseptični meningitis itd., a kasnije se lažno tvrdilo da je iskorijenjena dječja paraliza. Tijekom svojih pokusa Enders je sa suradnicima sterilizirao kulture tkiva kako bi se isključila mogućnost ubijanja bakterija stanice. Ono što nije uzeo u obzir jest da je sterilizacija i liječenje stanične kulture kod priprema za navodnu infekciju, upravo je ono što je ubijalo stanice. Umjesto toga, protumačio je citopatske učinke kao postojanje i djelovanje virusa dječje paralize, a da nikada nije izolirao niti jedan virus i opisao njegovu biokemiju. Potrebni eksperimenti negativne kontrole, koji bi pokazali da su sterilizacija i obrada stanica prethodili „infekciji“ u epruveti koja ubija stanice, nikada nisu provedene. Međutim, za ovu "izvedbu" Enders je dobio Nobelovu nagradu 1954. godine. 1954. je također godina u kojoj je Enders primijenio i uveo istu tehniku kako bi navodno replicirao virus ospica. Kako mu je iste godine dodijeljena Nobelova nagrada za navodni virus dječje paralize istraživači su vjerovali da je njegova tehnika znanstveno valjana. Tako se do danas temelji čitav koncept ospica na osnovu ove tehnike. Dakle, cjepiva protiv ospica ne

sadrže viruse, već čestice mrtvog majmunskeg bubrežnog tkiva ili ćelije raka od čovjeka.

Do danas nisu rađeni eksperimenti negativne kontrole ni u vezi s takozvanim virusom ospica, koji bi pokazali da upravo laboratorijski postupci dovode do citopatskih učinaka na stanice. Uz to, svi zahtjevi i eksperimenti koje su izveli Enders i sur. i sljedeći istraživači vode do jedinog objektivnog zaključka da su to zapravo bili promatranje i analiza umirućih staničnih čestica i njihove aktivnosti u epruveti, pogrešno ih tumačeći kao čestice i karakteristike navodnog virusa ospice.

Primjer virusa ospica

Sljedeća objašnjenja odnose se na sve takozvane (ljudske ili životinjske) „patogene viruse“. Šest radova koje je dr. Bardens pružio tijekom "ispitivanja ospica" kao dokaz za postojanje virusa ospica opisuju na didaktički idealan način razne korake lanca pogrešnih interpretacija do vjere u postojanje virus ospica. Prvi rad objavili su 1954. godine Enders i suradnici: „Razmnožavanje citopatogenih sredstava u kulturama tkiva od pacijenata s ospicama“ (Proc Soc Exp Biol Med. 1954. lipnja; 86 (2): 277–286). Ova se publikacija može naći na internetu, kao i sve druge publikacije predstavljene na suđenju protiv ospica. U tom su eksperimentu Enders i sur. dramatično smanjili hranjivu otopinu i dodali antibiotike koji uništavaju stanice stanične kulture prije unošenja navodno zaražene tekućine. Naknadno odumiranje stanica tada je pogrešno protumačeno kao prisutnost i također izolacija virusa ospica. Nisu provedeni kontrolni eksperimenti koji bi isključili mogućnost da postoji uskraćivanje hranjivih sastojaka kao i antibiotika što je dovelo do citopatskih učinaka. Endersa i njegovih kolega sljepoća se

može objasniti činjenicom da je doista želio pomoći ljudima, dok se histerija virusa pojačavala nakon rata i za vrijeme hladnog rata. To se također može objasniti činjenicom o kojoj Enders i mnogi njegovi kolege nisu imali pojma o medicini i natjecali su se sa Sovjetskim Savezom za razvoj prvog cjepiva protiv ospica. Takav pritisak za uspjeh također može objasniti zašto su Enders i njegovi kolege ignorirali vlastite rezerve i upozorenja izražena 1954. godine, kada su primijetili i ustanovili da su mnoge stanice također umrle nakon što su se normalno liječile (tj. bez da ih se "zarazi"), što su i učinile a za koje se smatralo da su ih uzrokovali nepoznati virusi i čimbenici. Sve te činjenice i upozorenja naknadno su zanemarene.

Drugi rad koji je podnositelj zahtjeva predstavio u pokusu protiv ospica objavljen je 1959. godine i, iz gore navedenih razloga, autori su zaključili da tehnika koju je uveo Enders nije prikladna za izolaciju virusa. O ovim pobijanjima ne samo da NE raspravljaju svi drugi istraživači, već se to i zanemaruje.

U trećem radu 5 autori su fotografirali tipične stanične čestice unutar stanica i pogrešno ih protumačili kao virus ospica. Nisu izolirali nijedan virus. Iz neobjašnjivih razloga nisu uspjeli utvrditi i opisati biokemijsku strukturu onoga što su predstavljali kao virus u zasebnom eksperimentu. U kratkom opisu korištenih metoda može se pročitati da autori nisu primijenili standardnu tehniku izolacije za viruse, tj.

centrifugiranje s gradijentom gustoće. Oni su jednostavno centrifugirali fragmente mrtvih stanica na dnu epruvete, a zatim, bez opisa njihove biokemijske strukture, pogrešno su protumačili stanične ostatke kao viruse. Iz načina izvođenja pokusa može se samo zaključiti da su stanične čestice pogrešno protumačene kao virusi. Istu situaciju nalazimo u četvrtoj 6 i šestoj 7 publikaciji koju je podnositelj zahtjeva iznio kao dokaz postojanja virusa ospica. Peta publikacija 8 pregled je koji opisuje proces konsenzusa oko toga koje bi molekule nukleinske kiseline iz mrtvih stanica predstavljale takozvani genom virusa

ospica. Rezultat je da deseci istraživačkih timova rade s kratkim komadićima molekula specifičnih za stanice, nakon čega - slijedeći zadani model - slože sve dijelove na papir. Međutim, ova slagalica napravljena od toliko komada nikada nije znanstveno dokazana da postoji u cjelini i nikada nije bila izolirana kao virus, jer virus ospica nikada nije viđen ni kod ljudi ni u epruveti. Pozivajući se na ovu publikaciju, sudski imenovani stručnjak izjavio je da opisuje zlatni standard, tj. cijeli genom virusa. Očito je da stručnjak nije pročitao ovaj rad, čiji su autori naveli da točan molekularni sastav i funkcije genoma virusa ospica morat će biti predmet daljnjih istraživanja, zbog čega su se morali osloniti na druge modele virusa kako bi postigli konsenzus o strukturi i funkcijama genoma virusa ospica.

Najlakše je bilo primijetiti u svim tim publikacijama, kao i u svim ostalim publikacijama o „virusu ospica“ i drugim patogenim virusima, da nikada nisu provedeni kontrolni eksperimenti. Niti jedan istraživač nije koristio gradijent gustoće tehnika centrifugiranja; umjesto toga, centrifugirali su samo stanične ostatke na dnu epruvete. Ova tehnika, prikupljanja svih čestica iz tekućine, naziva se peletiranje. Iz logičke i znanstvene perspektive može se reći da u svim publikacijama o takozvanim "patogenim virusima" istraživači su zapravo pokazali samo čestice i karakteristike stanica.

U našem sljedećem izdanju WissenschaftPlus, objavit ćemo znanstveno pobijanje tvrdnje da postoji virus ospica, što se odnosi na sve takozvane patogene viruse. Također bismo željeli istaknuti još jedan članak u kojem smo opisali takozvane divovske viruse 9, tj. Zamotane nukleinske kiseline koje se mogu naći svugdje u moru i u osnovnim organizmima. Kao i svi bakterijski fagi, ne samo da su bezopasni, već imaju korisne funkcije. Oni se također mogu izolirati pomoću centrifugiranja s gradijentom gustoće, što dokazuje njihovo postojanje (vidi

grafiku gore). Također preporučujemo relevantnu recenziju profesora Lüdtkea (1999) .10 Primijetio je da je u ranim počecima virologije većina virologa su uvijek zaključivali da se pokazalo da su strukture koje su zamijenili za viruse sastavnice stanica. Dakle, oni su bili samo rezultat eksperimenta, a ne uzrok uočenih promjena. Nakon otkrića i karakterizacija faga i nakon uvođenja dogme da je nukleinska kiselina genom svih stanica i virusa, rođen je konsenzus prema kojem takvi virusi moraju postojati i kod ljudi i životinja.

1992. godine u znanstvenoj zajednici povučena je dogma koja kaže da je nukleinska kiselina genotip svih stanica. U 2008, povučena je i za dio njemačke javne zajednice.¹¹


Dogma o patogenim virusima, međutim, još uvijek nastavlja da se promovira.

Australska Perth Group (predvođena Eleni Papadopulos-Eleopulos, Val Turner i John Papadimitriou) 12 dokazala je znanstvenim argumentima da nije dokazano da HIV postoji. Eleni Papadopulos-Eleopulos bila je ta koja je još 1992. ohrabрила i ponudila mi znanstvenu podršku da prihvatim stvarnost o HIV-u, proučim činjenice i podijelim znanje da nema patogenih virusa. Jako sam zahvalan njoj i njenom timu.

Slika

Centrifugiranje s gradijentom gustoće znanstveno je potrebna standardna tehnika za dokazivanje postojanja virusa. Unatoč činjenici da je ova metoda u svim priručnicima za mikrobiologiju opisana kao „tehnika izolacije virusa“, ona nikada nije primjenjena u eksperimentima namijenjenim demonstriranju postojanja patogenih virusa.

1. Čjevčica za centrifugiranje s gradijentom silikonskih zrnaca slojevita sa suspenzijom virusa i staničnih čestica
2. Epruveta za centrifugiranje s „trakama“ virusa i staničnih čestica nakon centrifugiranja
3. Ekstrakcijom virusne trake pipetom, virus se na taj način izolira i pročišćava.



Napomene:

1. Siehe Ausführungen zu Virchows Leben und Wirkung in WissenschaftPlus Nr. 5/2015 und Nr. 6/2015.
2. Anticontagionism between 1821 and 1867. Aufsatz von Erwin H. Ackerknecht in der Zeitschrift Bulletin of the History of Medicine, Volume XXII, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1948.
3. Das Robert Koch-Institut im Nationalsozialismus. Buch von Annette Hinz-Wessels, 192 Seiten, 2008. Kulturverlag Kadmos Berlin.
4. Bech V, Magnus Pv. Studies on measles virus in monkey kidney tissue cultures. Acta Pathol Microbiol Scand. 1959; 42 (1): 75–85.

5. Nakai M, Imagawa DT. Electron microscopy of measles virus replication. J. Virol. 1969 Feb; 3v (2): 187–97.

6. Lund GA, Tyrell, DL, Bradley RD, Scraba DG. The molecular length of measles virus RNA and the structural organization of measles nucleocapsids. J. Gen. Virol. 1984 Sep;65 (Pt 9): 1535–42.

7. Daikoku E, Morita C, Kohno T, Sano K. Analysis of Morphology and Infectivity of Measles Virus Particles. Bulletin of the Osaka Medical College. 2007; 53 (2): 107–14.

8. Horikami SM, Moyer SA. Structure, Transcription, and Replication of Measles Virus. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol. 1995; 191: 35–50.

9. Siehe WissenschaftPlus Nr. 1/2014.

10. Zur Geschichte der frühen Virusforschung. Übersichtsarbeit von Prof. Karlheinz Lüdtke. Reprint 125 des MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTSGESCHICHTE, 89 Seiten, 1999.

11. Erbgut in Auflösung. Die ZEIT vom 16.6.2008. Siehe zu diesem Thema die Beiträge in WissenschaftPlus seit 2003.

12. <http://www.thepertgroup.com>