Dear [redacted],

Here is our response to your email dated 8th April.

Regards,

Eleni and Val
April 24th 2009

I

"The common ground of both groups ["the Duesberg group and the Perth Group"] is that there is no viral agent".

Unfortunately this is not the case. In fact the vast majority, if not all the members of the "RA executive" believe "there is a viral agent". However, they disagree with each other about highly significant details and also contradict themselves in regard to the evidence said to prove its existence. According to Peter Duesberg, "HIV" has been proven to exist by "the most rigorous method available to date, i.e., molecular cloning of infectious HIV DNA".

David Rasnick disagrees: "No one has ever obtained viable, infectious, HIV…". (NB: by definition viruses are infectious. That is, the virus particles are transmitted from one cell to another cell and replicate (produce more of the same particles). This occurs *in vitro* (culture) and *in vivo*, which is person to person transmission. If there is no "infectious HIV" then there is no virus. Nonetheless, David claims: "HIV exists for the simple reason capable scientists have synthesised hundreds of versions of it in laboratories and labelled all of them HIV. By definition, that stuff was HIV".

First, viruses are particles possessing unique molecular constituents and well defined morphological characteristics and they are infectious. You cannot take something, label it HIV and say I define it as being the virus "HIV", and thus "HIV" exists.

Second, as far as we know, to date nobody has managed to synthesise any virus of any kind. We have all heard the conspiracy theories that HIV was synthesised in laboratories by retrovirologists, including Peter, including the CIA. We do not participate in conspiracy theories.

According to Etienne de Harven, by using the electron microscope the "HIV" experts were able to find particles which are "typical retroviruses". However, in his view these viruses are not HIV, they are other viral agents. Etienne's view, that is, the finding of particles with the morphological characteristics of retroviruses is

proof for the existence of a retrovirus, is not shared by Peter: "…particles and proteins could represent non-viral material altogether".

Before he became a member of the "RA executive" Henry Bauer was saying that "HIV" is a "fraud". And that he has presented evidence that "HIV" has not been isolated, that is, proved to exist. In his paper "*Incongruous Age Distributions of HIV Infections and Deaths from HIV Disease: Where Is the Latent Period Between HIV Infection and AIDS?*" he wrote: "The reason is that a successful isolation of whole virions of HIV directly from an AIDS patient or an HIV-positive person has never been accomplished or published[16-18]". References 16-18 are:

16. Bauer HH. .Jefferson, N.C. *The Origin, Persistence and Failings of HIV/AIDS Theory*: McFarland; 2007.
17. De Harven E. Problems with isolating HIV. Address to European Parliament, Dec 8, 2003. English translation by de Harven. http://hivskeptic.wordpress.com/2008/01/15/hiv-has-never-beenisolated-from-aids-patients/. Accessed Mar 23, 2008.
18. Pease EP. *AIDS, Cancer and Arthritis: A New Perspective*; 2005: pp 124-131. ISBN 0-9550567-0-5. Available at: www.phyllis-evelyn-pease.com. Accessed Mar 23, 2008.

Now he claims that if we ask for evidence for the existence of "HIV", we "…only reinforce the mainstream insistence that we're cranks".

David Crowe on the one hand claims that he disagrees with Peter over the existence of HIV but on the other convinced Kevin Borick we are wrong in this regard.

II

"…there is no sexual link to "aids" whatsoever".

It is true there is no proof AIDS is a sexually transmitted disease. Meaning AIDS is transmitted from the passive to the active sexual partner and *vice versa*. But it is equally true that since 1982, when the first study was conducted to examine the relationship between sex and AIDS, the data prove beyond doubt the receptive (passive) anal partner is at risk of getting a positive "HIV" antibody test and AIDS. This is true of both gay and heterosexual sex. Significantly, the active partner is not at risk. To use an analogy, a positive test or AIDS is like pregnancy. It can be acquired by the passive partner but not by the active partner. AIDS and a positive test, like pregnancy, can be sexually acquired but not transmitted. The difference is that pregnancy can be acquired following a single sexual contact. With AIDS it takes many contacts, that is, a high frequency of sexual contacts over a prolonged time.

The claim by some dissidents that sex plays no role in AIDS is contrary to the evidence and has done immense harm to the dissident movement. This evidence is so overwhelming that no editor of any scientific journal could support the dissidents. Because of this the "HIV" experts have labelled us as dangerous (and still do). And we were, and many of us still are.

Today all the experts have to do to cause the dissident movement irreversible harm is:

1. take the RA brochure "The AIDS Trap".
2. find a few individuals who can claim they followed the advice in this brochure and although they had never taken any drugs (legal or illicit), developed a positive test or AIDS.
3. take the "RA executive", which claims to represent all the dissidents, to court.

III

"I agree with a previous comment that cases can be argued in the alternative very effectively. Just tell a judge or a jury there are two streams of thought, one: that no virus is detected by these tests and no virus has ever been found linked with these problems and second; that these tests may indicate the presence of particles from a virus but that virus is not connected to aids. In other words the tests are detecting something totally unconnected to any known disease. So the common ground is that, whichever is correct, aids is not caused by a viral agent".

It is true we all agree that AIDS is not caused by "a viral agent", "HIV", but it is also true this is where the "common ground" ends. There is total disagreement on the main point, that is, how one proves that "HIV" is not the cause of AIDS. The arguments used by the "Duesberg group" have been presented in one form or another for over two decades but without success. Such arguments have been repeatedly rebutted by the HIV experts and such rebuttals have been published in the scientific literature. Furthermore, as we said in our response to David Crowe, in this regard it is not difficult to join sides with the HIV experts.

Let us imagine you are the Judge and you hear the following testimony:

A

David Rasnick (representing RA): HIV is harmless because it is neutralized by the antibodies.

"HIV" experts (many): Not all "HIV" antibodies are neutralising.

VFT (representing the PG): Viral antibodies are not neutralising. This was proven by Sabin as far back as 1935.

B
DR: The tests are detecting something totally unconnected to any known disease. If one takes a group of HIV positive haemophiliacs or military groups and a similar group of HIV negative the disease incidence will be the same.

"HIV" experts: The frequency is higher in the positive group.

VFT: We agree with the "HIV" experts.

C
DR: The antibody tests are "rotten". They are not a 100% specific.

"HIV" experts: True. The HIV antibody tests are not 100% specific but no antibody or any test is 100% specific. Nonetheless they are very useful in clinical practice.

VFT: There is no proof of the specificity of the antibody tests. Their specificity may approach 100% or zero. No one knows which. However, we agree with the HIV experts that they are clinically useful.

D
DR: HIV does not fulfill Koch's postulates

"HIV" experts: HIV does fulfill Koch's postulates

VFT: If one accepts that "HIV" has been isolated and thus exists, and the antibodies are "HIV" antibodies, then it is not difficult for anyone to argue Koch's postulates are fulfilled.

E
DR: Since the mechanism by which "HIV" causes AIDS is unknown, HIV cannot be the cause of AIDS.

"HIV" experts: You do not need to know the mechanism. All the evidence shows that HIV is the cause.

VFT: Just because one does not know the mechanism by which an agent causes a disease, it does not follow the agent is not the cause.

[redacted], how would you judge such testimony?