

Introduction To The Book: "Inventing the AIDS Virus, by Peter H. Duesberg

[Source](#)

[Return To Karl Loren's Article About AIDS](#)

[E-mail this article about AIDS from Karl Loren to a friend](#)

Duesberg
on AIDS

[Home](#) | [History](#) | [Scientific Papers](#) | [Articles](#) | [Media](#)
[Books](#) | [FAQ](#) | [Viewpoints](#) | [Related Sites](#) | [Subject Index](#) | [Contact Us](#)

[Viewpoints](#) > Kary Mullis

Kary Mullis, Nobel Prize winner in Chemistry

The following was written by Kary Mullis for the introduction to the book "Inventing the AIDS Virus" by Peter H. Duesberg (Regnery Publishing, INC; Washington DC, 1996):

In 1988 I was working as a consultant at Specialty Labs in Santa Monica, CA, setting up analytic routines for the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV). I knew a lot about setting up analytic routines for anything with nucleic acids in it because I invented the Polymerase Chain Reaction. That's why they hired me.

Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), on the other hand, was something I did not know a lot about. Thus, when I found myself writing a report on our progress and goals for the project, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health, I recognized that I did not know the scientific reference to support a statement I had just written: "HIV is the probable cause of AIDS."

So I turned to the virologist at the next desk, a reliable and competent fellow, and asked him for the reference. He said I didn't need one. I disagreed. While it's true that certain scientific discoveries or techniques are so well established that their sources are no longer referenced in the contemporary literature, that didn't seem to be the case with the HIV/AIDS connection. It was totally remarkable to me that the individual who had discovered the cause of a deadly and as-yet-uncured disease would not be continually referenced in the scientific papers until that disease was cured and forgotten. But as I would soon learn, the name of that individual - who would surely be Nobel material - was on the tip of no

Let's Kill Stones

• *by Karl Loren*

 [E-mail this article about AIDS, by Karl Loren to a friend](#)

[Write to tell Karl What You Think of This Article You will get a personal response.](#)



**IT'S HARD TO KILL SOMETHING
ALREADY DEAD**

by Karl Loren


Government scientists get billions of dollars to research how to kill stones!

It's true. Most people can reasonably agree that stones and mountains of rock are not alive and that it would be fruitless to spend money figuring out how to kill them.



Yet your tax dollars pay for research in how to kill things that are already dead.

Almost all of medicine is on the wrong track -- originally looking for drugs which would kill the bad bugs inside us -- bacteria and germs that cause illness and disease. They seldom study what makes a man well! They study what makes man sick! There is a long and well-documented history of who was looking for what in terms of causes of disease. Generally, for centuries, the researchers have been looking in the wrong direction. There is a good book written by Dr. Peter H. Duesberg. In THAT book (click on image to the left) you'll find the best history I've ever read of how health research on AIDS went wrong -- many years ago. Here is a publisher's



note:


Duesberg, the world's foremost retrovirus expert, argues that no conclusive link has ever been proved to exist between HIV and AIDS. In this collection of essays, Dr. Duesberg theorizes that the various diseases under the AIDS umbrella are brought on by long-term recreational drug use, unhealthy living conditions and are not sexually transmitted. ([source](#) -- [copied source](#))

[Click here](#) to read an article by Dr. Peter Duesberg, and find the link to his web site. [Click here](#) to read the introduction to the above book by a Nobel Prizewinner in chemistry. Time Magazine has been in the forefront of spreading false information about AIDS -- all to the aid of the drug companies that get billions of dollars in research money to kill stones. Click on the Time Magazine cover to read some of Time's lies about AIDS.



*Much of today's medicine and today's processed food create illness and disease. There is a new science being developed by a few of us -- we who are trained as investigators, not as medical doctors. That new science is called Anabiology, meaning the **science of restoring something to a formerly healthy condition**. Hundreds of years ago man was physically in great shape! This article is written by Karl Loren, researcher, author and publisher of more than 20,000 pages, health subjects, on 18 web sites. Karl is also the Founder of the International Academy of Anabiology.*

Ancient man? He often died from lion attacks and other violence, and his life span was not that great, but during the time he was alive, he was very alive. Modern science has to be acknowledged for introducing the vital concept of sanitation and of the germ killers. But modern life has also brought heart disease and cancer -- not known hundreds of years ago.



But, in the last few decades the only new things introduced by medical science have been new ways to make more money -- like the [fraud of bypass surgery!](#)

One of the latest in fraudulent medical ideas is the one that something called a virus can cause

disease and illness. That fraud is making billions for fake researchers.

Karl Loren

http://www.viewpointkarl.com/viewpoint/karl_loren/article2.htm

Here is a review of a book by the most famous expert on the virus:



Prof. Peter Duesberg

Dr. Duesberg, the world's foremost retrovirus expert, argues that no conclusive link has ever been proved to exist between HIV and AIDS. In this collection of essays, Dr. Duesberg theorizes that the various diseases under the AIDS umbrella are brought on by long-term recreational drug use, unhealthy living conditions and are not sexually transmitted. ([source](#))

[Click here to go to a page with more information about Dr. Duesberg.](#)

An earlier book, co-authored by Dr. Duesberg and one of his graduate students, Bryan J. Ellison, has actually been banned from publication and may not be sold or given away for free. I purchased a copy of that Book before it was banned -- and have it still. This Book? -- [click here.](#)

"As far as I know, this is the first time in American history that the Federal government has banned a documentary book," said Ellison, who was clearly shaken by the decision.

You can read the full story about the government attacking this book, and why, by [clicking here.](#) Part way down that page are many links to the more than 250 scientific articles on the myths about AIDS and the "virus." At the bottom of that page is a publication on the web site of Dr. Duesberg, of a book written by him and Mr. Ellison. This is information you will not easily find elsewhere.



Many others have written on this same subject. That fact that YOU haven't seen these articles in your newspaper is a tribute to how well the drug companies control the media. Here is another doctor, writing about the virus:

First, let me tell you what a virus is NOT. A virus is not a bacterium, nor an independently-living organism. A virus cannot survive in the absence of a living cell within which to synthesize copies of itself (replicate). Antibiotics do not harm a virus; it is for this reason that treatment for the "flu" for example, is mainly to help ease the symptoms of the illness rather than to kill the organism which causes the "flu." ([source](#))

Even THIS author is using the "wrong" words. He talks of the virus as "causing" the flu. This is a wrong-headed view, as you'll see below.

While Dr. Duesberg, and Mr. Ellison give the exact scientific explanation of why the "war on AIDS" can never be won -- because the HIV (virus) is not the cause of AIDS, this issue of Viewpoint addresses this same question in a philosophical way -- so that anyone with a dictionary

Be careful! This information is considered "dangerous" by the US Government!

This story starts with a fundamental philosophical question -- one which practically no doctor ever examines. That question is:

WHAT IS LIFE?



Without getting into religion, what is life? That's a serious question which medical science must answer if they ever want to study health. If they intend to study only death, they need not define life. That seems to be the way they are going.

Life is motion -- all life includes the concept of motion. Not all motion indicates life, so let's look more technically.

Even if most doctors don't deal with the viewpoint of life, they do have to at least include that word in their dictionaries. Here's what a typical medical dictionary says about "life:"

Life: Generally, living things share, in varying degrees the following characteristics: organization, irritability, movement, growth, reproduction and adaptation. [Footnote #1]


That seems sufficiently materialistic to be acceptable within the field of medical science.

Even though this word is defined in a medical dictionary, it was not defined in a typical medical textbook of more than 2,300 pages. The word is surely used a lot, but not defined. [Footnote #2]

One of the most famous text books in all of medicine has certainly been the famous Gray's Anatomy. While that book is out of print, almost every medical student and certainly every doctor has a copy and has had that Book as one of his course assignments. My copy has a cover like the image to the right, and



is called "The Classic Collector's Edition" of Gray's Anatomy. [[Footnote #3](#)]



Unbelievably, that famous Book does not include a definition of life!

How about a standard, non-medical, dictionary?

Life: The property or quality manifested in functions such as metabolism, growth, response to stimulation, and reproduction, by which living organisms are distinguished from dead organisms or from inanimate matter.

Footnote #4]

The absence of the definition in standard medical textbooks is very revealing and I'll address that subject in another article. But, for now, let's just take the two definitions, which don't conflict, and then look at this interesting thing called a virus.

The medical dictionary has many pages for the definition of virus, but boiled down and simplified, it says:

Virus: A part of the whole blueprint of some cell, without the ability to take in food or grow, and capable of reproduction only within a living cell. [[Footnote #1](#)]

The standard dictionary, with some words simplified, makes it rather clear what a virus is:

Virus: A part of the whole blueprint of some cell, where that blueprint has been altered from the form in some original healthy cell. [[Footnote #2](#)]

Footnote #4]


I'm glad you were willing to wade through those definitions.

Did you notice that the virus does NOT have the characteristics of life?

VIRUS NOT ALIVE!

Living things are capable of independent movement. A virus cannot move itself. It is an object which is moved by the blood stream, or other fluids in the body. A cell can move. Some can swim upstream! A cell is alive and it is fair game when it comes to anti-biotics -- substances which kill life!

Living things are capable of taking in food and growing. A virus cannot and does not take in food or grow. The word metabolism means the physical changes inside the body, whereby food is changed into body tissue -- new cells. Living things can metabolize food. A virus cannot metabolize anything. A living cell can and does metabolize various substances, such as water.




Living things are subject to reaction. When you poke at them, they do something. When you poke at a stone, it moves because you poked, but it doesn't have any reaction of its own. A virus does NOT react to stimulation.

Living things can and do organize themselves. Even one living cell is a vast organization of small parts, none of which is alive by itself, but all of which, in one combined unit, have the other characteristics of life.

Living things can reproduce. One cell, all by itself, is capable of creating a new cell. A virus is often described as being able to reproduce, but always the condition is put there that it can only replicate WITHIN a living cell.

So, by any of the agreed definitions of life, a virus is not alive. [Click here](#) for yet another explanation of the difference between a living bacteria and a non-living virus -- but, even here, this author ascribes the qualities of "life" to the non-living virus! The image on the right is a virus.



There have been those who claim that life actually started from "mud," and that there is no need to acknowledge any spiritual source of life. Such persons can, of course, claim that even a stone is alive, as they have claimed, and thus worthy of being killed. Basically, those who claim the virus to be alive are using the "man is mud" theory of creation. I suppose they are entitled to that belief. It is no more provable by science than that God created life. Fortunately for us, we need not get into any dispute about whether stones (and hence viruses) are alive because there is a perfectly fine explanation of what happens in the body without ascribing "life" to a piece of mud!

Here is the history of the origin of life:

One of the most fundamental axioms of biology is that all life comes from pre-existing life. Still, until the later part of the 19th century, life was believed to arise from non-living matter by a process called "spontaneous generation." Ancient Egyptians, for example, thought mice arose from the mud of the Nile. In 1600, J. B. Helmont even reported "proof" for the spontaneous generation of mice claiming that if wheat, cheese, and soiled linen are placed together in a jar, mice will eventually appear! This idea of the spontaneous generation of life from non-life was so deeply ingrained in biological thought that it took nearly 200 years of experimental evidence to completely disprove it. ([source](#))

The concept of life from mud was furthered by Charles Darwin, and is still believed by many "scientists."

Most evolutionists are dead certain that life evolved by chance (without divine intervention) from non-living chemicals through a process called "chemical evolution." Some evolutionists even insist that life must have independently evolved more than once on earth. Most evolutionists are confident that life has evolved many times in many other places in the universe. Although Darwin spoke longingly of the chance origin of life from simple chemicals in some "warm little pond," there has never been evidence that anything remotely like this has ever happened. In fact, the evidence for chemical evolution is so embarrassing, some evolutionists insist that the whole idea of the origin of life is not even a part of the theory of evolution but rather is a creationist plot to discredit evolution!

Evolutionists speculate that life gradually evolved from mere hydrogen in a series of stages. The first stage began about 15 billion years ago with the "Big Bang" which produced an expanding cloud of hydrogen gas -- all else was void. With time and energy, hydrogen transformed into all the other chemical elements. Then, about 4 billion years ago, the earth's atmosphere consisted of methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water, from which life would inevitably evolve. ([source](#))

Psychology was, originally, the "study of the soul" and when they couldn't find it, they fell into the Darwinian camp, believing only that man is an "animal" that rose from the mud -- and that you can plumb



the depths of his character by measuring his reaction to stimuli. Chemicals, electric shock and brain surgery are the stock in trade of those who believe that man came from the mud -- I would put most doctors and virtually all drug companies in this category, too. [Click here](#) for my history of psychology, starting with the effect Aristotle was having on the Catholic Church.

When you click on that link, or the image, you'll read how the question, "How Many Angels Can Fit On The Head Of A Pin?" could be such a truly burning question just a few hundred years ago -- at the dawn of psychology. Believe me, this has everything to do with AIDS.

I have written a major article on the destruction of the American Education system, caused by two men -- long ago. These men dumped onto American society, and more particularly, the American educational system, the concept that man arose from the mud. With this concept it is easy to believe that a virus can be the CAUSE over anything. So, we owe the stupidity about viruses to John D. Rockefeller and Dr. W. Wundt -- both born around 1840. This is an amazing story -- well researched and presented by me, Karl Loren. Don't miss it. [CLICK HERE.](#)

Why, then, do we hear so much about medical science trying to find ways to kill the bad viruses!

Why are viruses given such a label of being dangerous?


CAUSE V. EFFECT

Medical science doesn't understand the difference between cause and effect. This problem has lingered for centuries!

They Are Chasing Their Own Tails!

Medical science, for decades, has been going down the wrong path -- the path of looking for causes among the effects.

They see a sick cell, notice a virus in it, and foolishly assume that this virus is the cause of the sickness in the cell. Rather they should look in the other direction -- in the direction of



the virus being the effect of sickness within the cell.

THEN they would realize that they had looked in the wrong direction for the cause, and start looking for the REAL cause of sickness in the cell.

In [another article](#) I've written about what are some REAL causes of illness -- but the virus is not among them. This is not true because the virus is NOT associated with illness. It is true because the virus, itself, is not the cause of sickness.


BRILLIANT SCIENTISTS?

How can so many brilliant scientists be wrong, and author Karl Loren be right? Let's look at a mechanism which fools the usual scientists.

Start with examination of some healthy cells, taken in a blood sample. A few months later, in a new blood sample, the doctor looks and finds that the cells look different. In place of the formerly healthy blood cells there are now cells which contain within themselves a virus. The doctor gives this virus a label -- calls it the AIDS virus, and then gets billions of dollars to figure out how to kill the thing.

What happened there was that some healthy cell got sick. When the healthy cell got sick some of the small parts inside the cell were damaged because of a lack of proper food being taken in by the cell.

That damage is not any different than if a blueprint, made of paper, had a piece torn off -- not any different than if the blueprint



had some smudge marks that made the plumbing connect up with the electrical outlets instead of the bathroom faucets.

One of the most important parts inside the cell is the blueprint that governs how the cell will reproduce itself. That blueprint,

often referred to as the DNA, is just a large, complicated molecule and all it takes to damage it is for one or two electrons to be moved out of the molecule, or one or two new electrons to be added. That makes this complex molecule into a DIFFERENT molecule, a different blueprint, an altered DNA. [Click here](#) for a DNA Tutorial.

Let me go back a minute. For those who still believe in Darwin, and his concept that man came from the mud, there is generally a belief that the virus existed before more highly developed life forms, and that the virus was, in turn, one of the developments of more primitive chemical reactions in (the mud) that sea of amonia.

Here is a quote from a modern "thinker" who still claims that man came from the mud:

Many years ago, Lecomte De Nouy "proved" that life could not have arisen by chance or accident, because it is just too improbable to have all the right atoms to come together by chance in the right numbers and configurations. He calculated the probability of this n-body collision, and concluded that the time required for this to happen by chance would be far longer than the known age of the universe. Ergo, he reasoned, God must have created life.

To me, that argument is fallacious, because ([source](#))

One of the origins of the man from mud concept was Greek mythology. [Click here](#) to read that story.

The most influential man to claim that man arose from the mud was Dr. W. Wundt, a psychologist who founded the behavioral psychology movement that took over American education. [Click here](#) to learn a great deal about him and his works.

So man did come from the mud, according to some, and once you accept that you can comfortably assert that a virus is a "form of life." It may not be as "alive" as a bacteria, but since all life originated in mud and chemicals, then the virus is properly on that evolutionary chain!

Let's move back to reality. There is no question that a living cell can die -- become a dead cell.



The Grim Reaper Comes: A CELL DIES

Now, that cell dies. It can die for many reasons, but the event of death means that all the parts that were inside that cell gradually become disintegrated into random pieces floating in the blood stream.

The body treats this stuff like garbage, to be disposed of like any trash that is no longer useful. A lot of it goes out through your urine.



One of those pieces is the damaged blueprint. That is the DNA from the cell, formerly OK, but now disintegrating and obviously altered. That blueprint, floating in the blood, has none of the characteristics of life. You couldn't possibly kill it any more than you can kill the trash bag under your sink. You guessed it, that floating trash -- that disintegrating DNA can be a "virus." It "comes" from life! Yes! But, it is the dead garbage from the death of life.

Something else that has no characteristic of life would be a couple ounces of *arsenic*. If you swallow a couple ounces of arsenic, you'll die. The arsenic is a simple poison. You die after taking it into your body.



The image on the left is an example of an extreme case of arsenic poisoning -- more arsenic? Death!

Here is the tricky part. Did the arsenic kill you? That is the popular way of describing the event. The truth is that the arsenic, itself, cannot cause anything, only life can be at the cause point of an event. You need to look back the chain of apparent causes until you find a unit of life. A unit of life can cause things to happen.

First, a person causes the arsenic to be taken into his body. HE is the cause of that action. Arsenic is the tool.

Then, skipping a bit, some cell inside the body causes the arsenic to be sucked into the

cell -- the arsenic didn't swim upstream, or burrow into the cell -- no, the cell caused the arsenic to enter the cell. It may be the "nature" of living cells to "take in" anything floating along in the blood stream!

Now, the cell may have other common characteristics of living things -- it may be capable of being confused. It may become unable to differentiate between good food and bad food. You probably know people who continue to eat junk food and don't eat healthy diets! Why couldn't a cell have the same confusion about what is good and what is bad food.

The cell thinks this arsenic is good stuff and uses it to repair some damaged part within the cell. It doesn't work. The damaged part can't use the arsenic and no longer performs properly within the cell. The cell doesn't die because of the arsenic, but because that damaged part did not get the proper repair materials, and because the cell didn't know how to live without that part. Like, you don't know how to live without your heart beating properly.



It's like a man dying from lack of water. He needs water. Giving him potato chips won't help him. When you don't give him water, but he is confused and chews on the potato chips, he might die. Did he die from eating potato chips? Or, did he die from lack of water? Or did he die because YOU, a living being, gave him a potato chip instead of water? (Or did he die because of his own foolishness at getting himself into this position?)

In Karl Loren's science we would look at this event and say that water needed to be restored to this body to bring it back to life. We are aiming at restoring life, not understanding killing dead things.

Modern medical science tries to blame the poisons for causing death, but the truth is better stated that it is the ABSENCE of proper nutrition and proper life style which causes death. These absences are caused by decisions and actions of living units, from the person himself down to an individual cell.

[Click here for a rather standard article about a virus.](#) This is an article that admits that scientists don't know if the virus is alive or not, but then immediately goes into language which includes phrases like: "the virus attacked the cell." Stones do not "attack." A cell can "suck in" a virus, but the virus does not "penetrate" the cell.

The virus is being blamed for millions of deaths in Africa.



The word "virus" has an old tradition in English usage. Back in 1828 the dictionary then defined "virus" as:

***Foul or contagious matter, or an ulcer, pustule
& etc. Derivation from vir = man, strong.***

By 1895 Funk & Wagnalls Company, A Standard Dictionary of the English Dictionary was defining it as:

1. A morbid poison: the morbid element or principle, whether a germ, the product of a germ, or of unknown character, that is the agent or medium for communicating infection or infectious disease; as, smallpox-virus, syphilitic virus, etc.

Virus is always the result of some morbid process, and differs from venom in that the latter is a natural secretion peculiar to certain animals or insects.

2. Hence, something that communicates moral taint; that which degrades or corrupts, as sensuality.

The virus of a cursing creed is rendered comparatively harmless by the time it reaches the young sinner in the nursery. [Holmes, Over The Teacup, Chapter 10, Page 249. (H.M. Co.)]

3. Virulence of mind; acrimony; as, the virus in his argument.

Derivation: Latin, poison

The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, 1971 Edition, defines virus as:

1. Venom, such as emitted by a poisonous snake.

2. Pathology. A morbid principle or poisonous substance produced in the body as the result of some disease, especially one capable of being introduced into other persons or animals by inoculation or otherwise, and of developing the same disease in them.

3. figurative. A moral or intellectual poison, or poisonous influence.

4. Violent animosity; virulence.

Derivation: Latin, virus = [slimy liquid, poison, offensive odor or taste](http://www.reference.com/viewtopic.php?p=10942). Hence also French, Spanish, Portuguese = virus.

In terms of scientific discovery, the first virus was "discovered" but not yet named, when Edward Jenner solved the "cowpox" disease by inoculating people with substances taken from those who had the disease and survived.



It was not until 1892 that Russian Dmitri Iwanowski discovered something so small that it could pass through all known filtering materials, and yet the liquid passed through these filters (taking out any known bacteria) still produced a disease on tobacco plants. Another scientist, independently, discovered the same thing, Dutch botanist Martinus Willem who gets credit for naming this as the "tobacco mosaic virus."

American chemist Wendell M. Stanley, in 1935, found that the "tobacco mosaic virus" could be processed into pure crystals. (Crystals don't sound very "alive!") He then could study the nature of the crystals. In 1946 Stanley received the first Nobel Prize ever awarded to a virologist, and two years later he established the Virus Lab at the Berkley campus of the University of California where, later, the now-famous Dr. Peter Duesberg studied.


Up to this point you can see that the virus was not treated as something alive! It is still not technically called a living entity, but it is sure treated in press releases now as a living entity that needs to be killed.

It would not sound so noble to be asking for money to get rid of some poison in the body -- some chemical poison! It is far more dramatic to consider this an evil living "thing" that "invades" our bodies and then "penetrates" our cells and "destroys" the immune system!

You can die because some cell has sucked in the AIDS virus, not because the AIDS virus is alive, but because the cell uses that virus in some way not intended by a healthy cell.

A sick cell sucks in the AIDS virus. A sick cell uses that AIDS virus instead of its own blueprint. A Sick cell can commit suicide!

CELL COMMITS SUICIDE



This AIDS virus, this damaged DNA particle, floats along in the blood stream. Then, some cell which is already sick, and can't detect the difference between good food and bad poison, sucks in this virus, just as it would suck in some food, just like it would suck in some arsenic.

When that virus gets sucked in, you wouldn't say that the virus invaded the cell, because that would be giving it a characteristic of life -- capable of independent motion.

You wouldn't say that a particle of arsenic worked its way into the cell -- these dead things get sucked in, they don't push their way in.

The sick cell, now also confused, sucks in the inanimate virus, and still confused, sticks that virus (which is nothing more than a piece of some old blueprint) onto its formerly healthy blueprint. In other words, the living cell is the cause of these actions. Dead things do not cause change in living things.

A stone is never the cause. You drop a large stone on a guy's foot! If you were careless, you could say that the stone hurt him, but if you were being more accurate, you would say that YOU hit the guy with a stone. YOU caused the harm, not the stone.



You simply used a tool.

When you use your fist to hit someone, you wouldn't say: "My fist hit you -- I didn't!"

When you use a hammer to hit him, you should say: "I hit you with the hammer." You would not say: "The hammer hit you!"

I'm repeating and dwelling on these points because the mistake the doctors make is ingrained into almost all of society by now -- the mistake of giving cause to objects when only living beings can be the cause of anything.

How, you say, can the clouds cause rain, which causes floods, which cause death and disaster?

That's a deeper question I'd like to get into in another article. The quick answer is that tracing back to an original cause which is a living entity is a fascinating philosophical exercise and worthy of your time -- but not in this article. Part of the answer is to trace back to what causes "weather," and consider whether man-made dams, lakes, carbon-dioxide emissions or man's over-use of fertilizer and the consequent [shortage of minerals in the soil](#), leading to lack of minerals in the plants, leading to forest fires -- could be the cause??

It's clear enough that stones don't cause painful feet, but the person who dropped the stone is the cause.

Modern medical science, going blindly down the wrong path, thinks that the virus CAUSES the problems, but the virus is only part of the effect. Most of science is not looking for the source or cause of illness -- but only at the effects.


Karl Loren looks for true causes, not effects. A true cause must always start from a living entity -- whether it be a man or a living cell.

And, in Karl's view we would have to define life more accurately than the current dictionaries do. It should be defined as:

*Life: The presence of some non-material essence within matter which allows that matter to become animated and without which that matter is not capable of movement; the essence, within matter, which causes that group of atoms and molecules to become organized into a life unit with the capability of metabolism, independent motion, reaction to stimuli, reproduction and thought. It is this ESSENCE which is life, not the matter. This essence is capable, itself, of motion and action, and is capable of animating matter so as to give matter the appearance of being alive. Matter is never "alive" but only animated by life.
(Karl Loren definition)*

The non-material essence is NOT the subject Karl writes about, other than by acknowledgment of its existence. The non-material essence could be called the soul or spirit, or it could be called by other names. It could have any sort of characteristics, but these matters are not the subject of this article.

Karl Loren does not study dead things -- just life and true science.



If research were aimed at figuring out what makes a man healthy, and actual causes of

losing that healthy condition, then the cure would be probably to first eliminate something harmful done by the person to himself. The first LAW of Karl Loren's Philosophy is to cease harming yourself.

Acting stupidly will always continue to be your free choice. The person who drinks too much alcohol dies. You should NOT say that the alcohol killed him, but rather that his own stupid actions killed him and he simply used alcohol as the tool.



Man is very capable of using tools -- the atomic bomb does not kill, but the person who designed it, the person who pushed the button -- these are the killers.

Man is capable of stupidity -- alcohol is neither capable of stupidity nor of causing death.

Don't get caught up, either, in the myth that your heredity or your environment control your IQ! That has now been long disproved, although some old thinkers haven't learned that IQ can be changed, both upwards and downwards -- another article.

Viruses are not alive. They cannot CAUSE anything, and it won't help us at all to find something that is supposed to kill them. They are already dead.

The substances which would "kill" a virus, of course, really "work" by killing the cell which contains the virus. It is easy to kill cells, and it even might be possible to kill only those cells which have a particular virus inside them. But, never make the mistake that you are killing the virus.

When science popularizes this issue, they ask for, and get, billions of dollars of your tax dollars to research how to kill the virus. They look for anti-viral drugs! They will even "find" them -- substances which sick cells suck in AFTER they have already sucked in the AIDS virus -- substances which, when sucked in, will be used by the cell to further alter the DNA inside that sick cell so that when IT disintegrates, the further-damaged DNA is no longer considered an AIDS virus.

Africa has become the largest battle field on which this battle between assigning cause to life, or assigning cause to stones -- that is the battle taking place in Africa. Life is losing! One entire

country is now being predicted to become extinct because of AIDS -- yet all the hope for cure in Africa is in drugs that only make the drug companies rich and ensure that Africans will die -- horribly. [Click here](#) for that story.

Botswana has the highest HIV prevalence in the world. One-third of its working-age adults are infected. Life expectancy, now estimated to be in the low 40s, is plummeting and could drop below 30 years by the end of the decade. Government leaders, who once celebrated the country's striking economic successes, now warn of the threat of "extinction." Business managers worry who will be left to do all the work. ([source](#))

Clinton may well have been one of the most causative agents in the extinction of Africa. It was he who started the whole push for free drugs for AIDS victims in Africa -- those drugs will kill the victims. But the drug companies don't care, nor did Clinton. [Click here](#) for a story on this.



Bill Clinton

Mr. Clinton said at a panel Thursday that conference participants were the real heroes in the fight against AIDS and that most of what officials like him have done "you've kind of dragged out of us over the course of 20 years." Mr. Clinton said he regretted not having done more about AIDS while president, citing his lack of support in 1988 for a needle-exchange program to prevent the spread of the virus among drug users. "I think I was wrong about that," he said. "I should have tried harder to do that." ([source](#))

The needle exchange program would never reduce AIDS because the cause of AIDS is elsewhere.

No matter how strong the drug, and even if there is some way of "killing" the JUST the cells containing the AIDS virus, further death is just around the corner.

Thus, you see, they have "killed" the AIDS virus, while, all the time, ignoring the path of true health:

What caused the cell to become sick enough, in the first place, to produce the altered DNA which then got labeled AIDS, and then what causes a cell to get sick enough to suck in that virus?

I've addressed that in a [separate page](#) -- the information there should change your life!

Good questions for another day. The wrong question is: "How can you kill the AIDS virus?"

Karl Loren is a popular writer and lecturer on health subjects. His book, [Life Flow One](#),

The Solution For Heart Disease, continues along the path he has chosen -- to expose the lies of big government and big drug companies. In this book he also describes a powerful new water therapy which is already available in your home -- and you don't have to pay a penny.

Footnotes

- 1. Dorland's Illustrated Medical Dictionary, Twenty-Sixth Edition ([return to reference](#))***
- 2. Cecil Textbook of Medicine, Beeson, McDermott, Wyngaarden, Fifteenth Edition ([return to reference](#))***
- 3. The Classic Collector's Edition of Gray's Anatomy, published 1977([return to reference](#))***
- 4. New College Edition -- The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, copyright 1981, Definition #1 ([return to reference](#))***
- 5.***

References

THE AFRICAN AIDS EPIDEMIC: NEW AND CONTAGIOUS - OR - OLD UNDER A NEW NAME?

Inventing the AIDs Virus: The Truth Behind the World's Greatest Miscalculation

Introduction To The Book: "Inventing the AIDS Virus, by Peter H. Duesberg

Time Magazine -- Full Of Lies About AIDS

What the Heck Is A Virus?

Stretching the Germ Theory Beyond Its Limits

Why We Will Never Win the War on AIDS

IS THE AIDS VIRUS A SCIENCE FICTION?

Virus or Bacterium?

The Origin of Life -- by David N. Menton, Christian

[DNA Tutorial Chemical Origin Of Life -- The Man Is Mud Theory Is Still "Alive!"](#)

[More False Information About The Virus](#)

[John's comments on the life of a cell](#)

[How Many Angels Can Fit On The Head Of A Pin? The Destruction Of American Education -- Leading To Corruption of Medicine](#)

[Botswana Sees Economic Rise Leveled by Raging AIDS Crisis Clinton, Mandela Call AIDS A Threat to Peace and Stability](#)

[Giant Anglo American Will Supply Free Anti-AIDS Drugs to African Workers Botswana Sees Economic Rise Leveled by Raging AIDS Crisis](#)

Of course, this simple reference had to be out there somewhere. Otherwise, tens of thousands of public servants and esteemed scientists of many callings, trying to solve the tragic deaths of a large number of homosexual and/or intravenous (IV) drug-using men between the ages of twenty-five and forty, would not have allowed their research to settle into one narrow channel of investigation. Everyone wouldn't fish in the same pond unless it was well established that all the other ponds were empty. There had to be a published paper, or perhaps several of them, which taken together indicated that HIV was the probable cause of AIDS. There just had to be.

I did computer searches, but came up with nothing. Of course, you can miss something important in computer searches by not putting in just the right key words. To be certain about a scientific issue, it's best to ask other scientists directly. That's one thing that scientific conferences in faraway places with nice beaches are for.

I was going to a lot of meetings and conferences as part of my job. I got in the habit of approaching anyone who gave a talk about AIDS and asking him or her what reference I should quote for that increasingly problematic statement, "HIV is the probable cause of AIDS."

After ten or fifteen meetings over a couple years, I was getting pretty upset when no one could cite the reference. I didn't like the ugly conclusion that was forming in my mind: The entire campaign against a disease increasingly regarded as a twentieth century Black Plague was based on a hypothesis whose origins no one could recall. That defied both scientific and common sense.

Finally, I had an opportunity to question one of the giants in HIV and AIDS research, DL Luc Montagnier of the Pasteur Institute, when he gave a talk in San Diego. It would be the last time I would be able to ask my little question without showing anger, and I figured Montagnier would know the answer. So I asked him.

With a look of condescending puzzlement, Montagnier said, "Why don't you quote the report from the Centers for Disease Control? "

I replied, "It doesn't really address the issue of whether or not HIV is the probable cause of AIDS, does it?"

"No," he admitted, no doubt wondering when I would just go away. He looked for support to the little circle of people around him, but they were all awaiting a more definitive response, like I was.

"Why don't you quote the work on SIV [Simian Immunodeficiency

"I read that too, DL Montagnier," I responded. "What happened to those monkeys didn't remind me of AIDS. Besides, that paper was just published only a couple of months ago. I'm looking for the original paper where somebody showed that HIV caused AIDS.

This time, DL Montagnier's response was to walk quickly away to greet an acquaintance across the room.

Cut to the scene inside my car just a few years ago. I was driving from Mendocino to San Diego. Like everyone else by now, I knew a lot more about AIDS than I wanted to. But I still didn't know who had determined that it was caused by HIV. Getting sleepy as I came over the San Bernardino Mountains, I switched on the radio and tuned in a guy who was talking about AIDS. His name was Peter Duesberg, and he was a prominent virologist at Berkeley. I'd heard of him, but had never read his papers or heard him speak. But I listened, now wide awake, while he explained exactly why I was having so much trouble finding the references that linked HIV to AIDS. There weren't any. No one had ever proved that HIV causes AIDS. When I got home, I invited Duesberg down to San Diego to present his ideas to a meeting of the American Association for Chemistry. Mostly skeptical at first, the audience stayed for the lecture, and then an hour of questions, and then stayed talking to each other until requested to clear the room. Everyone left with more questions than they had brought.

I like and respect Peter Duesberg. I don't think he knows necessarily what causes AIDS; we have disagreements about that. But we're both certain about what doesn't cause AIDS.

We have not been able to discover any good reasons why most of the people on earth believe that AIDS is a disease caused by a virus called HIV. There is simply no scientific evidence demonstrating that this is true.

We have also not been able to discover why doctors prescribe a toxic drug called AZT (Zidovudine) to people who have no other complaint other than the fact that they have the presence of antibodies to HIV in their blood. In fact, we cannot understand why humans would take this drug for any reason.

We cannot understand how all this madness came about, and having both lived in Berkeley, we've seen some strange things indeed. We know that to err is human, but the HIV/AIDS hypothesis is one hell of a mistake.

I say this rather strongly as a warning. Duesberg has been saying it for a long time.