

Nobel Prize winner's revelations

Several months have passed since an astounding interview of Montagnier came out on YouTube, and although many people are already aware of it, the Italian media have kept silent. It's critically important that it be discussed, and that the right conclusions be drawn from it.

A transcript of the interview appears below, following which is my comment on it:

(This article has been sent to important Italian newspapers and weekly magazines.)

Statements by Luc Montagnier, 2008 Nobel Prize for Medicine, conferred on him for the "discovery of HIV and its role as the cause of AIDS", made in the documentary film "House of Numbers" (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WQoNW71OnT4>)

[...]

Brent Leung: You talked about oxidative stress earlier. Is treating oxidative stress one of the best ways to deal with the African AIDS epidemic?

Luc Montagnier: I think it is one way to approach. To decrease the rate of transmission because I believe HIV, we can be exposed to HIV many times without being chronically infected. Our immune system will get rid of the virus within a few weeks, if you have a good immune system; and this is the problem also of Africa, of African people. Their nutrition is not very equilibrated, they are in oxidative stress, even if they are not infected with HIV. So their immune system

doesn't work well, already. So it's prone, you know, it can allow HIV to get in and persist.

So there are many ways which are not the vaccine – the magic name, the vaccine! – there are many ways to decrease the transmission just by simple measures of nutrition, giving antioxidants, proper antioxidants, hygiene measures, fighting the other infections. So they are not spectacular, but they could, you know, decrease very well the epidemic to the level they are in occidental countries, Western countries.

Brent Leung: So if you have a good immune system, then your body can naturally get rid of HIV?!

Luc Montagnier: Yes.

Brent Leung: Oh, interesting. Do you think we should have more of a push for antioxidants and things of that nature in Africa than antiretrovirals?

Luc Montagnier: We should push for more you know a combination of measures, you know, antioxidants, nutrition advice, nutrition, fighting other infections, malaria, tuberculosis, parasites, worms, education of course, genital hygiene for women and men also, very simple measures, which are not very expensive but which could do a lot.

And this is actually my worry about the many spectacular action for the global funds to buy drugs and so on. And Bill gates and so on, for the vaccine. But you know those kind of measures are not very well funded, they're not funded at all, or they are, you know, it really

depends on the local government to take choice of this. But the local government they take advice of the scientific advisors from the [international?] institutions and they don't get this kind of advice very often.

Brent Leung: There's no money in nutrition, right? There's no profit.

Luc Montagnier: There's no profit, yes! Water is important, water is key.

Brent Leung: Now I think you said you were talking about if you have a built immune system that it is possible to get rid of HIV naturally. If you take a poor African who has been infected and you build up their immune system is it possible for them to also naturally get rid of it?

Luc Montagnier: I would think so.

Brent Leung: OK. That's an important, that's an important point.

Luc Montagnier: It's important knowledge which is completely neglected. You know, people always think of drugs and vaccine (grinning broadly). So this is a message which may be different from the other what you heard before, no?

Brent Leung: The closing?

Luc Montagnier (smiling): No, no, yes, my message is different from what you heard from Fauci or er..!

Brent Leung: Yes. It's a little different.

Luc Montagnier (beaming and grinning widely): Little different!

COMMENT

Fabio Franchi

(Translated by the Treatment Information Group: tig.org.za)

Montagnier undermines the grounds for the award of the Nobel Prize to him in October 2008.

Montagnier had already tried to find a way out when claiming in 1991 that the “HI virus” only causes AIDS in the presence of co-factors (micoplasmas). He soon experienced the chilly isolation of the scientific community for this, and took the hint: he stopped making the point, and with that the orthodoxy reaccepted him into its ranks with open arms.

But that wasn’t his only “deviance”. In 1992, in order to explain the embarrassing presence of cases of “AIDS without virus” (CD4 idiopathic lymphocytopenia), Montagnier mooted a “hit and run” model, a blitz in a German style: contact -> infection -> damage.... and escape without leaving a clue. I’m sorry to say, but such an hypothesis is unfalsifiable, unverifiable and therefore unscientific.

Now Montagnier improves his creative hypothesis and says that “HIV infection” only takes place if the immune system is already deficient; otherwise “HIV” is unable to “enter”. He therefore understands this infection as the *consequence* of immunodeficiency: an

immunodeficiency present before the arrival of “HIV” and which is produced by oxidative stress. This is enough to explode “HIV” as the cause of AIDS.... and his Nobel Prize.

Were Montagnier consistent, he would at this point give back the Prize and say: “I’m sorry, but I’ve been pulling your leg.”

Without hesitating, he goes on to add that the best treatment for AIDS is not antiretrovirals, but antioxidants instead, precisely contradicting what he had said before. Not even vaccination is supposed to be useful, he says (even though he promised one so many times, and dedicated the last 25 years of his career trying to find one!).

Moreover, he acknowledged that huge sums in research funding were being squandered on this, omitting to mention that he’d received more than a few crumbs in this pointless pursuit.

He says Africans are immune deficient due to malnutrition and other diseases irrespective of “HIV” infection – which is precisely what several “dissidents”, also called “denialists”, have written, and which until now has been considered “dangerous to public health”!

Blithely expounding on these matters, he speaks as though he were revealing his own original, thoughtful and novel insights, shared with us at long last.

He claims we don't get infected if we are immune competent, but that if "HIV" is nonetheless able to penetrate an immune competent person, he gets rid of it within two weeks. Thus he contradicts (has he forgotten?) two cornerstones of immunology to be found in any textbook. Unless I'm to be corrected, (a) infections take place *irrespective* of immune competence (whereas the *evolution* of infections depends on it), and (b) the elimination of the virus can indeed take place within some weeks, but it leaves a clue, a scar even in immune competent people, namely the specific antibody reaction which is testimony to the "fight between the alien element and one's own soldiers". An organism cannot eliminate a virus without combating it (that is, if the virus has not first penetrated and multiplied itself).

Montagnier says that if the immune system of an immune deficient individual is strengthened, "HIV" can be eliminated! But what does he mean by *eliminate*? (Does the individual become HIV-Antibody negative? Would the "viral load" become zero?)

If Montagnier believes (as he seems to believe) that "HIV" is a retrovirus, he wouldn't say the body can eliminate it (if he claims "HIV" becomes part of the host's cells' genome). At most he would claim that the body can keep it quiescently repressed.

With these claims Montagnier degrades the role of HIV to a factor of secondary importance (not even as a co-cause any longer, as he claimed in 1991-92). He degrades it to a factor which is neither necessary nor sufficient for AIDS, so much so that – in his bright opinion – it is not necessary to fight HIV directly to treat AIDS!!

CONCLUSIONS

I don't know how this scientist should be judged, attracted as he is by fame and success but nonetheless capable of illuminating partial recognitions (albeit revealing dark compromises with his conscience). These acknowledgments are more than enough to subvert the reasons for his success (but, of course, only after having enjoyed it to the full).

What is important is that the theory of oxidative stress (first proposed by Papadopoulos-Eleopoulos, and afterwards by Passi, Kremer and others) should be restored to relevance. It is a unifying theory adumbrating numerous causal factors and allowing a range of perspectives of prevention, treatment and further understanding.

As for Africans, Duesberg, Rasnick, Fiala and many others have claimed from the beginning that AIDS in Africa (resulting from malnutrition, polluted and infected water and manifold diseases) is very different from AIDS in Western countries.

With these recent statements of his, Montagnier implicitly acknowledges the arguments of those who have always been his historical opponents, the so-called dissidents. But his bad faith is evident from the time he chose to make his claims – only *after* receiving the Nobel Prize – and from his *failure to credit* the originators of those claims made up to 25 years ago.

He, the individual best known for the HIV theory of AIDS ends up demolishing it. What ingratitude to the establishment that made him so rich and famous!