

Modern Medicine: A Castle Built on Sand?

Modern Medicine: A Castle Built on Sand?

by [Patricia Harrity](#), [The Exposé](#)

March 31, 2022

Dangerous Dogmas

All scientific research is built on particular dogmas including, or perhaps especially, biomedicine. It's easier for some "scientists" to perpetuate falsehoods than it is to admit they were wrong, abandon long standing ideas, and start again from scratch. Many scientists would rather pursue trendy research areas in order to win accolades and secure grant money than question long-held beliefs and dogmas.

This is exactly what has happened with modern medicine because too much money and too many reputations are at stake. If you're not allowed to question it, then it's not real science.

Erroneous theories in medicine have wasted billions and caused untold harm. Imagine if they had to admit that so many years of research and countless academic careers have been wasted pursuing ideas that have no basis in reality.

Thanks to the covid pseudo pandemic, the corrupt state of the medical establishment has never been more obvious to so many people.

See No Evil, Hear No Evil, Speak No Evil

It might be difficult for some to believe that the castle of medicine is built on foundations of sand. However, Stanford scientist John P. A. Ioannidis published a study in 2005

proving that most published research findings are false.

Marcia Angell the first woman to serve as editor-in-chief of the New England Journal of Medicine has extensively investigated the corruption of medicine by drug companies.

Richard Horton, editor of The Lancet, wrote that:

"The case against science is straightforward: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, may simply be untrue. Afflicted by studies with small sample sizes, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and flagrant conflicts of interest, together with an obsession for pursuing fashionable trends of dubious importance, science has taken a turn towards darkness."

There are countless victims of iatrogenic disease in countless on-line support groups who once trusted their doctors to have their best interests at heart and to abide by the oath to "first do no harm".

128,000 Americans die each year from correctly prescribed medications, making prescription drugs one of the leading causes of death.

Clearly, there is something rotten in the state of Denmark.

Dr. Harold Hillman Goes Renegade

In his final paper, the notorious British biologist Harold Hillman claimed that "cell biology is in dire straits". That paper was published in 2011 and summarises his life's work which began in the 1970s. He warned biologists and cell physiologists that something is seriously wrong with their ideas about the human body.

In the 1970s this cytologist and neurobiologist began questioning mainstream cell biology and presented evidence that the accepted model of the cell was completely wrong. He

suggested that the dire straits of cell biology was the reason medical research has failed to determine the cause and provide the cure for most diseases.

“During a research career lasting more than 50 years, I have concluded that the following procedures are unsuitable for studying the biology of living cells in intact animals and plants: subcellular fractionation; histology; histochemistry; electron microscopy; binding studies; use of ligands; immunocytochemistry; tissue slices; disruptive techniques; dehydration; deep freezing; freeze-drying; boiling; use of extracellular markers; receptor studies; patch clamp measurements; inadequate calibrations. The main objections to these procedures are: (i) they change the properties of the tissues being studied grossly and significantly; (ii) they ignore the second law of thermodynamics; (iii) they produce artefacts, many of which are two-dimensional; (iv) adequate control procedures have never been published for them.”

~ Dr. Harold Hillman

He challenged the fundamental principles of biology. He was a renegade who put the quest for truth above everything else.

Unsurprisingly his views were unpopular with many in the mainstream and this took a toll on his career and reputation. He had difficulty publishing his work. Mainstream scientific journals rejected his papers without reason and refused to review his books.

“The reason I’m so determined is because they [the mainstream] won’t engage. And if they won’t engage, then to my mind it proves that I’m likely to be right.”

~ Dr Harold Hillman

Many scientists agreed with Hillmans’ compelling ideas in private but wouldn’t support him publicly for fear of losing

their funding or tarnishing their reputation. Many leading biologists would refuse to meet with him to discuss his research. His goal was to start a discussion and promote a productive debate to improve and further scientific knowledge. Instead of being given a platform to share his work, he was stifled and ridiculed. Sound familiar?

Real scientists value truth above reputation and financial gain. Real scientists are willing to risk everything to expose falsities and incorrect theories. Scientists who blatantly ignore unpopular views or refuse to debate are not true scientists.

"I should like to draw attention to the fact that I regard my views as unpopular, rather than heretical, as I do not believe that scientists should talk in terms of dogma and heresy. In the best of possible worlds, good scientists who hear challenges to their beliefs, assumptions, hypotheses, procedures or conclusions, should examine such criticism with due attention. They should respond by entering into civilised dialogue with their critics. They should be prepared to admit mistakes, if necessary, and change their views. Such reactions have not occurred."

~ Dr Harold Hillman

Hillman claimed that the routine procedures used to study the characteristics and composition of cells are completely unfit for purpose. He was adamant that these procedures would change the properties of cells more than any differences being examined so any conclusions made on the basis of these procedures were invalid.

He claimed that electron microscopy is a "waste of time and money" which goes against the vast majority of the biomedical establishment who regard the invention of the electron microscope as a pivotal point in biomedical research. Only dead tissue can be examined under an electron microscope and

not living cells. Are findings based on electron microscopy relevant to living organisms?

Hillman's work includes compelling evidence to suggest that many of the subcellular organelles that some scientists have dedicated their lives to studying are just artifacts of preparation for histology and electron microscopy. This includes both the Golgi body and the Endoplasmic Reticulum.

He also claimed that cellular receptors and transmembrane protein channels do not exist in the mainstream accepted sense. One of the reasons for this is that these cell receptors cannot be seen under an electron microscope, despite their size being within the range of visibility.

He courageously stood up for what he believed to be the truth. Despite his career and reputation taking an enormous hit, he continued to publish his ideas right up until his death.

"If I am wrong, only my reputation has been damaged. If I am right, those colleagues proved wrong may well have been wasting their time and careers and using public or charitable resources naively. They might have used their time and resources to carry out more productive research."

~ Dr Harold Hillman

When considering the current state of medicine, it seems that "more productive research" is exactly what is needed. Research that doesn't follow dogma and isn't funded by the very pharma industry that has a vested interest in perpetuating erroneous ideas such as the "one germ, one disease" fallacy.

"It is absolutely remarkable how unsuccessful this sort of research has been. If one knew the basic mechanisms, whose disarray induced disease, one could then design logical interventions to prevent them developing."

~ Dr Harold Hillman

We're led to believe that modern medicine is highly advanced but the cause of most diseases apparently remains "unknown". Most Doctors have a mechanistic, reductionist view of disease often believing disease arises due to "genetics" or that the body is just prone to making mistakes.

"It is widely believed that medical research since the Second World War has been very successful...It is absolutely remarkable how unsuccessful this sort of research has been.

If one knew the basic mechanisms, whose disarray induced disease, one could then design logical interventions to prevent them developing... it is true that the cost of failure so far has been high. The most paradoxical aspect of scientific research is that it is widely believed to be objective..."

~ Dr Harold Hillman

Hillman also criticised the lack of sufficient control experiments performed in biomedical research. Proper control experiments are the cornerstone of good science ensuring that variables, other than the one being tested, do not influence the results of the experiment.

"Control experiments for the effects of reagents and manoeuvres used on the results of experiments have been grossly inadequate."

~ Dr Harold Hillman

Hillman also questioned the use of tissue cultures for histological analysis with compelling logic. Cells in culture have significantly different morphology, biochemistry, and environment than the cells from which they came.

"Tissue cultures are similar to the tissue from which they come in some ways and very different in other ways. It is clear that although there are a few properties in common, there are substantial differences. This is one of the most

important questions, in respect of the usefulness of tissue cultures as sources of information about cells in intact animals."

~ Dr Harold Hillman

Virology: Voodoo Scientism

Hillman's work challenges virology as much as it does cell biology and neurobiology. The world is slowly waking up to the pseudoscientific nature of virology because of the pseudo pandemic inflicted on all of us.

"Viruses" can only be seen under an electron microscope using procedures involving heavy metals, dehydration, low pressure, electron bombardment and X-ray irradiation. Are viruses real naturally occurring structures or are they artifacts of these harsh conditions?

The effects of "viruses" are studied on cell cultures and most cell cultures are grown from embryonic tissue, cancerous tissue, stem cells, or monkey cells whose properties are completely different from that of adult human tissue. Is any of this relevant to understanding virus infectivity in humans?

Coronaviruses are supposedly assembled at the endoplasmic reticulum-Golgi interface but if Hillman is right and the endoplasmic reticulum and Golgi body are artefacts of histological preparation and electron microscopy is presumed understanding of virus assembly completely wrong?

Different cell cultures are prepared by different procedures in different chemical solutions to culture "viruses". Could this explain why only some cells can grow "viruses" but others can't? SARS-CoV2 cannot infect many human cell lines but can infected monkey kidney cells which is not what you would expect from a supposed human pathogen.

Viruses are supposed to bind to host cell receptors as the first step to entry but if Hillman is correct macromolecular

cell receptors don't really exist.

Adequate controls have not been performed to test the effects of lab conditions, body fluids, antibiotics, and other chemicals on cell cultures so how can virologists be sure that it is the "virus" causing any observed cytopathic effects and not the chemicals and conditions themselves?

The biomedical establishment has chosen to ignore all of these crucial questions. Sadly, Hillman's level of critical thinking and radical questioning are rare and often completely absent in modern biomedical science.

His sharp intellect and critical thinking skills were a threat to the scientific establishment. He put his career and reputation on the line to expose the weaknesses of established biomedical knowledge.

But what if he was right? What if the castle of modern medicine really is built on foundations of sand? Will his work be forgotten, or will others be brave enough to pick up where he left off?

References

- 1) John P. A. Ioannidis "Why Most Published Research Findings Are False." PLoS Med. 2005 Aug; 2(8): e124.
- 2) Marcia Angell M.D "The Truth About the Drug Companies-How they deceive us and what to do about it."
- 3) Richard Horton "Offline: What is medicine's 5 sigma?" Lancet Comment| Volume 385, ISSUE 9976, P1380, April 11, 2015
- 4) Harold Hillman "Cell Biology is Currently in Dire Straits."
- 5) Harold Hillman "A Career in Neurobiology."
- 6) A Biomedical Scientist "Virology's Voodoo Scientism is Not

Real Science.” The Expose.

[Connect with The Exposé](#)

cover image based on creative commons work of [652234](#) & [sethink](#) / pixabay