ISSN: 2155-9597
Journal of Bacteriology & Parasitology

OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

Perspective

Defending Against Bacterial Toxins of Bioterrorism for the Aspect of Health Promotion

Ulric Rowe*

Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, USA

ABOUT THE STUDY

The purposeful release of viruses, bacteria, poisons, or other dangerous substances to cause sickness or death in humans, animals, or plants is known as bioterrorism. These agents are normally found in nature, but they might be changed or altered to boost their capacity to cause disease, make them resistant to existing therapies, or spread more easily. Biological agents can be transmitted by the air, water, or food. Terrorists are attracted to biological agents since they are difficult to detect and do not produce symptoms for several hours to days. Some bioterrorism agents, such as the smallpox virus, may be transmitted from one person to another, whereas others, such as anthrax. Because biological weapons are relatively cheap and inexpensive to procure, can be rapidly dispersed, and may generate broad fear and panic in addition to the real physical damage, bioterrorism may be encouraged. Whether it was appropriate to utilize public monies to create technologies to guard against biological weapons was a point of contention. Many others claimed that because the deployment of biological weapons was so unlikely, research funding should be invested elsewhere. The still-unsolved case of anthrax in the twenty-first century fueled the discussion, and resources have subsequently been directed toward biological weapons defense, including the development of new treatments. Too far, the antibiotics used to treat biological weapons agents have been off-the-shelf antibiotics produced for normal medical use. The future medications for biological weapons defense will require distinctive qualities specific to the objective of biological weapons defense, and that this will have an influence on drug discovery and development tactics. We must analyze the drug targets and methodologies utilized for discovering and developing medications to guard against biological weapons, as well as the basic differences between bioterrorism protection and general drug discovery.

Major advancements in molecular biology and associated technologies have happened all around the world in the three decades since. Commercially available molecular biology tools are now readily available and even high school students may modify DNA. In addition, the whole genome sequences of many harmful bacteria and viruses are readily available on the internet, and the synthesis of genes and certain basic agents, such as viruses, is as simple as placing an order with a bespoke gene-synthesis firm. The genie of molecular biology has escaped the bottle for good. It would be naive not to believe that bioterrorists will use this technology. This one has been stated that misusing biotechnology does not considerably raise the threat level over that arising from spontaneously developing infectious illnesses. The plagues of antiquity (such as the 1918 flu pandemic) and the development of HIV and continue to be far more deadly than anything a bioterrorist could unleash. The claim that nature is more dangerous than humans, on the other hand, misses the point. The problem is that although evil humans have access to nature's tools, humans are capable of doing things that nature cannot. The release of biological agents *via* the mail system is one easy example, but there are many more. Humans who are malicious stand on the shoulders of nature, not against it.

The diversity of new technologies such as gene shuffling, directed molecular evolution, and incorporation of toxin-encoding genes or genes to defeat the immune system and the number of ways that these technologies could be misused and deployed is one of the major problems in preparing for biological warfare or terrorism. How can we anticipate the development of new bioweapons? What are the most probable and dangerous scenarios? The extent and severity of the challenge become obvious when one analyses a matrix of each new engineering technique, the spectrum of organisms (available bacteria, viruses, parasites, and fungus), and the delivery possibilities. An anticipating all eventualities and developing defensive measures against them one by one is impossible. Universal protection strategies may be devised long ahead of an assault, and they must be intended to be successful regardless of the agent employed or how it was produced.

This argument motivates a target-selection technique in which the target must be generally preserved as the first requirement. There are dozens of bacteria species that have the potential to be

Correspondence to: Ulric Rowe, Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, USA, E-mail: ulricrowe@ule.edu

Received: 01-Mar-2022, Manuscript No. JBP-22-16342; **Editor assigned:** 03-Mar-2022, PreQC No. JBP-22-16342 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 17-Mar-2022, QC No. JBP-22-16342; **Revised:** 24-Mar-2022, Manuscript No. JBP-22-16342 (R); **Published:** 31-Mar-2022, DOI: 10.35248/2155-9597.22.13.413

Citation: Rowe U (2022) Defending Against Bacterial Toxins of Bioterrorism for the Aspect of Health Promotion. J Bacteriol Parasito. 13:413.

used as biowarfare agents, and these organisms are found throughout the bacterial evolutionary tree. Terrorists have employed anthrax, although it does not generally cause widespread human sickness. The migration of agents to places where they are not ordinarily found is a major issue in bioterrorism. We must reply with techniques that are successful regardless of modification if we assume that any organism may be genetically modified for multidrug resistance, greater virulence or transmissibility, or in other ways that we cannot predict. The creation of new classes of antibacterial drugs that target fundamental necessities of life and function through mechanisms that cannot be evaded by bioengineering must be a top priority.