
your article "Do Viruses Exist?"

Christine, an unincorporated woman <cmssyc@gmail.com>
To: [REDACTED]

Mon, May 27, 2024 at 8:20 PM

Hello Michael and Sucharit,

Someone sent me your recent article insisting that "viruses" do exist.

As you know, a massive body of "evidence" exists claiming that we've experienced a deadly worldwide pandemic, and even that humanity has been saved by "safe and effective vaccines", despite that not being true.

Therefore, reliance on stories, assertions, editorials, wikipedia entries, essays, tributes, reviews, pseudoscientific studies, etc. are not an acceptable substitute for valid primary scientific evidence. And yet the former is all you offer as evidence in your defence of virology (and for your claims regarding allegedly pathogenic bacteria).

You've relied on many reification fallacies (i.e. "*Virus particles differ considerably in size and shape*"), including in the following assertions where you attempted to counter the position of signatories of the [Settling The Virus Debate Statement](#) on the use of cell cultures in virology.

- "*The particles of many viruses have very characteristic shapes...*"
- "*There are many biochemical methods for characterizing viral particles, and moreover for establishing that they contain genetic information...*"
- "*Not all viruses can easily be grown in cell cultures...*"

Continually referring to particles as "viruses" doesn't make them so, isn't evidence that they are, and is misleading given the absence of valid, logical evidence. There may be many methods for characterizing submicroscopic particles, but no particle has ever been sequenced, characterized, studied with valid controlled experiments and shown to fit the definition of a "virus".

I cannot take you or anyone else seriously when you try to declare what a "virus" supposedly looks like or what it can and can't do, or when you cite indirect evidence from various tests, when you can't first cite valid, logical, primary scientific evidence showing that a replication-competent intracellular obligate parasite that transmits between hosts and causes disease via natural modes of exposure actually exists. A test cannot be validated without a gold standard (the alleged virus).

You've asserted that: "*A good example of such an animal study was published by Theil et al. [10]. It concerned the isolation of a novel virus from gnotobiotic, i.e. otherwise germ-free pigs.*"

Nothing was "isolated" in this animal torture/sacrifice study or shown to be a "virus". The authors did not conduct any valid scientific experiments designed to test such a hypothesis.

Observing diarrhea in 9/11 pigs that were fed the intestinal contents of other pigs with diarrhea is a far cry from evidence of a "virus" - especially when the study lacks a valid independent variable (purified particles taken from "hosts"), no randomization or blinding is mentioned, and a grand total of 1 pig that was not fed said intestinal contents was kept in an insulator until it was sacrificed by the researchers 24 hours after start of experiment and passed off as "the control".

(Amusingly, the [cytopathic effects](#) in cell cultures that are typically and absurdly passed off as "virus isolation" failed to occur in this study.)

Contrary to what you would have your readers believe, the tiny particles shown in an EM image and asserted to be "the virus" were not isolated/purified, they were not characterized, no "genetic material" was shown to come from those specific particles, and they were not studied with valid controlled experiments. They were not shown to be viruses. And there are no "*known viruses with similar morphology*" to which said particles could be compared.

Some of my colleagues and I call this **misleading use of imaging** "*the point and declare method*", and people around the world are becoming aware of this inanity.

As men who consider themselves scientists, I'm surprised you're not embarrassed to cite such a study. Nine of the 12 animals in this ridiculous study were sacrificed 15 - 48 hours after "inoculation" and there isn't a shred of scientific evidence to be gleaned from it.

I also can't take seriously your comments about a supposed "false dichotomy" (germ vs. terrain) when you haven't acknowledged the view, or ruled out the possibility, that "germs" (the ones that actually exist) are the result rather than the cause of dis-ease in a body and always play a beneficial role. **Said view** is in direct opposition to the claims of germ hypothesis adherents, even though both acknowledge that compromised bodies are more likely to end up with a so-called "infection".

Fyi, we're well aware that according to the "virus" hypothesis "viruses" can't grow in a pure culture. The need for purified samples (to be sequenced, characterized and studied with valid controlled experiments) and the overall logic of the postulates remains. Historical context doesn't change anything because logic doesn't change over time. It's just easier to bamboozle people who have already accepted "germ" dogma.

You have failed to disclose to your readers the details of a typical cell culture used by virologists to fake-isolate imaginary "viruses", even though your 5th heading is "*What does it mean to isolate a virus?*"

I challenge you to walk your readers through a typical "virus isolation" study, for example **A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin** that supposedly describes the "isolation" of "SARS-COV-2" as performed by Peng Zhou et al., and try explaining to them how this study adheres to **the scientific method** with valid independent and dependent variables and a valid mode of exposure, starting from the point of sample collection and storage and preparation of the cell lines.

If you're not able to see the problems with this study, I suggest you need a time-out and would benefit from a strong dose of **Baileys**, starting with **A Farewell to Virology** (film version [here](#)).

You've asserted that:

"While direct isolation is often used in the initial characterization of a novel virus, the use of cell cultures greatly facilitates the sensitive and speedy routine detection of viruses that are already known"

and:

"Has the SARS-CoV-2 virus ever been isolated? Yes, it has been—numerous times."

I challenge you to cite a study wherein any alleged "virus" was found in the bodily fluid/tissue/excrement of a so-called "host" and actually isolated (purified), sequenced, characterized and shown to cause the relevant illness. I literally have **hundreds** of freedom of information responses from >220 institutions in 40 countries on my website and in zero cases has any institution been able to cite a study describing actual isolation/purification of an alleged virus.

The so-called "**solid study**" (of n = 9 patients with mild symptoms and involving the infamous Christian Drosten) that you list as your 16th reference describes the typical cytopathic effects in a monkey kidney cell culture contaminated with calf serum and toxic-to-kidneys amphotericin B, etc., passed off as "virus isolation" (**supplementary methods**). A completely unnatural procedure that tells us nothing whatsoever about what goes on in a living body or why anyone got sick, lacking a valid independent variable or dependent variable, and without even a pretense of controls.

You asserted that "*the artificial nature of SARS-CoV-2 can be convincingly demonstrated based on nothing more than the nucleotide sequence of its genome [11]*", without citing valid evidence of "SARS-COV-2" to begin with. No amount of analysis of a made-up computer "genome" that has never been shown to have a physical counterpart could tell us anything at all about an alleged "virus".

Regarding your assertion that "*It is also possible to buy samples of the purified virus from the American Type Culture Collection*", I challenge you to back up that claim by showing that any "isolate" sold by ATCC or any other supplier actually consists of purified particles and that said particles were actually shown to be a "virus". Please see **my response** >2 years ago Steve Kirsch's same claim re ATCC.

I don't know why it's still necessary to point these things out >4 years into this hoax.

Regards,
Christine

your article "Do Viruses Exist?"

Christine, an unincorporated woman <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Mon, May 27, 2024 at 8:34 PM

To:

p.s. I had used Michael's Waterloo email address but it bounced so please forward my email to him.

[Quoted text hidden]