

The fallacies of the "no virus" doctrine

MICHAEL PALMER, MD JUN 19 2 5 1

A rebuttal

[Read →](#)

5 Comments

Share



Write a comment...

Oldest first



Gabriel Libre Solutions Network Jun 19 Liked by Michael Palmer, MD

Thank you for putting this out.

As a layperson it's been frustrating to see the "no virus" crowd basically act like one is morally responsible for 2020/21 for simply not adopting their dogma. Which I think is wrong even if they were correct.

Many "no virus" proponents argue that virology is a mythology to justify "public health" abuses. As a layperson this argument seems compelling, especially considering concerns with some pre-covid vaccines and other issues within medicine that seem to have come to a head during covid.

The problem I have with that is that it reeks of motivated reasoning.

As a follow-up question is it splitting hairs to argue that "regardless of the virology the measures taken in 2020 themselves were always going to more harm than good"?

It seems like there's no room for people to accept viruses or even gain of function without also conceding to the pretext of massive theft and abuse of lockdowns. That's currently the mindset I'm in, and it seems fairly lonely.

LIKE (1) REPLY (2) SHARE



Michael Palmer, MD Jun 19 Author

I remain convinced that 1) the SARS-CoV-2 virus is artificial, 2) the release of that virus and the "countermeasures" were part of the same script, by the same crowd, 3) the "countermeasures" were predictably and intentionally harmful. And this was not their first rodeo, nor apparently the last one.

Viruses are real, but the "pandemic" scares conjured up around them are false.

♡ LIKE (3) 💬 REPLY ↗ SHARE ...



Christine Massey FOIs Christine Massey's "germ" FOI N... 38 mins ago

Cute how you overlook the motivated reasoning of virus-pushers and the lack of valid scientific evidence.

♡ LIKE 💬 REPLY ↗ SHARE ...



Christine Massey FOIs Christine Massey's "germ" FOI N... 40 mins ago

"Against this background, it is pointless to shout from the gallery: "You don't have enough evidence!"—which simply means: "We demand more tests!"" -- This shows that you are either disingenuous or ignorant of the actual problems with virology. It is the QUALITY not quantity of the studies that is problematic.

Later, you indicate that you do realize it's the quality not quantity.

You cite several studies that supposedly show the existence of "hepatitis A virus". You label Figure 2: "A, B: Purified particles under the electron microscope [11]." Purified, you claim.

The images you label A and B are labelled C and D here:

<https://journals.asm.org/doi/epdf/10.1128/jvi.26.1.40-47.1978>

The author wrote the following about these images:

"(C) "Virions" accumulating at 1.34g/ml after rebanding of 160S particles in CsCl. Due to the almost complete absence of contaminating proteins, the adsorption of particles onto the carbon-coated grids proved rather poor." In other words, the particles are not purified.

"(D) Particles of the same fraction as those depicted in (C), but agglutinated in the presence of reference MS-I chimpanzee convalescent serum." Again, not purified.

In the image you labelled as C, you claimed the object shown is "A single viral RNA molecule released from a virus particle [12]." The study this image comes from is here:

<https://journals.asm.org/doi/epdf/10.1128/jvi.26.1.48-53.1978> The authors did not

demonstrate that the RNA came from any specific particle (they don't even show images of allegedly purified particles), let alone from a particle fitting the definition of a "virus".

♡ LIKE 💬 REPLY (1) ↗ SHARE

...



Christine Massey FOIs Christine Massey's "germ" FOI N... just now

p.s. just looked at the "SARS-COV-2" study, which is here:

[https://www.cell.com/structure/fulltext/S0969-2126\(20\)30372-5?_returnURL=https%3A%2F%2Flinkinghub.elsevier.com%2Fretrieve%2Fpii%2FS0969212620303725%3Fshowall%3Dtrue](https://www.cell.com/structure/fulltext/S0969-2126(20)30372-5?_returnURL=https%3A%2F%2Flinkinghub.elsevier.com%2Fretrieve%2Fpii%2FS0969212620303725%3Fshowall%3Dtrue)

You claim that "the virus was isolated from a single patient". Reality check, this is your idea of "isolation":

"Vero cells were used for the virus isolation" -- oxymoron.

"African green monkey kidney Vero cell (Female) (ATCC, CCL-81) were obtained from ATCC and maintained in Dulbecco's minimal essential medium (DMEM)(GIBCO) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS)(Corning) and penicillin (100U/ml)-streptomycin (100mg/ml)(GIBCO). Cell line has not been authenticated." -- Monkey, cow, chemical brew.

"The BALF sample was centrifuged at 5, 000 rpm at 4°C for 5 minutes, and then 200 µl supernatant was added to monolayer of cell in 6 well plates and incubated at 37°C and 5% CO2 for 1 hour. Then cells were washed with PBS 3 times, and fresh DMEM containing 2% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and 1% penicillin streptomycin (PS) was added to cell culture. Cells were maintained at 37°C and 5% CO2, and CPEs were monitored daily with light microscopy." -- Cells are malnourished and poisoned.

"(B) Vero cells were inoculated with a bronchoalveolar lavage fluid sample. The cytopathic effects were observed at 4 days post infection."

-- As usual, Santa was declared present, grown and "isolated" based on presents under the Christmas tree (CPE).

The imaginary virus' fake identity was then fake-verified by PCR.

Then particles that were only seen AFTER the fake-isolation process (and NOT in a clinical sample) were "inactivated by chemical treatment, purified by several centrifugation steps", yet vary considerably in appearance, page 3:

<https://www.cell.com/cms/10.1016/j.str.2020.10.001/attachment/c5c84847-43f4-4116-985b-2bbbb007d98c/mmc1.pdf>

These particles were NOT sequenced, and NOT studied with valid rigorous controlled (animal) experiments to demonstrate dis-ease causation. Nor was transmission of the particles or contagion of symptoms demonstrated. This study wasn't even designed to

demonstrate that a "virus" existed and the authors of the "supposed" article were looking at a "virus" and were motivated by quack-cine-development goals.

You wrote "The sequence was only determined directly from the sample material in this case."

-- This makes zero sense, isn't possible, and is an euphemism for: extracting all the RNA from the bronchoalveolar lavage fluid sample and absurdly labelling it "Viral RNAs". Then the "RNAs were subjected for next generation sequencing using the Illumina sequencing platform. The assembled sequence was further analyzed..." aka millions of small sequences were ASSEMBLED into a hypothetical, in silico 'genome' fraudulently passed off as something real and "viral".

♡ LIKE 💬 REPLY ↗ SHARE

...