

# Quotations from 'A Farewell to Virology' by Mark Bailey, MD

[Read or download the full paper here.](#)

*Compiled by Mike Stone, author of [ViroLIEgy.com](#), for [Planet Waves FM](#) and the [Chiron Return](#) investigative team.*

## **Virologists create their own pseudoscientific methods to replace the longstanding scientific method**

Virology invented the virus model but has consistently failed to fulfill its own requirements. It is claimed that viruses cause disease after transmitting between hosts such as humans and yet the scientific evidence for these claims is missing. One of virology's greatest failures has been the inability to obtain any viral particles directly from the tissues of organisms said to have 'viral' diseases. In order to obfuscate this state of affairs, virologists have resorted to creating their own pseudoscientific methods to replace the longstanding scientific method, as well as changing the dictionary meaning of words in order to support their anti-scientific practices. (Abstract)

## **No direct evidence, 209 inquiries**

As of 11 Sept. 2022 and following extensive enquiries through Freedom of Information (FOI) requests coordinated by Christine Massey, not one of 209 mainly health or science institutions in over 35 countries have been able to provide direct evidence of the alleged SARS-CoV-2 virus. (Page 5)

## **It is a game of deception, whether realised or not**

It is a game of deception, whether realised or not. It simply involves the assertion that a virus was in the sample, blaming the breakdown of experimentally stressed cells in the test tube on the imagined virus, and then declaring that some of the vesicles (whose biological composition and function were not established) were the viruses. (Page 8)

## **No sense of irony**

As is typical, there seemed to be no sense of irony for them that the purported human respiratory virus cannot be shown to 'infect' the relevant cell type, let alone the relevant species. And their experiments were once again invalidated by the absence of appropriate control cultures. (Page 9)

## **It appears more likely that the virologists are distancing themselves from their own techniques**

In May 2020, a publication appeared in the journal *Viruses* that claimed, "Nowadays, it is an almost impossible mission to separate EVs and viruses by means of canonical vesicle isolation methods, such as differential ultracentrifugation, because they are frequently co-pelleted due to their similar dimension." 'Nowadays' means in contrast to the past and it is unclear how such an observed technical change may be reconciled with biological laws. It appears more likely that the virologists are distancing themselves from their own techniques in order to avoid refutation of their own postulates. They may have to accept that the reason differential ultracentrifugation is not able to separate viruses from other vesicles is because their assertion that viruses are present in the sample is ill-founded. (Page 10)

## **At the heart of the matter is a simple concept**

Virology invented the hypothesis of viruses so whatever method it employs in an attempt to prove their existence, it must satisfy that definition. At the heart of the matter is a simple concept and we need to see evidence that alleged disease-causing particles cause new particles that are clones of the former. Claiming that detected proteins and nucleic acids are of a specific viral origin is not possible unless the alleged viral particles have been truly isolated by purification and shown to have these key biological characteristics. (Page 11)

## **You won't get a visible band**

In response to an email enquiry, Dr Marica Grossegeisse from the Robert Koch Institute responded that, "We purified SARS particles by density gradient. However, just from the cell culture derived virus, as you wrote. The challenge with purifying SARS from patient samples is that you won't get a visible band." (Page 13-14)

## **There has never been a physically isolated particle**

SARS-CoV-2 remains nothing more than a hypothetical computer construct, assembled from genetic fragments of unproven provenance. There has never been a physically isolated (i.e. purified) particle shown to be responsible for the production of identical particles or a particle shown to be the cause of pathological effects in any human or in an experimental animal model. (Page 14)

## **The complete absence of the scientific method**

It is hard to know exactly what to call virology, but it is not science. The current practitioners are engaging in some form of algorithmic or statistical speculation added to circular reasoning and confirmation bias, with a complete absence of what should be the corresponding process of refutation that lies at the heart of the scientific method. While the abandonment of the scientific method may be unnoticed or accidental by lower level participants, there are almost certainly conspiratorial motivations at higher levels of the global hierarchy. (Page 14)

## **Has virology ever been a scientific pursuit?**

It is thus a reasonable question to ask has virology ever been a scientific pursuit? With regard to the scientific method, the virologists create unfalsifiable hypotheses by setting up paradigms where any number of observations, whether it be illness or alleged test results can be attributed to their 'viruses'. The observations are passed off as proof of virus existence in the manner of a circular loop of reasoning that no longer requires the demonstrable existence of a virus. Any claims of reproducibility, for example, in the form of a PCR process or a purported viral genome, are simply more circuits of the same loop. (Page 15)

## **The lack of valid control experiments**

Historically, virology has been characterised by a lack a valid control experiments and none of its foundational claims have been established through proper exercise of the scientific method. (Page 15)

## **No further tolerance should have been extended to virology's unscientific experiments**

In 1954, when John Enders and Thomas Peebles claimed they had propagated the measles virus in human and monkey kidneys cells, no further tolerance should have been extended to virology's unscientific experiments. Enders and Peebles added throat washings and blood to their cell cultures and on observing CPEs, or dying and breaking down cells in their test tubes, concluded that the in vitro appearances, 'Might be associated with the virus of measles'. They did warn that, "Cytopathic effects which superficially resemble those resulting from infection by the measles agents may possibly be induced by other viral agents present in the monkey kidney tissue or by unknown factors." (Page 17)

## **Dr Stefan Lanka has documented the history of these unscientific practices**

The virologists however, have continued to repeat the uncontrolled methodology of Enders and to this day claim that such CPEs are incontestable evidence of viruses. Dr Stefan Lanka has documented the history of these unscientific practices, and in 2021 demonstrated that CPEs could be induced in cell cultures by the laboratory process itself. (Page 18)

## **Virology disqualifies itself from the scientific method**

As this essay outlines, the virology establishment will not divulge or carry out these required experiments, seemingly in order not to refute itself. It intentionally limits itself to ongoing opportunistic fishing-expeditions backed by confirmation bias, thus disqualifying itself from the scientific method due to its inconsistency with the hypothesis-driven and falsifiable approach described by Popper. (Page 19)

## **A scientific theory demands evidence**

Because a scientific theory demands evidence that has repeatedly been tested and corroborated in accordance with the scientific method, it is clear that 'viruses' never even reached the stage of a theory. According to the science, they remain mere speculation. (Page 20)

## **Guilty of failing to perform any valid controls**

FOIA requests have revealed that New Zealand's Institute of Environmental Science and Research (ESR), who have claimed isolation and genomic sequencing of the SARS-CoV-2 particle in the Antipodes, are also guilty of failing to perform any valid controls. In the tradition of Enders, they have not paused to check whether the CPEs they witnessed, or genomes they assembled via computer simulations, could also be created in valid control comparisons. That is, by performing experiments with other human-derived specimens, from both well subjects and unwell subjects who are said not to have the alleged disease COVID-19. (Page 20)

## **The World Health Organization (WHO) cannot point to one valid positive control experiment**

As has become apparent, the WHO cannot point to one valid positive control experiment, yet on February 11, 2020 they named the new disease they had invented, "COVID-19" with the associated claim that it was caused by a novel coronavirus. They have provided the green light for anyone around the world to "find" SARS-CoV-2 in their backyards without the need for valid control experiments either. (Page 21)

## **Shotgun sequencing and subsequent artificial assembly**

With all of the failures to culture postulated viruses, modern virology now favours direct metagenomics of crude samples, often with shotgun sequencing and subsequent artificial assembly of these genetic fragments to create new in silico 'viruses' out of thin air. This invention then provides other virus hunters with predesigned PCR primer panels so that they can also discover the same sequences and claim it is the same virus. (Page 21-22)

## **Nobody else has performed these required scientific experiments either**

Despite the resources available to them, ESR apparently do not believe in the necessity to check for themselves whether SARS-CoV-2 can be shown to exist. On 19 July 2022, in response to an OIA request they stated that, 'ESR has not performed any experiments to scientifically prove the existence of SARS-COV-2 virus and can therefore not provide you with any records'. On 17 August 2022 in response to another request, they admitted that, 'ESR has not performed any experiments to scientifically prove that [the] SARS-

COV-2 virus causes COVID-19 and can therefore not provide you with any records'. Nobody else has performed these required scientific experiments either. (Page 22)

### **More circular reasoning**

In summary, it engages in more circular reasoning: no protein has been shown to come from a virus, including the nucleocapsid protein in this case. It was simply asserted that they injected "viral" proteins into animals and in response the animals produced other proteins that are claimed to be "antibodies." However, a virus was neither shown to exist, nor required to exist for this sort of exercise. (Page 25)

### **The most flawed aspect of the animal experiment was that it did not follow the scientific method**

However, the most flawed aspect of the animal experiment was that it did not follow the scientific method as it lacked controls. That is, a comparable group of monkeys was not subjected to an internal assault with the same composition and volume of biological soup, sans the alleged 'virus', being poured directly into their lungs. (Page 26)

### **None of the studies show the actual existence of an infectious particle they are purporting to test**

Unfortunately, such unscientific methodologies are sadly replicated in all such animal studies that have been reviewed. Not one of them demonstrates: (a) a natural method of exposure utilising the samples alleged to contain viruses, (b) valid "mock-infections" (for example, the disingenuous use of phosphate-buffered saline only), or (c) animal-to-animal disease transmission. That is of course in addition to the foundational issue that none of the studies show the actual existence of an infectious particle they are purporting to test. (Page 26)

### **Why not simply aerosolise a sample into the animal cages so they inhale it?**

Additionally, if the 'viruses' are so infectious, why not simply aerosolise a sample into the animal cages so they inhale it? Once again such experiments are avoided in order for the virologists not to refute themselves with regard to claims of contagion involving the imagined particles. (Page 26)

## **A lot or a little?**

We are led to believe that inside a host such as a human, the viral particles are produced in such great numbers that they can rupture the very cells containing them, while at the same time they are present in such tiny amounts that virologists say they can't be seen in any patient specimens. (Page 26)

## **So why can no viral particles ever be found?**

Essentially, the virologists have offered multiple hypothetical pathogenetic mechanisms for a particle hypothesised to exist in an organism such as a human. And again, even if these speculative mechanisms were at play, it would require enormous numbers of cells to be affected to produce symptoms. But enormous numbers of cells would result in astronomical amounts of viral particles coming out of them — so why can no viral particles ever be found? Virology has a habit of diverting attention away from such aspects that raise doubts about its phantasmal model. (Page 27)

## **Genetic fragments of unknown origin**

In The COVID-19 Fraud & War on Humanity we documented the invention of SARS-CoV-2 by Fan Wu's team who assembled an in silico 'genome' from genetic fragments of unknown provenance, found in the crude lung washings of a single 'case' and documented in, A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China. (Page 28, [link](#))

## **The treasure chest of virological nonsense**

The GISAID database is the treasure chest of this virological nonsense and by 29 August 2022 had over 12.8 million claims of having 'found' SARS-CoV-2. However none of them can point to an actual virus, they are simply calling 'bingo' by assembling similar sequences which they have aligned with Fan Wu et al. and other previous assemblies, no actual virus required. (Page 28)

## **The general medical community acknowledges that no 'pathogen' is identified in around half of the cases.**

It should also be noted that while the author does not make pronouncement as to the cause of any case of pneumonia or acute febrile respiratory syndromes, the general medical community acknowledges that no 'pathogen'

is identified in around half of the cases. So what reason did Fan Wu et al. have to suspect that their patient was harbouring a brand new virus? (Page 29)

### **PCR itself cannot identify the origins of the sequences**

This is a sleight of hand as the PCR simply amplifies pre-selected sequences and has no capacity to confirm a previously unknown genome. As PCR expert Stephen Bustin has explained, "PCR requires you to know what the sequence of your target is...so once you know that there's something in your sample, then you would try to isolate it, yes. And then once you've isolated it, then you sequence it again, or PCR it up." In other words, PCR itself cannot identify the origins of the sequences and the methodology of Fan Wu et al. did not establish the origin of their described sequences. (Pages 29-30)

### **A virus is claimed to be a tiny replication-competent obligate intracellular parasite**

A virus is claimed to be a tiny replication-competent obligate intracellular parasite, consisting of a genome surrounded by a proteinaceous coat: it is an infectious particle that causes disease in a host. All Fan Wu et al. had was a 41-year-old man with pneumonia and a software-assembled model 'genome' made from sequences of unestablished origin found in the man's lung washings. (Page 30)

### **These alleged genomes are also simply in silico constructs that have never been proven to exist**

These alleged genomes are also simply in silico constructs that have never been proven to exist in their entirety in nature, let alone been shown to come from inside a virus. (Page 31)

### **The virus genomes have become what is possibly the greatest illusion in virology**

The virus genomes have become what is possibly the greatest illusion in virology, an illusion which propagates a belief that viruses are indeed being shown to exist. The virologists themselves don't seem to appreciate the fatal flaw in their methodologies even when they state it themselves." (Page 31)



## **How can metagenomics be used to establish the sequence of a previously unknown genome?**

The more important limitation with 'viral' sequencing is that the process itself does not determine the provenance of the genetic fragments, so how can [metagenomics] be used to establish the sequence of a previously unknown genome? (Page 31)

## **None of the virologists are demonstrating that the sequences are viral in nature**

Additionally, it is nonsensical to arbitrarily declare that sequences are viral by a process of elimination, that is, based on the fact that they do not have a previously conflicting assignment on the genetic databanks. None of the virologists are demonstrating that the sequences are viral in nature when they assemble the very first template and declare they have discovered a pathogenic virus. At no stage are any of them purifying alleged viral particles to prove their relationship with the sequences. And yet the first invented de novo genome becomes the touchstone with which other virus hunters will align their own in silico genomes or design 'confirmatory' PCR protocols. (Page 31-32)

## **No way to directly verify the size of the sequence**

Virologists do not have any laboratory techniques that can directly check whether there even exists a complete 30 kilobase RNA strand in any of their samples. (Page 32)

## **Not on direct evidence of a virus but on detection of sequences of unestablished provenance**

In other words, their declaration of discovering a viral genome was based not on direct evidence of a virus but on detection of sequences of unestablished provenance aligned to yet more fictional 'virus' templates. (Page 35)

## **The bat virus story has been in play since the 2003 SARS 'outbreak'**

Of note, the bat virus story has been in play since the 2003 SARS 'outbreak' and apparently after thousands of years, the human race is now under constant threat from viruses percolating in Chinese bat caves. (Page 35)

## **Unfortunately, this zoonotic folklore has spread from the virology literature into the imagination of the public**

They duly warned the world that, “genetic diversity exists among zoonotic viruses in bats increasing the possibility of variants crossing the species barrier and causing outbreaks of disease in human populations.”

Unfortunately, this zoonotic folklore has spread from the virology literature into the imagination of the public. (Page 36)

## **No demonstration that any sequence comes from a virus**

It should be clear at this point that each coronavirus genome has been templated against other so-called genomes without the virologists demonstrating that any of the sequences come from a virus. (Page 36)

## **Virology’s fictional genomic inventions have been relied upon to create wholly unnecessary medical and political interventions**

The danger to humanity is that the putative coronavirus genomes that have been templated out of the virologists’ speculations are now used as templates to create and inject products into hapless recipients who were conned and gulled into believing that virology’s latest invention was real. That is, virology’s fictional genomic inventions have been relied upon to create wholly unnecessary medical and political interventions. The dangerous and highly experimental mRNA and nanolipid biotechnology has killed more people than all other vaccines combined over the last 30 years, and we have only just begun counting. (Page 38)

## **CDC appear[s] completely ignorant to the fact that they are not following the scientific method**

In other words, the CDC appear[s] completely ignorant to the fact that they are not following the scientific method or they have realised that the game is up and are engaging in disingenuous responses. Either way, they cannot be taken seriously as a source of reliable scientific information if they are also promoting uncontrolled experiments as proof of viruses. (Page 41)

## **The lack of reproducibility of their own experiment instantly raises questions**

Aside from the fact that virology's current methodologies for finding viruses should be rejected, the lack of reproducibility of their own experiment instantly raises questions about the circumstances in which the original inventors of SARS-CoV-2 announced their new virus to the world. (Page 43)

## **If the virologists want to find a virus, it all depends on how they design their protocols and what they ask the computer to look for**

The independent analysis revealed that Fan Wu et al. could have found better in silico consensus matches for 'HIV' and 'Hepatitis D virus' than "a new coronavirus" in their 41-year-old man from Wuhan, who presented with pneumonia as one of the first claimed COVID-19 cases. If the virologists want to find a virus, it all depends on how they design their protocols and what they ask the computer to look for — and how would these fortune tellers know what to look for? (Page 44)

## **It remains unclear to us as to why Stephen Bustin failed to decisively point out the inappropriate use of the PCR**

To sustain the illusion of the COVID-19 'pandemic', cases were required. These were provided by the world's largest ever human 'testing' programme involving billions of PCR kits distributed around the world. It remains unclear to us as to why Stephen Bustin, who is a, "world-renowned expert on quantitative PCR, and his research focuses on translating molecular techniques into practical, robust and reliable tools for clinical and diagnostic use," failed to decisively point out the inappropriate use of the PCR process. (Page 44)

## **It makes no sense whatsoever**

Aside from the issue of specificity, it was not well publicised that the world-expert on PCR said to David Crowe in April 2020 that, (even on virology's own terms,) calling a coronavirus PCR result "positive" at 36-37 cycles, as was happening around the world was, "absolute nonsense. It makes no sense whatsoever. (Page 45)

## **None of the PCR assays have been developed as Bustin's MIQE Guidelines specify**

Even if SARS-CoV-2 had been shown to physically exist and the PCR was accepted as a valid diagnostic tool, Bustin would have to admit that none of the PCR assays have been developed as his MIQE Guidelines specify and none qualify as being clinically-validated. (Page 46)

## **The 'tests' are simply a molecular amplification tool**

Has Bustin forgotten that the 'tests' are simply a molecular amplification tool? As the inventor of the PCR, Dr Kary Mullis warned in 1993, "I don't think you can misuse PCR, no, the results, the interpretation of it [is misused]. (Page 47)

## **Clinical validation studies would need to be performed before the test was introduced into clinical practice**

However, if claims are being made that the PCR is a diagnostic tool, it should be obvious that clinical validation studies would need to be performed before the test was introduced into clinical practice. The Corman-Drosten paper skipped this step and the WHO accepted the fraud by placing versions of the PCR protocol on their website on the 13th and then 17th of January, 2020, before the paper had even been published. After that the PCR was simply used via circular reasoning to make claims about diagnosing "infections" in people. (Page 48)

## **Senanayake implied that if you don't have a gold standard you can just assume that a new PCR test can validate itself**

The next phase in the early stages of the alleged pandemic involved "experts" such as Australian Infectious Diseases Specialist, Associate Professor Sanjaya Senanayake promulgating unfounded claims about the accuracy of the tests to the public. In an interview on the 26th of April, 2020 he stated that with regard to COVID-19 testing, "there's no real gold standard to compare this to...for COVID-19 we don't have a gold standard test so so the current tests we are using, the PCR tests...they're our gold standard, but trying to work around that, we think that it's probably picking up around 70% of cases." Senanayake implied that if you don't have a gold standard you can just assume that a new PCR test can validate itself. However, this goes against all scholarship regarding test validation. It is unclear through this departure from the established tenets of validation logic

how he calculated that it worked “about 70%” of the time, not to mention the mental gymnastics involved in a “gold standard” that detects itself only 70% of the time. It would be agreed with his inadvertent admission that, “there’s no real gold standard” in COVID-19 testing because the real gold standard is something that doesn’t exist — that being the physical isolation and proof of a viral particle. (Page 48)

### **An absurd new definition of ‘pandemic’**

The WHO invented an absurd new definition of ‘pandemic’ and are now subverting the definition of infection — one that disconnects it from the concept of disease through the sole use of PCR results. Kary Mullis couldn’t have put it any simpler when he said the PCR is, ‘Just a process that’s used to make a whole lot of something out of something’. Unfortunately, on more than one occasion in the COVID-19 era, influential figures such as Bustin and Senanayake have supported the virologists use of a molecular manufacturing tool to make all sorts of unfounded claims, including both the unratified ability to diagnose a novel infection and the detection of an alleged virus. (Page 49)

### **The abandonment of the scientific method may be unnoticed or accidental by lower level participants**

We are familiar with the allegation that it would be impossible for the majority of the medical and scientific community to all be knowingly complicit with virology’s unscientific methodologies in the COVID-19 fraud. The author does not advance such a hypothesis, although it is wondered whether and for how long ignorance may be used as a defence? Indeed, that is why it was suggested earlier in this essay (in ‘What Is Virology?’) that, “the abandonment of the scientific method may be unnoticed or accidental by lower level participants.” Freshly-minted virologists are trained to follow the methodologies of their seniors and are unlikely to get far with their chosen career, and of course funding, if they dispute the basis of their laboratory’s work. (Page 50-51)

### **There is a complete absence of any appreciation of the fact that a virus must possess an actual physical existence**

And just like that, it is “confirmed” that the virus existed on the basis of comparing some new in silico assemblies with other in silico assemblies previously submitted to genetic databases. The author goes on to describe their next activity of phylogenetic tree analysis and building an evolutionary

path for the latest addition to virology's fictional family tree. There is a complete absence of any appreciation of the fact that a virus must possess an actual physical existence as a discrete particle with specific biological characteristics, including the ability to infect hosts and cause disease. (Page 52)

### **The circular reasoning and self-referential process of inventing a 'virus genome'**

To this day COVID-19 is not a legitimately-defined clinical condition, as the "confirmed" cases simply refer to the result of a molecular detection process. Additionally, we have already dealt with the circular reasoning and self-referential process of inventing a 'virus genome' through virology's methodology and then claiming that detection of almost identical assemblies in other places is confirmation that "the same virus" has been found. (Page 52-53)

### **The only thing that was spreading around the world, aside from fear, was the fictional WH-Human 1 'genome'**

There was never any virus to spread. The only thing that was spreading around the world, aside from fear, was the fictional WH-Human 1 'genome' and the PCR tests that were calibrated to its sequences. The 'pandemic' could have been stopped its tracks by the rejection of these tests; instead ignorant public health "experts" bought into virology's anti-science and have been parties to the COVID-19 fraud since. (Page 53)

### **The results of the simulation were sent around the world as digital code over the internet**

The "virus" was certainly invented in a lab but it was a computer lab and the only entity that was intentionally leaked out was a computer simulation. The results of the simulation were sent around the world as digital code over the internet and the resulting PCR primers that were deployed in kits en masse created the "cases" for the COVID-19 fraud. (Page 53)

### **There is no evidence that either the particle or the proposed novel disease exists**

As was outlined in [The COVID-19 Fraud & War on Humanity](#), there is no evidence that either the particle or the proposed novel disease exists. Further, in this present essay there has been a more detailed breakdown of

the Fan Wu et al. paper and their false claim regarding “identification” of a virus in Wuhan in early 2020. On the other hand, lab leak proponents such as Sachs and Harrison start their analysis by wholeheartedly accepting virology’s unestablished premises. (Page 55)

### **Such experiments do not establish that their samples contain viruses or have any pathogenic properties**

Such experiments do not establish that their samples contain viruses or have any pathogenic properties in the natural world. If they can’t even demonstrate the existence of viruses in their promoted public attempts, there is not much to worry about — it doesn’t matter what goes on behind closed doors because they have no viruses to start with. (Page 56)

### **However, none of this requires the existence of particles that qualify as viruses**

Similarly, their mention of alleged virus research taking place at the University of North Carolina (UNC) or “leaked” grant proposals such as “DEFUSE” made to the US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency are not evidence of viruses. To be clear, it is not being disputed that institutions such as UNC have been experimenting with entities such as spike proteins for decades. Some of these sequences have been patented and used in the development of injectable biological agents, recently forced onto many people under the guise of COVID-19 vaccines. However, none of this requires the existence of particles that qualify as viruses. (Page 56)

### **The Book of Nonsense**

Unfortunately, virology’s book of claims has become so convoluted that most readers do not realise that it is largely composed of nonsense. (Page 56)

### **The lab leak hypothesis is simply another narrative in the COVID-19 era**

The lab leak hypothesis is simply another narrative in the COVID-19 era that keeps alive in the public’s imagination the illusion of the material existence of SARS-CoV-2, as well as pathogenic viruses and microbe-related contagion in general. In recent months the fear-based narrative has continued with declarations of monkeypox outbreaks, alleged detection of polio “viruses” in London, and the COVID-19 lab leak theory even received backing from the

Director-General of the World Health Organization in support of the phantom disease and pandemic he named. (Page 57)

### **'Little Mountain Dog' story relies simply on the belief that there is a virus**

Like the "Little Mountain Dog" story, the lab leak story doesn't rely on any scientific demonstration of a virus, it relies simply on the belief that there is a virus, aided by some apparent supporting evidence. (Page 57)

### **All of these stories lead back to the same fear narrative involving a contagious and "deadly virus"**

The corporate media and Wikipedia's lavish promotion of the "cover up" would be comedic if it wasn't part of a war against humanity. All of these stories lead back to the same fear narrative involving a contagious and "deadly virus." It allows this fraud to be propagated and paves the way for other similar frauds to be carried out in the future. It astounds the author that so many of the 'health freedom' community do not trust any of the corporate media's claims about COVID-19, except the declaration that a deadly virus is on the loose, the biggest lie of all. (Page 58)

### **There is nothing in any of these documents that contain scientific evidence that viruses exist**

Despite the numerous patents involving, "methods for producing recombinant coronavirus," and federal grants to the likes of "gain of function specialist" Dr Ralph Baric and his team at UNC Chapel Hill, there is nothing in any of these documents that contain scientific evidence that viruses exist. Patent office staff and those approving research grants are not the arbiters of biological plausibility and simply carry forward that claims of the virologists. (Page 58)

### **Are the authorities worried that if they officially admit as much, there will be a revolt?**

It has been exposed that the virologists are not performing valid control experiments and their claims of "isolating viruses" have not been established in the scientific literature. Are the authorities worried that if they officially admit as much, there will be a revolt when the wider public realise the crimes that have been carried out on the basis of claims stemming from fraudulent virological experiments? (Page 61)



## **This is the virus hunters' basis of identifying what they claim are viruses**

It is pointed out that with regard to virology, a far bigger concern than "computing resources" is that a process that can be employed for sequencing genetic material of known provenance (e.g. human, bacterial, and fungal cells) has morphed into algorithmic assembly of genetic fragments of unknown provenance. This is the virus hunters' basis of identifying what they claim are viruses. Computing resources are no longer a problem for the virologists as they mine information from their completely anti-scientific "wet-lab pipeline" methodologies involving crude samples and feed these generated unfiltered reads into their theoretical "dry-lab pipeline" and its in silico models. (Page 63)

## **The descent of virology into further anti-science**

It would seem that the combination of massively reduced sequencing costs and shortened time frames have accelerated the descent of virology into further anti-science, for which humanity is paying a very dear price for non-existent viruses that are invented at will and used as excuses for spurious interventions and enslavement. (Page 63)

## **If nobody can culture or physically isolate alleged viruses, how can various genetic sequences in environmental samples be claimed to come from them?**

Once again however, if nobody can culture or physically isolate alleged viruses, how can various genetic sequences in environmental samples be claimed to come from them? As has been outlined, the declaration by Fan Wu et al. of a "new coronavirus" in Wuhan was based entirely on such proffered genetic sequences. Virology's attempt to pass off this methodology as proof of virus particles has introduced an unfalsifiable hypothesis that is inconsistent with the scientific method. (Page 64)

## **They certainly never demonstrate that the sequences they claim are 'viral' come from inside such an imagined particle**

The virologists invalidate the 'virus genome' process from step one by never establishing that they have a particle that meets the definition of a virus. They certainly never demonstrate that the sequences they claim are 'viral' come from inside such an imagined particle. Instead they claim that such

declarations can be made by consensus decisions, whether the sequences are labelled 'non-human' or 'novel' and by how much they happen to match 'known viral' sequences that were previously deposited on the genetic databanks. However, nature does not obey stories created by mankind. (Page 64)

### **Metagenomics has allowed virology's merry-go-round to keep spinning into the 21st century**

The metagenomics process allows for the de novo invention of such viral sequences and has allowed virology's merry-go-round to keep spinning into the 21st century. However, due to the inability of virology to fulfill its own postulates for the past century, its future is almost certainly going to be built entirely around this misuse, or at least misapplication, of metagenomics. One might hope that the recent failure of multiple organisations to prove they are performing valid control experiments indicates that viral pandemics are on their last legs scientifically. They can only be propagated for as long as this final fraud is hidden from the public. It could be expected in virology's final gasp, metagenomics will continue to be deceptively sold as a 'technological advancement' conveniently claimed to have rendered the proper scientific proofs obsolete. (Page 64-65)

### **Is it really pointless to entertain discussions concerning whether SARS-CoV-2 or any other pathogenic viruses have been shown to exist?**

The author has observed and been in contact with a number of individuals in the 'health freedom' movement who contest that it is pointless to entertain discussions concerning whether SARS-CoV-2 or any other pathogenic viruses have been shown to exist. Some of the arguments that have been advanced include that it distracts from the crimes being committed against humanity, that it is a strategic mistake as it causes more division, and that if the viral hypothesis (or wider germ 'theory') is being disputed then an alternative theory must be presented. (Page 65-66)

### **During an investigation one should not stop for reasons of convenience or because one's current state of knowledge goes no further**

The difficulty for some, even those in the freedom movement, could be that the repudiation of virus existence would come at the cost of calling into question much of their life's work. However, during an investigation one

should not stop for reasons of convenience or because one's current state of knowledge goes no further. On the contrary, it is a grave mistake to allow the foundational "facts" to be dictated by the virology establishment. The heart of the COVID-19 fraud is based on virology's claims. It is not a strategic mistake to direct our energy towards exposing virology's fallacies, otherwise defeating COVID-19 responses while leaving the virological nonsense intact opens the door to any number of "viral pandemics" in the future. Gaining insight into the entire fraud eliminates the unfounded fear of contagion and equips one with a more robust path to enduring freedom. (Page 66)

### **Virologists have provided no direct evidence of pathogenic viruses and instead have resorted to indirect observations**

The virologists have provided no direct evidence of pathogenic viruses and instead have resorted to indirect observations that are invalidated due to the uncontrolled nature of the experiments. Additionally, adhering to the scientific method places us under no obligation to provide an alternative explanation for these phenomena — when a hypothesis has been falsified, even once, it is done for. (Page 67)