



Chiron Return

Integrity in Journalism

RUSH TRANSCRIPT — ERIC F. COPPOLINO INTERVIEWS DR. JONATHAN JAY COUEY ON PLANET WAVES FM, JAN. 16, 2023. [GO TO FULL PROGRAM, AUDIO AND VIDEO.](#)

THIS TRANSCRIPTION IS COMBINED AI AND HUMAN REVIEW/CORRECTION. IT WILL NOT BE PERFECT AND ALL QUOTATIONS SHOULD BE VERIFIED AGAINST THE ORIGINAL AUDIO OR VIDEO. THE TIMESTAMPS BELOW ALIGN WITH THE BEGINNING OF THE CONVERSATION. HOWEVER, STARTING ON PAGE 32, IT IS NECESSARY TO ADD AN ADDITIONAL 1 HOUR, 31 MINUTES

00:00

I'd like to welcome to Planet Waves FM and Planet Waves TV for his first appearance. Dr. Jay Couey welcome.

00:09

Hi, thank you very much for having me. I'm excited to be here.

00:12

Where are you today, are you in Massachusetts?

00:14

I mean, I'm in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Got it. Okay, so

00:17

that's not that close to Massachusetts, unless you're in China, then it's right next door. And, um, you're a biologist.

00:25

I am a biologist. I was a biologist for about 22 years and academic biologists. So my PhD took me through the Netherlands. And then my postdocs took me through Norway, and then back through the Netherlands and then to Pittsburgh. And so at the start of 2020, I was a faculty member of the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, a research faculty member. But nevertheless, I was probably my 21st year in academia, I could be wrong. It could be my 19. I don't know. It's all blur.

00:59

Yeah, we're into two decades. So what what was your doctorate

01:04

in neurobiology, so? I did nicotine and how nicotinic acetylcholine receptors impinge on neuronal microcircuits. Nicotine is an agonist for acetylcholine receptors in your brain, and so choline is very important for attention. And so people have been curious for a very long time, why certain things are true. For example, one of the sort of easiest ways to throw into nicotine research is to say that if you're a regular smoker, and I'm not, and we perform any number of attention based tasks, and we test your ability and my ability to pay attention, if you're allowed to smoke freely, you will kill me on that test. If I'm told to smoke, I will fail miserably because I don't smoke. But there's something about smokers and the use of nicotine to augment their attention. The use of their nicotine to augment or to change their appetite, and augment their behavior is well documented in certain groups of people. And so you can see, it's not necessarily a detrimental thing, very many high performing people are chained smokers. And so there's a lot of this anecdotal evidence over the many hundreds of years that humanity has interacted with tobacco, to make us realize that nicotine and the receptors that it stimulates are an interesting place to wade into this question of the brain. And so my PhD was trying to look at nicotinic receptors and where they are in the brain, the microcircuits, were in the nicotinic receptors seem to be the most important. And so if you take that from the perspective of attention, that's thought to be in the frontal cortex. And it does happen to be that if you stain for nicotinic receptors, you will find a huge preponderance of them in the frontal cortices of all mammals, from bios, all the way up to primates. And so whatever nicotine does, it's going to hit a receptor. And those receptors are concentrated, but not at all only located but concentrated in the frontal cortex. And so because of this tied to attention in the frontal cortex, we just did some microcircuit observations. And we found these nicotinic receptors to be on inter neurons, which are neurons that turn other neurons off. If you don't know a lot about the brain, the brain has basically two kinds of neurons, with some many, many caveats. But let's say a huge majority can only turn neurons that they are connected to on or drive them. And then there's a whole host of other neurons that when they are connected to neurons, they can only turn them off. And so you can think of neuronal microcircuits, at least in the wrinkly part of your brain to be almost exclusively composed of neurons that can only turn their connections off. Meaning if I if a signals to be then B's activity will go down, or more preponderance of neurons can only turn the next neuron on. So if this one signals to this one, and this one's activity should call up. And so it's, it's extraordinarily. Let me say, it's enticing to believe that because of the nature of the simplicity at that level, that one could just Model A microcircuit, or model the brain and eventually figure it out. Because there's only zeros and ones. There's only ons and offs. And so if we could figure out how they're connected or start to understand how those connections change over time, then we'll be able to understand the brain but it is so much more complicated than that, but never The less that's the kind of framework I guess I entered neurobiology, and that would have been back in 19 9019. No, no, that would have been, I guess, 2002 would have been when I really started working on nicotine. Before that I was actually only next door neighbors to a lab that worked on nicotine. So it's kind of in my head for a longer time than I actually started working on

05:21

it. Do you have a theory as to why it is such a popular drug? I mean, besides the fact that it's inflicted on people and in ads and stuff, but why does our society consume so much tobacco? and Europe? Whereas China's even worse?

05:38

Yeah, it's a good question. I think it speaks back to what I said previously, which is that it does have an enormous number of benefits. And those benefits are, are somewhat cognitive. And so it is, you know, it's, it's, it's not without note that before it was used widely, it was still being used widely by, by Native

Americans, et cetera. I don't know if they abused it, per se, but it was certainly a it was a pharmaceutical. It now we shouldn't even call it ammonium. Right. It was used in America. Yeah. And it was used in ceremonies. And and, again, this is a cognitive effect, right. And so I think, all of these, these things that come from nature that actually interact with our brain are the ones that we've probably interacted with the longest. Because these are effects that we can, that we can most easily tie to the cause. And in our early exploration of our natural world as as thinking primates, I think that would have been the the trick is causing effect. I think that's so much of what's missing. In our general understanding of of our world and reality right now is these false senses of cause and effect that did get everybody to believe that certain behaviors or certain choices are going to make reality go in a certain direction. And we're very, very disconnected from what real cause and real effect is.

07:11

Yeah, we live well. There's a lot of complex influences, and confluences leading into every moment. So too, I mean,

07:21

certainly certainly one of the biggest reasons why everybody smokes tobacco as the availability of it, I mean, if you didn't grow it, and you couldn't prepare it, then it would have been a delicacy or something, you would have to seek out much like fancy tea. So I'm not so sure that that in the end, what I just said, which is it has cognitive benefits, maybe as the only reason why they were able to, to commodify it in such a drastic way that it is now I mean, I'm completely I haven't even thought about this more than 30 seconds. So I'm, you know, somebody out there who knows a lot more about the history of tobacco could could explain how wrong I am. And that would be totally okay with me.

07:59

Yeah, and I think it's interesting now also that we're seeing cannabis being legalized.

08:04

Yep. I mean, yeah, that had to happen. I think that, that the Netherlands had it right already 20 or 30 years ago, when they tried very hard to make a distinction between banning processed substances, and banning natural substances. And so if you can grow it, it's basically can't be banned, they're released in the thinking it shouldn't be banned. And that will give you in America. I don't think I should use the example that's on my desk, but they have, you know, you can go to residence and things that are purified, try combs that are super concentrated, maybe forms of pre hash. And even those kinds of things are technically not allowed in the Netherlands because they use a chemical to produce them all the hash that is available in the Netherlands has to be either hand rubbed or beaten, or some physical process of isolating and it's totally okay. But once you start using butane or carbon dioxide to extract that it's not allowed anymore. So I would say that that's where things should start or we should start thinking going back to, you know, what's legit. And for example, just to give you another hint about where we could go and discuss. I think it's been pretty well understood I have I don't have the the citation on my desktop that I could send to you, but you can you can boil the peelings of many tropical fruits, including grapefruit and lemon, I think also orange. And if you boil it for a few hours, and then take that liquid off of there in that liquid is a chemical derivative of Chloroquine. And so, this has been known In the tropics for many, many hundreds of years that boiling these citrus fruit peelings, and then drinking, this juice that comes off of it is a very good cure all for respiratory and gastrointestinal dysfunction just because a viral infection, if that's what it is a bacterial infection, anything that Chloroquine works against, these derivatives are found in these in these boiling. So that's, again, just a

natural thing, right? There's nothing wrong with with with boiling food and drinking the liquid that comes off of it. And I think more and more, it becomes clear to me that so many Americans are boiling, or even cooking raw food and eating and drinking the water from it anymore. There's an extraordinary number of people that use tap water on powder. And that's basically what they eat. And we have seen powder of soup in our house three or four times a week, and I can't, I can't stress enough how important I think it is these kinds of these kinds of basic changes in our behavior and nutrition that have really undermined our ability to, to really understand again, cause and effect. And I think that's really, where my whole story about the pandemic really dovetails is that coming in as a as a neurobiologist, I didn't have any business, you know, sticking my head up and saying, Hey, what's going on here, but I just happened to have a unique set of experiences in my life that that made it imperative for me to speak up, I had been using transfection, in my research for about five or six years. And transfection is the any number of methods that you use to express proteins where you want them to express in an animal or an in cell culture, and transfection had become rather ubiquitous and neurobiology. And just to say it for the people in your audience who might not know this neurobiology. And neuroscience is a field of academic biology that exploded in the last, let's say, 15 or 20 years in terms of funding, and in terms of, of departments, and just the sheer amount of, of resources that are thrown at the question of the brain has just skyrocketed. And I actually was often teased for having gotten on the train a bit late in 2002. So and it's not stopped, in all the years that I've been in it, it's not stopped. This is an ongoing train of money, just being sprayed out, to try and encourage as much exploration as possible into the question of consciousness in the brain and brain diseases and development in anything at all to do with the brain. And so one of the things that everyone in academia and academic neuroscience had been using as transfections. It's one of the reasons why I felt so Okay. With in 2020, when they were already describing the RNA idea. And Bill Gates was already on the PBS NewsHour with his little codon, and standing in front of a lighted table telling us about all this new vaccine was going to deliver DNA or RNA

13:31

death one with a model that they've scrubbed, remember the model? Oh, really, you'd be so kind as to send me that. I work hard. And we take this and then it sends a little message to your neuron. And then Dr. Evil.

13:50

So so that stuff when that started going on, I started speaking out already, and going, but they're, they're just talking about transfection on TV. And it was extraordinary how many, you know, it wasn't that many because actually, most people weren't coming in at that time. And everybody that could stay home did and so there were very few people in the lab at that time. But the people that were in the lab, we were talking to one another. And we were talking to one another with various numbers of face masks on some people were wearing to other people like me were wearing none. And it was very disconcerting time because to where no face mask was to go against the rule of the of the town, and a lot of people were uncomfortable with it. But even in my own little laboratory office when no one was around. When they would find me without a mask. They would be uncomfortable and a little bit condescending about it. Like you should be wearing a mask. I'm like I'm in my room by myself with the door shut up yours. I couldn't believe the kinds of things that were going on. You had to have I thought I brought it but I guess I don't have it here you had to have a on your sticker on your ID every day, you had to have a new sticker that said, you had gone through the inspection, which meant you took a temperature and you signed that you, you swear you have no symptoms. And because I rode my bike, I used to go through the garage every day, because that's the way you bring your bike to the service elevator. And it's much easier to get my bike in with mud and water and snow. So in the spring of 2020,

I was going in to take care of the animals and to do experiments that I had already planned before the lockdown happened. And I was still going in through the side door. Huge problem with that. So I started going in the front door, that was all fine. But they could not stand the fact that that I wouldn't. I always made a big deal about it. I always filmed it because I had this thing on my I was filming my my bike rides every day. And so I had the film on him every day. And that bothered them. They always asked me, What are you doing, I have a YouTube channel, I never used any of the footage except for one time just to show somebody taking a temperature of me. I never did it to make fun of anybody or anything like that. But I did it to make them. The people getting paid to do this feel uncomfortable that every day they were going to get filmed by me even if I didn't use it, it was just the idea. If you're going to stand where I work and, and take a job, you know, testing me and my thermometer and given me a sticker every morning, I'm going to film you and just just make you uncomfortable. And there were lots of these little things that I was doing that I think were annoying them. And at some point in time, I got an email that said you should mail in your badge and keys and we'll let you know if it's ever safe for you to come back. And then there was really some, two or three months before I got a little zoom invite where I talked to an associate dean who explained to me that that my contract wouldn't be renewed and I didn't have to come in. And then all of the data and all of the work that I had done was the property of the University of Pittsburgh, and I didn't need to worry about it, they take care of it. And so that was the end of really a very long, you know, attempt at getting in the system. And what I mean by that is that when you're a postdoc, you're not really getting paid, you're just you're just there on a year to year contract. In Europe, you can get a two year contract, or a four year contract if you're very lucky. But in America, postdocs are one year at a time. And so it's very difficult to you know, you can think about buying a house even if you have a down payment you can't think about you know, any sort of stability because at any moment in time, you might not have that job and your next job will definitely require you to move because postdocs move. I mean, I moved from the Netherlands to Oslo, Norway to Trondheim, Norway to Rotterdam, the Netherlands to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, all basically jobs that paid you know, 40,000 a year, good benefits, that's all great and wonderful, but making those kinds of sacrifices with young kids and with a wife who also has to follow you around and can't produce a stable, a stable resume or, or contribute anywhere, depending on how when you have to leave. It's a it's a large sacrifice to make. So I call myself a recovering academic. And now I'm a consulting biologist and a content creator and I try as often as possible to teach the immunology and virology and the basic biology that's necessary for anyone to understand the basics of what's being talked about on television was being debated on on social media and, and how to find your way through what is almost certainly the worst mire of, of mythology that the human race has ever been exposed. I wonder if if there's ever been so many crazy mythologies to believe in, in in human history? I don't know, I would certainly not have had access to all of them yet, like.

19:15

ERIC: So speaking of that, what I've noticed well over the past year, is that there's a debate between the virus and no virus camps. And this started I would say this was going on all throughout the entire crisis. And I noticed it kind of came to a point in early 2021 Where it really started to be obvious what was going on, would you sum up those two sides?

19:49

JAY: And I'm going to do my best now the no virus people and I are not on perfect terms right now because I've I've said some things that that disappointed them and I'm one of the particular things that I say had that I regret saying is that I said that it was a, it's a disingenuous position to take without clarifying what I meant by that. And so rightfully so a lot of these, these people on that particular bent,

were upset. And so just to clarify what I mean by that statement, the no virus position often comes off to me as a position which would like to disregard all modern virology. And that is with with the caveat that they often start with the principle that the SARS-cov-2 virus has never been isolated. And I'll repeat that the SARS cov two virus has never been isolated

20:46

ERIC: Are you saying that? Are you saying that they're saying that

20:49

JAY: that's where they start. And so the way that they they are where the mistake they make, I believe, is the idea that viruses are ever (sic) isolated. And so then they move to? Well, if viruses are never isolated, then they've never fulfilled Koch's postulates. And therefore, viruses don't cause disease. So it's a very, a very short through the corner, they say, in Dutch, it's very short, through the corner way of of getting someone to logically come to the conclusion that well, obviously, then all of this stuff is wrong. And this is the reason why I think that's disingenuous, because what that means is that no one in virology, no one in microbiology, no one in molecular biology, ever been clever enough to see through the fact that they are studying nothing, that all of these people are measuring ghosts, but they don't know it, that all these people are, I guess fooled. Somehow, even though they're using instruments, they're making measurements, they're devoting their life to understanding these phenomenon, all of them have been fooled simply because they think that viruses are real, when they're not. And I think that this is at least one bridge too far. And we need to start with, if you want to discard particular observations, I'm totally down with that, if you want to go back to 1911 And say that this paper was done incorrectly And we shouldn't use it as the basis for our understanding, great. But you can't start with papers in the 1920s, to say that the virology done in the 80s and the 90s and the 2000s. And the 2010s in the 2020s is all wrong, because it's based on those papers, because it's not. And so what is required of this, this angle, is a better understanding of the biology in the 80s to 90s, the 2000s in the 2010s. And that's where you need to find the discrepancies. That's where you need to find the evidence of their misinterpretation of this observation that some RNA and some DNA appears to be infectious. Now, these these, these positions, again, in my humble opinion, put biologists in a position where they cannot interact with their position because it's essentially like going up to a group of, of people in a church and starting out with Jesus Christ doesn't exist. Yeah, sure, even if and maybe this is the worst example I can come up with. But, but even if God doesn't exist, the proof of that is not going to start with God doesn't exist. Now. Everybody come out of the church, and let's be rational. And I think that it's much more complicated, just like the question of, you know, I mean, if you want to go there, or I want to go there, I guess is Does God exist? That's a pretty tough question to start with. If you have a definitive answer for it, and you better start somewhere in the middle. And I think it is a terrible thing they do. If they try to convince everybody that you don't need to learn anything, you just need to accept that there are no viruses that cause pathology, and they don't know what they're talking about and All of allopathic medicine is incorrect. Because we have learned a lot.

25:04

ERIC: that wasn't my path. That wasn't my path of learning. So I think your metaphor of the church is perfect. Because most people in a in a church would agree that there's not proof that God exists. But rather than as a member of the faith, it's kind of an article of faith. And that it's a community of faith. Right? I mean, maybe people have seen Jesus walking down the street, there's a guy down on my block, who says he's Jesus. And he may be I don't, I actually don't discount that. But there is no proof.

25:37

JAY: And so you don't think there's any proof of viruses?

25:42

ERIC: I didn't say that. But I'm looking for it. Now. On the virus side, we want to just make the the were there to be the ultimate debate or something, what would one side say? Boy, the other or if they were battling the experts in a court trial, what would it to sum up the argument of the of the no virus side, and then the virus side, if he had a really make it obvious.

26:07

JAY: The no virus side would suggest to you that that the isolation of viral particles to purity has never been done. You can't go into a sick person and take their sample, and then isolate the virus that caused the disease, and that they've never done that. That's their argument. The argument is not completely invalid. Because many of these experiments are done with proxies, many of these experiments are done under a false model of the biology of the virus. And that's where that's what I've been trying to teach on my stream. And everybody's been really, I've been failing at teaching it because not everybody, no one is understanding it. But the, the virus in the wild is not the virus that they represent on television, the virus that they represent on television is one, that if I have a virus, and it spreads through my family, they all have the same virus. And if you come over for dinner, you will take that virus home to your family, and then you will take it to your work. And over the period of time, all of these people get infected with the same virus. And **this is not how RNA viruses work. And it's certainly not how RNA viruses work on the scale of hundreds of 1000s of infections, nevermind millions of infections**, which is the scale that we talk on regularly in the TV and social media. And the issue is, is whether or not this is a known property of RNA viruses that they've just chosen to kind of drop and ignore. Or if it's if it's a, an unknown property of RNA viruses that we now only recently have the technology to answer the question for and I think it's the latter not the former. And I will go so far as to say that the the recent gains in the ability to sequence DNA and RNA directly using nanopore technology has finally revealed the actual virology misconceptions all out on the table. And since I have figured that out and started explaining it to people is when I've gotten the most resistance to anything that I've ever done in the last three years.

28:37

ERIC: Before you go there. What are the pro virus people saying the people who claim that viruses exist, particularly the ones in opposition to the to the ones that are saying they've never been isolated? They've never been purified? There's something else going on? What what's the answer to that?

28:54

JAY: They will say simple things. They will say things like, isolation, in your sense isn't necessary. The way that we isolate viruses is A, B, and C. They will also make the excuse or not make the excuse but collectively use the the parasitic or symbiotic nature of viruses in the sense of they need a cell host cell to replicate. So that's why we have to use cell culture. But **there's a couple of key experiments that haven't been done**. And so there's a couple key opportunities that exist right now, in virology to answer some key questions about how viruses replicate and how they spread and how they infect cells and the previous methodologies that have been used to describe and and check let's say, or prove how viruses infect cells and how viruses have tissue specificity these, these experiments are not extremely strong. **These are not the most exhaustive battery of experiments that's ever been done in order to understand the phenomenon and biology, these are tenuous understandings at best, because this paper was sort**

of built to this paper, and then this paper and now we're here. It's not, it's not, it's not decades and decades of understanding that that goes behind, for example, the cellular biology of bacteria, the cellular biology of our own tissues, the cellular biology that we understand from a DNA perspective. And it's the difference there, where this all comes to a head. And I think, up until now, it has been quite easy to tell very scary stories about viruses. And that's, that's the that's the part about the no virus people that frustrates me the most is because I think we have an enormous amount in common that we could share that we can unite on, and eventually come to you in United Front of understanding of what's real, and what's imaginary. And what's real and what's imaginary is, is not an all or nothing thing. And we've got to start there.

31:13

ERIC: Okay. So when, when the government, Chinese Communist Party, the government, World Health Organization, whoever it was, well, there were two papers filed in Jan, two, two so called sequences filed in January, fan WU, and Li Li Ren. Fan Wu paper is published, mn 908947 is filed. 402123 is filed. You know, do you familiar with these sequences? Okay. So what do they mean that that's the discovery that there's a that's the publication of the discovery that there's a virus, what did they say what are those papers do to establish their proof?

32:00

JAY: Well, they say that they're they're using primers which are specific for Coronavirus. And when they use these primers, they say that the primers are able to bring up amplicons which indicate the presence of a Coronavirus. So, after they did that, they immediately started cell culture which is a which is another layer of of variability and another layer of variables. And in that, I believe the way it went was in that 96 well plate only two wells or one well grew anything and so they use that one well, and they sequenced the RNA sequence that they found in that well, and they claimed to have been able to assemble a full Coronavirus genome from that one. Well, and that Coronavirus genome was published in that paper

32:59

ERIC: that's in the 90s. Right? Or is this is this is this

33:04

JAY: Oh, sorry. I was talking about COVID.

33:07

ERIC: Do you know which sequence you're talking about, which filing that didn't really sequence...

33:11

JAY: that's the Nature Neuroscience paper with um I don't know if Shengli she's on it. And that's why I was confused when you when you gave....

33:18

ERIC: there are four major ones from from from then. But so what you're saying is that they they were able to grow. Let's use your example. They were able to get some kind of cytopathic effect, I guess in one of those wells and they and they sequenced what was in that well using ...

33:38

JAY: using primers again that are that are designed to bring up sequences that are likely to assemble into a Coronavirus. Okay, so they wouldn't have found they would not have found a flu virus because they weren't looking for it. They would not have found respiratory syncytial virus because they weren't looking for it. They did say that they did a some kind of battery. I don't know you'd have to look up that paper again. They may not have they think they'd said that. They did that for the American paper. The CDCs paper says they did a battery of tests that said there were no other Coronavirus is present. But I haven't fought through those papers in a long time because I'm not I'm not at all convinced that the fidelity that they claim in any of these papers is real in the sense of the presence of a bunch of these amplicons and the assembly of a Coronavirus sequence is being done in such a way at that time at the beginning of the pandemic where I think you know, there's there's good reason to believe that that there's probably a Coronavirus present somewhere and anybody that would have been sequenced and as far as we can tell, they publish something. I don't trust it. But on the other hand it's a, it's a, it's a sequence that appears to have come up in a number of other places. And so it's harder and harder to dismiss the existence of the sequence. But again, the trouble is here, the entire public health apparatus immediately started with the 100% certainty, the presence of the sequence is asymptomatic infection, the presence of the sequence is means that whatever symptoms the person is suffering is caused by that sequence. And of course, we know that's not, that's not biologically, it's not a biologically valid position to take given how PCR works. And and so it is frustrating right to say that there's no virus exclude so many other possibilities, which would allow more of the observations made over the last three years to be genuine observations that were misinterpreted, as opposed to just lies. And I think that's the part that most maybe is most important for people to understand is that, that in order for us to understand what happened, we're going to have to identify the observations that we can't deny, and start with those. And so those include things like remdesivir, they include things like the exclusion of hydroxychloroquine, they include lots of things that contributed to what we experienced over this last three years, that has nothing to do with a gain of function virus.

36:45

ERIC: Let's stick with the early claims that a virus was a causative agent and was spreading. It sounds to me like you're saying that they identified what they claimed was viral specific RNA in the lab. And then they then exported a PCR and they claimed to have found viral specific RNA in patients around the world.

37:09

JAY: Basically, that's what they did. And as far as I understand, you know, it would be as (??) a tiny fraction of any of those identified cases would have been sequenced.

37:21

ERIC: So the thing is that they're looking for an amplicon, right, they claim to have viral specific mRNA. And then they, they, they they design various tests, they export the tests, you get your primers in the mail, you do your collect your samples, and you start essentially producing positives in your community. Where's the evidence that the amplicon matches a virus, or comes from a virus?

37:47

JAY: There isn't very much because the swabs, at least in North America, were all controlled by the US government, and I believe by DTRA Ditra. And so all the sequencing was also done behind closed doors in the United States. So any sequences that would have been off of the phylogenetic tree that they wanted to portray, could have easily been omitted, any sequences of coronaviruses that didn't

agree with the narrative of SARS-COV-2 could have been omitted. And that would have been a two fold process, right? First, you start with primers that will more likely not amplify those other viruses that are present. But that was an assumption that a lot of people made that I think is actually incorrect, because in reality, what's what probably occurred is is not even false positives, you just have to call them positives, because Coronavirus is with closely related amplicons in these locations of the genome because a PCR amplicon is not, you know, half of the genome. It's a very small portion of the genome amplified. And so, overlap here. We're trusting all of these companies, many of which don't exist anymore. There was 220 odd emergency us authorized PCR type tests in America in 2020 and 2021. Most of those are off the market now. And all of those tests use different reagents and different primers and different amplicons in order to find positive test positive results.

39:24

ERIC: So we were told there was a novel Coronavirus, a Coronavirus that had never been found before it was distinctly unique and all the world

39:33

JAY: and nobody nobody had immunity

39:36

ERIC: What's it nobody had any what?

39:38

JAY: nobody had any immunity because it was completely new

39:41

ERIC: Yeah, they had an immunity was like The Simpsons thing. It knows from the full monty from from 2010 or something. Well, why don't we just tell them is a virus no one has immunity. It'll kill everyone. Kitty Cat flu. We have to name it after something that's common that people are nervous about oh cats. So But the question is, where do we where, where along the steps of the known science? Do they rise to the confidence level to shut the world down? When when we know that their amplicons are not specific to a novel Coronavirus?

40:18

JAY: Well, that's where I think this this story Scooby doing comes in. I think that they have been working with this. Unfortunately, I think that this has been a long, long hatched plan, at least for some people in the sense of the entire gain of function in Coronavirus is literature and all of the papers that have been used to scare people into believing that this is indeed a lab virus and these papers are evidence of their tinkering is how they've gotten this money to move for the last 20 years, they've gotten this money to move by saying that it's very easy for viruses in the wild to cause a pandemic. That's the first myth. second myth is is that it's very easy to take viruses from the wild and passage them and animals and select for the deadly ones. That's also a myth. And then the third one is, is that now we have all these great technologies like CRISPR, cast nin (??) e and all this other stuff that allow us to take and modify viruses into anything we want them to be. And so really, now, the sky's the limit in terms of how many people could be killed by a virus, because we can do things now that we could never do with just finding viruses or just passaging viruses, now we can just write our own virus

41:47

ERIC: right. So we can set that aside, because I think that at the end of the day, in my opinion, the the virus created by gain of function is subject to the same proof of results in the world that a natural virus would be subjected to. In the end, in the end, if there's a natural virus loose or a manufactured virus loose, the claim is the same and that there's the claim of a contagious virus loose.

42:13

JAY: But see, that's the that's again, the I think the part of the misconception that the no virus people are cashing in on because that's not the biology I'm trying to teach. Because

42:23

ERIC: all I'm saying is that either way, there's common ground.

42:26

JAY: Definitely. Right. But we got to see it from the perspective that they are not lying about viruses, what they are lying about is the potential for viruses to cause a pandemic. There are definitely viruses, there are definitely sequencing reactions that work, these molecular biologists are not morons, they are pulling up DNA and RNA sequences and they are not imagining.

42:51

ERIC: Sure, but sequences are different from the concept of a replication competent, intracellular parasite, that that invades the cell turns the cell into a virus factory invades nearby cells, sickens the entire being and spews out more virions that then spread to another person. That's the theory of the virus. But what we have is a lot of finding of RNA. And what you're, you seem to imply....

43:22

JAY: That's exactly where this biology pivots and the reason why everybody gets confused. When the virus replicates in your body, before the year 2015, we had no molecular evidence for how it's done. And we took everything for granted, whatever the virologists say we just moved some stuff from this dish to that dish, and they're the viruses. And so that's why the cytopathic effect moves with it. But we now have the tools where the virologists cannot make any excuses anymore about well, we can't sequence the whole virus directly, because that's not how PCR works, we can't sequence the whole virus directly, because that's not how Sanger sequencing works. We can't sequence the whole virus because that's not how our techniques work. There is now a technique that can sequence up to 2 million contiguous bases at a time. There is no limit. So all you need to do is take these virologists and say Okay, give me some pure virus, and let's sequence it. And we should get lots of continuous sequences that show us that viruses have the sequence that you've drawn in these cartoons.

44:43

44:43

ERIC: What's pure virus?

44:44

JAY: Well, they claimed to have pure virus right?

44:49

ERIC: Ah, they, well they...

44:52

JAY: you will see where I'm going with this, right? They've done these experiments my friend. The data is already published. All you have to do is go look it up.

45:00

ERIC: you mean the 14 million? The 14 million filings each claiming to have a version of SARS-cov-2?

45:06

JAY: No. I mean, I mean, people trying to use nanopore sequencing to show us that there are full RNA viral genomes in a infected cell culture.

45:21

ERIC: Are you talking about metagenomic transcription?

45:24

JAY: metagenomics is exactly what the no virus people say, proves nothing.

45:29

ERIC: Well, metagenomics is what was used. I mean, every paper I've read the methodology...

45:34

JAY: yeah, every paper you've read, but not every paper I've read, there are lots of papers out there in the last three years. That's why I'm telling you. It's a new thing, where they have tried to use pure virus made with pure clones, and tried to infect cells and sequence the RNA, and they did not get what they expected. And no one seems to realize this.

45:58

ERIC: was this done after or before March 11 2020?

46:01

JAY: Before and after. That's the hilarious part. That's the reason why these no virus papers are so crazy

46:11

ERIC: For SARS-COV-2? Wait. For SARS-cov-2?

46:14

JAY: Also for... human Coronavirus 229E.

46:19

ERI: Okay, but I'm worried about the fact that on March 1st, the world was open. And on March 30th, 4.4 billion people were under house arrest. And I'm trying to trace my way back to a scientific study that would rationalize that. And I can't find one, all i can find is we've got some of this RNA, we did meta genomics on this, we turn that into a sequenceand we're testing for it in the population.

46:49

JAY: you do understand that every Western government has been behind the scenes instructed in the dangers of gain of function viruses since 2002, they have been told that this is the most dangerous thing and more dangerous than nuclear weapons.

47:09

ERIC: who's telling them?

47:09

JAY: the who, the United States government, the United States military, the Chinese military, the UN, everyone talks about....

47:19

ERI: but they claim to; I have like a six page chronology of gain of function investments and research and theories and works and openings and closings of the thing, they're all doing it. Or they claim to be doing it in a lab in China paid for by a corporation in New York, which was....

47:37

JAY: how many people are sophisticated to know whether that's true or not? How many people are in a position to know whether that's true or not? Right? That there's paper trails, people think that neural link is real, and that it's a big deal.

47:50

ERIC: So what I'm trying to get to is how do we go from a couple of sequences filed in China, from meta genomics 402123 M and 908947, the two most important, the one that you that you reference, how do we go from there, to shutting down the world?

48:09

JAY: Because they plan to do it. I mean, what more what more obvious reason would there to be than that, that they plan to do it? They had a worst case scenario plan. And they were looking for an excuse to trigger it. Once they were given the excuse they triggered it and they haven't looked back.

48:28

ERIC: What was the excuse?

48:29

JAY: What you just explained the sequence and a claim of a new virus. That's all they needed.

48:35

ERIC: Right. And it seems to me they could do that with or without the virus.

48:40

JAY: Sure.

48:41

ERIC: So what's to argue for the with? what argues that it was actually a mismanaged pandemic, as Bobby said?

48:52

JAY: again, you can't, it's a mismanaged pandemic, the moment you think it's a pandemic, I think, I mean, I'm not sure why you're bringing up Bobby now, I don't know what quote you're...

48:59

ERIC: Well those are his words. And I like those words, because they, they articulate a branch of thought about this. Really there's two branches of thought. One is that there was a mismanaged pandemic, which everyone would agree now, or that there was no pandemic and no virus and no syndrome. That seems to be the the split, but I'm wondering **what would get us from, from from no virus to virus scientifically? How do you make that step?** of...

49:34

JAY: there's a couple of reasons. First, **there's a couple of different ways. The first one is is that respiratory viruses exist. And you keep seeming to think that they don't, but they do. The second thing is is that coinfection occurs.** So the presence of one RNA doesn't rule out the presence of another, so most of these people could have had flu and we wouldn't know. Most of these people could have had respiratory syncytial virus and we wouldn't know. So you gotta be very careful because one of the things that no virus people would like you to do is disregard all respiratory pathogens as relevant.

50:07

ERIC: Okay, but let's, let's stick in the case of closing down the world for the claim of one virus, SARS-COV-2. It sounds to me like you're saying that, that the there was a plan involved.

50:25

JAY: I've said it like three times.

50:26

ERIC: Yeah. Right. So there was a plan involved

50:28

JAY: how can you come to another other conclusion, how can you come to any other conclusion at three years later?

50:32

ERIC: particularly since the left all their things on YouTube. But also, the method of the excuse seems to be able to work with or without the thing feared. Using metagenomic transcription, it's easy to make a Coronavirus. It's easy to find 20, a 20 base pair strand. So what would convince you it given that you're saying that there was a plan involved, what would convince you that the excuse was real?

51:05

JAY: Uuum. I mean, I guess I'm not I don't know why I'm not making myself clear. But I think that they were looking for an excuse, there was, the real trick is, for example, did the Chinese know we were looking for an excuse and gave us one? Or did we release viral clone in a number of different places on earth to get the signal we needed in order to have the excuse? Because there's lots of military lectures you can find on this exact operation where we'll just see a few cases in a few different places around the world and let the internet do the rest. You don't need...

51:51

ERIC: The internet ??? did a lot (??). Are you aware of the Dartmouth, the Dartmouth Hitchcock incident in 2006?

51:57

JAY: No, go ahead. Tell me the story.

51:59

JAY: Which, the PCR test?

51:59

ERIC: there was an incident at Dartmouth Hitchcock medical school in New Hampshire, where there were a couple of people coughing in the winter, you know, with the dry institutional air. And they presumed that there may be a pertussis outbreak and they and they did several 1000 samples and they came back with about 140 pertussis positives. But they also did split samples because Pertussis is a bacterium, they sent it to the lab. And they got 100% negatives on the lab analysis, actual wet lab analysis. And they got about 140 positives on PCR using a real kit, not in silico kit, using a DNA primer, not reverse transcription primary that's that both of those cut out sources of positives, but they still got 100% false positives. So they got a device they know is possibly capable of getting 100% false positives. How does that have any weight at all in this discussion? How does that get any credit for bringing any facts to the table?

52:39

ERIC: Yeah, how does that get any? How's that allowed? That's like me pointing people out on the street and deciding who's got pot in their pocket.

53:16

JAY: Well, that's that's the other the other part about this that I think a lot of people are missing the nuance of. PCR works when done correctly. PCR does not work when done incorrectly. And we have very little insight into how the PCR was done throughout the pandemic. If you ask some somebody at their bench to design primers to find SARS-COV-2, and they designed primers and they work and, that would be a pretty reliable test in the right scenario. But when you're putting swabs through the air into the window of a car into a person's throat, and then into here and then into a truck and then shipped somewhere else, and we're talking about a level of, of, of attention to detail and and find analysis that is done regularly in the academic setting where PCR is used to produce nature papers, and then in a completely different manner in the commercial setting as a product. We don't even know to what extent quality control was done on any of those PCR tests.

53:28

ERIC: No, we don't.

53:35

JAY: so we (have?) no concept, even if they were produced perfectly, could find something if they were produced perfectly. Again, because it was an EUA, because the FDA said no, because all of this stuff was done under the pretense that we were responding to the worst case scenario, we don't have time. We don't have the the freedom to look at the safety of this stuff. We just got to get it all out. No matter

what purity it is. No matter how good the manufacturing process is, because otherwise we're gonna lose millions more, right?

55:05

ERIC: I mean, that goes well with the pre planned scenario. It's like pulling the fire alarm, you know, the scene in Twin Peaks where he pulls the fire alarm in the hospital. everyone leaves and he kills the guy. but I'm still trying to grasp here what the evidence that there actually was a pandemic was, if every place along the line of declaring one, there seems to be nine parts room for error and one part room to get it right. And step after step, ugh, they're, they're, there's just one story building on another story, **Where's the proof of the viral spread of anything?**

55:44

JAY: **It's mostly anecdotal. And it's mostly the sequences.** So again, you you are, we are taking for granted the idea that one out of every 1000 or 10,000, or I don't know how many, is sequenced, and that that sequencing is done with integrity, and without malfeasance. And that those sequences are evidence of the existence of a virus. Now, **they have never proven to us that that virus wasn't already there in the background before 2020, because there's no PCR sequencing before 2020. So one of the easiest solutions to this would be that they have identified a Coronavirus that has been endemic already in the human population for some time,** they have produced a number of different ways to make sure that when it's there, they can find it. And then it's at a certain moment, they told us a story that this thing was traveling, and then they produced evidence of it.

56:52

ERIC: Which could be, which could easily be faked evidence.

56:57

JAY: Well, it's not **faked evidence if the virus is there and you're just never sick from it.**

57:02

ERIC: Oh, well, but that's like saying that you know, clock is right twice a day.

57:06

JAY: See, that's where the mistaken is, that's where you're mistaken. About 35% of all cause mortality every year is unknown respiratory disease. Now they tell us they know what it is. Okay, **you you are under the same impulse that so many other people are that before 2020 nobody died of Coronavirus and now they're dying of Coronavirus.** That's what the TV wants you to believe. **What I would like you to believe is that every year 1000s of people die of Coronavirus and 2020 wasn't any different** except we didn't treat the subsequent pneumonia the same way we usually do.

57:47

Well, that would be problematic, because seems like everyone starts dying in March, after the pandemic is declared not before it was declared. In January in February,

58:01

JAY: there's no there's no excess mortality, except for in New York and a few other places in 2020. It's very concentrated in the beginning.

58:08

ERIC: Right, wouldn't that argue for a political problem? I mean, all the airlines were flying people around and the, you know, the commuter trains and buses were going back and forth to the city 90 miles away where I live in New York City near New York City.

58:23

JAY: There's, you said there's no contagion.

58:24

ERIC: Well, no, I'm asking what the proof is. How do we rise to the level of saying there's contagion, shut the world?

58:32

JAY: No, I didn't say that we rose to that occasion. I'm saying that they created the scenario where they could say that, and one of the ways they did it was in New York City not treating anybody for pneumonia correctly. Everybody that got sick from this (??) and that's the thing that people don't fully grasp, is that while a wild Coronavirus can't spread around the city and make millions of people sick in New York, a cloned Coronavirus, RNA applied in some way definitely could.

59:05

ERIC: But what did we need that.... when I was sorting this out in 2020, I came to the conclusion, which is not really a conclusion, but it was like a working postulate that we need the same proof no matter where the contagion came from.

59:20

JAY: That's the reason why these PCR tests in the beginning using the primers that they did in the sequencing, as done as it was by the WHO and other organizations had some fidelity to it.

59:34

ERIC: But you're aware of the Corman Drosten retraction, right? Are you aware of the Corman Drosten retraction demand?

59:42

JAY, Yeah, they demanded it, but they didn't retract.

59:44

ERIC: No, no, but I'm saying that the paper stands on its own. It was a retraction request. And it pointed to the fact that the Corman Drosten assay that was initially outsourced to every place in the world except the United States, itself was Work of fraud from top to bottom.

1:00:03

JAY: Work of fraud is a is a bold statement.

1:00:06

ERIC: Well, that's what it says.

1:00:08

JAY: I know what it says, but I'm in touch with many of the author's already. I'm not saying you're wrong, I'm saying that you're misinterpreting it. They said that the PCR primers were not specific. And then they could make primer dimers, which would give false positives, which are all true.

1:00:22

ERIC: Right. But if they knew, but if they knew any of that going in, that's intent. That's what I mean by ...

1:00:28

JAY: What's more important about the PCRs primers that were used by the WHO at the beginning of the pandemic because they weren't specific for any particular SARS virus.

1:00:38

ERIC: Well, but to claim it a test for a novel Coronavirus, than would be scientific fraud, if they're not specific to any virus, but they're saying that...

1:00:46

JAY: I didn't say any virus I said any SARS virus, that's the point. All they were doing was testing for SARS virus.

1:00:52

ERIC: but they were claiming, they were they were claiming they were seeking a novel Coronavirus, not any SARS virus.

1:01:00

JAY: Mmm hmm. But...

1:01:02

ERIC: so that's, that's and they're then using that for public policy. How is that not scientific fraud on the public?

1:01:08

JAY: It is, but it doesn't mean that there's no virus man, it means that there was, it just was not the cause of a pandemic. I think it's extraordinarily different. And it's it's really so important that people understand that you can't have all of this molecular data without there being the molecules associated with it. You've got to explain the existence of this RNA. And the only way to explain it is that it was already there.

1:01:08

ERIC: But they're PCRing it to find it, right. That's the only way they can find it.

1:01:42

JAY: they're PCRing to find something that they claim indicates its presence, but it has to be there in order for these full sequences to be found.

1:01:50

ERIC: Okay. Okay, so let's, but there's a couple of fine points in there. One is we know there's the RT issue that makes false positives, primer dimer issue makes false positives, nonspecific amplicons. That's making false, false positives. But then there's the cycle threshold issue right? Now we know from Bustin, Steve Bustin, who told David Crowe, that at cycle 35 you've found one molecule of your target. That's what Bustan said to Crowe, I've got the transcript if you're interested.

1:02:23

JAY: Mmm hmm.

1:02:23

ERIC: So we know that every, so one molecule, the thing's already going below the detection limit. And it's got to double the matter in the sample 35 times till the bell rings and says this sample is positive. That's, that's what positive at ct 35 means. And the and they found one molecule, which is highly unlikely to make someone sick. But then all the jurisdictions in the world that I know of, are actually running the PCR at 37 to 45. So how are they, how are they how claiming any validity to their PCR is running them between two to 12 cycles past the absolute detection limit?

1:03:05

JAY: I agree. And as I've been saying that since 2020, myself, I mean, I, I use PCR in my in my PhD project to find nicotinic receptors in the frontal cortex. So you're preaching to the choir here. And I don't, I think it's just it's an unfortunate desire that everybody would like everything to be very simple is to just say that it's all a massive lie and ignore all the signals. But you've got we've got to be more sophisticated than that.

1:03:36

ERIC: But you're saying that it is all a massive lie, except for the existence of the virus.

1:03:43

I'm saying it's a it's a it's much more complicated than saying it's all a lie. They're complicated lies. That's why so many people can believe them.

1:03:54

ERIC: But if they plan to shut the world down in advance, then everything that, that's the everything that flows, there is the fruit of the poison tree. Every excuse made on the way to the object of closing the world down is then suspect as being part of that same scheme.

1:04:16

JAY: Sure, I mean, I'm not sure I feels like we're arguing but I don't think we are I mean...

1:04:22

ERIC: no, I'm just trying to map out some basic facts. I mean, my audience has heard me give the PCR talk probably 100 150 times. So I dragged him through my my learning process on this.

1:04:34

JAY: I see.

1:04:36

Eric: So but here we here we are with I think the most, one of the most important facts is we've already got provenance issues moving into going into the first cycle threshold, the primers, but by the time were, by the time they're exporting a test, running two to 12 cycles past their detection limit, and claiming those are positives. How is that any of of the existence of anything except a test that is known to give false positives?

1:05:06

JAY: No, but remember that they sequenced only things that that had a low cycle threshold. So if you're looking to create a narrative of a virus spreading through a nation or world and you want all of the academic scientists and everybody that could question it to be on board, then you're going to have to do a pretty thorough sweep in order to to get people that are positive for a Coronavirus **so that you can actually do your metasequencing** and pull something out that you can claim is related to your original pathogen.

1:05:47

ERIC: I mean, I mean, to not to put too sharp point on this, but in the Fan Wu paper, they they sample one 41 year old, this becomes the most famous sequence MM908947, but they never did a healthy control. They never did the same process on a healthy control. They just took some lung fluid from this guy. **They did de novo metagenomic sequencing**, and they filed it as a virus and then this gets cited by Corman Drosten and by the CDC as the source of the amplicon.

1:06:21

JAY: **Yeah, that's the paper that I explained.** Right?

1:06:23

ERIC: Well, I'm not, you named a different author. I'm talking about the, and they're all similar the Fan Wu paper, which creates...

1:06:32

JAY: Who is the last author on that paper?

1:06:34

ERIC: What's that?

1:06:35

JAY: Who was the last author?

1:06:36

ERIC: I don't know. I mean, I can look it up. But are you suggesting that the that, you're naming it based on one of the other authors Zhu, Z h u? Anyway, the, we know what they did, and they didn't have a control. So we're taking a, taking as a potential virus source cited by Corman and Drosten and to this day, the CDC, and saying that's our source of our amplicon, when they can't show that amplicon doesn't exist in a healthy person. And they can't show the amplicon came from a virus. How is that science?

1:07:14

JAY: I'm not sure why I'm being asked to defend that paper.

1:07:18

ERIC: Any of them, they're all doing the same thing. All the early ones are all doing the same thing. They're all saying that we we did we did de novo metagenomic transcription from this patient. And we got this thing. And that's what we're going to test for.

1:07:34

JAY: And so your argument is what? What do you want me to say?

1:07:41

ERIC: That's not proof of anything. To me. It's a little like the argument. If you have a quarter in your pocket, you must be a bank robber because there are quarters and banks.

1:07:51

JAY: Well, what they did in in the paper that I believe you're citing is they sequenced the whole virus. In order to get a whole sequence, they had to have the entire sequence present in that sample. Was it chewed up? Was it part of another Coronavirus? Was it part of another six coronaviruses and then they assembled a SARS like virus? I don't know.

1:08:15

ERIC: They crumbled all the they covered all the genetic material.

1:08:18

JAY: That's that's your interpretation.

1:08:20

ERIC: That's what the paper says.

1:08:21

JAY: I understand. But that's your interpretation of it because that's how virology is done. So if you want to criticize the pandemic, you still need to understand that these sequences were measured around the world and found around the world and have been found with nanopore sequencing. So you've got to explain how that's possible.

1:08:45

ERIC: Well, since I'm not versed on the nanopore issue, I'm only versed on the

1:08:50

JAY: So one of the reasons....

1:08:51

ERIC: in silico code primers issues...

1:08:52

JAY: why I'm so excited about meta metagenomic sequencing is because it has to be done with very small fragments, those small fragments are all stacked on top of one another. And their overlap is then providing a consensus sequence at the bottom. So if you don't get 50 redundant parts that overlap over

here, then it's not going to be part of the consensus sequence. So what metagenomic sequence is doing is taking amplicons that it finds and trying to assemble from a known number of sequences. So if it's not in the database, it's not going to find it. So of course, that's a very apt and worthy critique of what they've done to find what's there. **But what they found is indisputably there simply because of the way metagenomic sequencing works.** You can't, you're not, they're not getting, they're not getting random words and assembling a Shakespeare. They're taking pages that repeatedly show up and then overlapping where they show up and then assembling the book. And so while they could assemble something that could be said to be something that it's not, **they can't assemble a sequence from nothing.** They're assembling sequences from amplicons that show up. And so it is not sufficient to say that they made up the sequence, it is only sufficient to say that until we understand what was in that database, and whether that database contained enough so that we know that this sequence is relevant. And whether those amplicons were broadly enough applied, so that we could see whether there were other coronaviruses here, whether there were other viruses present, this is the only objection you can have. Because the idea, it's frustrating, because again, I'm not in a position to nor do I want to defend virology, I want people to understand what biologists think they are seeing.

1:11:08

ERIC: That's very important, I think, I think that what they

1:11:12

JAY: they **are seeing are real sequences,** I can't stress to you enough. And **what people would like you to do is say metagenomic sequencing means that there was no sequence there.**

1:11:23

ERIC: No, here's what I here's what I think the no virus argument is saying, that you've got this metagenomic sequence the book, as you called it, and as Thomas Melendi, at SUNY Buffalo called it, how do you know that book matches the real book, and that that real book is the thing that got the effect.

1:11:44

JAY: So that's where the cDNA clones of viruses come in. That's how they know.

1:11:51

ERIC: what would make, what would establish the proof?

1:11:53

JAY: **When you take an known RNA viral sequence, and you make a cDNA clone of it, you can make many millions of perfect copies of that RNA, through through the copying of that cDNA and bacteria. When you reassemble these RNA and do the same experiments, you can show that that RNA replicates, that RNA produces more copies of itself. And that RNA causes disease in animals, it causes cytopathic, whatever the shit that is in, in, in cell culture, but it does it much better and much more reliably. And the argument that biologists make is that when you make it from cDNA, you make a pure version of it, which is never present in that infection. And that's why when we start with cDNA, we get cytopathic effects in every well.** But when we start from a patient, a lot of those viral particles are not perfect. And so we don't get cytopathic effects in every well. Now hold on. The most important thing to understand here is that up until now, there haven't been the sequencing techniques that are high enough fidelity to test any of those hand waving assumptions. And so **they've gotten away with the last**

30 years of saying that viruses replicate in cells, and they replicate long enough so that those cells die. And then when they die, all these particles come out, we can take those particles and put them in the next dish. And then those cells die. And when when we sequence for the pieces that are in this dish there the sequences that we found in this dish, and so obviously, it's replicating. And all previous experiments have been limited by how they can test that replication, how they can observe it, and how they can show it happening in different fractions.

1:13:55

ERIC: But when you're running the PCR on the population, it's cycle 40 or 45. You don't need any of that. Why bother with any of that? Why does that need to be true to things being run 12 steps below the actual detection limit?

1:14:13

JAY: No, but these are two completely different issues, man. And that's the reason why...

1:14:19

ERIC: you're saying there's something real underlying a lie.

1:14:22

JAY: Exactly. And the lie is exactly what you need to understand. I can't Wow, it's more frustrating than I thought it would be. Because you you seem very much to well, you are very rehearsed in their, in their trap. So this is exactly the argument...

1:14:45

ERIC: I wouldn't go so far as to say that I had already had about 900 days and before I met anyone on the no v... well, I knew Christine Massey, but you know I've done you know, this is for me day 1050 on the story, I haven't missed the day yet. And I focused on the amplicons, the provenance of the amplicons and the PCR and the history of the of the PCR. So I have not been indoctrinated here at all. I've come to this through my own understanding, Tom Cowan didn't convince me of anything. Andy Kaufman didn't convince me of anything. I was not following their work. I really didn't care that much.

1:15:23

But how how best to... the PCR not working has nothing to do with whether there's a Coronavirus or not. And that's part of this, this thing that the no virus people are confusing people about.

1:15:42

ERIC: Well, sure it does, because the entire existence of the virus is demonstrated with PCR.

1:15:48

JAY: No, it's not. It's demonstrated with sequencing. You see, that's the problem.

1:15:52

ERIC: I know. But you go to sequencing, and then you've got to put that into the PCR to find it, to demonstrate that people might be sick around you.

1:16:00

JAY: That's a miss, that's a misconception of the data. And that's not the data but the way that the biology is being applied.

1:16:06

ERIC: No, no, I'm talking about what lands on page one of the New York Times

1:16:09

JAY: the PCR is being used to establish cases.

1:16:15

ERIC: but they're not cases

1:16:16

JAY: Cases established the existence of the virus their cases.

1:16:19

ERIC: What are they cases of if the existence of the virus hasn't even been done correctly?

1:16:26

JAY: ... These amplicons being present. They're not even specific.

1:16:29

ERIC: at cycle 45. How are they present?

1:16:32

JAY: No, there's been lots of people that have test positive cycle 25, That's an, that's the presence of false positives does not negate the presence of positives, that's crazy.

1:16:44

ERIC: It does. If you don't have a true provenance on your positive,

1:16:49

JAY: that's where the, that's where the mistake is happening here. That's where you're, you're letting that that very seductive narrative take you all the way off course. Because the fact that false positives exist, does not negate the fact that people test at the 21st cycle. And when you sequence them, you can find a strong nanopore detectable sequence in them. So there is replicating virus in those people. Is it causing their disease? I couldn't care less.

1:17:22

ERIC: And does it come from a virus?

1:17:23

JAY: What, does one come from a virus?

1:17:26

ERIC: the sequence found at cycle 21? How do you know that even comes from a virus?

1:17:31

JAY: because nanopore sequencing has shown us that it's RNA. Does it come from a virus? I mean, what you you really want? You really are also seduced by this idea that we should be able to make photographs of it when it's there?

1:17:44

ERIC: No, I'm saying that if I'm going to pay \$25,000 for a baseball autographed by Babe Ruth, I want to know why someone thinks that's a baseball autographed by Babe Ruth.

1:17:56

JAY: Well, when they find the full sequence using nanopore, it's, it's it's Babe Ruth.

1:18:04

ERIC: Ruth, but they're still finding it by assembling it. Right?

1:18:07

JAY: No, (nanoplants??). The point of nanopore sequencing, they don't need to assemble it anymore.

1:18:12

ERIC: So what is their whole...

1:18:15

JAY: I'd so much like somebody to listen to that and understand why that's so important.

1:18:20

ERIC: where's the whole base baseball that they're finding that they're then breaking down?

1:18:24

JAY: Again, you want a picture of something that that they can't take a picture of

1:18:29

ERIC: No, I'm saying I want proof that it exists. I study particle physics. I know how they established their proof. They can't take a picture of the Higgs boson. But they have their proofs, they have their, they say that we have these degradation...

1:18:44

JAY: of a, the existence of a replicating RNA molecule is the only proof they have right now. That's as direct as it gets. And they just got it like two years ago.

1:18:55

ERIC: two years ago. So they got it a year into the crisis.

1:18:59

JAY: Maybe three years ago, this one they got because nanopore sequencing just came on the scene in like 2015 or 16.

1:19:06

ERIC: Right. Let's talk about Christine Massey.

1:19:12

JAY: I mean, do you understand, do we, did we get anywhere with that? Because you still don't seem to be under the impression that you understand the point I'm trying to make.

1:19:22

ERIC: okay. So in the case of E. coli, you find the thing and you cut it up and you see what it's made out of. In the case of a virus that seems like it does the opposite thing.

1:19:32

JAY: Orders of magnitude bigger, you're talking about an RNA molecule rolled up in fat that you want to detect, versus an organism that uses 1000s of RNA molecules, has DNA and a cell wall, like I don't even get it. These are not the same.

1:19:50

ERIC: All above was your nose. We know that that E. coli exists because I get that it's bigger.

1:19:58

JAY: You know, you don't think that they're by viruses that infect bacteria called bacteriophages?

1:20:03

ERIC: It depends on your definition of a virus.

1:20:07

JAY: Again, here we go.

1:20:08

ERIC: and by definition of virus I mean, Fauci's definition.

1:20:11

JAY: You can't do that.

1:20:15

ERIC: What do you mean?

1:20:15

JAY: Really, it's really, you're going to lose so much biology by starting at this point, you're losing so many observations, and you're losing so much depth of understanding, by just saying that none of these particles exist, as opposed to them being misunderstood.

1:20:39

ERIC: They seem to be described in existence by inference, not by direct observation.

1:20:45

JAY: But you said that was fine in physics. Why isn't that fine in biology?

1:20:48

ERIC: I'm not saying it's fine in physics. I didn't I never said the Higgs boson exists. I'm saying that I'm studying their thought process of how to get there.

1:20:57

JAY: What is happening when these when these replication, these RNA sequences replicate, what happens then? If it's not...

1:21:05

ERIC: where are they replicating?

1:21:06

JAY: They're replicating in cell culture and in sick animals, they can follow these sequences with nanopore. So they're definitely moving between animals, they might not be causing the disease because you say we can't prove that. But when they use clones, they seem to prove it. See, that's the weird part that all of you people don't seem to acknowledge that if they make a DNA copy of what they say is a consensus viral sequence, and they put that in animals, it kills them.

1:21:35

ERIC: But what is the consensus virus sequence? The one that everyone agrees...

1:21:38

JAY: here we go, now you're asking the right questions. When you do a metagenomic sequencing analysis, you get a consensus sequence, the consensus sequence appears because of the way RNA replicates. We haven't understood it until around 2018 or 19, for the coronaviruses. But we made the experiment in 2019. We saw the data, and then the whole world of virology just ignored its implications and went on with the same story that you're saying rightfully so doesn't make sense.

1:22:15

ERIC: Are you saying there has been a breakthrough in virology that even virologists are ignoring?

1:22:23

JAY: I'm saying that Yep, I'm saying that. That's what I think.

1:22:29

ERIC: And it proves as right what was previously not correctly proven as right?

1:22:35

JAY: I think it shows that viruses exists, they, not viruses exist, I think it shows that that that self replicating RNA exists, and that it's likely that some self replicating RNA can be infectious and moved from from animal to animal. But there is much more reason to believe that the particles that are produced during a viral infection cause immune responses in conspecifics, without causing more infection. And I don't have the paper up now. But I could draw a little picture, I guess, if you wanted it. I'm trying to think if I can, oh, how to best explain it. But when a virus is replicating in your cells, you are told that the virus has to make copies of its RNA, and then it's got to make new packages of itself. And then it's going to release all those things, right. So you can do the thought experiment then that if we took a cell culture of SARS-COV-2 that was growing in a lab and (WIV??) in China, and we took all of

the virus out of it, and then we're going to sequence it, and that's what they say they do. When they did that with nanopore, what would you expect them to get?

1:23:58

ERIC: So an older method, I don't know the technique.

1:24:02

JAY: Well, just just think about it this way. nanopore doesn't, the nanopore that they selling as the venture capital investment of tomorrow is that it doesn't need any amplification, because it can sing sequence Single, single molecules of DNA, go through the nanopore and give you an electrical signal that reads out into a sequence. So a single RNA from a single virus can be read from the top to the bottom. So if they made a pure culture of an RNA Coronavirus, and then they ran it through the nanopore machine, what do you think they would find? How many pure sequences how many? What would they see for RNA, would they see cell culture RNA and whole viral mRNA or a bunch of broken shit? Or what would you expect them to think they would see?

1:24:59

ERIC: Even if they're accurate and what they're seeing, there's two other issues. One is, how do you connect that to a virion? And the second is, how do you connect that to a causative agent in the illness?

1:25:12

JAY: Okay, so you're still, I think you're still fighting the wrong fight, but that's okay. The, the important issue in my mind is to figure out which observations are worth dismissing. If we're going to get to the stage where the general conclusion is that viruses are not dangerous, we're gonna get there, by starting where we are now and walking away. We're not going to get there by taking a plane to wherever that is. And **so I understand your objections to viruses don't cause disease, but they're unfounded, especially when it comes to respiratory viruses because they're present.** No, you don't want to say that they're cause because there are also bacteria. And they're also an immune response. I totally agree with you. **But I think thre presence of viruses, in correlation with pneumonia caused by bacteria is documented.** Are the virus is replicating in our lungs? Or are they replicating in those bacteria or both? All valid questions. But again, you can't start with there aren't any viruses because the sequences are there and the sequences are replicating.

1:26:27

ERIC: I'm not starting from there, actually, this is never my issue, or it wasn't since the early 90s when I worked on HIV. What I what I came into this investigating was the claim of a viral outbreak. I didn't come into this to investigate virology. I was investigating the claim of a test for a virus and a test for a viral out and a viral outbreak.

1:26:48

JAY: you think the same thing was done with HIV? With the test?

1:26:52

ERIC: are you aware of the Perth group's work and their paper A virus like no other? There's so there's there's been a lot of work done on HIV by many people from Montangier to the Perth group and other other people as well. And so I'm not ignorant of that whole dataset, or the fact pattern that it presents. I prefer to stick to SARS-COV-2 in this discussion, because it's less of a red herring. HIV can become a

red herring for people to have a lot of emotional attachment to it. But they have a lot of emotional attachment to SARS-COV-2 as well, because I think ... in the event that there is a problem with establishing the truth of this virus, we've got a very serious problem on our hands. And the line between the mismanaged pandemic and the made up pandemic is the line of intent. And the line of intent is the difference between bad public health policy and genocide.

1:27:50

JAY Yeah.

1:27:52

ERIC: that is very sensitive, right?

1:27:54

JAY: It is very sensitive. And it taken me almost three years to get to the stage where I would say what I'm seeing on your on your program now.

1:28:01

ERIC: But it sounds like you're saying that well, they may not have done the work to prove the existence of SARS-COV-2 at the time, but we've we've retrofitted that, we've retro proven that by using this other technique, you're describing your nano particle...

1:28:20

JAY: nanopore sequencing has proven that full virome, full virus sequences exist in some patients. And it has also shown that viral replication does not occur and the way that they have claimed up until very recently, which is that it makes copies of itself and then explodes and all these copies go free.

1:28:44

ERIC: It does not do that?

1:28:46

JAY: No, it doesn't do that at all.

1:28:47

ERIC: Well, that seems to disprove the entire concept of a virus as put forth by the CDC.

1:28:53

JAY: The entire concept no, but yes, it's not every viral particle is infectious at all, in fact, the vast majority of viral particles produced are not infectious. They're just irritating. And that's the whole misconception of what viruses do. The other thing that's very, I think, will make a lot of sense to you is that viruses, no, no RNA sequence would be capable of making your cells do something they didn't already do. And all of our cells and tissues are capable of producing exosomes in a in a in a manner that allows them to send RNA to other tissues, allows them to send extracellular signals to one another, the brain and neurons do it with Arc protein and arc RNA. And there's lots of other examples that we'll find as we move on to a new sort of understanding of what of what virology is because the only way that viruses could exist is if your body already made a similar thing. And so if your body already uses exosomes in communication, then occasionally, you can imagine a scenario where RNA that's either foreign, or RNA that's erroneous, or RNA that's harmless, would hijack, or be temporarily using that

same machinery to produce copies of itself. If that happens, you can imagine a scenario where there is an irritation to the immune system, which stops that erroneous RNA replication. It's that simple. We've been having to fight this for, for all of our existence, since we, since we were eukar, became eukaryotes...

**FROM THIS POINT ONWARDS IT IS NECESSARY TO
ADD 1 HOUR, 30 MINUTES AND 40 SECONDS
TO THE TIMESTAMP THAT IS LISTED**

00 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Look, I think this is interesting science. What I'm trying to get to is the legitimacy of locking down the world on March 11. And I don't see anything.

00:14 + 1:30:40

JAY: You're not going to get there with me. I mean, I don't I don't think that there was a reason to do it. I think that there was an elaborate story that was told beforehand, and right up into the pandemic, and then a series of molecular signals was claimed to be real. Some of them had to be real because there were whole sequences that were drawn from them. Those whole sequences are, are not likely to be wholesale fake. I think they're likely to be to have been generated by a particular set of biological circumstances that they understand but we don't

00:14 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but in one study they're matching 30 base pairs, they're taking 30 base pairs and claiming they've got 30,000 They they extrapolate from their known sample and they build up their their sequence I've got this paper came out in the spring in the US.

01:12 + 1:30:40

ERIC: How are they going from, you know, 30 base pairs to a 30,000 base pair full sequence?

01:18 + 1:30:40

Jay: No, that's for sure that that's there's no question that that's all.

01:23 + 1:30:40

JAY: That's all very shady stuff.

01:25 + 1:30:40

JAY: But if you if you take the 30,000 foot helicopter view that I do, the idea is to entrap everybody. So no matter what side of this story, you come down, you have to be wrong. Otherwise you're not trapped. And up until very recently, I have been pushing that this is a gain a function virus, that they made it, that it went around the world that it's you know, still probably around and by forcing myself to read hundreds of papers to see what what the theme is in this Coronavirus research and Coronavirus thinking in terms of grants and this kind of stuff. You see clearly that virology itself even understood that they were studying shadows of a biological phenomenon they they understood that what they were looking at were indirect signals of replicating genetic things that we don't really get. And the the morphing of that

very mysterious world of ghost biology to a oh my gosh, anybody in their garage can create a virus that could kill millions is the illusion and so to dismiss the existence of viral particles to dismiss the cause of respiratory disease is a failure to realize that what they have fooled us about. And if we don't realize what they fooled us about, that we will discard all of the knowledge that can still help us see the depth and breadth of their malfeasance.

03:15 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Who's discarding the nuances here? The people who I know are working very hard to get them right

03:26 + 1:30:40

JAY: yeah, I guess you I hope you know people that I don't know that because I don't know anybody who will have a useful conversation that doesn't start with defend these four papers.

03:38 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Well, have you read Mark Bailey's paper A Farewell to virology?

03:41 + 1:30:40

JAY: When did it come out?

03:44 + 1:30:40

ERIC: It came out, I guess around them alone. It was late last year. I think it was around October. Nope. Let's see. Hold on. Hold on. Hold on, hold on. Give the exact date

03:54 + 1:30:40

JAY: because I don't think that it's the same fight to make a fight between, for example, one of the things I can't understand is why the the people that want there to be no virus would like to make it such a confrontation for everybody on this side.

04:20 + 1:30:40

JAY: It's a question of it's a question of, of genuine wanting to meet in the middle or understand versus not, so they never want to talk to me, never want to they want to talk on their terms with their moderators with their specific topics. They don't want to discuss anything else. To me...

04:47 + 1:30:40

ERIC: If this went to court the question would be, the battle of the experts would be, can you assert the existence of a virus that's never been seen before, using metagenomics or not? Because that's what was done. They asserted the existence of a virus that had never been seen before by metagenomics said there was pandemic and shut down the world. Can that call be made using the methods that were used? I think this is a very important question of fact for the jury. Can that be done?

05:20 + 1:30:40

JAY: I think that's a well a well worded question. I think that's very nice.

05:24 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but it is a confrontation. And either that kid shot that person with that gun or not.

05:29 + 1:30:40

ERIC: If you're having a murder trial, and you don't, your witnesses are important, but then you have to match that bullet to that gun and you have to replicate the riflings on the bullet that killed the victim and another bullet produced by that gun, you got a very high level of proof to say that did that.

05:51 + 1:30:40

ERIC: And I think when you see, when you experience people taking the no virus position as polarizing, they are saying "prove to me that that person shot that person with that gun and that bullet"

06:05 + 1:30:40

JAY: Yeah, I, again, I don't I don't see that argument as being a reason for Christine Massey to try and get me in trouble on the internet. I don't see it as a reason for Cowen to send threatening emails to Robert F. Kennedy Jr. on my behalf.

06:31 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I don't I haven't seen any threatening emails.

06:35 + 1:30:40

JAY: maybe you haven't seen threatening emails but that's what they sent. They sent, they copied me and my and Bobby Kennedy and they say that if I won't come on their show to defend the existence of SARS-COV-2, then they'll do their own show, to show and use my previous statements. And I don't I don't really understand how that's productive when I've asked to just have a Zoom meeting with them and talk to them in private to see if we could come up with a way to have a meeting of the minds. They don't want that.

07:10 + 1:30:40

ERIC: they don't, they won't, who particularly?

07:13 + 1:30:40

JAY: Christine Massey said that she had no time for a Zoom meeting. And also Tom Cullen only wants to do it if there's going to be a moderator out there, you know, and there's a specific topic and so we can't look at nanopore sequencing papers or anything like that because those are based on previous papers that they say are nonsense that they don't have time for. And I don't understand why.

07:35 + 1:30:40

JAY: I don't understand why we can't talk.

07:38 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Well, but when you and I are here, you and I are here

07:41 + 1:30:40

JAY: you are not the same person and you are clearly not. I feel very much as though the challenge that you've presented to me today has been the best one that I've had in a very long time and the sense of not feeling

07:58 + 1:30:40

JAY: I can feel very much where you're coming from I can feel very much the the stance and why you are defending that hill so well and I can't I can't, How can I say it, I can't criticize you for for choosing that place like many other people choose that place to stop but that's a that's

08:23 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I mean, I'm not sure if you know my background, but I have been involved in unraveling scientific fraud since I was 19.

08:32 + 1:30:40

ERIC: When I landed in Love Canal, one day I had my feet on the ground and Love Canal neighborhood and Niagara Falls and so everyone knows the story but I'm standing in a neighborhood of 700 homes and 23,000 tons of nuclear and toxic waste. And the state having made various claims it was perfectly safe to live there. And I'm 19 years old, you know, today you're (???) So it proceeded from there and I've covered Monsanto and I see I've seen all of the same maneuvers that were done during COVID done many other times and many other instances not not involving viruses and involving viruses both

09:15 + 1:30:40

JAY: can you see though why my I'm extremely hesitant to say that the towers didn't fall and I think I am extremely hesitant to say that there was no virus. Now, did the virus not spread? Was it only found in 10 people? Was it only found at 100 people? Has it never been found again? All of those are legitimate questions based on the simple fact that we know that the PCR was used ridiculously incorrect.

09:45 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Yeah, and only the original 41 patients. I mean, do you know how many tests are positive of the original 41 patients?

09:51 + 1:30:40

JAY: I don't know

09:53 + 1:30:40

ERIC: 15. 15. so even with this test that can manufacture false positives, they still only have 15 testing positive based on God knows what cycle threshold and then they're gonna they're gonna they shut down the world based on 15 positive test results. I mean, this is just

10:13 + 1:30:40

JAY: remember, remember, I remember again when I'm not remember but try to

10:21 + 1:30:40

JAY: maybe I just have to teach that paper at some point again, but the nanopore sequencing paper is extraordinary because what they found when they used cDNA to make a copy of the human Coronavirus, 229E they made perfect infectious RNA clone of it. I can send you the paper after we're done here. What they did was they then grew it in a dish. So they grew this virus in a dish. And then they took all the contents of the dish out and they ran it through the nanopore. it's where you would think in a dish like that there would have been 1000s and 1000s of full genomes that would have gone through the nanopore while there was another 30,000, there's another 30... Well, they found two.

11:12 + 1:30:40

ERIC: So when you take that same stuff

11:16 + 1:30:40

JAY: Wait. in comparison, they found 400,000 copies of the spike protein subgenomic RNA, they found 300,000 copies of the n protein, subgenomic RNA, they found almost no copies of the RNA polymerase RNA, 2. So out of a sample where they can quantify, this is why it's important to understand what nanopore sequencing could potentially do for the no virus people is that it can quantify the relative presence of these molecules, not perfectly. But if that was a dish full of replicating viruses, and you ran it through the nanopore you would expect it to find a hell a lot more than two full genome sequences at a 400,000 copies of the spike protein. What you see there is this replicating RNA genomes aren't very good at getting the full genome into an exosome and coughed (?) out, which is the reason why Coronaviruses don't spread that well, which is reason why Coronaviruses aren't that easy to isolate from an infected case. Because the vast majority, the vast majority of particles that are produced don't even contain the whole genome. They might not even have any genome in them. They might just have spikes on the outside. So you have a group of people that's exposed to a release... a generated RNA clone sprayed inhaled by a (??). Every person that gets that RNA is going to be spraying mostly noninfectious particles, which are irritated, irritating to the immune system of everybody exposed to them. They might even show symptoms but only one person in that hospital needs to be shedding anything in order for all those people to get sick from the same immunogen, which is the reason why lots of people who are present in the same household will show an immune response even though they don't get sick. Because the shedding that the virus the virus causes when a virus is replicating is almost exclusively incompetent particles. Because for every full genome they make, they make millions of partial genomes that never ever, ever couldn't replicate and another cell, could only stimulate the immune system to respond. If you see that every experiment that they've done with SARS-COV-2, shows the same thing. Start with a clone, will make a little cell culture, try to do nanopore sequencing. Oh shit, we only found 10 sequences. But we find millions of copies of these subgenomic RNAs. So it turns out that one of the major things that they say happens when a virus replicates is not happening. Something very different is happening where again, because the RNA is replicating, the RNA couldn't be detected as small PCR amplicons even in you if you got a little bit of that spike protein RNA from somebody that coughed on you and then you use PCR for what it does. Of course, it's going to find that RNA, it doesn't mean you're sick. It means you were close to someone who was shedding particles that had that RNA amplicon in it.

14:50 + 1:30:40

ERIC: we were told they were sick and that there were 500,000 cases a day... society...

14:56 + 1:30:40

JAY: very different than there being no real signal.

15:02 + 1:30:40

ERIC: ... given all of the games that were played, we'd really want to look closely at the claim of a real signal.

15:10 + 1:30:40

JAY: I'm just trying to suggest to you that the real signal of 10 Perfect sequences shown to the right people would have been enough excuse to trigger off this, this full response and never looked back, especially if it was in the background and could be found in everyone. So there's there's too many simpler explanations for why the molecular biology signal exists as it does and it's been misinterpreted, as opposed to just being wholly generated false. You cannot dismiss the people that are testing positive and then are sequenced. And there are a few 100,000 of those people. So either the virus was there, or that's got to be what it was, or the virus as some other you know, there's only one way I can't even come up with another one anymore. There's only one way is that the virus was already there. And when they seeded the pandemic, they seeded it specifically, specifically with a clone because that's the only way you can create any local noise with a Coronavirus. There's no other way to explain it, the other all the other major outbreaks of human coronaviruses have involved 10s or perhaps 100 people in an old folks home or in a small town or in an army base, but never ever in the history of the world has gone beyond 800 people dead which is what the first SARS virus supposed to have done. we don't even know if that's true.

16:50 + 1:30:40

ERI: But we're really a long way from Lili Ren and fan Wu claiming that there is a novel Coronavirus when they could have had no way to make that claim

17:08 + 1:30:40

JAY: no way to make the claim that there was a novel Coronavirus

17:12 + 1:30:40

ERIC: and therefore shutdown the world.

17:14 + 1:30:40

JAY: It could have been could have been a novel Coronavirus. Why not?

17:17 + 1:30:40

ERIC: it could have been one but this is like somebody shows up at a bank with a water gun and everyone knows it's a water gun.

17:22 + 1:30:40

JAY: Not necessarily. I don't I don't I still don't think you see that it just has to be that a virus was in that person.

17:31 + 1:30:40

ERIC: it's sounding too coincidental to me, it's sounding like they falsely claimed there was a virus and then coincidentally there was one. And if that's true, why did the deaths only begin after the mitigation measures began?

17:47 + 1:30:40

JAY: That's also an illusion. I don't know why you're thinking that that the deaths ... The deaths are there every year, excess deaths start when we stop treating people

17:59 + 1:30:40

ERIC: it seems like they started when we started treating people with SARS-COV-2.

18:02 + 1:30:40

JAY: OR stopped. Right? because that's what we did. We didn't have any treatment

18:11 + 1:30:40

ERIC: ...various different drugs use people coming to the hospital who might have had the same thing last year, but they didn't go to the hospital, then they commander, then they're poisoned. I'm trying to figure out where you're arguing, I think a very narrow argument that there is legitimacy to the claim of finding these sequences that you say are viral. And I'm looking at the legitimacy of shutting down the world based on the claims that were made up through March of 2020.

18:47 + 1:30:40

JAY: Right so we're really arguing past one another. I'm not arguing with you at all. I don't I agree with everything You're saying.

18:54 + 1:30:40

ERIC: You've agreed that was basically all a scam?

18:56 + 1:30:40

JAY: I do. I mean, I said that in the beginning. That's why I don't understand why we're arguing.

19:02 + 1:30:40

ERIC: no, no, we're not. This is I'm from New York where you can be standing on the street and two people can be screaming at each other and they're best friends. Somebody else will think they were arguing ultimately... This would seem this would seem to me to support the work of Christine Massey, who's only asked Do you have a sample taken from a human or no and they all say no. But the problem with they're saying no is they're all ... saying the virus exists.

19:32 + 1:30:40

JAY: Specifically, I think it's this is part of the thing that annoys me. There is a FOIA Freedom of Information request for records pertaining to... so there aren't any records then there's nothing to produce. And that's very separate from from whether there is a virus or not. And so it's it's it's again...

19:57 + 1:30:40

ERIC: we're not in the abstract. I'm not asking that in the abstract. I'm asking for the people who claim that there was one to show their evidence that there was one. That that's that's why I think Christine Massey project is so important, because she's asking the people making the claim. She's not submitting the claim to Housing and Urban Development, or the parts department. She is submitting the claim to the very entities that that, she's submitting her request to the entities that said there was a virus and she's saying, show me your virus, and they're all saying well, either we don't have any or the way you're asking it doesn't exist.

20:32 + 1:30:40

JAY: Yeah. And then she's stopping there, I guess.

20:44 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Well, she's not responsible for the whole thing. she's got her little part.

20:52 + 1:30:40

JAY: Why would she not want to talk to me then, I don't understand. If, if the whole idea is that she has evidence that there wasn't a virus isolated, and I'm trying to explain that the excuses for why they think they don't need to isolate it, and why nanopore sequencing can finally open up a scientific dialogue that isn't just 'there's no virus and you didn't isolate it', but very specifically understanding the techniques that these people are currently in belief of..., and turning them against them, saying to them, I understand your your claims. I understand your technique. And I would like you to use your latest techniques to explain to me why you don't see what you predicted to see. And instead, they get stuck on FOIA requests. They get stuck on that. I can't argue why there's no SARS-cov-2, and I'm not the virologist they're looking for. I'm just a person who's trying to suggest that if we stop there, and we don't try to understand the illusion that has been created, how are we going to explain the illusion to anybody who's currently under its spell? You can't get anybody to stop believing in a scripture by telling them that that Scripture is a lie. You're gonna have to break it down a little better than that. And I don't feel a genuine effort on the part of Christine to do that. Because otherwise she wouldn't be so aggressive with me behind the scenes and would gladly have a phone call with somebody who approached her with "I would like to talk to you about this no virus thing". So we can come together.

22:42 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but she has her specific angle on this.

22:44 + 1:30:40

JAY: And that's a whole ridiculousness of it.

22:48 + 1:30:40

ERIC: wait wait, but she's just one person, a citizen.

22:52 + 1:30:40

JAY: One person who has antagonized me to my boss repeatedly, to a person that I respect and consult for, repeatedly in a threatening manner, that's taking a call.

23:05 + 1:30:40

ERIC: that's Robert Kennedy right?

23:07 + 1:30:40

JAY: because they would really like to be on screen with him as opposed to just having a discussion off screen.

23:12 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Well, I mean, I had my three minutes of fame with him in April. But one thing Bobby wrote in 2020 when Bill Houston got back a FOIL from New York saying that they didn't have one sheet of paper about whether masks work or are safe.

23:28 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Right? That's what they said. And Bobby commented out loud on Instagram, he said, quote, " it erodes popular faith in democracy when public officials insist that their arbitrary policies are science-based and yet they cannot produce a single study to support sweeping mandates. This letter illustrates

the hazard of abandoning due process." That can easily be said about all of Christine Massey's work, it applies to the same thing. A no records found FOIL, and Bobby, an attorney, is saying why that's so important that they can't prove the basis of their policies.

24:05 + 1:30:40

JAY: I think, I think that's that when you say it this way, I can come up with the best response that I have for Christine and for you in this regard. And that is that Christine is aimed, I guess, at convincing different people than I am. I'm very interested in specifically convincing academic biologists to question academic biology. So I'm talking to the priests and I'm preaching to the priests. Having already converted a lot of normal people. A lot of normal people don't need to be convinced that this this priesthood is broken.

24:44 + 1:30:40

JAY: And so in that sense, the FOI requests may be a great way to convince carpenters and plumbers, and school teachers, that this whole thing is a scam. It may work...

24:59 + 1:30:40

ERIC:, but they would be on the jury in the United States. Teachers and carpenters are on the jury, right? And so you have to convince them, it's not about experts.

25:09 + 1:30:40

JAY: Sure, but for me, it is. so you can say that, but for me it is, because the human human race right now is under the control of experts under the under the pretense that the experts at the top of the pyramid are deferred to by all the people at the lower levels of the pyramid. So I'm talking to the people in the middle of the pyramid.

25:31 + 1:30:40

JAY: I'm trying to convince virologist to wake up. she's not trying to convince virologist to wake up. ...

25:42 + 1:30:40

ERIC: she has found, what to me...

25:51 + 1:30:40

JAY: There's the rub. She's not trying to convince anyone of anything. I am trying to teach biology in the context of the pandemic, in the context of a lot of mythology, a lot of misnomers a lot of lies about how certain types of biological products work.

26:10 + 1:30:40

JAY: And so it is insufficient for me to approach the biology that I'm trying to teach, by starting with the fact that proof of no SARS-cov-2 is therefore proof of all viruses don't exist.

26:25 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Who is saying this? I don't think anyone's saying that. I see people going case by case looking at outbreak after outbreak where there was one claimed to be viral. I see them going back and looking at the provenance of every single different case not not trying to misuse inductive logic. SARS-cov-2 doesn't exist, therefore the measles doesn't exist. I don't hear that. I hear the case being made virus by virus.

26:57 + 1:30:40

JAY: she's saying that there's no measles.

26:59 + 1:30:40

ERIC: she's not saying it as a logical consequence of these FOIL requests. sHe's saying that for example, as logical consequences of Stefan Lanka's lawsuits in Germany which show that there are no isolation papers on the measles.

27:12 + 1:30:40

ERIC: So I don't I don't see them doing this one thing you seem to be saying they're doing, which is making false leaps of inductive logic. I see people doing independent in depth work, and then comparing that work and seeing where their scenarios match up.

27:34 + 1:30:40

ERIC: And really, if we focus on SARS-cov-2 just from a policy standpoint, if the CDC recommends an action in society, my question is, what what grounds did you have to do that and when they answer 10 times if they don't have a paper showing the existence of a virus that would certainly raise the question in the mind of the jury that they were acting in good faith and on real information.

28:04 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Most ordinary people would expect someone to say 'here's the paper showing that we have it'.

28:11 + 1:30:40

JAY: So how do we how do we, how are we going to wake up doctors? How are we going to wake up everybody who thinks that they understand the biology, enough to know? because FOIA requests aren't going to do it. That's my point.

28:33 + 1:30:40

ERIC: No, I'm not saying they're going to do it. I'm saying that they're an element where I believe an attorney making up the case, that would be ... I have five basic pillars of the case

28:45 + 1:30:40

JAY: where is the case going to be? I mean, where's who's going to bring the case? who's doing that?

28:49 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I'm not sure, it's hypothetical at this point.

28:52 + 1:30:40

JAY: Right. So again, that's my point. How can we rest right now that somebody found and sent a bunch of FOIs to a bunch of organizations like police departments? she sent FOIs to police department.

29:05 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Yeah, but she also sent them to every health agency in the world.

29:09 + 1:30:40

JAY: Every or just a lot?

29:11 + 1:30:40

ERIC: the major ones Health Canada, CDC, the corresponding in Australia and New Zealand.

29:16 + 1:30:40

ERIC: no they responded in the negative and said they have no records.. And I'm saying that stands as its own independent database and is not being used, for example, ..

29:16 + 1:30:40

JAY: they're saying they have no records. They have no records pertaining to the isolation of SARS-COV-2 from a patient and that it's very specific, whatever she wrote, and so she got no responses from them.

29:42 + 1:30:40

JAY: how should it be used other than to say that the government's are guilty of doing something wrong?

29:51 + 1:30:40

ERIC: it demonstrates, it brings an element of factual basis to the argument. I think it's very important to have that and also to not claim anyone else believes it means something else.

30:07 + 1:30:40

ERIC: It just what it says, it's very narrow and there's she says, Do you have it? and they say, No, we don't and it's unanimous and let's move on.

30:18 + 1:30:40

JAY: They don't have any records?

30:21 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Right. You certainly would expect them to. the prosecution must produce the bullet from the gun to convict on the basis of a gunshot wound.

30:30 + 1:30:40

JAY: But this is not a murder trial.

30:32 + 1:30:40

ERIC Sure It is, in my mind it is.

30:35 + 1:30:40

JAY: this a prep act emergency, that's another thing that I ..

30:38 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Well they exempted themselves from prosecution. and it would be a murder trial in any sane society.

30:44 + 1:30:40

JAY: what they did is legal and on the books, so you're gonna have to work with the fact that they are in a prep act emergency where countermeasures are being used.

30:53 + 1:30:40

ERIC: countermeasures to what? it's only countermeasures if there's something to counter. That's why the question is so important.

31:03 + 1:30:40

JAY: the prep act doesn't require them to prove that. So see, this is where, again, those FOIA requests don't really matter. If we're going to win we are going to convince real lost ingra... people that are in the system right now and think that we are in the midst of a national security emergency that has to do with a bioweapon that was released or created. We need to convince those people that they are wrong, we are not trying to convince these people they are wrong by telling them that a bunch of FOIA requests has proved that there was no agent.

31:40 + 1:30:40

JAY: That is ridiculous.

31:42 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I'm saying that's one element of the argument

31:45 + 1:30:40

JAY: but none of those people are vulnerable to that one element at all. That would be equivalent to saying to a Christian, that God the Father doesn't exist.

31:56 + 1:30:40

ERIC: , no, no, no, no, no, no, it would be the equivalent of a letter from the Pope, saying that God the Father doesn't exist. And if there's letter from the pope that's a really important letter. it doesn't prove or disprove God. But it tells you...

32:10 + 1:30:40

JAY: you're overestimating what real lawyers and what real people that use FOIA requests attribute to those FOIA requests because the no existing non existence of a record that fits her description is not going to prove to any lawyer that there is malfeasance happening in the execution of the prep act. So this is the confusion

32:37 + 1:30:40

ERIC: you have to give me a chance to respond to that. No, no, no, no. you have to formulate the hypothetical questions for the jury. They moved...

32:47 + 1:30:40

JAY: There won't be a jury trial. You see what I'm trying to tell you. There's never going to be this hypothetical jury.

32:53 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I consider the jury trial going on all the time. The The this is we're doing this as trial by media, ie zoom.

33:01 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Right? We we have to use the tools that we have and look, to my ear as reporter who covers fraud, meaning federal fraud and failure to warn, that the admission that the the infectious agents cannot be found is a big admission. It's an admission against interest. And that itself should be followed up on with the next question being okay, on what basis did you act? It's not the end of the story. I think this FOIs are the beginning of the the beginning of the questioning process. Well, then what happened?

33:38 + 1:30:40

JAY: I mean, I won't, I can't argue on that big picture. I just I am I have been dealt with in a very disingenuous way by these people repeatedly and I can't figure out why it is. And so if they have well meaning in their in their behavior, I'm happy to hear it and I'm I'm hopeful that it's the case

34:13 + 1:30:40

ERIC: IF YOU read farewell to virology, you'll get the reasoning process whereby Mark Bailey deconstructs whether virology can do the things it says it can do. This is really the faint central question here. Can they make the claims they're making based on the technology that they have?

34:34 + 1:30:40

ERIC: And this seems to me to be the topic of mark's paper.

34:39 + 1:30:40

JAY: I guess I'll have to read it.

34:42 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I mean, it's an important one. I mean, I think Mark Bailey would be our you know, most likely

34:48 + 1:30:40

JAY: he would be the only the only one I would be interested in talking to because he's the only one has ever shown any restraint and in any of the appearances I've ever seen. and he's not contacted me via email at all.

35:02 + 1:30:40

JAY: Tom Cowen and Christine Massey are the ones who have taken a very aggressive and and quite negative bent on communicating with me directly. They would always like it to be in some way that they can exploit it for publicity, so I'm not interested in playing their game and the problem with them in my mind comes from what else they say.

35:29 + 1:30:40

JAY: If if they said a lot of other extremely in line with the movement and the health freedom movement, things that I would be a little bit more apt to do to give them the benefit of the doubt but when you know you're you're promoting people like Veda Austin and freezing water with memory and a lot of other hocus pocus. I think it's there's something very disingenuous going on and that's why I said disingenuous, because if, if we were just trying to find common ground, we would have already had a discussion a long time ago. And if they were interested in in converting me in a meaningful way, we would have had a discussion a long time ago, but there's always been chess moves and always trying to position themselves in a manner. Not only can they win over me, but they can do it in the context of a

nice audience or a nice platform and i i find that just to be, I've been, I've had my life ruined, ruined by speaking out about this. And I lost a career that I used to love. And I've struggled to to recover from that for the last three years because it's a it's a difficult career path to jump off of, especially if you don't want to jump into industry that would be pharmaceuticals and whatever else, so I definitely feel like I have enough skin in the game to to have an opinion that isn't 'there's no virus at all'. Also, because having used other types of viruses in my in my neuroscience career, I have the impression that some of this molecular biology is very well understood. And so, until somebody convinces me otherwise.

37:27 + 1:30:40

JAY: I think the idea that virology has overextended itself is, I'm sure of it. The idea that the the dangers of viruses from a gain of function perspective has been exaggerated I am for sure of, and so I agree from abroad, from the high altitude perspective that these know that the no virus position has so many valid claims and I've I've explored a number of them and it's a result of exploring a number of them that I find myself where I am now and where I wasn't six months ago. So credit to many of them, credit mostly to Mark Bailey because again, he's probably the only one who I can really listen to and and hear the biology at a level of understanding that at least seems like he's using similar similar principles and concepts that I would share...

38:39 + 1:30:40

ERIC: so remembering that Christine's goal, as I see it, is only to establish what the government knew and when it knew it. I think.

38:55 + 1:30:40

JAY: I don't know. I don't know how what we know now really plays into that. we know now that the United States government was responding to this as a national security emergency so we don't even know if if if and when and how all of these these governments were responding. And at this stage in time, I just don't I don't see how we're going to make any more progress until we we collectively agree that it is the actions of the government that caused a pandemic and not some virus and I think the frustrating thing that I am encountering is that although I say those words out loud, Tom Cowen and Christine Massey won't won't communicate with me in a meaningful way but only with aggression and with with with some kind of antagonistic bent and I don't understand it, because I'm one of the few people so far on the academic biology side, who isn't still pushing the gain of function virus narrative and the SARS-COV-2 is circling the globe for three years.

40:19 + 1:30:40

JAY: I'm the only one who's offered an alternative explanation for how Omicron could have shown up when the phylogeny that it had, and I'm the only one who's trying to incorporate a majority of the biological observations that have been made but explain them in an alternative way as opposed to what a lot of of these more seductive no virus narratives are, is to try and claim that nobody got sick, none of the tests work, none of the data is real. And everybody's lying.

40:58 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Because if the test isn't valid, if the test is a test based on an in silico sequence, that's then jacked to cycle 45, how is that relevant information, especially when they knew in 2006 this very thing could get 100% false positives?

41:13 + 1:30:40

ERIC: There's absolutely no validity to the test. It seems in any context for diagnostic purposes.

41:20 + 1:30:40

ERIC: This is premeditated, because they knew that in 2006, the CDC circulated a memo in 2007 saying, you cannot use PCR this way and then they do it.

41:36 + 1:30:40

JAY: Again, it's you're conflating two different things, you're conflating or mixing up the, how would we say it another way, how can we do it another way?

41:52 + 1:30:40

JAY: How about if we breathalyze everybody? And we set the breathalyzers so sensitive that like half of the people that were driving cars tested as though they were intoxicated, and therefore there are no drunk drivers. That's what you're saying. And so no,

42:08 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I'm not saying that at all. No, no. I'm saying that it would not be enough to shut the highways down.

42:15 + 1:30:40

ERIC: The big issue whether there are drunk drivers or not is not the issue the issue

42:19 + 1:30:40

JAY: okay, but then we're drivers include perfect and we totally agree, because that's what they did. There are drunk drivers most likely, in order to make sure that when they decided to declare that they needed to close the roads because drunk driving was an epidemic. They've probably seeded it a few places with drunk people in order to make sure that at least some police departments had a few examples where they were like, holy shit, this is a low PCR and they have ground glass capacities, and they're sick, holy crap. And I got sick after being around them, because I was exposed to something of what they had, these things happen.

43:03 + 1:30:40

ERIC: you may have gone into a house that had poisoned, have the Poison bottle left open.

43:09 + 1:30:40

JAY: Okay, but then there's still something that they share, right?

43:14 + 1:30:40

ERIC: It doesn't mean it's contagious. If there's polyethylene open...

43:21 + 1:30:40

JAY: I just explained to you why the nanopore sequencing data shows that the RNA sequence can be present. It can be producing proteins that cause other people to get sick, but they themselves will never test positive.

43:38 + 1:30:40

ERIC: we're a long way from a legitimate reason to lock the planet down on March 11.

43:45 + 1:30:40

JAY: And you're you're asking me to give you a reason that I don't have and I don't I never said that I have it, right. We know that.

43:52 + 1:30:40

ERIC: And that's what's motivating everyone that I know on this. No one's in this for the abstract theory.

43:59 + 1:30:40

ERIC: This is not about some abstraction. This is about what was said and what was known, what was the claim and what was the proof.

44:05 + 1:30:40

JAY: Like I've said it before, and I will say it again, I'm not trying to convince the average guy anymore. I haven't been for a very long time. I'm trying to convince the people that think they have enough sophisticated knowledge about molecular biology and biology in general, that they understand how this works. And in order to convince those people that they think that they can open up a paper and read it, that they can incorporate it into their understanding and they they listened to tweet on YouTube and they listened to Vincent rants in yellow tell them about polio. And they think they understand. Those are the people I'm talking to. Those people will not be awoken by a simple acknowledgement of all those FOIs as well. I I guess these people must all be crazy. I need to be able to talk to a university level virologist and say why their understanding of virology is incorrect. That's my goal.

45:08 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Yeah, that's whole different than the political action that Christine is taking. On the political level, to ..??... the letters by lawyers are reviewed by

45:20 + 1:30:40

JAY: I contacted her and said that I had some biological data that I thought might help her more provide a more nuanced position.

45:28 + 1:30:40

JAY: They tried to get me discounted by CHD, they tried to get me released by CHD. They try to belittle me as as a biologist, rather than realizing that... I sent an email saying I'd like to have a discussion, we should we should get together and talk. and it immediately became antagonistic and about getting me on a stream. And it's ridiculous. I'm sorry, but it's ridiculous. That's not a genuine person, trying to make a genuine contact with somebody. It's somebody trying to leverage something. It's weird. You contacted me and talked to me. It took one week. We scheduled it, it happened. I sent her an email and it's led to a series of of group emails from different people accusing me of being disingenuous to them. It's ridiculous. It's not the behavior of people trying to get to the bottom. Its people trying to win or get subscribers or sell substack, of which I have not.

46:36 + 1:30:40

Right, well,

46:37 + 1:30:40

JAY: It's very frustrating.

46:39 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I haven't found a reason to question their personal motives. Like to me, nothing about Christine Massey's actions, I've known her for two years, have in any way indicated to me that she's not sincere in her actions.

46:59 + 1:30:40

JAY: Has she ever invited you on a podcast next week, and if we don't show up, she's going to use your old videos for it?

47:04 + 1:30:40

ERIC: No, I mean, I, I invite her onto my show all the time.

47:09 + 1:30:40

JAY: Has she invited you on a podcast and threatened to use your old videos if you decide not to come?

47:14 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Well, no,

47:15 + 1:30:40

JAY: because that's what they did to me. They would like a podcast on January 10. If Jay doesn't respond, we'll use his old videos. And we'll do a podcast without him.

47:15 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I don't agree with that journalistic approach.

47:28 + 1:30:40

JAY: they cc'd that to Bobby over Christmas break.

47:33 + 1:30:40

JAY: And they cc'd it to the head Council of children's health defense. These are not people trying to make allies. These are not people trying to find common ground. They're not behaving like you behave.

47:49 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Right. Well, I've developed my own approach as a journalist and I like to be circumspect and give people a chance to lay out where they're coming from to present their facts and present the best case they have for their arguments.

48:04 + 1:30:40

JAY: I think that we just have to be realistic in the sense of there are an extraordinary number of very smart people who have been fooled. Very smart people who think that they get the subtleties of this scenario and understand where the variants come from. All of this stuff.

48:27 + 1:30:40

ERIC: you're saying there are variants?

48:29 + 1:30:40

JAY: No, I don't think there are, but you know

48:32 + 1:30:40

ERIC: they make the illusion of variance?

48:34 + 1:30:40

JAY: how they make the illusion of the variance needs to be understood well enough.

48:42 + 1:30:40

ERIC: wouldn't they understand that by the illusion of the virus? by the illusion of, metagenomics does not equal a virus circulating?

48:49 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Right. So you have to give me that paper. And when I read that paper, can we talk about it in another conversation?

48:49 + 1:30:40

JAY: Again, metagenomics is not used anymore. And that's one of the arguments that a lot of these people use. they've found the whole virus with nanopore sequencing.

49:04 + 1:30:40

JAY: absolutely, of course, I'll send you a few papers that will all line up the same observation, which is that they that they start with clones, and that's another thing that I think we should do a whole a little show on is understanding why so much of virology is based on clones. So if they can't find it in the wild, but they can find a sequence in the wild, they can make a clone of the sequence and then they can use it all they want.

49:31 + 1:30:40

JAY: Another, I wonder if a good example would be like, let's say that you found, went out into the wild. That's perfect. This is going to work.

49:43 + 1:30:40

JAY: You go out into the wild and you find an old car. And in the old car, you pop out of the cassette player in the old mixtape and on that mixtape, for example

49:57 + 1:30:40

JAY: That mixtape then is something you think is really cool. But you know every time you play it and more importantly, every time you copy it, it's gonna get shitty. It's gonna lose its fidelity. And interestingly enough, that's a very apt analogy for what a Coronavirus is. They take and they go out in the wild and they take millions of samples and they find little broken cassette tapes and every once in a while they find a whole cassette tape. And when it puts in the cassette player, holy crap, it's making music.

50:30 + 1:30:40

JAY: They they sequence that music and they can find that it's a captain and tenille tape or it's a jump Van Halen from 1984, And they take that tape out and they can take that that consensus piece of tape.

They can make a CD of it. When they make a CD of it, now they can make lots of cassette tapes that they can infect animals with, that they can take that CD and make a copy of it And send it to another lab. They can store it forever. And whenever they want to make a laboratory model of a Coronavirus, they almost inevitably start with a CD version, a DNA version of the crappy mixtape that they were able to archive out of the junkyard where they found it in one cassette player out of all the dead junk that they looked through.

51:24 + 1:30:40

ERIC: We seem to be a long way from there to a replication competent...

51:30 + 1:30:40

JAY: No no no no no. **The clone replicates.**

51:35 + 1:30:40

ERIC: **intracellular, replication competence within the cell?**

51:39 + 1:30:40

JAY: **It does it all the time, that's how they prove that it works in the wild, is that the DNA version does it.**

51:46 + 1:30:40

ERIC: So essentially what you're saying is that all the arguments that are being made by the you no virus camp are are correct, and you're also correct, because now you've answered all their objections by this one new technique.

52:00 + 1:30:40

JAY: Sort of kinda. Yeah, I mean, that's exactly why I'm super frustrated with the fact that they won't talk to me. because it is a scenario where we may actually understand what these sequences are, and what there's a much better way than we thought and it's right there in front of them. And all kinds of molecular biologists and all kinds of biologists are fighting really hard to not pay attention to me right now, because they don't want you to know that their own nanopore sequencing data shows that Coronaviruses don't replicate the way they say they did. Not even close. It's not even remotely close. So the trick is, and listen to this very carefully because I think this is the key.

52:50 + 1:30:40

JAY: **Pharmaceutical companies have the capability of starting with a cDNA construct and making millions of copies of it**

53:04 + 1:30:40

ERIC: **What proves that that cDNA came from the virus or matches virus that they say causes that disease over there?**

53:14 + 1:30:40

JAY: **exactly, because when they use a clone it works.**

53:17 + 1:30:40

JAY: When they make a SARS virus clone from 2002 Viral sequence called urbana, because that's where they isolated from some guy named urbani, when they make a clone of that virus, it makes every monkey sick.

53:32 + 1:30:40

ERIC: That's like saying we have to make a clone of this water gun, only make it shoot real bullets and then it'll kill people.

53:38 + 1:30:40

JAY: Now it's close. It's very close to that, it's more like when a virus replicates, it's making all the different parts of a gun but very, very rarely do all the parts come together in the gun. And so as a result, when it's replicating in your body, your body is fighting the replication of that RNA. The RNA never manifests itself as the full sequence again very often.

54:07 + 1:30:40

JAY: And they have the evidence now, so we can see how it would be possible for a government agency or non government agency that wanted to create the illusion that there was a pandemic, that it would be very easy to take CDs of Van Halen 1984 and put them in Iran, in Wuhan, in Italy, in Washington state and in New York City. And lo and behold, everybody heard Jump, and they started making copies of it, but when they look for those copies, when they're looking for them, there's lots of there's lots of stuff in the background. That as you said, the test is applied poorly, no one's ever going to be able to discern where that that real pathogen started and where that illusion began and it could have been as few as 10 patients

55:04 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but but it seems also that based on this set of agreements, that the whole thing was fake also, it seems like it's a possibility

55:12 + 1:30:40

JAY: no it's not a possibility, it's an absolute certainty that unless they made, and I said this on my stream 1000 times, unless they made a truck full of a Coronavirus clone that would assure that 1000s of people would test positive for a very specific pathogen, there's no way that this many people could test positive. So they had to have, had to have exaggerated any possible real existing pathogen by many, many orders of magnitude.

55:50 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I get where you are... I was exactly where you are at, in December of 2020. But my question is, why do you need that real thing in the heart of anything when you ... the threshold was set at 37 to 45 and you've gotten a primer dimer, reverse transcription error.

56:11 + 1:30:40

JAY: The real scientists still need to be fooled that there is a virus. So even if the cases are being inflated, they're being inflated because according to these little scientists in this little room that are doing all the smart thinking, we're still avoiding the crisis by over-testing.

56:32 + 1:30:40

JAY: These are not super smart people. These are people who have been scared into believing this mythology over many years.

56:41 + 1:30:40

JAY: So you're not going to tell them, you can't. You can't fool a nuclear scientist by not having nuclear bombs, right. So there there was a nuclear bomb. Are there 1000s of them in the wilderness out in the west and 1000s of them in Russia? I don't know. but I'm pretty sure there was a nuclear explosion every once in a while when they said there was one, and viruses are similar. There is, **there are viruses. They are detectable, but they are far less malleable, far less tractable, far less manipulable that they claim they would they they can be** and as a result, it would appear as though this is just one giant ball of lies.

57:28 + 1:30:40

ERIC: So would you say that there was or wasn't an outbreak of SARS-cov-2 in 2020?

57:33 + 1:30:40

JAY: **I wouldn't call it an outbreak, I would call it a release of something which caused PCR positivity for a brief period of time. Because there were positive that are real.** That's what I I can't stress enough

57:47 + 1:30:40

ERIC: what does real mean?

57:48 + 1:30:40

JAY: that **there was a replicating RNA that then was legitimately amplified by those amplicons.**

57:56 + 1:30:40

ERIC: But the amplicons come from a metagenomic...

58:00 + 1:30:40

JAY: No, that's that's another thing that's being

58:02 + 1:30:40

ERIC: they're listed off on the Corman Drosten Paper and the CDC.

58:05 + 1:30:40

JAY: Sure, but not every product in America used those primers, nobody in America use those primers.

58:12 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Okay, they're all looking for different primers. This opens up a whole new can of worms.

58:16 + 1:30:40

JAY: Of course it does, but it doesn't. Again, again, again, again, again, again, again, I'm trying to

58:22 + 1:30:40

JAY: I think that you are going again to the stage where you're saying there were no drunk drivers when there only needs to be a few.

58:31 + 1:30:40

JAY: And you have to, the difference between there being a few and none is exactly the same as shutting down the highways. And then you fighting it by saying there are no drunk drivers because there are but there aren't enough to shut down the highways. There were Coronavirus cases, but there weren't enough to shut down the world. That's the way I think is the most parsimonious way to see it

58:58 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but Coronavirus cases or SARS-COV-2 the novel 2019 Coronavirus.

59:05 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Did that even exist ?

59:08 + 1:30:40

JAY: the only evidence that I have that it existed is the sequencing database.

59:15 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Meaning all these all these forms, all these genetic sequences filed?

59:20 + 1:30:40

JAY: meaning yes, this very, very sketchy database. So the only that's the only data that I have, that's the only data anybody has, as far as I know that this particular virus exists is that, because the primers don't prove, and I'm totally ...

59:38 + 1:30:40

ERIC: the primers come from the metagenomic in silico sequences.

59:42 + 1:30:40

JAY: Yes, but the primers were made for n and for RNA dependent RNA polymerase. And it's very arguable that neither of those two genes is specific enough in this viral sequence to not overlap with any of the 1000s of other non chartered unknown Coronavirus glossary

1:00:04 + 1:30:40

ERIC: and then cross react?

1:00:06 + 1:30:40

ERIC: and create positive, so why spread something when you can just have an appicon that's going to show up frequently? For example, you look to the letter "and "in a book and you say Oh, clearly Hemingway wrote it. It has the letter the word "and" 600 times.

1:00:06 + 1:30:40

JAY: and cross react

1:00:21 + 1:30:40

JAY: I agree. I think that that's what they did, but I'm not that doesn't that does not preclude.

1:00:26 + 1:30:40

JAY: Again, it doesn't preclude the fact that there that there is molecular biology out there that molecular biologists believes, and I am not, that's that's where I start and maybe, that's the best way to put it. I'm not in a position to say that all of these people are either naive or dumb or crazy. Or you know. I have to assume that the vast majority of biologists are doing their best to understand what they think they need to understand. And they are using the measurement techniques that they understand to the best of their knowledge. And in that sense, when I talk to people that work on sequencing every day, they are convinced that the sequencing data that is shown to us cannot be completely faked. It could be that much of the data that's available is omitted.

1:01:22 + 1:30:40

JAY: It could be greatly edited, but **to fake all of this sequencing data is not really possible**.

1:01:32 + 1:30:40

ERIC: right but you can have a little bit of real sequencing data, but that doesn't prove a real virus or real pandemic.

1:01:39 + 1:30:40

JAY: **No, it proves a real virus**. It doesn't prove a pandemic.

1:01:43 + 1:30:40

ERIC: No, it proves proteins. It doesn't show where they came from

1:01:49 + 1:30:40

JAY: Sure. Okay. That's That's great. Again, you're now getting into what I think if we're going to get there, you're going to need to get there step by step. And we're doing that now on this stream as we talk to one another, but you're talking to someone who's already taken like four steps down this road, you're already talking to a converted choir member. You're not talking to someone who is embedded in this system, and is trying to use effort to go through it and

1:02:20 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but the people listening to this are not necessarily converted choir members on I never treat my listeners and viewers as if they are. I encourage them to recognize, you know, where they're where they give the benefit of the doubt as a matter of critical thinking and to be able to establish all sides of the argument.

1:02:39 + 1:30:40

JAY: Does that does that make sense to you though, why? where I'm coming from with the idea that I don't want to, **I want to err on the side of not not discounting as much data as possible**. So these observations are being made.

1:02:58 + 1:30:40

JAY: And there are a number of labs in the world that are doing their best to make observations that can contribute to understanding the phenomenon and when they do it

1:03:10 + 1:30:40

JAY: they get things that the narrative people underinterpret. And I think there's a huge, just a huge opportunity here for for a tremendous amount of growth in our understanding of human biology in

general. And I want that, I don't want to miss that opportunity. And so for me, it's a it's a, it's definitely about details. It's definitely about, about understanding, where I've been fooled and where other people have been fooled. And so given that I'm interested in questioning almost everything I understand and have, in three years gone from one side of the spectrum all the way to the other. You were already probably much more skeptical of the system that I was in 2020 when I still wanted to be a tenured professor, and I thought everything was great and so I'm very, very free to admit that I am in the most unstable intellectual position that I've been in, in my whole life in the sense of how open I am to having been misled or having misunderstood biology as I know it. On that sense, I have spent the last three years relearning and rechecking and retesting everything that I understood, and it is because of people on the no virus side that I've come this far, that I've come to realize that so much of what you're saying is true, so much of what people are objecting to, from the from the perspective of, you know, what is the justification for this? This is the whole reason why, Panda that organization Panda is really a group of people that thinks largely this way that you don't need a virus to explain what happened. And I've said this many times. I even said it on Bobby's podcast When I was with Robert Malone. In my little seven minute speech, the end of that speech, I said, you don't even need a particularly deadly virus in order for this pandemic to whatever has occurred to have occurred, and I still firmly believe that. **I guess I'm just trapped in this in this notion that some of the biological observations that have been made in the last three years cannot be wholly discounted, and so I'm trying really hard to err on that side,** and I find it difficult to get to the stage where I think that there are no coronaviruses and so I'm more at the stage where what if, what if for 20 years, there has been something that that they have been trying to figure out, something that they've been trying to understand, something they've been trying to use as a potential biotechnology or perhaps that they've been trying to mislead us about the potential dangers of and this has culminated in a biological mythology that was rolled out using PCR testing, and a controlled narrative about a new cause of death. Which three years in retrospect, we can now see that there was no new cause of death. There was a lot of really bad decisions, and a lot of really bad protocols that we don't use anymore, but there was no novel cause of death per se. And so if in the end, one form of of respiratory disease or one name of respiratory disease was replaced with another, we are dealing with an entire charade, if you will. If we took the flu and call the Coronavirus now and using a test we're rolling more people into it.

1:07:11 + 1:30:40

JAY: This is a this is a crime of you know, obviously global proportions and I'm fully on board with that being a major possibility. I'm afraid of the possibility that

1:07:28 + 1:30:40

JAY: it is, it is a **it is a trap to believe that there are no coronaviruses, that is a part of a controlled narrative, if you will,** in the same way that it was that I think that they did to me in 2020 and 2021 by getting me to feel as though I had discovered that it was actually a gate a function virus and that they were lying about it, and that it's actually much worse than even a normal Coronavirus. I was sucked into that narrative by the theater that was on television. And I think that my recent awakening to that possibility that I was that it wasn't just a story on one side, but there were stories on both sides that were designed to catch us all and I'm surprised to no end that three years into this, my neighbors have come to the conclusion that I came to already three years ago which is a gain of function virus. And it's because slowly the TV has allowed these people to think this. And so whatever conclusion they come to, natural virus or gain a function virus, they're terrified. They accept the countermeasure. They accept the reality

1:08:52 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but it's brilliant, isn't it?

1:08:53 + 1:30:40

JAY: It's a brilliant, and you know what, I'm afraid, I'll just finish then you talk, I'm afraid that this no virus idea, or let's say some, some aspect of it, could used in a very similar way to get people to come to a conclusion which doesn't help them escape. That's what I'm worried about.

1:09:14 + 1:30:40

JAY: If that doesn't happen, I'm fine

1:09:16 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but I mean, if you read Mark Bailey's paper, you'll see this is not any kind of a swipe.

1:09:22 + 1:30:40

JAY: I'm excited to read it. I honestly am

1:09:25 + 1:30:40

ERIC: this is done with incredible precision at 26,000 words. I've got a 6000 word excerpt of it for people's convenience. You know, we chose like, Mike Stone chose like the juicy is like 30 quotes. We ended up sampling a quarter of the whole paper. So I wanted to give like five quotes that I got, I got 30. You know, it sounds like your position is evolving, first of all...

1:09:50 + 1:30:40

JAY: absolutely It is

1:10:14 + 1:30:40

ERIC: and that you're open to the possibility that you agree this whole thing was done to us and that it may be so that this distinct entity the novel 2019 Coronavirus, as its own special you know thing, this red heifer, doesn't exist.

1:10:16 + 1:30:40

JAY: again, I think it's important that if we can explain it in a way that biologists can understand, those are the people that need to wake up. if everybody at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine realized that they had been completely fooled by what a Coronavirus does, how it does it and how it interacts with our immune system, then our entire society would start to change and it wouldn't involve a a trial or anything like that. It would just be like an awakening that would be unstoppable. If those people are permanently trapped in the New York Times biology and permanently trapped in the woke biology, then we will never escape because the young kids that are going to those schools right now that are following the mandates, they unfortunately are not going to be woken up with repeated readings of FOIA and telling them that three years ago there wasn't a virus. they need to be explained why the testing was done. And what was done with it. The testing wasn't done just so that they could create these cases, the testing was done so that genetic data could be harvested in a mass scale in a way that was never possible before and in an age group and demographic that would never have otherwise surrendered their genetic data on a regular basis. And there are several lawsuits in the United States right now where there are whistleblowers and universities around the United States and hopefully there will be more where these universities actually already knew from the very beginning,

that the that the PCR tests would provide remanent samples that could be sold on and they all did it, and some of the largest universities in the United States are still doing it. And this is part of, of the the real plan. The plan was to convert ?? based manufacturing of egg based vaccines to an RNA platform. They've already been talking about this for like 10 years. So they were waiting for an excuse to shift this entire public health apparatus to a new paradigm. And this is why the RNA vaccines if they are questioned will be questioned only in the context of the spike protein not in the question of a methodology as a whole because they plan to use this for everything. So I think one of the things you can expect is that they're going to tell you that oh, actually these RNA injections that Pfizer moderna put out they actually didn't work. But the reason why they didn't work was because we put the wrong protein in them. But other than that, the rollout has proven over billions of doses that mRNA is super safe. And so the only reason why these people got sick is because we did the wrong protein.

1:12:51 + 1:30:40

JAY: That's correct.

1:12:52 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Okay.

1:12:53 + 1:30:40

JAY: And I I've been teaching that biology with regard to the swarm and the idea of how the genetics of the virus work. That's the reason why

1:13:16 + 1:30:40

JAY: It's going to be fine for pneumonia for flu for HIV, trust us again and again and again. And it will be very similar to what they did with j&j pulling for a little while. Fame, the idea that we're watching for your safety, obviously, because we pulled j&j. They're going to do this over and over until everybody's accepted that what they want to put in your arm they can put in your arm. And I don't know how we're gonna save our children's lives, is the only thing that I'm concerned about is is saving my children's children from this so that they still know what freedom is. I don't even know if college kids in America right now have a have a good enough concept of what freedom really is in order to defend it and I'm afraid they've already been coerced into giving it up. So I'm trying to talk to them and with them...

1:14:11 + 1:30:40

JAY: I think they need to be shown how wrong their professors are. I think they need their professors to wake up and so that's again why I'm hoping that more academic biologists will try to work hard to find the faults of virology. So I'm really excited to read Mark's paper because either it will be something that I can use to bring us you know, some common ground or it'll be something that that will will show me you know, what I missed and how I can get get all the way to where I need to be, I mean I again, I think I know I really think right now convincing...

1:14:59 + 1:30:40

JAY: you know, I use these analogies only because when you are really good at your job then that's all you know. And so when I say plumber or carpenter I mean somebody who has been a carpenter they're whole life is not very likely to have read you know a lot of virology papers and is likely to have absorbed a lot of the common, you know, common misconceptions about what viruses are and how they're used and what they mean. And so that person doesn't need a lot of convincing that the government will lie.

1:15:32 + 1:30:40

JAY: But I do think there are a lot of academic biologists who, even though they accept that the government will lie,

1:15:40 + 1:30:40

JAY: they somehow think the government couldn't lie about this. And so that's to me, probably the most extraordinary aspect of this whole thing. People that used to be obviously skeptical of Big Pharma suddenly just aren't anymore. And people that used to be very skeptical about nature because you know, I can't get into nature because I can't get tenure if I don't get a Nature but Nature's shit. Not suddenly they believe Nature, everything. And this kind of extreme inversion in terms of their faith in the system and what they think or not think or what they're skeptical about is pretty impressive. I think it's mostly due to what they did on TV to us and what they did on social media makes you feel very afraid of bucking the narrative. So only people like you were in a position where you are already skeptical. So when this came out, you were on a baseline of skepticism and I really wasn't. I mean, I started out with the idea that they might lie about it just to cover up how dangerous it was you know and I think that's that's

1:16:49 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I had to come from that because usually all the government lies i exposed were things that were incredibly dangerous like dioxin, but they're putting these bullshit stories that it won't hurt you. You know, what is what is what is noncarcinogenic mean? And once in one study, I have killed all the rats with cancer, that's a noncarcinogen. All the rats, at like 100 zillion PCBs.

1:17:17 + 1:30:40

JAY: This is the this is the part about it that I'm also frustrated with myself, you know, I mean, I was I was naive to think that neurobiology was immune to this kind of contamination, but now that I've stepped out of it and and looked at it in depth, one of the things that I'm most shocked about is how much money for example is right now aimed at finding genetic causes of autism and, and how much the whole field of neuroscience is bent on finding genetic causes of these diseases.

1:17:53 + 1:30:40

JAY: And how easy it is then to convince all of these biologists that it's real, because they're correlation studies get funding, their correlation studies are the result. They result in my salary, and so far be it for me to question these assumptions. And there are virologists who are also trapped in a very similar way. And so these people can be saved. I do really believe, and if they are saved, I think our whole system can make a spontaneous, you know, sort of pole shift that won't be stoppable.

1:18:27 + 1:30:40

JAY: But it really will require people that already have a gut feeling that something's wrong to actually follow up on it and those gut, those people with those gut feelings that something's wrong are usually experienced faculty members who aren't in a position to speak up right now or certainly weren't in a position to speak up in 2020 but maybe in a position to speak up now. And so **I wholeheartedly hope that in a few months, we look back on this and see Mark Bailey and Christine Massey and Tom Cullen and and and Andy Kaufman as all allies on the same side together with me, I would like that a lot.**

1:19:10 + 1:30:40

JAY: I think there is a there is, there has to be a group of humans that can agree that this is wrong.

1:19:21 + 1:30:40

JAY: have to agree that something very very incorrect has occurred over the last three years and under that common ground alone we should agree not to fight and to work together to to forward the end of this. And for me, that's one of the reasons why I really admire Bobby Kennedy because Bobby has spoken to all these people he has given them the floor multiple times. He's open to listening to every side of of most stories under the pretense that it's better to get sunlight on this than anything else. And I've tried very hard to learn from his example, even though being a recovering academic it's often my instinct is to critique and my instinct is to, to point out what's wrong or or identify sort of flaws, and in reality, I think I need to follow Bobby's example a little more and try to lift everybody up a little bit in that sense, at least from the perspective of this podcast, I think one of the first things I'm going to do is read read Mark's paper and see what I get out of it, I'm really excited about that.

1:19:25 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I mean, the thing with with RFK is that he's not really allowing the no virus position on to his platform, Mike Wallach made it on for an hour with the Viral Delusion, but that seemed to me to require a measure of follow up. I mean, the things that are in the viral delusion that Mike Wallach has documented so beautifully, really call for follow up and not just like 'you got your hour, thank you, now we're gonna move on to claiming there's a monkey pox pandemic and a polio pandemic and a SARS-cov-2 pandemic and a lab release'. These are all the assertions under the editorial policy of the Defender. I'm concerned that there's an editorial policy of of stuffing one side of the issue and stuffing even the question.

1:20:36 + 1:30:40

JAY: I don't, I only work for Bobby directly, so I can't say anything about the Defender. I've written one article for the Defender that that I felt was, well, I wouldn't have wrote it written it the way that I've written it now were I to write it again, because some of the biology that I understand better now I didn't understand then. I can say that in helping Bobby craft the outline of his latest book that he's writing,.

1:22:02 + 1:30:40

JAY: which is about the Wuhan thing, I have been working with with great focus on trying to get the virology closer to saying what I said earlier and what you've said earlier, which is this seems like we don't necessarily need a particularly violent, virulent virus to have caused the results of what we see here.

ERIC: Why do you need a virus when you have a test that gets 100% false positives?

1:22:33 + 1:30:40

JAY: Well, I, you keep saying that but I really caution you in saying that it's 100%.

1:22:38 + 1:30:40

ERIC: My source is the CDC, Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center, and all the virologists who commented in the New York Times coverage. All you have to read is that CDC document, it's in my open letter to Denis Rancour. It's Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, it's from 2007, it's all, I linked right to it. They admit that they were false positives in three different outbreaks, 100%.

1:23:05 + 1:30:40

JAY: Is it possible to put the link in zoom right now?

1:23:08 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Hold on, I'm just gonna link you right to my open letter to Rancour, **do you know Denis Rancourt?**

1:23:16 + 1:30:40

JAY: I've had him on my show a couple of times. He's awesome.

1:23:18 + 1:30:40

ERIC: And are you planning to be on his virus existence Committee?

1:23:21 + 1:30:40

JAY: He has not asked me to be on that committee. So that's interesting. I didn't know there was such a thing.

1:23:29 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Yeah, that's what this letter is about. i'll put it in the chat. you'll see that if you go to part two of the article that I that I talked about the Dartmouth Hitchcock incident and then that's also in as you probably know, I'm the day keeper of this whole thing, and I keep the chronology and it's also listed in the chronology, in the first of the two chronologies. i'll link these anywhere the article appears, I've linked in the first few times.

1:24:00 + 1:30:40

Right.

1:24:02 + 1:30:40

ERIC: You've been very generous with your time. Thank you. You've been on for three hours. ...

1:24:10 + 1:30:40

JAY: Yeah, I don't know. I feel like I only dropped the ball once when I was talking about that analogy with God and whenever, I don't think that works very well

1:24:24 + 1:30:40

ERIC: but it does to me because it's such an article of religious things. The idea that a virus exists and a vaccine cures it or prevents it is an article of religious faith.

1:24:33 + 1:30:40

ERIC: They sing about i, they, Carole King rewrites her songs and you know, and then and they lock you out of the Bruce Springsteen show and they lock you out of, you know, that's madison square garden if you don't have it, and the idea that ... Madison Square Garden could all have the injection, if one person walks in without it and somehow threatens them, is completely off the roofs. isn't the whole point of having the vaccination to let you work in the disaster zone?

1:25:08 + 1:30:40

JAY: No, no, I these these are all very, very, they're very important points that I've made since the beginning as well.

1:25:16 + 1:30:40

JAY: I've also made the point that the biology that was known of Coronavirus is before the pandemic. If you believe right if you believe any of the biology that was published, there was no evidence from any animal model or any veterinary model that Coronavirus infection could be prevented. There was no evidence that vaccination of any sort would prevent it. And in fact, the only evidence they had was that using a Coronavirus protein as an immunization target often resulted in enhanced disease when exposed to the original clone. but let's keep in mind here that that this is biology. So we if we say that there was no there was no Coronavirus, SARS-cov-2, we are still not saying that there aren't replicating RNAs that appear to do these two things which is 1) cause sickness replicably in animals, and 2) that when we immunize to a protein in that RNA sequence, that exposure to that RNA sequence can result in worse symptomology than is seen from the clone alone. So again, all I'm saying is that there is a laboratory version of Coronavirus infection that works, and can be repeated and can actually be sent around the world so that you can use it in your lab and it's called a DNA clone of an RNA Coronavirus.

1:26:56 + 1:30:40

JAY: And so those things may not prove what exists in nature. But for virology, they are the proxy, which allows the entire field to believe that the natural version is capable of doing what the clone version does.

1:26:56 + 1:30:40

ERIC: I'm still not past the point where I understand what the natural version they're making into their clone is. How do they know it's the right thing? That's my question. They make something, it's a whole new thing. When they make cDNA it's a whole new chemical.

1:27:31 + 1:30:40

ERIC: How do they know that that all of the old chain of events leading up to that is relevant?

1:27:39 + 1:30:40

JAY: So if you if you were to do it with insulin, for example, they would use PCR to find out if there was insulin present in the person. This is a bad example, but I'm trying, and the PCR would tell you that there was insulin present but not the levels of it. So you couldn't explain to the person whether their symptoms that they're experiencing was from the level of insulin, you just know that insulin is present. And so some of those people would have symptoms of too much insulin, some of those people would have too little. But we're only going to tell the story about the people who have too little, because that's the story we want to tell. And so with this PCR test or with the sequencing or any of these diagnostics, they are telling a particular aspect of the whole story. And that particular aspect leads everyone to believe that there's a novel cause of death, and that there's some evidence of it.

1:28:40 + 1:30:40

JAY: And it's very big, I think.

1:28:42 + 1:30:40

ERIC: Yeah, and that does not appear to be the case. There's certainly never a novel virus and causation was never established.

1:28:51 + 1:30:40

JAY: Yeah, it's tricky because you might make the argument that for all severe respiratory disease, I think that there's almost always a multiple factor component to it. So even if there is replicating RNA present, there's also bacteria present and it is impossible to, in those scenarios, it is impossible to say for certain what is causing the immune response, which is the .. disease, whether it's the presence of one thing or another thing and all of these, these, these assumptions and the foundations of our understanding are all based on indirect measurements of this. So if they're present or not, is obviously separate from whether they're causing the immune response. They have tried very hard to use separate proteins and they can show that the proteins cause similar immune responses. So for example, the spike protein of Corona viruses in general, if you take that spike protein and apply the protein by itself, depending on the on the Coronavirus that you're deriving it from it can cause a lot of the respiratory disease that we see. So then it's very difficult, from my perspective, from an immunologist perspective to divorce the particular cause of a respiratory disease from the general idea that we get respiratory disease with exposed to foreign antigens. So the problem is, again, comes back to what virology claims versus what virology can prove and I think this airs where again, maybe Mark and I have all kinds of things in common because the one issue that I think that I've stumbled upon recently and have leveraged to my own arguments, is that the cytotoxic cytopathic effects presumed to be in the cartoons are the overproduction of viral particles until the cell just explodes or until it's overwhelmed or until it's so toxic that it dies, and then we release all these particles and they go on to infect more cells. And so much of what virology has done in the last 10 years shows that not to be true. Yet, it gets somehow or another, public health and the television and social media and all of the general biology about viruses goes on with this simple mythology. And so having become frustrated with that I guess I'm just trying to figure out what's right and wrong and maybe I'll end up thinking that Mark Bailey's had it right all along, I don't know. I'm definitely open to the possibility.

ERIC: we've all had to figure it out, I don't see much a priori thinking going on, foregone conclusions, in other words. Listen you've been very generous, thank you. What was the other thing...?

JAY: I'd like to talk about clones.

ERIC: clones and nanoparticle data

JAY: nanosequencing, nanopore sequencing, we could definitely do a minishow and I wouldn't take 3 hours of your time. Thanks very much, nice to meet you. We'll do it again.

ERIC: Good luck to you, bye for now.