

"Why is so-called virology completely unscientific?"

Because of what has happened in the last two years, never before have so many people questioned the fundamentals of virology, as the science that has been put forward is anything but credible. It's time virology was put under the microscope, says independent researcher John Blaid.

In order to shed light on the problems in virology, it is useful if we first take a historical overview to understand where it all started. In the 19th century, a lot of experiments were conducted with bacteria to try to find the cause of various diseases, but when several of these experiments failed, the idea was born that it must be something smaller than bacteria that is the cause of diseases. This something was called a virus. What is important to note here is what the definition of a virus was at that time, which was different from today. A quick search on the origin of the word leads us to the Latin word *virus*, meaning *poison* or *harmful substance*.

The researchers also worked under the unconfirmed assumption that there was a virus in the samples they used in various experiments. Why do I say it was under an unconfirmed assumption? Because the technology to see particles smaller than bacteria was not available until the early 1930s when the electron microscope was invented. With this technology, scientists could for the first time see particles much smaller than bacteria, such as *bacteriophages*, which today we mistakenly call bad bacteria - but that's another discussion. Along with this, the view of what a virus was also changed. It went from being a poison or harmful substance to being a self-replicating toxic protein.

This idea lasted until 1952, according to Stefan Lanka, a German virologist and marine and microbiologist. According to Lanka, medicine and science gave up on this idea because they could not find these alleged viruses with the electron microscope. What they first thought were viruses were in fact the remains of dead cells after a normal decomposition process. It should also be added here that until this discovery, no properly conducted control experiments had been carried out, which is of the utmost importance when we are talking about scientific research. Without properly performed control experiments, research cannot be considered scientific.

After 1953 and the discovery of DNA, virologists had a new idea of what a virus could be. They chose a model based on research on bacteria and bacteriophages, where the idea of a virus became a harmful gene sequence encapsulated in a protein shell, which they still go by. Until 1949, in so-called old virology, virologists grew alleged viruses by putting allegedly infected genetic material on healthy tissue of the same type. This increased degradation, which spread to the healthy tissue. This was misinterpreted as an increase and spread of a virus. After proper control experiments were performed in 1951, they discovered that what they saw were normal degradation processes that was not caused by any alleged virus.

Enders study is misused

In 1949, a bacteriologist named John Franklin Enders accidentally discovered that different types of tissue began to break down when a piece of brain from a person who had died of polio was placed on these tissues. Because of this discovery, Enders was awarded the Nobel

Prize in Medicine in December 1954. After 1949, Enders accused the inventor of the polio vaccine, Jonas Salk, of causing a high number of deaths and injuries with his polio vaccine. Enders claimed that it was contaminated with unknown human viruses as a result of Salk using human fetal tissue, which was why Enders himself chose to work with monkey kidneys and fetal serum from horses and unborn calves.

On the first of June 1954, Enders carried out his first measles experiment, taking various samples from people with measles and combining them with different types of genetic material, as well as different types of antibiotics, in cell cultures made from monkey kidney tissue. What is interesting here is that Enders control experiment showed that the cytopathic effect, i.e. cell death, could not be distinguished with confidence from the experiment with the putative measles virus.

The reason I mention Enders is because it is his method that laid the foundation for modern virology, which virologists have been working on since 1954. This despite the fact that Enders himself showed that his method could not be equated with any proof of a virus. When Enders was awarded the Nobel Prize a few months later for his work in the old virology, his pure speculation about an alleged virus also became the basis for the new virology.

The question we must now ask ourselves is: How can virologists today work according to this method when Enders explicitly said in his own study that it proves nothing? What should again be highlighted is the unproven assumption that virologists have made since the beginning, which is that the samples they use contain viruses before the experiments take place. Here it is important to highlight the scientific method.

The foundations of the scientific method

The scientific method involves first making an observation of a natural phenomenon, then creating a hypothesis about what we think might be the cause of the phenomenon. Next, the hypothesis should be tested by trying to find and isolate what we think is the cause of the phenomenon and then performing scientific experiments, which must include properly conducted control experiments. If the hypothesis proves correct, then a scientific theory can be created from this.

Unfortunately, there are several fundamental problems in virology. First of all, no one has observed a virus directly in nature, that is, in a sample taken from a sick individual, without the sample first having been combined with other genetic material, such as a cell culture. So how can we create a hypothesis based on something we have not found directly in nature?

Secondly, the scientific method requires that we also have what we believe to be the cause of the phenomenon isolated, that is, separated from everything else. This is the only way to be absolutely sure that the result we see in any experiment is caused by what we believe. But if they haven't succeeded in this, how can they perform any scientific experiments?

There are thousands of studies claiming isolation of various purported viruses, but when we examine their methods we quickly see that what they are doing is the complete opposite of isolation. Instead, virologists use an unpurified sample, such as lung fluid, and assume that it

contains a virus. Then this unpurified sample is mixed with a mixture of genetic material and various types of antibiotics.

It should also be added here that all alleged images of viruses are from samples taken after these experiments and not from purified samples taken directly from sick individuals. Stefan Lanka stresses that these particles could be either fragments of dead or dying cells or pure artefacts created by the electron microscope photo procedure.

Official requests and virus challenges

From 2020 onwards, there have been responses to official inquiries made to some 205 institutions in over 35 countries by various people, including yours truly, regarding the alleged SARS-CoV-2 virus, and all have responded that they lack documentation of a properly performed isolation.

A Canadian woman named Christine Massey has started a project to collect all these responses to inquiries, and she has also collected similar inquiries about most alleged viruses. The responses have been the same and at one point the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the US National Institutes of Health, responded that what was requested is impossible to meet in virology, which says it all.

However, the problems in virology do not stop here. Something historic happened in 2016 when virologist Stefan Lanka won a court case, after an appeal, for lack of evidence for the existence of the measles virus. Lanka had offered a reward of one hundred thousand euros to anyone who could present a study proving the existence of the measles virus. During this trial, Lanka was confronted by David Bardens, who presented six studies which Bardens claimed would prove the existence of the measles virus. The court ruled in favor of Lanka on all six studies.

The trial is very interesting because one of the six studies presented was the 1954 study by John Franklin Enders. This same study, which laid the foundations of modern virology despite Enders warnings, was thus declared unscientific due to a lack of control experiments. What this ruling also indirectly meant was that the whole of virology had now been declared unscientific, as the basis for virology was removed. In other words, Lanka not only won and proved that there was no scientific evidence for the existence of the measles virus, but also that virology lacked a scientific basis because the method established by Enders in 1954 was unscientific.

Control experiment exposes the scam

What few people know is that during this trial Lanka contacted two independent laboratories, which carried out the control experiments that virologists should have carried out since Enders time. The head of one laboratory said in his summation that the cellular changes they could see in their control experiment were identical to the changes that the virologists claimed were due to the measles virus.

The virologists claim that the result of the experiment would be unique to the measles virus, but this is a misinterpretation because the result is caused by other factors. These factors are in fact the starvation of cells in combination with the use of antibiotics. Ironically, the

antibiotic used by virologists is the type that degrades kidneys, the very tissue that Enders favored and that is now accepted in virology.

Now, more control experiments have been conducted by Lanka and others. In 2021, it was proven again that the effect that virologists have misinterpreted as virus-induced is caused by the procedure itself as well as the use of antibiotics in combination with starvation of cells - not by any alleged virus. This time, Lanka also went a step further. Using the same method as the virologists, he managed to prove with a control experiment that the alleged genome of SARS-CoV-2 could be constructed from yeast RNA, with no alleged infected material at all.

Alleged virus genome

Here, however, we need to step back and highlight the fundamental problems with alleged virus genomes. If we are to sequence a genome from a virus, we must first find the virus in the wild, that is, directly from a sample taken from a sick individual. Then we need to isolate the virus, that is, separate it from everything else. But if virologists and institutions around the world admit that there is a lack of documentation on the proper isolation of a virus, how can we sequence its alleged genome? What are all these purported genomes anyway?

Let's take SARS-CoV-2 as a good example of the unscientific method behind the sequencing. What they did in China was they used a single sample taken from one patient out of 44 with atypical pneumonia. From this unpurified sample with genetic sequences from all possible origins, short gene sequences of around 150 base pairs were taken, which were assumed to belong to a virus. These sequences were then assembled using the computer programs *Megahit* and *Trinity*. In joining these short gene sequences together, holes were plugged and overlaps were smoothed out - all with the help of computer programs (the procedure is called alignment). Once this process was complete, the longest sequence, 30,474 base pairs long, was selected from *Megahit* from 384,096 genomes created with lengths of 200 base pairs up to 30,474 base pairs. In *Trinity*, the genome length ranged from 201 base pairs up to 11 760 base pairs. Why they chose the longest genome from *Megahit* we can ask ourselves, as there is no explanation for this specific choice.

However, this created SARS-CoV-2 genome cannot be found in nature in its entirety. It can only be found in computers, which also gives us the term *in silico genome*, meaning a genome created in a computer. The short gene sequences that are part of the created genome may be found in nature, but the genome as a whole is not, because it is only a fictitious genome and has no link to reality.

To make the problem easier to understand here, let's make an analogy. Imagine that you have to sequence a genome of a specific human being! You first take a sample from a mixture of genetic material with all sorts of unknown sources. Then you assume, without confirming it, that some of the short sequences in this mixture belong to this human being and assemble these sequences with the help of computers. After this, you choose the longest genome without explanation, even though you have no direct evidence that this human actually exists, which also means that you cannot validate the created genome.

The question then becomes: How can you know that the short sequences belonged to this human if you have not been able to prove that the human existed before you assembled the genome? Shouldn't you isolate this human from all other humans, animals and plants and take a sample directly from him to be sure it is the right genome?

The argument that comes up when the existence of the virus is questioned is what makes people sick if it is not because of the virus? However, that is another discussion. Just as in a murder trial where there is no evidence to tie a suspected perpetrator to the crime, the suspect goes free, even if there is no new suspect.

Experiments with alleged infection

There are also many different experiments with alleged contagion, which show the problems behind this hypothesis. One of the more famous was done during an ongoing outbreak of the so-called *Spanish Flu*, where eight different experiments were conducted with one hundred male volunteers on an island in Boston, all by Milton Joseph Rosenau. In the experiments, they took different strands of the *Pfeiffer bacillus bacterium* and created a spray that they used in their eyes and swabbed in their throats and noses. The result was that no one got sick. Subjects were also inoculated with mucus taken from the mouth, nose, throat and bronchi of flu patients, with none of the volunteers getting sick. Then some volunteers were injected with blood taken from flu patients, and none of the volunteers became ill. Thirteen of the volunteers were also admitted to the influenza ward, where they were exposed to ten influenza patients per person. Each volunteer was asked to shake hands with the flu patients and get as close to them as possible, talk to them for five minutes and allow the sick to breathe and cough directly into the subjects' faces. This process was repeated five times with each flu patient and none of the subjects became ill. At the end of the study, Milton Joseph Rosenau wrote: *"We thought we knew the cause of the outbreak and were quite sure how it spread from person to person. If there is anything we have learned from this, it is that we are not quite sure what we know about the disease."*

Virology under the microscope

The burden of proof for the existence of viruses lies with those who claim its existence and not with the people who raise these fundamental problems, because it is not possible to prove scientifically that something does not exist.

In the case of viruses, there is a lack of scientific evidence for their existence due to unconfirmed assumptions and lack of control experiments that have led to misinterpretations, where virologists have unwittingly deceived themselves and in turn the rest of humanity, despite their good intentions.

We cannot prevent disease and create a healthier population if we start from the wrong premise. In my opinion, this is the single most important question of the day to answer, as the answer has huge implications for medicine, health and society at large in terms of policies, recommendations and laws, for example. Because of these huge implications, it is more important than ever to always question science and not blindly believe what anyone claims. Indeed, science today is anything but scientific.