

Transcript  
The End of COVID  
Session 8 - FOI Requests & Virology on Trial

**SPEAKERS**

Christine Massey, Marvin Haberland, Alec Zeck

Notice to Viewers ([00:00:00](#)):

**This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed in whole or in part without express written permission.** This information is not intended to diagnose, treat or cure a condition; nor is it to be considered medical or legal advice, opinion or recommendation.

The purpose of this presentation is to educate the public on everything there is to know about “the pandemic”, and all the pandemics before it. That way, we can finally end this fictional show that’s been on air since screens looked like this.

Alec Zeck ([00:00:30](#)):

Christine, thank you for joining me. It's, it's really amazing. We've heard a lot about virus isolation and the genome and things like this up to this point, but it's almost better to hear it directly from the horse's mouth, so to speak. And what you've been doing with regards to FOIA requests to various institutions around the world is really quite mind blowing. So I wanted to start first by asking you how you even got into this process. What made you want to submit these freedom of information requests to various institutions around the world?

Christine Massey ([00:01:03](#)):

Sure. well the, what got me started was really a presentation by Dr. Andrew Kaufman early on in 2020, sometime in the spring. And that was his second presentation where he talked about Koch's postulates. And yes, we know they don't apply exactly to a virus <laugh>, even if, even if a virus existed. But he was talking about Koch's postulates and how basically if, if virologists were scientists, how they could purify an alleged virus, they could actually look for it, find the particles purify it so there's no contamination from anything else, and then, and then proceed from there to sequence it and characterize it, and then do controlled experiments. And then he also explained what is actually going on in virology, which, which he found out in the Sarco two papers where they claim to have isolated. So he laid it out very simply and clearly what they were doing with the cell culture and passing that off as virus isolation.

([00:02:06](#)):

And so that was really my inspiration. It was he explained it so clearly, and I thought, well, I had experience in the past with freedom of information, and I knew I could use it to verify if there were any legitimate studies where they really did do proper steps. And if not then the responses would show everybody, look you know, health Canada doesn't have any records where they actually did a, you know, if they didn't do that first initial step, we know they didn't carry on with all the other steps. So that was what got me started. And then fortunately, a lot of people around the world jumped in and started helping, and it just took off on its own.

Alec Zeck ([00:02:52](#)):

Wow. And, and why the FOIA request route specifically, were you dealing with any sort of, you know, cognitive dissonance, what Dr. Kaufman was presenting and you just wanted to sort of verify the legitimacy of it? Or what frame of mind were you coming from?

Christine Massey ([00:03:08](#)):

Yeah, basically I did look at the studies that he referenced in his presentation. I think there were four of them maybe a couple from China. One, one was from Canada, I believe, and I forget the other one. But so I looked at those studies and I verified for myself that I could see what he was saying was correct. But then I thought, well, you know, you never know if you missed something, let me just make sure, I'll, I'll, you know, I I, I started talking about this on social media and sharing Andy's videos and but I wanted to be 100% sure. So I thought, well, I'll start with Health Canada, because I'm in Canada, and if anybody in Canada has this record, the, that was the first institution I thought to ask, because they are sort of the equivalent to the FDA here in Canada where they approve products, they approve the clinical trials as well. So I thought if they have it if anybody has it, it would be Health Canada. So I'll just make sure. And like I said, if not, I'll have evidence in writing that, hey, they don't actually have any, any proper records. And that was what it turned out that they didn't have any records.

Alec Zeck ([00:04:20](#)):

Can you show us some of the examples of these requests that you've submitted and then the subsequent responses from various institutions around the world?

Christine Massey ([00:04:29](#)):

For sure. So I guess what I'll do is I'll share my screen. Okay. So here, here, here we are at my webpage. Well, I'll show you the homepage first. So if anyone's looking for my webpage, I'll, I'll tell you people two ways to find it. So one is the website is fluoride free peel ca, and fluoride is spelled F L u o r i d e. And then it's f r e e and ppl, p e e l d o c a. And then there's also a tiny url, which is tiny url.com/no record found. So that's my homepage. And then if you go to the very last item here on the, the main menu, that's where it will take people to the, the main page where we have the SARS CO two F O I responses. So this is just an introductory blurb.

([00:05:30](#)):

I'll just mention too, before we get started, that there's a couple of links right at the top here. So if we have time later, we'll talk about a couple of other important pages on my website. So the first one there's a link here. It says, go here for fois and other imaginary viruses. So that's for everything aside from SAR COV two. And then the next little link here, it's here for FOIS and virus control experiments. The page that we're on right now, these are the fois, the vast majority of them were asking for records of the alleged Sarco two being found in the bodily fluid or tissue of any, any people, anybody, anybody, anywhere on earth. And it's a very long webpage because there's literally, I would say probably minimum at least 240, 250 documents on this web, on this one webpage.

([00:06:27](#)):

So it's a very long website. All the Canadian ones are grouped here together. And then the rest of the page, it's, it's, I, I admit it's not terribly well organized, but if people wanna find something in particular, the easiest thing is probably to use your browser, use the, the search function in your browser. And then, for example, if you wanna go to the CDC, just type in CDC, and that's the easiest way to find something. So I'll, I'll focus on, because the CDC is so well recognized around the world and so well regarded I'll focus somewhat on the CDC. So this here is our very first FOIA response from the CDC. And

this was November 2nd, 2020. It was my colleague Michael, I have to give a shout out to Michael Ss in New Zealand, because he has helped a lot with this project.

[\(00:07:23\)](#):

And he obtained the first response from the CDC and in this response, they, they gave us just a flat out no records found. So all these documents, people can click on them, they can download them, and later I'll show you an easier way for people to download a lot of them quickly. But we'll get to that later. And then I thought I'll highlight we actually have eight responses now from the CDC, because at different time points people have asked repeatedly. So this was Michael again, and this was March 1st, 2021. He sent another request to the CDC, and he was asking the same question again. And from this time point onwards, the CDC stopped giving a straightforward of response. Never again did they tell us we have no records, because I guess at some point they realized that we're sharing these documents and we're saying, Hey, look, <laugh>.

[\(00:08:20\)](#):

So they started giving a less straightforward response to give the impression that, of course we have records <laugh>. So what I'll draw attention to here is if you go to scroll down, I think it's the bottom of page three. Michael was having some back and forth, and he was explaining to them, even though he had already explained clearly, look, this is what I mean by isolation. We're just talking about separating the alleged virus particles from everything else. And the CDC made a really important statement here. So down on the very last paragraph of page three, they said the definition of isolation provided in the request. And he, so he had defined it as we're talking about the everyday meaning of the word separate from everything else. And they're saying that definition is outside of what is possible in virology, as viruses need cells to replicate, and cells require liquid food.

[\(00:09:23\)](#):

So they weren't just saying, no, we don't have this for sars COV two. They're saying it's never done in virology period for any virus. And their excuse is, viruses need cells to replicate. And we get this a lot. I'm sure you've heard it a lot. Yeah. Alex, some people say this to us all the time. Well, the thing is, the, the request had nothing to do with the virus replicating. I didn't ask, we, we never asked for records of a virus replicating. We're not asking for it. Replicating without host cells we're just asking for records of it being found in the bodily fluids. So if there really was a virus, supposedly they multiply inside cells and then at some point they butt out of the cell and they're outside the cell. And of course, they would have to leave a cell to go to another cell, or if they're going to infect another host, obviously they have to leave a cell.

[\(00:10:23\)](#):

So it's a strange excuse to use because if viruses were automatically destroyed when they leave a cell, obviously they couldn't, they couldn't go to other cells, they couldn't go to other hosts. So it doesn't really make sense, the excuse that they're giving. And they say, so cells require liquid food then they say, however, the Sarco two virus may be isolated from a human clinical specimen by culturing in cell culture, which is the definition of isolation as used in microbiology. So again, they're telling us this is not just a SARS COV two issue. This is an issue with virology in general, when a virologist says that they are isolating a virus, they're actually doing cell culturing, and of course cell culturing is the exact opposite of, of isolating anything. So that is probably one of the most important responses that we have in our collection.

[\(00:11:22\)](#):

Another one I'll show you quickly, it's quite similar. And this one is coming from Mount Sinai Hospital in Toronto. So in Ontario where I live in Canada we had four institutions that had claimed publicly to have

jointly isolated the virus. They had researchers from four institutions, and these were Mount University of Toronto, McMaster University, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Center, and Mount Sinai Hospital. So what Mount Sinai told me in not one, but two letters, they told me twice here it is. So the, the lady who was responding to the request, she said, I have been engaging with our experts. I'll just make that a little larger so people can see it with our experts at Sinai Health. And we're not clear on the records that you're requesting. As we're not aware, the isolation of a virus in the manner that you have described is possible for any virus. It's not within the scope of current scientific processes. So there again, we have the same admission, and they, they actually said it to me in two separate letters. They're both on here. So that's Mount Sinai Hospital.

Alec Zeck ([00:12:47](#)):

And again, this is just confirmation that they are not able to find viruses in the fluids of a sick person in the fluids or tissue of a sick person. And their claim is that viruses exist and are excreted out using the fluids of a sick person as their method of travel, so to speak, and they can't find, they have no record of any of these particles inside the fluid or t of a sick person. And as we will discuss with Jordan Grant a few sessions from now, this is simply a reification fallacy where they're assigning characteristics to something that is still fundamentally abstract.

Christine Massey ([00:13:27](#)):

Absolutely. So I'll show you now the Public Health Agency of Canada's response, because they said something interesting to me in their very last letter. So I have an article here about this on my communications with them. And if people just scroll down to the very bottom, there's A P D F that has all of the emails and letters back and forth. And so if people just go down to the very last letter, I'm gonna show you what they said. So on the bottom of page two, they're saying, your request has resulted in a, no records exist because of the way you've formulated the request. The isolation of the virus is not completed without the use of another medium. Now, that was actually a red herring, because the only thing I say in the request is don't give me records where any genetic material was added to the clinical sample.

([00:14:28](#)):

It's fine if they use a medium like the, the sucrose, which is used in ultracentrifugation. So I wasn't weeding out that, I'm just saying don't add any genetic material to the clinical sample. And then she says, therefore, we have no records that would show that this process taking place, it's important to understand the following. The gold standard assay used to determine the presence of intact virus in patient samples is virus isolation and cell culture. Now, this is, you know, completely ridiculous, as you know, has already been covered. They're going in the exact opposite direction there, but this is health public health agency of Canada saying this is the gold standard. And then she goes on to say well, she's just doing circular reasoning here. If the virus is present in the sample, it'll multiply and produce visible cytopathic effects, which means that infected cells demonstrate visible changes. So she's, she's, you know, doing that logical fallacy where you're saying, if A then B, and we observe B therefore a Yeah. Which is like saying, oh, look, Santa, there's presence that the, the

Alec Zeck ([00:15:40](#)):

Consequent logical fallacy.

Christine Massey ([00:15:41](#)):

Exactly. Yeah. So then she goes on and says, the detection of an increase in the genetic material by P C R further confirms the intact virus is present in the sample. So here she's just talking about a ridiculous P C R test. So, and then she mentions also another strange thing down here. She says, in the case of sars COV two isolation Vero cells combined with the minimal essential medium were used because they are essential to support viral replication and cell growth. Now, again, that makes no sense because allegedly we're talking about, first of all, we're talking about something that supposedly already replicated in the infected post, the sick person. And then secondly, even if you did feel the need to do a cell culture, vir cells are monkey kidney cells. So to say that you have to have monkey kidney cells in order for this alleged virus to grow again, makes no sense.

[\(00:16:44\)](#):

So from Health Canada, we have another interesting comment. This is more of interest to people in Canada, but it's, it should be in interesting to people around the world as well. So on page four, the lady from Health Canada told me health, so again, health Canada is the one that authorizes products and clinical trials. And what she's telling me is, health Canada is responsible for authorization of health products. And this type of information, what I'm asking for, would not typically be evaluated by Health Canada as part of the authorization of these activities. In addition, health Canada does not work with patient samples or SARS COV two virus. And then she says information on virus isolation would be best obtained from Public Health Agency of Canada, which does not have any records or the National Research Council, which already failed, but they also failed to provide any records. And then I'm gonna show you just one other thing with Health Canada, what they told me, which was pretty outrageous, so this is on page 10. They said, please note that Health Canada's role is not to do pure scientific research or discovery. It is to review evidence provided by sponsors in order to make regulatory decisions, to approve products and authorize clinical trials. You may wish to contact the sponsors of clinical trials and or companies in order to get the information you seek. This is Health Canada literally telling me, go ask industry for this information. I mean, this is just, it's mind blowing. It's mind

Alec Zeck [\(00:18:37\)](#):

Blowing. Yeah. And I, I'm pretty sure the same applies to the FDA and the CDC and I think specifically the FDA is that they don't validate or verify any of the research coming from industry. They just take it at face value in most cases.

Christine Massey [\(00:18:51\)](#):

Cases. Yeah. And we do have since you mentioned the FDA , we do have the FDA on record here. This one, this one, I what happened was I usually file my FOIS through email. I'm a little stubborn in that regard, and I, so I sent one to the FDA and this lady who responded, her name is Sarah Kotler, she's the director of the Division of Freedom of Information, and she has JD after her name, which means she has training in law. It stands for Juris doctorate. So this lady who should know what she's talking about, she, we had some back and forth and I, she was trying to get me to use an online portal. And the online portal asks for your your address, your telephone number, things that aren't necessary that she shouldn't need from me.

[\(00:19:43\)](#):

So we had a little back and forth, and I was stubborn and I wouldn't use it. But what she ended up, she did end up disclosing to me that what I'm asking for, they would not have it. It, this is on page eight. She said, in any event, the information you're seeking about purification would not even be with this, the FDA . So again, like Health Canada, this is the director of the Division of Freedom of Information telling me that. We also have the niaid that's your National Institute of Allergies and Infectious Diseases. That's

your Anthony Fauci Institute, of course. And we have three responses from them. And one of them I gave a summary here. They basically conflated isolation and purification with cell culture. They made some irrelevant comments about cook's postulates. They cited a ENT studies and, and webpage and talked about the fabricated genomes.

[\(00:20:56\)](#):

And just generally made some silly comments. There's another one from N I H. And in this one, they actually referred me to the c's so-called Isolation study by Jennifer Harcourt and her colleagues. And so I explained to them, well, I, and they were telling me to ask the CDC , and I told them, we already have asked the CDC , the CDC doesn't have it. And I explained that the HARCORT study is study unscientific, but, and, and that was the end of it. So this is your, your National Allergy and Infectious Diseases Institution, and they didn't have any records. And then there's one more interesting response from them that was obtained by somebody else. His name is Ron <inaudible>, and I'll just show you that one. He asked them quite early on, this was not freedom of information, but it was a, a casual email.

[\(00:21:56\)](#):

And what he did was they had released electromicroscopy images that were, they were claiming were of the virus. And so he said to them, I see that you released these images, and I'd like to know how do you know for certain that those are the virus and how was it isolated? And the response that he got I won't open it, but I'll just explain. Basically what they, he was told he wasn't given an entirely clear response, but they referred him to the CDC D'S study by HAR Court, Al they said for details about how the isolation was done. Look at that study. They didn't actually say it came from that study, and it doesn't really appear to be connected with that exact study, but that was what she referred him to for the methods. So would you like to see more, or would you like to talk about,

Alec Zeck [\(00:22:55\)](#):

Well, this is just mind blowing to me, and it should be for anyone watching this, that these, again, are the institutions that are claiming that there is a new virus. They're the institutions that are advising the governments around the world to make decisions regarding this alleged particle that is infecting people, and they don't have any documentation of these particles in the fluids of the sick. And just to be clear, Christine, you've submitted to now 214 institutions in over 40 countries. And have any of them come back with a record of SARS cov to two or any other virus?

Christine Massey [\(00:23:33\)](#):

No, absolutely not. Not not any of them. We get various excuses. Sometimes they, they do refer us to studies or web pages, but we look at them carefully and they never have what we're asking for. So, no.

Alec Zeck [\(00:23:49\)](#):

Can you show us an example of e exactly what you ask, because that's another excuse. Oh, yeah. I've heard people come up with is that the way you're asking it is too specific and no one could possibly fulfill that. And I'd like to dispel that myth right here.

Christine Massey [\(00:24:04\)](#):

Yeah. And I actually have I actually wrote a little article, it's just a very brief article. I'll bring that up. Where I respond to that gaslighting that we get quite often from people like Jeremy Hammond, for example. Yeah. Often they'll, they'll make it sound like I've asked, it's some ridiculous request. Jeremy Hammond continually calls it a hoax. And I mean, it's just, I, I asked an honest question. I was very clear

about what I asked about. What we get a lot is people focusing on the word isolation too. And they make it sound like, oh, well, you asked for records of isolation, but you ruled out the way that virologists actually isolate viruses. And my response to that is two things. First of all, I explained exactly what I was asking for in the request, and I've never tried to misrepresent the requests.

[\(00:25:03\)](#):

I mean, we, we've all done interviews. We've all talked about this ad nauseum over the last three years. We're looking for records of purification. And because of all of this controversy over the word isolation, quite early on, I stopped using the word isolation and I switched to purification. So my earliest request, yes, I did use the word isolation, and then I defined exactly what I meant by that, and later I just stopped using the word altogether to stay away from it. And then the other thing I'd like to just point out is the wording that I've been using. I specifically state that I'm looking for records. Here it is, please know I'm using isolation in the everyday word. Sorry, maybe I'm not showing you the right part there, but I say using standard laboratory methods for the purification of very small things.

[\(00:25:54\)](#):

Mm-Hmm. <affirmative> for quite a long time, I've been using that in my request. So I'm not even I'm, I'm not asking for anything unusual. It's supposedly other things of the same size range or smaller can be purified. So if they can do it with those things, they should be able to do it with an alleged virus as well. So and then I thought I would show, you asked about a template. So I'm gonna show, or you asked about the wording, but I'm gonna show also a template. So if people type in template, the easiest way to find it would be to, to use the search function and down near the bottom of the page if you go there, it open up a template, and this is if anybody would like to file a response where they live and ask the institutions there there's a template on my site.

[\(00:26:55\)](#):

There's actually two of them on here, so people can just copy and paste the wording from there as well. So yeah, we can review. So I'll make this a little larger so people can see. So I asked, this was for example, to the CDC, so all studies or reports that are in the possession, custody or control of the CDC describing purification of the alleged c ovid 19 virus including any alleged variants directly from a sample taken from a diseased human, where the patient sample was not first combined with any other source of genetic material, for example, monkey kidney cells, or which are called Vero cells or fetal bovine serum. And then I just clarify, I'm not asking for studies or reports where the researchers failed to purify the suspected virus and instead they cultured something or they performed an amplification test, or they fabricated a genome from sequences allegedly detected in an impure substance or produced electric microscopic images of un purified things.

[\(00:28:07\)](#):

Because these are things that typically show up in the papers that they try to give us. And then I say and a lot of the requests, I said, I'm already aware that according to virus theory, a virus requires host cells in order to replicate. I'm not asking for records that describe replication of a virus without host cells, nor am I requesting records that describe a strict fulfillment of Koch's postulates or records where researchers conflate the extraction of genetic genetic material from a patient sample or cell culture with virus isolation. And I'm not asking for records that describe a suspected virus floating in a vacuum <laugh>, and I'm not asking for private patient information because these are some of the, the types of responses. We actually had one institution imply that I was asking for something floating in a vacuum. So I try to make it clear I'm not asking for these things.

[\(00:29:04\)](#):



I'm just asking for records that describe purification separation of the alleged virus from everything else in the patient sample as per standard laboratory practices for the purification of other very small things. And then I also point out my request includes any study report matching the above description authored by anyone anywhere, because I want to make it clear, sometimes they respond as though they'll say things like, oh, well, we don't work with patient samples. You know, we don't do this, we don't do that. But I'm not asking only, I'm not only interested in a record where you guys did it, where you wrote the report, any record that you have of anybody on earth, because if these institutions, these public health officials were doing their due diligence, they would've made sure yet, yeah, there really was a virus shown in China. They would've made sure that yes, it was actually found in their country, but they're not doing that.

[\(00:30:07\)](#):

And then I also say, if records match the above description and they're currently available in the public domain, please provide enough information about each one so that I may access them with certainty. Because one thing for people to know is that when you file, typically I mean, the legislation varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but basically freedom of information covers things that are not already publicly available. So they sometimes they might try to make it sound like, oh, yeah, you know, sure, there's records like that, but, you know, just go search on PubMed or, you know, you can find them online somewhere. And so this is where I'm telling them, well, okay, basically their duty is to assist us in finding things. So if you're claiming that it exists and it's already out there, that's great. Just tell me where it is.

[\(00:30:59\)](#):

Gimme the title, let me, let me find it, right, so that it's not just a vague response like that. So yeah, even though with all this effort to be so, so careful in the wording and so many people searching all around the world, we still don't have a single example of this being done. And if people would like to see the list without scrolling through hundreds of documents, there is an Excel file. And again, if you just use the search function in your browser, you can find it that way I won't try to open it because it will, you have to download it to be able to open the file, but there is that Excel file. And another thing I'd like to point out right underneath the Excel file, we have a link to my Google Drive, and that's where I have been putting compilation PDFs there, and they're grouped somewhat by country.

[\(00:32:03\)](#):

And this, right now there's eight, I think there's eight there right now. So this is it would have all except the very most recent fois in there. So every once in a while I create a new compilation, P D F, and that way there's just eight PDFs for people to download, and they will get hundreds of the responses that way, rather than trying to download one at a time. We also have responses on many other viruses, alleged viruses. So if people want to go to that page, we have a lot of information there too. And because we're focusing mainly on SARS COV two I'll just mention that we have asked about other alleged coronaviruses, I'm just gonna find it.

[\(00:32:59\)](#):

Okay. So for example, we have requests where we've asked about the alleged sars virus from 2003 or any alleged common cold coronavirus. And so again, we have the CDC on file admitting that they have no record of I any of those having been purified ever by anyone with numerous institutions in New Zealand or a couple of them mentioning that as well. And then we have, we have a lady in England who has been helping us, and she has asked many different local public health or local municipalities, the ci, the little cities and towns and whatnot that have health units. So she has asked, there's probably at least



10 of them, maybe a dozen that she has asked. And typically when she contacts them, she'll ask them about many different viruses. There's about 10 of them that she typically asks 'em for.

[\(00:34:00\)](#):

So when people scroll through this page, they're gonna see like alleged virus after virus where none of those municipalities in England have ever. And these are, these are like public health units where they actually do testing of people, right? So they should have records. But basically we have not every single alleged virus you know, that has ever been talked about, but we have, I think all the major ones by now. And I'll just draw attention to this one too. So this is one with Public Health Agency of Canada. I just asked them for any record of any alleged virus being found in any diseased human period, any virus whatsoever. And they didn't have, and they just told me no. Like they just, it was a straightforward no. We've also asked the CDC for any record of any alleged virus that supposedly is addressed by either the childhood or the adult immunization schedule.

[\(00:35:01\)](#):

And they had, they admitted they didn't have any for any of those alleged viruses. We have one other page that's of interest as well. So that's the one with the control experiments. This is where we ask we're asking institutions, do you have, sometimes we're asking for details of the alleged controls that they use when they're doing their so-called isolation. So what happens, typically we find in these articles where researchers claim to have isolated the virus, typically they don't mention any controls at all. There's just none. But we also know there's some papers where they make a vague reference to mock controls. And it's very interesting because they never go into the details in their methodology section. They don't tell you exactly what they did. They don't tell you if they treated those those, they would've dishes where they have the same cell line, but they don't add a sample from a allegedly infected patient.

[\(00:36:09\)](#):

And they never tell us what they actually did do to those, those cell lines. So we've done made some efforts to get responses to get more information that's not included in the studies. So for example, both my colleague Michael and I have contacted the CDC, and we asked about their study by hard court, all because that's one of the studies where they mentioned mock controls. And so we both received quite ridiculous responses. Michael tried it first, and then I followed up within another attempt, and instead of getting anything with any of these details, what they gave Michael was 37 pages consisting of emails between authors in the HAR court study, which didn't give us any of the details that he was looking for. And then a copy of one of the earliest Chinese papers that had claimed to have isolated the virus.

[\(00:37:08\)](#):

So that was quite silly. And then when I asked them, they gave me also some emails and they gave me 24 pages of the letters A, T, C, and G, which was a printout of the alleged genome from the United States. So again, this whole page is quite interesting because you'll see different attempts. At times we were just asking do you have any controlled experiments where that were done with purified particles, fully controlled experiments where someone's scientifically showed the existence of the alleged virus. And they don't have any. And then again, anytime we ask, we try to get details of their alleged controls where they mention mock controls, we get the most ridiculous responses. Michael tried with the UK Health Security Agency in in the uk and they told him that this would be a national security issue and that they couldn't release the information for that reason.

[\(00:38:17\)](#):

They also said it would directly contravene an explicit request from the World Health Organization not to release that information. So it's just, we're always running into ridiculous excuses. One time they asked for thousands of dollars to release the information. Sometimes they call us factious. It's just

nobody to date. We haven't had a single institution willing to provide details about their so-called mock controls. So there's that. And there's a couple of important responses also that I'll just show you on the main, back to the main page about SARS COV two. So we have done a couple of requests about the spike protein. So there's two requests where we asked if anyone if they had any record of anybody just finding the spike protein and purifying that from a clinical sample. So we know they never actually found the virus but did they just find an alleged spike protein on its own?

[\(00:39:26\)](#):

And again, they've not been able to provide any study where anybody has even done that. And one thing for people to know is what they, what they do when there's many studies published where supposedly they're analyzing the SARS COV two spike protein, but what you have to watch for is they're, they're either looking at studies where they did an indirect test, which has never been shown to be specific for this alleged protein, or sometimes what they're looking at is they're looking at a protein, but it's what they call a recombinant protein, and it's actually a protein that they made in the lab so that they could study it. So again, it wasn't something where they actually found the alleged spike protein in an actual person. And then the final sounds kind

Alec Zeck [\(00:40:16\)](#):

Of like r n a infectious clones <laugh>

Christine Massey [\(00:40:19\)](#):

Yeah. Is yes. And then I'll show you one more with the spike protein. So this was actually, this one was inspired by Tom Callan. He said he suggested this, so I asked them this one. I was not asking for anything being purified, and I wasn't really asking for legit studies, but Tom, I guess, had, was aware that they weren't even doing the, what you might call a bogus sort of study on the spike protein. So you would think because they put out these mRNA so-called vaccines where supposedly it causes the body to create the spike protein, you would think there would be studies where they compared people who had had those injections and people who had not to compare and see, okay, do we, when we run our tests, when we run those indirect tests that supposedly detect the spike protein, do we find them in the people that had those injections and not find them in the people who didn't have the injections?

[\(00:41:28\)](#):

And of course, you would wanna weeded out anyone who you think is infected if you actually believe there's a virus, you would wanna weed those people out. So there's no confounding, but they don't even, they couldn't even offer a study where anyone had done that to check and see, you know, if this claim is actually backed up by any data, even any insufficient unvalidated tests, tests. And then the other thing we asked for was they tell us that these antibody tests are specific to the alleged spike protein. So you would think there'd be studies where they had people had received these injections that supposedly caused the body to make the spike protein or supposedly had Covid Ovid 19. And they should be able, you would think they would detect the alleged spike protein in those people and then compare them with people who had been injected with other toxins.

[\(00:42:26\)](#):

And that might sound like a strange thing to ask, but I mean, they inject people with other so-called vaccines all the time, which contain toxins. So they could do a study where they check to see, look, do we get positive test results on people who were injected with other so-called vaccines and do a comparison? But again, they don't even have that. So they don't even have you know, a test based

studies based on their own bogus tests that you would think that they would have. So again, it, it is quite mind blowing,

Alec Zeck ([00:43:03](#)):

Christine, the magnitude of this information is really quite incredible. Again, because as I stated earlier, these admissions are coming from the very health institutions that are making claims about these particles and the subsequent products that were developed because of these alleged particles. And they're the ones who are advising government so-called authority figures around the world on what to do because of these particles. So it's really amazing that they have no records of any of these things when you request them.

Christine Massey ([00:43:45](#)):

Yeah, and I mean, and we know that it, it just it just affirms what we already knew from looking at the literature, you know, and especially some people like Mike Stone and the Baileys and, and Stefan Blanca and others who have gone, Andy and Tom who've gone through paper after paper after paper searching the, these responses. They're just affirming what can already be seen. And you know, I had somebody say just yesterday they were suggesting, well, you know, maybe all these institutions, maybe they've been told by someone to, to withhold the records. You know, like they're like a conspiracy type theory that they're just not, they have the records, but they're not releasing them. And again, you know, I, I said to them, well, that doesn't make sense because it's not as though their, their methods are hidden. We know their methods, they publish their methods. It's in there and study after study, all you have to do is read the papers. So it's not, it's not that they're withholding anything, it's just that this is what they've been getting away with for decades and decades. So, yeah.

Alec Zeck ([00:44:55](#)):

Yeah. And, and it's all obfuscation and, and creating intentional confusion or I guess you could speculate on whether it's intentional or not, but it's, it's all confusing. And it, when you get to the details, the granular details of each of these things, you really see that they don't make any logical sense, nor do they make any scientific sense. As we'll cover later in a session with Dr. Jordan Grant. So, Christine, thank you so much for your work. This is such a vital piece of what we're trying to communicate again, governments and, and health institutions admitting that they also have no record of SARS cov to two or any other virus is really quite, quite extraordinary. So thank you so much for your work,

Christine Massey ([00:45:39](#)):

And thank you, Alec, and thank you to all the people who helped collect these. And thank you to Dr. Andrew Kaufman for his inspiration because it was him that got really, kind of got the whole thing triggered. So thank you to everybody and for everything that you're doing, Alec, it's just amazing. I'm, I'm, I'm in awe of you, so thank you. Thank you. All the best to you and your family.

Alec Zeck ([00:46:01](#)):

Thank you, Christine. Marvin, thank you so much for joining me, brother. It is an honor to be talking with you, especially because what we're going to be talking about with respect to virology is something that happened really recently. The only other time I'm aware of virology and it's foundational premise regarding these obligate intracellular parasites and their supposed pathogenicity being on trial was with respect to Stephan Blanca's measles case. So this is the first time in a while that I'm aware of where virology has sort of been put on trial. So could you just go into the details of what happened with you,

you know, purposefully being fined based on the, the measures that were in place in Germany, and we'll, we'll go from there.

Marvin Haberland (00:46:58):

Yes. sure. So basically when the regulations were put in place, the policies in Germany, basically the same like everywhere. So we had mask mandates, we had restrictions to enter restaurants and so on. We had lockdowns, we couldn't meet with more than two people at the time. So during all these restrictions Stefan Lanka who went to court in 2015 and 16 with the measles virus basically issued a guide guidance on, on how to how to object this in court. The good thing in Germany is we have a law of infectious disease, which really starts in the first paragraph with a science requests. So it, it, it says that every, everybody, every virologist, every health institution, every hospital, every authority should work according to the latest state of the scientific method.

(00:48:02):

And therefore yeah, Stefan Lanka told everyone, Hey, if you get fined by these fines, just objected and say that the covid measures which are based on the law of infectious disease are not rightful because the paragraph one of the law is already not fulfilled. So I followed this recommendation by Stefan, basically. And what I did is to prove my case, to prove my point in the court very early on, I sent a Freedom of Information Act similar to those by Christine but more focused on the control experiments. I sent one of one to Australia to the University of Melbourne to the Tery Institute, which basically published one of the first sars Cov two papers out of the Asian continent. And I asked them very specifically if they perform control experiments on the genome sequencing, for example.

(00:49:18):

And I got a very honest and, and straightforward answer by them that they have not performed any controls on the whole genome sequence process, and that they didn't do it because they didn't have the resources. Basically, this is what they told me. So I, I had this four year request as proof in the court, and I sent many other proofs. For instance, I quoted the German Society of of Science which clearly says that in order to be in, in line with the scientific method, you have to do controls, you have to control all your methods and so on. You have to document every result and everything. And these are very standard methods and standard rules. And our center for Disease Control in Germany called the Robert Hubbert Institute, H k i is supposed to follow these rules.

(00:50:21):

They say it on the website also, and they are by law obliged to do so. So this, everything together was my strategy in the court here in Germany, in Hamburg. And I also consulted three other cases with the same strategy. And yeah, all of them got closed. So all were one, nobody had to pay the fine. And this is basically what, what happened. I was fined, as you said it was intentionally, I went outside very early on and collected as many fines as I possibly could not wearing a mask to be very quick into going into the court. So yeah, I just went inside the police office without a mask and asked you know, for the fine and also in the street where I left, I, I did it. So

Alec Zeck (00:51:19):

What was their response when, when they saw that you were being fined intentionally?

Marvin Haberland (00:51:24):

Yeah, I just gave them my, my ID without even talking or bothering. Yeah, like this was very quick <laugh> and also on the street where I lived. I, I mean, I, then I had a chat with them to, you know, check

how the police officers were reacting to my arguments. But then yeah, it was very easy. And also on some demonstrations in Hamburg, sometimes what happened was very funny. I I didn't wear a mask, and when the police approached me, I, I showed them, or I gave them my id like without even finding an excuse, and they just ignored me and went further to the next person. So <laugh>, they were kind of overwhelmed with this reaction. But yeah jokes aside this is what I did. And then some weeks or months later, I received the, you know the fine, and I objected it, and then it went to the court, and then I, I received the invitation for the court trial which already was like one and a half years later in October last year was the first invitation.

[\(00:52:37\)](#):

Then two weeks before I received a letter from the court that the judge is apparently sick and then that this will be postponed. And then I, I followed on like for weeks and months, I didn't hear from them, and I thought, okay, they just ignore it and they just you know, close it without even doing the hearing. But then finally, like six weeks ago, I, I received the invitation, and on the 26th of April, so very recently we had this yeah, court trial. We had many people here in Hamburg coming like a hundred of people. The court room was completely full. And yeah, I, I made my arguments, I stated my points. The judge told me, okay, basically you sent here all these documents, all these proofs. And then he he invited as a witness, also the police officer who gave me the fine.

[\(00:53:43\)](#):

But basically she couldn't remember anything. She couldn't recall it. So this was just a basic protocol and, and standard stuff. And then he just closed the case, basically, he told me, yeah you will find like more than one time already. And I don't see any reason to to find you again, or basically to find you at all. And then he just closed the case and I asked him why are you not issuing, issuing an official statement or, you know or even sentence me, whatever. And then he, he said that he doesn't see it in this case. And for him he, he, he, he, he did, he doesn't want to bother me any longer, and he, he will close the case, which is fine, because this happened like four times, as I told you before.

[\(00:54:38\)](#):

So all of of the four cases that I supported with this strategy here in, in, in Hamburg were closed, which is you know, four times winning. And the court is just helpless. They cannot possibly do anything else because in the, in the case that they would they would find someone, one, finally, we could always go to the second level, to the higher court, and there it would be required to check the evidence. And that would be of course, detrimental. And therefore they just close it on the first stage very early on without, you know, public attention and very easy for them. Of course, we made it public anyway. So many people now know by following this approach that you will never pay any, any cent.

Alec Zeck [\(00:55:29\)](#):

So basically what you're saying is you, this, this is speculation of course, but what you get the feeling or the impression of is that they don't want to take it to the next level, because then they would be forced to sort of admit that their so-called measures were not based in anything that strictly adheres to the scientific method. No strict proof with proper controls. Obviously, you could also have used proper, properly identified independent variable. There's several things really you could show where virology does not adhere to the scientific method, and this is the premise by which they, you know, brought about these measures.

Marvin Haberland [\(00:56:11\)](#):

Yes. So this is what I suspect. And also it became quite, quite obvious actually, because the court in all these four cases never made any argument or any comment on all the documents that I handed in, like, not even one sentence. So they kind of totally ignored this. And of course, Stefan Lanka's case in 2015 and 16 was unprecedented. And the, you know, the community and the, the legal community knows about this of course, and they don't want to, this is my opinion now, I think they don't want to, to risk something like this

Alec Zeck ([00:56:50](#)):

Again. Let the cat outta the bag, essentially. Yeah. They don't wanna let the cat outta the bag. Yeah. Yeah. So it's so frustrating too, just for the people watching this and it'll be covered later on during this event, but Stephan Lanka's case, if you look that up on any search engine, of course you'll find that he lost in court, but that is not the case, because when he appealed, he actually won because there was not sufficient evidence to prove the existence or the pathogenicity of the measles virus. So when it comes to your case, this is sort of building on that context in Germany, and it sure as heck seems as if they definitely don't want to bring this to the next level for fear of letting the cat out of the bag, so to speak, with regards to virology, not adhering to the scientific method. You

Marvin Haberland ([00:57:37](#)):

Know, oh, wait, a, wait A 1 1, 1 more comment which is very important. Not only did Stefan win in the second, in the higher court of, of Stuttgart, but the doctor who wanted to have the 100,000 Euro price money and handed in these six publications, he wanted to go to the highest court of Germany, like the third level, but then he, he was not allowed to do so, so they, they really shut it down after the second level, after Stefan won. So this is also something that not many people know that the, the highest court just did not let the, the doctor go on further <laugh>.

Alec Zeck ([00:58:20](#)):

That's really interesting. I actually had never heard that. That's that's, that gives even more ulence to the idea that they don't wanna let the, the truth out about the pseudoscience of virology. And as, as a final question, Marvin del Bigtree in the United States has said a, a number of times now that the no virus position is an incorrect approach to take, because that would enable people like Anthony Fauci and some of these other people who have perpetrated this fraud against humanity. To walk off scot-free

Video Clip of The High Wire Show ([00:58:52](#)):

To me, because I know while we're talking about gain of function, we're talking about lab leaks, there's this little group of people out there that keep talking about terrain theory and germ theory, and this conversation that many of you may not even understand, but I just wanna say this, we are going to get into those conversations further down the road with some of the people out there. But if what you want is to remove the idea that any of this ever existed, that any of this ever happened, then what you're saying is you want Tony Fauci to walk off scot-free. You want all these liars that lied to us, locked us down to get away with this by saying, oh, the germ never existed. It was never there. When clearly the science is turning on them, their own science is turning on them. And right at the moment where we are going to move into indictments and take these people out, what some of you out there wanna do is let's just change the conversation all altogether and let these criminals that destroyed our lives walk off into the sunset. I don't understand it. I don't understand why that would be your conversation right now, for those of you that don't know what I'm talking about, just wait, we're gonna have this conversation further down the road.



Alec Zeck ([00:59:52](#)):

What are your comments to that with what you've experienced with your case?

Marvin Haberland ([00:59:57](#)):

Yeah, I, I don't agree to this argument because first of all fauci dros and many others were claiming that there is a virus, first of all. So if there is no virus, and we can prove it by our own control experiments that turn out to be positive as well, and also by the scientific documents that were issued by the virologists themselves, the original publications, we can show in the original publications that they have never followed the scientific method, and they have not, not isolated any virus whatsoever. So by, by, by clearly stating that we, we can put them in a, in a very difficult situation as well, we are not letting them run because yeah, I, I cannot, I I don't understand this argument honestly, because they all always said that there is a virus and that they have scientifically proven it.

([01:00:57](#)):

And would, this is totally wrong. This, this was based on scientific fraud and not following the method and the gain of function experiments. Yeah, you can call it like a distraction strategy by them, or you can call it misinterpretation. I don't care at all because I'm just focusing on the, on the facts, on the, on what actually went on in the, in the real you know, lab. And this is not a gain of function. This is just you know, soil science, like you said, it's it's experiments in cell culture. It's no, no experiments in vivo whatsoever. It's just artifacts stressing cell culture with antibiotics and other toxins and so on. No direct proof, just indirect proof and so on. So this is totally sufficient for us to really put them in a, in a very difficult spot. And I, I think they would love, they would love us to go the gain of function route because somehow they could use this as an escape hole to protect the, the, the virus idea, right? Yeah. If there is a gain of function experiment, then it implies that, yeah, yeah, you can create a virus on like artificially, but this is not our goal to, to go this route.

Alec Zeck ([01:02:21](#)):

Yeah. Mark and Sam Bailey will be covering the, the gain of function narrative more extensively later on during this event. But just a quick comment. You bring up a great point. I think that the gain of function narrative is actually a, a, has scarier future implications in that now we have the alternative side latching onto this idea of lab made viruses. And this idea is, is much more fear inducing that you could take something that is, that is naturally occurring, which is also, there's no proof of that in the first place, but take something that's naturally occurring and then make it sort of weaponize it and make it more lethal. This is, this is not only something that perpetuates the idea of virology, which has no basis in reality, but it also gives them plausible deniability surrounding all of the measures because then they can claim, well, yeah, you know, the virus was made in a lab, but ultimately we, it was an accident and we tried to come up with the best measures that we could in order to help humanity. And that was masking isolation and vaccines and things like this. Whereas the, the lack of proof of viruses altogether sort of puts it in the category of deliberate fraud.

Marvin Haberland ([01:03:38](#)):

Yeah, exactly.

Alec Zeck ([01:03:41](#)):

Well, Marvin, thank you so much for joining me. This was an incredible conversation. And if you enjoyed this session, please subscribe to Marvin's List and next levels list below, and stay tuned for more.

Marvin Haberland ([01:03:54](#)):

Thank you.

**This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed in whole or in part without express written permission from The Way Forward, LLC.**