Transcript
The End of COVID
Session 4 - Isolation of SARS-CoV-2

**SPEAKERS**
Dr. Tom Cowan, Dr. Andy Kaufman, Alec Zeck, Jacob Diaz

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**This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed in whole or in part without express written permission.** This information is not intended to diagnose, treat or cure a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 (00:00:29):

This is a really, really important session. I think probably one of the most important sessions for this whole event. And we're just coming off of a session with Eric Pelino giving the sort of chronology of what happened in early 2020 with respect to this so-called virus. And I think by now, most people in the health freedom space have at least heard virus isolation. The virus hasn't been isolated, things like this thrown around in, in many conversations in the health freedom space. Now, whether they've looked into the details or not is another story, and that's what we're gonna attempt to do with this session and the rest of this event. So, Tom, I'm gonna turn it over to you first because you have a really interesting epistemological philosophical take on the importance of isolation.

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:01:21):

Yeah, thanks guys, Andy and Alec. So I don't really know what epistemology take means, but let, let me just say, but I, I, I know what the thing I wanna tell everybody who's listening to this is typically when people start throwing around science, virus, virus isolation, scientific terms, they just sort of tune out and something happens in them, and they stop thinking. And really, the only message I want to say right now is this question of has the virus quote been isolated, is very simple, because all of us do isolation all the time in order to understand the world around us. The definition of isolation is very clear. It means to take a thing. So you have to start with a thing and separate it from all other things. And as everybody already knows, that is an obvious and logical prerequisite to studying the thing, knowing what the thing is made of and what the thing does.

(00:02:43):

Because if you haven't isolated the thing, there's no point in trying to understand, there's no way to understand what it does or what it's made of. So let's forget about the virus for a minute and say, what, what do I mean? So let's just take a simple thing like, what about a hammer? So how do you isolate a hammer? Find out what it's made of and what it does, it's, it's very simple. We all do it. We, we essentially go to a, the ecosystem where we expect to find the hammer, which is a toolbox. We look in the toolbox, and we see this object, this thing that looks like what we conceive of as a hammer. So then we take the hammer out of the toolbox, which means we isolate the hammer from the toolbox, and then we, if we want, we can analyze what the hammer is made of iron or whatever, and then we can see if the hammer knocks nails into the wall.

(00:03:54):

Now you can do a control with that step, because how do you know it's not just your arm going like this? So you could do your arm like this with the hammer, and without, and my guess is you'll find that only with the hammer does the nail go into the wall. So now you have successfully isolated the hammer from its home, the ecosystem, and find out what it's ma found out what it's made of, found out what it does, and done controls. Now, you could do that with a frog. So it's not just inanimate things is you could say, is there such a thing as a frog? So you go to the place where you expect to find the frog like a pond, and you scoop it out, and maybe now you use a net to do the isolation. And then you find this thing that looks like what we all know as a frog.

(00:04:52):

And then you take the frog, and now you only have the frog. So you have isolated the frog from the pond, and then you can watch the frog and see if it eats flies, et cetera. What it does, does it jump? And then if you're a mean person, you could kill the frog and analyze it and find out what it's made of. So that's a, a simple, you know, isolation characterization, using the scientific method to find out you know, what, is there a frog? What is it made of? What does it do? Now, this is not dependent on size. I've spoken to analytical chemists, and if they want to find very small nanoparticles, they do exactly the same thing. But just like with a hammer, it's different. You, you just take it out with your hand. And with a frog, you use a net.

(00:05:52):

And if it's a nanoparticle, you use different techniques. Sometimes you may even use magnetism or ultracentrifugation. The technique doesn't matter. The point is, none of them would accept that you found the thing, unless you find the thing in its place, you expect it, pull it out, meaning isolate it, and then you characterize it and see what it does. We do that with everything all the time. That's how human beings think. Now, virologists, let's take an example with the hammer. They take the toolbox, grind it up, add the, the, the, the garden shed to this, grind that up altogether, and then analyze it for what it's made of, and then bang the toolbox against a nail and say that they have found, they have isolated a hammer, and they know what it's made of. And when you hear that, you think, that's ridiculous. Nobody would accept that.

(00:07:01):

Or if I said, okay, the way I'm gonna find a frog is to take some ocean water and pour it into the pond and take some tap water, pour it into the pond, put a big scoop of the pond in a blender, analyze the contents, and see if somehow this goop kills flies. And then I'm gonna tell you that there's a frog, and here's what it's made of, and here's what it does. You would think I'm a lunatic, because that's not how people think. And so when we go over how a virologist isolates a virus, there is no step in this that is taking the thing out from its environment, showing that they have the thing and only the thing characterizing that thing and showing what that thing does. And it's completely obvious when you read the methods section of these papers. And so my guess is anybody listening to this will say, how could they possibly miss this?

(00:08:14):

Because it's not complicated. It's not, it's so obvious and intuitive and logical and part of our human experience. And that becomes an interesting question. How did they all miss it? And we can get into that at the end, but I think when you're hearing this, don't tune out because it's virology and you don't, you're not an expert. Just think how you normally think. And it will be perfectly clear that no thing called a virus, according to the definition of a virus, has ever been even attempted really to be isolated. Therefore, it can't be. Well, they attempted, they couldn't find it. Just like you go to a toolbox, they

didn't find any hammers. So that should have been the end of it. And, and you can't characterize something, you don't isolate, and you can't find out what it does. So every study after that is basically irrelevant.

Alec Zeck (00:09:19):

That sounds easy enough, Tom. And you know, I think this is relevant to Webster's dictionary definition of isolate is to separate from another substance so as to obtain an appear or free state. But the, the problem we have here is that virologists from around the world have published thousands and thousands and thousands of papers just even on, you know, sars cov to two, claiming to have isolated it and claiming to have proven its pathogenicity. So why are these claims and the papers they published incorrect or misleading?

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:09:55):

Well, if I may, I'd like to just back up a little bit before we get to that because and take, take it back a step further because, you know, isolation or the viral isolation experiments that you want us to discuss, they are given as the primary proof that they discovered a virus, right? Right. Now, along the line of what Tom said, if you wanna discover an organism in nature, right? You would go out to the ecosystem where you think it exists and look for it. So if we were to apply that reasoning, right, which is all of course, the way that we would all go about this, right? If we wanted to hunt deer, for example, we would go to the woods where we heard that deer can be found and we would look for them, right? And eventually we would, if we were lucky and got one, we would take just the deer carcass home with us, not everything in a, you know, 10 yard radius around the deer.

(00:10:58):

So you would go look in nature, and if you're looking for, you know, alleged viruses that are said to cause disease, then you would go to the, the host animal with a disease, right? So if this were polio, you would go to children who were afflicted, right? If it was pneumonia, you would go to patients with pneumonia, et cetera, et cetera, and then you would go into the area of the body where the disease was occurring. And that's where you should be able to find the alleged cause if it were a virus. And simply, and you should see a ton of it there, right? If it's enough to cause serious illness or death, then there's gotta be a decent amount of it that you can see. And when the electron microscope was invented in the, I believe the late twenties, early thirties, lots of scientists looked at diseased tissue under the electron microscope.

(00:11:59):

Now, we can talk about the methodological flaws and artifacts with electron microscopy, but even if you put that aside, what they saw was in every state of disease tissue, there were particles, right? And we sometimes call these breakdown products or extracellular vesicles, but when cells undergo injury and death, they compartmentalize. Just like if your house was destroyed in a hurricane, you would take all the remnants and put them in bags or in carts, right? So they could be removed. Same thing happens when a cell gets injured or destroyed. And when they looked at these, they saw that all these particles were heterogeneous in terms of their shape and size. There was no predominant particle that looked like it was the same thing that was causing havoc. So the way that we're told viruses work, right, is that they reproduce and make millions of copies of themselves, and those copies go and infect adjacent cells, and, and the chain continues until the, you know, the worst consequences of the illness is realized.

(00:13:14):

So you would see whatever thing, the virus, you would just see a ton of it. So if it's the coronavirus, as we're told it looks right with the corona dots around the outside, then we would just see tons of those and then a few of other things, right? But they never saw a, any predominant you know, particle that could be said. It was distinct, and it was the same thing. And they tried to use many physical methods at that time, like centrifugation. Subsequently they've used things like chromatography to separate the particles so that they could get a homogeneous you particle that they could say, oh, this is something, right? This could be a new organism. And then if they had that, they could characterize it like Tom said, which essentially means look at what it's made of, like dissect it, take it apart analyze the chemicals, Ana if there's genetic material, analyze that, right?

(00:14:16):

So this has never been found, and this experiment has never been successfully done. So they, they've never, by the method that we would use to discover any organism in nature, this has never been accomplished, alright? But it's been accomplished with every other organism, including organisms of the same size as viruses are said to be like oph phages which are particles that occur in bacterial cultures under stress. And you can easily find experiments where they show you how they purify those particles from the bacterial culture isolation, and then how they examine what they're made of. And you can see pictures where you just see a ton of those, and they all look identical as you'd expect, just like if you took you know, a sample from an ant colony and removed the, the sand and debris and you know, leaves that and twigs that they brought into the colony and just had the ants, you'd see that, right?

(00:15:20):

They all look essentially identical. There might be some mild size variation from the juveniles to the adults or maybe the queens and the workers, but essentially they'd all be identical and, you know, they're all the same thing. And you can examine them, you know, in any way the materials they're made of microscopically and see that, that they're the same thing. So this was never done successfully to demonstrate the existence of any virus. And so they essentially created a laboratory simulation experiment, which is very problematic because it doesn't actually tell you about nature. It's the simulation of nature, but not nature itself. And you know, of course they don't find predominant particles in the simulation either. But I think there's gonna be a separate discussion on that aspect. So this is a good segue, I think, to discuss like, how do they actually do these isolation experiments which we can show you from their published papers. And just know that this is once again, given as the primary proof by virology of the discovery and existence of every virus that causes disease that we've ever heard of.

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:16:35):

Let me just say one more thing about this, because I've spoken to a number of analytical chemists who make their living finding small things, some things that are even so volatile, they last like seconds. And when you describe what the virologists say about viruses, you know, there's like 10 million in a sneeze or something, and they're this size and they do this and made of this, they all say the same thing. If those things were there, I'd find them in a week. I'd find every one. I I I, there's, this is not a technical problem. This is not also a problem of there's not enough to find. They can find s things that are so much more less concentrated and so much smaller than these particles called viruses. And everybody needs to know all the excuses of, oh, it's hard to find them, and there's not enough to see and, and <laugh>, it's just, it's not true. Get an analytical chemist, he'll find it in a day. There's only one reason he won't 'cause it isn't there, then he won't find it.

Alec Zeck (00:17:51):

That's an interesting point. And I think, as Andy said, it's important that we bring up one of these papers as an example, and we'll probably cover a couple of them here. So this one is titled Isolation and Rapid Sharing of the 2019 novel Coronavirus Sars Cov to two from the first patient diagnosed with C Ovid 19 in Australia. And again, you know, Tom and Andy, we, we have thousands of paper papers that have been published describing something similar. You know, the title of the paper and the abstract are discussing the isolation of SARS cov to two. So I think it's appropriate to, to go to the methods section of this paper, and I'll have you guys comment,

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:18:35):

Y you

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:18:35):

Know, before Alec, if you could just scroll back up to the title because there's a, a really good kind of giveaway that something is not right with this paper right in the title there, because it tells you that it's only looking at one patient. Now, how can you, you know, make a determination about such a large phenomenon, right? Saying that there's a new disease that's gonna kill millions of people when you only look at one, one patient. It's, it's not how any clinical research is done outside of virology.

Alec Zeck (00:19:08):

And the, the method section of this paper, and that's what you two were referencing. The method section of this paper describes the procedure by which they go about isolating these viruses. So what is, what exactly is wrong with the methods of this paper and other virus isolation papers?

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:19:31):

Like Andy said, you would expect they would take this one patient if they're gonna say they can find it with one patient, look using physical separation techniques for this particle in some fluid of this person. That's what you would expect. It's easy to do. The, the procedures for doing that are simple, but they didn't do that. They first do a, a reverse transcriptase P c R test. Now, everybody needs to ask themselves the question that is a, a piece of the alleged virus, right? It's not the whole thing, it's just a piece of that. So if this, if you make the assumption that we don't know whether there's a virus or not, how can you possibly say that this piece of it came from this particle before you've proven that the particle exists? You don't go into your toolbox and say, oh, I found some iron, therefore there must be a hammer because other things might have iron for god's sake.

(00:20:47):

It's not complicated. So that's a ridiculous statement. This is not how you would find the first virus. Okay? So then they take some nasopharyngeal swab and they put it in transport medium. In other words, they swab the nose, put it in a bunch of chemicals, and separately for sputum, urine, feces, and serum. So they do all kinds of fluids from the pers from this one person. And then they do more of these P C R tests apparently on all of these samples. And some people make a big deal. Is it a nested P C r? Is it this it doesn't make any difference because you're looking, you're finding a piece of iron and you don't have a hammer yet. So they have a little piece of something that they have no idea whether it belongs to anything. So then they somehow do some sequencing on this.

(00:21:52):

Again, the problem is not the sequencing, it's the origin of this sequence that they're looking for. That is the only question. So then they go to the material from the swab was used to inoculate Vero h slam cell

line, and it's, and they go on the flass were monitored for the development of viral cytopathic effect and tell you how long it took and all that. So what does that mean? That means that, and and when, when you hear this, I want everybody to think, at which point in this did they even attempt to prove there was this particle called the virus? So they take un purified snot from somebody and maybe these other fluids, and they mix it with a cell culture made from inbred monkey kidney cells. And then as we'll find out when they, that they bury in the supplemental section, they add fetal bovine serum, they add antibiotics which are known to be poisonous to kidney cells.

(00:23:09):

They reduce the nutrients of this mixture. And then the cytopathic effect means that the cells eventually died. At least some flas, some flas, the cells died. And they say that is the proof that there's a virus. That is the proof in virology that a virus exists. But ask yourself, which stage proved this that, like, how can you possibly know that which part of the sputum, 'cause remember it's from a sick person, it's got enzymes in it, proteins, nucleic acids, maybe other debris, maybe toxins. How do you know it's not the antibiotics killing the cell to killing the cells? After all, there are kidney toxic antibiotics and you're using kidney cells for god's sake. I mean, this is not complicated people. And then they take away the food of the kidney cells, so they starve them, and then they add fetal bovine serum serum sucked out of the heart of a newborn calf, I believe.

(00:24:25):

And they add that. And you would never do that to find out what caused the cells to die. You can't possibly know. And then they do a so-called control, which they call a mock infection. And I don't even see that on there. But you know, the definition of a mock infection, I have it here is a control used in infection experiment. Two specimens are used, one that is infected with the viral virus of interest, and the others treated the same way except without the virus. In other words, you have to find the virus first in order to take it out so that you can do a mock infection. A mock infection would be one cell culture. You just put the virus, which you've already purified and isolated. And the other, you do exactly the same except you don't put the virus. If they tell you they can't find the virus before, then they can't do a control, which means, again, you have no idea from this experiment what killed the kidney cells. And that, as Andy said, is not a proof of the existence, it's the proof. In which case, every study after that antibodies, P C r, genetic sequencing, you don't know what you're doing it on. 'cause You never found the virus in the first place.

Jacob Diaz (00:26:04):

And Tom, real quick, I have a question regarding well, two things really though. The first point about the mocks is very interesting because we, we've all looked into the mocks and they say one thing, but when you look into it, they, they clearly don't use the same amount of chemicals and cell lines sometimes are completely different. But with regards to the use of like things, and like amphotericin, gentamycin, streptomycin, a lot of the excuses they use when we talk to them is we use them because we wanna keep the culture free from bacterial or fungal contamination. What is the issue with that? Or is that a valid excuse to use these things in the

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:26:42):

Culture?

(00:26:45):

I mean, they can make up whatever reason they want, but the, the bottom line is the question is prove to us that genamicin, streptomycin, penicillin, et cetera, amphotericin, which are known to be toxic to

lots of different types of cells. And which by the way, we don't have these papers here, but I've seen papers showing that amphotericin and genamicin actually kill cells in culture. So if you're gonna say that the proof that there's a virus is the cells die and you go and put chemicals in the culture that are known to kill the cells, you better account for that somehow and prove that's not what happened. It doesn't matter what the reason you're doing it. And by the way, I think what you're alluding to is I know Mark Bailey in particular has actually got them a number of virologists to admit, well, we put twice as much of the, of the antibiotics and anti mycotic in the experiment than we do in the mock infection.

(00:28:04):

And he said, well, why do you do that? He said, well, because the first one has all this snot in it, and so it's maybe contaminated even though by the way they filtered it to get rid of the bacteria and fungus. So there shouldn't be any possibility of bacteria and fungus being in there anyways. And so then they say, yeah, so the second one, we just put phosphate buffer solution in. And so now we have, and, and since that doesn't have bacteria, we don't have to worry about bacteria. So we just reduce the, the concentration of the poisons. But don't worry about that because that, that you're just not supposed to know about that because we didn't write it in the paper. So how would you know? You have to ask them but they don't tell you that because they know that this isn't science.

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:29:00):

I, I'd like to add a little bit on the back of that, if that's all right. One thing is Tom said something that's really, really pivotal which is that it's not possible for them to do an actual control, right? Because they don't have an independent variable. And let me just review that. I know that sounds like a fancy term independent variable, but it's really, really key because you can't conduct any scientific experiment without it. It's the thing that you're testing. Like for example, if you want to see, you know, does a flame boil water or heat water, right? The flame is your independent variable, and you have to have it by itself in order to do, you know, an experiment where you put a flame under a pot of water, and then the control would be a pot of water with no flame, right?

(00:29:52):

You might even have wood if it's from a wood fire, right? You'd have the wood, but you don't light it under the control experiment. So everything is there except the flame itself, which is the independent variable. So the independent variable in a virus experiment has to be the virus. If you haven't, you know, purified it where it's by itself, then you can't do a scientific experiment because you can't leave it out. So it's actually not possible. So whatever they're claiming to do with the mock infections, they, they can't do it in a proper way. So whatever they're doing has to be invalid. Now, I do wanna state that there are two examples in the published literature where there's something very close to a real control experiment. Now, they still didn't have the virus as an independent variable because that's never been done.

(00:30:48):

But I'm going back to one, the 1954 paper by enders on measles, where they did the same culture experiment. In fact, this is where the use of Vero cells came from. And they used slightly different antibiotics because some of them may not have been invented at that time, but they did use kidney toxic antibiotics in those experiments. And one of the cultures where they had I think it was also snot it could have been from an oral pharyngeal swab from someone without measles, gave them the same cytopathic effects as measles. And they discussed this in their interpretation of the paper saying that there were unknown factors causing it. Now, this also occurred in the original paper on Monkeypox which is from a research facility where monkeys were, came in from, you know, overseas and some of them developed score sores or lesions on their skin.

(00:31:49):

And from those, they did this experiment and showed cytopathic effects, and then they called that virus monkeypox. But they also tested some of the monkeys that didn't have any skin lesions. So, and they never manifested, they followed them subsequently, and they still also had positive cytopathic effects. And so that's another control experiment, right? That showed that they got the same thing when there was no virus, or at least no illness where you would, where you would might expect a virus to be. And then of course, the third time that was done was by Stephan Lanka and and anonymous partner where they omitted any biological sample from the experiment and just did the cell culture with antibiotics, fetal calf serum, and the reduced nutrition that Tom described. And they got cytopathic effects in that sample. And interestingly, they did an additional experiment for another purpose where they added just plain yeast, r n a, not viral r n a, but r n a from yeast, you know, the same kind of yeast that we would use to make beer if you're a home brewer. And just having that biological material in the soup actually was toxic to the cells. They had more cytopathic effects. And what do you have, you, you have naked genetic material in sputum and oropharyngeal and nasopharyngeal swabs from humans, and there's gonna be more genetic material if they're sick because they're sloughing off damaged cells. So, you know, we, we, another thing that could be in the mix here is actually there's the naked genetic material from the biological sample in addition to the other enzymes, proteins, microorganisms, et cetera, et cetera,

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:33:37):

Right? You know, the independent variable in this, because in some ways it, you could correct me if I'm wrong here, but it doesn't have to be a single thing. The independent variable is snot plus excess antibiotics plus change in the nutrition. That's what you're studying compared to no biological material, decreased an, you know, antibiotics and anchos. That's what you're studying. So you could come out with the conclusion that biological material from a sick person is more harmful if you add more antibiotics to growing cells than just putting phosphate buffer in. But right.

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:34:31):

If I, that would pass my peer review, Tom, if they put that as their conclusion.

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:34:35):

Yeah, that's, that's the accurate conclusion of this study. If you put un purified stuff from a sick person, it's more likely to be harmful to a growing culture than if you just put water or buffer or something. I mean, stop the presses

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:34:56):

<Laugh>

Alec Zeck (00:34:57):

Tom, you had mentioned earlier,

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:34:59):

I put feces on it. Would it be even more toxic I want,

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:35:01):

Yeah, right. Let,

Alec Zeck (00:35:03):
That's what enders let's,

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:35:04):
Let's added poop. Yeah,

Alec Zeck (00:35:07):
Enders added poop. So I mean, that's, that's what was done. We, we cover ender's experiment and and, and lanka's experiment in depth later on in this event. And also the scientific method, 'cause that's important here. Really showing that there is no adherence to the scientific method with, with any of their virus isolation studies. But

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:35:28):
Talk, I mean, they, they, they did a, they did urine. So you mean, I mean, why don't they do an experiment where they pee in the flask and see if that harms the kidney cells? And then you could say that would be the same as saying that proves there's a virus. Like, again, people, nobody would believe this if you were talking about frogs or hammers. It's just this ludicrous.

Alec Zeck (00:35:58):
Tom, you mentioned earlier that sort of these questions that Mark Bailey asked, it's, it's sort of the answer you would imagine virologists would give. Well, yeah, we didn't include that in the paper, so you're really not supposed to know about that. And Andy, we were talking before this, and you mentioned that in in older papers, they would put the methods section right at the top. Now, the reason I bring this up is because this paper was originally sent to me as proof that they don't always use antibiotics and antimycotic. And an interesting point to be made here is that that paper includes some supplemental information that is not referenced in the actual paper itself. And here we have the supplemental paper. So you see this is the supple supplementary method section for the paper that we just brought on screen earlier. And if you look in section 2.1, you'll see the use of geneticism and some other substances and talking about bringing the fetal bovine serum from 7% down to 2% in things like this. So I think it's really interesting that you have to really dig to find the antibiotics and antimycotic and other methods that are used, which I would imagine to be the most important part of the paper.

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:37:19):
Well, Alec, it's even more than that because, you know, they, so look at Earl's minimal essential medium. What's that? Right? They're not gonna describe it in the paper. You have to actually go look up what are the ingredients in that? And the same thing with things like viral transport medium, right? What is that? You know, it's not something that people have in their kitchen, right? So you gonna have to, and they're not gonna list the ingredients, right? But it's a commercial product. They often give the brand name. So, you know, if you really go and track down all these things, or you know exactly how the fetal bovine serum is collected for example, you know, many of these things, you'll, you'll just come across all these little you know, gems that, that you say, oh my gosh, this is really so complex. Like they're putting so many things in here, and gosh, aren't these chemicals, don't they have an effect on cells and, and biological organisms, right? We know this. They're used for other purposes. Like in one another paper

we might discuss today, they were talking about adding things to make the cells stickier. Well, how is that a good thing? Like, does that, could that affect the biology of the cells <laugh>?

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:38:38):

And, and you know, it's the, this thing is so absurd that, you know, people say, often ask, why do they put fetal bovine serum in there? Because obviously it's a rich source of genetic sequences or so-called genetic, you know, d n a and r n a. So it's gonna mess up any so-called sequencing or alignment process that you're gonna do later. So why do they put it in? The reason is it's a rich source of growth factors that keeps these cells alive, right? So here, here's how absurd this is. You got these, these old, you know, like infected so-called green monkey kidney cells inbred for decades, and you put 'em in, in this medium and they die. So what you do is you put something in there that keeps them from dying until the virus can kill them. Then once they die, <laugh>, because you, you, if you don't put that in there, they'll die before the virus kills them. So you gotta put this stuff in there to keep 'em alive long enough so the virus can kill them. So, right? You think about that, this is crazy.

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:40:01):

This is not, it's not the normal nutrition that they, if they were doing other experiments with these cell cultures and just keeping them alive, they can keep them alive, definitely indefinitely without yeah, any cytotoxic effects, right? But they have to use this starvation nutrition, right? The minimal essential medium, because they want to have cytopathic effects in the experiment. And if they have full nutrition, they're gonna be more resilient. But like Tom said, if they just do that, then they die without anything added to 'em, and they can't stay alive long enough to, you know, so they get this balance just right of these like, you know, growth factors. And, you know, there's special powers, right? In fetal like the colostrum, for example, is sought after by many cultures, right? So, so they're basically just titrating toxicity with, you know, the magic of youth to this potion that, you know, okay, at six days, that's, that's when we're gonna see the effects. We won't see it on, you know, on day one, or they won't all be dead within the first six hours. It'll take a few days and then we can you know, get our results that we need to you know, make false claims about interpreting,

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:41:16):

Right? Because if they all died within the first six hours, one of the lab techs might say, are you sure it didn't die? Just because we took all the stuff away, <laugh>. Like, are you sure that was 'cause of a virus? Oh, yeah. So you, you don't want anybody asking that. So you gotta keep it alive for six days, which then gives you the excuse that the virus must have replicated and it's too long.

Jacob Diaz (00:41:43):

I know you guys

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:41:45):

Yeah, yeah. Anyways,

Jacob Diaz (00:41:47):

I know you guys touched on it a little bit, and Andy mentioned the whole monkeypox thing where these monkeys were being given, you know, experimental polio vaccines and all that. Some people hearing this will say, okay, so this is for SARS Cov two, is this the same with every other virus, Ebola, rabies smallpox? Do they do the same methodologies for, you know, entirety of virology,

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:42:11):

Every single isolation? And the four of us have read probably a thousand of these. You get sent, all this one says it isolate. It's exactly this methodology. Exactly. And the one, you know, if we're gonna get to that, that Malone said yesterday, oh, they isolated 10,000 times. They just did this with a little technology mixed in 10,000 times. It's always the same. That's how they do it.

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:42:47):

That 10,000 is actually not an accurate quote because there weren't that many subjects in this study. But the lab claimed in their introduction that they have identified C O V I D that many times you know, in their own lab. But most of those are done by P C R tests. They haven't isolated, done this experiment on 10,000 samples. There were, you know, a hundred and something samples in this experiment.

Alec Zeck (00:43:21):

So we have this paper, which was alluded to by Dr. Robert Malone regarding, you know, the, it's the isolation of SARS cov to two from clinical sampling using miniaturized co-culture coupled with high content screening. So it's a

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:43:38):

Great title for a paper <laugh>. It's easy to remember, catchy. No, in all seriousness let me, I don't want to go through all the minutiae of this paper. And it is, it is hard to look at in this format actually, even though this is the format for peer reviewers to look at with the line numbers. But I'll just give a general description of what this paper is. So there's this lab in France that specializes in this technology. They've tried to apply it to other microorganisms as well. And what they wanna do is develop a method where essentially they can automate the isolation procedure. So they can have, you know, like a computer drip the things into the culture wells and a culture plate. And then they can have you know, an automated go over and scan all the samples at regular intervals and then be coupled with a computer software that can analyze the images and using a, a ratio of the injured cells to the total cell count, and determining a statistical cutoff to say that this is positive for CPEs, in other words, positive for a virus versus not.

(00:44:59):

Now, hopefully that wasn't too complicated, but essentially they want to just make it a machine where they, you know, squirt in some samples, and then a week or two later, they get a output that says, you know, sample 31 was positive and sample 32 is negative. Now, they actually did two procedures here. The first procedure is they, they took what they said was the actual virus and applied this automated procedure in order to calibrate where the cutoff would be for unknown samples. And this is really where the problems lie. And you don't need to go any further than that first initial experiment order to understand what the problems are here and why you can't interpret the results in the way that they say. And this is in actually line 65. The viral strain was previously isolated in our lab from a nasopharyngeal squab.

(00:45:59):

So they used a sample that they say is the virus. They say it's locally isolated. SARS COV two strain. They give it a strain number I h U m I dash three, okay, <laugh>. And they reference a paper that they did. Now after this step, they, so they, they put that in their automated system to analyze the microscope images, right? And then they use that to determine how to interpret blind samples subsequently. But, but what is that sample that they used to set up and calibrate this whole system? So we would have to go back. So this, it's, by the way, in the text of the paper, we're just looking at, it says that it's reference

11, but it's actually reference 12 is the right paper, which is this one. Now here, notice they like to use these terms like right high, what was it? High speed, large scale, ultra rapid. They're really full of these adjectives, but ultra rapid diagnosis, microscope imaging, genome sequencing, and culture isolation of SARS COV two. Okay? So this is where they say they got their sample from, and I thought this was really interesting because they did something a little bit different here. Now it's, it's still unscientific but it, it is definitely different. Okay? So what they did here is that did first of all P C R tests on a number of samples,

(00:47:40):

And the pc, PC the samples. So these are nasopharyngeal swabs, so you know, snot, and they, they did P C R tests to say whether they had the virus in it or not, right? Which we know right there is a problem because the P c R test was never is, you know, detecting a piece of something that's never been shown where it comes from. Okay? So, so we can't tell, you know, any derive any meaning from it. But in, in this case, rather than putting those samples into a culture and then looking at microscope images of the culture, they actually looked at microscope images right there, like tried to look directly in nature, right? To find the virus. So I thought that was fascinating. Now, of course, they did not attempt to purify or isolate particles out of the sample. They just took the sample, looked under the microscope and hunted around until they found what they were looking for.

(00:48:44):

And they said that this actually validated that they found the virus here. Now, these are the images that they found. Now I want you to look at those and tell me, <laugh>, this just looks like debris. This is random debris, right? So you can see that when they zoom out in those lower power images, you just see a bunch of dots of different sizes and shapes. There's nothing that stands out as being the same. Like, remember I discussed earlier that if you took a sample from an ant colony, right? All the ants would look identical. There's nothing in here that looks identical. So on the left where you have the a and C panel, they're just showing one particle, one single particle that doesn't really tell you anything, okay? Now on the, the second panel of two images on the right even when they zoom in, right?

(00:49:42):

You see those things don't even all look the same. Now, they all have kind of a black halo around them, but they're different sizes and we can't zoom out to see how they're spread throughout the whole sample. So that's not the end of the story for what they did for the other experiment, because after that, then they did take the nasopharyngeal swabs and put them in a regular type of tissue culture isolation experiment. And then they simply took the supernatant of that tissue culture and which is an un purified, you know, toxic soup of a cell culture. And that's what they used in the experiment mentioned by Dr. Malone in order to establish that automated procedure. So you could see that there are many, many steps of separation from actual reality and what's going on in nature. And what we are just having is essentially manipulating different laboratory simulations to give meaning. And then, you know, assigning meaning to things that don't actually have that meaning. And this is, you know, for commercial gain and other purposes, but not, they didn't discover anything from nature. They're just rehashing the same experiments with slight variations introducing automation, but there's nothing new here under the sun.

Alec Zeck (00:51:10):

All right? So Andy, Tom, all this sounds great, but we also have virologists saying that isolation is now not even relevant because they've moved on to sophisticated sequencing techniques, claiming they're able to show the virus exists without even having to prove a physical part particle. So the, the details

surrounding sequencing will be covered later on in this event. But why is it important to show the existence of these alleged particles in reality, regardless of what they say?

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:51:45):

Well, that's

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:51:45):

What they're saying, right? I have a little piece of rubber. I I, I found it in the garage and I know there must be a hammer here somewhere. 'cause I know that hammers have pieces of rubber. And by the way, I found a toenail in the pond, and I know that frogs have toenails. Nevermind rabbits are in the pond too. They have toenails, I think. And, and, and, but nevermind, because it must be a frog. Just think to yourself, do I ever claim that I that without ever once seeing the thing that some p piece of it, which by the way, is shared by many other things which we know about, right? We know rubber is found in lots of things. And so to use that as proof that there's a slammer, not a hammer is frankly illogical and ridiculous. And if they tried to voice that on you for anything but virology, nobody out there would believe it.

Dr. Andy Kaufman (00:53:01):

So Alec, I think that almost all of the folks in, you know, that have looked at this and, and believe that to be true, I think they all believe that if we went, if we went back and looked at the original science that they, so for example, if it's a coronavirus related sequence, right? I'll bet that they think you can go back in the literature and find where there was a physical coronavirus that they took the genetic material out of, showed that this was the sequence, and now we're just finding a, something that's very, very close to that, almost identical. And since we validated that original thing, then it's not, it's not that much of a stretch, right? Because you could say, oh, well, you know, you don't have to be so o c D about it, right? But the thing is, no one actually takes the time to go back and look for the original thing.

(00:53:59):

Like I went through this exercise today in a discussion with Steve Falconer, who is, I know another speaker in this event, and he was asking me about the ACE two receptor because it we're told right, that SARS COV two enters the cell through the ACE two receptor. And I never looked into that really, because if there's no SARS COV two, then there couldn't be any way that it enters the cell. So I knew that I, it was not a useful way to spend my time. But since Steve asked, and a lot of people talk about this and sometimes they even give this also as proof of a virus, I wanted to just trace it back to the first paper on SARS COV two, where they did an experiment to make this determination. And I found out that there wasn't one that the first paper just stated a claim because all coronaviruses go through ACE two receptors, and it gave a reference back to a paper on Ace two receptors from human biology that had nothing to do with viruses.

(00:55:08):

Wow. As that's where, so, you know, this is what I think we have to do is be sort of amateur detectives and just, and you know, I know of course Tom and I and the Baileys and anyone else who's looked seriously into this information, I'm sure you have Jacob, you know, Mike do Donio, Mike Stone, Jordan Grant, is that you just follow the clues of evidence back to the source. So every paper references something else, or many times they actually make claims without a reference. But you wanna find, you know, go back to the original thing where it was established because you see that they're, they're not actually doing it from scratch, right? They're not doing the real experiment. Now. They're doing a simulation, they're doing something without a control. And it's all predicated that if we go back to the

original experiment, we could see, oh, all that was well established, and everyone just believes that that's the case.

(00:56:07):

But the thing is that is like the Wizard of Oz, right? Where it's just a man with some fancy machines and smoke and mirrors to give the appearance that it was all established. And unless you are willing to look yourself, and I would challenge everyone who is interested in this question anyway, even if it's to get me off your back like I'm a thorn in your side. And the team, no viruses you know, we are the antichrist of the health freedom movement. Well, okay, so prove us wrong. Like find me the papers where established that this has all been shown to be true. And, you know, I will then relay that information to the whole world.

Jacob Diaz (00:56:57):

I love the antichrist of the truth movement a little bit. You kind of answered, I was gonna ask like a question about what Tom said prior to us recording. And Andy, you kind of hit on it about, you know, the obfuscation the virologists are involved with and not looking at the, at the research themselves. And we obviously want to point out that we don't think all these virologists are some part of some dark cult that is trying to mislead the masses, but is it truly that they're ignorant to the science or, you know, have we seen in this community some are even scared of disproving themselves and having their entire paradigm shattered and by extension losing their, you know, their jobs and their livelihood. Like, is there, you know, an explanation to that? Or is that, is that a good excuse? Or why do we think they're, you know, they're refusing to look,

Dr. Tom Cowan (00:57:47):

You know, the, because my guess is, again, I'm really trying to talk to the people listening. When you hear this, you think this is incredibly simple. Like, how do these smart virologists, all these medical doctors miss this? And so they're, that's where the doubt comes in. Tom, Andy, you guys are missing something. You're not telling us something. So on the, on the one hand, just like Andy said, just, you know, people need to ask the, the other side, so where's the study that shows this? And read it yourself. But then the question is, how does it come to this? And you know, when I was thinking about this I think it's all of us, including myself, it's human nature to sometimes not want to know things. You know, I use the example of, I live near a road, I have these cats. I don't want 'em to get hit by a car.

(00:58:52):

So I don't look out my front window to see if pumpkin has run out into the road. 'cause I don't wanna know. 'cause There's nothing I can do about it anyways. If I build a fence, he just hop over it. So now I, it's almost like I have myself convinced that if I don't look out and I don't know, he is out there, I can sleep better. 'cause I think he's safe. And, you know, so you just somehow convince yourself that I don't wanna know the truth. Now, it's one thing if you're doing that with your cat, it's another thing. If you're doing that with the locking down and poisoning the whole world, then I would submit you don't really have the right to do that and call yourself a scientist or a medical doctor because you're actually hurting people. And it's because of this normal, psychological, emotional thing, which we all do, which with this, I don't wanna know. I'm gonna lose my job. My wife will divorce me. I don't have any money. I spent 20 years doing this. I've already, I know I've sort of hurt people if I fess up, and that's too big for most people to do, and I get it. But it's, it's too important for us to allow that to happen.

Dr. Andy Kaufman (01:00:27):

You know, if you look at the doctors in our camp, we really all had to leave our mainstream medical careers and you know, figure some other way to provide for our families. And that, that's a big ask. You know, for for, for anybody, right? It was difficult to us, you know, like Tom went through it earlier before the Covid era. But you know, it's there, there are many reasons why folks may not be willing, but it only matters what you're willing to do. And in order to meet the responsibilities, to make good, honest decisions for yourself, for your family to understand the world around you, what is real, what's not you need to ask these questions and you need to find the answers and satisfy yourself. And we hope that you use logic and reason to come to these conclusions. But it's up to you to decide. And don't put your faith in the grandiose other, you know, into any authority figure or hero or anyone like that including us. Question what we say. Be a skeptic and then you'll find the truth.

Alec Zeck (01:01:47):

Beautifully said. And Tom, I remember back two years ago just as a final 0.2, two and a half years ago, I was continually messaging you on email, sending you papers. Well, this one claims isolation. What about this one? And you finally got to a point where you're like, Alec, you're, you know, you're smart enough that you can do this on your own. Go, you know, just go read the papers. And that's sort of a message that could be shared with really anyone else that's watching this, that this is not hard. Understand, yes, there's some language that you'll have to learn what it actually means, but you can read these papers yourself and determine the truth of what they show. And again, in, in summary, they're taking fluids from a sick person that they assume contains the virus without ever validating that it's there. Add it to a, a foreign cell culture alongside several cytotoxic antibiotics, antimycotic and other substances, cell experiences, what is called a cytopathic effect, breaks down into a bunch of fragments.

(01:02:51):

They then take those fragments, prepare them for electron microscopy, and we'll cover that in depth. Later on. In this event, we'll cover the question of, well, if it's not a virus, then what's making us sick? We'll cover that later on this, in this event, we're covering all of our bases here to cover all the questions that come up once you learn this fundamental paradigm shattering reality regarding the lack of proof for virtually everything that has happened the last three years and beyond. So with that, Tom, Andy, thank you so much for all that you do. Thank you for helping to educate others to help educate themselves. And if you like this session, please be sure to subscribe to Andy and Tom's list below and stay tuned for more. Thanks guys.

Dr. Andy Kaufman (01:03:38):

Thank you.