Transcript
The End of COVID
Session 9 - The Science & Logic of Virology

SPEAKERS
Dr. Jordan Grant, Mike Stone, Alec Zeck, Dr. Kelly Brogan

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This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed in whole or in part without express written permission.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.

Dr. Kelly Brogan (00:00:30):

Hi everyone. I have the pleasure of being in conversation today with three esteemed gentlemen with Alex Zeck, with Dr. Jordan Grant, and with Mike Stone. And I want to start out by reading a short paragraph from a presentation that they all participated in called Debunking The Nonsense actually has become one of my favorite, if not my go-to resource for anyone who is beginning to explore what we have all been magnetized towards, which is this fundamental question of the, of and around the nature of virology, germ theory, and of course, contagion and infection, and the underpinnings of everything we've been experiencing over the past couple of years. So they wrote this, truth is important, reality is important. Additionally, all arguments on the effectiveness of masks, shots, social distancing, lockdowns, et cetera, are irrelevant. When we understand that the evidence for pathogenic viruses is based on a pseudoscientific presupposition, we will be playing this game forever.

(00:01:35):

There will always be a new variant, new so-called pathogenic bio weapon, a new deadly virus. And all of those measures will always be on the table until we are willing to question the initial premise and evidence that all of this is based on. So, I am going to hand over the mic to Alec who has prepared some slides, and every time he prepares slides, I actually get excited to pay attention, which is some sort of cognitive dissonance from my own personal training experience. And we're gonna dive into some of the fundamental questions around science and logic when it comes to virology. And hopefully the questions will bring us somewhere that feels good and empowering and expansive. So take it away.

Alec Zeck (00:02:22):

Okay? So the first piece of this, I think it's like important to start with the thought experiment. And you know, this may seem elementary, but it's, it's an important thought experiment to lay the context for the rest of this. So does Santa Claus exist? You know, as a child, countless things in my environment reaffirm his existence. All of the cartoons, movies, songs, pictures, stories, decorations, half eaten cookies and milk on Christmas morning, pieces of beard found in the fireplace, presents under the tree. The Santa Claus sleigh tracking app that I watch on Christmas Eve, or I turn on Fox News or c n n or something like this. They're talking about Santa's trajectory across the earth and the positive emotions I feel when my mom and dad tell me that Santa's bringing me presence. 'cause I've been a really good kid, or the really negative fear inducing feelings that I feel when my parents say that my behavior has been

bad, and that Santa's gonna bring me cold this year. Right? Like all of those things mean Santa Claus actually exists. I have a measurable and observable biological response to the idea of Santa Claus. All these things in my environment confirm his existence. So that must mean Santa Claus is real, right? And of course, that's nonsense. <Laugh>.

(00:03:43):

Okay? And Jordan, you can why don't you do a few of these?

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:03:48):

Okay. so I guess we need to talk about, well, the reason we're talking about this in the first place, right? Is everybody and their grandmother talks about the science, the science, the science. When it, especially when it comes to covid viruses they say it, but they don't know even what the word usually means. And so you can, you know, science just as a word just means knowledge, right? The, the root word. But that's not what people talk about when they say, science says this, or The science proves this. They're talking about natural science. If, if we, if we span the word just mean knowledge, well then that's anything. And if, if, if a word means everything, it means nothing. And so I have no problem with people using the word science in a particular way, such as for the social sciences or the formal science.

(00:04:39):

You know, they'll say, you can talk about the science of flying a kite, right? Like it just means sort of something that's analytical, something that's been broken down in study. And that's fine, but that is not what we mean when we talk about natural science, natural science in people's minds. Even if they don't really know it in their minds, they think empiricism, they think proven. Now when you talk to the modern day pseudo scientists and you start bringing up the word proof, they have fits over that word. They hate it. I don't exactly know why. I think it's because deep down, they know most of the things they push are stories and not truth and facts, but they still need to, to use the word science, to attach it to those stories, to give it some kind of credence in people's minds.

(00:05:28):

So that being said, we can talk about, you know, these, these three branches of science, but again, science just means knowledge. So social science formal science and natural science. I think your next slide goes over all this in detail. So and again, formal science is just systems, which again, I I think that's fine to use it in that way. There's so many ways you could talk, you know, people just have books on the science of celestial navigation, right? Things like, which is not nothing to do with natural science. It just means a, a formal system. It's a systematized area of study. I mean, you could have the science of baking a cake, you know, things like that, tech, technological inventions, or any kind of technology. People think technology science, it's not, it's, it's a structure. It's engineering, it's tinkering, it's trial and error to figure out how things work.

(00:06:19):

And even if you don't know why they work, they just work. And here's, here's the best way to get X effect, right? Logic is not science. Logic is basically rules for how to properly reason which we'll go into probably later. So we'll go to the next one here. Yeah. Social science, I hate the term, honestly. It's just, you can't apply natural science to humans. There's, there's variables you can't control anthropology, archeology, all these things. And we'll go over why those can't be natural science in a minute when we talk about natural science. But essentially for something to be a natural science that you have to be trying to prove the effect, the, the phenomenon, right? The cause of a phenomenon you observe. Well, nobody's observing phenomenon in, in archeology. You're looking at concrete nouns, you're looking at things that you find, and then you try to make up stories about 'em in inventive ways.

(00:07:13):

And they'll make claims about the dates and using carbon dating. And those are fraught with issues. We don't have to get into all that, but essentially social sciences is just like humanities. You're trying to figure out why people may do a certain thing. It's, it's psychology. And, and it's basically all based on a lot of observational studies correlation. And there's nothing wrong with that. It's just, it's not natural science, which we'll talk about next. So, natural science, yeah, study natural phenomena tries to explain and predict nature's phenomena based on empirical evidence. And so we'll talk about what that means. 'cause A lot of people also have a very skewed view of what empirical evidence means. I've noticed that a lot. People think just looking at something is empirical evidence. That's not what it is. Empiricism in, in, in the context of natural science. Empiricism means you have done an experiment to validate a hypothesis, and a hypothesis has a strict meaning. So all these things have very strict meanings, which we're gonna go into in a minute. But in, in general, the gist of natural science, the whole point is you are trying to find the pause of an observed natural phenomenon that is key to keep in mind.

(00:08:31):

So I harp about this, like to the point where people I think just wanna shut me up all the time because it, it's, it's important. And the reason I do this is because you have to hold people's feet through the fire. All the people that we are discussing here with regards to virology and many other topics, use the word science a lot. And then when you start breaking down the scientific method to them, they don't like it again. Just like, they don't like the word proof, they don't like the scientific method. I've, and Mike, Mike has seen this on Twitter, right? People that come in and say that's out, the scientific method's outdated, that's for children. I mean, they, they just hate it, but yet they'll also start using it. If you catch 'em in other sentences, they'll start talking about the scientific method, and then you, you kind of hammer in and go, Hey, wait, whoa, whoa, let's, let's follow the steps of it.

(00:09:15):

Now, they don't wanna do that. They go, oh, there's multiple scientific methods. No, there's not. Mm-Hmm. <affirmative>. So the reason there's not is because you have to go back to the whole purpose of natural science, right? If you want to prove X causes Y, okay? You, you've got y is your effect. That's your observed phenomenon. It's something that you've seen happening in nature. Can't just be a concrete. Now, can't be a thing, can't be a tree. Maybe it's tree growth, right? Maybe it's, it is gotta be something happening. And then you want to try to find the cause of it. Well, logic, it is just simple stuff. Kids get this. If you, if you want to prove X causes y number one X, your supposed cause has to exist in reality. Can't be something you make up in your head. Number two, you have to figure out how to show it causes y.

(00:10:00):

So unless you see it happening, unless it's just obvious, like that elephant's pushing that tree over, well, now we know why the tree fell over, right? Like, you saw it happen, but we're not talking about animals or humans causing these things. We're talking about nature. And we, that's a philosophical black box, but we don't have to go into that. But basically just, this is very simple. And so that's why you always boil this down and ask people, how do you know that? How do you know that's the cause? Can you show me where that thing, in this case, viruses, right? Where does it exist in nature? Where was it first shown to exist? And then can you show me the experiments where it was proven that that's causing the effect under study? So that's the simplest way to organize that in your head.

(00:10:42):

And if you always keep that in mind, you can cut through a lot of bss with, with the way people start getting into jargon and talking about labasa and all these things, it doesn't matter. You, you've gotta

have those basics first. So that's why I harp on that a lot. So let's see here. Hypothesis. So yes, a hypothesis is the same thing. So what, this is another thing that drives me nuts. People talk about predictions in science, but what they'll do is they'll, they'll do what's called bait and switch, and they'll, they'll take something that you can observe and you can make predictions based on observations and call that scientific prediction. It's not a scientific prediction is a hypothesis. I predict that X causes y. Now you have to form an experiment, create an experiment to validate that. A lot of people use the examples of eclipses, quote unquote, those that's not a scientific prediction, okay?

(00:11:38):

That's, that's literally like the same thing as me watching the hands on a clock move. And then the next day going, okay, I know that the hand's gonna move to the, from the two to the three. Well, yeah, because it's repeated over and over. It's just a cycle that that's not scientific. And so a lot of people will form what's called a composition fallacy. They'll go, well, I observed that, and observation is part of the scientific method. It's like, yeah, it's part of it. <Laugh>, it's the first step, you know, is observe a phenomenon. So actually I guess we should go, you know, talk about that first before hypothesis is that you have to observe something happening in nature. And, and, and this doesn't mean an effect hundred in a device. It doesn't mean an effect in, in some technology you've created.

(00:12:20):

You can go down that path for that. And the scientific method, kind of the logic applies to those things as well. 'cause We all do that when we troubleshoot things. You know, you try to isolate a variable and see if that's causing an issue. But for natural science, it has to be a natural phenomenon that you observe. You have to observe it. So anything that is not observed is not scientific. Okay? All this nonsense about big bang and cosmology and all these things that people wanna jump into and call natural science have nothing to do. They're in a complete category error. They're not, they're not in the same ballpark. So immediately you just go, yeah, you don't know what you're talking about. I mean, they don't, they're making up stories. It's the same with, you know, evolution and all these things. Nobody observed any of that.

(00:13:00):

Nobody's observed any of those processes. They just make up stories and then they fit those to an effect. And we'll talk about the fallacies, what that fallacy is later. But start with this. You start with a phenomenon, right? And then your hypothesis is, I see that's happening. I think this is the cause of that. And that's a tough one in of itself. 'cause How do you know what all the variables could be? What is your possible, cause it could be a laundry list of things. Things that you don't even know, right? And so this is where we get in the weeds, even with natural science, even with the scientific method, you still have issues with that, but at least it tries. And most people don't even want to talk about it. They want to go into this other category where they just think making up stories is legit.

(00:13:49):

So we'll go back to hypothesis real quick, but basically a hypothesis that, that is your scientific prediction, right? It, it's, I think X causes y I think a particle in the fluids of people is causing 'em to come sick. Now we can full stop right there. 'cause That's not a legitimate hypothesis, really. I guess it could be, do we know these particles are actually in humans at, to begin with? I guess if you base it on electron microscopy, you could say that. But that's not what was done in virology in the beginnings. You know, em didn't come around until what, the 1930s. And so they showed, I think

Alec Zeck (00:14:24):

That's an important point here, right? Is that in order to proceed at all with the scientific method, you need to first show that these particles, the alleged cause actually exist.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:14:36):

Bingo. And that's what Mike and I, you know, we always ask these people, that's the biggest question we go to. Because if you can't show us the original papers, 'cause virus theory, quote unquote came around a lot and time before electron microscopy came about. So you've gotta go, okay, where are the foundational papers where number one, you identified this culprit in nature before it could even enter a hypothesis, right? Where somebody went, Hmm, that's interesting. I wonder if those are causing sneezes or whatever, whatever the, the herpes lesions, whatever they wanna call 'em. Where, where did they first find that critters and say, Hey, let's put that through the scientific method and you cannot find it. And I would be totally on board with all of this if people could just give me proof. You know? I think we all would because we're interested in the truth here. We're not, you know, I don't have a dog in the hunt other than truth. But, and Mike, you can speak to this too. You ask people all the time, can you show me where these supposed entities were found in a living human being or animal, right?

Mike Stone (00:15:40):

Yeah. Yeah. They, they can't, I mean, it's pretty obvious. It, you know, the, the virus, it was an idea, it was a concept they never had. Like you said, they couldn't observe it. They didn't see these particles floating through the air and, and going from one person to another, you know, at best they could say maybe the fluids were causing someone to potentially come down with symptoms, but they did not see the virus. But yeah, I, the, the best that I've gotten from people typically when you ask for this evidence, so where is a paper where they actually, you know, attempted to purify and isolate the particles from the fluids. It's always a cell culture or a tissue culture experiment. They, they cannot show that the same particles that existed after the cell culture were in the fluids before the culture ever took place.

(00:16:34):

And so it's a pretty big distinction. You know, you, you have to be able to have those particles. If you're gonna claim that a cell culture, you know, they replicated and, and grew, you'd have to know how many you had before you actually started your experiment. You know, you can't just assume they were in those fluids to begin with. You perform the experiment and now you've got more of it. So it's pretty, yeah, it's pretty laughable. 'cause They, they will agree to it. They'll say, like, I, I had a conversation with Dan Wilson, debunk the funk. He's got a podcast. And I asked him, you know, directly do these, do you have evidence of you know, purification and isolation of the viral particles directly from the fluids? And he agreed that he did. But when you prod them on this and you try to get the papers that they say, okay, yes, we have this evidence. And you say, well, show it to me. They always supply you with the tissue culture or the cell culture experiments. And then when you say, well, no, that's not what I asked you for. They're like, well, why not? Why, what, what's wrong with cell culture? Yeah. They can't grasp that They need to have those particles first. You can't just jump into the experiment. So it's, it's really interesting.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:17:51):

Yeah. The and, and Alec may have the variables part. 'cause I think that's important. You know, when we talk about independent variable, we use that term all the time. Your independent variable is the thing the researcher varies and manipulates in the experiment. It's your presumed cause, right? Like that's your, your iv and in this case it would be virus or the viruses. You have to have those two begin with the dv, the dependent variable is the effect understudy. So what's funny is we call these experiments that they're not doing experiments in virology. A cell culture and looking for cytopathic effect is not a

legitimate experiment. Why cytopathic effect of a cell culture is not your observed natural phenomenon. That's not what we're looking for. It doesn't matter how you can, things you can do to a cell culture that's already abnormal and has nothing to do with human physiology.

(00:18:40):

We're gonna do some stuff to it, look for an effect, and then claim that's proves our story. That's a fallacy. It's two actually wrapped into one. It's called question begging and then affirming the consequence, which we'll go over later. But it drives me insane and they don't understand it. And I'm sorry to say, I mean, I've yet to find an intellectually honest virus believer, I'll just put it that way. They, they will not, they cannot see that they're question begging and, and using logical fallacies. And I don't know if it's on purpose or if they just don't, they just can't go there. Anyway, it doesn't matter the motives. But what matters is what they do in virology is antithetical to the scientific method. And that's why we keep harping on this. We, and and that's why they can't give it like, it, it is, it's not even debatable that they cannot give us anything that adheres to the scientific method.

(00:19:31):

And that's why they red herring away from it. Or they make fun of it, or they call you names because they can't actually provide it. And I think that's important for people to know. I, I get that there's a whole world of academia that doesn't care for the scientific method. That's a bigger discussion. That's part of the problems we have in the world today. But for those who do care about this, who, who I would say intellectually honest people who may be on the fence, who go, yeah, you know, that's, that's interesting. Like here are the steps and why can't you guys show us this? Like, let's, we need to focus on that because to me that's the, the crux of the matter is show me X existing first and then show it how you prove it causes y right? Which is everything on the, the steps right here that Alex already put out on the slide here.

(00:20:15):

But I just, you know it, once you know it by heart, you don't even, you don't, you don't have to go back to slides. You just know it. And you can constantly just ask people these questions and I think it's important. But you know, what's interesting is that scientific theories come about after experiment. So all these people, most of 'em in academia, they don't even know what that means. They don't even know what a theory is. They'll ban banter this word about theory when in reality they mean a a story. Because theory comes after validation. Hypothesis comes first and they'll conflate hypothesis and theory all the time. And we all do this colloquially. And it's fine to use it as a colloquial term, right? I have a theory, meaning I have a speculation. That's all that means. A scientific theory is supposed to have validation by way of the scientific method and things that are called scientific that have not gone through the scientific method we call pseudoscience. Which I think you have definitions of. But you know, we've already just covered everything that in that last slide, the problems with virology. I think we just hit, hit it all in the head. So I don't think,

Alec Zeck (00:21:16):

Yeah, and we can go back to that just to reiterate, but it's, it's important here that like pseudoscience, again, these are three different definitions that I've found of pseudoscience. And every one of them talks about, you know, statements, beliefs, or basically anything claiming to be scientific. And that is the important point, claiming to be scientific that is not adhering to the scientific method. And that's literally what virology does. They're claiming this as a science. The whole field of virology when its very foundation does not adhere to the scientific method and never has. And that's the problem.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:21:53):

Yep.

Alec Zeck (00:21:55):

And just to reiterate, so the problems with virology, and this is not all of the problems, <laugh>, there are plenty of problems, but just with respect to the scientific method, the virus was not shown to exist in nature. They assume that there is a virus or virus particles in the fluids. They assume that the virus has an effect on the culture. The cell culture contains too many confounding variables itself. There's too many assumptions involved. They basically go into experimentation without ever first coming, formulating a hypothesis and identifying an independent variable within that step, which is the most important step. Again, if you're claiming that X causes Y, you need to have X and directly show that it causes y it's really quite simple. But to Jordan's point, yes, it's, it's, it's helpful to know the steps of the scientific method, but it's really quite simple.

(00:22:49):

It's just X causes Y or X doesn't cause y. That's what we're looking at here. And in order to even begin, you need to have X and they don't have X. They just proceed to experimentation, assuming that X is inside adding what they assume to contain X, the fluids from a sick person to a cell culture with a bunch of other confounding variables. And of course, this is not necessarily a step in the scientific method, although I'd argue that it absolutely should be. They don't conduct proper control experiments. And I know we talked about that el elsewhere in another session.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:23:22):

Yeah. The controls is, I mean, I think it's important. It's not necessarily a step 'cause you kind of have your control variables, which is not the same thing as the control and some of these other terms. I think. And you know, we use controls also in like interventional studies with drugs and things like that, placebos, placebo controlled, right? It's a similar, it's a similar ideology there, or philosophy, which is important. I'll,

Mike Stone (00:23:44):

I I just say something on the scientific method really quickly. Like just talking to people on Twitter, like Dan Wilson or, or I believe Thomas Baldwin. A lot of times when I ask them, 'cause I, I always bring up the scientific method. I'm like, you know, do you have evidence that adheres to the scientific method? And I will point out the steps just on the slide that you had up there. Alec are, is this the scientific method? And they'll agree, they'll say, yes, that's the scientific method. A lot of times they're like, well, that's a simple version of the scientific method. Or, and

Alec Zeck (00:24:15):

For clarification, these are two molecular biologists. Yes. One's a virologist actually, like Thomas Baldwin is a plant virologist.

Mike Stone (00:24:22):

Plant virologist. Yeah. And and so they'll agree, but then when you ask them to present you with the information that follows these steps, then they start to argue like, no, that's, that's your made up criteria. That's your version of the scientific method. I'm like, well, we just agreed on what the scientific method is. Why did now all of a sudden change now that you can't show us this evidence that adheres to these steps? So they, they try to wiggle around a lot. They'll, they'll agree with you with what the

scientific method is, but then when you challenge 'em on it, they obviously cannot provide us with the evidence that follows these steps. It's, it's pretty mind blowing.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:25:01):

Yeah. I see it all the time. And it, it is, it's mind blowing. It gets to the point where you don't wanna talk to people about it anymore. But again, they have a, I'm not, I'm not trying to question their motives as, I don't know, dividing motives is not our issue. But they have vested interests not to look at things like we're looking at 'em. It's just the way of the world. You're, what are you gonna do? What are you gonna do as a virologist? So that's your career. You've written papers and all of a sudden you go, yeah, this entity is that, that I'm claiming at the end of my cell culture are their culprit. Yeah. They don't exist in reality. And we were, we were, you know, we were mistaken this whole time. They're not gonna do it. Maybe every now then you'll find one that does, but they're gonna, they're gonna quit their job.

(00:25:39):

They're gonna walk away. But it's a, it's, it is fascinating and you know, from a psychological standpoint and we can, we see this with a lot of topics that we ask these questions about, not just virology. It's the same stuff every time. People use the word scientific method. They may even agree to it when they, when you show it to 'em before they know where you're gonna go with it. And then the minute you go down and follow the steps, they go nuts and they don't like it and they, they, they start calling you names. And so anyway, we're not trying to convince virologists here. We're trying to just, we're share this information so that those who are open and honest, I think we'll just look into it further.

Alec Zeck (00:26:18):

Exactly. And that brings us to this point. So again, to reiterate a scientific theory, it's an explanation of an aspect of the natural world and universe, I'll just say the natural world that has been repeatedly tested and corroborated in accordance with the scientific method. And again, we're talking about virology here, but as you'll find later on in the summit, this can apply to basically all of germ. And that's when I, you know, have been saying it's not germ theory, it's germ hypothesis. And with virology, I don't even know that you could say viral hypothesis either. But, because before you can even formulate a hypothesis, you need to first have the thing you think is the cause and they don't have the thing they think is the cause.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:27:01):

Exactly.

Alec Zeck (00:27:02):

And then that brings us back around to the Santa Claus thing, <laugh>, can we do a scientific experiment on Santa Claus

Mike Stone (00:27:09):

<Laugh>?

Alec Zeck (00:27:10):

Of course the answer to that is no. But the problem is a lot of people would say, well absolutely you can, because you can observe an effect that the, you know, kids have thinking about Santa Claus. And it's like, no, that's different. We're talking about thoughts and we're looking at an effect. And that doesn't

mean you're adhering to the scientific method again, you have to have the thing in reality that you think is the cause and see if it produces an effect.

Mike Stone (00:27:32):

I think that goes into pseudoscience with it being a belief, you know? Exactly. Yeah.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:27:38):

And there's nothing wrong with beliefs. We're not knocking people. I have beliefs, we all have beliefs. You know, when it comes to metaphysics, you can't prove those things. I can't prove to you that logic exists without using logic, right? It's circular. Circularity is unavoidable when it comes to our foundational philosophies. And everybody has a foundational philosophy. You have to start your reasoning from somewhere that you can't prove. 'cause If you could prove it, you'd have to keep going backwards and backwards. So you either end up in an infinite regress or you just have to start from somewhere. We're not talking about philosophy here though. We're talking about claims, about nature, about the natural and physical world. Physics, right? That's what's being discussed. We're not talking about the existence of God, we're not talking about any of that, right? You, I can't prove to anybody God exists.

(00:28:19):

It's a category error. But these people in quote unquote academia are claiming they have proof and evidence, right? So it's their claim and they have to back it up, you know? And it's not our job to even go through all this. All we gotta do is say, Hey, show us proof and real proof, not question begging, not showing the effects in a cell culture. And this is the biggest thing, if I can stress anything to people, and I see this, even people in our own side, quote unquote, people do not comprehend that you cannot point to effects to claim proof of cause unless your cause has first been shown to exist. And number two can be the only reason for that effect, right? Like, I can't walk outside and see my truck wet and go, man, unicorns must have been pissing in the sky, right?

(00:29:10):

I can't do that. And people, people get that, right? They go, yeah, that's stupid. That's what they do with all of this. It's the exact same fallacy. They just make it sound sciencey, right? And use all this jargon. It's no different. You, your, your cause hasn't even been shown to exist. Even if it did, I can, let's pretend unicorns exist and they pee in the sky. That still doesn't prove that that's why my truck is wet. It's still a fallacy for me to claim that because it's an affirming, the conseque fallacy, unless I saw it happen, my truck could be wet 'cause it rained. My truck could be wet because the sprinklers went off. A firetruck could have driven by and sprayed me, right? I could think up a million stories. And that's what people do, is they come up with stories to explain the effect and they go, well see it works.

(00:29:54):

My story works. Well, of course it works. You have the effect. It's real. You can fit any kind of story to explain that, even if it's wild and unproven. And there's, so it's like Santa Clause, right? Yeah. That's the whole point. There's some kind of fetish, there's a fetish in academia about wild stories being put forth as proof of some effect. Half the time they don't have the effect, they just make that up too. But even if they do have an effect or, or something, they can't study some, let's see, some intangible light in the sky and they just start talking about this moves because of space, time is warping. And you go show me space time and then show it bending, you know? I mean, it's insane.

Dr. Kelly Brogan (00:30:32):

But I was gonna ask Jordan, I was gonna interject because I was thinking about, you know, along the lines of the Santa Claus example, what happens if natural phenomena are not patently observable, right? There must be examples in nature of not easily observ, like let's say radiation or something like that. Not easily observable phenomenon that, that we can learn something from, right? Because we're talking about the invisible here, as you're saying. And we're trying to make it material and working with independent variables that at least in this hypothesis are not apparent to the observer's eye. So is there anything we can learn from preexisting examples of independent variables that are not easily observed?

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:31:17):

In my mind? No. I I think it's a rabbit trail. Just because how do you know that the thing that you're, let's say you have a piece of equipment that's registered something, right? How do you know that that's a natural phenomenon or just something in your equipment that's going on that you then try to explain? So it becomes almost a, a technology type question. And that, I mean, that's the deeper philosophical issue with science in general is can you actually replicate the natural phenomenon that you observe? Or even if you replicate it, that makes it look like that, is that the same thing that's happening in nature, right? How do you know? And so I don't even know that science is possible. I'm gonna just go ahead and say that right now from a philosophical perspective. And I think a lot of these guys get that on a deep level.

(00:32:04):

And I think they've gone through enough philosophy courses, some of the PhDs that they do understand that deeper issues with empiricism because they understand the flaws. They think making up stories is okay. So they, we we're going back to philosophy, right? If you go back and read from the Greeks, forward philosophy was people making up stories to try to explain the natural world, right? It was natural philosophy at first, you know, which became natural science. But it, it's, that's the interesting part of all of this is that natural science really isn't science, it's still natural philosophy. It's just men making up stories. So I know that's not exactly answering your question, but I, I've thought about those kind of things a lot to the point where I become a skeptic almost on so many things. 'cause You have to figure out, am I really registering something happening? Or is it, is it a correlation that I'm measuring? You know, and we talk about that with lab tests and things we find in the body and we go, are we actually measuring the thing we think we are or are we just getting a correlation? And how do you study that? So that's probably a good way for me. And

Alec Zeck (00:33:04):

That's not to say that that can't be useful either though, right?

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:33:08):

Oh yeah. No, they're all useful. Yeah. Technology's useful, right? And that's what I tell people all the time. Technology's great. It, it's come about by trial and error. You figure things out, oh, this didn't work, let's try this. And you start getting these effects that you, you remember how you got there? And you repeat that and people go, oh, well see, it's repeatable. It must be science. I just, I can flick a light switch on and off, over and over that's repeatable. That doesn't mean I'm doing science, right? Like, so we just, for me, this is just a, it's more, the reason I harp on the scientific method is because I'm holding their feet to the fire. 'cause They're the ones that use the word science. I don't even necessarily think it, it, I don't even know that empiricism in the sense of natural phenomena is even very possible. 'cause We don't even know all the variables that exist. Like you say, there's unseen things probably. We have no idea. So how do you control for nature? Like there's no way to recreate things we see actually in nature.

And so we do get into a bit of a rabbit trail there. They don't even have that though. They don't even have where they've tried. And that's, that's the problem. Well,

Alec Zeck (00:34:08):

With, with respect to virology, I would say that the closest examples of them attempting to actually replicate something in nature would be the attempts to prove contagion via the fluids of a sick person. Absolutely. And as will be shown in this summit as well, is that that has never been done either. They've never been able to prove that the fluids of a sick person cause disease in a healthy person. So that should have been the nail in the coffin right there. But this story, this unproven belief has been entrenched into society all over the world for so long that we have to do something like this to go through the steps of the scientific method, which we all learned in third grade, I think third or fourth grade science class, and take people back to step one and show them how this belief does not adhere to the scientific method and there's no proof for it.

Mike Stone (00:34:59):

I agree. And let's just say you need to have something like a standard that you can judge it based upon. And if you don't, then anyone can do any sort of method and claim that they're doing science. And so that, that's one of the biggest things that I've found when I've been interacting with these scientists on Twitter, is that they just kind of you know, throw out the scientific method and say, well that's, there's other, you know, if they don't agree, they're like, oh, it's, it's vague. There's other definitions. They'll pull up definitions from books and look, look at what this guy said it, you know it kind of adheres to those steps, but it doesn't. So it just, just because you have your set criteria doesn't mean that another scientist can't go and do it a different way and come up with scientific knowledge. And then you're, you're allowing way too much, you know, it's too broad. You have to have some sort of standard to come back to to, to be able to judge a field on. So I think that's one of the biggest importance of holding them, like Jordan said, holding their feet to the fire. If they're gonna claim that they're doing science well, they have a method. They need to stop ignoring that method,

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:36:06):

Mike hit it on the head, right? And that's, I mean, you can take that to broader issues, right? The, the question, anytime somebody makes a statement or a judgment, you go by what standard are you making that right? And we can apply that to morality, right? Somebody comes up and says, well, that's wrong. How do you know? By what standard, right? Everything has to have a standard. And if your standard is scientific method, you need to adhere to it. If it's not, admit it and just say that you're making up stories, we'll all be better off for that because then people will at least recognize you're just, you're just speculating and that's fine. You can go through that one. Alec, you like that? Yeah.

Alec Zeck (00:36:38):

Well I thought this one was important. <Laugh>, I thought this one was important to cover. Again, to just hammer the, the point down of their avoidance to explain why they can't adhere to the scientific method. When you show them the steps, they agree, yeah, those are the steps of the scientific method. And just like you said, they don't know what we're about to do. And we'll say it, we'll explain how virology adheres to that. And then they come up with these these question begging and reification fallacy excuses. And the first one is the virus is too weak to isolate or purify directly from the fluids. They'll say that on one hand. And then they'll also claim that a virus can survive on a surface for upwards of two to six, sometimes six or seven days. Flies freely through the air lands on a surface then makes it

into a body, makes it all the way to a cell, breaks into the cell, hijacks the cells machinery, and begins a replication process that overwhelms the body.

(00:37:36):

And then it's excreted out of that person where it repeats the same process over. So it's too weak to isolate or purify directly from the fluids. But then it does all of these other things that doesn't really make sense. And then they'll say that there's not enough virus present in the fluids to isolate or purify, which is also interesting 'cause they'll claim that there's upwards of a hundred million to 200 million virus particles in one sneeze. So there's not enough of these particles present in the fluids of a sick person to isolate or purify. But then there's that many particles. And remember this is, these are the things that are claimed to be the cause of someone getting sick, but there's not enough of it present in the fluids. And then the third one is a virus needs a host in order to replicate. So that's why we use the cell culture.

(00:38:18):

Again, if you're claiming that the virus is excreted out of a person wherein it travels to another person causes disease, then you should at the very least be able to take those fluids and put them into a healthy host where you replicate symptoms. They can't even do that. And then they also can't it inside the fluids, they have to add it to a cell culture, as they say, which they're just begging the question of a virus. And then they're also reifying the idea of a virus. And we'll get into what those fallacies are in a

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:38:47):

Second. Just, just to hit on this, like, yeah, it's important. Look at every single statement has the word virus, right? What is, you're already question begging. What's the virus? Okay? You have to start there. And that's what I think if people start doing that, you gotta go wait, put the brakes on. What's the virus, right? When they start spouting this stuff, you could literally insert anything else in there and it would, it would make it make sense to people. I go chlorines right from Star Wars, the chlorines are too weak to isolate and purify. Like, you could just start putting that word in there and people go, what? Like, what's chlorine? You gotta show me one existing before you can make all these claims about 'em being too weak or not enough, right? It's the same thing. So the the question, begging never ends,

Alec Zeck (00:39:29):

Okay? And this is where we go back to formal science. Again, it's, it's interesting because they're claiming formal science as a branch of science, but then again, it's like self-refuting because anything that doesn't adhere to the scientific method is pseudoscience. And these are all their definitions, right? So study formal systems such as those under the branch of logic and mathematics. And for here, we're gonna talk about logic. And again, logic is useful. It's just weird when they're claiming it to be scientific, when it doesn't employ the scientific method. So,

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:39:57):

Yeah,

Alec Zeck (00:39:58):

And I think to contextualize this, we need to talk about what isn't logic, and those are logical fallacies, okay? So logical fallacy is a failure and reasoning which renders an argument and valid or flawed, deceptive or false arguments that can be proven wrong with reasoning. Okay? So this one, we get quite a bit appeal to authority. An appeal to authority. The argue claims a perceived authority figures position

to either support a claim or to support the entirety of the argument. Example I brought up here is Robert Malone is a vaccinologist, and he says the virus has been isolated. So you're wrong. I mean, you can, this, this is an easy one. I think we see this one all the time. And people will do that with people like Kelly or, or with you, Jordan. They'll refer back to you and what you say, or they'll refer to what anyone in the so-called health freedom movement, Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. Del Bigtree and all, what, what they say, Peter McCullough, and that's what they use to support their claim without understanding the material.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:40:56):

Yeah, I would and I don't know, you may have it in the slide here in a minute, but this is basically the flip side of ad honu or genetic fallacy, right? It's the same thing. It's appealed to the man, it's appealed to the person instead of the argument. So genetic fallacy is saying, Hitler said, trains run on time. Hitler was a bad guy, therefore, trains don't run on time, right? It's absurd like this, the claim is, stands on its own, or, you know, Jordan Grant is a, he's not a virologist, therefore, anything he says about this topic can't be right. That's an ad hominem attack. It's, it is not just people. Ad hominem is just saying you're stupid. Ad hominem is actually, it's against the, it's against the man or the woman. And this is the flip side of that, right? It's still, to me, this is still a type of ad hominem, but it's like, for the man, you know, it's, well, he is supposedly an expert in the field, therefore, whatever he says must be true.

(00:41:47):

Well, we better just all go home. But then you gotta go, well, wait a minute. There's lots of experts in these fields, and they don't all agree. So again, by what standard do you judge an expert? I ask this all the time to people because there are experts in different areas, and it can be the same in religion, it could be the same. You know, as a Christian myself, we have whatever, thousands of stupid denominations, and you got all these claims going back and forth, and people go, well, the Roman Catholic church said this, and they're the experts. And I go, but the Eastern Orthodox Church said this, and they're experts. And then you got the other guys. How do you judge their claims? Because if you're gonna say, I just have to trust 'em because they're the authority, well, then you just, you just have to choose. And then you just go with, well, what, what happens when they change their mind? Was that not true the whole time? Right? Like, truths don't change. And so it's the same thing with a lot of this sort of expert worship, and I think our world is built on expert worship. And so that's a, that's basically what this fallacy is.

Mike Stone (00:42:42):

Well, George, it's intellectually lazy too. They're, they're not willing to come up with their own, you know, correct educated opinion of like, well, this guy says is true. The, the person in the white coat on the TV told me it's true. So it, I gotta believe

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:42:55):

That it's a cop out. It's a cop out completely. Yeah.

Alec Zeck (00:42:58):

This one easy, a bandwagon fallacy is one in which to argue attempts to validate their position by referring to the majority stance, the position. So again, the overwhelming majority of people believe the virus exists, and that's their claim. And then they'll say that that's proof that a virus exists. And that's, of course logically fallacious. So this one happens <laugh>, I think this in affirm <laugh>. Yeah. This one in the affirming, the consequence fallacy, I think are the most common. Maybe reification fallacy too.

Yeah. Burden of proof reversal fallacy. Burden of proof reversal fallacy occurs when the arguer makes a claim that needs justification, then demands that the opponent justifies the opposite of the claim. And that would be, well, where's your proof that viruses don't exist? And you know, for people who are just coming to understand this or don't understand this, they, that may sound like a valid question, but again, insert unicorn in place of virus, insert garden gnome that walks or a pissing unicorn or any, literally any story fairytale thing. Well, where's your proof that unicorns don't exist? Where's your proof that Santa Claus doesn't exist? And again, it's the, the onus is not on those who are falsifying the so-called evidence of virology. The onus is on those making the claims that viruses exist and do x, y, and Z things. So they are the ones that need to come up with the proof, the burden of proof lies on them and not the other way around.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:44:18):

Yeah, this is the one of the most common fallacies. I see it, you see it daily on Facebook, right? Or Twitter you prove to me. And then they'll, they'll make up some claim, like some straw man that you're not even claiming and say, you know, prove to me. And I'm like, I'm not making a claim about that, right? Like, again, this just goes back to if you say, X causes Y, show me X and show me how, you know, that's it. It's that simple. If you can't do that, we have a problem. Like, to me, this is just so black and white and people wanna get in all these rabbit trails and they'll go down these pathways of begging the question, or, or red herrings away with genomics and all this stuff doesn't matter. Like if you can't answer the question easily, I mean, you would think that any intellectually honest person, if I had those kind of claims and I've shown X causes y I can go here, man, lemme show you right now.

(00:45:04):

Oh, lemme go grab my experiment, you know, and my papers are let's go replicate it again right now. Easy. Do it right now. Do it today. They should be able to do it right or within a week, you know, replicate it. They don't, they can't do it. And so they have to, they have to go back to their cell calls for their question begging and all that. But the burden of proof reversal, man, it, it just, people have got to be able to spot that and, and put the brakes on real quick in a conversation and to keep things back on track because you can end up going down their rabbit trails where you start looking like an idiot almost, because you're like, this is, this has nothing to do with the topic. So

Mike Stone (00:45:38):

Yeah, it just veers off. Yep. Quite a bit. I had that same issue with Thomas Baldwin when I was asking him about the scientific method. I was like, do you have a paper that adheres to the scientific method that proves virus? He's like, of course I do. I'm like, okay, can I see it? Well, I'll show you it when you show me yours. So that adheres to the scientific method first. Like, wait a second, what, why would I need you to, why would I need to share one that's, you know, fulfills what I'm asking? If you say you have it, it just made no sense.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:46:11):

It's like a, it's like a sixth grader, right? Like, it's like a sixth grader saying something and you go, what? Like, that doesn't even make sense. Like, I'm not making a claim of something. I don't have any science. Like, I'm not claiming it. So what are you talking about? You know? And they'll say, you need to prove to me this doesn't exist. And then you realize these guys don't have any good training in philosophy or logic. They just don't,

Mike Stone (00:46:31):

Right? <Laugh>, it just make, made me laugh. Yeah. <laugh>,

Alec Zeck (00:46:34):

I think this one, Jordan, I'll let you take it a begging. The question fallacy occurs when the arguers conclusion is assumed in one of the premises. And I think you are so good at spotting this one.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:46:45):

It's really sort of the same as affirming the consequence, honestly. Because you start with something that's not ever been proven, and then you use the effect at the end to claim the proof of the thing that you're claiming to begin with, that that hasn't been proven to exist. And so you, it's hard to separate the two fallacies. And again, circular reasoning for some things you can't avoid it for, for like an example, a logic, right? I can't, I can't claim anything about logic without using the rules of logic. That's just how our minds are structured. So there's, there's nothing inherently wrong per se, with circular reasoning when it comes to those foundational principles, but it does become fallacious in, in this realm that we're discussing of natural science. And another good example is like, you know, fossil dating. And they'll say, oh, how do you date those fossils?

(00:47:34):

Well by the, the rock layers. Well, how'd you date the rock layers? Well, by the fossils. See, you see the circularity there. Like, that's, that's a good example of, of circular reasoning. And so, you know, for me it's more question begging, question begging being just like, I'm gonna start talking about something never proven to begin with, and then I'm gonna go down this rabbit trail and point to an effect to claim that proves my cause. And that's the affirming consequent fallacy, which is my, like, that was world life changing for me when I first learned about this fallacy. And I, I'm, I'm sad to know, I didn't learn this stuff in high school. I was probably 24, 25 reading some philosophy of science, things like that. And came across this fallacy and I started just, once I picked up on it, it was mind blowing because you see it everywhere.

(00:48:24):

It's literally, it's ubiquitous. So when I went to med school, I'm just laughing at half the stuff we're being taught. I'm going, that's from the consequence, that's from the consequence. Like it's everywhere. It's point and declare and making up a story is the same thing. I remember being in histology courses and being shown these little arrows on an electron microscope to some gap or something, like, that's a channel that controls this, that and the other molecule. And I go, they don't have a clue. They don't know that that's literally just begging the question and affirming the consequence. But, so the best way to see this is if x then y y therefore X, right? And so that's fallacious. And it sounds sort of, it kind of gets people confused sometimes when, when people use a lot of technical lingo to, to commit this fallacy. And people do this all the time in daily life. Like they'll deal with gravity, right? Quote unquote. And they go, what, what's scientific evidence for that? Can you show it to me where it was manipulated? And they go, well, things fall. Like that's the effect, right? Like, so what, what, what's your proof of? Cause like, well, no, that's my proof of, cause it's just things fall so therefore magical force, whatever, non force, bendy, warpy, space time, whatever. No, that's why

Alec Zeck (00:49:35):

They come up with graviton now. It's exactly, again, this obsession with materialistic science in correct particles and saying, oh, it must be this graviton that's causing this effect.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:49:44):

It's the same in particle physics, quote unquote particle physics. They have no particles. They do things, they see something macro level with their eyes in a gas bubble chamber. And then they say, that's something about these nanoscopic particles that nobody can even find. You go, but I can see the effect. Like I just saw it zip through and you're telling me that's evidence of this other thing that nobody can prove exists. It's insane. And it's the same thing with like electrophoresis and all these things we talk about with D N A and you go, yeah, these macro level bands on the gel, those represent individual molecules. And you're like, show me an individual molecule. How do you know? How did you, how did you corroborate that? And they can't, they can't tell you, right? But this fallacy is everywhere. So you see somebody appealing to an effect to claim, proof of cause unless that's been valid.

(00:50:33):

Unless the effect can only come from that proven cause. So one-to-one, like necessary antecedent, consequent relationship, unless you have that, you cannot appeal to an effect to claim proof of. Cause you can, you could have probability if your cause exists. So the example I give as a urologist, right, because we know kidney stones exist or ureteral stones, let's say somebody's got obstructing stone with a CAT scan, I can pretty much say a hundred percent, I can see it, there it is in your ureter, it's block in your kidney. Let's say I get an ultrasound of the kidney and I can't see the ureter and the kidney's dilated. So I can say you probably have a ureteral stone. Right? And that could be true. What I can't say is you probably have a small GN in your ureter obstructing it. Okay. You see the difference, like the effect is the same. The claim, cause one is true, but still may not be true in that case because all I have is indirect evidence. The other one I just made up the cause. But what people do is they say they use indirect evidence to grease the skids for their just so story of their made up. Cause that's where you have to catch 'em. And it's one thing to use an affirming consequent fallacy in like a probabilistic manner. It's another ball game entirely when your, your cause has never been shown to exist. So, and

Dr. Kelly Brogan (00:51:51):

This is baked into so much of allopathic medicine, right? Because of the use of surrogate markers. That's pretty much what most testing is predicated on, right?

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:52:00):

I totally agree. And the, the deeper I've gone down into that, the more I question what most of these markers mean, I think they do probably have some type of correlative use. But even there, it's sketchy. Like how do you know you really can just correlate certain things with sick people or somebody's got this ailment, so their levels are this. But then you can also find just as many people with outta whack levels that are totally fine and healthy, but yet they'll go down these pathways of, of a treatment, quote unquote for what, you know, think about h i v think about all the crap they're pushing on people because of a crap test, that test for nothing, but yet that marker. What does it mean? We don't know. I mean, there's certain things, there's gotta be something in that person one versus the other maybe that's causing that to be off or out of the norm.

(00:52:48):

But you're gonna go take a, let, let's say bbr, B R C A two, right? A gene, right? And and how many women get mastectomies for that? It's insane to me. And but that's, that's people's trust in the tests, right? That's their tests, or I'm sorry, their trust and and faith in those tests. And so it's fine if the tests are legitimate, but we have to ask how was it validated? And, and that's a whole different, that's the same thing with virology, but it's the same thing with genomics and all these other things we'll talk about is please show me every step where you validated that this test means what you say it means.

Because the, the the meaning, a lot of times people just assign meaning to something. It's, it's not true. So

Alec Zeck (00:53:28):

Yeah, I think this brings up an important point. Thomas Baldwin, when I was harping on the lack of validation according to the scientific method, he, he brought up a point, well, you must then have to question all of cell biology because we use similar steps. And I sort of just replied with a winky face because yes, that's true. I do question all of modern cell biology because it's all based on these unproven presuppositions and, you know, un inval, un invalidated tests. So

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:54:01):

I think that's a key point. I'm sorry I keep interrupting, but like, these are important points to make is, you know, I see this on Mike's blog a lot on Twitter. On Twitter. These people kind of get that. They don't have the proof that, that we want. And so then they'll red herring and they'll go, oh, so you must not believe electrons exist. And you're like, show me electron. See, they don't get it, right? They don't get that we're questioning bigger picture stuff, foundational things on every topic has to be dissected. They think it's just virus, right? And then yet they'll still kind of go off on the genomics rabbit trail. We'll see we've got all these genomics, so that must mean you're like, no, what's a gene? Show me a nucleotide. Show me one, show me how one nucleotide was found. You can't make a claim about a sequence of 'em if you can't show me one of them.

(00:54:45):

I can't show you a sentence existing if I don't have a letter, right? Letters have to come first. But they can't, they can't grasp that. It just, it just, it's too cognitively painful, I think to have to go back to the foundations of every test that they're doing every day in a lab. And you know, we've discussed this with people who do P C R for a living, right? We've discussed this with people who actually have kind of come away from that, at least on the virus topic. And we go, how, how do you make a primer? How do you know that you're linking nucleotides together? And they're like, a computer's telling me that's what's going on. And it's like, at least you're honest. But that's not good enough for me. Like <laugh>, we need validation.

Alec Zeck (00:55:23):

And, and again, that's not to say like there isn't some effect happening with, let's say, as an example, genetics, right? Like I can trace back my lineage. There's might be some errors associated with that. There's definitely some errors associated with that. But the point is there's, we're separating the effect from the claimed cause, like how it actually works at the fundamental level. There is a measurable effect that has some correlation that there is something chemically happening there, but they're making the claims about what it looks like, what it's nature is and, and you know, the claims about nucleotides and other things. Exactly. Jordan, you just brought this one up. A red herring fallacy occurs when I, relevant information is presented alongside relevant information, distracting attention from the, that relevant information. And of course example here could be virologists referring to an insco genome when you question them on lack of adequate controls and lack of adherence to the scientific method. Hasty generalization, fallacy making a claim based on evidence that is just too small. <Laugh>, this is the example I used. Someone in Wuhan got sick and the r n a and his fluence didn't match any reference in silco genomes, which is a problem in and of itself. Therefore he has a novel virus and we should shut down the world. <Laugh>.

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:56:38):

Yeah, that's a, that's a big, I mean you could, you could lump that into like stereotyping fallacies. It's really just an inductive fallacies. It's induction meaning you, you're trying to derive a universal from a particular, right? And, and people make that mistake a lot. Oh, this guy said that. Therefore all men are like this, right? You see that a lot and you just hurt your head.

Alec Zeck (00:57:00):

This one stone. Do you wanna take this? 'cause You just wrote about this one.

Mike Stone (00:57:03):

Well, yeah, I mean just the un falsifiability or falsify falsification, it just means that your hypothesis or your theory must be able to be proven false. Pretty simple. If you can't, then you basically, it's a, it's a line between what is science and what is pseudoscience. So kind of an example that I really like is you know, with the, the cell culture, they're, they're looking for this effect. We, we already know it's kind of a pseudoscientific experiment, but they're looking for the cyto pathogenic effect that is supposed to be the sign during this culture that a virus is present, right? So if that was a, a real effect showing a virus, then you would get that every time. But virologists can also get that effect without a virus present. You can get the cytogenic effect and you know, healthy, you know, just using healthy materials. Or they'll claim sometimes that there's viruses that are within the cell culture that cause or do not cause cyto pathogenic effects. So you can't falsify this premise. It's unf falsified. You can't, you know, prove it wrong because they've got an an escape clause or an out, basically with multiple avenues.

Alec Zeck (00:58:19):

Exactly. Or, or like the example of claiming asymptomatic infections, right? Like as, as you know, viruses are claimed to cause disease. And when they don't, oh, okay, well then they just have an asymptomatic infection. Or they'll claim that this person didn't get sick with said virus when they were introduced to said virus. And again, virus and air quotes and everything that we're saying, there's again, this is not a proven thing. They'll claim, oh, well they probably had antibodies to said virus.

Mike Stone (00:58:44):

Yes,

Dr. Jordan Grant (00:58:44):

It's a rescue to rescue devices are used right when things don't, when things don't match up. And again, if this were scientific, we wouldn't have any of that because falsifiability is built into the scientific method. That's your null hypothesis. X doesn't cause y it either causes it or it doesn't. It's binary. So people like to go, and I know Mike wrote about Carl Popper and all that because these guys love to bring up Popper. They don't have a clue what they're talking about with Popper. First of all, I don't think Popper was that instrumental when it came to adherence to the scientific method. He was better than some of the other guys. Him, he didn't need to go into his big spiel about falsifiability in the way he did because if we're talking about science, it's already there. You don't need to talk about falsifiability. 'cause That's part of the method that's your null, right? So it, again, people get so caught up into all this, you know, quote unquote philosophy of science with these guys that don't really didn't seem to know what natural science really was. They were, they were sort of like, I don't know if they were just hired guns to kind of lend credence to a lot of these stories. I have no idea. But anyway, falsifiability is already built into the true scientific method.

Mike Stone (00:59:51):

Exactly. And, and I I love that. And like you said, Alec, that asymptomatic escape clause, so to speak. I, I, I know we've talked about this probably in other presentations with the, the contagion experiments with Rose. Now in 1918 during the Spanish flu, I presented that to someone and they're like, well, yeah, but at that time they didn't know about asymptomatic carriers or they didn't know about antibodies and all this stuff. And so they always have an, an escape clause ready and available to make it so that, you know, they can kind of throw the contradictory evidence under the rug. It's pretty interesting.

Alec Zeck (01:00:32):

And this one, again, this goes to that one slide I showed of all their excuses, they, they come up with well, essentially it's when an abstraction is treated as if it were a concrete, real, physical entity. And that looks like assigning any characteristics or attributes whatsoever to a virus saying that it mutates saying that it requires a cell culture saying that there's not enough of it present, saying that it's too weak to isolate or purify any of these things, saying that it produces antibodies that's assigning characteristics or attributes to something that is still fundamentally abstract. It's not a concrete real thing.

Dr. Jordan Grant (01:01:11):

Yes. That's, that's one of the bigger ones we see too. It it people these guys love it because they'll use the word model a lot. We have models, right? Models have to, a true model, first of all isn't reality. So when you assign and, and claim make claims about reality based on a model that's already a reification, because we don't live on models, we live in reality. But for a model to even be somewhat accurate, it has to be based on something real. It can't just be something you've made up in your head. Like I tell people, if I wanna make a model train, then a train first exists, and then I try to model it the best I can on a smaller scale. Obviously it's not gonna be the train. So it's not quite the same when they, you know, everything's computer models now.

(01:01:54):

Well, people program those, those models don't, aren't just out there, they're not natural people. Program these things and make these models based on presuppositions. The question is, are those presuppositions valid? Even if they are models, don't actually truly explain reality. Now, a scientific model would be no different than a scientific theory, right? It would be validated after experiment. That's when you get a quote scientific model. That's not how these guys use those terms. When they talk about, we have a model, you're, you're essentially saying, I've come up with a story to explain this and I'm gonna present to you that as, as reality. And that's, it's reification.

Dr. Kelly Brogan (01:02:35):

All right? So I think we cleared that up, <laugh>.

Dr. Jordan Grant (01:02:39):

It's all, it's over. See, COVID is over. Go.

Dr. Kelly Brogan (01:02:42):

Exactly. And mic drop. Yeah, I mean, I do think that the, the nature of free thought and critical thinking is part of, if not like, perhaps the most essential ingredient to examine. Because absent that there is only like the terrain of emotional and interpersonal warfare, right? So what you all have tried to bring us back to are the, the consensus, right? These are consensus points of what scientific thought and methodology

consists of. And if we can reference these as a collective, then at least we have a place to begin when it comes to intellectual conversation. And of course the, you know, we talked about this in the ad ho section, but the emotional hysteria that often attends not only this topic, but Jordan, as you mentioned, there's so many others that invoke similar responses, is, you know, to sort of like peel those apart becomes possible when you can see that people are not, not in a place to even participate in the consensus, then, you know, they're really in that, that what I would call a trauma field, right?

(01:03:54):

In that place where they, they actually are incapable of using executive functioning and thinking rationally it's actually not possible. So I think that this, this helps us to have a structure within which we can all agree to operate. And you know, this is one of the few things I insisted that my children learn is logical fallacies, right? Because once you have those, at least, and it's practice, right? It's pattern recognition. So once you have them under your belt it's such a powerful orienting mechanism, you can really see, you know, where you are and what you're working with. So I want to just maybe close on, on final thoughts about how to, how do we interact with this framework, right? Do you think it's, it's helpful to position the scientific method upfront and get people to onboard with that so that you, so we're playing in the same sandbox.

(01:04:51):

Do you think once you observe that somebody is making certain logical fallacies that it's already a lost cause and maybe save your, save your energy and your effort? Many times, you know, all of you referenced that, you know, there's nothing sacred about the scientific method, it's just what we've, you know, purportedly agreed upon, right? So what if there are a lot of limitations to this method, as you know, the nature of this realm becomes increasingly complex and what we can appreciate about it may not be easily reduced to these to this approach. So what should we do with this, you know, with this methodology and everything that's been clarified when it comes to interpersonal interactions and really how we hold our, our truths? I guess that's a bit of an abstract question, but I wonder if that peaks anything for any of you.

Dr. Jordan Grant (01:05:42):

I'll I can start just because I think about this stuff all the time. I mean, I, I literally go to bed thinking about these kind of things and I mean, my wife thinks I'm crazy because you do, you start going, okay, wait a minute here now, scientific method. Yeah, I know the steps. How do we actually, how do we apply that in reality, right? Like, can we actually discover the cause of a natural phenomenon? Like, can you do it? And I start going, maybe we can't. Maybe there's, there's so many things like you say about the realm that we may not be meant to know. And what we end up doing is as humans in my, you know, in my religious belief, in my, in my world, it's humans made in the image of your maker, right? And so we are, I'm not gonna say little gods, but we are image bearers, meaning we create, we do these things.

(01:06:27):

And so what ends up being called science is really just man and technology and us doing things and taking our world and manipulating our world to get an outcome. And there's nothing wrong with that. But we try to make that, I think based on our ego, make it seem like we are these discoverers of these grand truths of the inner workings of all this. When it's like, nah, you just figured out how to do stuff. And then, and again, there's nothing wrong with that. I just, to me, that's the bigger picture, right? These are things that I think about because it's so easy to get caught up in, in ego and saying, look, what I discovered, if you really start going and looking at even laws, right? We didn't even touch on quote unquote laws of science, which aren't scientific laws are supposed to be descriptions of reality.

(01:07:11):

Used math mathematically, laws are not discovered, laws are created by men. They're created using. How did, why did you pick that equation over that one? Why did you pick the average and not the, the mode and not the mean or the mean and not the mode, right? We choose all these things based on something here, which was not furnished to us by nature. Nature didn't furnish that. So it's an interesting kind of conundrum when you start thinking on a, on a deeper level. But I think for me, the use is to falsify claims because so many of these people are control. Like, I don't mind people making up stories. I have no problem with models. And I've said this in multiple interviews, the problem comes when the models you have are reified into a reality that then enables tyranny on people. So mass vaccination, lockdowns, genetic testing leading to mastectomies, like whatever you wanna say, that's when it becomes a problem.

(01:08:05):

And when I go, okay, now we need to, we need you to show us we need some cowbell, right? We need some proof in the pudding. Show us where these things are validated. Because if just making this stuff up, now you're violating human rights. And that's, to me, the, the crux of this. It's not, I want to go out and start figuring out the secrets of reality. It's, I'd rather just be able to call a spade a spade and when it's just a story we just call it for what it is. So maybe people can go, you know, I don't want to get that vaccination 'cause there's no evidence I need that. Like, to me, that's the bigger picture.

Mike Stone (01:08:37):

Yeah. And I, I think you know, there's, there, there's just some things we just can't know. You know, we have to be comfortable in the fact that we're not gonna have all the answers to everything. But and the scientific method might not be perfect, but you know, it is, these are the steps that were agreed upon at, at the very least throughout, you know, the last whatever, couple hundred years. It's the best that we've got, you know, to be able to hold these fields to a certain standard. And so I think that's the power in the scientific method, and that's why I bring it up. And I, I, you know, you were the first one who really kind of lit that light bulb in my head, Jordan was I, I think I was mostly focused on co coke's postulates at the time, and you're like, well, there's a better method, scientific method.

(01:09:20):

I'm like, ah, I learned that in middle school. Why? Why? You know, it's so simple. And yet they're trying to make it something more difficult or more big than it really needs to be. But it's not, it's simple. We can hold them to it. It's a way that we can, you know, we can use it as a barometer to judge whether virology or any other germ theory, bacteriology, genomics, you know, all that stuff is valid scientific evidence. And so I think there's a lot of power in that. And, and, and like you said, you can hold their, their feet to the fire. So I, I definitely think it's a vital piece to moving forward. And, and so kind of like what you were talking about, Kelly, is keeping, like bringing people into that and making them more aware of the scientific method and, and how this process should, you know, be applied. I think it's, that's definitely very important going forward.

Alec Zeck (01:10:11):

Yeah. And the, the last thing I'll add, because both of you summed it up so perfectly, especially on the point that you know, the only reason that I harp on this so much now, and I gotta give credit to Jordan as well, is he's done such phenomenal work behind the scenes in helping us understand this, is because they're the ones claiming that it is scientific. They're claiming to adhere to the scientific method, and then that is being weaponized against all of humanity. That's the problem for me. I recognize that the scientific method is inherently limiting. I do recognize that. And that reality's much more complex.

There's so many things that we can't know. And then that's the important point too, is distinguishing knowledge from belief. And I would say that I believe that there's some things that we're not meant to know in this realm, that with our limited human capacity, we're just not meant to know and we're not going to know, and we have to be comfortable with not knowing. And I think at the least when we're comfortable with not knowing, we are then set on a journey, continuing to explore what is true. Whereas when you confuse or conflate a belief with objective knowledge, you then stunt your ability to continue exploring. And that's what's happening here with virology. And that's what we're trying to do with this event, is to, to push the envelope so that people continue exploring.

Dr. Kelly Brogan (01:11:34):

Love it. Amen. Amen. I love it. I think, see, I'm thinking that being in a world where you three men exist feels better for me and it feels safer for me. And it's because I have recognized that in the modern era, you know, true masculinity is this capacity to think with rationality, with di you know, emotional dispossession, and to be present to the sober assessment of what is actually happening. And I'm not even sure how much I value knowledge anymore, <laugh>, right? It's, it's this capacity to think that is our greatest protection you know, as a collective. And, and clearly it's, you know, something that we have to reclaim and we're doing it, you know, and, and in so much thanks to the three of you. So it's really been an honor to be a part of this and a fly on the wall. I was actually taking notes throughout the entire presentation, <laugh>, I loved it. And I know that this will be an incredible resource. I always think when, when Alec makes slides that I, I want to sit my kids down to watch them. So perhaps something to add to your homeschooling library. So thank you everyone for, for tuning in and more to come. Thanks guys.

Mike Stone (01:12:54):

Thank you.