Transcript
The End of COVID
Session 7 - What's Under the Microscope

SPEAKERS
Dr. Marizelle Arce, John Blaid, Mike Stone, Mike Donio, 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This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed in whole or in part without express written permission.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.

Jacob Diaz (00:00:30):

Hello everybody, and thank you for joining us for this session about electron microscopy. One of the things that people point to as proof for viruses, or one of the many proofs they say, is that we can use electron microscopy. I.e. we can put stuff in a sample, do things to it, and then see them directly. So seeing them directly will mean that these things exist. Right? Well, we're going to ask questions about it. Um, especially with Dr. Mari. Her mother was a former electron microscopist, so she's very knowledgeable in how this stuff works. We also have us here that we're, we we're very knowledgeable on what happens in this methodology, and we're gonna get to the crux of the issue. Does electron microscopy really prove that viruses exist? So, uh, without further ado, we're gonna go to the first question. Uh, so the first question with regards to electron microscopy is, what is it? Whoever wants to jump

Mike Stone (00:01:33):

<laugh>, it's Go for it. Go for it. I was just gonna say, it's just a technique to visualize really small particles. Ones that we can't see using regular microscopes like mi light microscopes, viruses, you know, are so small. They're in the, the nanoparticle scale that you cannot see them under regular microscopes. So this technique was developed, I believe, in 1931. Don't ask me who, I can't remember the names of the guys, but I don't believe it was really technically used widely until the 1940s for viruses. But, um, yeah, so it's just a, it's a process. Uh, it, we'll go over the, the numerous steps that they use to prepare a sample for, uh, visualizing the, these particles that small. But, uh, it's just a different way of visualizing things that we can't see normally.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:02:23):

Right, exactly. I, I was gonna add to that. Exactly. That's the most simplistic way, and it's the easiest way to understand. Right. So, uh, just to add to that a little bit of the science is that a light microscope uses photons, right? We're using light and electron microscopy. It's using electrons. Um, and there's various different types of electrons. I mean, within the realm of, uh, the way it used is used, right? So you have transmission and scanning, and scanning is just a focused electron beam, where transmission is more of a spread out electron array. Um, and, uh, again, it's using electrons, which gets us to a point where it goes past a certain point that light converges, right? And so then we have more of a, kind of a, a smaller

scale, 'cause we're passing a certain diffraction point to get to see what we see in, like, like Mike said, in the, the nano meters rather than the micrometers or micrometers.

Jacob Diaz (00:03:21):

So the other question regards, it's kind of connected to the first one is do we know who developed electro microscopy? And initially for what? So we obviously know it eventually went to viruses, right? So what, you know, what, what are they trying to do in the beginning with regard to this?

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:03:39):

So, I, I'll just, you know, briefly, and again, anybody who wants to jump in, um, max Noel and Ernest Rusk, you know, started the transmission. You know, I honestly don't even know why they started it. I know that, I mean, meaning like, I don't know what, what particulates they were actually looking for other than the fact that you were looking at particulates that you can't see in light microscopes. Um, but I didn't know if they started it for inorganic material, like rocks and stones and minerals, or if they started it for biological. But, um, they were, they invented the transmission one. And then I think Rus later on, uh, had got, uh, kind of created the scanning one. And, uh, like Mike said, again, it, it really wasn't commercially used until like the 1940s. Um, and then there's a, there's a, a cryo em that's fairly recent, um, which was, I forgot who invented that one. Um, uh, uh, de Boucher and Frank and um, um, um, Henderson, um, they did the, the cryo em fairly recent, fairly recently, which is just, it's the same EM methodology. It's the same electron usage. It's the same kind of it either transmission or scanning, but it's the way the sample is prepared for the electronic microbe that makes it different. And that's it.

Jacob Diaz (00:04:56):

Um, and I've, I've heard some other explanations as well. I think, uh, Dr. Cowan talked about how for a very long time they were trying to prove that germs cause disease. So they tried to make things even smaller and smaller and smaller to keep finding a villain. And which may have led to the creation of this microscope with the intent on finding something that causes disease that we can blame it on. And obviously, you know, bacteria and fungus, we tried for a long time and it just didn't work, <laugh>. So maybe they, they tried, Hey, let's try, let's try to see something else, something smaller. Um, and, you know, that's where we are today. So without further ado, we're gonna get into the, the crux of electron microscopy and why the issues or where the issues arise. So number three, the question would be, what are the preparations otherwise the ingredients used for electron microscopy?

(00:05:52):

And I'm going to share my screen. So the electron microscopy preparation, that is what this document is called. It comes from the infinite wisdom of Dr. Mari and her mother as well, <laugh>. And obviously all of this stuff can be found on virology papers and transmission and electron microscopy papers. They kind of make it hard to find and hard to understand, but we're gonna make this very easy to follow. Um, and again, anybody can jump in. We're gonna have Dr. Mary, 'cause she made this P D F explain, uh, what these things do, um, what they're used for, what they claim they do, at least. And obviously the effects seen after. So, go ahead, Dr. Mari, can I just

Mike Stone (00:06:30):

Make a a point really quick just to kind of set the stage. I think a lot of people when they, they see these images of viruses, they, they think that what we're, or what we're seeing is directly from the sample, they're just taking it, putting under a microscope and then finding these particles and seeing them. Um, but what we're going to go over is that that's not even close to what they're doing. There are so many

steps that are the, these samples are put through just to get these images. So that's, that's what we're gonna see with this difference between what people might be thinking and what really occurs.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:07:04):

Absolutely. Um, and, and the other emphasis is the fact that this is showing prep just for the electron microscope. There are various preparations that happen prior to even getting to this stage. Um, so that might be more likely discussed in another panel. And that needs to be emphasized as well, because we, like Mike said, are not getting, uh, a live pure unadulterated sample. Right. Um, and, and that also, uh, you know, going back to question one, which we should also just reemphasize. The difference between a light microscope and an electron microscope is that in a light microscope, you have a simple and a compound. But either one, you have the opportunity to see something live, you know, in, in, in the skew of, of living, right? In whatever parameters we wanna say living. But at least it's moving. There's some sort of viability to it.

(00:08:01):

Whereas an electron microscope, it is completely impossible a hundred percent to see anything live. So we have to just make sure we understand that we're not seeing anything live ever in an electron microscope, despite the fact that, again, you have these wonderful computer graphical images that show moving, moving things, okay? There's nothing live. Um, it, we have to deal with that. And the other thing is, an electron microscope is inside a vacuum, right? There's no oxygen, there's no air, zero pressure, um, negative pressure of anything. Um, and so you're also having that environment where, again, a light microscope is air, it's just within the realm of, of existence. And, um, so we just have to just make sure we, we understand that part.

Jacob Diaz (00:08:48):

So for the layman, it, you're, you're, you're essentially saying that it's completely unnatural for any sample to reside in an electron mass. So

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:08:56):

From the get go,

Jacob Diaz (00:08:57):

Absolutely. From the get go and their claim that these particles that we're gonna talk about in a second are viruses, and they exist and they have so much action within the cells, cannot be proven with electron microscopy because we're seeing pictures that are just stills and we're not seeing them pretty much do anything. 'cause they're not alive. 'cause electron microscopy can't see them alive.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:09:20):

Correct. You're, you're seeing two dimensional images, although you'll have, again, people who talk about, uh, the, the cryo scanning or the, the cryo em who supposedly say they're getting three dimensional images, when in fact you're just tilting the two D image slightly mm-hmm. <affirmative> in various angles to kind of get the gist of what possibly the three D is, when in fact, it's not three D it's just two D on angles. So you have your transmission and your scanning, like I said there, the way they initially, so if we were to go back when they first created it in 1931, all the way up until when they started changing certain methodologies, like in the cryo or the severely new one, which is called the liquid cell electron microscope, um, they both basically had to first start off with getting a sample, right?

And like I said, we don't know what methods they use to get that quote unquote sample that already has all sorts of staining and purifications.

(00:10:21):

But in order to put some what was once living tissue into an electro microscope, you can't have any water molecules. Um, because in a vacuum it'll literally sizzle, it's like sizzle away, um, and create an explo, like a mini explosion in there. So they have to, they've formulated a way to remove the water, um, out, out of biological samples. So the first thing is called fixing. And fixing really starts to help remove water, but also kind of, how do I make it simple? You're, you're linking proteins, but in a simple form, you're actually just creating kind of like a, almost like a stuck, uh, image, um, by binding certain constituents, certain things in the biological sample so it won't move. And that's why they call it fixing, right? So you take something like aldehyde, which is, you know, we already know there's all aldehydes are essentially we make our own aldehydes in our body, but the aldehydes that they're using are toxic.

(00:11:22):

So like formaldehyde that they used to basically preserve dead bodies, um, can, was initially used, but then they used something called glutaraldehyde. And then there's other ones that they used to pay it based on the biological sample after they dous that. And it could be several hours, uh, if not more than that, they could soak the tissue sample in that amount of fluid. They, depending upon if it changes the pH of the sample, they'll add a buffer, which is the second one. Uh, sodium caco dilate. So that will actually buffer the solution so it doesn't, um, become too acidic, right? And then, um, after that, they do another fixing. So if, if the initial fixing of the sample how to pro had other types of components, right? Mm-hmm. <affirmative>. So you have like proteins, like if you think in your mind, proteins, carbohydrates, fats, fats are actually lipids or fatty acids.

(00:12:22):

Those all need separate types of chemicals in order for them to be, uh, again, suspended, right? Suspended, like think of suspended animation, right? So you want all those chemicals to do their job to further dehydrate the tissue to ensure that you don't have a single water molecule left to create that mini explosion in the vacuum. So after the secondary fixation, which could be, uh, more than likely a heavy metal, um, this helps further remove any water from any other types of structures in your sample. Um, after that, you kind of, they kind of go in and out of going into certain of the, of the chemicals and then out, and then they dry 'em, and then sometimes they douse them again and do it several times again, depending upon the sample. Um, and then to remove some of the supposed chemicals that they use, they use ethanol or acetone to kind of just ensure that some of the other ex other liquids are removed.

(00:13:24):

What's not seen, and I didn't write down, is that sometimes in between, again, depending upon the sample that they have, they put it in an incubator just to kind of make sure that they dry, or sometimes they wait overnight to ensure the dryness before again, adding it to like a, a compound that creates kind of like a resin. So the first ones that were used most of the time was the propylene oxide and the epon that was actually put in and, you know, the sample was put into this compound and you'd get like a little block. And again, that had to be heated, um, in order for it to solidify. After that's done, then there, then they use a microtome, which is kind of like a, a really, really, really, really specialized knife to slice up that resin block. Which again, if I were to show you the block, they're like little tiny, tiny, tiny pieces.

(00:14:15):

They slice 'em down to really thin slices. I can't remember exactly. I think it, it's in the obvious nanometer size, right? We're looking like probably like a hundred nanometers or something around

there, where they're super, super thin because you, you want the electrons to be able to go through them, but also bounce off them or absorb them depending upon what Im, what, what particles are in the, the resin, right? So after that, then they have to stain it. So now you have this fixed in resin product. Now, if I were to put it under the microscope right now, you wouldn't really see too much. You'd see either all white or all black, depending upon if you use negative or positive staining. So the problem is, is that you need something to help contrast all the different particles in that resin. And basically the chemicals they use is all heavy metals.

(00:15:08):

'cause heavy metals adhere to different things in different ways. So they would use either something that was based in uranium or like urinal acetate, which was the old, old, they started that from the way before, um, osmium again, um, sometimes gold, all these different things would happen. And you would actually, again, douse that little snippet of that little slice, and it would get coated with the heavy metal. It would bind to certain products. And then now once you put it in the electron microscope, you can see the various features because again, the heavy metals bind in different ways. Now if you see, there's a column two and a column three. Column two is cryo, which is a fairly recent, within the last 10 years, uh, preparation. So there's no, um, fixing because the fixation is vitrification. So vitrification is when you freeze something and they would freeze something between, they would start it at negative four Celsius and go all the way down to negative 90 cel Celsius in order to slice it up.

(00:16:14):

Um, and then you have liquid helium and liquid nitrogen to freeze. So a lot of, all those processes, the fixing processes don't happen. They actually, funny enough, if you really dig deep, they actually happen beforehand. They actually happen after the sample is taken. There's some staining processes and some fixing processes to reduce some of the fluids. So the vitrification would actually happen more rapidly. So a lot, a lot of the things you see in this, uh, in this chart in cryo, they'll claim that they don't use anything and it's just, you know, they're just freezing it. When in fact they're actually doing the staining in the preparation. Now, once it's frozen, you slice it up. Um, again, they need a component to help with, um, the contrast. So they do something called spurring, which they actually, again, they kind of like douse the slice with a little bit of some heavy metal, mostly the time it's gold.

(00:17:09):

Um, sometimes carb depending upon the material. And you'll see the contrast. Now, the last one, and it's very brief, is the liquid cell. Now the liquid cells, supposedly, again, there's no, there's no slicing 'cause it's actually two graphene slices. And the liquid is supposedly alive going in and being shunted through these two very thin slices of graphene into the electron microscope. And it, even though there's liquid and there's potentially water, um, it, the electrons are not permeating that and actually heating that up. So supposedly you're getting live cells, moving cells, but what's not told is that in the mix of that slurry of stuff that goes in, you are emitting stuff like gold and fluorescent particles in order to again, adhere to, to create contrast so that you can see it. Um, and the other reason why also they needed the graphene is 'cause graphene takes heat.

(00:18:10):

Well, so another thing that we didn't mention is that in a, in a light microscope, you're gonna get, um, it's normal room temperature or a, a cooler, depending upon if you're in a lab. But in electron microscope, in a transmission or even an s uh, scanning, you're going up to 150 degrees. So you're actually cooking the sample, and that's why it needs to be put in a resin. So it's not cooked off as fast the liquid, they supposedly have lowered the temperature and the cryo, there's no real temperature, but you're still imparting all those chemicals that we've already discussed.

Mike Stone (00:18:46):

Um, can I make a a point too, what these processes, like the fixing, um, the staining, embedding, like, what they're trying to do is not only prepare for the electron microscope imaging, but they're trying to fix it or get it in a state as close to what you would see within the body as as possible. But they don't know, they don't have like a, a reference to actually view that from. And so you look at a lot of these processes, and there, there are many times when you look at these papers, they admit that they're creating artifacts through these numerous procedures that they're, they're putting the sample through. And, and like Dr. Mari said, um, just before we even get to this point of preparing the sample for electron micro microscopy imaging, they, they sell culture, you know, they culture the sample beforehand, which is a whole host of numerous alterations beforehand. So there, there's nothing, it's not as simple as just taking the fluids from a sick patient and putting it under a microscope and, and looking at it. This is like literally killing anything that's in the sample, fixing it, trying to get it to a point that they say is as, uh, close to natural as possible, not knowing if, whether it is or not, and then trying to interpret the images after all these processes are done. It's pretty crazy.

Jacob Diaz (00:20:10):

Any other comments?

John Blaid (00:20:11):

Uh, I would just, uh, tie, tie the knot a bit. Uh, I think it was, uh, Mari that touched upon the preparation that was done before the, the use of the electro microscope. That needs to be kept in mind at all times there, because that, that method is destructive too. And there there are no controls for that. So,

Jacob Diaz (00:20:35):

Fantastic point. And another thing I was thinking about is if, and Mike mentioned it, if they're, they're trying to get something as close to the body as possible, but wouldn't using, you know, things are endogenous to the body, be make more sense, like not harming the sample as much as you can, instead of using things that clearly don't exist within the body, like high doses of formaldehyde and, you know, chemicals and dyes and heavy metals. Why, why are they adding these? And you know what, leading to the next question, what is the potential destructive factor that these ingredients have to the cells? You mentioned artifacts, so we can use that word. They say that they're, you know, they do controls or whatever they're looking for, you know, you know, their, their false methodologies that can lead to false conclusions. But we obviously know this isn't true based off the ingredients. So what are artifacts or what is the potential that they're creating within these cultures or samples that can lead to false conclusions? What are artifacts? What are the destructive capabilities of these ingredients to the cell cultures?

Mike Stone (00:21:42):

Well, I would just say really quickly, um, just as an example, I, I think Dr. Cowen's pointed this out, or maybe it was Harold Hillman, I can't remember. I I know we're gonna speak about him later, but just, you know, the dehydration process alone, you're taking something, you know, first they're killing it, but then they're, they're dehydrating it. So it'd be like trying to determine the structure of a grape. Now it's become a, a raisin, you know, you're taking it and altering it completely. It's, it's not gonna look like what it was in its original state. And so that's, it's just not logical to believe that after you're taking these fluids have already been heavily altered and then putting them through even more processes that you're actually gonna see how these so-called particles, if they really did exist in the foods to begin with, were

in that natural state. Or whether they're actually artifacts that are created from just this fixing, embedding, you know, staining, um, process that they're put through.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:22:39):

I think another thing to also consider is that, as an example, one of the, one of the chemicals used in fixing is osmium tetroxide. And if you were to really research just that one chemical, there have been zero toxicology experiments done with it. Nobody knows exactly what it does to the body. Nobody knows exactly what it does to the cell, other than, again, people who use it to fix right. A sample. But we don't know if, if we were to, I mean, I've seen, I've seen a, um, by accidents where, you know, a a scientist is under a hood and they're using it and it splashes on them, and it creates such a reaction on their skin. It it dies their skin. They have all sorts of like dark lesions from the chemical itself. And so this is, there was one study because one woman, you know, managed to get it all over her arm, and they were able to see what happened.

(00:23:39):

And, you know, she had, um, her, her white blood cell count went crazy. Her red blood cell count went crazy. Um, you know, she had severe anemia for a month. Um, you know, it, it's an interesting thing to see what a couple of splashes of just one chemical that's used for electron microscopy did to her body. Um, and one can imagine that amount on one tiny little cell what it could possibly do. You know, like what, what damage is it imparting to create the images that we see? And nobody knows. Because again, going back to if we were to talk about, and you guys talked about control, what do we, no person has ever just done an experiment on one chemical and seen what are all the different reactions different tissues have with that one chemical

Mike Stone (00:24:32):

And then what it does with the com combination of other chemicals on top of that? Absolutely. They, they need to do 'em, you know, by themselves or in different combinations together, and they just don't do that.

Jacob Diaz (00:24:43):

So we're in agreement that these chemicals and additives and soaps and dyes and all that on top of the dehydration and heating and cooling and slicing like a deli meat <laugh> will affect the sample. Correct. That's a

Mike Stone (00:24:56):

Logical conclusion. Yeah. Yes,

Jacob Diaz (00:24:58):

Absolutely. And that anything after the fact we really wouldn't know is present within the sample before we even started.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:25:08):

Correct.

Jacob Diaz (00:25:09):

Got it. Right. So that, I mean, for everyone listening, that makes perfect sense to me. You know, I was learning this stuff a couple years ago and I, I obviously, I ca I didn't come from a scientific background, but hearing this makes total sense. You have to make sure that what you're starting with is present first, and that the experimental conclusions aren't a result of the experiment itself. That you're, you know, you're trying to find of natural phenomenon in case in these virus particles, and you're actually not seeing them. What you're doing is you're killing the cell that then creates cellular debris and all these different things to pop out and you're just making conclusions based off this. So that kind of answered the questions. I know. Do these harm the sample? Absolutely. And we touched on it a little bit. Um, and in, in your experience, uh, Donio and, um, Mary, you have, you, you guys have used electron microscopy in your, are you having it? I

Mike Donio (00:26:06):

No, I haven't, but I've used a other forms of microscopy where you're treating the samples, you're doing a similar fixation and staining process, not with heavy metals. And I mean, so it's somewhat similar, but obviously more specific for the different type of imaging or whatever you're doing.

Jacob Diaz (00:26:24):

And you got in your, in your experience for both of you, um, and obviously with your mother, you can chime in with her experience as well. What are the type of controls that they are using for electro microscopy? Or are they doing any controls? 'cause we, we talked about controls experiments with regards to virology, but this is like kind of a, a step prior to or after the cell culture experiments. So are they doing controls with this method or any of these microscopes?

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:26:51):

So, um, in terms of electron microscopy, no,

Jacob Diaz (00:26:54):

No, I figured

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:26:56):

<laugh> it, it's, uh, it's, again, you're, as Mike eloquently put it, you, we don't have any studies on one chemical, let alone the interaction of others, right? So you're already creating variables. If we were to you guys, there was a whole discussion on control and, and scientific method. And the problem is, is that the electron microscope doesn't abide by it. There's too many variables. There's too many things being added to the soup. Too many cooks in the kitchen. You just, you're not seeing what you think you're seeing. You're throwing a carrot in water and then 17 different people are throwing 17 different spices. Is the carrot soup at the end of the day? I don't know. I don't think so. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>, I mean, logics dictates it's not. So the problem is, is that if we were to really kind of go, okay, let's take a cell unadulterated, stick it into electro microscope, unadulterated, then maybe we would have something, maybe there would be a conversation somewhere.

(00:27:51):

But at, at this point, like, uh, Mike Donio said, you're, what they're doing is even just from the point of just using the electron microscope, not the electron, so the light microscope to confirm something, you're already adding certain stains and preservatives, and then to supposedly grow it, you're adding all sorts of other beautiful things, antibiotics and serum of this and that and the other, and then other

chemicals. And then, and then you're gonna add more chemicals. So again, 17 different chefs, 17 different spices from each chef. You, you don't know, you, you really don't know. And for science to simply say that they, they've got it and they know just from that means that science has just fell off the cliff.

Mike Stone (00:28:40):

Yeah. And that's, that's why it's, um, like what you're seeing in these images is very subjective and it's open to interpretation. I think that's one of the biggest, I I'm, I'm not sure I, I'm assuming we'll discuss that a little bit, but just, um, looking at these particles to one person, it might be a coronavirus to another person that could be a, like a multivesicular body or a trin coated vesicle, you know, they have, um, multiple, uh, interpretations of what these particles are and, um, or

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:29:10):

Dust

Mike Stone (00:29:11):

<laugh> or Yeah, exactly. It could be, yeah. I mean, who knows what, uh, any of these are, are really what they say they are. But there's, there, there's different ways that they interpret them. And that's the, the, the key word there. Interpret. They're interpreting images. They don't know what they are. They're guessing what they're seeing. You know, is the person opening the door or closing the door? They don't know what these things are doing. Is the virus budding from the cell or is it going, they don't know. They're just creating a story based on the pictures that they're seeing,

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:29:38):

Right? The snapshot. It's the snapshot effect.

Mike Donio (00:29:40):

And 'cause you can see particles, that doesn't mean that you can then draw the conclusion as to what those particles are or what functions they might have or what they're doing. Again, it all hinges on how you're preparing the samples. Do you have the proper controls to be able to interpret what you're seeing and, and ensuring that it's not coming from something that you did. You know, if you're culturing something or whatever that you have, or maybe you have different samples from different patients with different, uh, clinical right pathologies or whatever, you know, you have to have those controls. Ideally, you'd to do this to get something meaningful, you'd wanna do a proper isolation so that you're not using just a crude sample that's gonna have a lot of contaminants and stuff. 'cause then you really don't know what the heck you're seeing. But even then, if you like, oh, look it, I have a pure thing of where I can see uniform particles.

(00:30:31):

Okay, great. You still don't know what they can do. You need to take that pure sample and then do other things to it to characterize it. It's, it's just giving you, like you guys said, it's a snapshot because of the fact that we can't visualize these particles using light microscopy or other things. This, this, unfortunately, this is, this gets into a greater discussion about the limitations of science because we can't, this is right now the way that you can get to visualize a particle that's in the, you know, roughly a hundred nanometers. And so if we want to be able to look and say, do we have a particle? And what is the approximate morphology and this kind of thing, that's, that's the way, but you still don't know what

that particle is just by looking at it under electron mi microscope, you have to do more with it. You have to have the right controls. So, you know, it's important to have that, uh, that context and not just think that you can just point at something and say, we know this is a virus. No, not, not just by, by doing that imaging technique, I mean, you can't, you certainly can't draw that conclusion.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:31:38):

It's assumptions, right? It's assumptions. It's a, it's it's assumptions built on assumptions built on some other guy who goes, this is definitely has to be it. And that's the problem. I mean, it's as simple as you, you look at a, uh, if someone were to take a picture outside their window, right, and take a picture of a u p s guy sitting there, and you take that snapshot, how many different versions of stories can come up from the snapshot of the u p s guy? One person will say, oh, he was delivering something. Some person, oh, he was picking something up, another one. Oh, he was having his lunch. I mean, we can go on and on about what in that Polaroid is being seen. And that's the problem, is we are, we're leaning, science is heavily leaned on assumptions.

John Blaid (00:32:22):

Yeah. And, uh, and I mean the, those biological samples that are used, those are samples from tissue cultures, not directly from any human being. So already there we are working under an unproven assumption that these are viruses just from that perspective.

Jacob Diaz (00:32:38):

Exactly. So why, or really it just, it just begs the question even more because why do we need to resort to such a complex and toxic methodology to see things that presumably should be budding out of the cells of sick people at such a high rate? Why do we need to concentrate it so much with so many different poisons to see these things when we should simply just look at the sample directly, look at the blood directly, look at the broncho vela lavage directly and see it for yourself. They can't. So it really, it ask whoever's listening, ask yourself, why can't they see these directly in the people and categorize them directly in the people with the characteristics they claim viruses have? This is, we're, we're, we're literally like broken records here. We ask these virologists all the time, show me a paper from a clinic, from a direct clinical sample unadulterated that has particles that are pathogenic disease causing replication competent and shown to be the causative factor in the disease. They don't do it. They always send the same papers that they obviously haven't read that we're like, no, they didn't do this. They, they assume this, they did this, they did this. So really what are they doing? Someone mentioned before Harold Hillman, who was a fantastic biologist, who wrote very good papers. Um, and I'm not gonna spoil anything that he said, because I want you guys to spoil it for them. Who was Harold Hillman and in his work, what did he show and what was his goal with regards to his work?

Mike Stone (00:34:16):

I, I, I mean, I'm loosely familiar with his work. I've, I've looked at it somewhat. I, I, unfortunately, I've been so focused on a lot of other areas, I haven't really delved into his papers too much. But like you said, he is a microbiologist, um, or biologist, and he showed through his work that what they are interpreting in these electron microscope images don't reflect reality. Most of them are artifacts. And, um, I know Dr. Cowans talked about a lot of the different components of the cell. Like I think, um, there was just, uh, a few things that Harold Hillman said, for certain are real, but the rest, like the, I think the ribosomes, the endo, uh, rough, endoplasmic, speculum, all these things are just artifacts. But my favorite thing that Hillman expressed was that these images that we see in these textbooks or in these

studies and papers, they're, you know, once you take a sample from a, a living being like from an animal or a human, you've already altered it.

(00:35:19):

You're already taking it from its natural environment, and it's already going through this process of, you know, decaying it. It's not living within that environment. So then you put it through the, he didn't talk about cell cultures particularly, but once you factor that into the equation, all the alterations that happen during the cell culture, then you take that and further prepare it for the electron microscopy imaging, the fixing, embedding, staining, all that. The end result is nowhere near, uh, what you would see in a living being. So his, his work was really instrumental. And I know, I know it was heavily censored because it was controversial,

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:35:57):

Which is sad because he was, he, uh, one of my favorite videos, which I actually posted on Twitter, was him showing how when you, when you take, when you took a nerve cell, and he was actually showing when he, they added the different chemicals when it went from this, and then all of a sudden it went to this, you know, and that's just size. Like he was just showing how like the, the membrane on the cell is not the, what we think it is. And all those, like Mike said, all those different parts of the cell inside called organelles are not actually maybe potentially even there. Um, so to even just show that some of those chemicals can make a, just a visualization of a cell go from here to here makes you wonder what else is it doing to the cell in order for it to go like that?

(00:36:46):

Right? So how does water actually become removed from a cellular structure? It has to go through that cell membrane. And in doing so, you're creating these little bubbles coming off. So potentially, again, if we were to look at a, a snapshot, and again, it's all about interpretation, as both Mike and Mike said, you're looking at potential destruct, the destruction happening, and you're creating kind of like a, an suspended animation of the destruction, and you're watching the cell completely be dissolved. And all this interpretation of this dissolving part can, can easily be interpreted by this is coming out and this is coming out, and this is going in. And they name those structures just by simply, it's like a dehydration. You're just dehydrating the cell. Right? Could be as simple as that. Um, but yeah, I, I, Hillman was a, a great finder of, of, of scrutiny, right? He, he actually was able to question all the different methodologies of the electron microscope saying, Hey, how can you simply say all these structures exist if you're doing all this damage to the sample?

John Blaid (00:37:59):

Yeah. Well, uh, he lived, uh, between 1930 and, uh, 2016. So, uh, and, and he was a British, uh, scientist, uh, an expert in neuro-biology of execution methods. That was his primary profession. But then he also, of course, questioned the electron microscope. What I would add is that he held many talks, uh, in open venues where he was met, uh, after the talks by, um, other experts in, uh, electro electromicroscopy. And they acknowledge all of the points that he made. But when, when Hillman asked them if they will go on record, they refuse because of various reasons, because they would lose their funding or, or research or career or reputation or, or many different reasons why people, uh, like the electro microscopist, uh, refuse to acknowledge these problems in open. So I think that point should be, um, brought up at least

Jacob Diaz (00:39:05):

That is a very good point. And it's kind of a, a theme with regards to people in this, the science field, the medical field, when they see that their entire career is based off lies, many of them are scared to talk

about it, many of them are scared to come out because they do run the risk of losing their job, of losing their licenses. Like, like Mac Donio, he didn't wanna take a shot and he lost his job. Like we saw this everywhere. And, uh, completely unfair. And this is why I didn't, you know, judge people during the whole three years where they were scared because I understood this is their livelihood. Their families rely on this. Everything they know is hindering on this, uh, one car, the entire building collapses. So, um, it, it, it's interesting to see that this, that with, with, uh, regards to his research, it was met by people in the field that knew they were wrong, but we're scared.

(00:39:55):

And that, that kind of goes into the theme of how much of a choke hold the medical and scientific paradigm has on these people that are practicing within their paradigm. And one of the quotes, uh, I believe it was in, uh, Stone's article, SARS Cov two t e m images game over from Hillman directly just to get a, a, a theme of people listening to him and how, um, Hillman, you know, wrote and how easily his, his words were for were to understand. He said, I have shown to my own satisfaction that at least some popular important biochemical research techniques have never been controlled. He knew this. Let's just like we know this now, most of the new structures in cells apparent by electron microscopy are artifacts. There are only nerve cells and naked nuclei in a ground substance in the brain and spinal cord.

(00:40:51):

There are no synapses. The transmitter hypothesis is doubtful. I have published all the evidence for these ex for these statements, although this has not always been easy. 'cause obviously if you wanna publish something that goes against the narrative, it's gonna be hard. He has, um, two very well known papers, a serious indictment of cell biology. And then cell biology is currently in dire straits where he goes into a lot of the themes that we talked about, the electromicroscopy, the, the chemicals and all that stuff. Um, so I highly suggest everyone go into that and read it because it is worth it. So the next questions that we're going to be talking about or answering rather, are about the particles that we are seeing. 'cause we are not denying that, you know, if they take a picture of, you know, a stained sample with a bunch of chemicals in it, that there are, you know, things that kind of look like what they claim viruses look like. Um, and stone hit on it, how, depending on who it is that sees these particles, they're gonna call it something different. Clathrin coated vesicles, apoptotic bodies, cellular debris, whatever. So we're gonna go into a couple studies that all of us are fairly well, um, aware of, and we're gonna explain them and see whatever they're finding, if it's actually a virus. So let me share my screen,

Mike Stone (00:42:13):

Man. There's a really, another really good Harold Hillman quote too that I, I should have brought up where you like, basically question all the different, like, uh, subcellular fractionation, histology, histochemistry electron microscopy, binding studies, use of ligands, amino cyto chemistry, tissue slices, disruptive, like he just went off on all of these different techniques describing how they are not, you know, valid or accurate. Yeah.

Jacob Diaz (00:42:47):

Alright. So, um, these slides here, we're going to be going through a couple of studies. Um, I like to call it the oh point and declare method coined by our very good friend Jordan Grant. Dr. Jordan Grant, who is very, uh, well versed in explaining what the scientific method is. Uh, and we did have a session on that and why usually people don't really follow it and they point at something and then they make a declaration of what they're pointing to as fact without ever controlling or double checking if it's actually true. So the point and declare method, why do I have a picture of six different virus, quote unquotes and then Spider-Man next to it? Well, as a huge Marvel fan, I loved the last Spiderman movie, which, which

all the spidermans came together. And there was a scene where they all pointed at each other 'cause they were confused.

(00:43:37):

Like, who are you? I'm you, you're me, you're him. Why do I have that there? Because in the left hand side, you have a bunch of particles that look exactly the same. And yet scientists claim they're different. Why? Well, we're gonna go into it. So a anybody can chime in. I'm just going to do the slides and maybe chime in a little bit. Um, but the very first, uh, and this is one of the more famous ones, Dr. Cowan has talked about ad nauseum. Um, it was, uh, entitled SARS Cov two Varians or Ubiquitous Cell Co Cell Structures, the actual dilemma in the C Ovid 19 era. I'm not sure if you guys are well versed. I know, I know we've talked about it a lot, but you know, what did this, uh, study show? Because I, I know we, we've read it a couple times.

Mike Stone (00:44:28):

Yeah. Well, I think, if I remember correctly, this one, they were looking at, uh, samples from people, uh, with that tested positive for SAR Cov two, and then people that were negative for SARS COV two. And within the samples, they found the exact same particles in both those who were positive and those who were negative. And they, as you can see from this, this quote, they question multiple times. It might be a virus in the image, but it might not be a virus in the other image. So they, they don't know. They're just, you know, interpreting these little circular particles. Sometimes you see some spikes on 'em, sometimes you don't, but you can find them whether the person has the so-called virus or test positive for the virus and those who don't. So, you know, it's not specific to a disease.

Jacob Diaz (00:45:15):

In the quote here I'm seeing they stay acknowledged. These particles, quote could be a cluster of viral PR particles or multivesicular bodies with in intraluminal vesicles inside. So again, begs the question for sure, they don't know what they're looking at 'cause they look exactly the same. And depending on who is doing the study, they're going to make a different conclusion.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:45:44):

Right. And, and on to add to that, to, not to interrupt, but to add to that is the fact that every chemical is going to create an M V B, right? It's gonna create, it's, it's the way the body releases toxins, even from a standpoint of understanding. If you were to ingest a chemical, your body wants to release it, that's a macrocosm, right? So we know cells will, in, in, in their own natural environment, they take in whatever's around them in the extracellular fluid and they realize, oh wait, it's, it's a chemical, so they're going to release it. So in any event, you could create my cells, you can create MV MVPs in any which way, shape, or form. So for a person to say that it's in, in a, in a non quote unquote non-infected, uh, patient versus infected, we we're not looking at anything else other than two cell cultures that have been disrupted by a tons of stains and chemicals and fixatives and things like that.

Jacob Diaz (00:46:42):

Bingo. With this study, this is also a very famous one that we talked about a lot. And again, anybody can literally chime in. The, the, uh, study was entitled, or one of the, one of the, you know, many words within the title was pretty long, appearances can be deceiving. So based on what we see here on the, on the screen, what did the, uh, people conducting this study conclude, and why is it, you know, so relevant?

Mike Stone (00:47:10):

Well, it looks like, again, um, from this study, they found the exact same particles in people that were negative for, uh, SARS Cov two. And as you can see, it's from before the Covid to 19 era. So, um, granted obviously they're, they've called these particles coronaviruses forever, but you know, you're still finding the same particles and in, uh, patients where you shouldn't be finding them. If they're supposedly sick with this virus, then they'll just, you know, claim they're not the virus, they're just something else. They're multivesicular body, they're an exosome or some, you know, they'll, they'll have a, a a, a really good escape pause in therefore,

John Blaid (00:47:49):

And, and that study, they uh, they acknowledged that, uh, this confusion, uh, they expect to the seventies at least. So they, they known this for a long, long time.

Mike Donio (00:48:02):

Yeah. And the key is, the key is if these are particles that are supposed to be causing someone to be sick and you're calling them a virus, they should only be found in the patients that you're claiming are sick with the disease c ovid 19 or whatever. And that's why it's so important to have those controls. And if you see the same particles in patients you're calling healthy or negative or that have other, um, you know, perhaps other diseases of the lung or whatever, then you can't just assume that that's the particle you're looking for. It has to be specific and unique to that particular patient subset or whatever you're calling the, the disease that you're trying to attribute causality via this particle. Uh, you know, and so if, if you're seeing these same particles in negative patients or even before the disease was around like that, that's a clear sign that those particles are not what you're claiming them to be. They really can't be,

John Blaid (00:49:08):

Should be pointed out that those corus are not isolated either. Uh, there are a bunch of other things there that can, that could be the cause as well. So,

Jacob Diaz (00:49:18):

Great point, John. I was gonna hit on that these are not isolated and this is what virologists do. They claim that these pictures here, but this one specifically, I mean this was a different study that we talked about previously, but they claim that these things are isolated particles when in actuality it's a whole chunk of, of a sample with a bunch of stuff in it. So it, it cannot be scientifically and, you know, uh, semantically correct, because it's not isolation at all. Um, and not to bore, you know, people listening 'cause all of these studies are pretty similar, but donio hit it on the head because we can see these particles in healthy people and unhealthy people, and we don't see these things do anything for the most part. Not even move. 'cause the electron microscopy can't see it. We are begging the question, we're pointing in the clearing, and we're not thinking about the negative effects that we can have on an entire society based on taking a picture, misinterpreting the picture and making a whole conclusion and hypothesis based on the picture, which is what they did for three years.

(00:50:29):

They took pictures like this, we see here, made assumptions and then made people believe these things were out to get you. When in actuality with this one here, it turned out to be rough endoplastic reticulum cross sections or basically cellular debris of the rough endoplasmic reticulum. And these particles were misinterpreted as viral particles. This study here found very similar things, multi vesicular bodies that mimicked sars CO two in patients with c ovid 19 without c ovid 19. So they saw the same

particles and people that didn't test positive. And I believe that was from the nine. Uh, they were talking about something from the 1960s or how micro vesicular vesicles or multivesicular vesicles have been known to be a thing for a very long time. Same thing here with this study. Caution and identifying coronaviruses by electron microscopy, they acknowledged, yeah, with the use of electron microscopy and the use of specifically kidney tissues. And they, they, they talk about this pretty frequently and a bunch of other studies. I was gonna ask anybody why do they use, you know, especially for these methods and with electro microscopy and cell culture, kidney tissue specifically, and why is that? So why is that connected with how we, we are seeing these particles? Is is there a reason that's, they're specifically most of the time using kidney cells?

Mike Stone (00:51:56):

Well, it's creating the particles that they wanna see. I mean, that's basically what it is. They say kidneys are like harbors viruses, but it's obvious that from these experiments that they're doing when they're breaking down the kidneys, uh, the, the cells from the kidneys in a certain way, that's the only way that they're able to get these particles, um, that they can claim are coronavirus. And so, uh, it's, it's all based on whatever recipe and whatever particle that they want to generate and create and look for. They'll have different cell lines or, or different, um, you know, mediums and, and different ways that they'll, uh, incubate or, or uh, try to create the particles that they want to see, um, with the end result of these imaging.

John Blaid (00:52:41):

Uh, it also, uh, goes back to the enders study and why enders shows kidney. That was because, uh, who was the guy that did the polio? Uh, Jonas. So

Jacob Diaz (00:52:54):

Yos, yeah.

John Blaid (00:52:55):

Yeah. So Anders blame Jon salt for creating, uh, infectious material because he used human tissue, uh, some other human tissue. That's why he, he went away from that to, to monkey kidney tissue instead. So it goes back to the C P E experiment with tenders from 1954. That's why the, the show stick. Now, I

Mike Donio (00:53:17):

Think with respect to coronaviruses, they believe, although, you know, we could go crazy with this one too, that the, for the coronavirus is this protein called ACE two. And you know, all, although the proof of that is very, very suspect if you look into the papers, that that has attempted to have been demonstrated. But the thing is, the kidney cells are one of the tissue types that are supposed to express ACE two. So I think they perceive that that should be a place where you can find these coronavirus particles. But again, it's all built on assumptions. And so, and I'm guessing this is primary tissue, but I don't know if that's

Mike Stone (00:54:02):

Yeah, I believe so.

Mike Donio (00:54:03):

Interrogation of that tissue.

Mike Stone (00:54:04):

But I was just gonna say, you know, kind of touching on too, when you were talking about the fact that these are not isolated particles, you know, they're, they're not purified, they're not isolated. Um, you can go through a lot of these studies when they're actually trying to find the, these particles for the first time. Like with, um, with the coronavirus in the, in the, I think it was like 1968 when, or 67 June Al Ada was searching for the particles. You know, these, the coronavirus technically it existed for a few years before that. They just had no images of it. They just had studies claiming that there was a, a coronavirus, they hadn't named it at that time, but just that this was this virus causing these symptoms. And she was looking, when she was looking through the samples that she was provided by two different researchers, she found the particles like she had to search through, obviously 'cause they weren't purified and she admitted they weren't purified in isolated samples.

(00:54:59):

She was searching for a particle that she ended up ultimately finding that fit. Um, ones that she had found in mice, in, in, in chicken, the infectious bronchitis virus in chicken and mouse hepatitis I think, or some whatever. There are two different viruses. So she found a particle that she thought looked like a virus based upon previous studies or, or samples that she had looked at in animals. And when they had, she had, you know, sent those in, they actually rejected those images. They said they were just bad pictures of the flu virus. So, you know, they, they can't, and, uh, separate the flu virus, if you look at it, there's images of the flu virus in the coronavirus that look exactly the same. So it's just all in the eye of the beholder. Um, eventually they did end up saying, oh yeah, those are, those are different.

(00:55:48):

They're coronaviruses. But, or even like, uh, with h I v Luke Montagnier said, when they were searching for the h I V particle, it was a hercule effort. 'cause they, they had to sift through and search for a particle that fit their preconceived idea of what an H I V would look like and what it should be doing. And I think one other example was the, the Marburg virus, if I remember correctly, it took over 30 hours for them searching through electron microscopes of the samples to find the particle that they claimed were the marburg virus. And, and it was like, there's this lead electron microscopist, he, they'd been searching for like 20 something hours, 24, 25, I think 28 hours, and he left for lunch and then his assistant took over. And then when he came back from lunch, the guy's like, oh yeah, we found it now <laugh>. I mean it's just absolutely ridiculous. <laugh>, they, they, so how is, go ahead. Oh, I'm sorry. I was just gonna say, it's ridiculous how they come to these conclusions that, you know, this particle is a virus versus any of the others that are, you know, potentially within that sample. They're just, they have a preconceived idea of what they're looking for. In other words.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:56:57):

Exactly. Just like the snapshot of the u p s truck, how is this any different than, than gossip? Like if we go to the village and they gossip about, well, it could be this, it could be that, and then you have the people who are the elders of the village. They make, they, they justify their opinions as the most important. And then other villagers will look at that as, okay, no, they must be right. And that's, that's why the tree is doing that, or the house or why the girl ran away, or something to that effect we're these, we rely on not us <laugh>, but most people rely on scientists as these people who Oh, they got it down that what whatever conclusion they came to must be it. Yeah. And the problem with dogma in that regard, dogma should have, should never be in part of science.

(00:57:43):

Science and dogma should be two separate entities that exist on opposite sides of, of the universe. Because we have failed to understand and fail to realize that we have to question everything repetitively and, and create a, a, a structure in which we go, okay, we see this and we see that, but let's eliminate even many more variables that we're not even considering. And there should be even discussions within the scientific community, within any community in, in the scientific community that there could be one variable that we're not considering. And they should be taking hours upon hours to even consider. Do they, have they gotten to the really end point to kind of justify what, what their conclusions are?

Mike Stone (00:58:32):

Then they don't, they just assume based on a consensus that, uh, you know things. Yeah, I love that word, don't you? That, uh, things are the way that they say that. That's why I love that Michael Creton code, uh, quote where he said, you know, if it's consensus, it isn't science. If it's science, it isn't consensus and correct. Um, but that's what they do. They create this idea that everyone agrees and, and this is just the way it's done. And then when you challenge that, well, no, we've already determined all this. There. It's just gonna be a waste of time and resources. We don't need to to look into it any further. And it's just, um, you know, that's sad. It's not,

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:59:08):

You don't move forward with that.

Mike Stone (00:59:10):

Exactly.

Jacob Diaz (00:59:11):

Yeah. And they're simply building off of what other people did previously, doing the same exact thing. They're not doing something different. That's why it's so funny seeing virologists say, oh, we, we've done cell culture for so long, it's consensus, blah, blah, blah. We've done electron microscopy, this and that for so long. Well, and genome sequencing another one, we've done it for so long, it gets us the same results. The reason it gets you the same results is because you're not doing something different. You're doing the same thing over and over and over again. It's a self-fulfilling prophecy. So it's, it's not science. <laugh> you said

Dr. Marizelle Arce (00:59:45):

Is not common. It's not, but it's not even common sense. It's not even co Think about if an inspector came to your house and it was consensus that your house was stable, the inspector would be like, okay, you're good. And your house falls down the next day. <laugh>,

Jacob Diaz (00:59:58):

Uh, this, this study here was one of my, one of my personal favorites right here. 'cause, um, it, it, it, it, it went through, uh, particles that were, you know, quote unquote indistinguishable from SARS COV two, or they were actually identified as SARS Cov two. But in actuality, they were found to be clathrin coated vesicles, or essentially clathrin is a, is a, is a very, um, it's, it's an endogenous protein. It's, it's ubiquitous within the body and it's, it's not disease causing, it's just a protein. And they found that when the cells were harmed, or, you know, when you're sick, you know, the, in the detoxification mechanism, clathrin will butt out of the cellular fragments and look like spikes, but doesn't mean they're viruses. Um, so really it, it, again, it's an, it's another issue. Are these spikes that we're seeing in these particles, you

know, the, the disease causing part or like the part that gets injected into your body, which leads to the disease, or are they simply proteins directly from the cell as a result of poisoning? And I go with the latter 'cause it makes a lot more sense. And that was the final slide about the particles.

Mike Stone (01:01:12):

And, um, just, just to your point about the protein, I, I can't remember, I think we've talked about this in another session, but in the, the study with the Australian, the Australian SARS COV two study where Yeah, I was

Jacob Diaz (01:01:23):

Gonna mention that. Go

Mike Stone (01:01:23):

Ahead. Yeah. Okay. Yeah. Just that they, they tried, you know, they tried in their electron micrographs to get that, that, uh, Corona particles, but all they got were spheres until they added trips into the, the culture, and then it dissolved the proteins, and then they were able to get the, uh, the images that they wanted to see.

Jacob Diaz (01:01:41):

That was the very first, I think, c ovid 19 isolation in Australia.

Mike Stone (01:01:45):

Yeah. Mm-hmm. <affirmative>. Yeah,

Jacob Diaz (01:01:46):

<laugh>. Yeah. When we add a poison that eats proteins, it did something <laugh>. Of course it did.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:01:52):

And then just had a heavy metal. And it makes it highlighted

Mike Stone (01:01:56):

Exactly right.

Jacob Diaz (01:01:57):

<laugh>, we gotta gotta love those poisons. So in, in your guys' opinion then, what do you guys think these particles are? You know, we, we have a lot of different opinions on what they are, but what do you guys think?

Mike Stone (01:02:08):

I don't think we can really know. Yeah. I'm sorry. I mean mm-hmm. <affirmative>. Yeah. They're just, you know, it could be a, could be celery debris, it could be, you know, any of those things that they claim. We just know they're not a virus. There's no evidence that they're viruses. They, they haven't been put through the scientific method. They haven't been shown, shown that these particles are actually within the fluids of a human. They, uh, without Turing, you know, they haven't shown that they're in a purified

and isolated state, state all by themselves. They haven't been shown to be pathogenic naturally. So we know for a fact, even if they can image these particles, we know for a fact that they're not viruses because they just have never been proven to be what is called a virus.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:02:50):

Agreed. We know what they're not. Yeah. We just, we know what they're not, because you have to prove that they are, and there's no proof that they are because of all the variables. Right. But we know what they're not. I always imagine what, what's happening, what I see particles like that. What I imagine is my child's toy, where it's like, it's filled with water or gel or something, and it's got this mesh over it's rubber and it's got this mesh over it. And when you squeeze it kind of like sluts out all over the place.

Jacob Diaz (01:03:17):

That's so funny, because I have my stress dumpling right

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:03:19):

Here. Yeah. That's it. Yeah. But you have, you gotta get the one with the mesh. Yeah. When you get the one with the mesh, it does this, all these little, like little things protrude out mm-hmm. <affirmative>, all the little mesh holes. That's in my mind what's happening.

Jacob Diaz (01:03:31):

And that is a direct, um, lead. The reason I ask that is, it's a good lead into the next question about the rife microscope. And I think it's very, um, it's very important that we know who this guy was and what he did and what he showed. Um, Royal Raymond Rife, he created the rife microscope, and I believe he created the rife machine. I'm not sure if there were, there were two different things. The Rife machine was, was used. He used frequency to heal people, you know, with, with various different diseases. But with the rife microscope, I'm not gonna, I'll let you talk about it. Uh, Dr. Murray. So what did he do with his microscope?

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:04:09):

So it, it, I mean, it was one of the best inventions in the world. He wasn't the only one that created that, a microscope similar to that. But he wa it was, I mean, his knowledge on creating lenses where he actually traveled all the way to Germany to create his own lenses of made of quartz. Um, and he was actually able to, uh, do two things that light microscope can't. So there's something called the frown Hoffer. Uh, um, it's, it's physicsy. So <laugh>, I won't go into it, but it's, the light has a certain convergent point and it, you can't magnify after certain points. So he was able to, with his quartz lenses and the way he, um, oriented, uh, the objective versus the eyepiece, he was able to create and surpass that magnification just using light, just using photons, not electrons. And then on top of that, he was able to, without using any staining or chemicals, he was able to actually use light specific wavelengths to actually see the particles in their, their natural structural forms without actually having to impart chemicals. So he was actually to go, he was able to go down to almost the electron microscopes, uh, you know, ability to see using just light.

Jacob Diaz (01:05:21):

That is so cool. Going further with him. He was, and I believe when he went into this, he wasn't, you know, a terrain theorist. So, you know, he, he believed in germs. He believed in the common consensus regarding viruses. He believed in his published papers, what he saw, these particles were viruses. But

what he didn't see was that these weren't really the cause of anything. Correct. What he saw was these were the result of a disease state, and that using frequencies, he would get rid of these particles because the, the, the cells would heal. So he would heal people with cancers and all these things with different frequencies. Another thing he showed, which I, I wish Rife and, um, bamp were around at the same time, 'cause they could just meld together into one superhuman. He's, he inadvertently proved P polymorphism. Yes. And in one of his papers, and I'll let you talk about it, he took a virus particle, which we, we would just, you know, we'll just say cellular debris. That's basically what it was. And he changed it into a bacteria like a e coli, and then using the same machine, took the coli and turned it into a fungus. Correct. Which was so cool. So if you want to expand on that for

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:06:31):

Sure. Absolutely. So he, like I said, he wasn't the only one. I know we were gonna have a discussion on other microscopes, but just to kind of get like a, a bigger, broader picture, there was, uh, underlying, had his microscope and then Gaston nascent in Canada mm-hmm. Had his microscope, the somato scope, and they were all able to see these changes in live tissue, uh, what they call native blood. Um, and, um, they were able to watch as the tissue either decayed, um, or died in that way. And to see how the environment would alter these changes, which create the alterations of these changes. And, um, and like you said, he was seeing particles and again, being imparted by the wisdom at that time, because again, the rife machine and the rife microscope were created before the electron microscope, but then was used after the electron microscope and the terminology of virus became rampant.

(01:07:28):

Um, and so he was just, you know, utilizing that type of information. But then again, he did talk to, um, people like Wilhem Reich, and he talked to, um, um, who's the other person he talked to Gustan, I think he talked to Gustan, I'm not sure. Um, and so there was some sort of interaction and his understanding did shift. So he actually, there are quotes of him saying like, he doesn't know what he exactly, he wasn't gonna get into the conversation of what was happening in terms of the chicken or the egg, like who caused disease or whatnot. But he knew, understood that with, with, um, certain frequencies, he was able to alter these, these, uh, changes and, and create better health for the person who was coming in with, with whatever illness that they had.

Jacob Diaz (01:08:15):

That is so cool. And we're, we will, we will have a session regarding, um, uh, bacteria, which we will go further and into ple amorphism. And the really, the impact it's gonna have on the entire understanding of microbiology and us as humans, our health, our bodies, how they react. Essentially, he was creating these microbes from another microbe, from another microbe, from another microbe, depending on the environment and what it was subjected to. And he was taking these cellular fragments or, you know, debris in and changing them. So it really, it, it makes me wonder, you know, these particles that we see budding from the cells in these cultures, um, you know, they're, they're a result. Or of, um, like Chris protein, crystallization of cellular capitalism where the cells breaking down and it crystallizes and it creates, um, more simpler compounds are these particles actually quote unquote living in the sense that they actually have some micro zy in there. And it's, it's a way for the body to try to heal itself. You know, detoxifying, getting rid of the, of the crap and then rebuilding itself, you know? So it's, it's, it's, it's interesting things you can get, you can really go deep into with regards to this. We won't go further, but it's very interesting. Oh,

Mike Stone (01:09:30):

I was gonna say, there's a video of, uh, Nissan, uh, shown. You can find it on YouTube. It's like a 17 minute video. You can see as they change their form and it'll explain mm-hmm. <affirmative> as the, as you're watching them, what the forms are. It's really interesting.

Jacob Diaz (01:09:45):

Right. Dr. Robert Young too, has a, has videos on that. Yeah. I think like live blood too.

Mike Stone (01:09:49):

Yes. Yep. Exactly. You can actually see it. It's not, not still dead pictures, it's actually as they go through these forms.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:09:56):

Exactly. Which, which goes to the question again as, as you were saying Jacob, is what are we actually seeing in the electron microscope? Again, we're seeing a snapshot and we could be watching a snapshot of all these different super microorganisms, you know, these, these different things happening that are not well studied at all, or have been shunned to be studied, interacting with a, a dying cell. Right. We have this, we have a whole microcosm that we still to this day don't understand, as Hillman obviously pointed out, that we've construed in our heads that there are all these different organelles in the cell, all these different parts, when in fact they're not. So what do we really know about cell biology? What do we really know about the interactions of the cell with the staining, with the chemicals? What, and, and the vacuum and the 150 degrees and the resin and the electron bombardment. What do we really know? What are we really actually seeing?

Mike Stone (01:10:52):

Yeah. We just took a bunch of pictures and created the story around those pictures. We don't know what the intent of the story was. We just made it up and people started agreeing.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:11:03):

Right. Yeah.

Jacob Diaz (01:11:04):

Literally. Um, and you mentioned how all this information has been censored with regards to ple amorphism. It was pretty well known for a very long time. And, you know, conveniently, you know, it's all that era around the forties, fifties, you know, everything changed and they erased everything with, with, uh, the Rockefeller, you know, the flexing report, all that stuff. Um, another thing, uh, to talk about Raymond Rife, just real quick, the F B I, I believe took his microscope <laugh> right? And took his machine <laugh>, and eventually he, he was led into, you know, depression, alcoholism. He, he kinda went nuts, but who wouldn't if you, you know, make this thing that helps people and you devote your whole life to it, and the government's like, Nope, no, you, we don't need that, because that helps people. So this is, this is a theme that's not new. It's been going on for a very long time. The closer you get to the truth, the more, uh, persecution you're gonna find the politic. We kind of, we kind of talked, go ahead.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:11:58):

I was just gonna say the politics, the problem with, and, and this is another discussion that one can have about the electron microscope, the politics behind the electron microscope is just backed by so much, right? Backed by so much government, institutions, private institutions. It fits a narrative. And the narrative fulfills the role for making money off of products that can be sold based on what is found by these machines, by these constructs, by these assumptions. Right? So if you, even if you were to come up with a microscope to this day to show, to really prove, like literally scientifically prove that there was a zero virus, and, and beyond that, you know, bacteria don't make you sick, all that stuff, it doesn't matter because at the end of the day, the construct of our economy, the construct of our politics is all based on what science has built up through the mechanism of the electron microscope and all the findings thereof.

Jacob Diaz (01:13:01):

Great point. Yeah. Last two questions. And I think we can, we answered kind of the, the, the, the, the last to the, the, almost the last one. The, the, what other microscopes exist? 'cause we kind of hit on that a little bit. Um, donio, I, I, I would want you to answer this 'cause you use different microscopes. What other microscopes exist or what, which ones did you use? And are there the same issues with those along? Would that have, you know, that exist with electro microscopy?

Mike Donio (01:13:28):

Yeah, I mean, so there are things that, like different kinds of fluorescence microscopy and things that people will claim to use, they'll create, you know, these like what they call like synthetic or reporter viruses that they can try to create what's occurring in absence of, you know, having the real thing and study that. And you encode these like, fluorescent proteins and, and then supposedly you can track, you know, the virus infecting a cell or something like that. But it's based on a lot of the technology that's used for just a regular light microscope. So you're still limited by the, um, the maximum magnification still can't get the resolution to see a particle that's at, um, you know, the nanometer size. And you have all the problems though with the preparation, um, that are observed with electromicroscopy because you have to prepare the samples. Um, often you fix 'em, you stain them, you can do, there are ways you can do live cell analysis, but you're still manipulating the samples quite a bit.

(01:14:41):

And so that, you know, this was a thi big thing that Hillman hit on was any time you're imparting anything onto the sample for, for preparation purposes, whether it's centrifugation, anything that you're putting on the sample to stain it, to fix it to anything, any of those things will inevitably alter it. And if you're not taking into account those things, then you don't know what, what you're observing, whether it's real or it's something that's simply created by the preparation procedure itself. And I'll tell you that the majority of the time, most scientists don't even think to account for those things. They just assume that you're not, what you're doing is fine and the result can't possibly be because of the preparation. But I mean, I've messed around with centrifugation conditions and, and different things, different types of solutions and stuff like that in preparing samples.

(01:15:38):

And it absolutely has an effect, you know, if, if you don't pay attention to that stuff, there's no way to know that what you're observing is real or a result of the preparation. And that's a lot of the outside of, you know, so you have light microscopy where you can literally put something directly under the microscope and visualize it. And I think I've talked to a lot of people that actually believe that when a scientist was saying, oh, we found a new virus, that they literally took like blood or some, um, fluid and put it under a microscope and looked down and said, oh look, there it is. Like, no, that's not at all what's

<laugh>. You can't do that. So as you move further away from that, any kind of microscope or imaging technique requires more and more and more preparation, manipulation of the sample. And you know, it's the same story over and over again. If, if you're not, you don't have the right controls. If you're not validating the different things that you're using to detect or image, you just don't know what you're, what you're seeing.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:16:40):

Can, can I add to that just a little bit even dark, like I do dark field microscopy. Mm-hmm. And even then, I, I take what I see under, with a grain of salt because it's outside of the body mm-hmm. <affirmative>, right? So even if you, people, when people, like you just said, people will hear taking the tissue and seeing it under the microscope, but the tissue itself is losing oxygen, losing nutrition. It's dying. So what, what are you, again, we go back to what are you seeing? You're seeing death. You're not seeing live structures interacting with other live structures in the context and medium that they survive and thrive. Right? So when I draw, when I see, you know, when, when I have people see their blood a little drop, right? They see that I, I go, okay, within the 10 minutes, I'm gonna give it 10 minutes, even though you can't hold your breath beyond two minutes, right?

(01:17:39):

So I'll say within 10 minutes we're, we'll see something that remotely resembles what potentially could be in your body, right? We can't go, oh, this is exactly what's happening in your body. Because I decided that when I take, when, when, you know, blood is on a slide, that it could survive in non its environment being oxygenated every two minutes in your body, that after five minutes it, it, it still is viable and means something to me. And, and that goes with all science, right? When, when doctors draw blood and they send it off to the, the phlebotomy lab and they're getting their blood work done, and you have patients come back going, oh, but my blood work again, how long was it sitting in the vial? It's mixed an anticoagulant, you know, how long was it sitting there? And they put it through the test. How, how real is that really?

Mike Donio (01:18:30):

That's a, that's a huge point to make. I mean, I encountered this a lot with, when you're doing animal studies and things and you wanna evaluate and try to look and see, can you find something to give rationale for an effect you're observing. And so you have to take tissue out. Well, in, in the case of like a mouse or something, you have to kill it first and then remove the tissue. You can't go in and do it while it's alive. And so, I mean, if you have to put an organism like that, an animal down, you're literally killing it. And then you're removing it. So you're double, I mean, so if you're using an animal model to study some, study something and you're removing the tissue, or let's say you're evaluating tissue from someone who, uh, a patient that

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:19:16):

A biopsy

Mike Donio (01:19:17):

Passed away, biopsy a biopsy. Right. Exactly. Well, that same case, once you stop that metabolic activity, you've stopped the oxygenation, the perfu, like you've changed the tissue and then you've taken it out. And then the more you do to it, every step is further changing the system.

Jacob Diaz (01:19:34):

And so much of science is based off death <laugh>. It's like mm-hmm. <affirmative>. Absolutely. We're trying to figure out how something works when it's living by killing it doesn't make any sense.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:19:47):

Well, when you really think about it, well, here's the, you know, Claude Bernard? Claude Bernard is the one that actually did the terminology milieu, right? So that's where the word terminology terrain comes from. And he did vivi sections. And listen, I'm against Vivi sections big time, but at least in his mind, just for one credit, he was going, how am gonna understand the body if the body's not alive?

Jacob Diaz (01:20:09):

Bingo. Mm-hmm. <affirmative> logic. I love this conversation. So, final question, and I want everybody here to get their shine on answering the question is the use of electron microscopy. And, you know, we can, you can talk about any other microscopy, if you like, a valid technique in science. And if not, what can be a solution?

Mike Stone (01:20:33):

I don't know. What can be a solution? In all honesty, I, I don't think the technology exists at this point. In order to be able to really see what they want, to see those particles down at that size, we'd have to see 'em, you know, we'd have to be able to see 'em alive if we want to see what they're doing and, and how they affect anything. Um, it's the best, probably the best technique we have at this time. If we're gonna say that these particles exist within the fluids of a sick person to begin with, then we have to show after purification and isolation that those particles exist. I mean, that, that's pretty much the, the best way that we can visualize them. Um, then we'd have to make, you know, go through the rest of the steps of the scientific method. So it's kind of, you know, it's a flawed method. There's a lot of flaws to it. But, um, going within the perineum right now, if we're gonna challenge them, we have to, it's kind of a double-edged sword. We have to use electron microscopy to show that they don't have these particles within the fluids, and they, they aren't, they're a creation of the, the cell culture experiment.

John Blaid (01:21:40):

Uh, in my view. I, I think that, uh, the electro microscope is not, is not valid at all. There, there's so many destructive processes, uh, just to produce the image. And then we haven't even considered the, the preparation before the, the electro microscope is even used, like the centrification and all, all the other things that are, that are required. So, and, and if we look at the work of Hillman, for example, then he said that during his 50, 50 years of research, that's 50 years, that's, that's a long time where he invalidated that CRO micro completely. So, uh, when, when it comes to like living tissue and, and, uh, living or organisms. So I would say that we need to find some solution. I don't know what, what it would be, but, uh, some solution that would, uh, analyze live tissue and living organisms. So

Jacob Diaz (01:22:38):

Anybody else?

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:22:41):

Uh, I think, I think I've said that it's garbage, <laugh> <laugh>, trash

Jacob Diaz (01:22:48):

<laugh>.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:22:48):

It's garbage. I mean, if they wanna use em for looking at mineral content of something or their plastics when they create, you know, certain structures mm-hmm. For plastics to see the, the, you know, the uniformity and things like that, that's great. But for, for organic biological mm-hmm. Living material, our em is crap. If we can bring back the rife machine, um, not the rife machine, the rife microscope mm-hmm. <affirmative> and really kinda analyze how and what he was looking at and, and take it from there at least again, with a grain of salt as we said. Um, because again, tissue outside the body is, doesn't really tell you too, too much, um, except for a few minutes maybe. But other than that, I'd say bring, bring back the rife microscope and throw away the other one.

Jacob Diaz (01:23:32):

I think. Um, not to, not to like talk about someone else's information, but Dr. Bare Lando has mentioned a couple times, he's, he's very, he's very well known in the terrain field, um, that he's working on kind of secretly on the side with a team of developing a microscope that can see living tissues and stuff like that. Fantastic. Akin akin to what the rife microscope will kind of be a little similar. So I don't, he hasn't said anything else, but I thought that was very interesting. And I, and I'm, I've been, you know, asking questions and seeing what he is doing well because that can be a def a definite solution for

Mike Stone (01:24:05):

Sure. Na nascent's microscope still works, or, or nason.

Jacob Diaz (01:24:09):

I think so.

Mike Stone (01:24:10):

Yeah. I just, I haven't, I don't know anyone who actually uses it. That's the thing. Exactly.

Jacob Diaz (01:24:14):

But they don't use the ones that make sense.

Mike Stone (01:24:16):

Yeah.

Jacob Diaz (01:24:17):

Um, Donya, do you have any final thoughts on if it's valid?

Mike Donio (01:24:22):

Um, I mean, I think the, the, the critical point is I, the ideal situation would be to have something like the rife microscope that you can visualize a particle of this size without having to do all these manipulations. Um, but the problem is we're right now severely limited. So if we want something to use to be able to evaluate a sample and say what, what may or may not be in there, that's, that's what we have to use right now. We have to recognize though the, the severe limitations of that technology, and we have to ensure that we have all the proper controls, you know, so we have to be able to start with a pure

solution, not accrued sample a bunch of tissue, you know, that that can so easily be confounded, uh, and, you know, try to deconvolute it as much as possible with the notion that there still is gonna be a considerable amount of, uh, lack of clarity in terms of what is truly there.

(01:25:25):

And that's gonna require additional steps and, um, things. And I, you know, I mean, having done a lot of these preparations and different tissue types and things, I mean, I, I, I always know that when you're doing this kind of stuff, fixations and staining and stuff like that, like, I never expect that in any way, shape or form to mimic something that's going on in, in the body. I know that that is just a procedure that you're undertaking to try to utilize this technology fully understanding that you are manipulating that to a certain degree depending on the, what you're doing, and that it's going to have some sort of an effect. Ideally, we would be trying to gravitate more towards something that can visualize in real time live, you know, minimally processed samples that are not allowing for any kind of DeGrado degradation process to occur.

(01:26:22):

So like, you can remove something from a, an animal, a person, and visualize it right away. But, you know, again, we have to, we're, we're limited. So if we wanna find something of, or, or evaluate something of this size, you know, we have to just work with it. So it's like, yeah, if there was something better that came along, I think the answer would be to scrap em for that. But, you know, we kind of have to work with what we have right now, but we have to insist that it's done correctly with the proper controls and everything, and that it's interpreted, right, so that you're not putting too much into it because you can only go so far with it.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:27:01):

I wouldn't, I wouldn't drive that car. <laugh>. Yeah, yeah, yeah. That car, that, that's too many assumptions based on wheels that may not turn, you know, the engine may not be there, the transmission sort of, kind of maybe works, you know, some engineer will say, yes, some engineer, I wouldn't drive that car.

Jacob Diaz (01:27:17):

The wheel is moving, but the hamster is dead. <laugh>. Yeah. Well that fantastic conversation. And for me, I, I'm, I agree with all of you guys. I mean, it's not valid and we need something better. Um, and like Stone mentioned, I mean, we, we use em to point out the issues with em. It's a good point. Um, if, for me, my, my personal opinion, we are 99% what molecularly water. So dehydrating, you know, bombarding with em, beans poisoning, all that stuff is going to affect the structure of our water, the structure of our water molecules, which will then express within ourselves very differently when we do these experiments. So if we are changing our makeup of our body, which is 99% of us, how can we make conclusions based on the results of experiments that are just completely erroneous and changing everything that we are in our body? Um, which is a good segue into our other session with Beta Austin, which we, we'll talk about water, but that'll be for another time. But thank you very much for joining us. Uh, please subscribe to this, uh, summit to the co the end of Covid summit filled with fantastic, uh, speakers and topics, and we're gonna try to answer everything about everything. I hope you guys enjoyed this conversation and it was a pleasure talking with you four as well. Definitely a pleasure.

Mike Donio (01:28:45):

Thank you. Thank you.

Dr. Marizelle Arce (01:28:46):

Thanks.