

And On and On It Goes: Dawn Lester on Why the “No Virus” Issue Remains So Important

[And On and On It Goes: Dawn Lester on Why the “No Virus” Issue Remains So Important](#)



“Therefore, one of the answers I would provide to the question of why the ‘no virus’ issue is so important is: that fear of ‘germs’ makes people believe that ‘disease’ can be transmitted between people, which means that we have to continue being afraid of each other.

“In fact, one of the fundamental problems with all of this is that it keeps people in a state of unjustified fear, which is disempowering. Releasing unjustified fear is empowering.”



[And On and On It Goes...](#)

by [Dawn Lester](#), [Dawn’s Writings](#)

June 11, 2023

It seems that many people wonder why the ‘no virus’ issue remains important now that the ‘pandemic’ is over.

To add to that, there are some people in the ‘freedom movement’ who have recently asserted that there are many

aspects of the globalists' agenda that are not related to health and are far more dangerous to humanity, such as technocracy, transhumanism, digital currencies, smart cities etc.

Yes, these are important issues – **really** important issues, I totally agree – but so is the idea that 'pathogenic agents' exist because it has tentacles that reach into many aspects of our lives, so it cannot be brushed aside as if irrelevant, especially in view of the complete lack of evidence to support this idea.

I would therefore recommend that people who believe in 'pathogenic agents' become aware of the various reports that claim there will be 'future pandemics'. For just one example, a 22nd May 2023 'News' item on the UN website states,

"Although COVID-19 may no longer be a global public health emergency, countries must still strengthen response to the disease and prepare for future pandemics and other threats, the Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) said on Monday in Geneva."

There has never been a 'pandemic' due to an infectious agent and there never could be. But, whilst people believe that pathogenic infectious agents exist, they will believe in the possibility of other 'pandemics'.

Therefore, one of the answers I would provide to the question of why the 'no virus' issue is so important is: that fear of 'germs' makes people believe that 'disease' can be transmitted between people, which means that we have to continue being afraid of each other.

In fact, one of the fundamental problems with all of this is that it keeps people in a state of unjustified fear, which is disempowering. Releasing unjustified fear is empowering.

Furthermore, fear of 'germs' makes people acquiesce to measures that are claimed to be for their benefit but are far more likely to be harmful, and in many cases potentially or even actually fatal.

For example, the maintenance of a belief in pathogens permits the maintenance of a belief in the idea that STIs are real, as demonstrated by a recent BBC article *Gonorrhoea and syphilis sex infections reach record levels in England*,

"England is seeing record high levels of gonorrhoea and syphilis sexually transmitted infections, following a dip during Covid years, new figures reveal."

Is the claim that these STIs 'dipped' during the Covid years intended to suggest that people maintaining their distance from one another was beneficial? This point is not elaborated upon, so maybe it was not intended to imply that. Still, the point was stated, so maybe it was intended to be drawn into the sub-conscious mind.

One of the key messages in the BBC article is that people should 'practise safe sex' – whatever that means. In order to be 'safe', people are encouraged to 'get themselves tested' – does this sound familiar?

In addition, the article states that,

"The age group most likely to be diagnosed with a sexually transmitted infection (STI) is people who are 15-24."

The reason for STIs to mainly affect young people is not explained, although it is possibly because this age group is more likely to be tested, as the article indicates,

"Some of the rise will be due to increased testing, but the scale of the surge strongly suggests that there are more of the infections around, says the UKHSA."

A particularly significant comment made by the spokesperson for the UKHSA, and reported in the article, is that,

“Testing is important because you may not have any symptoms of an STI.”

Yet, according to the CDC,

“An infection occurs when germs enter the body, increase in number, and cause a reaction of the body.”

In other words, an infection causes a reaction or ‘symptoms’, **but** infected people may not have symptoms. A contradiction in terms, surely!

Just to be clear, the definition of ‘symptom’ according to the online Merriam-Webster dictionary is,

“...subjective evidence of disease or physical disturbance.”

So, to summarise: according to the medical establishment, a symptom is evidence of disease and ‘germs’ are pathogens, which means they cause disease, which is defined by the presence of symptoms. Yet ‘germs’ are said to be able to cause an infection even in the complete absence of symptoms.

Confused? You should be, because this is all nonsense!

But it is nonsense that people are not only expected to believe without question, but are not allowed to question.

Maybe it is because this is all so confusing that people are likely to just switch off their thinking, because they don’t understand it, and instead defer to the so-called ‘experts’. I am not being disrespectful. I do wonder, however, whether this approach may be intentional and that those in control of the narrative intentionally promote contradictory information to ensure that people are confused.

Deferring to 'experts' is however, a serious error of judgement, because it means people will believe the experts' reports about 'germs' and become trapped in a false narrative that they may have been 'infected'. This in turn will make them believe that they need to take certain drugs and act in a certain way to 'protect' themselves from other people or protect other people from them, especially people with whom they are in a loving relationship. They are made to believe the idea that they could cause harm to their partner or vice versa, and they therefore live in fear.

This fear is fuelled by a variety of statements, such as the claim in the BBC article that,

"An untreated infection can lead to infertility, pelvic inflammatory disease and can be passed on to a child during pregnancy."

There is no evidence for this claim. Yet, this is exactly the kind of message that will encourage people to want to be tested to make sure they are 'safe'. Again, does this sound familiar?

An even deeper problem is highlighted by the comment from the Chief Executive of the Terrence Higgins who is reported to have said that,

"Sexual health services and public health budgets have been cut to the bone."

This comment was followed by his statement that,

"This was exacerbated and laid bare by last year's mpox outbreak, which left sexual health clinics in the most affected areas unable to provide HIV and STI testing, HIV prevention and access to contraception due to the displacement of these core and vital services. Until sexual health is properly resourced – with an appointment easier to

access than a (sic) – we won't see the number of STIs heading in the right direction."

Where do I start with this?

OK, so the Terrence Higgins Trust web page *About our charity* states,

"We're the UK's leading HIV and sexual health charity. We support people living with HIV and amplify their voices, and help the people using our services to achieve good sexual health."

I realise that I don't have a Substack article specifically about HIV, but this is one I wrote about STDs,

[There's No Such Thing as a Sexually-Transmitted Disease](#)

In addition, I wrote an article about monkeypox last year,

[Monkeypox: Yet More Madness](#)

HIV is a huge topic, but the fundamental point to convey here is that there is no evidence, and there never was, that there is such a thing as a 'virus' called HIV that is the cause of a health problem called AIDS – or any other health problem for that matter.

It is abundantly clear that there is a lot at stake here. It is also crystal clear that belief in the existence of any kind of pathogenic agent is absolutely essential for organisations such as the Terrence Higgins Trust (THT), as well as 'health' institutions, such as the WHO, CDC, NHS, and all the other alphabet agencies.

I have no idea of the motives of those who are in charge of the THT, nor do I intend to speculate on them. However, whether they know it or not, what they are promoting on their website is fully supportive of Agenda 2030 and the 'Global

Goals', as the message at the foot of their website claims,

"Time is running out. Donate now and together we can end new cases of HIV in the UK by 2030."

To those in the 'truther' community who claim that the 2030 Agenda has nothing to do with the 'virus' issue I would strongly suggest that they read SDG3, especially target 3.3.



Target

3.3

By 2030, end the epidemics of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and neglected tropical diseases and combat hepatitis, water-borne diseases and other communicable diseases

And target 3b



Target

3.b

Support the research and development of vaccines and medicines for the communicable and non-communicable diseases that primarily affect developing countries, provide access to affordable essential medicines and vaccines, in accordance with the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, which affirms the right of developing countries to use to the full the provisions in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights regarding flexibilities to protect public health, and, in particular, provide access to medicines for all

The 'no virus' issue – and the associated understanding that there is no proof that any 'diseases' are caused by any 'microorganism', whether bacteria, fungi or parasites ('viruses' aren't relevant in this context) – is and remains an extremely important issue; especially in view of the intended 2030 Agenda rollout of vaccines, because vaccines rely on the existence of pathogenic infectious agents.

Another reason to understand its importance is because the idea that 'germs' cause illness that only the medical establishment can address supports the idea that we need a 'health service' to look after us when we become ill, which is not the case. To this, I would add a caveat that accident and emergency services **ARE** important and should remain in place, although those who work in that sector should receive further training to teach them how the body actually works, and how it can and does heal itself; this knowledge will certainly improve patient recovery times and outcomes.

We may not reach everyone, but the importance of the 'no virus' issue cannot be underestimated. When people lose their fear of 'germs' of all descriptions, they will be able to concentrate their efforts on all the other aspects of their lives.

People can only make informed decisions when they are in possession of all the relevant information.

[Connect with Dawn Lester](#)

Cover image credit: [fernandozhiminaicela](#)