

Refutation of Virology: There Is No Scientific Proof That Natural Pathogenic Viruses Exist

[Refutation of Virology: There Is No Scientific Proof That Natural Pathogenic Viruses Exist](#)

commentary sourced from [Medic Debate](#)

video by [ALightOn](#)

January 28, 2023

Refutation of Virology

There is no scientific proof that natural pathogenic "viruses" exist.

Following the rules of thought and logic there can be no mutation or gain-of-function of non-existent virus. There is no viral spike protein, etc.

One cannot mutate something in the labs that does not exist to start with.

[Video available at ALightOn [bitchute](#) and [odysee](#) channels]

Transcript provided by [Truth Comes to Light:](#)

Dear world, viruses don't exist.

I know that sounds crazy, but sometimes we get things wrong, and it gets passed along for centuries and centuries until a few brave people try and change things.

See, they take a sick person and assume they have a virus without ever finding and isolating that viral particle and validating that it's there.

So they take a sample of that sick person's boogers and put it on some monkey kidney cells that are already be weakened and starved of nutrients.

In the same culture they add a number of ingredients. Two of those ingredients are amphotericin and gentamicin. These are nephrotoxic antibiotics.

Antibiotics kill life. Nephrotoxins specifically kill kidneys.

Now, the marker for proving any new virus is the cytopathic effect, aka cell death. When those monkey cells die, boom, you got yourself a new virus. At least according to mainstream science.

That's like putting paper into fire and expecting it not to burn.

Yep. Viruses are an inside job.

The problem here, besides the fact that they never validated a virus to begin with, is that virologists don't do a control experiment. How scientific.

Dr. Stefan Lanka, however, decided to actually do controls.

He did the same culture experiments without adding any sample from any sick person. And guess what? Those monkey cells still died.

So the marker for proving a virus is present with no virus, even if you believe there was ever one in there.

This can only mean that there is no such thing as viruses according to the process they use to prove them.

And, yes, all viruses are proven this way.

I know what you're thinking. Well, if there are no viruses, then what's making people sick?

Well, it's not my job to figure that out. I'm refuting a theory.

Imagine your kid tells you he heard noises and there's an evil butt gremlin under his bed. So you check under the bed, and there's no evil butt gremlin anywhere in sight. You've refuted his theory of evil butt gremlins. And he says, well, if there are no evil butt gremlins, then why did I hear those noises?

Who knows? Could have been a drafty window. Could have been a creaky floor. But we do know it wasn't an evil butt gremlin.

Just like we do know people aren't getting sick from a floating submicroscopic particle.

Could have been common exposure to toxins, bad food, bad water, bad air, household cleaners, bad feelings.

It would be silly to continue to believe in evil butt gremlins when it was only ever an idea.

Just like it would be silly to continue to believe in viruses when they've never been proven.

[Connect with Medic Debate](#)

Connect with ALight0n – [bitchute](#) – [odysee](#)

Cover image credit: [andreamsantana](#)