

# “No Need to Isolate the New Virus, We Have Its Genetic Sequence”: Really?

## [“No Need to Isolate the New Virus, We Have Its Genetic Sequence”: Really?](#)

*“Isolate” means: “There it is, we see DIRECT evidence of it, it’s not attached to anything else, it’s not possibly hidden in a glob of cellular material, it’s not just a piece of some decaying old virus, it’s not a random chunk of DNA or RNA, it’s not a Maybe floating in a soup of cells in a dish, it’s not an assumption based on what we’re predisposed to find...”*

by [Jon Rappoport](#), [No More Fake News](#)

August 25, 2020

The headline of this article is a typical defense offered to “prove” researchers actually discovered a new pandemic virus, SARS-CoV-2.

It’s laughable.

They have the genetic sequence of the virus? Well, where did they get it? From the man in the moon? An old 10,000-dollar bill in Bill Gates’ wallet?

You need a pure specimen of the virus to start with, if you want to make sure you’re fleshing out its genetic sequence.

A piece of RNA, as a starting sample, doesn’t work. It’s somewhere between a random shot in the dark and a preconceived notion.

Let’s say, instead of a purified and isolated virus, separated

from all surrounding material, we're talking about a gun used in a crime. At trial, a lab technician from the vaunted FBI lab is testifying.

Defense Attorney: So you're sure the gun was recovered from my client's car?

FBI tech: Absolutely.

Defense Attorney: Please explain how you located the gun.

FBI tech: It was in the junkyard.

Defense Attorney: Excuse me?

FBI tech: Well, you see, the defendant's car was in an auto junkyard, along with about a thousand other cars. His car wasn't actually in one piece. It had been taken apart. And then there was the dog.

Defense Attorney: The dog?

FBI tech: The watch dog. He roams over the whole junkyard. He picks up objects in his mouth and runs around with them. We found his saliva on the gun.

Defense Attorney: The gun used in the crime.

FBI tech: As far as we know. The weapon was pretty banged up. Apparently, it had been in a car that was crushed in one of those machines.

Defense Attorney: I see. Did you actually discover DNA from my client on the gun?

FBI tech: Yes. Well, I mean, we found human DNA on the gun. The sample was mixed with other DNA from an unknown source. It was difficult to separate the two samples from each other.

Defense Attorney: How difficult?

FBI tech: Isolation wasn't possible. We couldn't make a positive ID. But we did find a tiny piece of red thread on the gun. We determined it came from a shirt.

Defense Attorney: My client doesn't own a red shirt.

FBI tech: He might have discarded a red shirt. And he does own shirts. Generally speaking.

At this point, the judge leans over and says to the FBI lab tech, "Are you drunk?"

FBI tech: Certainly not, Your Honor. I might have had a few drinks with lunch. I sometimes do.

So much for isolation of the gun.

Or the virus.

Intelligent researchers, where they exist, do talk about isolation and purification of a new virus from surrounding material. And if they understand what those two terms mean, they know how important this process is.

It's the difference between saying WE HAVE DIRECT EVIDENCE OF THE VIRUS and WE HAVE SOME STUFF THAT MIGHT CONTAIN A VIRUS IF WE'RE LUCKY.

In past articles, I've detailed how large coherent studies should be done (but aren't), using electron microscopy, to determine a) whether or not a new virus has been discovered, and b) how probable it is that the virus, if it exists, is causing harm to some people (whose immune systems are already compromised).

Nothing is riding on all this except the immediate future of the human race—since political leaders have decided to destroy untold numbers of jobs, businesses, and lives, all based on a story about a new pandemic virus.

Talk about a sell-job. They don't have to isolate the virus because they've found its genetic sequence. That's called putting the cart before the horse.

Based on this reasoning, I believe I could say I've discovered a thousand viruses in my cellar. I have "their genetic sequences." Meaning: I've found sequences from who-knows-what listed in old public reports.

In elementary logic, students are taught that inferences flow from prior premises and propositions and simple rules. If you erase those premises and propositions and rules, you have nothing. You have conclusions whose basis is missing.

The statement, "We have the genetic sequence," is meant to hypnotize the uninformed, who have been trained to salute any claim which refers to genes, as if they're magic.

For example, there was a period during which researchers tried to pass off the idea, "one disease, one gene is the cause." Eventually, they were forced to admit this notion didn't fly. It was a simpleton's fantasy. They then retreated and concocted a different hypothesis: any given disease was caused by a collection of genes, acting in concert. This soupy assertion had the advantage of vagueness; it was hyped as a moving target. If one collection of genes didn't work (and it inevitably didn't), researchers, with a straight face, could say the cause must be another collection.

Junkyard science.

"We might have found something that resembled a gun near a piece of what was once someone's car, in a location filled with tens of thousands of pieces of cars. And there was a dog."

Brilliant precision.

"We've narrowed down the search for the killer, Chief. There's

a twelve-percent chance he was in New York last Thursday.”

“How many people were in New York last Thursday?”

“About seven million.”

“Keep going. You’re getting somewhere.”