

Part 2: The Steve Kirsch Debate on the Existence of the Virus

[Part 2: The Steve Kirsch Debate on the Existence of the Virus](#)

Doing revolutionary science

by [Jon Rappoport](#), [Jon Rappoport substack](#)

August 8, 2022

I'm moving on from [Part 1](#) into a completely different area.

There is lab work in the sciences that crucially affects populations. Two examples: virologists claiming they've isolated SARS-CoV-2; and researchers deciding they've found a way to adapt RNA technology to produce a COVID vaccine.

In the first case, the purported discovery of SARS-CoV-2 enabled the launch of the global pandemic announcement, which eventually led to the lockdowns and the crashing of economies. In the second case, the RNA-vaccine "breakthrough" led to the vaccination of billions of people, and massive numbers of injuries and deaths.

These are crucial effects, to say the least.

And yet, those on the outside, who have no access to these labs AS THE WORK IS BEING DONE, those who are independent scientists and analysts and can only read the studies once they are published—

—This is an unconscionable situation, when you stop and think about it.

The whole world is changed by the research, but we can't watch

it IN PROGRESS.

People have been brainwashed into thinking this lack of access to labs is normal. Standard. Non-official persons entering these labs and tracking the work step by step would amount to a criminal invasion. That's what we're supposed to believe:

"Just accept our statements about our findings and shut up and obey."

"We're the pros. You're the idiots."

"We're certified. You're the guinea pigs."

"Call security, call the FBI, call DHS, terrorists are trying to break into our lab."

"This is a holy sanctum, anointed by God. You're a mortal sinner."

Here's my kind of debate on the existence of SARS-Cov-2. Here's my bottom, bottom line.

Virologists are compelled to replicate, in the lab, the so-called discovery of SARS-CoV-2. An outside team of truly independent scientists and journalists is present.

So is a camera crew. With many cameras. And many mics.

The team watches every single move the virologists make. Any member of the team can stop the work and ask a question or criticize a move.

The questions and answers and the criticisms and replies are all recorded. Ditto for every action the virologists take.

THIS is a REAL debate. The most real debate.

"Wait. That's ridiculous. You can't expect these highly trained virologists to submit themselves to this kind of...inspection."

Of course I can.

For example: Our team member in the lab says, "All right, you're observing that the monkey cells and the human cells in this soup you've created are dying off. You claim the killer must be 'the virus' in the patient's tissue sample—the sample you dropped in the soup. You claim nothing else in the soup could be killing the cells. So let me ask you this? Where is the control experiment?"

"The what?"

"The control. My, my. You really forgot about that?"

"I don't understand. Turn off the cameras."

"Leave them on, boys. This is interesting. Let me explain, Dr. High Horse. You should have a second dish of soup that is absolutely identical to the first dish, except the second dish does NOT contain the tissue sample from a patient. You also keep an eye on that second dish and see whether the monkey cells and the human cells in it die off. If they do...then your contention that 'the virus' in the patient sample is killing those cells is worthless. And you have no evidence your virus is in the patient sample. Or that it exists."

"Oh. Well..."

"Well, what? You don't mean to say all those virologists in all those labs who claimed they found the new virus omitted the control experiment, do you?"

YOU KNOW, THAT KIND OF THING. THAT KIND OF INVESTIGATION.

On camera, in the lab, in person.

"That would never happen. They would never let you in there."

Which proves what? I'm just stating what the MOST REAL DEBATE WOULD CONSIST OF, in a half-sane world. It would look exactly

like that.

Here's a parallel for you. A civilian no one ever heard of develops a car he says runs on water. He says he's got a new process that VERY cheaply splits the water into hydrogen and oxygen, and the car runs on the hydrogen.

Over years and decades, the legend grows. Finally, major media are starting to nibble around the edges of the story.

So one day, a bunch of Saudis and oil execs and scientists and men in suits show up at this man's garage, and express great interest in his work. THEY REALLY WANT TO KNOW WHETHER THIS CRAZY GUY HAS STUMBLERD ON A REVOLUTIONARY WAY TO POWER A CAR.

So what would they ask him to do?

See, they're the outsiders with no access, and he's the insider.

Are they just going to ask him for assurances?

Hell no. They're going to ask him to take the engine apart and put it back together again. They're going to ask him to take the fuel system apart and put it back together again. They're going to want to go through his whole car and his garage and his kitchen and his bathroom with a fine-toothed comb. BECAUSE THEY WANT TO GET TO THE BOTTOM OF THIS SITUATION, SINCE IT COULD AFFECT THE FUTURE OF CIVILIZATION, AND THEIR PROFITS, AND SO ON.

They're not screwing around.

And neither should we.

Our lives and futures and the lives of future generations are on the line with this "virus thing."

We should be looking at every beaker and tube and slide and instrument in the virology lab. We should be looking over the

shoulders of the virologists and watching every move they make and asking pointed questions and demanding answers.

So we really know whether they're doing science or preposterous bullshit.

And of course we wouldn't be paying attention to random assurances from "highly qualified and respected scientists" along the way. We'd be studiously ignoring them.

If you need another parallel to the real kind of investigation I'm demanding, think of bringing a team into the Vatican and inspecting every inch of space in every building, including the basements and caverns...to see what's really there. The whole enchilada.

All right, you get the idea. You see what I'm asking for.

Now, short of that, what do we have? What can we get access to?

Well, it's not entirely reliable, but here it is:

We can read published studies which claim to have found SARS-CoV-2. Those studies all have methods sections. In them, the researchers describe, step by step, what they did to "isolate the virus."

We have that.

I'm now going to republish one of those methods sections, chunk by chunk, and have Dr. Andrew Kaufman make his criticisms as we go along. I published all this about a year ago.

I want to emphasize that Dr. Kaufman's analysis should be just the beginning of highly detailed analyses of these methods sections, from a number of other independent critics. We need much more of this.

The devil is in the details.

Here we go:

I found several studies that used very similar language in explaining how “SARS-CoV-2 was isolated.” For example, “*Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 from Patient with Coronavirus Disease, United States, (Emerging Infectious Diseases, Vol. 26, No. 6 – June 2020)*”.

STUDY: “We used Vero CCL-81 cells for isolation and initial passage [in the soup in the lab]...”

KAUFMAN: “Vero cells are foreign cells from the kidneys of monkeys and a source of contamination. Virus particles should be purified directly from clinical samples in order to prove the virus actually exists. Isolation means separation from everything else. So how can you separate/isolate a virus when you add it to something else?”

STUDY: “...We cultured Vero E6, Vero CCL-81, HUH 7.0, 293T, A549, and EFKB3 cells in Dulbecco minimal essential medium (DMEM) supplemented with heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (5% or 10%)...”

KAUFMAN: “Why use minimal essential media, which provides incomplete nutrition [to the cells]? Fetal bovine serum is a source of foreign genetic material and extracellular vesicles, which are indistinguishable from viruses.”

STUDY: “...We used both NP and OP swab specimens for virus isolation. For isolation, limiting dilution, and passage 1 of the virus, we pipetted 50 μ L of serum-free DMEM into columns 2–12 of a 96-well tissue culture plate, then pipetted 100 μ L of clinical specimens into column 1 and serially diluted 2-fold across the plate...”

KAUFMAN: “Once again, misuse of the word isolation.”

STUDY: “...We then trypsinized and resuspended Vero cells in

DMEM containing 10% fetal bovine serum, 2× penicillin/streptomycin, 2× antibiotics/antimycotics, and 2× amphotericin B at a concentration of 2.5×10^5 cells/mL...”

KAUFMAN: “Trypsin is a pancreatic enzyme that digests proteins. Wouldn’t that cause damage to the cells and particles in the culture which have proteins on their surfaces, including the so called spike protein?”

KAUFMAN: “Why are antibiotics added? Sterile technique is used for the culture. Bacteria may be easily filtered out of the clinical sample by commercially available filters (GIBCO). Finally, bacteria may be easily seen under the microscope and would be readily identified if they were contaminating the sample. The specific antibiotics used, streptomycin and amphotericin (aka ‘ampho-terrible’), are toxic to the kidneys and we are using kidney cells in this experiment! Also note they are used at ‘2X’ concentration, which appears to be twice the normal amount. These will certainly cause damage to the Vero cells.”

STUDY: “...We added [*not isolated*] 100 µL of cell suspension directly to the clinical specimen dilutions and mixed gently by pipetting. We then grew the inoculated cultures in a humidified 37°C incubator in an atmosphere of 5% CO₂ and observed for cytopathic effects (CPEs) daily. We used standard plaque assays for SARS-CoV-2, which were based on SARS-CoV and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV) protocols...”

STUDY: “When CPEs were observed, we scraped cell monolayers with the back of a pipette tip...”

KAUFMAN: “There was no negative control experiment described. Control experiments are required for a valid interpretation of the results. Without that, how can we know if it was the toxic soup of antibiotics, minimal nutrition, and dying tissue from a sick person which caused the cellular damage or a phantom

virus? A proper control would consist of the same exact experiment except that the clinical specimen should come from a person with illness unrelated to covid, such as cancer, since that would not contain a virus.”

STUDY: “...We used 50 μ L of viral lysate for total nucleic acid extraction for confirmatory testing and sequencing. We also used 50 μ L of virus lysate to inoculate a well of a 90% confluent 24-well plate.”

KAUFMAN: “How do you confirm something that was never previously shown to exist? What did you compare the genetic sequences to? How do you know the origin of the genetic material since it came from a cell culture containing material from humans and all their microflora, fetal cows, and monkeys?”

—end of study quotes and Kaufman analysis—

Readers who are unfamiliar with my work (over 500 articles on the subject of the “pandemic” during the past two years) will ask: Then why are people dying? What about the huge number of cases and deaths? I have answered these and other questions in great detail. The subject of this article is: have researchers proved SARS-CoV-2 exists?

The answer is no.

As I stated, Dr. Kaufman’s analysis should be just the beginning of intense and detailed examination of studies that describe “how the virus was isolated.”

As opposed to a few hours of Zoom debate in which people summarize their opposing positions, and then submit to a vote from a panel of judges who descend from the sky with motives as pure as Superman and Wonder Woman. All this happens with Steve Kirsch in the background holding a million dollar prize. In Vegas, Steve would be called the house. And the house always wins.

No dice.

[Connect with Jon Rappoport](#)

cover image based on creative commons works of [geralt](#)