

# The Covid “Sceptics” Who Spread Viral Dogma

## [The Covid “Sceptics” Who Spread Viral Dogma](#)

Roger is determined to win  
€1 500 000.

With his grandad's sextant,  
he believes he can get  
scientific proof of the  
existence of a coronavirus.

Lucky he took that course  
called "Triangulation for  
dummies."



by [Dr. Sam Bailey](#)

March 17, 2022

*“The real purpose of the scientific method is to make sure Nature hasn’t misled you into thinking something you don’t actually know...One logical slip and an entire scientific edifice comes tumbling down. One false deduction about the machine and you can get hung up indefinitely.”*

– Robert Pirsig, Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance

On 11 March 2022, an [article](#) was published on The Daily Sceptic website titled “The Real Truth About Viruses”. It was written by Dr Roger Watson, a PhD-qualified registered nurse, who recently retired from the United Kingdom’s higher education sector and now has a part-time position as Academic Dean of Nursing at Southwest Medical University, China. The article was a blatant hit piece against me, typically the domain of the controlled corporate media, so it was a surprise to see it on a website that developed from Lockdown Sceptics. They have the motto “question everything” but apparently you shouldn’t question germ theory and the existence of viruses!

“Question Everything”...except germ theory and viral existence, that’s pure crazy.

Dr Watson appeared to know very little about my work and never attempted to make contact with me before he did his hit and run. We offered him the chance to come on my channel but he declined saying “I am not sure how fruitful a debate with me would be,” perhaps not feeling confident about backing up his claims or perhaps a little shaken by the derision he received in the comments section on the Sceptics website. Much of his article was ad hominem in nature and doesn’t need to be dignified with a response but I will proceed to address his inaccurate scientific claims point by point...

*“I would like to hear Duesberg or Sam Bailey explain how haemophiliacs contracted AIDS from blood infusions. Somehow, I think they’ll have a stock response to that one.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

It is unclear why Watson has conflated my views with [Peter Duesberg](#) and his sentence will take some unpacking. His reference to Peter is a link to Wikipedia, a known [disinformation](#) site, which should raise a red flag for a sceptic or anyone wanting to know more about a topic. Peter

does not claim that viruses don't exist: he is one of the world's most prominent retrovirologists after all! His position is that the HIV particle exists but that it is a harmless "passenger" virus that does not cause the clinical condition AIDS. I know he outlined the evidence of why haemophiliacs do not become "infected" through blood product transfusions [here](#) but cannot otherwise speak for him. My position is that there is no proof of the existence of a retrovirus called HIV and that the particles nominated "HIV" have never been shown to fulfil the definition of a virus. Thus "HIV" has not been shown to cause AIDS.

In this regard, the biggest influence on both myself and my [Virus Mania](#) co-authors has been the work of [The Perth Group](#). Watson fails to define what he means by "haemophiliacs contracted AIDS from blood" but presumably he means that the reason some haemophiliacs develop AIDS is because there is a pathogenic virus that is being transmitted to them via infected blood. (They actually receive factor VIII concentrate from pooled blood donations.) I am unaware of any research demonstrating HIV particles in blood or any human or animal models showing transmission of "infected" blood that then causes a recipient to develop AIDS. In Virus Mania we explain that "HIV" cannot be the explanation for the development of AIDS in haemophiliacs. Increased death rates did correspond to changes such as the introduction of "anti-viral" pharmaceuticals including the highly toxic AZT in "HIV positive" patients. If Watson wants to get serious about claiming that a virus is being transmitted to haemophiliacs and causing AIDS then he should have an attempt at refuting The Perth Group's 1995 [paper](#) "Factor VIII, HIV and AIDS in haemophiliacs: an analysis of their relationship". In my estimation it is the best I have come across and I would welcome Watson's critique of what I've missed.

*"Her views have been debunked regarding the existence of viruses but, possibly unknown to many who are unwilling to*

*wade into the depths and breadths of her views, she denies germ theory completely."*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson doesn't let his readers know how he established I've been "debunked" or by who. Instead he provides a link to a small [blog post](#) written by a University of Waikato employee and Pfizer BioNTech injection enthusiast Alison Campbell. Campbell set up the blog "as a resource for secondary school biology teachers preparing students for Scholarship Biology examinations" which is probably not the level Watson should be aiming for in this debate. If he checked Campbell's [usual publications](#) he would have realised that she has no experience in virology or medical matters. In fact, when we reached out to her she quickly retreated and would not even agree to a phone call. Watson follows in the footsteps of our state-sponsored mainstream media who also used this largely ad hominem rant as "evidence" against me. I've already [responded](#) to Campbell and the MSM's little foray into virology – unfortunately, like Watson, they are limited to repeating the claims of the virologists on face value.

I'm not sure why my views on germ theory would be "unknown" to my viewers as I openly point out that I do not believe it is satisfactory model. Virus Mania is largely dedicated to dismantling germ theory and my views are closest to that of "terrain theory". I outline why I'm in the terrain camp in much of my work, including in my video "[Germ Theory vs Terrain Theory](#)". For those not familiar with Virus Mania, a window into the book can be found in this [short essay](#) I wrote with my co-authors.

*"This essay is prompted by the most recent video from Sam Bailey: The Truth About Viruses published on March 9th 2022. She is to be congratulated for its brevity – it is only 17 minutes long – but it is presented in a typically sneering, sarcastic and patronising manner."*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson seems to completely miss that this video is a light-hearted and satirical take on some of the historical claims of the virologists. It was designed to engage a wider audience with material that can be a boring subject for many. If he wanted to have a serious discussion about a particular topic then he could have easily accessed my other published work or contacted me to fill in any gaps.

*"It is hard to understand how Sam Bailey arrives at her views and it is not necessary to be a virus denier to be highly critical of the way the pandemic was managed."*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson has ignored the vast majority of my work and never bothered to converse with me so perhaps it is not surprising that he is confused. I'm not sure why anyone would decide to be a "virus denier" because they needed to criticise "pandemic" management or how this is relevant to his argument. In fact, it's disingenuous to even suggest such a modus operandi and it slumps into the argument of the destitute.

*"After all, anti (Covid) 'vaxxer' supreme, Dr. Mike Yeadon made it clear in his excellent interview with Neil Oliver on GB News that he believes a unique virus exists. The HART Group led by Dr. John Lee, who have mounted the most credible and well-informed responses to the UK lockdown, is not stocked with virus deniers."*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson has not provided any evidence for the existence of viruses here: his argument seems to be that other people believe in viruses, therefore viruses exist. Some people also believe in the tooth fairy but that would not affect my own investigations into the topic. Appeal to common opinion is a type of faulty reasoning that also plagues the medical community. Heretics like myself are prepared to examine the evidence for ourselves and reach our own conclusions, not

parrot those of others. We are not motivated by the number of people who agree with us and our publications are not restricted by governments, institutions, or colleagues. Note to Dr Watson: in all the virology textbooks I've looked at, the method of proving the existence of a virus does not include 'beliefs held by Dr Mike Yeadon'. (For the record: I have no problem with Dr Yeadon, we just have different thoughts on the existence of viruses.)

*"It is hard to know where to start but, since she denies germ theory itself – as properly understood – I will start here with Dr Bailey's views on whether anything exists that can cause an infection and spread between people. Louis Pasteur comes in for criticism by Bailey in her Delingpod interview. I am sure Pasteur was not perfect but he did knock the theory of spontaneous generation a body blow with his swan neck flask experiment."*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

I'm unsure what Watson means by "properly understood" germ theory. My investigations into germ theory, which are dealt with in Virus Mania and videos such as "[Koch's Postulates: Germ School Dropout](#)," have informed me that the theory is fatally flawed. I have looked into Koch's original work and he did not fulfil his own postulates correctly. His often uncontrolled experiments failed to take into account the traumatic effects of his procedures on animals or consider other factors that were making them ill. With regards to "infection" spreading between people, it seems that clinical experiments have struggled to demonstrate this phenomenon. Perhaps the most spectacular failure has been the inability to ever demonstrate transmission of influenza, as I outlined in this video [here](#) and ViroLIEgy's Mike Stone detailed [here](#). If Watson wants to send me a paper that proves the concept of microbes transmitting between humans to make them ill, then I would be happy to critique it. Pasteur's work has been exposed as largely fraudulent, but it is unclear why Watson is




bringing in his spontaneous generation and swan neck flask experiments and how that relates to anything I've published. Perhaps he thought terrain theory was claiming that microbes appear on the basis of spontaneous generation?

*"Dr. Bailey has batted the theory of disease back into the 19th Century. Edward Jenner was another scoundrel according to Bailey and, while his experiments would not have passed muster with an NHS ethics committee, you can see where Bailey is going and leading her disciples into the realm of the 'anti-vaxxers', a topic which I will not explore here."*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson may be shocked to know that I'm not the only one who has [questioned](#) the alleged contributions Jenner has made to human health through the practice of vaccination. I would also suggest he reads the book [Dissolving Illusions](#), or at least examine the [charts](#) that Dr Suzanne Humphries and Roman Bystrianyk have put together, if he believes that the smallpox vaccine or any other vaccine has been shown to be of benefit to the public.



*The realm of “anti-vaxxers” and their bloody inconvenient, irrefutable data!*

I am up front about my position on vaccines as it is clearly stated on my website [FAQs](#) that, “I am not ‘anti-vaccination’ in the sense that I don’t wish to tell other people what to do with their bodies. I’m always happy to consider new evidence, but for me personally, I don’t believe any current vaccine can provide health benefits for myself or my loved ones.” It is unclear to me why Watson thinks I am “leading disciples” into any realm. If he thinks he has sound evidence that vaccines lead to better health outcomes then he is welcome to provide it – our Virus Mania team has sought such data from major institutions such as the Robert Koch Institute for many years and they have been unable to provide it.

*“She mentions, in passing, the famous TMV (tobacco mosaic virus) in a ‘that’s all very well’ kind of way. But the fact is that the TMV has been sufficiently purified for its structure to be studied by [scanning electron microscopy](#); and that represents a very high level of both isolation and purity. A plant virus it may be, with no animal equivalent, but it is the case that disproves, in a Popperian way, the argument often repeated by the virus deniers that ‘no virus has ever been purified’. Some have been sufficiently purified for study by [X-ray crystallography](#) and that represents an extremely high level of purification.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

It’s not at all convincing in his article that Watson knows the difference between isolation and purification. He refers to a microscopy study which purports to show TMV. We may need to remind Watson that a virus is a tiny replication-competent, intracellular parasite that can infect a host and pass onto other hosts. Apart from images of tiny particles, there is nowhere in the paper he cites that any of these key properties are demonstrated. I have explained in my video “[Electron](#)



[Microscopy and Unidentified “Viral” Objects](#)” the limitations of the technique and why particles that appear amongst dead tissue cannot be classified as “viruses” without further experimental steps. His reference to an x-ray crystallography paper is likewise useless. Plenty of particles can be purified Dr Watson – the issue is that they need to be shown to be viruses. In any case, you’re in for a treat as I currently have a video in production exposing the Tobacco Mosaic “Virus” story going back to Ivanovsky’s unscientific experiments considered by some to be the beginning of virology.

*“But the fact is that the existence of any virus is triangulated by an array of increasingly sophisticated laboratory techniques whereby theories may be tested, cultures grown, and infectivity demonstrated. In fact, a great many [viruses have been purified](#), often against the odds.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Triangulation? The process of measuring distances and determining locations. Watson goes next-level cunning with his conflations to make virology look respectable again! If Watson looked at all my publications he would see that I am familiar with the historical techniques, which failed to demonstrate the existence of pathogenic viruses and how they have morphed into modern molecular detection techniques to keep the virus paradigm alive. His citation is “Virus Purification” techniques in the Encyclopedia of Virology (Fourth Edition), 2021 – I have an e-copy of this publication and am familiar with the described methods. However, Watson needs to show his hand and let us know which particles he thinks have been purified and demonstrated to be “viruses” instead of pointing at a textbook.

**Dr Watson: stop keeping us in suspense and please publish your list of viruses that were purified**

## **“against the odds” with their proofs.**

*“The virus deniers trot out the Koch’s postulates argument repeatedly, even though Koch’s postulates were simply one way – long before the advent of amino acid and nucleotide sequencing methods – of demonstrating the presence of a bacterium. Koch’s postulates were never intended to be applied to viruses – the existence of which were not known when Koch postulated.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson appears completely confused about Koch’s Postulates which relate to establishing a causative relationship between a microbe and a particular disease, and conflates it with “demonstrating the presence of a bacterium”. The postulates were designed to be applied to all microbes, but as I have stated, my investigations indicate that Koch’s Postulates have never been fulfilled and there is no sound basis to germ theory: bacteria, fungi and postulated “viruses” are not the causal agents of disease. And it doesn’t matter what nucleotide sequences or proteins you discover Dr Watson, you still need to establish where they come from – are you sure the virologists establish this or even do “sequencing”? (See below).

*“The original SARS, which almost certainly jumped species, is very unusual for that very reason and, for example, bird flu does not infect humans. The jury remains out on whether SARS-CoV-2, which possibly jumped species, did so spontaneously or after a ‘gain of function’ nudge.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Interestingly for a “sceptic”, Watson espouses most of the virology industry’s stories about viruses jumping species. Can he point to the investigations he performed to conclude something that hasn’t been shown to exist “almost certainly jumped species”? We deal with these highly speculative and sometimes baseless claims in Virus Mania and I covered the original “SARS” (and “species jumping”) in another of my

videos banned by Big Tech but still available [here](#). There is a fatal flaw regarding gain of function research with “viruses” when the pathogens themselves have not been shown to exist, as I have pointed out in more videos banned by Big Tech but still available [here](#) and [here](#). Dr Stefan Lanka has also [outlined](#) the fallacies of “bio-weapons,” including fabricated “viruses” and how they have been used to drive fear into the public for many decades.

*“I have corresponded with Siouxsie Wiles, a major debunker of the Koch’s postulates argument, at Auckland University in New Zealand over this point and over the point regarding ‘purification’ of the SARS-CoV-2 virus.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson makes an appeal to “authority” here, which was the same mistake made by Steve Kirsch when he clumsily waded into the issue of the existence of “SARS-CoV-2” in January 2022. My husband Dr Mark Bailey has previously [outlined](#) why Kirsch shouldn’t rely on such “experts”. Like Watson, Kirsch started off all guns blazing against the “virus deniers”. Like Watson, Kirsch rapidly retreated when the Baileys, [Dr Tom Cowan](#), [Dr Andy Kaufman](#), and [Dr Stefan Lanka](#) all offered to participate in a live debate with his chosen “experts”. It is odd that our “sceptic” Watson corresponds with Wiles as she is heavily promoted by the NZ government and advised our country that “the world is on fire” and we should “all behave as they [the government] are asking us to behave” in [March 2020](#).

*“If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences.”*

William Isaac Thomas and Dorothy Swaine Thomas

She is notorious for avoiding open scientific discussions and even has a lengthy automated email reply excusing herself from such pursuits. Incidentally, in February 2022, a state-sponsored media platform was [found guilty](#) of publishing one of her false claims. Watson has referred to an [article](#) by Wiles which is a case of the blind leading the naked. In the article she provides no explanation as to how disease causation is

satisfied with viruses when it is conveniently claims there are no suitable clinical experiments available. She tries to distract the reader with Falkow's molecular postulates, and fails to inform her readers that River's postulates were designed specifically for viruses but have not even been close to being fulfilled for SARS-CoV-2 – the first problem being that no one can show it exists. There is certainly nowhere in her article that demonstrates she can prove the existence of SARS-CoV-2 or any other virus, only excuses as to why direct proofs are lacking. I have previously addressed her false claims surrounding the application of the PCR in another video banned by Big Tech after several hundred thousand views, but still available [here](#). New Zealanders have endured two years of state-sponsored nonsense from Wiles, who is paraded by the MSM as a go to “expert”. I'm willing to bet that a live debate with Watson & Wiles on one side and the Baileys on the other would be very revealing.

*“It transpires that the purification of the novel coronavirus argument is a straw dog created by the viral deniers. In fact, nobody has claimed that it has been purified. However, it has been ‘[isolated](#)’, which is a different concept whereby studies are carried out to check it is there.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

If Watson hasn't already indicated that he is bringing his pocketknife into a gunfight, then this is where his pocketknife falls to the floor. I suspect he didn't know that I have already analysed Vincent Racaniello's presentation he refers to in this [video](#) (banned by Big Tech of course). It is not clear that he even listened to Racaniello's words: if the virologists don't have a specific definition of “isolation” what does Watson think it means? Can he see a problem when Racaniello says “an isolate is a virus that we have isolated...” or has he been swept up in their circular reasoning? The problem of what “isolation” means is the pivotal issue with

regards to proving the existence of viruses and the virologists have a habit of playing fast and loose. As stated by The Perth Group in [2017](#): “The fact is that in virology, while purification retains its everyday meaning, “isolation” is an expedient term virologists assign to data they claim are proof a particular virus exists.” Watson instead chooses to cheerlead the virologists denigration of the English language: if their use of the word ‘isolation’ isn’t what everyone thinks it is, then it’s useless as a method of providing proof that a particle is a virus.

Watson, however, gives the thumbs up to ‘isolate = particles + every other bit of junk in a specimen’, perhaps oblivious to the deception of the virologists.

*“According to Siouxsie Wiles, the virus has been found in hundreds of [disparate samples](#) and [subsequently sequenced](#). The viral deniers point to the way the sequence was merely pieced together in the early stages, thus proposing a hoax. But this is how viruses are sequenced.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

How on earth this made it past the Daily Sceptic editors is a mystery to me. For his source of “truth” Watson has cited “fact-checking” organisations that are supported by Big Tech, and have financial [conflicts of interest](#) with Big Pharma. If it is not apparent at this stage of the “pandemic” that these organisations have been consistently misleading the public since day one then it is difficult to believe that he really is a “sceptic”. The fraudulent invention of the “SARS-CoV-2 genome” by Fan Wu’s lab has been [exposed](#) by Stefan Lanka’s team and it was even worse than the usual imaginary “viral genome” assembly circus. The ViroLIEgy website has one of the best [collections](#) on the many assumptions and biases involved in “genome” creation, from the collection of the crude specimen through to the hypothetical model constructed by computer software. And with regards to “viruses”, we do not call it a “hoax”, we call it [fraud](#). “Viruses” are not really

“sequenced” as you might think Dr Watson (see below).

*“In any case, as explained to me by Siouxsie Wiles, it is not necessary to purify the coronavirus and as Dr. Ros Jones says in her Unity News Network interview with David Clews, this is not how it is done; the virus is cultured. This is about as close to Koch’s postulates as you could get: grow the purported virus in a cellular culture and identify it by sequencing. Introduce what you have to some other cultured cells alongside a control culture. If the one with the purported virus shows subsequent evidence for the presence of the virus and the other does not, that is about as watertight an experiment as I can think of.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson has a great deal of faith in Wiles and her reassurances that purification is “not necessary” and again seems to be confused about what Koch’s Postulates is all about. He describes cell culture experiments and what he believes is “identification” of a virus. How does he know there would be a new virus in there? Apparently, by “sequencing” (I’m not sure he understands what they are actually doing – see next point.) And what does he mean by a “control culture”? Official Information Act requests have [exposed](#) that the virologists do not do valid control experiments and this has been a [problem](#) ever since Enders and Peebles started the “virus” culture technique in the 1950s. Lack of valid controls = unscientific. I can only suggest to Watson that he digs a little deeper and examines the methodology of the papers rather than simply browse their headlines.

*“Bailey and co. try to debunk all the methods that are used in virology and to deny the whole field of laboratory science. The only possible retort can be that no method is perfect, and experiments often fail to show what is being hypothesised. That is an argument for rather than against science, which constantly tries to improve its methods. I recall a whole room being dedicated to a huge amino acid*



*sequencer when I was a PhD student. Now, amino acid sequencing can be done on a microchip."*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

This is so full of non sequiturs that perhaps the best advice to Watson is that he needs an editor to help him communicate what he is trying to say to his readers. He should be able to clearly see my pro-science position in the video "[Science vs Dogma](#)". My publications analysing virology have clearly pointed out that much of it involves uncontrolled experiments and thus cannot be claimed to be scientific. He refers to Karl Popper earlier in his article but fails to see that Popper would be horrified by the reasoning used by many virologists. How is an in silico "viral genome" that is created de novo from an unpurified specimen, that has been templated to another "viral genome" which was invented in the same way, falsifiable? How is a PCR result that "diagnoses" a disease on the basis that a positive result means you have the disease, falsifiable? I also suspect he is confusing complete in silico assembly of hypothetical "viral genomes" with actual physical sequencing, such as via the Sanger method, which he may have seen when he was a student. Computer games are indeed very seductive, particularly for kids but sometimes for adults too.

*"I have had Covid, despite the remarkable claims by my virus denying friends to the contrary. How do I know I had it: it hit me like an express train; I felt terrible for two days and slept for 29 of 48 hours, rather like the flu. My taste was not lost but my sense of smell became incredibly deranged, not something that I had experienced after many bouts of flu in my 66 years."*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

Watson appears to include this story about his bout of illness as evidence that viruses must exist. Despite it being another non sequitur, what is his definition of "COVID"? Virus Mania co-author Dr Claus Köhnlein pointed out in 2020 that it

was nothing more than an imaginary clinical condition based on a new PCR “test” with no demonstrated clinical diagnostic capability. His interview in German reached over 1 million viewers before it was quickly shut down and his interview in English with me on Youtube had 125,000 views when it was shut down. It is still available [here](#). I produced another popular video in 2020, “[What Is A Covid-19 Case?](#)” which outlines why “COVID” is a meaningless construct – which was also banned by Big Tech. In Dr Watson’s view how do we define a case: does a person dying in intensive care and an elite athlete running a marathon both have “COVID-19”? According to the [WHO](#) they should both be counted as equal “confirmed” cases if a PCR result is positive.

*“When I felt worst, I reluctantly took a lateral flow test (LFT). This showed up positive almost instantly and with a thick test line. As I felt better the test – which as it uses antibodies is highly specific but not very sensitive – took longer to show and the line became fainter. Of course, the virus deniers have this one covered under the rubric that immunology is also bogus, antibodies are not at all specific and will pick up anything. My ‘gotcha’ to this is: if I run a pregnancy test which uses antibodies to detect human chorionic gonadotropin, will it show me I am pregnant?”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

It is unclear if Watson is claiming that his lateral flow test proves the existence of viruses or “COVID” or both. What does he think the test is for? Something unique to the postulated “CoV” particle or a specific bodily process? Oh dear, we are back at square one! I have dealt with “COVID” LFTs [previously](#) and they are as equally unsuitable as the PCR with regards to clinical diagnostics and proving virus existence. With the rest of his claims, I’m not aware of who said antibodies pick up “anything” and it certainly wasn’t me. The issue surrounds assigning meaning to various proteins that

can be detected through in vitro chemical reactions compared to what this informs us about health in real life. This topic has been outlined in Virus Mania and I also cover it in some of my other [videos](#). His “gotcha” with regards to human chorionic gonadotropin has nothing to do with postulated viruses and related “immunology”.  $\beta$ -hCG is a specific glycoprotein of known composition and provenance that has been clinically validated for diagnosing pregnancy and can be easily compared to a “gold standard”: a foetal ultrasound scan (or the actual baby). As per many of Watson’s attempts, it’s another own goal. I can also suggest to him that if he has a positive result on a pregnancy test, as a man he’s unlikely to be pregnant and should be checked for cancer.

*“The virus deniers who tend to promote their views on increasingly bizarre websites and within such a deafening echo chamber that they are completely unable to hear, yet alone contemplate, alternative views. They certainly don’t listen.”*

Dr Roger Watson, The Daily Sceptic

What are these “bizarre” websites that he is referring to and what’s wrong with bizarre anyway? The orthodoxy doesn’t like being challenged Dr Watson. If they played like real scientists they’d welcome views that challenge their comfy status quo and we could all go on the same URLs. It may disturb Watson but the appetite for the content we produce seems very healthy. Our audience size is mostly restricted by Big Tech censorship and I’m sure he doesn’t agree with such interference with free speech. However, despite my Youtube channel being heavily suppressed, with millions of views being [removed](#) and people informing me that my videos and articles can’t be shared on platforms such as Facebook, the audience still grows every week. Mike Stone recently put together a list of [websites](#) that challenge the virus paradigm – I am in regular contact with many of these doctors, scientists and journalists and none have indicated that lack

of demand is a problem. Last year, Mark and Dr John Bevan-Smith published their essay "[The COVID-19 Fraud & War on Humanity](#)". Not only do they explain that there is no pathogen termed "SARS-CoV-2" but also why everyone should be sceptical about everything the virologists have ever claimed. They were tracking the viewership across various internet platforms for a few months before they gave up. By that stage it had reached about 250,000 people – I would say that's a few hundred times more than most virologists are reaching with their papers. Watson's "deafening echo chamber" may turn out to be his own case of tinnitus...

## **Postscript**

Perhaps Dr Watson's annoyance stems from the fact that because people get sick and die, he thinks it is unsporting to question the methods of the hard-working virologists? They are the white knights, so if we go against them – it means we must be on the wrong side. I don't have all the answers as to why people get sick but the extensive research I've done informs me that pathogenic "viruses" do not seem to exist and are not the cause of disease. The tree of virology has borne no fruit for humanity unless that fruit is a multi-billion dollar pharmaceutical industry that targets enemies that have not been shown to exist. In the last two years, virology and germ theory have brought the planet to its knees, manifesting in anti-humanity measures such as face masks, stripping of civil rights, and mandated "vaccines". For some of us, germ theory refuted itself at its inception and we see it for what it is: a tragic misunderstanding of nature, now used as propaganda in a perpetual phoney war, like something out of Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. Dr Watson can call us whatever names he likes – we see the universe in a different light and it is a light we choose to walk in. Perhaps he'll take a stroll with us some day?

***"There are three steps in the revelation of any truth: in***

*the first, it is ridiculed; in the second, it is resisted;  
in the third, it is considered self-evident."*

Arthur Schopenhauer

[Connect with Dr. Sam Bailey](#)

*cover image based on creative commons work of [Mysticsartdesign](#)*