The Non-Existent Virus; an Explosive Interview With Christine Massey

The Non-Existent Virus; an Explosive Interview With Christine Massey

by **Jon Rappoport**, *No More Fake News*
October 7, 2021

With a background in biostatistics, Christine Massey has been using Freedom of Information (FOIA) requests as a research tool, as a diamond drill, to unearth the truth about SARS-CoV-2. As in: Does the virus exist?

Her approach has yielded shocking results.

In a half-sane world, Christine's work would win many awards, and rate far-reaching coverage. In the present world, more and more people, on their own, are waking up to her findings and completely revising their perception of the "pandemic."

Here is my recent interview with the brilliant relentless Christine Massey:

> Q: You and your colleagues have made many FOIA requests to public health agencies around the world. You've been asking for records that show the SARS-CoV-2 virus exists. How did you develop this approach?
>
> A: In 2014, a lady in Edmonton submitted a freedom of information request to Health Canada asking for studies relating to the addition of hydrofluorosilisic acid (industrial waste fluoride acid) to public drinking water (water fluoridation). HealthCanada's response indicated

that they had no studies whatsoever to back up their claims that the practice is safe or effective.

A few years later, some high quality government-funded studies showed that common fluoride exposure levels during pregnancy are associated with lower IQs and increased ADHD symptoms in offspring. Nevertheless, dentists and the public health community continued to promote and defend the so-called "great public health achievement" of forcing this controversial preventative dental treatment onto entire communities, and were dismissive of those studies. So I used freedom of information requests to show that various institutions promoting and defending water fluoridation in Ontario, Alberta and Washington State could not provide or cite even one primary study indicating safety with respect to those outcomes.

So once I learned from people like David Crowe, Dr. Andrew Kaufman, Dr. Stefan Lanka and Dr. Thomas Cowan that the alleged [COVID] virus had never been isolated (purified) from a patient sample and then characterized, sequenced and studied with controlled experiments, and thus had never been shown to exist, I realized that freedom of information (FOI) requests could be used to verify their claims.

Most people are not going to take the time to check all of the so-called "virus isolation" studies for themselves, so FOIs were a way to 1) ensure that nothing had been overlooked, and 2) cut to the chase and back-up what these gentlemen [Kaufman, Cowan, Crowe, Lanka] were saying, if they were indeed correct.

So in May 2020 I began submitting FOI requests for any record held by the respective institution that describes the isolation/purification of the alleged "COVID-19 virus" from an unadulterated sample taken from a diseased patient, by anyone, anywhere on the planet.

Q: How many public health and government agencies have you queried with FOIA requests?

A: I have personally queried and received responses from 22 Canadian institutions. These are public health institutions, universities that claim to have "isolated the virus", and 3 police services – due to their enforcement of "COVID-19" restrictions. I have also personally received responses from several institutions outside of Canada including the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Anthony Fauci's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). I await responses from a number of additional institutions.

Many people around the world have obtained responses to the same/similar, or related, [FOIA] requests, from institutions in their own countries. One person who has done a lot of work on this in New Zealand and other countries is my colleague Michael S. Also a fellow named Marc Horn obtained many in the UK. A handful of other people obtained several responses, and lots of people have obtained 1 or 2.

I have been compiling all of the responses that are sent to me on my **FOI page**, and as I type this (October 4, 2021) we have FOI responses from 104 institutions in well over 20 countries all relating to the purification/existence of the alleged virus. Additionally, there are court documents from South Africa and Portugal. In total, 110 instructions are represented at this moment on my website. There are FOI responses from more institutions that I haven't had a chance to upload yet.

Q: How would you characterize the replies you've gotten from these agencies?

A: Every institution without exception has failed to provide or cite even 1 record describing purification of

the alleged virus from even 1 patient sample.

Twenty-one of the 22 Canadian institutions admitted flat out that they have no such records (as required by the Canadian legislation). Many institutions outside Canada have admitted the same, including the CDC (November 2, 2020), Australia's Department of Health, New Zealand's Ministry of Health, the UK Department of Health and Social Care…

And in some cases, silly excuses were provided. For example, the Norwegian Directorate of Health's response was that they do not own, store or control documents with information about patients. Public Health Wales told Dr. Janet Menage that they have not produced any such records, and that while they would normally be willing to point her towards records that are in the public domain it would be too difficult in this case.

Brazil's FDA-like injection-approver, the Health Regulatory Agency (Anvisa), told Marcella Picone that they have no record of virus purification and are not required to by law, thus it is (in their minds) not their obligation to make sure that the virus actually exists.

Q: What is the exact text of your FOIA requests?

The text has varied somewhat over time. For example, in the beginning I used the word "isolation". But since that term gets abused so badly by virologists, I now stick to "purification".

In all requests I specified exactly what I meant by isolation/purification (separation of the alleged virus from everything else), and that the purified particles should come directly from a sample taken from a diseased human where the patient sample was not first adulterated with any other source of genetic material (i.e. the monkey kidney cells aka Vero cells and the fetal bovine serum that

are typically used in the bogus “virus isolation” studies).

I always clarified that I was not requesting records where researchers failed to purify the alleged virus and instead cultured something and/or performed a PCR test and/or sequenced something. I also clarified that I was requesting records authored by anyone, anywhere – not simply records that were created by the institution in question. And I requested citations for any record of purification that is held by the institution but already available to the public elsewhere.

The latest iteration [of the FOIA request] is posted on a page of my website where I encourage others to submit requests to institutions in their own country: **Template for “SARS-COV-2 isolation” FOI requests**.

Q: These agencies are all saying they have no records proving SARS-CoV-2 exists, but at the same time some of these agencies sponsor and fund studies that claim the virus does exist. How do you account for this contradiction?

I will address this by way of an example.

The Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) is the only Canadian institution that failed to provide a straightforward “no records” response thus far. Instead, they provided me with what they pretended were responsive records.

The records consisted of some emails, and a study by Bullard et al. that was supported by PHAC and their National Microbiology Laboratory, and by Manitoba Health and Manitoba’s Cadham Provincial Laboratory.

Neither the study nor the emails describe purification of the alleged virus from a patient sample or from anything else. The word “isolate” (or “isolation” / “purify” /

“purification”) does not even appear, except in the study manuscript in the context of isolating people, not a virus.

…in the Materials And Methods section we find that these researchers performed PCR “tests” for a portion of the E gene sequence (not a virus), and they incubated patient samples (not a virus) on Vero cells (monkey kidney cells) supplemented with fetal bovine serum, penicillin/streptomycin, and amphotericin B, and they monitored for harm to the monkey cells.

No virus was looked for in, or purified from, the patient samples. No control groups of any kind were implemented in the monkey cell procedures. No virus was required or shown to be involved anywhere in the study, but “it” was blamed for any harm to the monkey cells and “it” was referred to repeatedly throughout the study (I counted 26 instances).

Nevertheless, this was the sole paper provided by the Public Health Agency of Canada.

And although the researchers did not claim to have “isolated” the alleged virus in this paper, they performed the same sort of monkey business / cell culture procedure that is passed off as “virus isolation” by virologists in country after country. (Because virology is not a science.)

…Note the admission in the [study] Abstract: “RT-PCR detects RNA, not infectious virus”.

…So I wrote back to the Public Health Agency of Canada and advised the that none of the records they provided me actually describe separation of the alleged virus from everything else in a patient sample, and that I require an accurate response indicating that they have no responsive records.

In their revised response, the Agency insisted that the gold standard assay used to determine the presence of

> intact virus in patient samples is visible cytopathic [cell-killing] effects on cells in a cell culture, and that "PCR further confirms that intact virus is present".
>
> …As you have pointed out to your readers again and again: No one has isolated/purified "the virus". They simply assume that patient samples contain "it" (based on meaningless PCR tests). They adulterate patient samples with genetic material and toxic drugs, starve the cells, then irrationally blame "the virus" for harm to the cells. They point to something that has never been purified, characterized, sequenced or studied scientifically, in a cell culture and insist "that's the virus". They fabricate the "genomes" from zillions of sequences detected in a soup. It's all wild speculation and assumptions, zero science.
>
> So the people responsible for the blatantly fraudulent claims made by these institutions are either wildly incompetent or intentionally lying.

—end of interview—

To bolster Christine's final comments, these agencies will respond to FOIA requests with: "we have no records of virus purification"—and then sponsor studies that claim the virus HAS BEEN purified and discovered, because…

The standards for purifying the virus in the studies are no standards at all. They're entirely irrational.

However, because Christine is very precise and accurate in her FOIA requests, when it comes to what purification means, the agencies are compelled to reply…

"Well, in THAT case, we have no records of virus purification…"

Meaning: There are no records showing the virus has been

isolated; there are no records showing the virus exists.

Connect with Jon Rappoport

cover image credit: ErAnger / pixabay