

The Steve Kirsch Debate About the Existence of the Virus

[The Steve Kirsch Debate About the Existence of the Virus](#)

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

August 4, 2022

Let me be clear. I'm speaking for myself here, as a reporter who says SARS-CoV-2 doesn't exist. I'm not speaking for Andrew Kaufman, Stefan Lanka, Tom Cowan, Christine Massey, Sam Bailey, or anyone else who has come to the same conclusion.

OK. [Steve Kirsch](#) frames [the debate](#) (see also [here](#)) this way: There are a set of facts about COVID you can lay on the table. Then you decide which hypothesis best explains those facts.

In his case, he chooses: "SARS-CoV-2 exists."

This approach is an elementary mistake.

I'm not challenging any hypothesis. I'm ATTACKING A STRAIGHT-OUT LABORATORY PROCEDURE.

My attack is on the level of: "You poured the liquid from beaker A into beaker B. Wrong. You should have poured it into beaker C."

Virologists employ a lab procedure to discover a virus they've never seen before. They claim this procedure ISOLATES the virus from all the surrounding material in a soup they create. I say their procedure doesn't produce that result at all. Period.

I say there is no isolation.

That's it in a nutshell.

Arguing about hypotheses is entirely beside the point.

But I will write a few words on that subject, just to clear the air.

If a real scientist laid a whole collection of facts on the table, he would then do a hard examination of each one, to make sure it is a true fact. When satisfied, he might sit and think and ask himself, "What hypothesis would explain these facts?"

Let's say he comes up with one. That's just the beginning of doing actual science. Why? Because the only scientific value of a hypothesis is its ability to PREDICT.

And by that I mean, MAKE A SPECIFIC AND VERY USEFUL PREDICTION THAT CAN BE VERIFIED OR DENIED BY ACTUAL EXPERIMENT.

Claiming a hypothesis which explains a set of facts as a reason to pop champagne corks signals a gross misconception about what science is.

Forming a debate on that basis would be futile, irrelevant, and a waste of time.

Finally, for now, carrying out a debate on video may impart useful information to viewers, but there is a reason why medical and science journals stubbornly persist in presenting studies as words on the page—as opposed to having the authors dress up and describe their work on camera instead.

Words on the page are much better.

They allow other scientists, journalists, and civilians to go over a study very carefully, phrase by phrase. They allow other scientists to REPLICATE the authors' work, in order to discover whether the results and conclusions stand up.

Of course, in this “fast moving world, with people on the go, living the active lifestyle,” we should perhaps adopt Easier and Quicker as the mode of scientific decision-making.

“OK, Fred, are the cameras set up, are we ready to roll? Are all the debaters online? Have you got the poll screen in place, so the viewers can vote and decide what’s science and what isn’t when we’re done?”

I’m breathless with anticipation.

On the other hand, if we have “a panel of independent experts” on hand to make that ruling, we can rent them out, in the future, to The New England Journal and The Lancet. Yes, a roving panel making all sorts of judgment calls. They’ll spice up science, which is badly in need of instant melodrama and boffo box office.

Hell, let’s make this debate a game show.

“Great idea, Jim. A couple of tall models in bikinis walking around with big signs, and a host like, oh, Chris Wallace or that guy who keeps talking about laying down a bet for a million dollars. What’s his name? Kirsch. Steve Kirsch.”

Stevie, baby, nobody cares about your money. Nobody cares about your million dollars.

[Connect with Jon Rappoport](#)

cover image credit: geralt