question re the Banerjee study you cited

Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com> Tue, Oct 18, 2022 at 4:20 PM
To: [redacted]

Dear Dr. Watson,

I've read your new article *Will the 'Virus Sceptics' Ever Accept the Evidence That Proves Them Wrong?*

In it you cited a study by Banerjee et al.and I am wondering if you have been provided any additional details about the "mock controls" used in this study?

About this study you wrote:

> *However, in 2020 a study was published titled the "Isolation, Sequence, Infectivity, and Replication Kinetics of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2" where it is clearly stated that: "Relative to mock-inoculated cells, cells inoculated with both samples (SARS-CoV-2/SB2 and SARS-CoV-2/SB3-TYAGNC) displayed extensive CPE (cytopathic effects) 72 hours after infection."* ***If that's not a controlled study, I am not sure what is.***

The previous sentence in that paragraph of the study is:

> *For virus isolation, we inoculated Vero E6 cells with aliquots of mid-turbinate swab samples and monitored the cells for cytopathic effects (CPE) daily.*

I'm sure you noticed that it was clinical samples and not purified particles that were added to the monkey kidney cells, and that the Methods section of the study makes no mention of controls. Here is the Methods paragraph on "isolation""

> *Isolation and Quantification*
>
> *We seeded Vero E6 cells at a concentration of 3 × 10$_5$ cells/well in a 6-well plate. The next day, we collected 200 µL of mid-turbinate swab samples from 2 COVID-19 patients, mixed it with 200 µL of DMEM containing 16 µg/mL TPCK-treated trypsin and inoculated the cells. After 1 h, the inoculum was replaced with DMEM containing 2% FBS and 6 µg/mL TPCK-treated trypsin. We observed the cells daily under a light microscope. Supernatant from the cells was used to determine virus titers (50% tissue culture infectious dose [TCID$_{50}$]/mL) according to the Spearman and Karber method (6,7) as outlined previously (8).*

I'm sure you realize that a valid experiment drawing conclusions of causation of something by a specific alleged particle requires that specific alleged particle to have been used as the independent variable, and that this is not what was used in this study.

I'm sure you also noticed that cytopathic effects in monkey cells led the researchers to conclude that "the virus" was in the clinical sample, "the virus" grew, "the virus" damaged the cells and "the virus" has been isolated.

I'm sure you also noticed that the RNA used for "sequencing" was not extracted from purified particles, rather:

> *RNA was extracted from the supernatant of Vero E6 cells after 1 passage by using the QIAamp Viral RNA Mini kit (QIAGEN) without addition of carrier RNA*

and that the authors' so-called "genome" was assembled in silico, not discovered in the physical realm.

One of my colleagues tried asking some of the authors whether they had tried assembling the "genome" via the same procedure but using clinical samples from healthy people or "uninfected" cell culture supernatant as controls. The responses (and lack of responses) are uploaded to my website:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Mubareka-Mossman-etc-no-valid-controls-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

We also have freedom of information responses relating to this study:

2020 (post-publication of the study):
University of Toronto, McMaster University, Sunnybrook HSC & Mount Sinai Hospital have no record of "COVID-19 virus" isolation/purification, by anyone, anywhere, ever:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/university-of-toronto-sunnybrook-hsc-have-no-record-of-covid-19-virus-isolation/

February 1, 2022:
University of Toronto refused my request for any records containing additional details re the "mock controls" used in this study:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/U-of-Toronto-controls-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

So again, my question for you is: have you been provided any additional details about the "mock controls" used in this study? I curious to know why you consider this a valid controlled experiment.

Thank you in advance, best wishes,
Christine Massey
Ontario, Canada

question re the Banerjee study you cited

Roger Watson <[redacted]> Tue, Oct 18, 2022 at 6:01 PM
To: Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Dear Christine

I assume you're a virus sceptic?

Roger
Sent from my iPhone
Twitter: @rwatson1955
Skype: roger.watson3
Mobile: +447808480547

question re the Banerjee study you cited

Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com> Tue, Oct 18, 2022 at 6:03 PM
To: Roger Watson <[redacted]>

Dear Roger,

I'm a virus realist, but how is that relevant?

Are you willing to answer my question?

Christine

question re the Banerjee study you cited

Roger Watson <[redacted]> Tue, Oct 18, 2022 at 6:05 PM
To: Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Dear Christine

What's a virus realist? New to me.

Closing down for the night here in Spain - pick up tomorrow.

Roger

question re the Banerjee study you cited

Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com> Tue, Oct 18, 2022 at 6:07 PM
To: Roger Watson <[redacted]>

Hi Roger,

How about you answer my question first? It's a simple question :)

Cheers,
Christine
[Quoted text hidden]

question re the Banerjee study you cited

Roger Watson <[redacted]> Wed, Oct 19, 2022 at 2:42 AM
To: Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Hi

Dud they say in the study that they had isolated the virus? I can't recall and haven't got time today to check? But even if they did the university I'd unlikely to hold that information. I've no more information than you - but I think we come from different perspectives. I thought the study was ok. But I doubt anything I say will help.

Roger

question re the Banerjee study you cited

Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com> Wed, Oct 19, 2022 at 6:35 AM
To: Roger Watson [redacted]

Hi Roger,

Yes, this is Canada's so-called "virus isolation" study that you cited: "*Isolation, Sequence, Infectivity, and Replication Kinetics of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2*".

Ok, well thanks for confirming that you have no additional details. I'm having trouble understanding how you can consider this a valid study about a "virus" when they didn't even have alleged "SARS-COV-2" particles to use as an independent variable in experiments, nor could they show that the sequences used to assemble their "genome" came from any particular particle.

The alleged SARS-COV-2 genome wasn't even shown to be present, intact, let alone surrounded by the alleged protein shell.

FYI: we also have FOIA responses from the CDC and other agencies regarding the alleged SARS virus and the alleged common cold coronaviruses, below. They have no record of any ever being found in bodily fluid/tissue and purified (by anyone, anywhere, ever), in order for these alleged things to be studied. It turns out that the studies where these other "viruses" were allegedly shown to exist are very similar to the Banerjee study.

(And of course you have to show that a thing exists before you can develop a valid test for it, so pointing to genetic sequences as evidence of these alleged viruses is not valid.)

Best wishes,
Christine

New Zealand's crown research institute, the Institute of Environmental Science and Research admits to having no record re isolation/purification of "SARS-COV-1" or any "virus" on NZ's Immunisation Schedule and simply "ignored" a query re isolation of any "common cold coronaviruses".
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/ESR-FOI-reply-schedule-SARS-common-cold.pdf

FOI response from the CDC dated December 30, 2020 re the alleged 2003 "SARS-COV-1" and all "common cold coronaviruses" – the CDC has no record of any having been isolated/purified:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/CDC-isolation-FOI-reply-any-coronavirus.pdf

New Zealand's Ministry of Health obviously has no record describing the isolation of the alleged 2003 "SARS-COV" or any "common cold coronavirus" by anyone, anywhere, ever, but wasn't willing to admit such. Instead they falsely implied that the requester had asked for things he had not asked for.
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/NZ-MOH-SARS-COV-1-Isolation-Response-redacted.pdf]

New Zealand's crown research institute, the Institute of Environmental Science and Research once again equates "isolation" with cell cultures and this time admits to having no record re isolation/purification of "SARS-COV-1" or any "virus" on NZ's Immunisation Schedule and simply "ignored" a query re isolation of any "common cold coronaviruses".
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/ESR-FOI-reply-schedule-SARS-common-cold.pdf

December 20, 2021:
Public Health Agency of Canada confirmed that they have no record of **any alleged "virus"** having been purified from a sample taken from **any diseased human** on Earth, by anyone, ever, period.
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/PHAC-ANY-virus-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

Peterborough Public Health has no record describing anyone on Earth finding and purifying any alleged **SARS**, H5N1, H1N1, MERS, Ebola, or SARS-COV-2 "virus" from the bodily fluids of any diseased human, ever… or any study that in Thomas' opinion proves the existence of any of those alleged viruses:

https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/Peterborough-PH-SARS-H5N1-H1N1-MERS-Ebola-SCV2-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

Brighton and Hove City Council have confirmed for Yvonne Hobs that they have no records:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Brighton-SARS1-common-cold-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

Nottingham City Council/Public Health have confirmed for Yvonne Hobs that they have no records:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Nottingham-County-Council-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

Public Health at Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council confirmed for Yvonne Hobs that they have no records:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/PH-at-Rotherham-Metropolitan-Borough-Council-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

Leicestershire County Council in the UK confirmed for Yvonne Hobbs that they o have no record of this "virus" having been purified from any patient sample, by anyone, anywhere on the planet:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Leicestershire-many-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

Derby City Council in the UK confirmed for Yvonne Hobbs that they o have no record of this "virus" having been purified from any patient sample, by anyone, anywhere on the planet:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Derby-City-Council-many-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

Hertfordshire County Council in the UK confirmed for Yvonne Hobbs that they have no record of this "virus" having been purified from any patient sample, by anyone, anywhere on the planet:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Hertfordshire-County-Council-many-and-sc2-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

Rutland County Council in the UK confirmed for Yvonne Hobbs that they have no record of this "virus" having been purified from any patient sample, by anyone, anywhere on the planet:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/Rutland-many-no-sv2-response-only.pdf

December 14, 2021:
London Borough of Bromley confirmed for the requester that they have no record of this "virus" having been purified from any patient sample, by anyone, anywhere on the planet:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/BOROUGH-OF-BROMLEY-many-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

January 2022:
Derbyshire County Council in the UK confirmed for the requester that they have no record of this "virus" having been purified from any patient sample, by anyone, anywhere on the planet:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Derbyshire-scv1.pdf

London Borough of Lambeth confirmed for our dedicate requester in England that they have no record:
https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Lambeth-many-PACKAGE-redacted.pdf

[Quoted text hidden]

question re the Banerjee study you cited

Roger Watson <[redacted]> Wed, Oct 19, 2022 at 7:02 AM
To: Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Thanks - that's your cue for an article on why those who believe in viruses won't be convinced by the evidence. I'll have to think about the controlled experiment bit - it's always good to be challenged, and politely. Thanks for those links

Roger

Roger Watson PhD FRCN FRCP Edin FAAN
Editor-in-Chief, Journal of Advanced Nursing
Editor, Nursing Open
Professor of Nursing, University of Hull, UK

question re the Banerjee study you cited

Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com> Wed, Oct 19, 2022 at 8:14 AM
To: Roger Watson <[redacted]>

No problem Roger, and thanks for being polite as well :)
[Quoted text hidden]