Gmail Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

your recent comments re Caldas et al. paper

Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com> Wed, Jun 8, 2022 at 1:46 PM
To: "Peter A. McCullough" <peteramccullough@gmail.com>

Hi Dr. McCullough,

Someone sent me what appears to be a recent video wherein you were still citing a paper by Caldas et al.

I just wanted to help you out to avoid further public embarrassment on your part, as this was the 2nd time I've seen you cite that paper as proof that the theoretical SARS-COV-2 has been isolated/purified.

(You also **cited** Caldas back in January to a gentleman named James Henderson.)

In the 2020 Caldas paper, the authors didn't claim to have isolated/purified anything. Rather, they stated that:

> "*SARS-CoV-2 isolate (HIAE-02: SARS-CoV-2/SP02/human/2020/BRA (GenBank accession number MT126808.1) was used in this work.*"

The so-called SARS-CoV-2/SP02/human/2020/BRA "isolate" originates from another study: SARS-CoV-2 isolation from the first reported patients in Brazil and establishment of a coordinated task network.

From that study:

> ***Virus isolation - We used Vero E6 cells for isolation*** *and initial passages. We cultured Vero E6 in Dulbecco minimal essential medium (DMEM) supplemented with 10% of heat-inactivated foetal bovine serum (FBS) (Vitrocell Embriolife, Campinas, Brazil).*
>
> *We used NP swab specimen for virus isolation. For isolation and first passage, we sow cells in a 25 cm2 cell culture flask in a concentration of 5 × 105 cells/mL. After 24 h, we removed the culture medium, washed three times with FBS free-DMEM and inoculated aliquots (500 µL) of the clinical specimens into the flask. After 1 h of incubation (adsorption), we completed the volume for 5 mL with DMEM supplemented with 2.5% FBS and 1% of penicillin-streptomycin. We grew the inoculated cultures in a humidified 37°C incubator in an atmosphere of 5% CO2 and observed for cytopathic effects (CPE) daily up to 72 h. Supernatant was collected daily, and virus replication was confirmed through CPE, gene detection and electron microscopy."*

Obviously an alleged virus could not be isolated from a clinical sample by mixing the sample with monkey cells, cow serum, penicillin-streptomycin and DMEM and waiting for cytopathic effects.

This is just the oxymoronic use of the word "isolation" that is rampant in virology, wherein harm to an abused cell line is unscientifically interpreted as proof that:

- "the virus" is present
- "the virus" replicated
- "the virus" caused the harm to the cells
- "the virus" was isolated

If you read and think about the so-called "viral genome sequencing" methods, you will find them equally inadequate and based on similarly ridiculous assumptions:

> ***Next generation sequencing of viral full-length genome*** *- We extracted total nucleic acid from the NP and oropharyngeal (OP) swab samples and cell supernatants isolates...*

I trust this is clear and will save you from further embarrassment. I'm here for you, any time.

Just to update you as well, we now have responses from **190 institutions** from well over 30 countries, all failing to provide any record of the alleged virus being found in any clinical sample and isolated/purified, by anyone on Earth.

Of course this means that virologists have no independent variable to use in any experiment, no potential "virus" to extract nucleic acid from and sequence, and no potential "virus" to characterize.

And hence it's clear that the alleged nano-sized particle consisting of a ~30,000 bp RNA genome surrounded by an encoded proteinaceous coat that acts as an intracellular obligate parasite spreading disease from host to host has never been shown to exist.

If you've found any proof to the contrary in recent months, please do share it.

Best wishes,
Christine