

---

## share scientific evidence of viruses?

---

Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Wed, Oct 26, 2022 at 8:53 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear Robert and Mary,

I hope this finds you both well!

I've been investigating claims of viruses and would appreciate your input. Attached are some papers wherein authors claimed to have isolated and sequenced the alleged "SARS-COV-2" (including the CDC paper, the Canadian paper by Banerjee et al., and the earliest papers out of China).

 [Banerjee et al.pdf](#)

I have some questions for you and your science advisors at the CHD.

1. Have you read the Methods that were used in these papers, or in any other "SARS-COV-2 isolation/sequencing" papers? If so, do you consider them valid and scientific?

Keeping in mind that "SARS-COV-2" is said to be an infectious, replication-competent, obligate intracellular parasite that consists of a genome (of which there are now millions of versions uploaded online) and a proteinaceous shell that is encoded by the genome, that spreads from host to host causing disease via natural modes of exposure...

2. Can you cite even 1 document (i.e. "isolation/sequencing" paper, "gain of function" paper, patent) wherein the scientific method was applied and the alleged "SARS-COV-2" (or any other alleged virus, natural or man-made) was shown to exist?  
If not, can you cite a paper wherein the genome of particles alleged to be "SARS-COV-2" was actually determined in a valid, logical fashion using appropriate controls?

If not:

- Why are you/CHD continually indicating to people that viruses exist?
- Why do you let governments and other perpetrators off the hook for having to prove the existence of alleged "viruses"? Why are you "giving them the viruses for free"?
- Why do you defend dogma that keeps people in fear, makes them easy to manipulate, and has been weaponized against humanity for a very long time?
- Will you stop doing these things and lend support to the [Settling the Virus Debate statement?](#)
- The following essays are recommended reading for you and your colleagues at CHD:  
<https://drsambailey.com/the-covid-19-fraud-war-on-humanity/>  
<https://drsambailey.com/a-farewell-to-virology-expert-edition/>

To help with your answer, recall that scientific proof is not merely opinion, belief, speculation, review papers and/or descriptive papers, and that scientific proof requires:

- Use of the scientific method
- Repeatable and falsifiable hypotheses that have been tested using valid, controlled experiments where only 1 variable differs between the experimental and control groups
- In this case, the 1 manipulated variable would be the presence/absence of purified particles suspected of being a "virus"
- Consistent results from valid, controlled experiments (i.e. identical "genomes", consistent in vivo effects).






Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thanks and best wishes,  
Christine Massey  
Ontario, Canada

<https://tinyurl.com/novirusisolated>

---

**5 attachments**

-  **Zhu NEJM A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019 SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX.pdf**  
176K
-  **Zhu NEJM A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019.pdf**  
910K
-  **Wu.pdf**  
7165K
-  **Zhou A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin.pdf**  
10593K
-  **CDC Harcourt June 2020.pdf**  
3931K

---

## share scientific evidence of viruses?

---

Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Mon, Oct 31, 2022 at 9:37 AM

To: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Hello again,

Just following up, hoping to hear from you soon.

I will be publishing these emails, with or without a response from you.

Best wishes,  
Christine

[Quoted text hidden]

---

## share scientific evidence of viruses?

---

Mary Holland [REDACTED]  
To: Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Sun, Nov 6, 2022 at 1:56 PM

Hi Christine,

Here are our thoughts on this. Thanks for reaching out and for all your excellent work in accessing information from various agencies.

All best,  
Mary

There is no question that coronavirus biology and virology in general are among the most tenuous fields in biology. In a world where viruses exist but everyone involved has both exaggerated their ability to identify and study viruses and underplayed the danger of synthetic infectious RNA clones, the most important thing is to move slowly. It is in virologists' best interests that we never figure out the extent of their exaggerations.

Infectious clones are at best poor approximations of coronaviruses and are synthetic infectious constructs which allow controlled experiments to be conducted. Coronaviruses exist as semi-stable quasi-species in nature and are largely benign genetic noise, especially in healthy mammal populations. At worst, infectious clones found in laboratories all over the world represent a purity level of a biological agent that would otherwise never exist, and if manufactured to quantity, represent a significant potential danger with untold possible consequences. But this danger is obviously man-made and absent in nature, and gain-of-function as a boogie man is distracting us from this fact.

Furthermore, synthetic biology allows for the directed selection of optimized molecules and even short immunogenic sequences that when inserted into a synthetic infectious RNA could create a new and as yet undescribed danger. However, even then, it would only be in a pure quantity that any such agent would pose a potential threat to many thousands of people.

The idea of a natural yet novel coronavirus posing a threat to millions of people is a myth because of the dynamic nature of RNA viruses, and on this we agree. However, a pure infectious clone of even an endemic human coronavirus OC43 made to a quantity of 1000s of liters might pose a threat. Such an event, intentional or accidental, would result in a situation where even a non-specific PCR diagnostic could appear to be rather accurate for a time.

While we agree that there have been many, many lies during COVID, we believe that the situation is complicated, and that the "no virus" stance lacks sufficient nuance to be the most viable position.

On Wed, Oct 26, 2022 at 8:53 AM Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com> wrote:  
[Quoted text hidden]

—  
Mary Holland

---

## share scientific evidence of viruses?

---

Christine Massey <cmssvc@gmail.com>

Wed, Nov 9, 2022 at 5:47 PM

To:

Cc:

Hi Mary,

Thank you so much for getting back to me, this is great. Although I don't see any citations or answers to my questions, and to be honest I now have a few more questions.

(I've copied Robert to make sure he stays in the loop.)

Does CHD have any references for the type of controlled experiments referred to?

Does CHD have references that demonstrate these claims?

*"coronaviruses exist as semi-stable quasi-species in nature and are largely benign genetic noise" - (existence of the alleged coronaviruses, including the referenced "OC43", and their benign nature)?*

*"infectious [coronavirus] clones found in laboratories all over the world ... if manufactured to quantity, represent a significant potential danger"*

If a "synthetic virus" was ever made as suggested, why is it unfindable in the human body? Why is it not possible to find and purify it?

Would it be possible to get answers to my original questions shown below, from Brian Hooker, or from whoever wrote the paragraphs that you sent, and ?

*1. Have you read the Methods that were used in these papers, or in any other "SARS-COV-2 isolation/sequencing" papers? If so, do you consider them valid and scientific?*

*2. Keeping in mind that "SARS-COV-2" is said to be an infectious, replication-competent, obligate intracellular parasite that consists of a genome (of which there are now millions of versions uploaded online) and a proteinaceous shell that is encoded by the genome, that spreads from host to host causing disease via natural modes of exposure... can you cite even 1 document (i.e. "isolation/sequencing" paper, "gain of function" paper, patent) wherein the scientific method was applied and the alleged "SARS-COV-2" (or any other alleged virus, natural or man-made) was shown to exist?*

*If not, can you cite a paper wherein the genome of particles alleged to be "SARS-COV-2" was actually determined in a valid, logical fashion using appropriate controls?*

(If the answer to #2 is no, would it be possible to get answers to my other original questions about the virus challenge, legal strategy, etc?)

Just to clarify regarding this line: *"...because of the dynamic nature of RNA viruses, and on this we agree."* - No, we actually don't agree. Where did anything meet the definition of a virus?

Re this: *"...the "no virus" stance lacks sufficient nuance to be the most viable position."* - 1) Viable for what? 2) This is not a scientific statement; nuance is not required in order to critique the claims/methods of virologists. 3) I get the impression that whoever wrote these paragraphs is not very familiar with my stance.

Thanks so much Mary, for your kind consideration.

---

## e-introduction

---

Mary Holland <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Nov 17, 2022 at 1:31 PM

To: J Jay Couey <[REDACTED]> Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Hi Jay and Christine,

Putting you two in touch.

Christine, Jay follows your work and Jay, a scientist forced to leave a PA university over vaccine mandates, has been working with us on a consulting basis.

I hope you will be in touch to discuss current issues.

All best, Mary

--

Mary Holland  
CHD President  
Children's Health Defense  
The Defender  
This Week with Mary and Polly

---

## e-introduction

---

J.J. Couey [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Dec 1, 2022 at 10:17 AM

To: Mary Holland [REDACTED], Christine Massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Hello Dr. Massey:

I am a former research assistant professor at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine. I have been independently advising CHD for the last half year. I would love to opportunity to speak with you about a hypothesis I have that could unite the resistance.

It might sound a bit arrogant, but I think actually both sides are right. To the point, I think you are 100% right but also being used as I was to sustain their intended narrative.

I look forward to hearing from you. I think I would need more than 30 minutes of your time before I think you'll be sold on my idea.

Sincerely,

Jay

J. J. Couey

---

## e-introduction

---

**Christine Massey** <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Thu, Dec 1, 2022 at 11:18 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Mary Holland [REDACTED]

Hi Jay,

Nice to hear from you :)

I don't see how a virus can both exist and not exist, or how my work to expose virology as pseudoscience could serve the virus narrative, but if you'd like to send me a written summary of your hypothesis I'll have a look at it and share it with my colleagues for consideration.

Apologies, I'm not much of a phone person, and have a lot going on right now.

All the best,  
Christine

[Quoted text hidden]



**Christine, of the Massey family** <cmssyc@gmail.com>

10:49 AM (11 hours ago)



to Mar [REDACTED]

Dear Robert and Mary,

I'm following up one last time, hoping you will provide answers;

Mary, if you were expecting Jay Couey to answer the questions on behalf of you, Robert and CHD, please let me know - he offered to share a hypothesis with me, but didn't address any of my questions;

Cheers and have a great day,  
Christine



**Mary Holland**

to J, me ▾

Hi Christine,

Sorry if we weren't able to provide what you were looking for.

All best,

Mary



On Thu, Dec 15, 2022 at 10:49 AM Christine, of the Massey family <[cmssyc@gmail.com](mailto:cmssyc@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Robert and Mary,

I'm following up one last time, hoping you will provide answers;

Mary, if you were expecting Jay Couey to answer the questions on behalf of you, Robert and CHD, please let me know - he offered to share a hypothesis

## e-introduction

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Sat, Dec 17, 2022 at 8:41 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Mary Holland [REDACTED]

Rfk [REDACTED]

Bcc: [REDACTED]

Hello again Jay,

I have watched up to the 51:20 mark in your new [interview](#). You've spoken a lot about "coronaviruses", "genomes" and "RNA clones", and said some false and misleading things about no-virus people.

You do not think I'm "*100% right*", contrary to your email of December 1st. You now publicly insist that myself and others have "*gone too far*", are in "*a trap*", that we might even be "*part of this*", and that it's sooo obvious we're part of "*a game*".

(Are you really not able to distinguish between people refuting the pseudoscientific premise of a war on humanity, and pointing to potential mechanisms whereby people experience the same symptoms at the same time? I will not listen further, given the incredibly offensive and frankly ridiculous comments being made.)

My conclusions about virology are not based on a wild leap of illogic and "*throwing out the baby with the baby water*", as you suggest. I did my homework, I read the methods used in many virology papers and I collected hundreds of FOI responses from around the world. The FOIs are not restricted to "SARS-COV-2" or to the topic of isolation/purification. They address many alleged "viruses", and the utter lack of valid control experiments and the utter lack of scientific method.

Pivoting to ad hominen attacks is not going to change this. And meanwhile, I haven't heard you cite any science to back up your claims, which you admitted on December 1st are merely your (untested) hypothesis.

So here are my questions for you:

Have you read the Methods that were used in any of the papers wherein alleged coronaviruses were supposedly isolated, sequenced and/or shown to cause disease? Can you cite even 1 (a study, patent, any record of any kind) that is valid and scientific, for any alleged virus of any kind, ever?

If not, can you cite a paper wherein the genome of particles alleged to be "SARS-COV-2" (or any other alleged virus) was actually determined in a valid, logical fashion? I have never seen such a paper. (Mary and Robert are unable/unwilling to answer any of these questions.)

Can you cite paper that demonstrated contagion of a respiratory disease? Are you aware that many attempts have been made and completely failed?

I will publish your response or non-response, as the case may be. And please let's not waste time with untested hypotheses, I'm asking for science.

Christine

[Quoted text hidden]

---

## e-introduction

---

**J.J. Couey** [REDACTED]  
To: "Christine, of the Massey family" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Sat, Dec 17, 2022 at 8:51 PM

Well since you are watching, I'll address your questions in a stream in the next few days.

It's evident in the text below as well. In fact, thanks to the text below, I think I'll be able to address you fairly and directly by name and end this nonsense once and for all.

I look forward to making these slides.

Sincerely,

jay

---

## e-introduction

---

**Christine, of the Massey family** <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Sat, Dec 17, 2022 at 8:56 PM

To: "J.J. Couey" <[REDACTED]>

And you had the nerve to call no-virus people "disingenuous". Unbelievable.

[Quoted text hidden]

**J.J. Couey**

to me ▾

9:33 PM (1 hour ago)



Please don't contact me again unless you are will to discuss your stance openly and without simply pointing to a few weak papers and vague email responses as proof viruses are fake. This feigned drama is really unnecessary, and I think you know it. I am not affected by these games. We are adults fighting for more than one generation of kids to come, so pull your head out.

I have spent 1000s of hours and then more hours attempting to do more than just send gotcha emails and then to hold those emails up as proof of something. I understand that you think you have found something. I think you might be mistaken on what parts are significant and why, and you are too arrogant to take a zoom call.

I am sorry that you are choosing to make this a confrontation and conflating my description of your behavior as attacks. You have behaved in a way not congruent with someone looking to build a coalition united but to win some intellectual property contest.

We are indeed in a fight for our kids future. I find it terrifying that you've decided to engage with everyone on the good team in such an aggressive and closed minded manner. But it is a pattern among many of you and other bigger names: arrogance rather than humility. You are only willing to have contact with people that agree to your terms, and that's somewhere between childish and dubious. And that's how I will continue to describe this email chain as well. You are behaving as though you'd rather beat me than beat them. That's frightening.

Guess you'll have to start streaming so you can correct the record, or maybe you'd like to come on my stream and talk about this? I mean I have offered to facilitate private conversations with key CHD people and you balked?! What more do you want from us?

Maybe you should just stop watching my little flea circus of a stream and get on with your campaign of 'truth' without me?



Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

10:49 PM (24 minutes ago)



to J.J., Mary, Rf [REDACTED]

I see JJ, you have no science to share (and couldn't be bothered to put your *hypothesis* in writing, even though I offered 2+ weeks ago to review it), so you're resorting to further ad hominen attacks, attempting to reverse the burden of proof, downplaying the spectacular collection of evidence that's on my website (proving that CDC and hundreds of other institutions have zero covid science), characterizing my polite and perfectly reasonable emails as terrifying and aggressive and pretending that written contact isn't really contact and only "streaming" counts. But I'm the childish one.

My priority has never been a coalition with "*the good team*" that's busy legitimizing the very same weaponized pseudoscience that threatens our children's future. My goal all along has been to expose the truth of virology, for the sake of humanity. Why on Earth people such as yourself have to be dragged into reality kicking and screaming, I have no idea.

In your December 1 email you did not offer to "*facilitate private conversations with key CHD people*", and that's the only other communication I've ever received from you, to my knowledge. Instead, you wanted to talk to me for 30+ minutes about your "*hypothesis*" of how both the yes-virus and no-virus sides are right, which isn't possible. Hence it wasn't something I wanted to spend time on, so I invited you to send a written summary and you didn't.

This is "*what more*" I want from you, Mary and Robert: a course correction. Find some valid science to back up your claims about "viruses" and "transmission", or stop making those claims. Surely CHD donors don't expect or deserve any less.

Christine

---

## e-introduction

---

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>  
To: "J.J. Couey" <[REDACTED]> Mary Holland <[REDACTED]>

Tue, Dec 20, 2022 at 4:25 PM

"Rfk" <[REDACTED]>

Jay, I'm 25 minutes into your [video critique](#) of the FOIs, me and the no virus movement.

Over and over again you pretend/imply that the no virus position is based solely on the SARS-COV-2 purification FOI responses... even though I explained to you 3 days ago (something you would have already known if you were more than just vaguely familiar with my work) that:

*I did my homework, I read the methods used in many virology papers and I collected hundreds of FOI responses from around the world. The FOIs are not restricted to "SARS-COV-2" or to the topic of isolation/purification. They address many alleged "viruses", and the utter lack of valid control experiments and the utter lack of scientific method.*

The FOI project is the **result** of people having carefully examined the ridiculous methods used in virology, through its history. There is a **vast body** of excellent, in depth material from other no virus people, a small sampling of which is **collected** on my website. The FOIs confirm and evidence what could already been seen

You could hardly be more confused/inaccurate, and it's really unfortunate for anyone who is taking you at your word. And once again, you're attempting to reverse the burden of proof, relying on ad hominen distractions and complaining about your feelings instead of citing science to back up your position that "*surely viruses do exist, surely the sequences are real*".

Meanwhile people around the world, including children, have been jabbed and otherwise seriously compromised for decades and decades, in the name of all sorts of alleged viruses that were never shown to exist.

Christine

**FOIs reveal that health/science institutions have no record of any "virus" having been found in a host and isolated/purified. Because virology isn't a science:**

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/fois-reveal-that-health-science-institutions-have-no-record-of-any-virus-having-been-isolated-purified-virology-isnt-a-science/>

**Do virologists perform valid control experiments? Is virology a science?**

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/do-virologists-perform-valid-control-experiments-is-virology-a-science/>

[Quoted text hidden]



## e-introduction

---

**J.J. Couey** [REDACTED]  
To: "Christine, of the Massey family" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Tue, Dec 20, 2022 at 4:55 PM

I appreciate the critique. I remain impressed at how different your voice and expertise becomes in emails

I hope you'll watch the entire video several times and try to absorb what I am saying by taking notes and maybe repeating some of the point out loud in a mirror.

I think I have been pretty fair given your behavior with me and others. I stand by my position that your FOI responses are merely a good a starting point. For us to win, we are going to need to understand the biology (whatever it is) better than they do. We are going to need to explain what's wrong with it down to the fine details. You and many of the others seem to want to do something else, whatever it is.

I have work to do.

I hope you have a pleasant evening.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

## e-introduction

---

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssvc@gmail.com>

Tue, Dec 20, 2022 at 9:53 PM

To: "J.J. Couey" [REDACTED]

Cc: "J.J. Couey" [REDACTED]

Mary Holland [REDACTED]

Rfk [REDACTED]

Jay, I'm not saying anything in my emails that I haven't been saying in interviews for the last 2 years (most of my interviews are posted on my main [FOI page](#), and the one you featured is actually from August 2021, not this year). Debunking virology isn't exactly rocket science.

I won't be watching the rest of your video. I've skipped through it and everywhere I land you're whining that the no virus people aren't this enough, aren't that enough, that you aren't "*feeling it*", that we have to explain this, we have to explain that.

There is no onus on us to offer alternative explanations in order to refute wild claims that are based on blatant pseudoscience. Ask Mary or Robert if you should be held in jail for a string of murders that you obviously didn't commit, on the grounds that you can't provide precise details as to who did commit the murders. That would be ridiculous, especially if the murders were never investigated properly because everyone assumed that you were the killer.

Nevertheless, plenty of in-depth analysis and alternative explanations have been put forth. The fact that you aren't familiar with them doesn't make them any less real. The no virus movement has already gone far above and beyond the call of duty. My newsletters / substack entries contain links to loads of such content.

People such as yourself have been telling us all along that we're wasting our time, that no one will ever listen to us. Yet day by day more and more people are seeing the truth. Virologists do not adhere to the scientific method and they engage in blatant pseudoscience. People who see this no longer live in fear of imaginary pathogens and cannot be manipulated the way the true-believers can.

Meanwhile, the leaders of the freedom movement who publicly insist that we're wrong have consistently failed to cite a shred of science to show that this is true. It should be easy, if there really were 60 years of science, as you claim.

Have a wonderful evening,  
Christine

[Quoted text hidden]