
studies cited during debate with Saeed Qureshi?

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

Fri, Mar 3, 2023 at 1:53 PM

To: dr.wilson [REDACTED] Thomas Baldwin <[REDACTED]>

Greetings,

I've been watching your discussion with Saeed Qureshi. Could you please list the studies that you referred to, that purportedly show that a virus exists?

Cheers,
Christine

studies cited during debate with Saeed Qureshi?

Debunk the Funk - [REDACTED]
To: "Christine, of the Massey family" <cmssyc@gmail.com>
Cc: Thomas Baldwin [REDACTED]

Fri, Mar 3, 2023 at 4:43 PM

Hello Christine, I believe you have been shown several studies by several people showing that viruses exist. But here is a small list of studies I compiled over a year ago. If you reply here, please be specific in your rebuttals.

Isolation of SARS-CoV-2

China - <https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017>
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7094943/pdf/41586_2020_Article_2008.pdf
<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2012-7>
Korea - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7036342/pdf/jkms-35-e84.pdf>
Australia - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7228321/pdf/MJA2-9999-na.pdf>
Italy - <https://journals.asm.org/doi/epub/10.1128/JVI.00543-20>

Isolation protocol: <https://www.protocols.io/view/culture-of-the-severe-acute-respiratory-syndrome-c-bcduis6w?step=5>

Characterization of specific CPE: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-17796-z>

Transmission

<https://www.thelancet.com/action/showPdf?pii=S0140-6736%2820%2930154-9>
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32422201/>
[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(20\)30607-3/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(20)30607-3/fulltext)

Koch's postulates are outdated, and Koch acknowledged this

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2595276/pdf/yjbm00143-0072.pdf>

Satisfaction of "Koch's postulates"

Production of comparable disease in the original host species or a related one and detection of a specific immune response to the virus:

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41392-020-00269-6>
<https://science.sciencemag.org/content/sci/368/6494/1012.full.pdf>

Re-isolation from infected host:

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2312-y>

Structural studies

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-19619-7.pdf>
<https://science.sciencemag.org/content/370/6513/203.long>

[Quoted text hidden]

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

to Debunk, Thomas ▼

Fri, Mar 3, 5:18 PM (17 hours ago)



Hi Dan,

I've yet to see any science demonstrating the existence of a virus.

I'm not looking for a list from a year ago, just the specific studies that you discussed while talking with Saeed.

Cheers



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

to Debunk, Thomas ▼

Fri, Mar 3, 5:24 PM (17 hours ago)



p.s. I have already seen all those "isolation" studies. None of them even have a valid independent variable (pure particles) to use in an experiment.

So, in addition to the specific studies that you discussed while talking with Saeed, I'm also now challenging you to cite a study where a pure sample of particles alleged to be "SARS-COV-2" was obtained from a patient, in order for "it" to be studied.





Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▾

Mar 3, 2023, 6:22 PM (16 hours ago)



Those have been provided to you in that list. If you can't be specific in your rebuttal, then there's no conversation to be had here.



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

to Debunk, Thomas ▾

Mar 3, 2023, 6:32 PM (16 hours ago)



No, they haven't been listed. You discussed **tobacco mosaic virus** with Saeed and there is nothing about that "virus" in your list.

And you know perfectly well that none of those "isolation" studies resulted in purification of particles, and that literally hundreds of FOI responses from around the world align with what is seen in the published literature - no one on Earth has a pure sample of the alleged virus.

I'm not trying to have a "conversation" with you. I'm simply asking you to **cite the specific studies that you discussed with Saeed**, and I'm **challenging you to cite a study where "SARS-COV-2" was purified**.

I'll be publishing your response, or non-response, as the case may be.

Freedom of Information Responses reveal that health/science institutions around the world (212 and counting!) have no record of SARS-COV-2 (the alleged covid virus) isolation/purification, anywhere, ever:

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/fois-reveal-that-health-science-institutions-around-the-world-have-no-record-of-sars-cov-2-isolation-purification/>

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/>

Cheers



Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▼

6:47 PM (32 minutes ago)



They have been listed and more than TMV was discussed.

I know perfectly well that your M.O. is to deny, deny, deny.

I'm not interested in your FOIA's. If you don't have a specific rebuttal, then you have nothing and I'm not interested in conversing with you.

...



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

to Debunk, Thomas ▼

6:59 PM (20 minutes ago)



In other words, you have no science, no independent variable, no valid controlled experiments.

The rebuttals have been made countless times, we went over this many times on twitter. If you have nothing new, that settles the matter.

Cheers

...

A circular profile picture featuring a person's face and the text 'FUNK' in green.

Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▼

7:04 PM (16 minutes ago)

All of that is included in each study listed.

You aren't rebutting it because you can't.

That reminds me, ever figure out how BLAST works?

A circular profile picture featuring a person's face and the text 'FUNK' in green.

Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▼

7:08 PM (13 minutes ago)

PS, here's a TMV paper that you also won't rebut.

Hebert, T.T., 1963, January. Precipitation of plant viruses by polyethylene glycol. In Phytopathology (Vol. 53, No. 3, p. 362). AMER PHYTOPATHOLOGICAL SOC.

C Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>
to Debunk, Thomas ▾

7:10 PM (10 minutes ago) ☆ ↶

Thanks.

Reverse the burden of proof much? Change the topic much? Me playing around with a database could never provide proof of a replicating disease bomb. Try to stay focused, Dan.

Just to be clear, you are claiming that the "isolation" studies you listed resulted in purification of particles, and that those particles are "the virus"? Is that correct?

...

 **Debunk the Funk**
to me, Thomas ▾

7:15 PM (6 minutes ago) ☆ ↶

So that's a "no."

Yep. Do you have a rebuttal now?

...

C Christine, of the Massey family
to Debunk, Thomas ▾

7:18 PM (3 minutes ago) ☆ ↶

Dan, a database full of codes is not science. Logic please.

I can't find full-text of that study, so please forward it to me.

And please confirm whether or not you are claiming that the "SARS-COV-2 isolation" studies you listed resulted in purification of particles, and that those particles are "the virus"?

...



Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▾

7:20 PM (9 minutes ago)



Oh it is, Christine. You should learn to use it.

You can't search the journal, volume number, and title yourself? Really?

Already said yes, Christine. Good lord.

...



Christine, of the Massey family

to Debunk, Thomas ▾

7:30 PM (0 minutes ago)



Yes, I can Dan, but the back issues only go to 1970:

<https://www.apsnet.org/publications/phytopathology/BackIssues/Pages/default.aspx>

Can't find it on pubmed, or presearch or sci-hub. If you have it, please send it.

...



Christine, of the Massey family

to Debunk, Thomas ▾

7:30 PM (0 minutes ago)



And please confirm whether or not you are claiming that the "SARS-COV-2 isolation" studies you listed resulted in purification of particles, and that those particles are "the virus"?



Debunk the Funk

7:46 PM (5 minutes ago)

to me, Thomas ▾

Goodness you're helpless. Just find a more recent method.

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF02876605>

...



Christine, of the Massey family

7:52 PM (0 minutes ago)

to Debunk, Thomas ▾

Earlier you wrote :

Hebert, T.T., 1963, January. Precipitation of plant viruses by polyethylene glycol. In Phytopathology (Vol. 53, No. 3, p. 362). AMER PHYTOPATHOLOGICAL SOC.

and now you're switching to a paper from 1978:

Concentration and purification of viruses and bacteriophages with polyethylene glycol

I asked you for **the specific studies that you discussed while talking with Saeed**. That's all I'm interested in.

If you discussed the Hebert paper with Saeed, please send it to me.

Please confirm whether or not you discussed this 2nd study with Saeed.

...



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

Fri, Mar 3, 7:53 PM (15 hours ago) ☆

to Debunk, Thomas ▾

And once again, please confirm whether or not you are claiming that the "SARS-COV-2 isolation" studies you listed resulted in purification of particles, and that those particles are "the virus"?

...



Debunk the Funk

Fri, Mar 3, 7:55 PM (15 hours ago) ☆

to me, Thomas ▾

It's the same methods, Christine. You're so helpless.

...



Debunk the Funk

Fri, Mar 3, 7:56 PM (15 hours ago) ☆

to me, Thomas ▾

I've said yes to this 3 times now. Holy cow. How do you function on a daily basis?

...

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

to Debunk, Thomas ▼

Mar 3, 2023, 8:19 PM (14 hours ago)



I didn't ask for any articles you feel like sending, only the specific ones you discussed with Saeed.

The 2nd article you've now cited is also behind a paywall, without even an abstract showing. I was able to find it on sci-hub (<https://sci-hub.hkvisa.net/10.1007/bf02876605>), and it's a review. It is not a study even purporting to show the existence of "TMV" or "SARS-COV-2"

Your "SARS-COV-2 isolation" studies have already been rebutted over and over again. For example, the ridiculous Australian study is featured on my site (<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/australian-dept-of-health-has-no-record-of-covid-19-virus-isolation/>), along with a "no records" FOI confession from the Victorian Infectious Diseases Reference Laboratory at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, where the imaginary virus was said to have been "isolated". This is the study where the authors had to add protein-eating trypsin to their impure monkey/cow/human/bacteria/fungi soup, in an effort to get the particles that they were passing off as "the virus" to look spikey lol.

Fan Wu study - they found 56.5 million sequences in RNA extracted from their impure soup, and made up a fraudulent "genome" from some of them.

All these studies are the same old, same old. No valid independent variable, no valid controlled experiments, just PCR, fabricated in silico "genomes", monkey cell rubbish, EM pics with arrows added, and wild assumptions.

I guess we're done here.

Cheers

Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▼

Fri, Mar 3, 8:28 PM (14 hours ago)

You've been sent what you asked for.

I'm well aware. It describes the methods you constantly ignore.

Again, your FOIA's are useless and you have no understanding of the methods. If you want to come on my channel and embarrass yourself like Qureshi did, feel free.

...

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

to Debunk, Thomas ▼

Fri, Mar 3, 9:06 PM (13 hours ago)

You've had your chance to cite some science, but can't even show me a valid independent variable, so we're done, thanks.

...

Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▼

Fri, Mar 3, 9:09 PM (13 hours ago)

You don't know what an independent variable is, do you?

So you issue a challenge then run away when I invite you to talk about it live? Figures.

...



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

to Debunk, Thomas ▼

Fri, Mar 3, 10:19 PM (12 hours ago)

Ok let's talk about the Wu study, or the Australia study, live.



Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▼

6:08 AM (4 hours ago)

We can talk about the literature live. No reason to limit it to 2 papers. Name your availability and let's pick a time and date.

studies cited during debate with Saeed Qureshi?

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>
To: Debunk the Funk [REDACTED]
Cc: Thomas Baldwin <[REDACTED]>

Sat, Mar 4, 2023 at 8:47 AM

I'll only do it if we pick a specific study(ies) ahead of time so that I can prepare for a proper discussion, with quotes from the paper. There's no value in broad, vague unsubstantiated claims that this and that have already been done. I'm not going on your show to argue over beliefs and opinions.

We can review the Wu (China) and the Caly (Australia) "isolation" papers that you have already "confirmed", 3 times now, resulted in purification of particles, and that those particles are "the virus". Or you can pick 2 of the Chinese studies.

If it turns out that those papers do not confirm purification of particles, or that "the virus" exists, there is no point looking at more papers.

I will not be accepting in silico codes in databases as proof of SARS-COV-2 or prior alleged coronaviruses, because they don't tell us anything about the methods used to arrive at those codes or whether they relate to an actual "coronavirus".

I will expect you to show logical, valid scientific evidence of "SARS-COV-2" (that the particle, consisting of a full length genome surrounded by the alleged spikey protein shell, actually exists and causes "covid-19" symptoms), not circular reasoning or assumptions.

If your "proof" relies on the alleged existence of a prior "coronavirus", then you will have to prove that that earlier one exists too, and provide the study(ies) you rely on in advance. And if that's the case, then we will only review 1 "SARS-COV-2" paper, not 2, or if there are too many papers re the earlier virus, we will only discuss that one.

We can discuss at date/time once you agree to these terms and send me the specific papers that we'll be discussing.

Isolation of SARS-CoV-2

China -

Zhu - A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019
<https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJMoa2001017>

this link you gave is no working but it used to link to the Wu paper:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7094943/pdf/41586_2020_Article_2008.pdf

Wu - A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China,
<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2008-3>

Zhou - A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin
<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2012-7>

Australia -

Caly - Isolation and rapid sharing of the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) from the first patient diagnosed with COVID-19 in Australia

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7228321/pdf/MJA2-9999-na.pdf>

[Quoted text hidden]



Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▾

8:55 AM (2 hours ago)



I said that the list of papers I sent you answer your question, Christine. So dense.

Fine, here are the papers I pick.

<https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abd5223>

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41392-020-00269-6>

<https://www.science.org/doi/pdf/10.1126/science.abb7314>

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-2312-y>

<https://www.researchsquare.com/article/rs-1121993/v1>

Pick a time and date.

...



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

to Debunk, Thomas ▾

9:01 AM (2 hours ago)



None of those papers are from your list of "SARS-COV-2 isolation" papers that you already "confirmed", 3 times now, resulted in purification of particles, and that those particles are "the virus". And all of them pre-suppose the existence of "the

Please review my last message.

...



Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▾

9:07 AM (2 hours ago)



If you want to limit the discussion to only a few papers, those are the ones that I pick. If you think they all "pre-suppose" a virus then it should be easy for you. Take it or leave it.

...

studies cited during debate with Saeed Qureshi?

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>
To: Debunk the Funk [REDACTED]
Cc: Thomas Baldwin [REDACTED]

Sat, Mar 4, 2023 at 9:48 AM

I already debunked the 1st paper in 2021:

MUC-1 aka MUC-IMB1: Corman/Drosten monkey business

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/muc-1-aka-muc-imb1-just-more-corman-drosten-monkey-business-fraud/>

2nd paper: Comparison of nonhuman primates identified the suitable model for COVID-19

They assume the virus and covid exist, they don't try to establish the existence of the virus particles.

"in this study, three species of NHPs were challenged with the same strain of SARS-CoV-2"

3rd paper: Comparative pathogenesis of COVID-19, MERS, and SARS in a nonhuman primate model

They didn't try to establish the existence of the alleged SARS-CoV-2 particle; they used a pre-existing "strain".

"macaques....were inoculated....with a SARS-CoV-2 strain from a German traveler returning from China"

4th paper: The pathogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 in hACE2 transgenic mice

They assume the virus and covid exist. They obtained the "virus" from elsewhere.

"Viruses and cells The SARS-CoV-2 strain HB-01 was provided by W. Tan....Seed SARS-CoV-2 stocks and virus isolation studies were performed in Vero cells, which are maintained in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM) (Invitrogen) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS), 100 IU/ml penicillin, and 100 µg/ml streptomycin, and incubated at 37 °C, 5% CO2."

They don't even claim to have purified "the virus".

5th paper: Safety, tolerability and viral kinetics during SARS-CoV-2 human challenge

They assume the virus and covid exist; they used a pre-existing "isolate" "SARSCoV-2/human/GBR/484861/2020"

They don't even claim to have purified "the virus".

These papers don't even claim to have purified "the virus".

We will discuss papers from your "SARS-CoV-2 isolation" list, that you already "confirmed", 3 times now, resulted in purification of particles, and that those particles are "the virus". Take it or leave it.

[Quoted text hidden]



Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▾

10:03 AM (1 hour ago)



You haven't. But if you think you have then it should be easy for you. Take it, leave it, or we can open it to discussing the literature. You're making this complicated for yourself. Don't make excuses. Either accept or stop wasting my time.

...



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

to Debunk, Thomas ▾

10:11 AM (58 minutes ago)



I guess you're not willing to defend your multiple "confirmations" that the 5 studies you initially listed resulted in purification.

We're done here. I'll be publishing these emails.

Have a nice day.

...

Mar 4, 2023, 10:11 AM



Debunk the Funk

to me, Thomas ▾


10:16 AM (53 minutes ago)



I initially listed more than 5 studies. They demonstrate what you deny. If you want to limit the conversation to a few papers, I gave you my choices. If you want to run away and continue denying in your own corner of the Internet, just say so.

So will you be posting to your audience that you refused to do a live debate or should I tell them?

...

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


to Debunk, Thomas ▼

10:50 AM (19 minutes ago)



I stand corrected, you initially listed **6** "SARS-COV-2 isolation" papers... but now refuse to discuss any of those papers with me on your show. You're only willing to discuss papers that used a pre-existing "isolate"/"strain".
I will be publishing all of these emails.



 **Debunk the Funk**

to me, Thomas ▼

10:54 AM (15 minutes ago)



I told you we can discuss the literature. You refused and demanded we only discuss a few pre-selected papers. I picked some papers and you still refuse. If you were too afraid to debate you should have just said so.

