SARS-COV-2: Debating To Dodge

Saeed A. Qureshi, Ph.D. (principal@pharmacomechanics.com)

There have been a few debates between virus and non-virus camps concerning the virus's (SARS-COV-2) existence and its isolation. However, a clear consensus (winners/losers) is lacking, but both parties claim to win. Why is it so? However, one thing is clear dodgy and fake science is certainly getting exposed.

The virus camp, which takes a judge's role, does not debate but forces its understanding of virology, notably about the isolation and existence of the virus. For example:

1. It describes isolation as isolation of "isolate" (culture/soup) and forces it to be accepted as isolation of the pure virus. How is it possible? It is a factually incorrect view.

2. It accepts and promotes (PCR and antigen) tests for the virus or (potential) infection when it is an invalid claim. Scientifically, none of these tests detect the virus and/or infection – never did.

3. PCR and antigen tests are surrogates for the virus through RNA and spike protein, respectively. However, surrogate makers have never been linked to viruses (i.e., not isolated from the viruses). So, scientifically these tests cannot reflect testing of the virus either.

4. Vaccines have been developed based on testing (clinical trials) in healthy human volunteers, not patients. How can the efficacy of a vaccine (or any drug) be tested in healthy people? Is it not an indirect confirmation that patients (or people with the virus) were not available during the peak period of the pandemic? Is it not enough to establish that one could not find people infected with a virus, i.e., there was or is no virus?

5. No further efficacy testing (i.e., clinical trials) has been conducted or planned for any viruses or their variants. However, vaccine variants are being developed with claims of efficacy. How are such efficacy claims established – other than just based on the views/opinions of the "medical experts"?

6. Sometimes, virologists and medical practitioners acknowledge these shortcomings. However, they then slip out with a statement that everything has been done according to well-accepted and peer-reviewed "scientific" methods and procedures - concluding that the virus exists and has been isolated.

7. Furthermore, voicing that people should learn virology to understand "science" - a subject that considers isolation of an "isolate" as isolation of a "virus." Why should anyone study such a misleading or dodgy subject or "science"?

The anti-virus group is considered a dissident group with a view that it has some mental flaw or limitation in comprehending the "modern science and technology" of virology. As a result, they are

hardly allowed to be heard respectably, but they are often classified and shunned as anti-science, anti-vaccine and/or anti-biology who should be ignored or left alone.

On the other hand, defending the virus's existence and isolation, both groups (virologists and medical experts) have a mindset developed based on the same education and training they received and do not even hear the issue or questions correctly.

Virologists and medical professionals on both sides of the debate always discuss methodologies used as a basis for their claim for virus isolation and purification, not viruses. This is the fundamental and most critical misunderstanding, i.e., they talk about methods of isolation, not the isolation of the virus.

Isolation, purification, and characterization of substances, in this case, viruses, RNAs, or proteins, requires an entirely different set of expertise and experience not taught in medical and/or biological sciences areas. The fact is that the subject of isolation of substance belongs to the science of analyses, more accurately, analytical chemistry.

For example, virologists and medical practitioners describe virus isolation using gradient ultracentrifugation. The technique is based on the principle that if one spins a multi-component solution or mixture, it helps separate and purify the content.

One of the layers (one of the separated layers, usually the supernatant is considered to contain "purified" viruses – so it is assumed"). However, how has this been established that a specific layer contains the virus and only the virus?

This is the only argument they use and emphasize for the isolation or purification of the virus, i.e., the gradient ultracentrifugation technique has been conducted. Hence the virus has been isolated and purified, and this view must be accepted as "scientific." But unfortunately, no specimen of the so-called isolated and purified virus is obtained to see or photograph, except for some culture samples of unknown compositions.

On the other hand, scientifically, the ultracentrifugation (gradient or otherwise) step should be the first step towards a long list of steps one needs to follow to isolate substances. In simple terms, centrifugation be considered a sieve having pores to separate bigger particles from the smaller ones depending on the size of the sieve pores. The pore size of the sieves will divide the content into groups smaller than pore size vs. larger, but both parts will still contain a mixture of particles if they exist.

How would one know which layers after centrifugation would contain the virus? Unfortunately, it is impossible to know. For the ultracentrifugation technique to work, it must first be calibrated with virus particles for their location. This cannot be done because it would require the virus particles, which no one has.

With this obvious flaw in applying the technique, the debate shifts to cell culturing, RNA, and its amplification and sequencing, as proof indicating they are working with viruses that release the RNA.

Interestingly, when one does not know or have an isolated virus, how could it be established that the

released RNA they are dealing with is from a virus? It can't be!

Analytical science/chemistry deals with such questions and challenges routinely to provide correct and authentic answers (authentication) for the isolation and purity of the substances.

Virologists and medical practitioners seem aware of the fakeness of their approach or "science." So, they avoid a valid resolution by continuing with irrelevant discussions on the virus's existence and isolation and creating new ones such as origin and related gain of function research.

Therefore, the only way to resolve the issue of virus isolation, purification, and characterization is to engage people with expertise in such areas as analytical chemistry. Without input from analytical chemistry subjects, understanding and resolving the issue related to viruses and pandemics is impossible. Furthermore, debating the topics of viruses, vaccines, and pandemics without a proper understanding of chemistry principles will remain irrelevant, illusive, and dodgy.

In addition, there should be a general recognition that medicines are chemical molecules/compounds; hence their development, manufacturing, and testing must be evaluated using principles and practices of chemistry/science, not the practice of so-called virology and medical science.