

drtomcowan.com

Only Poisoned Monkey Kidney Cells 'Grew' the 'Virus' – Dr Tom Cowan

Dr. Tom Cowan

6-7 minutes

This week, my colleague and friend Sally Fallon Morell brought to my attention an amazing article put out by the CDC. The link to the article is [here](#), and it was published in June 2020. The purpose of the article was for a group of about 20 virologists to describe the state of the science of the isolation, purification and biological characteristics of the new SARS-CoV-2 virus, and to share this information with other scientists for their own research. A thorough and careful reading of this important paper reveals some shocking findings.

First, in the section titled “Whole Genome Sequencing,” we find that rather than having isolated the virus and sequencing the genome from end to end, they found 37 base pairs from unpurified samples using PCR probes. This means they actually looked at 37 out of the approximately 30,000 of the base pairs that are claimed to be the genome of the intact virus. They then took these 37 segments and put them into a computer program, which filled in the rest of the base pairs.

To me, this computer-generation step constitutes scientific fraud. Here is an equivalency: A group of researchers claim to

have found a unicorn because they found a piece of a hoof, a hair from a tail, and a snippet of a horn. They then add that information into a computer and program it to re-create the unicorn, and they then claim this computer re-creation is the real unicorn. Of course, they had never actually seen a unicorn so could not possibly have examined its genetic makeup to compare their samples with the actual unicorn's hair, hooves and horn.

The researchers claim they decided which is the real genome of SARS-CoV-2 by "consensus," sort of like a vote. Again, different computer programs will come up with different versions of the imaginary "unicorn," so they come together as a group and decide which is the real imaginary unicorn.

The real blockbuster finding in this study comes later, a finding so shocking that I had to read it many times before I could believe what I was reading. Let me quote the passage intact:

"Therefore, we examined the capacity of SARS-CoV-2 to infect and replicate in several common primate and human cell lines, including human adenocarcinoma cells (A549), human liver cells (HUH 7.0), and human embryonic kidney cells (HEK-293T). In addition to Vero E6 and Vero CCL81 cells. ... Each cell line was inoculated at high multiplicity of infection and examined 24h post-infection. No CPE was observed in any of the cell lines except in Vero cells, which grew to greater than 10 to the 7th power at 24 h post-infection. In contrast, HUH 7.0 and 293T showed only modest viral replication, and A549 cells were incompatible with SARS CoV-2 infection."

What does this language actually mean, and why is it the most

shocking statement of all from the virology community? When virologists attempt to prove infection, they have three possible “hosts” or models on which they can test. The first is humans. Exposure to humans is generally not done for ethical reasons and has never been done with SARS-CoV-2 or any coronavirus. The second possible host is animals. Forgetting for a moment that they never actually use purified virus when exposing animals, they do use solutions that they claim contain the virus. Exposure to animals has been done once with SARS-CoV-2, in an experiment that used mice. The researchers found that none of the wild (normal) mice got sick. In a group of genetically modified mice, a statistically insignificant number lost some fur. They experienced nothing like the illness called Covid 19.

The third method virologists use to prove infection and pathogenicity — the method they most rely on — is inoculation of solutions they say contain the virus onto a variety of tissue cultures. As I have pointed out many times, such inoculation has never been shown to kill (lyse) the tissue, unless the tissue is first starved and poisoned.

The shocking thing about the above quote is that using their own methods, the virologists found that solutions containing SARS-CoV-2 — even in high amounts — were NOT, I repeat NOT, infective to any of the three human tissue cultures they tested. In plain English, this means they proved, on their terms, that this “new coronavirus” is not infectious to human beings. It is ONLY infective to monkey kidney cells, and only then when you add two potent drugs (gentamicin and amphotericin), known to be toxic to kidneys, to the mix.

My friends, read this again and again. These virologists, published

by the CDC, performed a clear proof, on their terms, showing that the SARS-CoV-2 virus is harmless to human beings. That is the only possible conclusion, but, unfortunately, this result is not even mentioned in their conclusion. They simply say they can provide virus stocks cultured only on monkey Vero cells, thanks for coming.

If people really understood how this “science” was done, I would hope they would storm the gates and demand honesty, transparency and truth.

New Podcast: Why Taking Vitamin D Might Not Be Good

We are posting my interview with the brilliant MIT researcher Dr. Stephanie Seneff today. In this interview, we cover many subjects having to do with circulation, Covid, glyphosate and the role of vitamin D in health and illness. Stephanie knows the medical literature on these subjects in a way that few others do. Some of her conclusions will surprise and challenge you. For example, she makes a compelling case that vitamin D supplementation is not a good idea.

Please join us for this interview, send us your comments and feedback, and please distribute Sally's and my book “The Contagion Myth” far and wide. We need its findings to get out there in the world.

With thanks,

Tom