

uncoverdc.com

Ten Fatal Errors: Scientists Attack Paper That Established Global PCR Driven Lockdown - UncoverDC

Celia Farber

9-12 minutes

War has broken out in the scientific literature that strikes at the existential core of Covid-19 and its proposed causative virus.

At the heart of the controversy lies the fact that the creators of the most commonly used test, the RT-PCR, published instructions for how to test for SARS-CoV-2 “without having virus material available,” in their own words, relying instead on the Chinese scientists’ genetic sequence published on the internet.

The paper “[Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus \(2019-nCoV\) by real-time PCR](#)” was published 24 hours after it was submitted to Eurosurveillance, clearly evading peer review. Its lead authors were Christian Drosten and Victor Corman, which is how it took on the title “Corman-Drosten paper.” It provided the “recipe,” or work flow for the Covid-19 diagnostic test, quickly applied all over the world, after it was accepted as the standard of testing by the WHO.

German scientist Christian Drosten was also a co-discoverer of the SARS-associated coronavirus, and developed a test for it in 2003.

Drosten, who heads the Charite Institute of Virology in Berlin, and a team of fellow scientists in Europe and Hong Kong, moved very quickly, as soon as cases of the illness were being reported out of Wuhan in December of 2019. They submitted the paper on Jan. 21, it was published in *Eurosurveillance* on Jan. 23, and was immediately accepted as the standard of testing internationally, by the WHO, which began sending test kits to affected regions.

In the harrowing months that followed, amid lockdowns, economic collapse, school closures and widespread panic, few were aware of the immense problems with the paper, which tragically offered a testing method that would yield between 80 and 97 percent false positive results, due to a non-existent gold standard which would be the virus itself.

CORMAN- DROSTEN REVIEW REPORT

CURATED BY AN
INTERNATIONAL
CONSORTIUM OF
SCIENTISTS IN LIFE
SCIENCES (ICSLS)

It all came to a head on Nov. 30, when the Corman-Drosten foundation paper was [challenged by 22 international scientists](#) who wrote a letter demanding the paper's retraction, along with an extensive critique citing 10 errors in the paper it deemed "fatal."

Titled "[External peer review of the RTPCR test to detect SARS-Cov-2 Reveals 10 Major Flaws At The Molecular and](#)

Methodological Level: Consequences For False-Positive Results,”

the paper’s lead author is Dr. Pieter Borger, an expert on the molecular biology of gene expression. Several other esteemed names are associated with the paper including Dr. Michael Yeadon, former VP of Pfizer and outspoken critic of much of the so-called science beneath the WHO’s global lockdown, masking, and school shut-down measures.

I reached one of the authors, Dr. Kevin Corbett, at his home in London. He spoke simply and with controlled apoplexy. He confirmed and cast additional light on the shocking fact that the paper was written in the absence of a viral isolate, among many other problems.

“Every scientific rationale for the development of that test has been totally destroyed by this paper. It’s like Hiroshima/Nagasaki to the Covid test,” he said. *“When Drosten developed the test, China hadn’t given them a viral isolate. They developed the test from a sequence in a gene bank. Do you see? China gave them a genetic sequence with no corresponding viral isolate. They had a code, but no body for the code. No viral morphology.”*

I asked him to define “viral morphology” for the layperson.

“In the fish market,” he said, *“it’s like giving you a few bones and saying that’s your fish. It could be any fish. Not even a skeleton. Here’s a few fragments of bones. That’s your fish. Listen, the Corman/Drosten paper, there’s nothing from a patient in it. It’s all from gene banks. and the bits of the virus sequence that weren’t there they made up. They synthetically created them to fill in the blanks. That’s what genetics is; it’s a code. So its ABBBCCDDD and you’re missing some what you think is EEE so you put it in. It’s*

all synthetic. You just manufacture the bits that are missing. This is the end result of the geneticization of virology. This is basically a computer virus.”

In an interview posted on his Twitter feed, Dr. Pieter Borger said, *“The virus wasn’t in Europe and the paper was already finished.”* He said these facts *“should have been on television long ago. I explained it on LinkedIn, but you get banned if you do.”* Regarding PCR he said, *“[You are not detecting a virus.](#)”*

“Once I heard a good comparison,” he continued. *“If you go to a junkyard and you find a wheel or a hubcap from a Mercedes, and a steering wheel of a Mercedes, can you infer that you are in a Mercedes garage at that moment? If you only see those two parts? No, you can’t. You don’t know anything about it... you only know you have a steering wheel, you can find those things everywhere. In every junkyard you can find them.”* He describes the RT PCR tests as having *“no relevance for the diagnosis whatsoever.”*

German lawyer Reiner Fuellmich who is central to a growing group of lawyers, scientists, politicians, and even secret pharmaceutical whistleblowers, said in an interview, *“We believe that in order to make this house of cards collapse, we have to attack the PCR test. The fact is, there are no asymptomatic infections.”*

This seemingly radical claim was bolstered by a paper out of Wuhan of all places, [published by Nature.com](#), which found no “viable virus” in PCR positive cases.

“The screening of the 9,865,404 participants without a history of COVID-19 found no newly confirmed COVID-19 cases, and identified 300 asymptomatic positive cases with a detection rate of

0.303 (95 % CI 0.270–0.339)/10,000. ... A total of 1174 close contacts of the asymptomatic positive cases were traced, and they all tested negative for the COVID-19. ... Of the 34,424 participants with a history of COVID-19, 107 tested positive again, giving a repositive rate of 0.310% (95% CI 0.423–0.574%.) Virus cultures were negative for all asymptomatic positive and repositive cases, indicating no “viable virus” in positive cases detected in this study.”



Dr. Kevin Corbett, Ph.D./Photo: Twitter

Dr. Corbett, a Ph.D., and retired RN elaborated: “There are 10 fatal errors in this Drosten test paper. Public Health England is a co-author on it. All the public health authorities across the EU have co-authored this paper. But here is the bottom line: There was no viral isolate to validate what they were doing. The PCR products of the amplification didn’t correspond to any viral isolate at that time. I call it ‘donut ring science.’ There is nothing at the center of it. It’s all about code, genetics, nothing to do with reality, or the actual person, the patient.”

I read him some of the critiques from the other side, that say it’s been isolated “all over the world.”

“Yes, there have since been papers saying they’ve produced viral isolates. But there are no controls for them. The CDC produced a

paper in July, I think it was, where they said: 'Here's the viral isolate.' Do you know what they did? They swabbed one person. One person, who'd been to China and had cold symptoms. One person. And they assumed he had it to begin with. So it's all full of holes, the whole thing."



One of their 10 challenges is the stunning fact that EuroSurveillance published the paper 24 hours after it was submitted back in January. *"Twenty-four hours,"* Dr. Corbett said incredulously. *"That never happens. It takes months to get a review done. They turned this around in 24 hours. It was waved through, it was not peer-reviewed. There's no standard operational procedure for this test. There's major and minor concerns about this paper and we go through it all here. it should be retracted. If they retract it, it means the whole thing falls to bits. The whole edifice collapses. It's a house of cards built on sand and we've just moved the sand."*

The authors of the Drosten paper, for their part, were dismissive on social media. One of them, Marion Koopman, referred to the Borger et al critique as *"ongoing nonsense."* Drosten himself launched ad-hominem attacks at some of the authors via Twitter.

Koopman tweeted: *"The labs on this paper all had worked with SARS, had samples from SARS patients in their freezers. So that made it possible to do a first check of how this would work. A valid choice in an emerging disease outbreak, where you are in the blind phase."*

At press time, *Eurosurveillance* at least did acknowledge to the paper's authors that they had received it and were reviewing it. When asked on Twitter if there had been a response, lead author Peter Borger replied that the response among scientists had been overwhelming in its support.

From his home in Germany, Reiner Fuellmich said, "*The reason why I decided to speak out is that I didn't want these crazy people who are pulling the strings behind the scenes to rule the world. I had no idea when I came out with my first video that these people and their corporations were such a powerful block. We are up against some really powerful and devious and bad, evil people. But they're not a united front. We on the good side so to speak, I am firmly convinced that we have the better people, who know much more not just intellectually. The thing is . . . we're humans, and they're not.*"

Celia Farber is half-Swedish and being raised there, she knows socialism from the inside. She has contributed to the Epoch Times, Harper's, Esquire, Rolling Stone and more. She left the legacy media, never to return. She is the recipient of the Semmelweis International Society Clean Hands Award For Investigative Journalism. She is the author of Serious Adverse Events: An Uncensored History of AIDS, and the editor of The Truth Barrier, an investigative and literary website. She co-hosts The Whistleblower Newsroom with Kristina Borjesson on PRN, Fridays at 10 a.m.