

## COVID-19: Scientific/Chemistry Experimentation For Virus Isolation – Options!

Saeed A. Qureshi, Ph.D. ([principal@pharmacomechanics.com](mailto:principal@pharmacomechanics.com))

Wow! Very interesting comments here on this thread and others.

To me, the most interesting ones are the comments concerning my (unacceptable) behavior and (poor) writing and communication skills. It is laughable; many clearly understand what I write about the science and the virus/virology. So, what is the issue? Do you expect that I should have writing skills like competing against a Harry Potter Novel writer or some linguistic expert? Sorry, I write simply using direct words, often science and scientific demands, not in sweet or double-meaning wordings or narratives.

So, next time, if you find my behavior or writing confusing, ask me to clarify. I do not have a hidden motive to confuse and demean anyone. It only appears to some readers because of their flawed mindset and bias against me.

I was almost ready to block some of the members from discussion here because of their rude behavior and saying things about me that were not true. However, I am passing the option for a little more time to give them the benefit of the doubt of being serious learners and questioners. So, here it goes.

In one post today, Wendy wrote ([link](#)), “I think what Saeed may be saying is that it is not the definition that will expose fraud but the actual science, the performing of actual science. If Saeed can do that and help expose the fraud of virology, I believe we will welcome that and him with open arms.” Mike Stone (ViroLIEgy fame) appears to be asking a similar question.

I am sorry; I do not work and write to be accepted in a particular group, especially those with flawed thinking and lacking scientific expertise. I write and explain what I learned over many decades with hands-on working experience and associated academic training in science/chemistry ([link](#)).

I hope the public will benefit from my writings, which have been deceived by fake scientists in medical/pharmaceutical areas.

In this respect, people who have not learned such a subject (science/chemistry) should try to learn and understand from my experience and knowledge—not shoving their views or “expertise” into my throat as if I were an idiot or ignorant.

The group is asking/expecting that I accept and support them by providing (experimental) evidence of their liking. Again, sorry, neither science nor I work this way. I cannot do or create experiments (of their liking) out of thin air.

A case in point is a request for some (science/chemistry) experiment similar to the one Dr. Stefan Lanka conducted to show the virus’s non-existence. People do not realize that biology or biological subjects (note, I have not used the word “sciences” but “subjects”) work on entirely different principles.

One is that they (e.g., biology) are not empirical but observational. Dr. Lanka’s studies show that the photographs (from the electron microscope) are the same or similar for the so-called controlled and test samples. He is just showing photographs, not the presence or absence of

**BIOANALYTICX**  
*Everything about pharmaceutical testing*



the so-called virus; people miss this critical point. More specifically, photographs of the cultures (or isolate) are the same – so ASSUME there is no virus. In my view, Dr. Lanka's studies have not proved or disproved the existence of the virus.

On the other hand, about the request, I should suggest some experimental study design that should be able to show that “the virus has not been isolated or exists.” This is an invalid request or dishonest approach to science, but it may be excused because people asking this question lack an understanding of science or its experimentation, in particular, science-related.

I realize some may jump on to such a request to get grants or fame, but I cannot. No wonder I am a lonely and poor scientist. So-called scientific institutions, mainly hospital-affiliated universities, are full of grant seekers and holders, such as physicians, and are running the show - the fake science shows. SARS-COV-2 virus, finding new viruses and their variants, antibodies, the gain of function research, origins of viruses, lab leaks, etc., are examples of such fake science research.

Actual science/scientists cannot design or conduct such studies. In physical sciences, such as chemistry, before conceptualizing such a study and planning for it, the question to be answered is where to get the virus specimen that one would like to isolate. In case no virus (reference) specimen is available, as for SARS-COV-2 (and others), sorry, no isolation experiment or experiment confirming the non-existence of the virus can be designed or conducted. If anyone says otherwise, they should be dealt with by court because it would be a corruption/criminal case, not a science case.

On the other hand, it is often argued that people are getting sick, so there has to be a virus somewhere. This view has two problems: one, where are the people who are getting sick? One could hardly find them. Supposedly sick people, if they exist, are described by some symptoms of common seasonal hiccups (commonly referred to as “flu”) and, in some cases, pneumonia or usual minor infections, which could be treated with standard practices or treatments.

The “newness or novelty” of illness is not evident. PCR testing has no merit in declaring illness or newness as new or novel. I have extensively written on my blog and book that a PCR test is simply a fraud (no other word for it). Just like one cannot isolate something without a reference specimen, one cannot develop a valid test without a reference specimen. It is not an opinion but a fact of fundamental principle of science. No exceptions!

The second problem with the above statement is that let us assume that people are sick with a new illness or disease – from clinical judgment, and all standard treatments seem to have failed. In that case, it is a new illness of **unknown cause**. We cannot consider the illness as viral because, for this labeling, we need a valid test for the virus, which we cannot have or develop, as noted above, due to the lack of availability of virus standards.

From clinical observation, the best we can do is say it is a new disease with an unknown cause. The unknown cause could be a pathogen (e.g., bacteria) or a chemical agent, which is already very well known but can not be a virus (because a virus is an unknown, non-existent thing, at least at present).

**BIOANALYTICX**  
*Everything about pharmaceutical testing*



So, now again, assume that there is an illness and it is new, and we need to find its source or cause. In that case, yes, scientific experiments can be conducted to isolate that “caustic agent” or “agent of interest,” as I used the words in the title of one of my recent articles on my blog—this is where I describe how the caustic agent can be isolated and linked to the illness ([link](#)).

If you have not followed that article for the first time, please consider reading it now; with this background, you will undoubtedly follow it better now. If you have a question and require further explanation, you are very welcome; however, do not attack me personally, my experience or expertise, but ask nicely and politely. I request and expect respect.

It is quite possible that, in the end, there might not be any pathogen at all. It may be a higher amount of food/environmental chemicals that were previously well-established or may be brand new. This is how science works or should work, not that someone says there is a virus in there, then starts isolating it or proving that no virus exists.

Suppose someone asks me to conduct such an experiment. In that case, I will certainly be happy to do so, most likely in developing a design and monitoring the project in a (chemistry) laboratory setup.

However, before anyone or I take on such a project, it should be clear that it would require sampling from lots and lots of people with illnesses. And, here is the kicker: no sick people are available for this new and novel illness, none, zero.

Why do I say that? It is because when studies were conducted to develop the vaccine (like mRNA from Pfizer-BioNTech, [link](#)) for COVID-19,

another fake science blunder, they were done in healthy humans because they could not find sick people during the height of the pandemic. So, how will we find sick people at the end of the pandemic? We can't. Therefore, isolation of caustic agent (“virus”) studies cannot be conducted. Conversely, it conclusively shows/proves that COVID-19 is not an illness or a viral illness – all claims are fake and fraudulent. It is a hoax! No virus can be isolated or shown to exist.

See, I saved you millions of dollars in research contract money and provided you the answer free. This is what actual science is and does - provide answers in an extremely cost-effective manner.

On the other hand, if medical experts and physicians had been asked for such a project, they would have applied for the grant, in billions, using some exotic terms like culturing, antibodies, RNA, DNA, mRNA, genetic engineering, sequencing, ultracentrifugation, etc., as has been happening for at least four decades without any end and virus sample, but publications after publications in so-called peer-reviewed “scientific journals” not in the actual scientific journals. Medical professionals never studied or practiced science or viruses; they called themselves scientists for large research grants and contracts.

So, when you hear from physicians that they see the virus found or isolated, it is associated with an illness; in that case, it is just a view (camouflaged by billions of dollars worth of laboratory “toys” which, in my personal experience they do not know how to operate them properly). Similarly, if they say that COVID-19 or the virus is dead or mutated, likewise it is a lie they never had the virus but mental

**BIOANALYTICX**  
*Everything about pharmaceutical testing*



gymnastic changed – nothing else. There is no virus – there is no science, and there is no physician-scientist. And as I wrote, an M.D. degree does not make or qualify a person a scientist ([link](#)). It is all fake and fraud. Scientists can only come from studying science, i.e., chemistry, physics, and/or mathematics. If one has not studied such subjects, it is safe to consider them fake science experts or scientists.

I am sorry that I have been very direct and strong. However, the issue of fake science and scientists has to be addressed directly and head-on to save the public and humanity at large.

If you like reading this article and found it helpful, please consider supporting my efforts with some contribution ([link](#)). Thank you very much.

**BIOANALYTICX**

*Everything about pharmaceutical testing*

