

## Virus Isolation Debate – Doctors vs Virologists

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

Recently, in one of his podcasts, Dr. Cowan (an M.D.) invited doctors, virologists, etc, to submit their evidence supporting claims that the virus has been isolated (i.e., it exists), which, in his view, has not been isolated (i.e., it does not exist), considering the "Scientific Method" approach ([link](#)).

This is not new, i.e., asking for a debate, but it seems more formalized and perhaps with better marketing effort.

Considering the literature, the virologists' view is that they indeed use a method called "culturing" and "sequencing," more formally known as PCR, to "isolate" the virus. Their "Scientific Method" has been well-established in virology for decades.

On the other hand, the doctors' group in the no-virus camp claims that the virus has not been isolated as their version of "Scientific Method" has not been followed. What is their version? It is not clear what they mean by the "Scientific Method." Apparently, they describe it using a cause-and-effect model with (statistical) hypothesis testing. To them, nowhere has it been shown that the so-called virus has its effect (illness or infection). To them, this means the virus has not been isolated

because no cause-and-effect studies have been reported.

It is not a debate about virus isolation but the choice of a "Scientific Method" approach. Interestingly, both groups debate **methods or approaches**, but it is unclear why they use "Scientific" with them; perhaps to sound more authentic or give themselves an advantage of being "knowledgeable" over their audience about "science."

The question is, are doctors and virologists capable, by their training and expertise, of assessing methods, particularly "scientific"? How and why? It is hard to see their experience or knowledge in this area of science, particularly in isolation and analytical method assessments.

Therefore, they argue about something in which they have not been trained or have expertise – a typical situation of blinds in a room with an elephant.

Is it not logical that they should seek help to address the issue from those who have experience and work in science (for isolation, method development, etc.)? The science of isolation/extraction and method development has been exceptionally well established for centuries and is called chemistry,



particularly analytical chemistry – the fundamental science. There should be no argument about it.

They have training and expertise to extract/isolate substances and have been doing so for ages, practically in isolation and extraction. For example, oil can be isolated/extracted from the bottom of the seas and oceans. All kinds of minerals are extracted from different geological formations with extremely minute quantities and much smaller molecular/particle sizes.

The logic dictates that one should consult such scientists to seek their opinion on the isolation subject and/or assessment of methods for isolation/extraction.

I have worked in isolation and method development areas in the pharmaceutical, medical, microbiology, food/agriculture, and environmental areas for almost 35 years ([link](#)). With this background, I would like to provide an opinion on the topic (isolation and method development) and doctors' and virologists' views.

In reality, the virologists' approach (culturing) is to grow viruses. It is unclear why they use the word isolation to describe culturing or growing, which is the opposite of isolation. Do they not know the difference in the meaning of these words? Most certainly, they do. They are perhaps too embarrassed to accept it, as they have

been "studying" viruses for so long. Now they have no choice but to embarrass themselves with many more orders – accepting that they never worked with isolation or isolated the virus. So, they should stop claiming that viruses have been isolated and that they are working with them. They lied to themselves and the public.

On the other hand, it is unclear why the doctors' group stuck with their "Scientific Method" based on hypothesis testing. It is a cause-and-effect model. Isolation does not work with the cause-and-effect model. Interestingly, the cause-and-effect model can work without isolation, e.g., straight with a swab sample, sputum, etc.

Once it is shown that the substance exerts its effect, an isolation step would be needed. Otherwise, there is no point in proceeding further with the isolation step. The method (scientific method) for isolation will be decided later depending on the virus's matrix, such as humans, animals, water, environment, food, etc.

Therefore, both groups have no working knowledge of the isolation of substances. However, some definitions or processes have been adopted to make it sound like the scientific claim that the virus does not exist. These are mental exercises that are not practical or relevant.



On the other hand, the issue is to prove that the virus has not been isolated or does not exist. This can easily be proven based on a scientific (analytical chemistry) approach. Both virologists and doctors, in general, claim that the virus is causing the illness or infection. This virus detection is based on a positive PCR (or antigen) test. So, the presence of a virus and/or its illness is based on a PCR test.

Simple question: How did the PCR test get validated, i.e., can it detect the virus?

A test cannot be validated for its use without the availability of a reference standard, in this case, the virus. As the virus is unavailable (or nonexistent), the PCR test becomes false and fraudulent. So, the conclusion is viruses do not exist, and the infection cannot happen ([link](#)).

Using a nonvalidated test for any claim is criminal – no ifs and buts. It is a court case, and it has to deal with it, not virologists or doctors. This (analytical chemistry/science) approach to showing the non-existence of the virus is 110% scientifically valid and independent of both the culturing method and the so-called "Scientific Method," which both groups have been arguing for decades without success, while it can be resolved in court in one hearing ([link](#)).

So, in short, it can be stated that virologists have no valid scientific

evidence that the virus exists or has been isolated. On the other hand, doctors' group cannot support their claim that the virus does not exist, using the "Scientific Method" approach, which is a misunderstanding of scientific methodologies.

However, based on the scientific (analytical chemistry) approach, it can be stated with full confidence and validity that the virus has never been isolated or existed. There should be no doubt about it.

A debate between two groups about "science" or "scientific methods" lacking an understanding of the actual science is undoubtedly a waste. There cannot be a winner in the debate, and if at all, then it will be the fake and fraudulent science with the continuation of the virus/virology/pandemic fraud as has been happening for the past many decades.

Please do not debate, but consider applying well-established science (chemistry) and its principles.

If the virus existence/non-existence issue is to be resolved honestly, please consider seeking help from science/chemistry/isolation/testing experts. The debate between the two groups, which created the issue or the virus, is the least productive exercise in achieving the desired outcome.



I hope this will be helpful, and I am available to discuss it further if needed.

Saeed Qureshi, Ph.D.

[Principal@Pharmacomechanics.com](mailto:Principal@Pharmacomechanics.com)

On non-virus side

Based on applying actual science (chemistry) principles

**BIOANALYTICX**

*Everything about pharmaceutical testing*

