

Twitter Thread by Deputy Dawgly



Deputy Dawgly

@DDawgly



1) To @Kevin_McKernan @MichaelYeadon3 @ClareCraigPath This may appear patronizing & repetitive to you, but as you are REPEATEDLY evading this issue & patronizing lay people who look to you as authorities on a so-called 'virus' that has devastated their lives,
I feel it's-

2) -necessary to simply and repeatedly spell things out:

A 'SARS-CoV-2 virus', the alleged cause of so-called 'COVID-19', is based on 'theoretical' (NOT actual, NOT real) sequences supplied by a Chinese laboratory to Professor Christian Drosten & Co, early January 2020.

The first and major issue is that the novel Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 (in the publication named 2019-nCoV and in February 2020 named SARS-CoV-2 by an international consortium of virus experts) is based on in silico (theoretical) sequences, supplied by a laboratory in China [1], because at the time neither control material of infectious ("live") or inactivated SARS-CoV-2 nor isolated genomic RNA of the virus was available to the authors. To date no validation has been performed by the authorship based on isolated SARS-CoV-2 viruses or full length RNA thereof. According to Corman et al.:

"We aimed to develop and deploy robust diagnostic methodology for use in public health laboratory settings without having virus material available." [1]

The focus here should be placed upon the two stated aims: a) development and b) deployment of a diagnostic test for use in public health laboratory settings. These aims are not achievable without having any actual virus material available.

Nevertheless these in silico sequences were used to develop a RT-PCR test methodology to identify the aforesaid virus. This model was based on the assumption that the novel virus is very similar to SARS-CoV from 2003 as both are beta-coronaviruses.

3) They're NOT actual sequences because at that time (early January 2020) no 'LIVE' or 'INACTIVE' RNA of the virus was available to Professor Drosten & Co, the INVENTORS of the 'SARS-CoV-2 virus'. <https://t.co/z8CxX9mE1>

The first and major issue is that the novel Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 (in the publication named 2019-nCoV and in February 2020 named SARS-CoV-2 by an international consortium of virus experts) is based on in silico (theoretical) sequences, supplied by a laboratory in China [1], because at the time neither control material of infectious (“live”) or inactivated SARS-CoV-2 nor isolated genomic RNA of the virus was available to the authors. To date no validation has been performed by the authorship based on isolated SARS-CoV-2 viruses or full length RNA thereof. According to Corman et al.:

“We aimed to develop and deploy robust diagnostic methodology for use in public health laboratory settings without having virus material available.” [1]

The focus here should be placed upon **the two stated aims: a) development and b) deployment of a diagnostic test for use in public health laboratory settings. These aims are not achievable without having any actual virus material available.**

Nevertheless these in silico sequences were used to develop a RT-PCR test methodology to identify the aforesaid virus. This model was based on the assumption that the novel virus is very similar to SARS-CoV from 2003 as both are beta-coronaviruses.

4) “To date no validation has been performed by the authorship [Drosten, Corman et al] based on SARS-CoV-2 viruses or full-length RNA thereof”.

Meaning that, until NOW, there’s NO proof the ‘SARS-CoV-2 virus’ is anything other than a THEORY.

The first and major issue is that the novel Coronavirus SARS-CoV-2 (in the publication named 2019-nCoV and in February 2020 named SARS-CoV-2 by an international consortium of virus experts) is based on in silico (theoretical) sequences, supplied by a laboratory in China [1], because at the time neither control material of infectious (“live”) or inactivated SARS-CoV-2 nor isolated genomic RNA of the virus was available to the authors. To date no validation has been performed by the authorship based on isolated SARS-CoV-2 viruses or full length RNA thereof. According to Corman et al.:

“We aimed to develop and deploy robust diagnostic methodology for use in public health laboratory settings without having virus material available.” [1]

The focus here should be placed upon **the two stated aims: a) development and b) deployment of a diagnostic test for use in public health laboratory settings. These aims are not achievable without having any actual virus material available.**

Nevertheless these in silico sequences were used to develop a RT-PCR test methodology to identify the aforesaid virus. This model was based on the assumption that the novel virus is very similar to SARS-CoV from 2003 as both are beta-coronaviruses.

5) How is it that, until today, an example of a fully-sequenced, ISOLATED ‘SARS-CoV-2 virus’ from an actual infected person has never been provided?

Because Drosten & Co, NOR ANYONE ELSE, is able to MAGIC a purely THEORETICAL virus into an ACTUAL one.

<https://t.co/QqqUz2IA3Y>

6) And because Drosten & Co took those THEORETICAL sequences from China, did SOME MORE THEORETICAL work, and with the aid of computer programs, simply added and recombined gene sequences from a number of various sources, including RNA sequences common to ALL human beings-

Dr. Kevin Corbett, a Ph.D. and retired RN: *“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.*

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.”

7) -which were stored in gene banks (data banks of gene sequences). Drosten and Co. completely dispensed with the NEED for ACTUAL viral material, or even a test-tube, and used COMPUTERS to construct a THEORETICAL MODEL of a virus and its genome sequences.

What is *‘viral morphology’* ? *“In the fish market,”* Dr Corbett explained, *“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.”

8) Professor Drosten called his computer-constructed invention, ‘2019-nCoV’, which was later renamed ‘SARS-CoV-2’. Meanwhile, in the REAL WORLD, the flu season had begun to pick up steam, so Drosten and his team, which included PCR ‘test’ manufacturer, Olfert Landt, quickly-

9) -developed a PCR ‘test’ protocol to ‘detect’ the newly-fabricated, ‘SARS-CoV-2’ computer virus. This PCR ‘test’ protocol consisted of some snippets of gene-sequences from Drosten’s computer creation.

<https://t.co/ggMBle7d8l>

6) Two of the INVENTORS of the so-called '2019-nCoV virus' - later relabeled, 'SARS-CoV-2' - and the PCR test protocol to 'detect' it.

Their computer handiwork is the basis of the global #COVIDSCAMDEMIC - a massive FRAUD of which the SCIENCE & POLITICAL world are FULLY AWARE. pic.twitter.com/ID4FbQAG2m

— Deputy Dawgly (@DDawgly) December 20, 2020

10) Some of these snippets included those from common sequences of human RNA, as well as RNA sequences from common cold corona-viruses and bacteria that were bound to provide a match, i.e. produce a 'positive' test result, in a significant percentage of any population tested.

11) To further ensure any tested population would provide 'positives' at a 'PANDEMIC' level, they took the added precaution of recommending an amplification cycle setting of 45ct (approximately double the scientifically accepted norm) for their PCR 'test' <https://t.co/LDg0Uzsi3N>

5) To increase the probability of 'positive results', the PCR amplification cycles were set ridiculously high enough to ENSURE a large number of these. No matter what illness a person had at the time of a 'positive test', it could be classed as \u2018COVID-19\u2019 - same for any death.

— Deputy Dawgly (@DDawgly) December 27, 2020

12) As there was already a predicted heavy flu season underway, they strove to get 'approval' to begin mass 'testing' for their computer-constructed 'SARS-CoV-2 virus', ASAP. They IMMEDIATELY got that approval from WHO on January 17th - just a few days after Drosten & Co had-