

Tom Cowan on Why There Is No Immune System

By Jeremy Nell, Jerm Warfare, 9 January 2023

If Viruses Don't Exist Then the Concept of an Immune System Becomes Redundant.

Tom Cowan, who was **previously on my podcast** in which he discussed his book ***The Contagion Myth*** and why germs **don't cause disease**, is a doctor and author of multiple books challenging current medical paradigms, specifically relating to illness and optimal wellbeing.

His approach is sensible and logical and he has a wonderful way in simplifying complex concepts.

In terms of the discourse around viruses and germs in general, I've had numerous conversations with great thinkers including

- **Sam Bailey** and her husband **Mark** on their medical journeys;
- **Andrew Kaufman** on virus isolation;
- **David Rasnick** on HIV not existing and **rethinking cancer**;
- **Anthony Brink** on why the former South African president was right about HIV;
- **Steve Falconer** on the death of Germ Theory;
- **Mike Donio** on pharmaceutical propaganda; and
- **Mike Stone** on questioning the entire field of virology.

There are more but the aforementioned discussions cover a lot of ground and well worth listening to.

Tom joined me on my radio show to chat about similar talking points, but gave some superb analyses into the differences between contagion and infection as well as the absurdity of the currently established virus isolation claims.

The cherry on the top was his takedown of the immune system and why it can't exist if there is nothing against which to be immune.

Partial transcript prepared by Truth Comes to Light

Jerm:

Tom, you are one of the biggest influences on my life in the last year or so — yourself, Andy Kaufman, Sam Bailey and a handful of others. And I never in my life thought that I would have taken this road in challenging my own paradigm, particularly around viruses and germs in general...

And holy cow, Tom, how is it possible that we have all gone down this wrong road? ...

Tom:

How is it possible? I don't know. That's a speculative question, I would say. My role in this, I think, is not to speculate on so much why it happened, but documenting that it did happen...

[...]

Because one thing that I've learned in these past three years, and I try to be as rigorous about this as I can, is that the road to — I'm not sure what you call it, freedom or health or liberation — is not so much finding the truth as finding out what's not true.

Because at the end of the day, once you extricate all the things that we think or believe or hope that are not true, you end up, like I say, back home as a place that you are always looking for.

Jerm:

That's very true, Tom. It does feel like I'm home... There's a sense of liberation that comes when you realize that you don't need to outsource your health to the pharmaceutical industry...

Tom:

Right. Again, it's all about questioning fundamental assumptions. And you can get into this with things to do with actions of the government.

And interestingly, the fundamental assumption when you're dealing with actions by the government is that the government is there to help you. Right?

That's why these elected officials, we put them there and their job is to help the population. And of course, they have different ideas how to do that. But the fundamental assumption there is they're there to help. And I would submit that there's actually no evidence for that. They're not there to help you at all. They're there for a whole different reason.

And once you realize that, then you stop looking to them to help you because you realize that's not what they're meant to do.

And the reason I bring that up in response to what you said is it's actually the same thing with doctors and pharmaceutical industries and health organizations like the CDC and the NIH and whatever you have in your country, in the world.

We think they're there to protect and foster health. But that's an assumption which I would submit is actually not true. Now, it doesn't mean that the individuals who work for the CDC may think that's what they're doing. I'm sure a lot of them do.

But as an institution and as an endeavor — like the pharmaceutical industry is there to make money off you. And one of the ways they do that is to get you to buy their products by making you sick.

And if you think like that, which I would submit is actually closer to reality, then it makes sense of everything they do. It's just obvious.

If that was your goal, then you would give people things, otherwise known as vaccines, to make them sick, and then they would get asthma, and then you sell them this drug, and then they would get bronchitis, and then you sell them this drug. And it all makes sense...

Once you realize that and you realize those are not the people that you should even be asking the question to, because they're not interested. They have a different agenda, basically.

Jerm:

I was one of those people about two years ago. I remember when I first came across some of your work and I knee jerked. And I thought, no, come on. And there was something in me that said, no, just keep on go down this path and see where it goes.

And I have to say, Tom, I now have the converse view. I think 'how can people think like I did three years ago?'...

[...]

So, okay, Tom, where does the story start? I mean the contagion myth. When we talk about contagion, what are we talking about?

Tom:

Well, there's also a difference between contagion and transmission. Transmission is likely a real phenomena. Contagion is not a real phenomenon...

So what we mean by that is classically — I mean, you can get into semantics here, but contagion refers to the fact that microorganisms, in particularly viruses and bacteria, are spread between organisms like people or animals or maybe plants, and they cause disease.

[...]

If you drop a bomb on somebody with napalm, somebody meaning a city, and a lot of people burn to death and asphyxiate or whatever, does that mean that napalm bomb was contagious? So obviously no.

So then at that point, you have to do something called science. Which means you have to actually do an experiment. Which means if you think that a virus is contagious, meaning spread from one person to another, you have to do an experiment in which you take the virus, and the virus only, and introduce that to a number of people or animals in the usual way...and

see if they get sick.
Right?

It's like the example I use. If you say ping pong balls knock down walls, the only way to prove that is to take a ping pong ball, and only a ping pong ball, and throw that at the wall and see if the wall knocks down.

You can't put a ping pong ball in a bucket of stones and throw it at the wall, and if the wall knocks down, say it's because of the ping pong ball...

[...]

Now, let me just say transmission means sure that organisms can communicate with each other. And that actually is a real phenomenon.

Like, you put 20 menstruating, women in a cabin for a year and they all start menstruating, more or less at the same time. Is that a virus? I mean, nobody thinks that. Is it some sort of communication between people? Apparently. How does that work? I mean, I don't know. Nobody has actually studied it. Is there chemicals called pheromones? Maybe, but I have my doubts about that.

So that gets into a whole realm of how do biological organisms communicate with each other?

Trees do it, frogs do it. Presumably people do it. If one person starts laughing, other people start laughing...

[...]

Jerm:

Tom, before I ask you about the alternative vectors to illness or the expression thereof, obviously I have to ask you the elephant- in-the-room question which everybody always asks.

'Okay, but these scientific journals say that viruses have been isolated.' SARS-CoV-2 was apparently isolated, if you read that substack by Steve Kirsch. All those comments keep coming up.

So what is it that they are seeing?

Tom:

So the problem with that question is you have to get into the definition of what isolation means...

When you ask somebody like Steve Kirsch, 'has there been a paper that claims isolation of SARS-CoV-2', he says yes.

In fact, I would say there's let me guess, 10,000 papers in the medical literature claiming the isolation of a virus.

So the question is not 'do they say that?', it's 'how did they do it?'.

[...]

So you would think they would take a sick person, and doing very well-known and easily-performed techniques, they would purify the virus out of the snot or the blood or the cerebrospinal fluid, and then they would show you the pictures of the pure virus and that would constitute an isolated virus.

That has never been done. And they agree that that's never been done. So no organism, no particle that's "a replication competent protein coat, DNA or RNA on the inside, infectious particle" has ever been isolated using the definition that we all use — from any plant, animal or human being. And I will stake my entire career on the fact. And everybody agrees with that.

So because they couldn't do that, and because you can't study something that you haven't isolated, they made a new definition of isolation.

So what they do is they take snot from a person who's got a cough for unknown reasons. They do certain techniques, either centrifugation or filtration, which does not end up with a purified virus. It's just to get some of the debris out of the sample, right? So that is not a purified or isolated sample. That's just the liquid from your snot.

And then they put that on a cell culture, which means growing kidney cells from African green monkey, called verocells. And then they take away the nutrients. They add nephrotoxic, kidney toxic antibiotics. They add fetal bovine serum. (They suck the serum out of the heart of a newborn calf.) They add trypsin and usually some other things. Then they don't do an appropriate control. They do what they call a mock infection, sometimes, but they always change the parameters.

So, for instance, they don't add antibiotics. They never do what a mock infection is meant to. The definition is to do the same thing without a virus. Obviously they can't do that because they can't find a virus in the snot.

And then when the tissue breaks down — so we take monkey kidney cells that are growing, we take away their nutrients, we poison them, we add other genetic material and growth factors, we put in pancreatic enzymes — and when that cell culture breaks down, that is called isolation in the medical virology literature.

So if you ask Kirsch or any of those people, 'has it been isolated?', they say yes. If you say, 'how is it isolated?', they don't know. He doesn't know. Some of them know, but they won't tell you because everybody who can think knows that, like Vince Raccanello, that's not isolation.

And if it's not isolation, that means you never actually found the virus. Which means there's no evidence that the virus exists, Which means you can't study it. You can't find what genetics it has because you don't even have it in a pure form.

So all they do then is essentially assess the genetic material in the broken down kidney cells and fetal bovine serum and all the rest of it. And then they make a hypothetical model, which they match up with the previous hypothetical model to say they have a new virus. This is simply madness.

You cannot have a more unscientific procedure than what I just described...

[...]

Jerm:

Now, your book basically states that, I think, there are about four vectors to what would be defined as illness or the expression of illness, one of them being toxicity or poison, another being mental wellness or mental state. What's the other one? Physical injury and I think starvation of the cells. I think those are the four major vectors, am I right?

Tom:

Yeah, not quite. It's simple.

Number one, injuries, i.e. fall off your horse, right? Because that can give you a broken leg.

Number two, starvation. I wouldn't say of the cells, because even the whole cell theory is an unproven theory. But you don't have good food. Now, food includes — like stuff we eat and stuff we drink, and also mental, emotional food. If you're fed lies and BS all the time, you're starving for the truth.

The third one is poisoning. And we have varied and creative ways of poisoning other people and animals and plants.

And the fourth one, which I didn't used to emphasize so much, but now I think is the most important, is: people are delusional. In other words, they believe in nonsense. And because they believe in nonsense... typically when you believe something, that becomes the basis for the actions of your life. And the actions then have consequences.

And I can give you an example that really hit this home. There was a guy I knew who was an anthroposophical doctor, and I met him 20 years ago, and he worked at a community clinic in San Francisco treating so-called AIDS patients with HIV drugs.

I told him HIV has never been proven to exist, and the whole thing is nonsense. And of course, he didn't believe it. And he spent his life treating people for imaginary viruses, right? That's what he believed in.

So then, of course, because he believes in imaginary viruses, he got four COVID shots — the two normal ones, whatever normal is, and then the two boosters. And I think it was four or five days after this second booster, he was found dead in his bed. And he was otherwise a healthy guy, supposedly.

So why did he die? You could say he died because he was poisoned, and that's true. But the real reason he died was because he believed in viruses, because that led him to self inflict this poison, and that killed him.

So it's huge what you believe...

[...]

Jerm:

The thing though, Tom, is then what is sickness? Or what is illness? Is it an expression of something?

Tom:

The whole concept of illness is misinterpreted by doctors and medicine.

Again, I've given this example a million times. You get a splinter in your finger, you don't take it out. That's like a toxin, so to speak. And then you make pus to get the splinter out.

And in medical school you learn pus means infection, means bad, means give the person antibiotic.

But it's obvious that if you get rid of the pus, the splinter will stay there and you'll get pus again and again and again. And then you'll encapsulate the splinter, unless you take it out, and then you'll have a tumor, which means a new growth. And that's exactly the sequence of events of what happens to people.

So another one. You put debris in your lungs. People do that with smoking and breathing crappy air like Wuhan and Italy and places all over the world. And then you get a cough to get the crap out of your lungs. Well, you go to the doctor and he says, because he doesn't understand medicine, he says you have bronchitis. So he gives you cough medicine and antibiotics to keep the debris in your lungs. And then you do that twice a year for 20 years. And then you get a bag of debris in your lungs and we call that lung cancer. And we say, I don't know how you got lung cancer. You must have smoked or something. Right? But your body kept trying to get it out.

And the doctors, because they don't understand how medicine works or how every symptom you have is your body's attempt to heal and we don't understand that. So every encounter makes things worse.

Jerm:

I suppose, by extension, Tom, I have to ask you, does the immune system exist in any meaningful way?

Tom:

There is no immune system. They made that up to make you think there were viruses. What happens — there is no immunity to imaginary viruses. There has never been any proof of any chickenpox, smallpox, measles virus in any living human being or animal, period.

And so you can't get immune to something that doesn't exist. In fact, what happens if you have a situation in your life of toxicity or exposed to mental stress or a child who's growing too much too fast essentially, and they don't have the collagen in their diet to keep up, they break down a little bit and they excrete that through their skin.

We call that measles or chickenpox and we can't even really tell the difference between measles and chickenpox.

If you go back to the historical literature, they knew that these were just different manifestations. And so then you make white blood cells to clean up the debris. That's like garbage collectors. And then you make these proteins called antibodies to repair the tissue. They're not killing off or remembering any viruses. And so obviously, if you're breaking down more like you have AIDS, you'll have more antibodies because you have more tissue to repair. That has nothing to do with anything called immunity.

It has to do with if you break somebody down because they smoke and take amphetamines and poppers and you don't eat and all that stuff and their tissues break down and they're psychologically terrorized. They break down and they make antibodies to repair. And we test and see if they have antibodies and then they say they have a virus. This is absurd.

It's like nursery school thinking.

Jerm:

But yet it's 150 years, or thereabouts, old. I mean it's crazy to think that it's been so established.

Tom:

Well, it's not the only thing, I can tell you that.

Jerm:

...Going into the year 2023, what advice could you give people?

Tom:

Don't believe anything coming out of mainstream media or your doctor or health authority. And don't let anybody put stuff in you that a) you don't know what it is, b) if it came from a carrot, that's okay. If it's the chemicals that supposedly are in a carrot, don't eat it because it's not good for you. That's not how we're organized. Don't inject anything into yourself. And think for yourself.

I think the most important thing I've learned is focus on understanding what's not true and give yourself a break from saying therefore I must know what is true. You will find out what's true at the end of the day once you've cleared out all the stuff that you believe that wasn't true.

There was a quote from Mark Twain that I sometimes show. He says, "It ain't what you don't know that gets you. It's what you know for sure but just ain't so. "

That's the problem. You have a lot of things that people, including myself, we think we know for sure: There's cells, there's immune system, there's viruses. The medical profession is there to help you. The government is there to protect your well being.

There's no evidence for any of that stuff. So once you get rid of that, then you will be left with 'so how does this all work?'. Then that becomes fun.