Why Pathogens Don't Exist

By Dr Sam Bailey, 5 May 2023

Many of us who can see that **viruses don't exist**, find it easier to do so as virology is an off-shoot of **germ theory.**

If germ "theory" is wrong, there is no sense in pursuing alleged disease-causing sub-microscopic organisms. That's why the germ theorists don't want us scratching beneath the surface of the so-called '**science**' involving bacteria either.

Let's have a look at why the concept of "pathogens" is a complete fail on their own terms from **Koch's Postulates** through to some modern day animal experiments.

Connect with Drs. Sam (Samantha) & Mark Bailey

---

*Transcript prepared by **TCTL** (Truth Comes To Light) editor:*

Dr. Sam Bailey

When it comes to science and the scientific method, we need to be precise. Very precise.

One of the problems many people have noticed during the COVID-19 fraud is that the "science" is anything but precise. For example, the public was told that according to the science, masks were not useful. But then useful a few weeks later, even when no new data was provided.

This is not science, of course, but political whims and agendas in motion.

However, the problem goes much deeper than most people can imagine. In the last three years, we have spent a lot of effort exposing the pseudoscience of the virus model.

This is a branch of the fallacious germ theory paradigm. And many of us find it easier to see that viruses don't exist. Because if germ theory is false, then pathogens do not and cannot exist either.

~~~

In 2020, when I was coming up to speed with virology, the work of my soon-to-be "Virus Mania" co-authors Torsten Engelbrecht and Dr. Claus Kohnlein, as well as the Perth Group, caused a paradigm shift in my thinking.

For the first time I looked at virology critically and became focused on the terminology being used. That unlocked the door to understanding the methodologies of their experiments and a realisation that their claims that viruses existed were not backed up by scientific evidence.
~~~

In other cases, it is through the perversion of the English language that the public is deceived into believing they have produced various results.

There came a wider realization that doctors and the majority of people involved in science were not actually scientists. They are practitioners and technicians, following "guidelines" and so-called best practice protocols.

By contrast, to be a scientist, it really means someone who systematically gathers and uses research and evidence to make hypotheses and test them, to gain and share understanding and knowledge.

Some of the keywords here are 'systematically' and 'to test hypothesis'.

As we and others have demonstrated, the virus model is being held together by ether.

The various hypotheses involved in virology have been systematically refuted, and in most cases these refutations are on their own terms.

All that is left now are apologists who embarrass themselves by claiming that we don't need the old science because detecting genetic sequences proves that viruses exist.

As I have mentioned, virology is an offshoot of germ theory and started gaining momentum at the end of the 19th century when the latter was taking hold, largely due to the promotions of Robert Koch and Louis Pasteur.

The germ theorists were convinced that microbes they could see under the light microscope were the cause of various diseases. It was thought that these microbes were behind the concept of contagion.

However, in some diseases, specific microbes, whether they be bacterial or fungal, could not be identified. So it was imagined that even smaller microbes, so-called viruses, were responsible for disease causation and contagion.

Without even worrying about virology, the problem for germ theory is that it never got off the ground, and it is only through sustained fraud that it continues to be touted as a scientific theory.

Once again, it is more accurately defined as a long-refuted hypothesis, which we will now explore.

In order for there to be germ theory, there needs to be pathogens. The Merriam Webster Dictionary defines a pathogen as a specific causative agent, such as a bacterium or virus of disease.

The keyword here is causative. They are saying that there are microbes that can make an organism sick by coming into contact with it.

Medical News Today spelled it out, saying 'A pathogen brings disease to its host' and 'Pathogens can spread in a variety of different ways'.

Whenever scientific claims such as these are made, there should be specific evidence that is cited. However, this charade has been going on so long that various individuals and organisations will now claim that it is common knowledge and doesn't require citations.

Remember that I have pointed out previously that Wikipedia's scientific theory page states 'Some theories are so well-established that they are unlikely ever to be fundamentally changed'. Alas, the germ theory of disease is one of them.

Wikipedia's germ theory of disease page, then doesn't bother to provide any reference for the claim that 'microorganisms known as pathogens or "germs" can affect disease. These small organisms, too small to be seen without magnification, invade humans, other animals, and other living hosts. Their growth and reproduction within their hosts can cause disease'.

Invade. Now that is strong language.

The claim is that we are potential prey for invading microorganisms or germs with a vicious streak. It would be scary if it were true.

While the Wikipedia page doesn't provide any direct citations, it of course mentions Louis Pasteur and Robert Koch. These heavily promoted historical figures are generally considered to have cemented the scientific foundations for germ theory by people that are relying on accounts of their work.

Rather than having actually read their source publications, with regard to Pasteur, Wikipedia states that 'Louis Pasteur's spontaneous generation experiment illustrates that liquid nutrients are spoiled by particles in the air rather than the air itself. These results of these experiments supported the germ theory of disease'.

This is a trap for young players. They are conflating spontaneous generation with germ theory. Pasteur's Swan Neck Flask experiments do not support germ theory at all.

If we look at the first experiment, any bacteria in the flask are killed by the heating process. And then if no further bacteria can reach the nutrient broth, no bacteria grow.

Actual conclusion: Heating bacteria to high enough temperatures will denature them, as happens to all organisms. And if bacteria can't get somewhere, you won't find them there.

Experiments two and three show that bacteria will recolonise nutrient broth after sterilisation if they can reach the broth.

Actual conclusion: Bacteria are everywhere and will grow in nutrient broth.

And that's it.

You're supposed to believe that this is evidence of germ theory. Humorously, this is actually evidence of terrain theory.

The problems for the germ theorists is that a nutrient broth is not an organism, such as a human. The experiments do not show that bacteria can invade a host. They show that bacteria will proliferate in suitable terrain, which could be a nutrient broth or could be dead or dying tissue.

They describe the liquid nutrients as "spoiled". But what does that mean?

If you put out some tasty food on the dining table, do you say that your family are spoiling it as they enjoy nutritional intake that is suitable for them.

As a little segue, here's something we did at home recently that acts as a good illustration of terrain.

Our older boys picked buckets of apples from our orchard to make apple juice.

We took some of the juice and placed it in a five litre demi jar for controlled fermentation by yeast. The result: A lively and fruity cider a few weeks later.

And another partially-filled demi jar with exactly the same starting juice. The fermentation was less controlled and it smells like it is on its way to apple cider vinegar, which is also a welcome addition to the home pantry.

Now do we say that the apple juice is spoiled? Not at all.

When the juice was inside the apple and attached to a living tree, the yeast all over the apple did nothing to it. However, when the apple was removed from the tree and juiced, the yeast went straight to work.

If you want to keep it as apple juice, then you need to kill the yeast first and then bottle it up right away so that no more yeasts can get to it.

We do not say that the yeast is a pathogen that can invade a host, because its only capacity is to work on breaking down tissue.

Pasteur's Swan Neck Flask experiments do not show evidence of pathogenic behaviour of microbes.

As we have just discussed, a nutrient broth or apple juice is not the equivalent of an organism.

Nutrient broths do not get diseases and it is silly to call something spoilt or infected when you have laid out an all-you-can-eat buffet for our microbial friends.

It may be inconvenient if your apple juice unintentionally becomes vinegar, but nature doesn't make mistakes as it orchestrates the life force in our world.

The only problem is for people who think they can fight nature and view many microbes as unwanted troublemakers or worse, the agents of their all-too-often self-inflicted disease.

We have examined the fraudulent nature of Pasteur's other work on several occasions and covered this in Virus Mania as well.

Pasteur never demonstrated that bacteria could invade and cause disease in any of the animals he experimented on. His cruel experiments involved unnatural exposure roots and failed to show that bacteria had any capacity to invade a healthy host.

Additionally, it eventually came to light that he had deceived the world with regard to the effectiveness of his vaccines.

No surprises that injecting the filthy products of disease into a healthy host was a foolish and dangerous practice.

The next big gun that Wikipedia's germ theory of disease entry pulls out is Robert Koch. Now the famous Koch's postulates are actually reasonable scientific postulates. The problem for the germ theorists is that they have never been fulfilled.

Of course, only the most foolhardy virologists suggest that they have satisfied Cox postulates.

As my husband Mark wrote in A Farewell to Virology: "…whether different virologists want to entertain the validity of Koch's Postulates or not, it is simply another distraction as the postulates require the physical isolation of a microbe rather than assertions that one exists through means such as computer simulations, imaging vesicles of unknown biological function, or claiming that unpurified biological soups given to animals contain 'viruses'."

However, even outside of virology, the germ theorists have distanced themselves from Koch's Postulates. Because if they follow the scientific method, they end up refuting their own hypotheses.

Wikipedia covers things up by stating, 'While Koch's postulates retain historical importance for emphasising that correlation does not imply causation, many pathogens are accepted as causative agents of specific diseases without fulfilling all of the criteria'.

They provide a citation in the form of a 2002 publication titled Natural History of Bartonella Infections (an Exception to Koch's Postulate).

This is a review article and it does not provide evidence that bacteria are pathogenic. It simply states that some bacteria are pathogens.

So where does the distancing of themselves from Koch's postulates leave the germ theorists? The lack of evidence of a microorganism in its entirety exhibiting pathogenic behaviour has led them to sight Stanley Falkow's 'Molecular Koch's postulates…' which was put forward in 1988.

This is a system to purportedly show that a gene present in a microorganism gave it a virulence or ability to cause disease factor.

Then we had Fredericks' and Relman's 1996 publication: 'Sequence-Based Identification of Microbial Pathogens: a Reconsideration of Koch's Postulates'.

Once you understand what they are doing here, you can see that they can't produce a smoking gun. So now they are presenting gunpowder.

We have covered this previously, including in my video 'Koch's Postulates, Germ School Dropout', where we also looked at these attempts to modify the postulates over the years and the desperation to keep alive germ theory.

Mark and I also obtained a translation and analysed Koch's pivotal paper from 1882, 'The Etiology of Tuberculosis', in which we expose the uncontrolled nature of his TB experiments, and the fact he only showed association of mycobacteria with disease rather than causation.

But wait! Some germ enthusiasts say we have shown that mycobacteria cause TB in modern day studies. Really?

In 2021, our colleague Michael S wrote to the New Zealand Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Primary Industries and the Institute of Environmental Science and Research, with an Official Information Act request for 'all studies and/or reports in the possession, custody or control that uses purified bacterium, Mycobacterium bovis to prove causation of the alleged Tuberculosis disease in animals'.

None of them claimed to have this evidence. And the Ministry for Primary Industries transferred the request to Ospri, the agency that "provides a national traceability scheme to help create a TB-free New Zealand". Ospri thought they had this one covered, and with brazen audacity said to Michael S: The information we hold in relation to your request is publicly available. Per section 18(d) of the Official Information Act, we are not obliged to provide publicly available information. However, as a goodwill gesture we have elected to provide copies of the following:…" And listed eight publications.

Now at this stage we can tell by simply glancing at most of these papers that they are a waste of time. But their trump card is a study, "Experimental Mycobacterium bovis infection of cattle", published in the New Zealand Veterinary Journal in 1994.

As always with animal studies, we need to go to the experimental design. We see here that each cow was knocked out with intravenous xylazine and then a cut was made in the neck. A 2.5 centimetre cut was then made in the trachea and a bronchoscope was inserted down to the level of the first bronchus. At this point, a broth containing the mycobacteria was injected directly into the lungs. Five cows received a low dose, five cows a high dose, and five pregnant cows also a high dose.

A control experiment was performed where five cows were injected with an albumin broth. Although this is an inappropriate control as more than one variable was changed. It should have consisted of the developed Mycobacterium broth with the bacteria then removed.

Another flaw with the experimental design was that it was not blinded.

So did the cows subsequently become sick or succumb to the bacteria?

Well, no. There was no report of them becoming ill, but every cow was slaughtered and subjected to extensive gross post mortem examination, between 161 and 171 days post inoculation.

They found tuberculosis lesions in the lungs and draining lymph nodes of the cows that were injected with the bacterial broth, and reported that the lesions were larger in the high dose group.

M. bovis was isolated from the animals that had been injected with the bacteria but not in those that had not been injected.

So-called antibody levels through an elisa technique and interferon levels were also recorded. But neither of these bodily responses to the insults can offer direct evidence of bacterial pathogenicity.

So how on earth is this study supposed to show that this mycobacterium is a pathogen?

Unless you believe that natural exposure means trapping an animal, knocking it out, cutting open its airway, injecting large numbers of bacteria into its lung, and then killing it a few months later?

It doesn't.

It offers no evidence that a healthy cow can inhale certain bacteria which then attack it, or that animals could pass disease between each other via microbes.

There are many entities, including non-living ones, that are harmless to organisms through natural exposure, but toxic if nature is perverted through mechanisms such as direct injection.

We are also constantly inhaling alleged pathogens such as these mycobacteria species.

And what do they do to us? Absolutely nothing. Because if our lung terrain is healthy, there is no suitable tissue for them to work on.

The establishment needs cover stories, such as the person with a certain disease being immunocompromised. But this does not mean there microbes have pathogenic capabilities.

The problem for the unwell is not their so-called immune system, but the fact that their health is so poor that areas of their body are devitalized. At this point, the microbes simply do as they are designed, and breakdown the dead and dying tissue.

There are no studies that show that microbes can attack a healthy host in natural circumstances and spread around to attack other hosts.

Pathogens do not exist, as has been claimed.

You are best to ignore these fear-inducing germ narratives that benefit vested interests and evil agendas.