Cabinet Office

Room 405
70 Whitehall
London, SW1A 2AS

foi-team@cabinetoffice.gov.uk
www.cabinet office.gov.uk

Bartholomeus Lakeman
By email: request-766314-06f3a6c8@whatdotheyknow.com

FOI Reference: FOI2021/13240
07/07/2021

Dear Bartholomeus Lakeman

I refer to your request where you asked:

"Dear Cabinet Office,

Bearing in mind the 8 facts (provided below) supporting my 3 requests; please provide

> *a) the named person, department or organisation being responsible for proving the existence of SARS-CoV-2 virus as by its isolated form in a culture or by a photograph;*
> *b) the named person, department or organisation being responsible for proving the validity of the Covid-19 tests;*
> *c) the named person, department or organisation who can order an inquiry with subpoena power to obtain above requested proofs.*

Above requests' supporting 8 facts are;

> *1) Test regulators must publish evidence for this 'novel Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) showing viral purification and visualisation in orderto underpin the gold standard for the respective RT-PCR and antibody tests. Viral purification and visualisation prior to test manufacture are the scientific approach for validating how accurately tests perform - 'gold standard' (Whiteand Fenner, 1986 p9). Many renowned virologists have asserted that purification of viral particles is an absolute requirement for the discovery of new viruses and the development of diagnostic tests (PCR and antibody). These assertions were cited within sworn*

evidence by expert witnesses in a court of Australian law[2007]. http://www.theperthgroup.com/paperscontinuum.

2) Currently there are no published data that document the PCR/Antibody test being reliable parameters for the 'novel Coronavirus' 'SARS-CoV-2'.

3) Reliable analytical data is critical for the correct determination of the real presence or absence of COVID-19 infection"(Ogenstad et al 2020 pp3-4). Ogenstad et al (2020) are clearly admitting that no purified infectious 'novel Coronavirus' ('SARS-C0V-2') 'has ever been adequately demonstrated as coming from patients (e.g. see Huang at al 2020)'. The implication is that the 'novel Coronavirus' RNA/antibodies whose veracity are assumed by PHE/MHRA/FDA may not actually prove to be 'viral' but could represent other phenomena. E.g., Dr A. Kaufman showed that the SARS Cov-2 icon (mace with spikes and suction pads) is identical to an exosome (particle of the immune system functioning as its messenger when there is a threat e.g., infection, toxin and stress. When there is a threat, exosomes are present in body fluids, and under the microscope its size is similar as of a virus). Whilst others scientists point to numerous confounding process artefacts (Schierwater et al 2009) or due to laboratory 'quality processes' which appear remarkably open to errors and mis-interpretation(Bustin & Nolan 2017). Until the proper research is suitably undertaken (and reproduced) regulators cannot scientifically claim that the tests are accurate.*

4) On 27 May 2021, a judge of the High Court of the Western Cape has ruled that 'it is not an urgent matter that the government of the Republic of South Africa produce the evidence for its claim that a virus called Sars-CoV2 actually exists'.

5) DHSC, in reply to FOI#1228983- seeking proof of the SARS-COV-2 virus being isolated and to exist, stated on 7 July 2020 "we are not the appropriate authority on this subject", and advised to pose this FOI to Govt Office for Science. Who however, did neither hold information relevant to this FOI. 0n 24 Sep-in reply to INTERNAL REVIEW CASE REFERENCE IR to FOI-1228983/666987, DHSC relies on Section 12(1) of the FOIA because to provide proof of the existence of SARS-CoV-2 exceed the appropriate limit i.e. £600. Suggesting they are unable to answer this FOI.

6) DHSC, in reply to FOI-1243364, stated on 24 Aug- 2020 "DHSC does not hold information on the isolation of aSARS-COV-2 virus." With the apology "For some diseases, it is possible to establish causation between a microorganism and a disease by isolating the pathogenfrom a patient, growing it in pure culture and reintroducing it to a healthy organism; known as "Koch's postulates".

However, as our understanding of disease and different disease-causing agents has advanced, these are no longer the method for determining disease causation. It has long been known that viral diseases cannot be identified in this way as viruses cannot be grown in 'pure culture'. When a patient is tested for a viral illness, this is normally done by looking for the presence of antigens, or viral genetic code in a host with molecular biology techniques." And on 124336428 Oct 2020 in reply to INTERNAL REVIEW CASE REFERENCE IR to FOI-1243364 DHSC 'uphold DHSC's statement that the Department does not hold the requested information'.

7) PHE, in reply to FOI Evidence to prove SARS-COV-2 virus 21/08/ld/1079, claimed on 27 Oct proof of the existenceof SARS CoV-2 virus by its research document "Duration of infectiousness andcorrelation with RT-PCR cycle threshold values in cases of COVID-19" (https://www.eurosurveillance.org/content/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.32.2001483). In it PHE's proof is based on a cross-reverences of hypothesise: Patient's lung fluid contains SARS-Cov2; A mix of zoonotic host-cells and chemicals can cultivate this virus; It can be isolated by centrifuges; Some of its genomes can be detectedby its elected tests; The computer can model its full sequence of genomes. This polysyllogismof postulations sees no need for the actual proof e.g., checking whether the lung fluid culture contains SARS CoV-2 by Koch or the Rivers postulations, its PCR test average used Ct was 32 which has a too high false postive rate, nor did they validate their RT-PCR test and enzyme immunoassay with a gold standard, nor did they exclude (in the culture) the presence of one of other 6 corona viruses. And from what is claimed to be the isolated virus; they could not make a picture nor an isolated culture nor a vaccine. PHE stated "Unknown is the Correlation with observational epidemiological data analysing known infector–infectee pairs, and the dynamics of infectiousness and viral transmissibility" and "The cultivable SARS-CoV-2 from URT samples is only a proxyvaluable for infectiousness". All what this PHE research serves is validating what Covid-19 researches found in China. Both were funded by the same source whose intend is to create such concepts of the reality which only, they by their funds can validate.

8) In 2018 was said SARS Cov-2 icon showed by Dr Charles Morgan, an expert on neurobiology, in his talk to the army cadets at West Point Academy about the ability to edit DNA for the purpose of mindcontrol. In that talk he referred to a paper published in Nature in 2015 entitled "The Unnatural Origin of SARS and New Species of Man-Made Viruses as Genetic Bioweapons" in which Dr Zheng-li Shi explains how she altered the spikeprotein of a bat coronavirus to infect human cells: She described the virus as "a new era of genetic weapons which can be artificially manipulated into an emerging human disease virus, then*

weaponised and unleashed in a way never seen before." In 2018, Zhengli Shi generated a chimeric CoVs virus; attaching a sequence coding for a spike protein that attaches to human ACE2 receptors. As Peter Daszack of WHO explained "Shi inserted these spike genes into the backbone of a number of viral genomes ("reverse genetics" and "infectious clone technology"), viral parts which are proteins. And you can take the spike protein and make it the basis for a vaccine."

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request, in which you asked for:

a) the named person, department or organisation being responsible for proving the existence of SARS-CoV-2 virus as by its isolated form in a culture or by a photograph;

b) the named person, department or organisation being responsible for proving the validity of the Covid-19 tests;

c) the named person, department or organisation who can order an inquiry with subpoena power to obtain above requested proofs.

I am writing to advise you that following a search of our paper and electronic records, I have established that some of the information you requested is held by the Cabinet Office.

This information is exempt under section 21(1) of the Freedom of Information Act. Section 21 exempts information if this information is reasonably accessible to the applicant by other means. Section 21 is an absolute exemption and the Cabinet Office is not required to consider whether the public interest favours disclosure of this information.

With regard to question a), Public Health England published guidance here, stating that "On 31 December 2019, the World Health Organization (WHO) was informed of a cluster of cases of pneumonia of unknown cause detected in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China. On 12 January 2020, it was announced that a novel coronavirus had been identified in samples obtained from cases and that initial analysis of virus genetic sequences suggested that this was the cause of the outbreak. This virus is referred to as SARS-CoV-2, and the associated disease as COVID-19."

With regard to question b), the Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency has published guidance here that provides a guide to COVID-19 tests and testing kits, including information on how COVID-19 testing is regulated in the UK.

For further information, the Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency may be able to assist and I would refer you to its website here. The Department of Health and Social Care may also be able to assist and can be contacted here.

If you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your request or wish to request an internal review, you should write to:

Rachel Anderson
Head of Freedom of Information
Cabinet Office
70 Whitehall
London
SW1A 2AS

email: foi-team@cabinetoffice.gov.uk

You should note that the Cabinet Office will not normally accept an application for internal review if it is received more than two months after the date that the reply was issued. If you are not content with the outcome of your internal review, you may apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the Commissioner cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the complaints procedure provided by Cabinet Office. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

Yours sincerely

FOI Team
Cabinet Office