

Richard Cooke
Clerk - Public Accounts Committee
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

Date: 28 October 2021

Dear Richard Cooke

Subject: CJ 201 - PAC Report - Test and Trace Update

I refer to the above subject. A copy of the report dated 21 October prepared by "Public Accounts Committee" [PAC] is attached hereto.

I have noted the content and recommendations to UK Government. I offer the following observations that may be helpful to PAC in its scrutiny and overview role.

The RT-PCR test - referred to in the report - has been found to be not fit for purpose; following an external peer review by a well respected group of 22 international virologists, microbiologists and related scientists. They published a call for the scientific journal "Eurosurveillance" to retract the article by Dr Christian Drosten published 23 January 2020 titled "*Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus {2019 - nCoV} by real-time RT-PCR [Eurosurveillance 25{8}2020]*". The peer review revealed, inter alia, 10 major scientific flaws at the molecular and methodological level, and concluded that the test should not be used for the diagnosis of viral infection. The findings have subsequently been endorsed in court judgements. A chronology of recent litigation on this subject is set out in Annex 1 below.

The PAC refer to an eye-watering budget of **£37 billion** over two years for the test and trace programme. It remains unclear why important information regarding the invalidity of the RT-PCR test has not been drawn to the attention of Committee members by UK Government officials. The invalidity of the test undermines the entire UK Government Covid response strategy and policy.

I would be grateful if you could arrange to circulate this information to Committee members for their information in their scrutiny and overview role. I have attached hereto details of the external peer review. Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Wynne Jones

Annex 1

Evidence - Invalidity of RT-PCR test for diagnosis of Covid 19 infection

8 April 2021

In summary proceedings [Ref: 9F 148/21], the Weimar Family Court in Germany ruled on the subject of the RT-PCR test. The expert witness Prof. Dr. med Kappstein pointed out in her testimony that the RT-PCR test can only detect genetic material, but not whether the RNA originates from viruses that are capable of infection and thus capable

of replication [i.e. capable of reproduction]. The expert witness Prof. Dr. rer. biol. hum. Kammerer confirmed, in her testimony on molecular biology, that a RT-PCR test - even if it is carried out correctly - cannot provide any information on whether a person is infected with an active pathogen or not. This is because the test cannot distinguish between "dead" matter, e.g. a completely harmless genome fragment of the body's own immune system's fight against a cold or flu [such genome fragments can still be found many months after the immune system has "dealt with" the problem] and "living" matter, i.e. a "fresh" virus capable of reproducing.

24 March 2021

The Vienna Administrative Court judgement VGW-103/048/3227/2021-2 ruled on a complaint filed by the Freedom Party of Austria [FPO] against what is considered a grossly illegal ban on a registered rally. In its ruling, the court rejected the Corona policy of the federal government. Citing internationally recognised experts, studies and the World Health Organisation, the court found that the Minister of Health, Anschöber's, disease definitions were wrong and that a RT-PCR test for Covid 19 diagnosis was unsuitable. The RT-PCR test is destroyed as a credible determinant of Covid illness. Antigen tests are also deemed not credible. Certified medical doctors alone are able to determine specific cases of illness. The Vienna Administrative Court examined closely the basis for the Austrian federal government's policy and found that definition of illness from the Ministry of Health alone is completely wrong and baseless. Confirmed Covid 19 "case" is defined 23 December 2020 as:

- 1] Any person with detection of SARS-CoV-2 specific nucleic acid [RT-PCR test], regardless of clinical manifestation, or
- 2] Any person with detection of SARS-CoV-2 specific antigen, who fulfils the clinical criteria, or
- 3] Any person with detection of SARS-CoV-2 specific antigen, who fulfils the epidemiological criteria.

None of the three "confirmed cases" defined by the Minister of Health meet the requirements of the World Health Organisation [WHO] term "*ill / infected person*." The sole reliance on the RT-PCR test [confirmed case 1] is rejected by the WHO. The Health Service of the City of Vienna uses the words "case numbers," "test results," "case incidence," as well as "numbers of infections." This jumbling of terms does not do justice to a scientific assessment of the epidemic situation. For the WHO, the decisive factor is the number of infection / illnesses and not the number of people tested positive or other "case numbers." This is similar to a ruling made by a Portuguese appeals court in November 2020 that the tests are unreliable and that it is unlawful to quarantine people based on test result. The verdict can still be appealed to the Constitutional Court or an extraordinary appeal can be filed with the Administrative Court.

15 December 2020

"Cease and Desist" papers served on Dr Christian Drosten regarding the fraudulent content of the "Corman - Drosten paper" on RT-PCR tests, by Dr Reiner Fuellmich [Dr in Law] who leads a team of international lawyers prosecuting global officials over Covid 19.

27 November 2020

A highly respected group of 22 international virologists, microbiologists and related

scientists published a call for the scientific journal "Eurosurveillance" to retract the article by Dr Christian Drosten published 23 January 2020 titled "*Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus {2019 - nCoV} by real-time RT-PCR [Eurosurveillance 25{8}2020]*". The external peer review by the 22 scientists revealed, inter alia, 10 major scientific flaws at the molecular and methodological level, and concluded that the test should not be used for the diagnosis of viral infection. The following key findings were revealed.

1. Qualitative Covid RT-PCR tests are incapable of distinguishing between the virus and remnants of viral fragments discarded by the immune system after successfully dispatching the virus.
2. Qualitative Covid RT-PCR tests cannot be used diagnostically to determine who is infectious and who is not.
3. Recommended Cycle Threshold [Ct] Values to determine a reasonable cut off point for who is likely infectious versus who is likely not infectious were curiously omitted.
4. The products for the Qualitative Covid RT-PCR tests were never validated at the molecular level.
5. The peer-review process for the Corman-Drosten paper lasted only two days. For reference, it is common practice for most published manuscripts to go through an extensive two-month [or longer] peer-review process.
6. The Corman-Drosten authors had significant financial conflicts of interest that they did not disclose during the peer-review process.

11 November 2020

An appeal court in Portugal has ruled that the RT-PCR process is not a reliable test for SARS-CoV-2 [the purported cause of the Covid 19 disease]. The virus has not been isolated or identified with a compiled genome available, and therefore any enforced quarantine based on those test results is unlawful. Further, the ruling suggested that any forced quarantine applied to healthy people could be a violation of their fundamental right to liberty. Most importantly, the judges ruled that a single positive RT-PCR test result cannot be used as an effective diagnosis of infection.