

THE LATEST MAD SCARE THAT FERRETS and MINK CAN PASS SARS-Cov-2 TO HUMANS and VISA VERSA



You may wonder what this document has to do with Court Hearings. Well quite a bit, because judgements in court cases are stacking up. As they do, they totally undermine the pillars used by those behind the scenes to peddle lies to us. Later in this document the outcome of court cases and the scientific peer reviewed papers, that destroy the lies are cited in correspondence to various authorities.

Not content to scare the living daylights out of poor ignorant people, by spreading a blatant lie that there is a global pandemic in force due to an imaginary virus that is deadly, highly contagious and threatens to wipe out humanity. Those that have perpetrated this hideous, genocidal attack on humanity by finally surreptitiously introducing a deadly gene therapy – the mRNA - injection that has horrendous effects that have already been indicated by pathetically conservative statistics; that it has killed and maimed more people to date than the phantom Covid-19 disease. They now try to regroup (as people are increasingly getting wise to the fraudulent scam) and reinvigorate the fear amongst the uneducated and ignorant public.

First it was the totally discredited (scientifically and by the original inventor Dr. Kary Mullis), and proven unfit for purpose: the RT-PCR test. This useless tool was used to discover 'cases' so fondly reported by the likes of the BBC and other mainstream media. Absolute brazen misinformation and lies. The peddling of pseudo science and fiction.

Then it was the 'variant' threat, which is ludicrous in it's own right, as the supposed original virus has NEVER been isolated, identified or had it;s genome fully sequenced properly (their supposed sequenced genome of the so called 'virus' is a computer modelling programme that has filled in the gaps – based on assumptions). Do you still have faith in

garbaage in = garbage out computer modelling programmes? Just think back to the mayhem caused by the Imperial College nut case – Neil Fergusson the computer modeller.

Then there was the myth of asymptomatic transfer of a contagion – never before witnessed in the modern era of virology and germ theory. A simple lie.

Now to cap it all, they are scaring people by telling them that their animals and pets can pass the contagion on to one another and humans. The pinnacle of this most recent audacious lie, is a call for a UK register of all mustelinae (ferrets, mink etc.) to protect their owners from catching the ‘deadly’ virus. Try as they have – ardently - no virologist or microbiological scientist has EVER managed to make anything jump species in a laboratory. This is an old chestnut, used repeatedly (starting with the bat soup science fiction in Wuhan, before that swine flu/ bird flu etc.) because it adds further fear, not only have you got to keep away from humans, but you have to be wary of any other mammalian species. This is utter tripe, and not a very good one at that. Utter and sheer nonsense a tarted up lie, among a pack of lies, expertly promoted by the mainstream news media.

We’ve taken the authorities to task on this latest ferret laughable nonsense (see Index No. 53 of our Correspondence Journal)

Here is the contents of the correspondence on this subject to date:

153 Enquiry

Freedom of Information Team
Information Rights Unit
Welsh Government
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Date: 29 June 2021

Dear Team Members

Subject: Covid 19 Ferret Register Wales

I refer to the above subject and attach copy of “Advice for pet owners: Coronavirus [Covid 19]” downloaded from Gov.Wales website [[LINK](#)]. The advice was last updated 17 June 2021.

I note the establishment of a Covid 19 voluntary ferret register in Wales with plans for a compulsory register at a future date.

Reference is made, in your documentation, to research demonstrating that new variants of SARS-CoV-2 can arise in ferrets and other mustelinae and that infection can spread within their own species, and that ferrets are known to be susceptible to SARS-CoV-2 virus. I would be grateful if you could arrange to provide me with the following information under the FOI Act 2000 / EIR 2004.

Can you please provide a copy of the scientific evidence available to Welsh Government confirming that ***“new variants of SARS-CoV-2 can arise in ferrets and other mustelinae and that infection can spread within their own species, and that ferrets are known to be susceptible to SARS-CoV-2 virus.”***

If you require further clarification you are welcome to contact me at any time. I look forward to receiving the information at your convenience. Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Wynne Jones

(BGB Correspondence Journal Editor)

153 Response 01

Subject Final Response – ATISN 15283 – C J – 153 Covid 19 Ferret
: Register Wales
Date: Mon, 5 Jul 2021 13:07:34 +0000
From: animaldiseases@gov.wales
To: cj-editor@biggeesblog.cymru

Good afternoon, Mr Jones,

Please see attached [[LINK](#) to 5 PDF docs in zip folder for download] the final response from the Welsh Government regarding the Freedom of Information Request:

ATISN 15283 – CJ – 153 Covid 19 Ferret Register Wales

Regards,

Polisi Clefydau Anifeiliaid / Animal Disease Policy

Swyddfa'r Prif Swyddog Milfeddygol / Office of the Chief Veterinary Officer

Llywodraeth Cymru / Welsh Government

E-bost / E-mail: animaldiseases@gov.wales

153 Reply To Response 01

Animal Disease Policy Branch
Office of the Chief Veterinary Officer
Welsh Government

Date: 05 July 2021

Dear Animal Disease Policy Branch

Subject: Covid 19 Ferret Register Wales – Final Response – ATISN 15283

Thank you for your prompt reply to my request for information in a letter dated 5 July, with attachments.

I note that the steps taken to protect public health from the infection with dangerous variants is based on scientific research into the susceptibility of mammals to the virus, with the evidence informing guidance issued by the Welsh Government regarding SARS-CoV-2 virus and the potential risks presented by ferrets and other mustelinae. Having carefully examined the scientific papers provided I offer the following additional observations.

I note that studies published in preprint [not certified by peer review] are based on RT-PCR tests. I must advise you that the study findings, drawn to my attention, have been superseded by external peer review undertaken by a highly respected group of 22 international virologists, microbiologists and related scientists. A copy of the paper is attached hereto. You will note that 10 major scientific flaws were found at molecular and methodological level. The review concluded, for the reasons stated, that the RT-PCR test should not be used to diagnose viral infection. The review conclusions are endorsed in recent court rulings. A chronology of current litigation on this subject is set out in Annex 1 below.

In the studies you have drawn to my attention, I note that amplification cycles [C t value] of between 35 and 40 were used. I must again advise you that the RT-PCR test actually measures the presence of partial RNA sequences present in the intact virus, which could be a piece of dead virus. The SARS-CoV-2 viral genome was part-constructed using a computer model, hence the ongoing litigation. A C t value of 35 amplifies the fragment of partial RNA 34 billion times [34,359,738,368]. A C t value of 40 amplifies the fragment of partial RNA 1099 billion times [1099,511,627,776]. Additional information is available in the attached document.

In view of the above, I would be grateful if you could review your decision to introduce a Covid 19 Ferret Register in Wales taking into consideration the latest scientific evidence

available regarding the validity of the RT-PCR test to diagnose Covid 19 [an infection purportedly caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus] and update the guidance published on Welsh Government website.

I look forward to your further observations when you have been fully briefed on the latest scientific information available and the court rulings regarding the validity, and use, of the RT-PCR test for the diagnosis of Covid 19. Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Wynne Jones

Annex

1

RT-PCR test – Chronology of current litigation

8 April 2021

In summary proceedings (Ref.: 9 F 148/21), the Weimar Family Court in Germany ruled on the subject of the PCR test. The expert witness Prof. Dr. med. Kappstein pointed out in her testimony that the 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. Kämmerer confirmed, in her testimony on molecular biology, that a 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 as a remnant 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 judgment VGW-103/048/3227/2021-2 ruled on a complaint filed by the Freedom Party of Austria [FPO] against what it considered a grossly illegal ban on a registered rally. In its ruling, the court rejected the Corona policy of the federal government. Citing internationally recognized experts, studies and the World Health Organization, the court found that the Minister of Health, Anschöber’s, disease definitions were wrong and that a PCR test for Covid-19 diagnosis was unsuitable. The 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 [PCR test], regardless of clinical manifestation, or
- 2] Any person, with detection of SARS-CoV specific antigen, who fulfils the clinical criteria, or
- 3] Any person, with detection of SARS-CoV 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 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 “number 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 **infections / 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 34 lawyers prosecuting global officials over Covid 19.

11 November 2020

An appeals 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 [which 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 PCR test cannot be used as an effective diagnosis of infection.

Supporting documents attached to the above letter: [[LINK 1](#) & [LINK 2](#)]

If this whole charade was not so serious you would split your sides laughing!