Here we go again.....

Dawn Lester
Apr 6

An article posted on the BBC website on 5th April caught my eye because it provides yet another example of why it is so important to not only expose the lies about 'viruses' being pathogens, but to also refute the claims by many voices in the 'alternative health movement' that the 'no virus' position is divisive and of no real importance.

I strongly disagree that it is divisive and of no importance.

In fact, I would say that it is absolutely central to our ability to live in freedom that we understand that there is no evidence for the existence of a pathogenic 'virus' - or any other so-called 'germ' for that matter - because it enables us to live without fear and to take responsibility for our own health.

The aforementioned BBC article, entitled *Rare tick disease found in England, health officials say*, begins with the following claim,

> "A virus carried by ticks, which is common in many parts of the world, is now present in the UK and health officials are reminding the public how to avoid bites from the tiny bugs."

The idea that it is 'now' present in the UK would seem to be contradicted by a later statement in the article,

> "But the tick species which carries the virus is widespread in the UK."

There are similarities with the claims about this tick and those about the mosquitoes that are claimed to cause malaria, because they are also said to be widespread in the UK; a situation that raises the obvious question: Why are there no cases of malaria in the UK? Maybe they have not yet added malaria to their list of 'diseases' to scare us with!! But if they do, rest assured I am ready with my rebuttal!

The problem with ticks is claimed to be that they *could* cause tick-borne encephalitis (TBE),

although the BBC article states that the risk is 'low'. Which raises the question of what is the purpose of this article if the risk of health problems is low? I would suggest it is merely another fear-mongering exercise!

There are other similarities with these ticks and mosquitoes, one of which is that they are not born with 'viruses', but, according to a page entitled *The Lifecycle of a Blacklegged (Deer) Tick* on the *TickTalk* website,

> "Ticks do not hatch with any diseases or infections, however the smaller animals that they typically feed on at this stage of their life can carry disease-causing pathogens."

Note the use of the word 'can' with respect to the ability of the animals they feed on to carry pathogens.

The web page also makes the statement that,

> "If a larva feeds on an infected animal, the pathogen can be transmitted to the tick and they become a carrier."

It is interesting that a so-called 'infection' can happen in both directions because, according to the BBC article,

> "While feeding, they can transmit viruses and infections that cause disease, with the most common being Lyme disease - a bacterial infection which can be treated with antibiotics."

The vital question that needs to be asked is: Where is the evidence that animals carry the 'pathogens' in the first place and that these 'pathogens' are passed to ticks during a blood meal?

I won't hold my breath waiting for the answer.

However, it should be noted that there is to be increased 'testing', as the BBC article states,

> "The UK Health Security Agency has recommended changes to testing in hospital so that any new cases can be picked up quickly.

> Enhanced surveillance for the virus is now being carried out in England and Scotland, where there is one probable case of tick-borne encephalitis."

Unsurprisingly, the types of 'test' used seem to be either PCR or antigen tests, neither of which have been proven to be able to detect the existence of a pathogen or to show that a pathogen was the cause of a person's health problem.

Another really interesting question that does not seem to be asked - or answered - is: How can the tick transmit a virus that is said to cause serious health problems to a human but not be adversely affected itself? To simply state that the tick is a 'carrier' is woefully inadequate and parallels the nonsense of 'asymptomatic carriers', which I have discussed in earlier articles.

Furthermore, there is no explanation for the claim that the tick is able to receive a 'virus' from the few drops of blood it draws from an 'infected' animal. Surely the odds of that happening are minuscule - unless the animal is riddled with 'viruses', in which case the animal would be extremely ill, according to the mainstream view of 'infections'. This clearly makes no sense.

Nor is there proof for the claim about the process by which the 'virus' passes to a human host when the tick is drawing blood, because this would involve the virus travelling to the human body from the tick's body, which is in the opposite direction to the flow of blood.

There is an attempt at an explanation of this process in a 2013 study article entitled *Tick salivary compounds: their role in modulation of host defences and pathogen transmission*, which states that,

> "Pathogens exploit tick salivary molecules for their survival and multiplication in the vector and transmission to and establishment in the hosts."

The answer to the question about transmission is that no 'virus' does this; because, as I have repeatedly shown, there is no evidence for the existence of 'pathogenic viruses'.

I am not denying that tick bites cause reactions and can make some people feel unwell and experience various symptoms.

Although I cannot possibly speculate on what does cause these problems, I can share some information I have found.

The first piece of information involves the use of 'insect repellants', such as DEET, which is recommended by the NHS. Interestingly, it is claimed that scientists do not know how DEET works to repel insects. Although DEET has not been found to be particularly toxic, it has been found to be an irritant, which may explain why some people react to this substance.

I would strongly suggest, therefore, that people research the ingredients of insect repellants before using them, as it is possible that these chemicals enter the body through the open wound of the tick bite and thereby cause a reaction.

It is also reported, such as in the 2013 study article mentioned above, that ticks inject 'salivary molecules' into the host to 'modulate' the response. Maybe some people react strongly to these 'molecules' for various reasons, which may depend on the overall health of their body.

There is, however, another aspect to this fear-mongering about ticks, which is an alleged connection to 'climate change', as can be seen in this comment in the BBC article,

> "They speculate that infected ticks may have been brought into the UK by migratory birds because of climate change."

This is nonsense!

I am NOT denying that the climate changes. What I am denying is the claim that human activities are driving changes in the climate as the result of increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide. There is no evidence to support such a claim.

What I would also like to emphasise is that the environment has been and is still being damaged; but a substantial proportion of that damage is due to pollutants, none of it is caused by increased levels of carbon dioxide. In fact, carbon dioxide is essential for life - without it, plants would die; and so would we.

Do people who are making every effort to reduce their 'carbon footprint' not understand this?

this?

I will return to the topic of 'climate change' at some stage because again we are being made to fear the wrong 'enemy'.

Back to the 'ticks'. The most important point to make is that they are not 'infected' with any virus or bacterium that can be transmitted to humans or animals and make them ill.

Bacteria, which are claimed to be the cause of Lyme disease, another 'tick-borne disease', have similarly never been proven to be the cause of any disease. This is important because the NHS website advises people, if bitten, to,

> "...clean the bite area with antibacterial wash/soap and water, and monitor it for several weeks for any changes."

Antibacterial products are, by their very nature, toxic and therefore harmful. The application of antibacterial substances is another likely cause of health problems after a bite.

It is abundantly clear that the incessant reporting about so-called 'pathogens' that can 'infect' us, continues to promulgate the idea that 'viruses' are not only real, but they are also pathogenic and therefore pose a risk to our health. This serves to keep many people confused and fearful - which is of course part of the intention of such reporting.

And it is for this reason that people need to recognise that they are being made to fear 'germs' - an invisible 'enemy'. But, in the case of a 'virus', this enemy has never been proven to exist in the way it is described.

I would dearly love to write about other topics, but the 'germ theory' lie needs to be dismantled - once and for all - a task that I do not accept is unimportant or 'divisive'.

I hope you agree.