DIAGNOSE

Διά- γνώσις

An example

We take snot from someone and go to examine it and, as always, we find some virus residue.

The conclusion of modern science is: this person is infected by a virus.

Is this a correct diagnosis?

We look at something and we find a virus residue.

But a diagnosis asks us to see through it, not to stop at the phenomenon because then we make a scientific rookie mistake by concluding: this person is infected by the virus.

And that's it, we don't look through it, we don't look further, our job is done?

However, we must ask ourselves where do these virus remnants come from?

They are worked out of the body as waste products of a process.

A process we do not yet know.

Science assumes that a virus enters humans from the outside and then infects those humans.

But on the contrary, we see that virus residues come out through snot and mucus.

The reverse movement from inside to outside!

Very strange.

Of course, it could also be that the virus originates in man and in the animal and in the plant itself and plays a certain role there and then, when the task is accomplished, is excreted to the outside.

So what could that task be?

We know that there are millions and millions of viruses in the world and now suddenly a few would be pathogenic and even deadly?

From the perspective of probability, that is already very unlikely.

One even speaks of a virus infection in imitation of a bacteriological infection.

But can we really speak of a virus infection?

What could be the role of a virus?

According to experts, a virus is created when diseased cells are healed.

The scientific questions then become:

* Where do these sick cells come from?
* And how does the healing process proceed that ultimately produces virus remnants?

So these data lie behind the virus residues found, in other words, in this approach, *not the virus is the cause of the diseased cells but the result of the healing process.*

And the excreted virus residues consist of dead material and that dead material by itself does nothing at all.

No one is infected by the virus residues; they are not dangerous.

An important study from 1918 in Boston by the physician Milton Rosenau[[1]](#footnote-1) during the Spanish flu confirms this line of thought.

Bioweapons

Well there is a difference between viruses and bio-weapons.

Bio-weapons are dangerous though!

Bio-weapons are designed to eliminate the opponent as quickly as possible.

Bio-weapons can have virus residues built into them and as we know, the body reacts to virus residues by making snot and mucus.

If we now package these remnants of virus into something that can enter the body and then also enter a living cell that will reproduce this virus remnant then we have a problem: the body starts to produce mucus and snot.

So by the constant production of new virus particles, more and more mucus and snot are produced until the human being suffocates in his own mucus and dies.

In this construction, a virus residue itself is not dangerous but the body's reaction to the production of those virus residues is.

The bio-weapon is a construction that does not occur in nature but was developed by unscrupulous researchers who are financed by unscrupulous governments.

Radiation

A second cause for the creation of diseased cells is radiation.

We know from research that people who live near or even under high voltage cables develop cancer sooner than people who live far away from them.

Also people who have professions with a lot of exposure to radiation are at increased risk.

The transmission towers for cell phones are under suspicion and certainly now that an even higher frequency has been chosen, the so-called 5G frequencies, these questions come up again.

And in addition to 5G there are the even higher military frequencies.

A modern application of those military frequencies is already on YouTube[[2]](#footnote-2).

Satellites

Now there are already more than 20,000 satellites circling the earth and they are there, they say, to make internet traffic faster.

These satellites are equipped with 5G equipment.

But if that can be done, why not immediately equip those satellites with the higher military frequencies?

And just like in the video on YouTube with the Ray Gun, why not unleash this radiation from space on countries, towns and cities and individuals?

The typical thing was when the global hysteria started that in Huwan people dropped dead in the streets, nowhere else did that happen, only lately on the sports fields, but in the streets?

The scenario may have gone like this:

We are going to do a military trial, we have satellites in orbit and we have built into them the higher military frequencies in addition to 5G.

Now someone is walking down the street with a cell phone turned on, so we know exactly the position of this person.

We relay that person's position to satellites that then point the higher military frequencies at that person.

What happens next?

The person is then in a microwave, so to speak, the body temperature is rising and more and more sick cells are developing in this person.

The reaction of the body will be to try to heal those sick cells.

And in the process, viruses are created!

If the heating continues long enough, the person dies because the body produces more and more mucus and snot to clean up the mess or the virus residue.

Then the body enters the hospital and mucus and snot are removed.

And then of course as expected one finds virus residues and the conclusion is: this person was infected by a virus and died from it.

The wrong diagnosis is made and the world is caught off guard.

The fear spiral is set in motion.

Conclusion:

The good news is: viruses are harmless!

The bad news is

1. There are bio-weapons and they are dangerous and deadly.

2. There are the higher military frequencies which can also be deadly.

3. Are the 5G frequencies safe for humans?

For the bad news, we come to politics with the questions:

* What do we do about this?
* With regard to points 1 and 2, should there not be agreements worldwide to stop these developments?
* Is there a safe alternative to 5G? For example, more cables and less radiation?
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