

WIR - Wissen Ist Relevant  
WE - Knowledge Is Relevant

Part 1  
Biology As It Is Not  
A Refutation of Genetics, Virology & Cell Theory  
Dr. Stefan Lanka  
January 21, 2022

(transcription of English subtitles from [video](#))

0:00:00 – Many thanks for letting me speak to you. Many thanks to everyone who made this possible. After this presentation it will become clear how important our ‘WIR’ motto is ‘Knowledge is Relevant’. Not only to deal with the corona crisis constructively, but much more will be revealed.

0:00:40 – Now in the first part we deal with the difficult part, namely ‘biology as it is not’, and that may be painful – refuting genetics – but this biology lesson is a prerequisite for understanding why we believe in viruses. Where does it come from, what are the concepts behind it. If we are constricted, we’re forced to think in opposites, in good/evil, that something is here to harm us or to be used for evil. You’ll see it is a product of our history and I’ll show this step by step. I am a biologist myself, was a marine biologist for a long time. I came across a structure that I interpreted as a harmless virus. Now we know these are mini-spores. They have a specific function. At the time, I was a virologist, but I still believed in evil viruses, so I took it step by step and went deeper and deeper to where the idea came from. I concluded that they were wrong. Come with me on this journey. I also revealed my Challenge, but after that lecture we found that the majority of the population believes in these concepts the way we believe in terrorism [“terror biologie”], in that our own molecules can turn into terrorists within the body, which only destroy and which can even go wandering around. Whoever believes this also believes in flying metastases and gets angry at those who don’t wear a mask. So let’s start on the presentation.

We now see a model of a corona virus here. We could look at other virus models as these are all artwork and right away we have the first tough lesson, because none of this corresponds to reality. None of it. The proteins, the spikes, the bits of nucleic acid, this is a model that doesn’t exist in reality, and I’m telling you, if you learn the new biology, which we get to in the second part, then you’ll understand. When you know real biology, this can’t possibly exist. Here’s the so-called nucleic acid, the genetic strand of a virus. We test that hypothesis here and the simplest thing about corona is it has never been proved to exist. Out of very short pieces, they calculated – mathematically – a whole strand of genetic material that does not exist in reality and if you understand where these concepts come from, why we as a culture believe in it, then we’ll have leverage, namely to use corona as an opportunity to address unfortunate developments in politics and our so-called representative democracy in our media system, etc. We have a chance to change things from the foundation with corona. We can only change if there is a global dogma and means of global communication - without these two prerequisites, change is not possible. One country opts out, the others will fight them, but when something

shakes the whole world and it's clear that it's not true, then we have a chance. We can learn from our mistakes, because if we don't learn we are forced to repeat forevermore.

0:05:15 – So we have a big task ahead of us and a few hours to understand where these ideas came from. Back in history, we go about 2000 years when this person, Democritus, learned from his father and expanded. With motivation to form the basis for our teachers today, for our understanding of life but also of disease, Democritus said 'we need an explanation of life, an explanation of disease, but we don't want any consciousness, please, we don't want the spirit in it, we don't want gods.' Why? Because religion always causes fear and that's why we need a materialistic explanation of life. He postulated that there are atoms that are immortal. When they join they form molecules. These molecules merge again and this results in life. This pure materialistic idea of life sounded great, it was motivation to stop, but they never imagined that a new religion would emerge from it, namely a good/evil religion which forces to think materialistically. Because if we want to explain something that actually exists, an illness that appears simultaneously or one after the other, we are forced to believe in physical defects as reality. We have no other choice. If talk of consciousness is forbidden, we can't imagine that a word can kill, which it can, or that a word can heal. If thinking is forbidden, then it is naturally unthinkable that a word can become flesh e.g. so-called psychosomatics. That I'll touch on part two, but for now we had a state-supported philosophy for 2,5 thousand years where it is forbidden to think, to explore, whether consciousness gives form or not and can it affect your health. Languages from all nations are full of idioms that show that it can. That a fright can run through my bones and up my bones to my kidneys or my liver and so on, shows what's going on here. It was Plato who quoted his teacher Socrates saying the Greek doctors can no longer deal with diseases. They were just using medication to suppress symptoms in order to get slaves back to work faster. But free people would have their souls treated with a body-soul biology, which is very exciting and which we'll talk about in the 2<sup>nd</sup> part.

0:08:57 – From Socrates and Plato we go a long way forward in history to Eugene Rosenstock, who I consider the strongest most important German thinker, at least of our time, because he predicted this whole thing in detail. He said if we research purely materially, then we end up like Greek criminal law, where we have precedents, and everything we observe we judge as a precedent. And it's then impossible to imagine anything new or to bring about changes with this approach. He first published *Sociology* (1) in 1929, then in book form in 1956. I recommend a reprint the way he wanted it in 2007 by Thalheimer publishing house. He writes here about a very important mechanism – why it is the way it is today, namely "the growth point on the scientific age lies in a new tension between research and knowledge. This fight is still largely underestimated". What he means by this is we have scientists on one side and we have researchers on the other side. Scholars are competent and therefore incapable of allowing subversion of their work. They are science bureaucrats and they will stand together against amateurs. But research officially belongs to science like the holy spirit belongs to the church, so we have en-masse pseudo-science competing with free research, yet the former alone is supported by the official bodies and foundations because only that is worthy of support in their professional opinion. Such sham research acts on the principle "to have one's cake and eat it". And now comes a sentence that has been the elephant in the room since 1929, "they researched cancer according to Pasteur's outdated ideas as if it were rabies". So a double criticism! – cancer is not right, plus is based on Pasteur's infection theory which isn't right either. You have to imagine the suffering of people in an area, in a family. If I am in a family or in a neighbourhood all suffering and dying with the same diagnosis, it's proof that evil must exist there. They used religion according to Welhausens ideas, but because his research

relies on old authority, it was well financed. As long as scholars and researchers remained poor, real research had prospects up until 1903 when the prospect for research deteriorates, because the grateful people finance “science” (“corona”), so that power shifts from research to “the science” (“pseudo-science”). Our Rockefeller doctor factories and grants are eloquent testimony. Unbelievably true.

0:12:37 – The next important thinker in this field is Ivan Illich. He is a philosopher who predicted corona in 1976. In his book The Nemesis of Medicine he states that if medicine is not separated from the economy, it must provide increasing profits, year on year. But where is biology in that? What happens? They exaggerate little by little, unnoticed like the frog in the water that slowly starts to boil, and he said there comes a point where the whole thing destroys society as a whole. He describes the exaggeration in the book starting with vaccination, but also shows it in cases of fever where at 43 degrees you give treatment, then at 40, then at 39, 38 and today mothers are treated if they bring their children to the paediatrician at 37,8, because the mother is hyperventilating with fear. This he described in 1976. Also ignored.

0:13:50 – This man, Rudolf Virchow, was the one who came up with a defective carrier (gene) concept for explaining illnesses. He is one of the most dramatic figures in our history. He was an epidemiologist during the French revolution of 1848, which, although didn't have the desired outcome, brought about a little progress. Not straight after 48, it got worse first and there was a rollback, in 48 he came up with titles, I mean, he named things. He was such an official. He made questionnaires for people who got sick and found if they had bad bugs they got sick, if they breathed vapours from faeces they got sick, if they don't have chimney, yes, they get sick, if they have damp fuel, etc. Give the people sewage works, give them better social conditions and they get better and they stay healthy. He was commissioned to do this for them. He is still praised to this day. His motivation was unclear and it is not well known what he did ten years later. He wanted to become priest. His father forbade that because he himself had an expensive hobby and debts, so discouraged him saying ‘you really have to become famous and rich, which you can't as a pastor’. So he studied medicine with the military, because an uncle on his father's side was a major in the Prussian army. But state-sponsored medicine was only 20% of medicine at the time and was hated by the general populace. They had a bad reputation. They were responsible for organ harvesting. So he gets a bad reputation. Neither poor nor rich come to him. So he becomes the leader of the reform movement. Of these military doctors, 80% were completely free to do whatever they wanted, where they practiced, national or international. Nothing was regulated. Can you imagine? So he had to somehow get into the highest state office. Then he said the state had to merge with medicine. So medicine and science had to be nationalised so that humanitarian catastrophes, such as typhus “epidemics”, cholera, etc. would be prevented in future. The revolution was a flash in the pan. Fortunately nobody died, but everyone who was on the barricades was banned from practicing, but not him. He was protected and was taken from the public eye to become a full professor at the University of Wurzburg and there he comes up with a completely new theory refuting the old humours theory whereby he postulated diseases were caused by disease toxins. Because one could observe that one gets sick if one takes disease toxins, e.g. a teenager who drinks a bottle of vodka – 10 years ago they would be dead unless their stomach was pumped out. We all know, maybe not all, but Yeltsin needed two liters of vodka to be able to speak in parliament and three to get on a tank. Because he had anti-toxins as in the humours theory where you get better if you have the antidote. That's how this defective carrier thing still persists in medicine – of the virus and the antibody that is supposed

to neutralize it. That is the theory that the majority of the population still believes. So he fought these 'humourist' teachers. He had many arguments published against it which were right to this day. But... he revived the humours theory in 1858, fighting famous doctors like Billroth, the surgeon whose surgical technique is still used today for kidneys, moving himself into the management position at the Charité, where Christian Drosten now sits manipulating world politics. There he became director, stepping over people who were much more qualified, because he was protected. And what did he claim in 1858? He said life consists of individual cells, that was clear, life arises through cell division of a single cell and all diseases can be traced back to a single cell producing the 'disease poisonous virus' and distributing it and it would then diffuse and the disease would spread in the body. He came up with this theory, and this is the crux, via an anti-clerical network, namely the freemasons, his maternal uncle, who protected him, wasn't only a friend of the Prussian king but also the head of the freemasons. And they had a bible, a booklet about Democritus, which was in a simple format by a Roman poet, Lucretius from the year 200 that survived the iconoclasm of Christianity, and would be stolen in 1408 from a German library and then copied, copied, copied. In this book Democritus' atom theory is transported to the future and usurped by this person to make it seem like Virchow invented some new idea – the smallest visible unit of life, the cell – although it was clear it was tissue, tissues in woven networks. So he merges the cell theory into that – later Einstein also postulated atom theory and blah blah blah came across the same thing – that the disease poison would diffuse. And he has political success because he stated that there are individuals in a society who are like parasites. He recommended we eradicate them root to branch as this cellular pathology – birthing the excuse for euthanasia/eugenics. Once a humanitarian, he injects this cellular pathology as a scientifically founded claim into the political arena and turns everything on its head, claiming everything comes from the individual cell, so the theory of disease being caused by disease poison would then be official. He did the proof they had that disease did not spread. Then, when the magnifying glass came along 650 years later and then microscopes, it became clear that each organ consists of 4, back then 3 tissues were found, we now know there are 4, so 3 different tissues, which when diseased only 1 of these 3 tissues died. But this new finding was not transmitted right and left and so was not widespread. And that was just one example how the humours theory was refuted, the ancient humours theory – poison and antidote – with which, among others, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart was transported into the beyond now playing harp. I don't know, in any case it's clear he was in a healing crisis in which he was cramping. When we suffer a motor trauma that's called epilepsy and then he had fever and so on and back then they believed he had many illnesses so then they drained a lot of blood. Bloodletting, they drained too much blood and that's why he is stone dead. That is the theory of the disease poison and the bloodletting and that's what was set in stone.

0:23:30 – So the stage is set to grasp that the whole concept is probably not correct. If cellular pathology is not correct, our picture of cells is not correct and then viruses are implicated, with which I came across, as I said, being a biologist becoming a marine biologist, I saw all this poison ending up in the sea and it hit home and I then discovered a structure of marine biology that I believed was a harmless virus. Why harmless? Because these are all over the world, or maybe on one coast that produces THIS structure, which looks like a virus. The viruses seen here are enlarged just as we imagined, reproducing, reproducing and I noticed it was not going well. They were not surviving and I was able to isolate structures from these and see the same biochemical composition every time. So I had something and saw the same protein. I repeated isolation hundreds of times and with each got the same nucleic acid, the same biochemistry. I had isolated something and was then able to show sufficient proof that they are always

identically composed. Next we see these particles that are supposed to be the measles virus. They are shown to us and they say these are viruses. Here we see a couple of small parts with circular appearance, spherical, but then big chunks here and these structures presented to us as viruses have never been seen in humans, never in animals, never in liquids, in mucous membranes, in saliva, in blood, in urine, never. Everything that we are shown as viruses is false. They are very typical decomposition products of test tubes with which we work with, in which you try to, or believe you can, study life, which goes back to Virchow. He was a pathologist who believed that by looking at decayed matter of decaying tissue, he could learn about life and that's exactly what we're doing. We take tissue from organisms, like monkey kidney tissue that lasts the longest in the test tube, that's what they like to say, but they only live a bit longer because we surrounded them with foetal serum. Serum is blood without any solid components. If we took it from adults or grown mammals the tissues would die immediately. Now with foetal serum it stays alive for a while and doesn't disintegrate so quickly. And these signs of decay in these pictures are a specific test tube phenomenon that has never been seen in life. So quickly we move from being virus believers to an end to virology and with WIR. Here these particles are shown to us as viruses but what are they really? They take tissue, isolate this tissue from everything around, the core that can still survive, and chunks of the tissue develop little fingers very quickly like an amoeba that wants to rebuild the tissue again. That's why everyone who works with these cell cultures in test tubes has to constantly separate them again and again. These chunks of tissue are misinterpreted as cells and these little fingers with which it drags itself along to try to rebuild the tissue, these are called villi, of which a cross section in the electron microscope underneath is presented to us as viruses. It's that simple, it's hocus-pocus zimzalabim. We see that the virologists (later we'll also learn why) are completely anti-scientific because they never on any level of their work document control experiments. For example they could have cut through chunks of the edge or in the middle. In the middle the diameter appears large, at the edge it is smaller like this and this and if I am outside the chunks of tissue then nothing would appear and those are the photos they are constantly presenting to us. You don't even find areas where you just have some particles, if you look, the rest of the tissue is still there, you have an anti-scientific error. This pseudo-science was the basis of their actions. I can only call something scientific if it hasn't been refuted (falsification) and you didn't do that at any level of your research, yet you paint us these models of viruses that don't really exist. And now I see that you're amazed. How did they come to interpret particles as viruses and why do I call myself an ex virologist, why? There actually are structures that exist which are the template for the virologists' viruses that you can isolate easily, that you can photograph, that can be biochemically characterized and that always have a nucleic acid in them that always has the same extended DNA strand of the same length and the same composition that we call a sequence. These role models are called phage – from Phagocytosis (from to eat up) – because they believe that they eat bacteria. Today we know if bacteria don't have time to form their proper spores from which they can quickly emerge, then they make mini-spores. They believe these mini-spores were dead because back then people believed living matter is something that has oxygen metabolism that can be measured. Today we know that these structures propagate themselves and have a metabolism and I was the first one in marine biology, more than 30 years ago, to discover them in the sea. They actually exist and help other organisms that are not doing so well. When living conditions deteriorate they supply them with nucleic acid and building material and this process is bacteria simply transforming into phage and is not destructive. It is a metamorphosis that reproduces the entire nucleic acid of the bacteria, 100% these structures and are not in any way destructive. Now of course we know, ahaa there

are these structures and they became a role model. When did it happen that they became a role model? That is crucial to understand virology.

0:32:00 – When, why, by whom? There was an old virology before 1952 and they thought viruses came from protein pieces and the proteins had genetic material. Then the virologists did control experiments and determined 'if we allow healthy organs to decompose, then do the same experiment, the same filtration steps, we find the same proteins that we misinterpreted as viruses', so they immediately carried out control experiments along with attempts at infection and found that no transmission attempts of the infection ever worked. On the contrary they found that the experiment itself, namely extracts from sick animals injected or dripped into the lungs via a tube, caused illness. That causes the diseases. It has never been possible to transmit an extract to date from a human who was infected. You can read all about that in a review published in 1999 at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin on the early history of virology by Karl Heinz Ludtke. Back then virology was of course lacking a virus model. [33:32 ...?... 33:42] that protein cannot come from protein. So protein is not genetic material. But we're forced to think that there must be a hereditary substance. That's logical. If we believe that life comes about through cell division of one cell and there is no consciousness, no spirit that works here, then of course we need something to make the molecules work so that from wheat seeds wheat always emerges (or biblical mustard? that could be interpreted wrong) or the elephant or the human. Then we're forced to acknowledge a hereditary substance that orchestrates the installation and functional plan of life. So it used to be the proteins, then it was the nucleic acid from 1952 onwards. Because it was found with research that these proteins that are produced here always come with a piece of nucleic acid as a catalyst. And from 1952 on, the hypothesis of nucleic acid being the hereditary substance emerged and it was believed. Then these new viruses took shape from what we called Phage, which always had a strand of genetic material inside, because that is a fact. It's not surprising what happens next. A bacteriologist, John Franklin Enders, suddenly takes up biology. He was a researcher and studied everything possible and he met a bacteriologist who works with Phage. He is fascinated, so he takes up biology for his doctorate. Having never studied biology, natural sciences, medicine, so never taught scientifically to check every step of his research, he uses the idea that bacteriophage emerges from the tissues of animals and believes that if these tissues die too, it could transform into these viruses. We don't know what they look like, we haven't seen any, but if the tissues die in the test tube, that would hint we have a virus, we have an agent. And he describes what they are doing here. He uses this foetal serum, he uses antibiotics, but never a control experiment, otherwise he would have understood that his tissues are dying because he suddenly deprives them of foetal serum. If he used an adult serum, they'd die too and antibiotics alone are enough to kill the tissues. If he had done the control experiments he would have found the laboratory stuff kills his tissues, but he translates this dying into virus presence and isolation. So finally bringing what was outside into the lab and we can then repeat that over and over again and the repeatability is the proof. But they are only repeating a false assumption to this day and in this publication, which he explicitly described as speculation, he writes [textually from the slide "In so doing, however, it must be borne in mind that cytopathic effects which superficially resemble those resulting from infection by the measles agents may possibly be induced by other viral agents present in the monkey..."] 'In so doing, however, we must bear in mind that these cytopathic effects which resemble pathology could result from a different agent that was already in the tissue or by unknown factors', because we observe that tissue that we did nothing to also suddenly dies off. Hello, you're studying a process of something dying. Anyway, in a second attempt, an application of a second agent was tried and the cytopathic changes could not be

distinguished from the one with the assumed infection. So, obviously the possibility of finding the same effect with other agents has to be considered. Summarizing, 'accordingly, the results that are summarized here must be subjected to most critical analysis'. So that is what we are doing here, giving highly critical analysis. But that never happened. I'll explain right away why. He writes [textually from the slide "there is no ground for concluding that the factors *in vivo* are the same as those which underlie the formation of giant cells and the nuclear disturbances *in vitro*,"] 'there is no reason, no assumption, no justification to believe that these results in humans, *in vivo* would be the same as here in the test tube, there is no reason' he writes 'we are only dealing with indirect indications and two experiments are essential for the establishment of a connection between these agents that are produced here and the measles virus', namely the infection in humans and animals that the experiment was supposed to find. What then happens? John Franklin Enders, 6 months later, out of the blue on the 1<sup>st</sup> June 1954 for a completely different thing, got a Nobel Prize for medicine. And that came out of this explicit speculation? The foundation for modern medicine arose like a phoenix from the ashes and the ongoing fight from virologists against the old virus model was lost, as they made a new one that is questionably linked with a pseudo-technique that has never been controlled. So I controlled their measles virus experiment, namely stopped the feeding, the poisonous antibiotics which kill the bacteria that are everywhere and that causes the cell death like clockwork and then the biologists produce a supposed infection and the cells die and they say 'Hey, that's the virus' and based on this conclusion, production is carried out of this soup for 'live' vaccines. They said the infectious virus is living in the substance. For 'dead' vaccines, only a part of the virus, so a protein, and more recently mRNA that we call inactivated virus. My control experiment was just doing the exact same thing except with no infection and the tissue dies in the same way. Then what does the virologist do? The virologist takes nucleic acid, bits please, he's never seen the whole thing, like with phage, which we have been isolating and characterizing the nucleic acid for 70 years, we show we always have the same. But he constructs something that he calls the virus ABC and that shows us this publication is quite clearly taking an anti-scientific turn and now proves that virology has refuted itself. They describe step by step that they isolated nothing, that they haven't found anything and that they had to multiply it a little and then mathematically construct something which you never find in reality. And also these control experiments, as done with measles virus and now with corona, are available now and I'm curious who will be the first to publish them, because they'll be holding the trump card. So we do control experiments, whatever nucleic acid, from humans, from animals, we do exactly the same as geologists do, and lo and behold, we can construct the exact same genome if we tell the program what to make. Now corona virus, or from the same data, now make HIV virus or here make Ebola or Influenza. You get what you pay for.

0:42:57 – And now I'm going to show you the genetics refutation. This knowledge from 2008, [Genome In Dissolution](#) (download this from Internet before it is censored, yes, get it), this is the refutation of genetics and thus of virology, because the geneticists did not tell the virologists that they had refuted themselves. Now they say 'we are doing epigenetics, we need more money, 40 years, and then we know more about heredity'. This report is about a conference that took place in 2006. The genome was considered an unchangeable blueprint of humans. That's what we believe, that it's fixed at the beginning of our lives. We take from mama, papa and then our combination is set. Science has to say goodbye to this idea. In reality, our genetic make-up is in constant flux, changing, and I guess our legacy is constantly changing. Like Krugerrand becomes paper, is printed green certificate, it can become worthless overnight. Who would take that on? So 2 years ago 25 geneticists sat down at the University of

California at Berkeley to answer the simple question 'What is a gene?' in an attempt to precisely define the basis of their field. However, defining it turned out to be extremely difficult. The expert meeting almost ended in disaster, remembers Karen Eilbeck, Professor of human genetics at Berkeley and host of the panel – you can search for the entire original document via her name on the Internet about it all – "We had sessions that lasted for hours, everyone shouted at everyone else". And exactly the same thing happens when the virologists are confronted with their own deeds. They don't just yell at each other though. I'm quite sure if Christian was there he'd be eaten up, because the others would say 'You idiot, must you exaggerate so much? now they'll watch us'. So why? The dispute in Berkeley has little to do with researchers' vanity, it was a first symptom that life sciences were dying unnoticed by the public. Facing a brick wall unnoticed by the public. That was 2008, so what did we learn? The scientists have disproved themselves, but still the public believes in the gene tests, paternity tests, blah, blah, blah and so on. In reality these researchers talk about the chromosome strings of humans or animals. Bringing it to light shatters the previous idea about genetics. Medical research is facing new challenges, the first outlines of which go back to body and soul – aha, suddenly the soul is back, yes – health, illness, development and aging are subject to a genetic interplay whose complexity exceeds all previous ideas. And now comes the crux: 'The geneticists have to say goodbye to their image of a stable genome in which changes are pathological exceptions'. So, thinking wider, we get the idea that there must be a hereditary substance that forces us into materialistic thinking propped up by cellular pathology and cell theory of life, there must be an inheritance substance so the same thing always comes out of the same thing and is, of course, unchangeable. That's all, for now we're sitting again in the cave with Plato. You see shadows, we see it described and interpret it, you dare not turn like him to see where the light is coming from and who in your audience makes the most noise. This is the situation for us. Why? 'The genome of everyone is constantly remodelling. Every organism, every human being, every body cell is a genetic universe in itself'. Boom, and that's exactly what virologists do today, they look for fragments, read them and then build a strand of genetic material just as geneticists build a chromosome, and we didn't bring them to account, *let it be, let it be*, but no, they continued, too big to fail. When even the geneticists didn't tell the public the truth in 2008 (we are now in 2022), then it's completely disproved, we can't expect that from the virologists either. Can't wait for them and maybe, no maybe, but that's a very important point here, it's our culture. So we should really approach these people carefully, because it's almost impossible for them to give up their own models. Because it is their identity, their family and so on and that's all supposed to be wrong and in this case even dangerous. So everything changes. Every core of the idea. We have completely refuted their genetic material.

0:48:32 – So let's see now how corona started. The Chinese tried to calm the wave of panic that broke out at the end of 2019 and Professor Christian Drosten didn't get drunk on New Year's Eve, but went on the internet, looked at the sequences from the hospital and thought 'aha, it's a kind of SARS'. He took the sequences attributed to the corona virus and prepared three very different test procedures. He synthesizes the chemical sequence – that alone takes 5 days – and on the same day as the authors of this study posted their sequence – the quote is here at the bottom in Nature on 10<sup>th</sup> January – using the sequence that he calculated from the internet, Christian Drosten sends his test chemicals all over the world. The Chinese government said 'look, here we have a sudden emerging respiratory syndrome, SARS, but all 49 cases of pneumonia in the greater Wuhan area were all isolated. All friends, all neighbours, all work colleagues, everyone that they had been in contact with were all quarantined and none of them got sick, so this was NOT SARS', they communicated openly and honestly to the

WHO, to everyone and said 'It's OK, we are handling it. It's extremely difficult to transmit and we've closed the fish market and the world markets and we're not getting new infections, so can we have our New Year's celebration on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2020, the Communist Party planned event? Yes, half of China will take to the streets'. What happens? A friend of Drosten, a doctor, travels on his own initiative from South China to Wuhan, holds a press conference at noon – all the western media are there – and says that Chinese government is lying. Imagine that! Usually they would be made into fishmeal or end up in an insane asylum if they said the government lies about viruses or that Lauterbach is wrong. Yes, and this in a dictatorship that we can't imagine. They have one million Falun Gong in camps, 100 children die every day in these things. It's no funfair there. Then, of course, a huge panic breaks out, because the doctor says they lied and 'look, I have two patients from southern China who weren't in Wuhan that are positive with the virus using the test from doctor Drosten'. So the panic took off. They can't get this under control anymore. And reading from Fang Fang Wuhan diary they brought the panic under control with military on the street ordered to shoot anyone who comes out of their house. Everyone in the streets who couldn't find their family, or they made the wrong choice, were stuck, they weren't allowed out for months. And garbage trucks had to throw the food at their doors, they don't have time to pack for an 11 million population. And that's how Christian Drosten turned a local panic into a global one and that's his business model and that's what he always did with SARS, with Zika, what else did we have, in the Congo, they had Ebola. So there we have it, everywhere now. He did it before with influenza viruses and yes, bird, pig, fish, frog flu, we always hear the same thing. Christian Drosten gives his sequence for the PCR to the world free of charge for 'humanitarian reasons', which give positive results and gives the impression there's something spreading, for those who believe.

0:53:09 – And this is the publication we're reading from now, step by step. Now I have a mathematician who really knows his stuff and has a very responsible job, but he is also a responsible father, so he doesn't want to show himself yet. He analysed this work step by step to be published soon, showing all the contradictions, the self-refutation of the virologists on every level. It shows that only with a program that the Chinese made themselves could a genome of this length, which could correspond to the corona, be generated. If you try another program, sometimes it doesn't work at all. So sometimes the program looks for bits of overlaps of individual letters and then it builds something whole that's called 'assembly' and in one program it works, in the other it doesn't. Later, bioinformaticians wrote 'HEY, with all 49 other programs that we virologists use it doesn't work either. He shows you step by step – this is the raw data and there are these gaps that they fill with dirty PCR. If I set the PCR to be dirty, then over 14 cycles it will be positive, then 30 cycles are completely dirty and 45 cycles are completely unscientific, because, theoretically, the PCR can no longer function with all these gaps. To construct the whole genome they must mathematically fill it with a second very dirty PCR. And also many details reported refute the whole thing and we have shown that there are many sequences that are typical human sequences and that tallies with the control experiment we commissioned at an elite university. They don't want you to know who they are either. The data is there. It's published. In it we show with a clean 14 cycles we find human RNA. We already get 98.5% of the genome range while after their first step they only got 10%.

0:55:56 – So how do we approach the topic? Let's get to our basic rights, which are secured by the declaration of human rights, which precede every constitution as a tool with which we get things under control and how we as humanity collective can learn from this. And then, with a deeper understanding of biology, of our biology, to finally leave dualism, this good/evil thinking, behind us. That's why I do this work. Because we have a great chance to make a leap

in human development based on human rights. Human dignity is inviolable. The German people – all peoples – must commit to inviolable and inalienable human rights as the basis of every human community of peace and justice. And here it is important to present another book by Tom Holland, *Dominion*. He shows that the principle of human rights, individual freedom, individual responsibility, freedom of conscience, equality are all Christian values that go back to Jesus Christ, just not called that since the French revolution. But that's also very important, because I see an impulse going on here, an absolutely constructive impulse. It's our task to take it on and implement it. The following basic rights bind legislation as directly applicable law. And everybody here knows that there is massive interference with freedom of personal development. We can't do certain jobs, I'm not allowed to go anywhere and so on. There is, of course, also this right to life and physical integrity which is being attacked by the infection protection law, we must be vaccinated or we risk isolation. Vaccination, some will die, yes, but that is our service to the community so that we can all live. It simply has to be so, vaccine damage and all. That's your service to the community using the Infection Protection Act to enforce it. But it does not interfere with our right to freedom of conscience, political view or religious belief. That is not in the infection protection act. So, if I plead a belief in a god who made me without an injection in the ass and I believe in a god who doesn't throw viruses at unsuspecting babies, then I'm out. OUT. It's my belief. When minarets stand here to enforce their belief, then I can also say I believe in a God who made me perfect, at least to the extent that my so-called immune system doesn't need a booster. In the U.S.A. people are now being acquitted and people who sacked them now have to pay fines. Because they exercised their faith, so this is also a tool. But it gets better, it gets easier. Article 5, freedom of expression, censorship should not take place, but it certainly is. Politicians commissioned this after lessons learned from the Federal Health Journal 12/2010 'Pandemic Lessons Learned'. Lessons like, why suddenly 93% of the population rejected the swine flu vaccination at the time? Because they figured out that there are nanoparticles in there. Today critics are screaming about proteins RNA etc, making sure no one knows that the dangerous nanoparticles are in there this time. Those cause the vaccination damage. Because they learned from the swine flu. They said 'OK, OK, the swine flu was gone from the media overnight and they saw there were too many conflicting specialists, so in the future only one opinion may be presented and we can't let misinformation run riot on the Internet, because that led to 93% of the population believing them and refusing vaccination and that is an important detail.' So they start censoring, but forgot the censorship clause in the infection protection law. So they are all anti-constitutional. One and all, anti-constitutional. For this reason they have contravened faith and freedom of conscience. In my political view, yes, 'Censorship should not take place' and the freedom of the press takes a back seat because they've been ordered to and because they are anti-scientific. Everyone going along with corona has proven they are anti-scientific, because the law states that art, science, research and teaching are independent, but that independence does not absolve you from loyalty to the constitution. That means I am again bound to the truth by inalienable rights and that therefore requires the greatest care in science and it isn't there. Here we now have the infection protection law and paragraph 1 part 2, here is the cracker, because it says you have to be scientific. In law we have 'can', if you feel like it, do it, or 'shall', you must do it. 'Can' or 'shall'. 'Shall be supported according to the current status of the works of medical epidemiological science and technology', i.e. the infection protection law prescribes science which is false. Which means the infection protection law loses its validity from the moment they know the true facts (and of course also for the public, we are working on that here today, for which I am very grateful). They have lost their validity and all corona measures that are based on the infection protection law are illegal from the start. Paragraph 2 regulates here the pathogen, yes, that is the virus defined, yes, an agent, yes, you know like

agent 007, only blond women can isolate him, an agent is clearly there by order of the queen, but it doesn't say in there an idea or equation. It also mentions vaccine damage as a fact. So this is how virology has now been shown to be anti-scientific by more and more people, because this memorandum that came out in 1997 exposes a huge international research fraud that went public in Germany first. Everyone in genetics, biology, vaccination, AIDS, cancer, everyone you can imagine, all were co-authors on a publication by Friedhelm Herrman – you can read on Wikipedia, wonderful that it is still on there. He invented almost all of his data and a whistle blower went public with it. And that's how this scandal broke out and a lot of politicians, public prosecutors and so on said 'That's enough, now we need a paragraph of scientific fraud, this stunt has cost us 300 million in research funds'. The science they deleted from was about high-dose chemotherapy in women but the chemotherapy remained and they said 'that's the end of it, now let's build a paragraph of scientific fraud'. And then came the DFG, the German research association, which distributes billions in research funds. Remember what Rosenstock said in 1929, 'the grateful people fund science extensively' and this has been going on for a long time. And then I get angry when they call this corona a 'plandemic'. No, it's not. It's an inevitable outcome from Illich to now, culminating in a quasi 3<sup>rd</sup> world war, but a soft war, a war that's caused so little human damage, at least directly. So it's been kind of a *hello, wakeup call* with a good spirit. Now, to get to the point, namely virology. Virus, yes or no? Science, yes or no? They said oh no, no, no, only scientists can assess who is scientific. No politician can, no one else, only we scientists can, and what do you want, because there are so few bad apples among the good ones, so let's please write down the rules that we've always observed as part of the employment contract, so that politicians could be reeled back in. The set of rules agrees that scientific work is based on fundamental principles that are the same in all countries and scientific disciplines. Good scientific practices blah blah blah important for us right now... It's the task of the scientist to consistently check and doubt results. Why? Because in the history of mankind no proven theory exists so far, not a single one. Everything has had to be revised and if there are still one or two theories that persist, then they have been changed in such a way that what they once believed is gone, and that is the point. To err is human but not to admit the error is fatal and for that we have rules. For that we task every scientist to constantly doubt everything, also other findings must be presented. The results and hypotheses are to be questioned. So they are forced into my position, as a virus discoverer, virologist, I can say that, virus discoverer, I have such a structure, yes, doctorate in biology which is what I graduated in, biologist, yes. They must publish it! But they don't. It's clearly because, from Eugen Rosenstock, 'scholars are competent and they don't like to overturn what they did'. So we have to do this work. Here is the sentence 'Control experiments with just as complete disclosure of the experimental setup are a central component of scientific methodology to verify applied methods and exclude disruptive factors.' And they never did that. In the entire history of virology there was no documentation of control experiments at any level of their work and that's why they are anti-scientific. That's why the infection protection law violates rights and all measures are illegal. Carry that forth. Use this in future complaints in court proceedings and please make sure you only present this point, not a second or third one. I used to do that a lot. It helps a lot, yes? No. You jump from one point to the other, 'too much', said the judge in Los Angeles. Are you scientific or not? And there can be no virologist who comes and says we are unscientific, because there is no publication with documented controls. None. Over and out. At the same time we have the beginning of a leap in human development where we can learn from everyone and are no longer forced to repeat all that nonsense, AIDS, cancer and so on, and that's what the next lecture is about – What is real biology? I would like to thank everyone who made this possible. See you next time.