

Scientists Or Rating-Critics



Translated and edited by Northern Tracey and John Blaid.

Original article found at: <https://telegra.ph/Quoten-Kritiker-02-06>

The 90th session[1] was eagerly awaited by numerous loyal spectators and fans of the Corona Committee, because the topic promised explosive material.

For the first time and finally!! a joint stage of Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg, Dr. Stefan Lanka and Dr. Andrew Kaufman was announced. Wow! If this is not exciting, what is?


And so, in the meantime, a whole 30-40,000 viewers followed the live stream, which lasted over 6 hours - the interest was comparable to that of a Champions League match!

After all, it was about nothing less than the virus existence question! And, of course, linked to this is the hope of finally getting scientific evidence for pathogenic viruses, or not - and then being able to put an end to the whole farce with facts and legal support!

What the audience was then to be treated to, however, could not be topped in its absurdity and presented the attentive contemporary witnesses with an eye-opener par excellence - on a silver platter.

It is almost with some melancholy that I realize that the suspicion, which has long been held by various parties, has been confirmed. That the "Corona Committee" seems to be a kind of partial criticism, because the committee was obviously not the least interested in the most elementary findings to disprove the existence of viruses, let alone presumably to be able to put a quick end to the plandemic.

We are amazed to read on the website of the Corona Committee under the FAQs:



[2]

"We are committed to independent, transparent and evidence-based analysis."

Oops. But, the lack of evidence of a disease-causing virus was ... forgotten?

If someone pretends to be critical, but does not pursue this in all consistency, and only up to the point allowed by the limits of his agenda, he deserves the designation "rating-critic" which is someone that is more interested in approval ratings rather than actual evidence. His behavior is easy to see through and manifests itself in personal attacks on the other person or he exposes him to ridicule - even more so - when the other person is able to provide much more suitable explanations and evidence.

Which is why the entire Corona Committee and anyone who willfully ignores facts and shrouds themselves in silence deserves nothing more than to be called a rating-critic!

I will now ask a few questions to illustrate what could possibly go wrong here and who is actually sabotaging any real chance of finally ending this pandemic:

- Why were none of the protagonists able to cite any publication that adhered to the scientific rules for detecting a disease-causing virus? (see publication of part of our correspondence, here everyone can get the picture in black and white) [3]

- Why does a committee, particularly their attorneys, seem disinterested in the fact that Dr. Stefan Lanka has already carried out and published several control experiments on SARS-CoV-2 in Swiss laboratories, which refute the claims of all virologists? (this includes the mistakenly labeled "viral" (mis)-interpreted cytopathic effect in the laboratory, the purely fictional construction of a viral genome which does not exist in reality and, last but not least, proof that any viral genome can be constructed from the raw sequence data published by the Chinese). [4] [5]

- Why is nobody on the Corona Committee interested in Dr. Stefan Lanka's measles virus case won in 2016, which was a unique occurrence in the world? (The 1st civil senate of the BGH has confirmed the judgment of the Higher Regional Court of Stuttgart (OLG) of February 16, 2016. The court-appointed expert Prof. Dr. Podbielski has expressly stated on page 7 at the top of the protocol [6] based on the inquiry by the adjudicating court confirms that the authors did not perform any control experiments. Dr Stefan Lanka has already carried out the necessary and mandatory control experiments in the measles virus process. These include the cytopathic effect in monkey kidney cells, which was incorrectly interpreted by virologists as viral, and which is not caused by an assumed virus, but by the experiment itself. Then there is the nucleic acid sequence comparison. In the paper, Dr. Stefan Lanka incorporates scientific proof that the published "gene sequence" of the measles virus actually consists of mentally assembled fragments of completely normal cell components. These fragments are increasingly produced when cells are killed in the test tube. Two reputable laboratories, including the world's largest and leading genetics institute, independently came to exactly the same conclusions.)[7][8][9]

- Why is the Corona Committee not at all itchy that the correspondence we have already published with Prof. Bhakdi, Prof. Reiß and the entire virology research in Switzerland, including his Corona Task Force, gave them a certificate of inadequacy? Yes, they even admitted their unscientific actions [3] and continued that they could not provide any proof of SARS-CoV-2 and do NOT have their own isolate of a claimed disease-causing virus (as previously claimed or assumed by Prof. Tanner) ...

- Why are Wodarg and his team ignoring the more than 150 inquiries made by Christine Massey to governments and their institutions worldwide as to whether they can provide scientific evidence for SARS-CoV-2 - as it turned out nobody was actually able to do so ? [10]

- Why doesn't anyone actually need 1.5 million euros? Or is that still not enough? Our Isolation Truth Fund guarantees the payment of this sum to a virologist who presents the scientific proof of the existence of the corona virus, including the documented control attempts of all steps taken to prove it? [11]

- Why did the Corona Committee sweep all these findings under the rug for almost two years, even though Viviane Fischer had met and talked with Dr Lanka more than a year ago and we wrote to Dr. Reiner Füllme offering our support for the lawsuit and to the Corona Committee? The latter refused on the grounds that he did not want to address the question of the existence of the virus. Despite the overwhelming burden of proof? Shouldn't that be of great interest to a lawyer?

- Why does Dr. Wodarg continue to insist that the virus exists, despite neither he nor Prof. Bhakdi (with whom he is in constant contact) providing proof of it when asked? [3]

- Why did Dr. Wodarg state, according to his own statement in the 90th meeting of the Corona Committee, that he had not previously dealt with the publications of Dr. Stefan Lanka and Andrew Kaufman? Shouldn't he have done that if he had even the tiniest spark of interest in finally clarifying the question of the existence of the virus? [1]

- Why does the committee allow false claims made by Dr. Wodarg without subjecting them to a critical review – are we really looking at a one-man show or real satire here?

- Why has the Corona Committee been reluctant to accept all offers of a constructive discussion with us for over a year?

- Why does the Corona Committee choose the much bumpier and less productive path of attacking the PCR test to remove grounds for future pandemics - why not start right at the bottom, with proven-unscientific virology that is already being offered on a plate? (we have already explained in our article why attacking the PCR test is not enough) [12]

And now we come to the most interesting aspect:

- Why did everyone consistently refuse to carry out the obligatory and prescribed control tests at the expense of Dr. Lanka and carrying them out together in the laboratory, filming, documenting and then publishing?

And now let's be honest: How can you seriously reject something like this if you pretend to be interested in the truth and have at least a shred of scientific code of honor in your heart? Even from the point of view that, strictly speaking, success is inevitable - see control experiments in the measles virus process. All the groundwork has already been done!

And why are we only writing this article now???

The question is perfectly justified, but easy to answer! For almost two years we tried to enter into a constructive and goal-oriented discussion with everyone involved, but this was not kept by the other side, even after promises and agreements.

Anyone who remembers the old process used in the HIV/AIDS criticism, in which a well-known critic called Prof. Duesberg used pseudo-criticism, distracting from the essential criticism that HIV was never isolated (the proof is not provided to this day) to keep the virus narrative alive. Presently we find ourselves with déjà vu. Only the players are different. Dr Wodarg's interactions, together with his inherent stubbornness, prevent him from gaining important knowledge - and whether he knows he's doing damage to the whole movement is now an open question.

When it came to the topic of AIDS, it was possible to suppress the enlightenment through the actions of very specific "players". This is why we find ourselves in a kind of repeat loop with Covid. Since HIV, everyone should have known that neither the PCR test nor any other test have any significance. . .

Not only was Dr. Wodarg behaving strangely on the day of the 90th session, the whole presentation and the procedure somehow seemed "staged".

What may not be known to many: Wodarg, Bhakdi and Reiß promised us in advance, at a meeting, that they would later be willing to discuss the topic of refuting the claim of virus existence together with us if we discussed the issue of virus existence up to the then Swiss Referendum [13] held on June 13, 2021 and we concentrated on vaccination together.

However, we were the only ones who stuck to this agreement 100% ... hence the radio silence ... out of the naive hope that we all want the same thing: to find out the truth!

At the 90th session, Dr. Wodarg showed his true face, I quote:

"I WANT THIS TOPIC OFF THE TABLE TODAY"

Meaning the topic that there is no evidence of pathogenic viruses. For Wodarg, there must be, because, as he himself explained, "there are diseases" and, given his limited biological perspective, he cannot imagine any other explanation. If you smile now and feel transported back to the 1st year classroom - I felt the same way. Bottom drawer. We saw classic circular reasoning a la: 'Because there are diseases, there are flying killer viruses and because there are vaccinations, there must also be viruses.'

So now he had invited Dr. Lanka to get "the theory that there are no viruses" off the table – as he himself said. That sounds very much like the kind of enthusiasm with which one finally completes a long-put to bed, unloved task.

Climbing to the pinnacle of absurdity, Dr. Wodarg demands of Dr. Lanka that he should please prove the non-existence of the virus – and 'before that you can't carry on talking'!?

However, it is an epistemological and logical fact that the non-existence of something cannot be proven, only its existence. Strictly speaking, the burden of proof is on the people who claim the existence of viruses.

Dr. Lanka had already successfully refuted this supposed evidence in his presentation so far – but Dr. Wodarg's ears did not want to hear that.

It should be noted here that in science a theory is only valid until it is refuted. That's called falsification. A single valid argument is enough, it is not about a majority decision.

To sum it up a la Wodarg:

Tied in knots of belief in viruses, he demands proof that he is wrong.

However, he is not prepared to accept the evidence presented. To illustrate, you might as well believe in Donald Duck—and if someone denies it, then ask them to prove Donald Duck doesn't exist. "But it has to exist, after all there are a lot of magazines, books, TV programs with and about him, even a Donald Duck club - so why should one doubt its existence? Who please can explain to me plausibly that there is no Donald Duck?"

For more than a year now, Bhakdi, Wodarg and all other participants of the Corona Committee have been encouraged by a number of people and large alternative channels, to please enter into a dialogue with, to meet Dr. Stefan Lanka, Dr. Andrew Kaufman and Co. or invite them to the committee.

Despite these countless requests from so many people and although the committee invited statisticians and other specialists for the umpteenth time, the most important and decisive piece of the puzzle was still missing, namely the findings of Dr. Stefan Lanka that there is no evidence of a disease-causing virus! And I have to emphasize again here: with which he already won a court case! [14]

Not even after more and more scientists worldwide were willing to state that SARS-CoV-2 had not been isolated [15] did the entire Corona Committee care enough about this piece of the puzzle. What are you supposed to think of that?

Both Dr. Wodarg as well as Prof. Bhakdi and his wife were informed that Dr. Stefan Lanka had the control tests carried out in Swiss laboratories, which are missing in all scientific publications but are the duty of every scientist (these control tests have been mandatory since 1998 by the DFG [16]). A work that does not document these steps, and therefore has not carried them out, may not be claimed to be scientific.

And now to the course of the 90th meeting of the Corona Committee

In peace, Dr. Wodarg spent just under an hour drawing his pictures of viruses and vaccinations, managing to pick apart just about everything that could be wrong. He could not provide a single piece of evidence to support his claims. Strange that neither Dr. Reiner Füllmich followed up on Viviane Fischer – this fact alone had to convey to the viewer that what was said would be correct, since nobody raised any objections. I felt like I was in the middle of a sales talk with a pharmaceutical representative who was rewarded in monetary terms for praising the advantages of conventional vaccinations.

Here are a few examples to illustrate:

- "The rabies virus exists and it is deadly, so vaccination against it is good"... that this idea goes back to the fraudster Louis Pasteur [17] does not seem to interest Wodarg - or he has simply forgotten that.

- Chickenpox is so called because it can fly from door to door.."

- "The RKI is actually doing its job very well..." – this statement may come from the fact that he worked for the RKI himself, or still is? [18]

- "The flu shot is good and helps." - Here it would have been prudent to read our article about flu vaccination [19] [20] in order not to make such a false statement.

- "Retroviruses exist..." and they photographed it. - We can also remedy this point and refer to our HIV/AIDS article [21].

- He told stories about how viruses work in an egg cell and that viruses existed long before humans....

- He started with flower comparisons to explain viruses.

- ... and many more crazy things ...

I don't want to repeat everything in this article that we have already written down in our other articles [22] and in our book "Die Zeitzeugen Band 1.0" [23]. That's why I refer to both here, you will find all refutations together with serious sources and statistics to the things claimed by Wodarg.

Before Dr. Stefan Lanka & Dr. Andrew Kaufman were finally allowed to take the mike, a statistician was allowed onto the stage, who only regurgitated what had already been heard from several others of his species. With what felt like 100 slides, he overran his planned time frame.

After a delay of almost 1 hour, the time had finally come: Premiere! For the very first time, the question of whether it was ever possible to detect a disease-causing virus was to be addressed in the Corona Committee.

Dr. Andrew Kaufman, who in the original language (English) presented all points cleanly and clearly, devoid of any excesses, to refute the claim of proof of a disease-causing virus. [24]

By the time he concluded his 26-minute lecture, the matter was settled. It is precisely at this point that Dr. Wodarg could and should have asked the relevant questions.

However, he seemed so overwhelmed by the scope and depth of Kaufman's lecture and at the same time perplexed that, after looking around for help, he would prefer to listen to Dr. Lanka so that he 'doesn't have to discuss things twice because he has so many questions'.

The impression that many viewers gained: he had been knocked out standing and wanted to take time to gather himself. As a strategy, he also chose to attack Lanka via ad hominem (financial interests, peer review), but we'll get to that in a moment.

The German viewer was able to follow the events with the help of a simultaneous translation, but it was clumsy and a complete disaster! Even we had a hard time understanding what Dr. Kaufman actually said in the original.

Meanwhile, Dr. Stefan Lanka dropped out of the stream several times and was forced to log in again each time. God knows what or who could have caused this.

Dr Stefan Lanka then tried to present his findings and the causes of the undesirable development within virology and medicine in laymans terms, but was interrupted by the lawyer Ms. Viviane Fischer with the words that there was no time for this excess! Here we have several questions:

- Why was so little time allocated for this immensely important topic? Or was more time actually promised, but reduced on purpose?
- Why was a statistician allowed to stretch out his time frame beyond measure when he had nothing new to contribute?
- Then why not simply allow the necessary time for what is probably the most central topic, especially when a Dr. Andrew Kaufman is presenting from overseas?
- Why did Dr. Wodarg get an extended speaking time, to postulate his flawed mainstream virology, without interruption, for over a whopping 45 minutes? Particularly questionable in that Wodarg has already had the opportunity to present his point of view several times in the committee.
- Why was Dr. Wodarg present at the lecture with Dr. Lanka and Dr. Kaufman, although neither of them knew anything about it?

After Dr Lanka and Dr. Kaufman had presented their findings shouldn't it have awakened an explicit and profound urge to research in an apparently ambitious scientist like Wodarg and also in the lawyers.

But no, the committee and Wodarg seemed to be guided by other tendencies, they moved on to personal attacks. So Wodarg was not in the least interested in the technical explanations on the part of Dr. Kaufman, and he only replied along the lines of, "... that if Dr. Kaufman had no better explanation for disease than viruses, then what he said would be irrelevant..."

The fact that his counterpart was swimming in murky waters and was only shooting blanks (which of course he tried to cover up by directing the battle to side issues), Dr. Kaufman, however, clearly recognized and articulated this – e.g. B. when it came to the "cause" of a "disease". Dr. Kaufman parried the "mobbing" on the part of Dr. Wodarg in a careful and skilful manner by repeatedly clarifying that the objections expressed were irrelevant to the virus issue and that he should not distract!

Because if there is no evidence of a disease-causing pathogen, the entire infection theory is debunked.

The two lawyers, Füllmich and Fischer, with their wealth of experience, should have pointed this out to Wodarg - but they didn't. This only leaves the conclusion that we have experienced a concerted effort here, which, however, grandiosely backfired ...

Let that sink in: For the first time in two years, with 90 episodes and hundreds of participants so far, "guests" in the Corona Committee have been downright attacked and one would have to be disingenuous not to perceive the lack of impartiality in this hearing - But isn't that precisely the mission that this Corona Committee has set itself?

Dr. Wodarg prefers not to respond to Dr. Kaufman's detailed and precise explanation of why a virus has never been isolated and why its genome sequence has never been detected.

Last year, in a 4-person video conference [25], when Dr. Judy Mikovits still believed in viruses, Dr. Kaufman argued similarly to the 90th meeting of the Corona Committee with Wodarg. Dr. Judy Mikovits, herself a former vaccine developer under Fauci, has since revised her view of viruses, as has Natural News' Mike Adams, which can be considered quite significant for the US.

But Wodarg remained true to his line, continuing to ignore the points made- that viruses were not isolated and that their genome sequence is only based on mathematical constructs from a gigantic sea of different, very short gene sequences. [26] [5]

Either Wodarg's complete lack of expertise is revealed here, or he ignores these facts for other reasons. He would have had enough time to acquire basic knowledge in preliminary talks or by means of the literature we have mentioned.

Also on the control experiments which Dr. Lanka carried out in Swiss laboratories, which clearly prove the refutation of all claims to disease-causing viruses, which Dr. Lanka published [4] [5] for everyone to see and which are reproducible for everyone, Dr. Wodarg countered only with attacks of a personal nature in the sense that he imputed financial interests to Dr. Lanka therefore creating a diversion.

But that was not enough, Wodarg went even further out on a limb and accused Dr. Lanka of not publishing in the scientific magazines of the state media. Is this okay? What kind of smear tactic is Wodarg pulling here? Weren't we all led to believe that the committee was about acquiring new knowledge and new findings in order to be able to go to court in the best possible way, equipped on all sides and promising success?

Do we assume Dr. Wodarg is intelligent enough to know that critical articles by Lanka, Kaufman, Cowan, Vollmer, Humphries, Wakefield, etc. do not make it into state medical science magazines.

The fact that Wodarg nevertheless allows himself to be carried away into making this claim in front of an audience indicates a possible cognitive dissonance (*de docta ignorantia*, recognizing his ignorance) from a spiritual point of view as well as a character deficit. Because it was no secret that Wodarg's and Lanka's views were contradictory from the start. Duplicity.

To invite an opponent within the pandemic critics' camp and then to show him up is hardly to be surpassed in bigotry. Which, in turn, is (rightly) criticized by the pharmaceutical lobby and health politicians, but is practiced even in the critics' camp. Because this is a cultural, sociological phenomenon, which Dr. Lanka also tried to explain in an exemplary manner. Unfortunately, he was also interrupted here, because his reference to larger contexts probably exceeded Wodarg's measure of tolerance.

A question, which I ask myself personally: How impudent is Dr. Wodarg who ignores arguments - only because they are not published in specialized state run magazines of medicine, which are peer-reviewed? Simply brazen, shameful and scurrilous, so here it is again:

Wodarg required Dr. Lanka to publish in state medicine science journals, although Wodarg has not done so himself.

- As an example of double standards, I would like to remind you of the topic of the different "vaccine batches" that Yeadon presented to the Corona Committee - were these published and subjected to peer review so that it could be critically examined? No, of course not, but sufficient for Wodarg in this case. Not so with Dr. Lanka...

- Wodarg is very well aware that this peer-review process has its pitfalls and very often slows down or prevents new knowledge.

- The world-renowned Prof. John P.A. Ioannidis, one of the world's most cited scientists, stated that over half of the publications in scientific journals are wrong! [27]

- The editors of "The Lancet" and "New England Journal of Medicine": [28] The National Institutes of Health (NIH) already published the following interesting article in October 2015: Skeptical of medical science reports?

"It is simply no longer possible to believe much of the clinical research that is published or to rely on the judgment of trusted physicians or authoritative medical guidelines. I am not pleased with this conclusion, which I have slowly and reluctantly reached during my two decades as editor of the New England Journal of Medicine."

Recently, Richard Horton, editor of The Lancet, wrote that "the arguments against science are simple: much of the scientific literature, perhaps half, is simply untrue. Plagued by studies with small samples, tiny effects, invalid exploratory analyses, and blatant Conflicts of interest, along with an obsession with following fashion trends of dubious importance, has turned science into obscurity."

Wodarg's killer argument that if something does not appear in his predefined science journals, it is irrelevant, would be tantamount to the conclusion that any research by alternative journalists is worthless and therefore automatically wrong, because it is not brought to the people via mainstream media - e.g. in Der Spiegel (German newspaper) or in the news.

But that would also mean that any statement by Wodarg would be rendered irrelevant!

The blatantly biased intervention in the discussion between Fischer and Füllmich was also striking. It should have been their task to intervene neutrally in the way of referees and to grant Dr. Lanka sufficient speaking time, especially since he had already been kept waiting for an unduly long time in the run-up. That was not only grossly impolite, but also unfair.

A look at the Code of Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice - which was created by the German Research Foundation (DFG)[16] in 1997 by an international commission on behalf of the German Research Society (DFG) and specified by universities and the University Rectors' Conference, in printed form and published on the Internet and made binding for all state scientific institutions and scientists in Germany would have been enough Mr. Wodarg. These rules and guidelines are part of the employment contract of each individual.

"The scientific/academic quality of a contribution does not depend on the medium in which it is published."

Guideline 15

Publication medium

Authors select the publication medium carefully, with due regard for its quality and visibility in the relevant field of discourse. Researchers who assume the role of editor carefully select where they will carry out this activity. **The scientific/academic quality of a contribution does not depend on the medium in which it is published.**

Good Research Practice

Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice

The aim of the Code is to enable the intended audience – researchers as well as heads of universities and non-university research institutions – to align their internal structures, processes and actions with the guidelines for good research practice. The intention is to create a deeply rooted culture of research integrity at higher education institutions, focusing less on breaches of good research practice and more on the professional ethics of researchers.



As of 1 August 2019, all universities and non-university research institutions will be required to implement the 19 guidelines in a legally binding manner to be eligible to receive DFG funding. For those universities and non-university research institutions that have already implemented the relevant requirements set out in the DFG white paper "Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice" in a binding manner, there is a two-year transition period for implementing the guidelines contained in the Code. This period begins on 1 August 2019 and ends on 31 July 2022.

[29]

My (absolute) final thoughts on this...

Nowhere does it state that it is a condition that you can only refute a theory if you have a better one at hand. Dr Lanka would certainly have had a lot to offer, but they simply didn't let him.

Instead, Dr. Wodarg is allowed to publicly deride him and accuse him of "secondary interests" after Lanka spoke of his self-made diagnostic device.

To hear this from the mouth of a book author (Wodarg), who himself had just returned from a promotional tour for his new publication, which revolves around the C crisis and is probably based on the prevailing virus theory. Conflict of interest? No, only everyone else has it!

Dr. Kaufman from the USA succeeded in exposing Dr. Wodarg's pestering regarding the question of 'the cause, how else people get infected, if there is no virus', as what it is: pure speculation, i.e. an assumption!

He also knows how to illustrate this, namely that he could just as well claim that an alien jumps from person to person. Again, this is just an assertion for which there is no proof.

What he managed to do very cleanly was: to separate the refutation of the virus evidence from the question of the causes of the disease.

Anyone who cannot comprehend such simple logical connections, factual designations and observations proves to be completely unsuitable. Game, set and match!

Who then on top of that refuses to look at the control experiments already carried out to disprove the virus existence claim and is also not willing to carry them out together at our expense - in order to get the strongest ace up his sleeve against those responsible in court - I unfortunately have to withdraw my trust, as sorry as I am.

Two days later, an interview with Dr. Reiner Füllmich on Bittel.TV, at which the 90th meeting of the Corona Committee was also discussed, can be found here. [30]

Comedy ... or rather schizophrenia and for the loony bin? Füllmich portrays Dr. Stefan Lanka as arrogant and says that Dr. Andrew Kaufman and Dr. Lanka do not understand the question of the burden of proof and a lawyer should explain it to them ... Should Dr. Reiner Füllmich's professional expertise be insufficient for this? The proof was already provided in 2016 by determining the nucleic acid sequence of the measles virus.

According to his own statement, Füllmich considers the existence of the virus to be sufficiently proven.

So we have a few questions:

- Where?
- In which study exactly?
- Title and publication?

But they were not willing to let Dr. Stefan Lanka present all the refutations in the 90th session in peace. An unprepared Füllmich played dumb and accused Dr. Stefan Lanka and Dr. Andrew Kaufman of the facts he himself had suppressed?!

And as if that weren't enough satire, here's the icing on the cake: Füllmich actually said that he wouldn't know how to argue in a lawsuit when most experts believe in the virus....

And now comes law for beginners: You have to present scientific evidence - not beliefs! Surely a lawyer must be able to distinguish between a claim made by a scientist and scientific proof? And if not, you should at least recognize that you are overwhelmed and delegate the case to a suitable colleague.

Dr. Stefan Lanka was not in court just the one time and already informed Reiner Füllmich during the Corona Committee meeting that no virologist will testify under oath to have performed control experiments.

Great theater and quite curious the excuses that Füllmich uses as to why he cannot ask the question of the existence of the virus in court - since the majority of experts believe in it and the knowledge is established, which can then be applied to everything else just as easily. Then you shouldn't attack the tests, masks, distances, measures either, then your whole committee would

just be a waste of time (or in the truest sense of the word "committee" - my thought) because the majority sees it differently.

It's bad that other critical channels also support the scientific fraud in the fake virus studies, you hear again and again that "it's the wrong time". But these very critics are sawing the branch they are sitting on and are apparently not even aware of it.

There is simply no better time than now to ask exactly this question about the proof of a disease-causing virus! Deviation is only put on the table by those who have simply not dealt at all with the facts of the unscientific nature of the publications.

Perhaps Füllmich should first fix his own arrogance and be more polite to guests who hold a different view than his own. If he did not stifle findings that are presented, he would not need to claim later that they do not exist ... Simply bizarre. Would you be surprised if some people suspect a conspiracy?...?

This committee is not part of any solution, but in this way part of the problem! Mono-Strategy. One must not address the fraud with virus studies without mandatory control trials..

Apparently it was never about winning, but only about psychotherapeutic support... or about good entertainment/distraction?

References:

[1] [Corona-Ausschuss - Sitzung 90: Das Virus der Macht](#)

[2] <https://corona-ausschuss.de/faq/>

[3] [Schriftlich bestätigt - Forscher können keinen Nachweis für ein krankmachendes Virus erbringen](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[Schriftlich bestätigt - TEIL 2 - Forscher können keinen Nachweis für ein krankmachendes Virus erbringen](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[4] [Video-Interviews zu allen 3 Kontrollexperimenten seitens Dr. Stefan Lanka](#)

[5] **Kontrollexperiment Phase 1** - [Wissenschaftplus Magazin 2021 Ausgabe 2 Seite 52](#)

Präliminäre Resultate der Kontrollversuche Die Reaktion primärer humaner Epithelzellen auf stringente Virusamplifikations-Bedingungen widerlegen die Existenzbehauptungen aller Viren und von SARS-CoV-2

Kontrollexperiment Phase 2 - [Wissenschaftplus Magazin 2021 Ausgabe 4 Seite 28](#)

Das Genom von SARS-CoV-2 wurde rein rechnerisch konstruiert - Eine Anleitung zu Widerlegung

[6] http://www.wissenschaftplus.de/uploads/article/Protokoll_13_4_20150001.pdf

[7] [Gerichtsprotokolle bestätigen: Kein wissenschaftlicher Nachweis für die Existenz des Masernvirus](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#) | [\[MP3-Audio\]](#)

[8] [Corona_Fakten & Samuel Eckert widerlegen Correctiv zum Masernprozess](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[9] [RKI bestätigt: Weder Viren-Existenzforschung, noch Kontrollexperimente durchgeführt](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[10] [FOIs zeigen, dass Gesundheits- / Wissenschaftseinrichtungen auf der ganzen Welt \(165 und mehr!\) keine Aufzeichnungen über die Isolierung / Reinigung von SARS-COV-2 haben, nirgendwo und jemals - Fluoridfreies Peeling \(fluoridefreepeel.ca\)](#)

[11] <https://www.samueleckert.net/isolate-truth-fund/>

[12] [Reicht eine Attacke auf den PCR-Test aus? Nicht ganz](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[13] https://t.me/Corona_Fakten/685

[14] [goVIRUSgogogo.pdf \(wissenschafttplus.de\)](#) - Der Bundesgerichtshof lässt den Glauben an die Viren untergehen von Dr. Stefan Lanka

Ergänzend können Sie dazu unsere ausführlichen Artikel mit allen Quellen, Prints und exklusivem Material lesen: Siehe Quelle [7] [8] [9]

[15] https://t.me/Corona_Fakten/777

Corona_Fakten präsentiert eine Reihe von Aussagen diverser Forscher, Wissenschaftler, Ärzten, Anwälten & mehr, die nach intensiver Recherche und eigenen Kontrollexperimenten zu dem eindeutigen Ergebnis gekommen sind - "ES EXISTIERT KEIN KRANKMACHENDES VIRUS"

[16] Research Integrity - [Publication medium](#)

[17] Die [Princeton University](#) veröffentlichte die Untersuchung seiner Laboraufzeichnungen, bei deren Lektüre man zu dem Ergebnis kommen muss, dass Louis Pasteur seinerzeit massiv gelogen, betrogen und manipuliert hatte.

[18] In der Pandemie arbeitete DR. WORDAG BIS 2021 in einer GEN-Kommission des Robert Koch Institutes - ernannt vom Bundesministerium für Gesundheit <https://archive.md/KDXxR>

Sachverständige aus Recht und Ethik

Prof. Dr. Henning Rosenau
(Vorsitzender)
Lehrstuhl für Strafrecht,
Strafprozessrecht und Medizinrecht
MLU Halle-Wittenberg

Prof. Dr. Regine Cramer
Fachanwältin für Medizinrecht
c/o Sozietät Schmidt, von der Osten
& Huber, Essen

PD Dr. Dagmar Schmitz
Institut für Geschichte, Theorie und
Ethik in der Medizin,
Universitätsklinikum RWTH Aachen

PD Dr. Andreas Vieth
Philosophisches Seminar
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität,
Münster

Vertretung aus Patienten- und Verbraucherorganisationen sowie Behindertenverbänden

Dr. Katrin Grüber
Institut Mensch, Ethik und
Wissenschaft gGmbH, Berlin

Prof. Dr. Jeanne Nicklas-Faust
Bundesgeschäftsführerin
Bundesvereinigung Lebenshilfe e.V.,
Berlin

Christian Judith
Hamburg

Prof. Dr. Regine Koller
Universität Hamburg

Prof. Dr. Raimund Geene
Deutsche Arbeitsgemeinschaft
Selbsthilfegruppen e.V., Gießen

Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg
Berlin/Kiel

**Als STÄNDIGE GÄSTE sind der Gemeinsame
Bundesausschuss und die Bundesärztekammer in
der Gendiagnostik-Kommission vertreten.**

Weitere Informationen

» Ehemalige Mitglieder der Gendiagnostik-Kommission (GEKO)

Stand: 01.10.2020

Nutzung von Cookies

Wir verwenden Cookies, um die Bereitstellung unserer Dienste zu verbessern und zu ermöglichen, dass wir Cookies verwenden. Weitere Informationen zum Datenschutz



[19] [Die Grippe-Impfung ist nicht nur nutzlos, die Beteiligten wissen darüber Bescheid](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[20] [Die Grippe-Impfung ist ein Verbrechen – und das bereits seit 78 Jahren](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[21] [HIV & AIDS einfach und simpel demontiert - Die Parallelen zu SARS-CoV-2](#) | [\[Telegraph\]](#)

[22] [Corona_Fakten: Liste der wichtigsten Artikel !](#) – [Telegraph](#)

[23] [Corona_Fakten & Ursula Stoll präsentieren ihr neues Buch - Die Zeitzeugen Band 1.0](#)

[24] [Dr. Andrew Kaufman & Dr. Stefan Lanka | Session 90: The Virus Of Power \[Englisch\]](#)

[25] Special Event Roundtable with Dr. Judy Mikovits discussing the magic virus and mRNA vaccines (Beginnend ab Minute 22)

Ergänzend unser [Telegram-Post](#)

[26] Video - [Wie Virologen Virusgenome am Computer frei erfinden](#)

[27] John P. A. Ioannidis - [Why Most Published Research Findings Are False](#)

[28] NCBI - [Skeptical of medical science reports? - PMC \(nih.gov\)](#)

[29] [DFG - Gute wissenschaftliche Praxis Kodex „Leitlinien zur Sicherung guter wissenschaftlicher Praxis“](#)

[30] Bittel.TV- Zusammenfassung mit Reiner Füllmich - Corona-Ausschuss - Sitzung 90
<https://t.me/bittelv/14467>