

Stefan Lanka: "Viruses are not microbes and have no infectious capacity"

DSalud Número 249 - April 2021 (I of III)

<https://www.dsalud.com/reportaje/stefan-lanka-los-virus-no-son-microbios-y-no-tienen-capacidad-infectiva/>

The well-known German virologist Stefan Lanka assures us that viruses are neither microbes nor do they have infectious capacity, so *Covid-19* could not have been caused by a coronavirus such as the alleged *SARS-CoV-2*, the existence of which has not been proven. This is what he assured us during an exclusive video interview in which he also explains that it is time to question everything that Virology, Microbiology and Medicine say about viruses. Moreover, he asserts that the tests used for *Covid-19* are a scam, that the figures of supposedly "infected" and "killed by" are unrealistic and that vaccines are not going to solve anything and are also very dangerous.

Born in Langenargen (Germany), the marine biologist and virologist **Stefan Lanka** studied at the *University of Koblenz*, obtained his PhD in 1989 with a thesis on virus infection in seaweed, his main discovery was precisely the isolation of the *Ectocarpus silicosus* virus present in seaweed, and is known worldwide for claiming that neither HIV - to which AIDS is attributed - nor the hepatitis and measles viruses have been identified, isolated, characterised nor their genomes sequenced. In fact, in November 2011, he challenged on the Internet those who claim that the measles virus exists to show him a single published scientific article describing its characteristics and, in particular, its components and diameter, stating that he would pay 100,000 euros to anyone who could present it to him. A few months later, a medical student named **David Bardens** sent him a letter with six papers that he believed together met his demand for the money. Lanka responded by telling him that these articles did not contain what he had requested and did not prove the existence of the virus, and refused to pay anything, initiating a legal process that ended up in the *Bundesgerichtshof* - the German Federal Court of Justice - which would agree with Lanka (we reported it in the report that appeared in issue 202 with the title *Incredible: the existence of the measles virus has not been proven!*)

The ruling would so irritate the establishment that the multiple lies and disqualifications about Lanka that were already orchestrated when he denounced the AIDS farce were multiplied and even the current "verifiers" of the "official truths" have signed up to distort the facts again and to disqualify him. A good example of this is that if you read what is said about him on *Maldita.es* and above all on *Wikipedia* - one of the platforms controlled

by today's professional disinformers - you can see the "bad slime" of those who have made the page about Lanka. Many people are unaware that *Wikipedia* allows anyone to create a page about someone else, say what they like about them, and the person concerned cannot delete it or correct the mistakes. And anyone can do so anonymously, because in fact it urges those who write on it to publish under a pseudonym and not identify themselves. And readers continue to trust what appears on *Wikipedia*, a portal whose credibility - at least in the field of health - is today, in our opinion, **NULL**.

We end this brief introduction by pointing out that Stefan Lanka published last December together with **Ursula Stoll** a book entitled *Corona: Weiter ins Chaos oder Chance für ALLE?* ('*Corona: Further into chaos or opportunity for ALL?*' Ed. Praxis Neue Medizin) in which he explains the Copernican turn that his convictions about microbiology and, of course, about virology have undergone in recent years. It is a work that at the time of writing had not yet been translated into Spanish and in which Lanka has had the courage to question his own scientific achievements and to make a radical critique of the current foundations of Microbiology, Virology, Immunology, Medicine, Genetics and, in general, the conception of life as it is generally considered in academic circles. Criticism that covers much of what is being said about *Covid-19*, the alleged *SARS-CoV-2*, antigen tests, PCR tests, the numbers of "infected" and killed by" and the supposed safety and efficacy of the vaccines that are being massively inoculated.

Having said that, I transcribe without further ado - after being translated from German - the interview that my colleague **Antonio Muro** did on my behalf for *Discovery DSALUD Television* through *Zoom*, with the questionnaire with which I provided him.

- Those of us who have been following your evolution for years have been able to see that yours has not exactly been an easy path and yet you have been moving forward regardless of the difficulties, allowing yourself to be guided by the coherence of your findings and assuming a role that is not only critical but also self-critical, something that should govern all scientific research but unfortunately is not the case today. Can you begin by explaining something about your training, your experience, the work you have been doing and briefly comment on this evolution?

- There are many reasons that have led me to my current position but I will try to be as concise as possible. What influenced me in the first place were my childhood experiences. I was born and grew up on the shores of Lake Constance and now I live there again. I was lucky enough to meet a man whose job it was to monitor the quality of the water in the lake and who noticed how badly polluted it was. Well, one of the most important rules that have guided me in life was given to me by him: "*If you ask life the right questions, you will get answers as long as you remain humble and show it respect*". He lived by that principle, always showed great respect for life and was a very dedicated person. A great example for me. That's why I was shocked to see how he was savaged

by politics when he tried to publicise his investigations into the poor state of the water in Lake Constance. That made me decide to study biology instead of chemistry.

It made me realise that the life of the planet was threatened. I understood that the lake could still regenerate with the flow of the rivers that flow into it - like the Rhine - but that this was more complicated in the case of the seas and oceans, which are the ones that ultimately end up receiving all the pollution. The death of the seas and oceans would lead humanity irreversibly to extinction, since 70% of the oxygen we need to live comes precisely from there. In short, in the end I chose to study Marine Biology and that was the beginning of a series of happy coincidences that led me to where I am today.

One of the first books that had a decisive influence on me was *Das Feuer des Heraklit* (*The Fire of Heraclitus: Sketches of a Life before Nature*) by **Erwin Chargaff**, who was the first critic of genetic engineering. Years later I met him in person and learned a lot from him; among other things that if something coincides with the mythology and philosophy of the ancient pre-Socratic Greeks, although this is no guarantee that it is right, it is an indication that it might be. I didn't understand it at the time, but today I know what he meant. In short, he was a good teacher who gave me a lot of guidance and revealed to me that if one goes into a subject critically, one will be rewarded with much more knowledge.

Well, something important for understanding what is happening with virology and medicine is the imposition of materialistic thinking in the scientific sphere. Chargaff illustrates this well in his book *Die Aussicht aus dem 13* (*The view from the 13th floor*). In it he imagines having a conversation with a physicist who, he tells him, could prove that the creatures of fables - nymphs, fairies, goblins... - do not exist, to which he replies: "*You cannot prove scientifically that something does not exist*". And he adds: "*If you rob a child of the power of imagination you will destroy the basis of humanity*". This is a true and important statement and it is perfectly applicable to what we observe today.

The coronavirus crisis is the pinnacle of 2,500 years of restrictions on thought by materialism, something that **Plato** already realised very precisely and criticised openly when he said that Greek physicians did not understand the diseases they faced because they excluded the soul from their analyses. According to him, they sought to repair the affected organ without seeing that the origin of the disease came from the soul. Plato describes two medicines: one for people who are not free - the slaves - in which the doctors try to suppress the symptoms with medicines, and another for free people who are treated by curing the soul.

One day I met **Fritz Pohl**, an Austrian professor who told me that the official version of HIV and AIDS did not "add up". He had heard that **Robert Gallo**, when he was competing with **Luc Montaigner** to be recognised as the discoverer of HIV, had committed fraud and

lied about his work. At the time I was still a student who had had the opportunity to work in a laboratory and using his findings on nucleic acid discovered a structure in a seaweed that I mistakenly defined as "a harmless virus". In reality, as I will explain in detail later, this structure was what is now called a "giant virus", which is really nothing more than a mini-spore similar to bacterial phages, which are also phages. So what I isolated was actually a "giant virus" but I classified it as a "harmless virus".

Today we know that mini-spores arise when the subsistence conditions of certain simple organisms - such as the bacteria or algae I worked with - become unsustainable. And in my case there were some prerequisites. I had great references, orientation, motivation and concern for the oceans and in the field of marine biology I thought I had discovered a "harmless virus" but, at the same time, my Austrian mentor was telling me about the inconsistencies about HIV and AIDS. It was then I developed the ability to combine different areas of knowledge to deepen my understanding of very different topics. In fact I also always turn to history because it is important to understand where concepts and ways of thinking come from.

The most important event took place in 2000, when I met **Dr. Ryke Geerd Hamer**. Between 1995 and 2000 I regularly visited Barcelona to give talks and lectures and it was there that we met in person. Up to that point I had heard and read about his discoveries, but as a person I found him somewhat disturbing and his theories, which I knew very little about, seemed to me too simplistic and mechanical. However, when I contacted him in 2000, faced with a case of cancer, he immediately invited me to talk to him and that is when he explained to me the truth about viruses. And from that moment on it was clear to me, without a doubt, that he was right. Hamer was the first to erase fear from biology and medicine. Thanks to that scientific support I had an answer to many of the doubts I had about science. For many years I was able to say "*No, there is no such thing as a pathogenic virus. It is wrong. Immunology is wrong. Genetics has been disproved*"..... But I didn't know what disease was. For 5 years I couldn't answer the question "*What is disease?*" And when I met Hamer I finally found the answer.

- You were in fact known to your colleagues for publishing the discovery and isolation of the *Ectocarpus Siliculosus Virus* in the 1990s, although you did not come to public attention until you denied that HIV had been isolated. You subsequently said the same about other viruses - such as hepatitis and measles - and the controversy grew. And in recent years you have published a series of articles that go much further, no longer denying one or the other isolation but completely dismantling what is understood by viruses. Do you really postulate that there are no pathogenic viruses that cause or generate diseases?

- The answer is clear: yes. But the road to that clear answer was arduous. It all started with HIV at the time when AIDS was on everyone's lips and I stood up and said, "No,

there is no virus here". But I couldn't say what was making people sick. Sure, I could talk about mass drug poisonings and things like that but a lot of symptoms were unexplained. It was a complicated time but I gradually realised that - as had happened with HIV - isolating a viral structure misinterpreted the death of the cell tissue in the test tube as evidence of the presence of a pathogenic virus in it and then built up the chain of viral genetic material. I have seen this approach in other viruses. My most important teacher in this field has been the Perth (Australia) researcher **Eleni Papadopulos-Eleopulos**. She and her team formed the so-called Perth Group and said: "*Look, we have read all the publications - it is impossible for one person to do that - and in our opinion there is no evidence of a virus anywhere*". Their group specialised in the HIV virus and nothing else; they say one virus is enough for a lifetime.

It became clear to me that if I only criticised the postulate of a single virus and did not mention the rest, I was reinforcing the virus theory. And if I did not challenge the conceptual framework from which that theory springs, I was reinforcing it. At the end of the day, everything stems from the theory of cellular pathology according to which we are born from a cell, there are only material interactions and it is a "poison" - a word that means "virus" in Latin, by the way - that makes us sick. That is the scenario since **Virchow** coined this theory in 1858 although he was only "a child of his time".

You have to go back 2,500 years, to the time of Plato as I said before. His colleagues **Democritus and Epicurus** are the ones who established the current Theory of Life, the theory of Atomism and the theory of Evolution. With some reason they said: "*We want a theory without spirit, without gods, without consciousness because religions always wield fear before gods. Therefore, we envisage a purely materialistic theory of life that does not arise from belief*". What they could never have imagined is that this same theory would eventually become a religion, the cruelest religion of all time.

If I think that I am in this world only by chance and when I die there will be nothing left of me and everything is governed by chance, the result is obvious: greed. To be successful, to enjoy what I can, to have no consideration whatsoever. If my life is meaningless and nothing of me will be left, then I will fear death. The result is what we are witnessing today. Because the coronavirus crisis is the accumulation point of 2500 years of materialism that arose, among other reasons, because the ancient Greeks did not understand the Ayurvedic texts as they were written in Sanskrit. By erasing the soul from their system, they developed the "theory of the four humours" or "humoral theory" on which everything else has been built.

In short, if one looks at what virologists do, one concludes that no, there is no such thing as a virus. Knowing the history we understand that it is in fact a wrong model and that the correct one was censored. Later I will discuss in detail the 7 points that virologists make to support their conclusions and how at each point they refute themselves. Dr. Hamer's

system of knowledge in itself refutes Virology as a whole. Once I understood his theory, the veracity of which anyone can check with themselves, I knew that it was impossible for a virus to assault my body. Do viruses exist? No. Simply because they cannot exist. You look at what virologists publish and you realise that they refute themselves. They act in an unscientific way because they never carry out control tests of their experiments, which is the minimum necessary to be able to affirm that something is scientific or not.

- In other words, you argue that viruses are not microbes, are not pathogenic and have no biological structure, but can they have an impact on us by working in symbiosis with our bacteria and cells, as the American biologist Lynn Margulis postulates? Can viruses then be said to be more like fragments of DNA or RNA that transmit information?

- Lynn Margulis and marine biologists have determined that in the sea there are enormous amounts of nucleic acid associated with the presence of so-called giant viruses. This biomass is even larger than all the life we know of on Earth, in humus or in the seas. It's amazing: the sea is full of nucleic acid! Delving into the theory of life, I discovered the main role of nucleic acid. Margulis was an important reference for me, but she gives nucleic acid a role that it does not really have. The main function of nucleic acid is to release energy and, secondly, it is a component in the production of a few proteins and enzymes. Ninety per cent of proteins and enzymes are generated by the human body without genes, i.e. without blueprints. For the remaining 10% the body does have "blueprints" or "templates". However, the belief that viruses have played an important role in evolution is wrong. Life generates its own nucleic acid and it is important because it is the primary energy generator of cellular metabolism. It is a fact that incredible amounts of nucleic acid exist in the sea in the form of giant viruses. **Gunther Enderlein** recognises that this is a fundamental step because it is how life materialises and becomes visible.

- How do phages, exosomes, extracellular vesicles and the so-called giant viruses differ? Are all these molecules aspects of the same reality, phases of what is known as pleomorphism?

- Bacterial phages - which do exist - are mini-spores as postulated by Gunther Enderlein, one of the most important scientists of pleomorphism. According to his view, more developed life forms are formed from simpler ones, but these more complex forms can regress and become simple again. For example, so-called "giant viruses" are mini-spores of uncomplicated organisms such as seaweeds. I have said before that I isolated a "giant virus" from a seaweed. These mini-spores contain a nucleic acid fragment of a certain length and a certain genetic sequence that never changes. And with bacterial phages we are in the same case: they contain a genetic sequence that is always the same. Both structures exist, they can be easily isolated and biochemically characterised and photographed, and the length of their genetic material can be determined. Of course,

such material can be sequenced. However, this is not the case for suspected pathogenic viruses. Virology has not been able to carry out such a procedure with a virus, they just interpret that "it must be so".

Look, phages and giant viruses are indisputably part of pleomorphism. There is a substance that is a fundamental part of the realisation of life and that is the so-called "water membrane" or surface tension of water. This membrane, which is wrongly defined as the 4th phase of water, is the substance that water itself creates when it comes into contact with gases, solid surfaces, dissolved substances or when whirling movements are generated.

From this substance, life is created. It is a substance of high density (1.4 kg per litre), liposoluble and viscous like a gel. We are made of it and it envelops nucleic acids, tissues, organs...

As for the term exosome, I don't like to use it. If I move into the realm of cellular theory it is correct, but what is not correct is that exosomes contain nucleic acid. You only have to look at what virologists do to artificially construct a genome from millions of tiny pieces to know that there is nothing specific that the body generates in large quantities during a disease that can be called an exosome. The term exosome, from the view of the cellular theory postulated by Virchow, might make sense, but his theory has already been disproved.

Virchow, in 1858, ignored and displaced the theory of the three embryonic germ layers developed by **Robert Remak** in order to assert that life comes from cells and diseases from them by generating the veins of the cells. but Dr. Hamer "rediscovered" the theory of the embryonic germ layers in 1981 and made them a fundamental part of his theory.

- As far as we know, you don't seem to agree with the Microbial Theory of disease postulated by Louis Pasteur. It was he, Robert Koch and others later on who came up with the theory that most so-called "diseases" are caused by microbes - first bacteria, then fungi and parasites, later viruses and prions - that attack our cells, tissues and organs like invading armies, and that the body must use its own molecules to fight them, which would constitute the army of defence: the immune system. This is clearly a warmongering view. What is your opinion on this?

- This theory is based on the Greek conception of life. The ancient Greeks developed a truly warlike culture. They were constantly at war with each other and saw life that way. Moreover, if one conceives life as mere material interactions, one can only understand disease as a defect, as something evil originating from within life that can assault an organism, that consumes and degenerates it but brings nothing to it. This materialistic view conceived 2,500 years ago was sanctioned by the Enlightenment and led to Virchow's Theory of Cellular Pathology according to which life is random, full of material

interactions, and disease comes from an incorrect interaction between molecules that leads to mutations, damaged genes...

And this applies to the case of the coronavirus. So it is not about one virus or the totality of viruses. What is at stake is our self-perception as human beings, the way we see ourselves: are we a mere product of chance whose health or illness is at the mercy of a war between poisons - internal or external - and our supposed immune system or is there perhaps another explanation for the emergence and sustenance of life? This is the fundamental dilemma and I can assure you that the first option has been refuted! It forces us to resign ourselves to war because there is no other explanation. First it was parasites and then the idea of disease was brought to the level of bacteria - after all, bacteria could be seen under the microscope! They soon realised, however, that there were diseases in which no bacteria seemed to be present, and so they assumed that in such cases the cause must be a poison that makes you sick, a virus. This idea has been around for a long time, but it is not correct. There is a better explanation of life and that is Dr Hamer's. He gave us the turning point. He gave us the turning point with what we could call the New Testament of Biology. He delivered us from evil. In his new conception of life and nature it has no place.

He showed that a trauma - which he called a biological conflict - if it lasts for weeks, months or years, leads to a series of reactions that are defined as "illness" but are immediately resolved when the original conflict is resolved. For example, finding a job if you have unexpectedly lost the one you had, if you receive news that your child's life is in danger but ultimately survives, or if you change your place of work or residence. You then enter the Healing or Repair Phase. When this is the case, in most cases the active phase organ damage - whether it was affected by cellular proliferation or cellular destruction - is reversed either by necrosis or regeneration. All this sheds light on the truth. And one concludes that no, the conception of health and disease as a never-ending war is not correct because the pattern that Dr. Hamer discovered is always reproducible.

- Louis Pasteur - who was a chemist, physicist and mathematician but not a doctor or biologist - also created the dogma that the body can be taught to fight pathogenic microbes by confronting it with small samples of them. Thus vaccines and the myth that they prevent diseases whose microbes are inoculated into us were born. Many experts - both then and now - consider this to be nothing more than an unsubstantiated theory that has been accepted but never proven. What do you think?

- Pasteur is a complicated character. He contributed a lot on issues such as milk preservation and wine production. Pasteurisation is still used today. He gave farmers and the food industry very useful knowledge, but he was a child of his time. He was **Robert Koch**'s competition and it all ended in what I call "the Pasteur tragedy". In a way he knew

that vaccines were useless and that the theory of poison and counterpoison was not correct. The experiments he carried out on animals were extremely cruel. He tied dogs and sheep to poles and injected liquids supposedly containing the rabies virus directly into their brains. The mechanical procedure itself drove the animal insane and caused it to writhe and drool; in other words, it supposedly recreated the symptoms associated with rabies, but they were actually caused by the procedure, not the contents of the liquid. *Princeton University* professor **Gerald Geison** analysed his diaries and concluded that Pasteur knowingly manipulated and lied.

For example, to publicly demonstrate that his vaccine against the anthrax bacillus was effective, he poisoned animals that died in front of the public. He then claimed that he had previously vaccinated other animals and when he inoculated them with the bacillus they did not die. But of course he didn't poison them! It was this sort of thing that came to light with his diaries and is more than enough reason to discredit the Infection Theory that he helped so much to cement. In journals such as the *New York Review of Books*, people like **Max Perutz** went so far as to write that fortunately Pasteur fooled everyone because if he hadn't, the infection theory would never have got off the ground. And in this he is right. Only in this way could the globally dominant Infection Theory prevail to this day.

There is a book published in 1999 by the *Max Planck Institute* on the History of Virology, which describes the different schools that existed and how in 1954 the school that understood the virus as a genetic material prevailed and is still accepted today. Pasteur died sad and with an evil secret.

- You go so far as to say that the thesis proposed by Virchow a century and a half ago that life develops from cells is incorrect and that it arises directly from tissues. Can you explain what you are postulating? Does life not arise in this case from the union of sperm and ovum?

- Thousands of sperm are needed to fertilise an egg. People think that just one sperm is enough, but it's not. It takes a lot of tissue to get the process going. Embryology is well documented. A sphere of up to 64 nuclei is created which, after a process of invagination, gives rise to the three embryonic germ layers that form the different organs. Only later do the cells appear at the edges of the organs or in the bone marrow where red blood cells are produced. But organs - such as the skin or the brain - are not structured in a cellular way. What you see under the microscope when you put dead organic tissue under the microscope after applying chemicals and dyes is a laboratory artefact. I have explained this in detail in three articles I published in 2019 in my journal that I would be happy to translate and publish in your journal because I consider them important.

Virchow really wanted to become a parish priest, but his father forced him to study medicine because sooner or later he would inherit his heavy debts. He sent him to Berlin to study the only medicine there was, which was military medicine. Bad training and a bad reputation. Neither rich nor poor wanted to be treated there. He took an active part in the Revolution of 1848 and the political demands and was in fact present on the barricades and in the revolts. During this period, he made very interesting proclamations such as the fact that epidemics were not the result of contagions but of the deplorable sanitary conditions of the population, who lived among insects, with no means of heating, no sewage, poorly fed.... He wanted the state and medicine to join forces to improve the quality of life of the people, but the revolution was repressed and Virchow was arrested. However, he must have been protected by someone influential because not only was he released but he was appointed professor in Würzburg and ten years later he was given the directorship of the *Charité Hospital* even though he was not the most qualified candidate.

And then, suddenly, Virchow appears out of nowhere, proclaiming the Theory of Cellular Pathology and censuring the theory of embryonic germ layers and concluding that the indivisible unit of life was the cell. He presumably arrived at this idea during his anticlerical period and took it from Democritus and Epicurus. He did not know much about cell theory as such. He took it from **Theodor Schwann** and from there came the fatal misinterpretation that the cell is nothing more than water wrapped in a membrane. I recommend watching the film *On the back of a Tiger* or studying the contributions of **Harold Hillman** [translator's note <https://www.big-lies.org/harold-hillman-biology/index.html>], who refuted this idea of the cell in the 1980s.

It is the tissues that play a major role because they are what our organs are made of. Dr. Hamer discovered that the four areas of the brain - the brain stem, the cerebellum, the white matter and the cortex - are connected to the different embryonic layers. In other words, they "control" the different organs in such a way that in the event of a trauma, a biological shock, a specific part of the brain will be affected and will send a signal to the specific organ it controls. This knowledge validates the tissue theory and invalidates Virchow's theory of cellular pathology.

- We know that you do not accept determinism in genetics and you defend the importance of epigenetics. To what extent do you believe that DNA is determinant?

- DNA has a different function than is commonly believed. It is the resonator and stabiliser of metabolism. Enveloping the nucleic acid is the substance I mentioned, the water membrane, which arises from water itself and turns back into water when it releases energy. It is the fundamental substance of life. **Aristotle** called it ether and the ancient Indian cultures called it *prana*. We absorb it with our breath. It is a thick substance - you can see it in the humidity of the air - which when it dissolves becomes mist, when the air

cools it becomes raindrops, and when it releases heat and energy and falls it is reconstituted again. DNA plays its part in this process.

The determinism in which we find ourselves has its roots in our history of estates and hierarchies. It stems from the attempt to justify the supremacy of one and one's lineage, the right to exercise power over others, to have a certain role from birth. In the article *Erbgut in Auflösung (Genetic inheritance in dissolution)*, which I published in 2008, I refute this predominant conception, which also prevails in genetics. The nucleic acids in each nucleus are constantly changing independently of each other. What virology is trying to do, which is nothing more than to make a larger viral genome out of small genetic fragments, has already been attempted by genetics. First they tried sequencing large DNA fragments in order to assemble them into a chromosome, but it didn't work. Then they resorted to *shotgun sequencing*, which consists of randomly dividing fragments of DNA and creating by *alignment* (sequence alignment) millions of fragments the continuous sequence that represents the chromosome. But this is a mental construct, as no one knows how long a chromosome is or what it looks like. In short, Chargaff warned that the prevailing scientific theories could not be used to understand reality and would only lead to destruction.

And I will tell you that knowing about his 1978 book prevented me from pursuing a conventional career and receiving a large scholarship that would have taken me in a different direction. I mentioned Chargaff in front of the board that was to determine the winner of the scholarship, and he is a taboo name in the academy. After all, he said that we had to be very careful not to intervene in life and he ruled out any genetic engineering project. I was promptly declassified and it was better that way. I realised as soon as I left the university that nothing constructive could emerge within its walls. Its walls were built on dogmas. **Ivan Illich**, another of my references, already said that as soon as knowledge is institutionalised, it turns against people and against knowledge itself. There is no more beautiful feeling than to feel secure with life, to feel part of it and with a goal to pursue.

- Let's talk about virus isolation and purification. Just type the word isolation into any Internet search engine and you will find a multitude of articles in which the authors claim to have isolated viruses. Are their claims true? In fact, after the Wuhan team claimed to have isolated and sequenced a new coronavirus that affected respiration in a similar way to SARS-CoV and named it SARS-CoV-2, there have been many more researchers claiming to have found and isolated it. What can you tell us about this?

- I can summarise that in 7 points but first I have to explain how a local panic in Wuhan turned into the global coronavirus crisis through the mediation of German virologist **Christian Drosten**. At the end of December 2019 a Chinese ophthalmologist living in Wuhan spread a rumour that seven people were isolated in his clinic who were allegedly

infected by a SARS virus. The doctor was really just informing people close to him to protect themselves, but the message leaked out. Panic soon spread and people began flocking to hospitals at the slightest sign of cough, asthma, bronchitis or pneumonia. The authorities then pressured ophthalmologist **Li Wenliang** not to talk about the situation. China is an iron-fisted dictatorship and he knew he would be sent to a gulag or killed if he failed to comply. Thanks to Dr. Hamer's knowledge, we now know that such a fear for physical integrity can trigger a biological shock that affects the lungs in multiple ways and can lead, in the repair phase of the conflict, to bronchitis. Well, on 10 January 2020, the doctor developed symptoms of bronchitis and was quarantined at his parents' home. The parents also started coughing and he was convinced that a 92-year-old patient had infected him the previous day. However, the woman did not seem to have any symptoms, nor did the other patients he treated. Even his parents were quickly cured.

Li Wenliang started taking antiretrovirals for treatment and trying all kinds of viral tests, but the results were negative. Finally, on 29 January, he tested positive for one: the Christian Drosten test! Believing he was going to die, he made public both the test result and the police document - which he signed under duress - stating that he had finally tested positive and it was a SARS virus. The news caused panic.

Drosten had entered the scene a few weeks earlier, as soon as he heard that a possible outbreak of the SARS virus had been detected in China, but he began to develop his detection test before the sequence of the alleged "new virus" had even been made public! How? By using sequences allegedly associated with the old SARS-CoV virus of 2003. It was on 10 January that the Chinese authorities made public the genetic sequence of the virus they were supposed to have found. It was the genome of what they understood to be a harmless virus found in bats. At the same time, however, Drosten sent his first tests to China from Germany, and although its primers had nothing to do with those in the published sequence, they were used and the first positives appeared.

In response, the Chinese authorities began to isolate all pneumonia patients, their families and hospital staff who had had contact with the first 49 patients considered infected up to 20 January, and determined that no one had been infected! The first conclusion reached was that the virus was not very contagious but was transmitted from animals to humans and it was determined that the source of infection may have been a meat market in Wuhan which was closed and disinfected.

Drosten's test sent from Germany had come into the hands of a friend of his who had already made his fortune during the SARS-CoV crisis of 2003. He boarded a train from southern China bound for Wuhan carrying the first two positive Drosten test results. The suspected infectees had not been to Wuhan so they were assumed to have been infected by someone in the area but the press conference he gave in Wuhan sparked chaos. The Chinese authorities were discredited in the eyes of the public because the test showed

that the SARS virus was highly contagious from person to person and Li Wenliang came to be regarded as a "hero". The city of Wuhan was placed under strict quarantine in order to control the panic. It must be said that this was as far as the Chinese government went. The other quarantines were geographically very limited and there were never many positive cases reported. From the beginning they understood that the detection tests were useless from the beginning and they intentionally made little use of them. This is why their infection figures have remained so low. In Europe, on the other hand, they opted for massive testing, national quarantines and the destruction of the economy. This is the context.

But what do virologists do? You only have to read any of their publications. In particular, you have to go to the Materials and Methods section to see that virologists are wrong on seven fundamental points, as well as acting unscientifically by not carrying out control tests; and on top of that, they are self-refuting.

Point 1. Virologists inadvertently kill cells in the test tube. They remove the tissue sample from the feeding solution and apply cytotoxic antibiotics. In other words, they starve and poison the cells to death. And once the sample has been "prepared" in this way, they apply tissue that is supposedly infected with the virus, but the truth is that the original tissue will die and decompose even if sterile material is applied. Well, since 1954 it has been assumed that cell death is due to the presence of the virus. And it is understood that the virus is present in the test tube because the tissue has been taken from an infected patient. Then, from that cell and tissue mass, genetic fragments are obtained and conceptually sorted to obtain "a viral genome". However, the relevant control tests to see if the healthy tissue dies and decomposes without adding anything are never carried out. Well, from this dead organic material, vaccines are made; if the whole material is used, they are called "live attenuated vaccines" or if only certain proteins are used, "inactivated or killed vaccines".

Point 2. Virologists assume that the virus is in the millions of tiny fragments of genetic material in that mixture of dead cells, so they pick out a few and sort or align them to build - using computer programmes! a complete viral genome that they have not actually found.

In fact, neither in cell cultures like these, nor in saliva, nor in blood has a complete viral genome ever been found. They construct it artificially. So it is the first team of virologists that constructs a viral genome that determines what it looks like, and all the others repeat the same alienation process so they get a result that is 99.99% identical to the reference genome, the one that was supposed to have been "isolated" the first time. In short, they find what they want to find! That they never find a complete viral genome and have to construct it that way is a clear indication that, quite simply, there is no such viral genome, there is no virus.

Point 3. The millions of fragments of genetic material that the tissues and cells under study release at death contain a great deal of material from microbes, many of which are not even known. The organism constantly generates new RNA independently of DNA, which was not thought possible. However, virologists who follow in the footsteps of the group that first "sequenced" a virus simply replicate the procedure and arrive at the same result. That is, they take as a reference, as a template, the original sequence - when it is nothing more than a theoretical and mathematical construct -, find the same pieces and reach the same conclusion. Nobody performs the following control test: from the same database of genetic material, instead of being guided by the reference template, they should try to construct other supposed viral genomes with the same information; for example, genomes of other RNA viruses such as HIV, HIV-like viruses, HIV-like viruses and HIV-like viruses. RNA viruses such as HIV, measles or Ebola. But, of course, they don't do that. It should be added that the idea that the death of cells in a test tube is caused by infected material being added dates back to 1954 and was the brainchild of Nobel laureate **John Franklin Enders**.

Point 4. Electron microscope photos taken by Microtomy are supposed to be of viral particles but what they actually show are typical components of decaying cells and tissues. The particles in the photos presented to us as viruses have never been biochemically characterised, nor isolated. Then they also disprove themselves. They show pictures of particles but do not work exclusively with them because they do not isolate (separate) them from the rest.

Point 5. In the Petri dish, the virologists shake and suck up the contents of the decaying cells and tissues with fine needles and inject them back into the Petri dish. The content of this liquid is a mixture of proteins, fats, torn tissue and cell fragments and chemicals. Well, the absorption of the liquid with the needle and its re-injection causes tiny bubbles to which a dye is applied when microscopic images are taken, and these pictures are then published as if what appears in them were viral particles. However, they are not biochemically characterised to show that they actually contain a viral genome.

Point 6. None of the microscopic photographs claiming to show a virus have been taken from samples of blood, saliva or other body fluids of any person, animal or plant. They work with artificial cellular systems that only exist in Petri dishes and laboratory test tubes and have nothing to do with what goes on inside organisms. If they want to prove what they say is true, let them isolate and photograph viruses in blood or saliva samples! It is striking that today we have to wear masks because it is said that the virus spreads like an aerosol and it turns out that no virus has ever been seen or photographed in saliva.

Point 7. Infection experiments are carried out on animals in order to cause symptoms similar to those ascribed to coronavirus. The idea is to demonstrate that the virus spreads

and causes a range of symptoms. This is done by injecting fluid into their brains or by inserting a tube into their lungs. Well, what that causes is aspiration pneumonia, but not because the fluid they are injected with has coronavirus in it: any sterile fluid would cause inflammation of the lungs (pneumonia)! Reading such studies, one realises that the symptoms described are caused by the cruelty of the experiment itself and not by the pathogen they are supposedly inoculated with, be it "X" or "Y", HIV or SARS-CoV-2. Hence, here too, no control experiments are carried out.

Seven rebuttals and seven blatantly unscientific procedures. In the infection protection laws of many countries, scientific rigour is demanded of all those involved, and this is being seriously flouted. There is no science here, but anti-science. The refutation of the official version is on the table and this alone destroys any legal justification for the measures being taken.

Jesús García Blanca

(Translator: **Alejandro Zamorano**)

PS: The second part of this interesting interview will be published in the next issue due to its length.