

Stefan Lanka: "Viruses are not microbes and have no infectious capacity" (II) - DSalud

The well-known German virologist Stefan Lanka asserts that viruses are neither microbes nor have infectious capacity, so that Covid-19 could not have been caused by the alleged SARS-CoV-2, the existence of which, moreover, has not been demonstrated. Moreover, he disputes that there is a pandemic, that there are millions of people infected and killed by this coronavirus and that vaccines are justified since they are neither effective nor innocuous but very dangerous. This is what he assured us -among many other things- during the extensive exclusive videotaped interview we had with him, the first part of which we published last issue and the second part of which we echo on this occasion as there will be a third. Stefan Lanka questions many of the established dogmas accepted by biologists and physicians around the world.

If there is one thing **Stefan Lanka** made clear in the first part of the interview he gave us, it is that the belief that there are pathogenic viruses that cause disease is false. Moreover, he states emphatically that the genome of any of the viruses said to cause disease has never been isolated and sequenced: influenza, the common cold, measles, mumps, rubella, chickenpox, shingles, mononucleosis, parvovirus, AIDS, Zika, chikungunya fever... But let's get straight to the interview.

- Dr. Andrew Kaufman states that with current technology it is not possible to differentiate a virus from an exosome, the Perth Group once stated that HIV cannot be distinguished from an extracellular vesicle and Robert Gallo himself published an article a few years ago acknowledging that viruses, retroviruses and extracellular vesicles are indistinguishable. And that seems to support what you claim.

- Every two weeks I have a video call with Andrew Kaufman. His work is very important because he uses arguments from the perspective of cell theory and pathology with the aim of reaching physicians, to speak to them in their "language", let's say. From the point of view of cell theory we can say that this view is correct and that the cell fragments we see under the microscope are no different from the supposed viruses. With viruses there is nothing clearly defined no matter how much we are shown magnified pictures of particles that are supposed to be viral. A virus is always supposed to have a capsid - that is, a coat composed of specific proteins containing nucleic acid of a certain length and sequence - but they never show that. It is therefore important to explain to physicians, laboratory technicians and molecular biologists that many things in the official theory do not add up. I personally do not like the concept of exosome but Kaufman is right in stating that what is defined as exosome and has been observed and documented by many people is indistinguishable from the supposed viral structures because they have never actually been isolated.

- From your current conception, how do you assess the conviction of some that SARS-CoV-2 is a chimera, a virus genetically modified in the laboratory? This is the opinion of personalities such as Luc Montagnier, Chinda Brandolino or Máximo Sandín.

-This is the right question in the right place. A certain Professor **Zhang** -from Shanghai- received from Beijing an assignment from the head of the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention: he had to find the genome of a coronavirus of zoonotic origin; specifically from a bat. And we know that he who seeks, finds. They provided him with a bronchoalveolar sample taken from a patient with atypical pneumonia and within 24 hours he reported that he had found a virus associated with bats, that its transmissibility was very low and that, in any case, the Wuhan meat market, the presumed source of the infection, was already closed.

It normally takes a team of virologists two weeks to sequence and align the millions of genetic fragments that make up any given viral genome. Zhang and his team accomplished that in 40 hours. Of course, the resulting sequence was very crude, very unpolished by the usual standards, which led several scientists to raise their voices and say that "such a genetic sequence cannot exist in nature, it must have been created in a laboratory". These critics are therefore right: it was created in a laboratory, but not in a test tube but in a computer by means of sequence alignment using a bat virus construct generated years ago as a reference template. And it could not be otherwise since there is no such thing, there are no viral genomes. The genome they showed has anomalies that they could not polish since it involves a lot of manual work and compliance with a series of rules that virologists have implemented over time. And all that was not done so the word spread that it was an artificial virus created intentionally in a laboratory. No wonder Montagnier claims to have found sequences that are present in the supposed *HIV* genome. After all, he carried out the same procedure to construct the *HIV* genome and, consequently, the supposed *SARS-CoV-2* genome has the highest proportion of sequences in common with the *HIV* genome. This is logical because they are all made from the same soup, from fragments of common genes that are created when animal tissue is destroyed in a test tube to which fetal bovine serum has been added, which in itself has an extremely high amount of nucleic acid identical to that found in the human body. The sequences may be aligned differently and the result will look different but the starting pieces are the same. With the genetic material used to sequence the *SARS-CoV-2* genome they could have sequenced and aligned the *HIV* genome and the other way around. This is why Montagnier says he finds *HIV* sequences in the *SARS-CoV-2* genome and other people say similar things with other genomes.

They believe that a virus is a unique and unrepeatable entity - it is one of their main hypotheses - but the reality is that a complete viral genome, in one piece, has never been found. It is always constructed. It is a mathematical and statistical construct. That is why not only do you find the same or similar sequences in different viral genomes, but if you develop a viral detection test you end up with positive results when analyzing samples from animals, people or even plants. In short, pathogenic viruses do not exist, they are a mental construct. Phages and the misnamed giant viruses are mini-spores that do exist, that have been isolated and biochemically characterized... but they are not pathogens.

-We know that you have just published a book in Germany together with Dr. Ursula Stoll. Can you tell us who she is, why you have written it together and what are the main topics you talk about in it?

-The book is titled *Corona. Weiter ins Chaos oder Chance für alle? (Coronavirus: Descent into chaos or a chance for all?)*. I have known Ursula Stoll for many years. She was a nurse in an intensive care unit for more than 20 years, experienced many things there and accumulated unanswered questions until she discovered Dr. Hamer and after training in his system of knowledge became a therapist. She writes very well, has already published several books and one day she approached me and said: "why don't we write a book together about what we know about viruses and the history of Virology?". She describes very well, from the perspective of Dr. Hamer's theory, how diseases and symptoms blamed on pathogenic viruses actually originate. I hope that a Spanish version of the book will be published soon. I assure you that I, personally, was greatly helped by Dr. Hamer's discoveries. There is no better life insurance than studying his theories. It gives one confidence in oneself, in life and in creation.

- In the book, you dedicate several chapters to Covid-19. What do you really think of the pandemic that you say is destroying the world despite the fact that the official figures themselves deny it?

- The "pandemic" is the logical result of 2,500 years of materialism and the dynamics that have brought waves of pandemics throughout history. Of course, I myself have a different opinion about AIDS today, for example; I used to think Robert Gallo was a liar and a phony, but I no longer do. He was simply incapable of thinking outside the realm of Cellular Pathology.

Ivan Illich already predicted this in his book *Medical Nemesis*. As part of the economic system, Medicine is governed by the same cost, revenue and profit patterns as other sectors and its companies' profitability is expected to increase year after year. That pushes pharmaceutical and all other companies related to medicine to exaggerate, pushes them to marketing and to attack life with antibiotics.

I met Illich in person in 1995, the year of the reissue of the book he published in 1976 when he was still optimistic about the future of humanity and believed that madness could be reversed, but even then he confessed to me that humanity was too stupid to survive. He was an insightful and important intellectual.

For my part I intended to turn my magazine *WissenschaftPlus* into a platform with which to inform people and alert them that either we stop modern Virology and Medicine or it will lead to mass hysteria and collapse. The campaign I have now organised, called *Three Red Cards to the coronavirus*, aims to encourage people to question health measures and write to the relevant authorities to demand answers to the seven points I mentioned above - in which virologists refute themselves - and thus help to shake up the system.

So you are optimistic in spite of the very serious situation we are living in right now?

- When I go out on the street and see so many people parroting the slogans of politicians and the media, I don't know whether to laugh or cry, but lately I smile. The reason? The coronavirus crisis is a turning point, an opportunity for us to once and for all draw the right lessons from history and bring humanity to a higher level of knowledge and consciousness. And it would not have been possible without this crisis. Never have so many people listened to us as now.

The alternative is that we continue to destroy the economy, destroy each other with vaccines and ruin people's health until society collapses. The next step would be for China to take the ruins we leave behind and the survivors to learn Chinese and wave the red flag.

The alternative is therefore clear: either we take on the lessons and stand up to our governments and make it clear to them that the virologists have disproved themselves and what they do is anything but science or we just whine and moan while everything falls apart. And for those who survive, let's learn Chinese! Because, to tell the truth, the smartest people have been the Chinese. From the beginning they were aware of what was happening. They knew there was no contagious virus and so they did a few local quarantines for a few weeks to calm things down, they sold themselves to the world as very efficient and responsible people and, above all, they hardly used PCR tests intentionally. On the other hand, in the West, we provoked our own pandemic with PCR tests while politicians, each one more idiotic than the next, took advantage of the situation to boost their egos. Let us not forget that the epicenter of the pandemic was not really China but the *Charité Hospital* in Berlin where Dr. Drosten developed the first PCR test - which the Chinese refused to use - and which we in the West have been using millions of times a day for more than a year without questioning the validity of its results. And yet I am confident that we can learn from all this and solve the crisis.

Such an important author as **Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy** already wrote in 1925 in his book *Soziologie, im Kreuz der Wirklichkeit* (Sociology I. In the Cross of Reality) that the naive governments who fund science so blithely do not realize that established science will never allow other conceptions or theories to grow and thus endanger its dominant position. The author writes that mankind is trapped by the science promoted by governments and the media... and that real research and real science are actively suppressed and censored in a headlong rush by the former to save face. In 1956 he wrote that scientists investigated cancer according to the old-fashioned rules of *Louis Pasteur*, as if it were rabies. He who believes in the prevailing explanation of cancer, who believes that the evil is spreading inside his body, that the cells of his organism are out of control and have turned against him is also going to believe in "metastasis" that spreads through the air, in viruses. And this is the situation that we have a duty to clarify. It is not only about viruses but about our conscience. Whoever believes in cancer in the way modern medicine understands it believes in metastasis and in viruses. In the materialism we have been dragging along for 2,500 years there is no place for reason, only for greed and the lust for power and recognition. Dr. Hamer already illustrated that if someone identifies intensely with his work, with an ideology or with a theory, if someone attacks those principles with which he identifies, he will react aggressively, as if his life depended on it. Many people can't stand certain things because their own identity is at stake.

- We know that you two hold virologists, physicians and health authorities responsible for the current health crisis, but above all Dr. Christian Drosten, whom you accuse of having designed the PCR for SARS-CoV-2 before the Chinese team had even published its supposed isolation and sequencing! How can you decide which primers to use without knowing the virus? What is striking is that the WHO has also approved six other PCR protocols with different primers! Does all this seem trustworthy to you?

- No; of course not. The first part of the question I have answered already. Drosten developed his PCR test even before the Chinese authorities agreed on the alleged viral origin of the atypical pneumonia outbreak in Wuhan. And before they published any results and before they released the preliminary genetic sequences associated with the alleged virus in question - which were

incidentally modified three times before being officially published - Drosten already had his PCR test ready and was distributing it around the world. His friend and business partner *TIB Molbiol* developed the "*primers*" for the test. TIB Molbiol also works for *Roche*, which holds the patent for the rapid PCR test. So you can see how the interests are interconnected.

The CEO of *TIB Molbiol* went so far as to say on TV that they sent the first PCR test kits to China for free for humanitarian reasons. And how did they know that such a measure was necessary and that the virus was going to spread? They have always sent "screening tests" for viruses wherever they suspect a supposed virus might "spread". They did it with the alleged outbreaks of the previous *SARS-CoV*, *Zika*, swine flu virus... Nowadays the laboratory that first sequences a suspected viral genome and develops the "*primer*" for its detection test is practically the market leader.

The *WHO* was quick to endorse the Drosten test and later endorsed others that were based more on sequences published by China (contrary to Drosten) but these sequences are equally artificial and do not correspond to reality. The templates of those screening tests contain about 300 nucleotides but actually sequence only two fragments of about 150 nucleotides. In short, there is nothing complete there, not even a supposedly complete gene belonging to the viral genome that they claim to have "isolated". These detection tests have nothing to do with what they define as *SARS-CoV-2* virus, since according to them the complete genome has almost 30,000 nucleotides. And we should know that the way PCRs are designed and programmed, they can give positive results without the sample analyzed having any trace of nucleic acid.

PCR is programmed with specific "quantification cycles" and any scientist familiar with the technique will tell you that with more than 20 cycles the results are prone to error. In fact from 30 cycles onwards the test is considered to be "dirty" and the results unusable because the detection of sequences is severely distorted. And from 40 cycles onwards the test can be positive without any of the programmed sequences being found in the sample to be analyzed. Well, the Drosten test has 45 cycles and is programmed in such a way that a certain percentage of tests are always positive. It can be programmed at will so that all passengers on a cruise ship are "positive"!

Doctors who do not believe the charade try to protect their patients and either send samples of non-organic fluids to the laboratory or try to swab the patient's mouth very lightly to avoid pulling out too much tissue. Many physicians know that all this is crazy but keep quiet so as not to lose their jobs. PCR has nothing to do with the virus they are talking about.

- In fact, those who claim that the reliability of PCR is null say -among other things- that the test uses as primers genetic fragments that are present in more than a hundred microbes and in the human genome itself. But if that is so, why don't they all test positive?

- Before the Chinese and other researchers created these genomes, they removed all known sequences. What happens here is that long sequences are discarded that the computer detects as being from microbes but smaller fragments are found in the viral genome they build. This is obviously not discussed. I repeat: all known sequences that are available on the internet are removed from the set of what has been sequenced and only then alignment begins. This is why so few actual known sequences are found in the virus genome and only those that were unknown at the time of creation are found. The known ones cannot be found because they were filtered out and what later appear are only a few fragments since the length of their sequencing is only 150

nucleotides. Large pieces of microbial genetic information never appear due to the technology used which carries out a conceptual mathematical sequencing of the virus genome.

- We have not been able to find a single article describing the isolation of SARS-CoV-2 and neither that of any human coronavirus. And we have conducted a thorough search....

- And you will not find any publication describing the isolation of a viral structure because such a structure does not exist. It was invented by computer programs. It was not found in humans or animals by isolating it. Earlier I said that Chinese virologists used as a reference for the conceptual construction of the SARS-CoV-2 genome a coronavirus genome supposedly found in a bat but that genetic sequence was generated years before in the same way: conceptually and by computer. And so on...

- In fact you do not believe that vaccines prevent diseases and that it is an uncritically accepted myth based on a concept of health and Medicine that has turned out to be wrong. On the other hand, you are one of the few scientists who defend the vision of life - and therefore of health and disease - postulated by Dr. Ryke Geerd Hamer. To what extent do you agree with him?

- Thank you for this very important question. For me it is not a "myth" that we believe in the effectiveness of vaccines. It is a core belief of our culture. Since **Democritus** and **Epicurus**, 2,500 years ago, our culture has conditioned us to believe in defects and, of course, in transmissible defects. And from this thinking inevitably results the conception that if there is an evil there is also an "anti-evil", that in front of the poison that makes us sick there is the anti-poison that heals. From this perspective the concept "myth" is true but not entirely correct since it is not a myth. The prevailing concept of health and medicine has no other explanation for the phenomenon according to which different people in a family or children in a school class get sick simultaneously or consecutively: it has to be a contagious pathogen. There is no other option. When one excludes from one's theory of life any hint of conscience or soul, one has no choice but to think and act in this materialistic way: *"I have a defect or a poison has invaded me, I need an anti-poison"*.

No less than **Plato** warned already in his time, as I said before, that the doctors of his time did not understand most of the diseases because they focused on what they saw, on the specific organ affected, forgetting that everything comes from the soul and that it is necessary to treat the soul and the body as a whole and not to focus on the eye, the bone or the part of the organism with the ailment, abstracting it from the whole. Can vaccination be useful? Not really, except in those cases where it can act as Placebo. Mothers whose children are in bed with 38 degree fever are spared from panicking because they believe that their child is protected having been vaccinated against everything. Vaccines contain a lot of substances and some of them can mitigate symptoms such as fever or pain if the person is in the healing phase... but only because the substances interrupt that phase.

This can only be understood in the light of Dr. Hamer's discoveries, but leaving aside these cases that have occurred to me - quite forced indeed - vaccines are not good for what they are supposed to do because none of them protects against any disease. Besides, vaccination is like Russian roulette: it can cause the death of one person in every 50,000 or more who are vaccinated. Obviously there are many more cases of injury or disability. Many appear at the

moment if the act of vaccination triggers a traumatic conflict in the person, as Dr. Hamer has already explained.

On the other hand, if the content of the vaccine is not absorbed by the muscle and affects the nerves or enters the circulatory system, it can reach the brain and cause a very dangerous intracranial pressure. This is a typical chemical poisoning effect potentially fatal to a child.

As a person and as a scientist I cannot but reject vaccines but I recognize that the vast majority of the population has blind faith in vaccines. Our challenge is therefore, on the one hand, to prevent governments from continuing with their mass vaccination campaigns and, on the other hand, to show people the truth. If one understands the truth, one also knows that the prevailing theory about viruses, bacteria and pathogens cannot be true and, consequently, one realizes that vaccines cannot work.

And now I will answer the second part of your question. This is the basis of everything: when you know the true biology, you know that there is no place in nature for a pathogen that suddenly invades or consumes you from the inside. You understand that every symptom and every disease has a specific cause that has nothing to do with what "official" medicine tells us. Dr. Hamer's discoveries could be considered the "New Testament" of Biology. That is why I usually use the expression "Biology after Hamer" with a double meaning. First, because unfortunately Dr. Hamer died almost 4 years ago; he left us too soon. And secondly because his theory eliminated fear and evil from Biology. I consider him the most important scientist and biologist. He was the first in 2,500 years - at least as far as Europe is concerned - to eradicate the concept of evil from Medicine and Biology. No one has to fear disease ever again. With proper understanding all so-called diseases have a solution. Dr. Hamer explains that what we call diseases are useful programs of nature with full biological meaning that are activated and developed to help us cope with and survive extreme situations. Programs that become complicated when they are not understood.

So I appreciate the question because the *Hamerian* theory is very important and has proven to be totally correct - time and time again - in practice.

- The WHO states on its website that vaccination is a simple, safe and effective way to protect us against harmful diseases before we come into contact with them and they do this by activating our natural defenses so that they learn to resist specific infections. What's more, they claim to strengthen the immune system. Is there any basis for this claim?

- A timely question. The basis of this idea is still a belief based on a concrete foundation: a poison is counteracted by an anti-poison. However, most of the symptoms - such as inflammation, fever or exhaustion - manifest themselves in the healing phase, as I said before. Medications can reduce symptoms and sometimes it may be advisable to administer them if the healing phase is very strong (due to a very large conflictual mass accumulated during the active phase) but modern medicine focuses on suppressing symptoms without realizing that health does not mean absence of disease. It focuses on looking for anti-poisons to counteract the supposed poisons that make us sick. Coffee or alcohol can be poisons depending on the dose. If a 14-year-old who has never tasted alcohol suddenly ingests a liter of vodka, he may die if it is not extracted from his stomach. On the other hand, **Boris Yeltsin**, if he did not drink two liters of vodka, could not even give a speech in parliament. But not because he drank an anti-poison to counteract a poison, but because his body had the necessary enzymes to process all that alcohol.

The materialism that we have carried with us for more than 2,500 years forces us to think in terms of defects and poisons. The humoral or four humors theory that dominated medicine for more than 2,000 years advocated that if any of the four basic substances in the human body - blood, yellow bile, black bile and phlegm - became unbalanced, it could become a poison and make a person sick. And from there to the modern theory of viruses is but a leap. What the *WHO* claims is that the introduction of a vaccine leads to a significant reduction in cases of the disease it is theoretically fighting, but this is not true. No serious statistics support that claim. The diseases that the new vaccines were supposed to prevent were already at a very low level at the time of their introduction. At the same level as today. And in any case no pathogen causes them so the vaccine is useless.

WHO is not composed of serious and responsible people. No one elects its members, nor is there any way to control them. It is a lobby financed by the pharmaceutical companies and, as we say in German, *Wes Brot ich ess, des Lied ich sing* (I sing the song of the one who gives me bread). It's as simple as that.

The *WHO* would be ridiculous if what it does were not so serious. Nothing it claims is scientifically proven. None of it. But it accurately represents the state of our culture and people's beliefs. If I believe that I am nothing more than an accident and that I am nothing more than a collection of molecules and I believe that nature is imperfect and cruel, then I believe that it can randomly "betray" my body and cause me to get a deadly cancer. The truth is that we should not use the word cancer. Mentioning it is like when in voodoo a needle is stuck into the doll of the person it represents.

Those who believe in metastasis, in cancer cells moving through the body to destroy it, also believe in "flying metastases" in the form of viruses. The concept is the same and people believe both. And this is the challenge for all of us: how can I change this? How can I contribute to making the truth known? Outside there is suffering, pain and hopelessness in many sick people whom modern medicine does not know how to help; in fact it is just the other way around. Everyone knows someone in the family or, at least, in the neighborhood or in circles of friends, cases of sick people in pain and despair. For most people it is the palpable proof that evil exists, that life is a roulette of luck and that if it's your turn you are doomed. *"Look: they died of cancer in spite of all the medical advances, in spite of radiation and chemotherapy. Behind this misfortune and this evil must be the Devil and he is stronger than God because God allows these injustices, this suffering and these deaths."*

That is the message spread by *WHO* and it is a false message. There is hope for everyone. Healing is possible by applying Dr. Hamer's discoveries.

- In your opinion, is the concept of immunity used by modern medicine correct?

- Poisoning is a real danger for the organism and in fact the organism produces enzymes to cleanse the body of poisons. Let's go back to the example of alcohol: the young man who drinks a bottle of vodka may die if his stomach is not pumped because his body lacks the enzymes necessary to process the poison that alcohol is. Yeltsin, on the other hand, had plenty of enzymes to metabolise absurd amounts of this substance. Many famous people throughout history feared being poisoned - such as **Napoleon** or **Rasputin** - so as a preventive measure they took small amounts of poison, such as mercury or arsenic, among others. Thus the body reacted by

generating enzymes that metabolised these poisons and repaired the damage caused. They prepared the body little by little in case someone tried to poison them. And in this sense we can indeed speak of "immunity" to toxic substances.

However, the theory of the four humors that I mentioned above and prevailed for more than 2,000 years led to **Mozart's** death. At one point he was in a healing phase afflicted with multiple symptoms and the doctors concluded that he had an excess of poison in his body; that is, his blood was stagnant and had generated a poison. The remedy then was to provoke the patient to bleed to "extract" the poison.

The theory of immunity tells us that if someone has healed it is because his body has overcome the poison (in the form of a virus for example). The aim of a vaccine is therefore to expose the body to a poison (in the form of a virus) in a preventive way so that the body produces the specific anti-venom, which generates defenses and resistance. And many alternative theories to official Medicine follow this same scheme of thought. Only Hamer has offered a totally different version.

Seamus O'Mahony said in his *Can Medicine be Cured?* that medicine has helped reduce infant mortality but then, on page 262, he states that the pharmaceutical industry has destroyed medicine. And that is not correct. The pharmaceutical industry is the consequence and not the cause. The ultimate cause is materialism - as the philosopher Plato once said - which Dr. Hamer put an end to with his discoveries. The underlying idea is simple: poison that makes sick, anti-poison that cures. Applied to viruses, the conclusion is that the virus is the poison that makes you sick and therefore we need the antibody, the anti-venom to counteract it.

Seamus O'Mahony concludes by saying in his book that Medicine has no solution and only a war or a catastrophe can bring a restart. For him there have always been two opposing conceptions of Medicine: one system that represses symptoms with drugs - that of **Asclepius (Aesculapius)** for the Romans) - and another - which he calls "**Hygea's**" (Asclepius' daughter) - that promotes harmony with oneself and one's environment as the only way to preserve health. And this definition of health is very beautiful and very true.

Jesús García Blanca

(Translator: **Alejandro Zamorano**)

PS: the third and last part of this interesting interview will be published in the next issue...