

Marvin Haberland & Katie Sugak: On the Court Case Against Virology – April 26, 2023 in Hamburg, Germany

[Marvin Haberland & Katie Sugak: On the Court Case Against Virology – April 26, 2023 in Hamburg, Germany](#)

by Katie Sugak

April 23, 2023

Dear friends, here is the recording of my very interesting conversation with Marvin Haberland. Marvin is an engineer and he comes from Germany. As a result of a tragedy in his family, he decided to investigate the subject of medicine. This investigation led him to virology, and he eventually discovered that the foundations of virology were based on anti-scientific misconceptions. After realizing this, Marvin decided to act.

Our conversation today will focus on his upcoming trial in Germany on April 26, 2023, in Hamburg. This trial will be the second trial in history designed to disprove virology and demonstrate the lack of real science behind it.

References cited in the interview with Marvin Haberland.

Marvin's letter to the court and his Freedom of Information request:

English

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/15Vkp5pou0E5u02c4iv0oRwUf6j>

[4-lFQm17q424Jxn80/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/11u10f18ZCMgPbk01oNpdtzeAUIEGt1EG7Pdjq2CAb0/edit)

Russian

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/11u10f18ZCMgPbk01oNpdtzeAUIEGt1EG7Pdjq2CAb0/edit>

German

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1MKGo6-0ltZ4_lairs06eDzkuKmijd0rE/view?usp=drivesdk

Isolation and rapid sharing of the 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) from the first patient diagnosed with COVID-19 in Australia

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7228321/>

Interview with Stefan Lanka from 2022 – Measles virus trial, control experiments and the final exposure of the coronavirus farce

<https://rumble.com/vmqkff-measles-trial-control-experiments-and-the-final-exposure-of-coronavirus-far.html>

Video on the Measles Virus Trial (2016)

<https://rumble.com/vsla5a-stefan-lanka-measles-trial.html>

Other videos, interviews and articles can be found on Kate Sugak's telegram channel <https://t.me/katesugakofficial>

Tehran Next Level channel (German)

<https://t.me/NextLevelOriginal>

Next Level website <https://www.wissen-neu-gedacht.de/>

[Connect with Kate Sugak](#)



Telegram: <https://t.me/NextLevelOriginal>
Website: <https://www.wissen-neu-gedacht.de/>

Transcript of first 25 mins. prepared by [TCTL](#) editor:

Katie:

Hello everyone. My name is Katie and today my very special guest is Marvin Haberland.

Marvin is an engineer and he comes from Germany.

As a result of a health tragedy in his family, he decided to take a deep look at medicine. That exploration led him eventually to virology and, as a consequence, he discovered that the foundations of virology are based on anti-scientific misconceptions.

Marvin decided to do something about this realization.

Our today's conversation will revolve around his upcoming court case in Germany, which as far as I am aware, will be the 2nd court case in history that aims to disprove virology and demonstrate the lack of real science behind it.

So, Marvin, I think it would be great to talk about your story.

What got you interested in the subject of virology and how did you start noticing there is something wrong with it?

Marvin:

Yes, thank you for the invitation.

Katie:

You're welcome. Thank you for coming.

Marvin:

So, like you said, basically due to a tragedy in my family. So my grandmother, she died when I was studying in the US.

And that got me quite interested in the topic; as she, before she was diagnosed with the cancer, she always asked me, 'Marvin, you're always so smart. You're always researching things. Can you help me?'.

And I was always saying, which I now regret, 'Grandmother, look, I don't know. I have no knowledge on this topic. Please go consult the doctors.' And so on.

I was kind of ignorant, which from today's perspective, of course, I regret. But this is the way it is.

So when she died, this triggered something in me and I started to then really research the topic of chemotherapy. And I found out that basically it's not really based on evidence. There are very, very low-quality studies without any control groups. There is always comparing chemotherapy to another chemotherapy, or chemotherapy to chemotherapy plus a new drug. But there is never the zero control group, without any therapy, or very rare to find that.

And actually if you research the real figures, the efficiency

of the five-year survival rate is about 2.3% only, which is basically zero because the statistical fluctuations.

So when I found this out it was very surprising to me. And then from that point, I also looked right and left of this topic to nutritionist sciences where I found very, very similar results. And also infectious disease and germ theory. And that got me interested in the field.

Katie:

From when you started your research, what was the first thing that you started to research the virology topic?

Marvin:

Yeah. So first was basically chemotherapy/ cancer, then nutritional sciences. And from that I moved on to virology and I found out about Stefan Lanka's work.

So basically, first was the measles virus and the early scientific practices, or unscientific practices, of Enders and Peebles in 1954. And then I also researched, of course, Pasteur and Robert Koch, from the really early beginnings of germ theory and vaccinations.

And then from there I moved on to HIV.

I bought the book – I have it here – the 'Virus Mania' book from Engelbrecht... and other authors, which got me very interested in HIV also.

And then I discovered there is a pattern in virology. It's always the same.

So, measles, HIV, SARS-CoV-1... These are repeating patterns which I found very interesting.

And then when covid or corona came up, I immediately did the research.

I remember in January 2020 when this came up, I went to GISAID [China National GeneBank] and other platforms where they upload the genomes. And I tried to figure out – OK, maybe this time they did the correct isolation, the correct scientific procedures.

And I figured out, OK, this is the same like with the swine flu, with the bird flu, with the SARS-1.

So from very early on, I was interested again.

I decided to start to be more active in speaking out and do work in this field to spread the misconceptions and the scientific fraud, basically.

I thought this was important because many people don't know about this and I felt responsible to share.

Katie:

Let's talk about the court case and what motivated you to go there, to do it. And what did you do?

This is important. What did you do to get there? And why are you doing it? And what is your goal?

Marvin:

First of all, I got motivated to do it, basically, also by Stefan Lanka who had a court case in 2015 about measles virus.

So little different strategy than mine, but pretty similar.

And he was saying in the beginning of covid, 'OK, people of Germany, if you get these fines because you're not wearing the mask or because you are meeting with other people during the lockdown, and so on, just...'. He laid out the basic strategy how to go to court.

And what I did is I just didn't wear the mask. I had a mask zone directly in front of my house, so I couldn't even exit my

door without wearing a mask, which I didn't want to do.

And after receiving the fine, I just objected it and I sent the court specific abstract from the law, which is basically the first paragraph, in Germany, of the infectious disease law, which says that every virologist, every institutional authority, has to work according to the status quo of science, scientific practice.

And I am basically saying that in virology this is not at all the case. And they are not following the scientific method. And not any sort of scientific method that is required.

And I sent proof to the court from several different Freedom of Information acts...

I sent one to the University of Melbourne in Australia and several others.

So my argumentation is basically the law is not fulfilled, and these are my proofs. And this is why I am not willing to pay the fine.

Basically this is just the strategy. And we will see how this goes.

It will be on the 26th of April.

After my first invitation got cancelled. It was originally scheduled the 19th of October last year, but then I received a cancellation letter because the judge apparently got sick.

And now I have the second invitation. So we will see.

And there are many others that do this in Germany, so I have already consulted three other people with the same strategy and all three of these cases got closed.

So basically the people didn't have to pay anything. But the court did not really issue an official statement. They just

closed the case.

So what I want to achieve is official statement by the court. Because if they close my case, basically I cannot do anything about it. I have to accept it. But it has not the effect that I would like to have – basically to have an official statement ‘Yes, indeed, paragraph one of the infectious law of diseases is broken. Virologists are not working according to the scientific method.’

This would be my goal.

Or something else they could say, which is also possible, they could say that the law states that they should work according to the scientific method, but they don’t have to, right?

If the court says something like this and I have to pay the fine, it’s OK for me.

But then I have the official statement ‘Virologists are not obliged to work scientifically’. Which would be fine. This is just about our goal to to share the the situation – how it is.

Katie:

So let’s talk a little bit more about the main problem of virology, so people who are completely new to this, they can understand better the lack of scientific method behind it.

Let’s talk about all of this – about controls and about your Freedom of Information requests.

Marvin:

Sure. So basically, in science how it works is, you observe something in nature and then you come up with a hypothesis on how this could work. And then you try to come up with an experiment to test this hypothesis. And if the experiments support the hypothesis, then the hypothesis turns into a theory, and the theory gets tested over and over and over again. And all experiments support it. OK?

But if the experiment, the outcome, is against the hypothesis, then you falsify the hypothesis. This is basically how it works.

And in virology the hypothesis is fair. OK?

You say that you get sick from some viruses infecting you, coming from the outside. Infectious disease are being spread and so on.

And the experiments should be that you bring together sick and healthy animals or people and you show that you can really transmit this.

Or you try to extract these particles, these viruses, and then you take them and put them in the food or you spread them in the air of the animals or of the humans. And you show, by doing that, that you can replicate the symptoms.

That has never been done in virology.

What they are doing instead of doing it in the way I just stated, is they try to come up with some sort of excuse. They say that they cannot really do it in the correct way because the viruses are too small. Or too little in quantity. Or they only can live inside the cell and so on.

So they try to find excuses why they cannot extract the particle. And then they do some experiments in the lab.

So they never do it in a real 'in vivo'. They only do it 'in vitro' in the lab. They take cell cultures and then they mix a lot of different chemicals, antibiotics and other substances together with fetal bovine serum, cell cultures from monkey kidney cells and so on.

They have a big brew of different components and then they observe that this cell culture basically disintegrates or dies. And they say, 'OK, this is the proof for a virus'.

But this is impossible scientifically because there are so many variables. There are the toxic antibiotics, the fetal bovine serum.

Then they take off the fetal bovine serum so they remove the nutrition.

Then there is different other chemicals involved – trypsin sometimes and several different steps along the way.

So it's impossible to say that the result is caused by a virus.

And what is on top of that unscientific – and everyone can understand this: They don't have the control experiment.

So they are just running all these steps and they are doing what is called circular reasoning. And they don't have any control.

They are trying to find causative results, cause and effect, but it's impossible to do it. This is just a correlation. They observe that something happens, but they are not really using the scientific method to come up with the cause/effect relation.

The control experiment would be – for the viewers. You do the exact same experiment. You do the cell culture experiment with the chemicals, same antibiotics, same steps, everything the same. But you don't add the so-called virus. This would be the only variable that should be different from the other experiment.

And the outcome then should be different.

If the virus would exist, and would be the cause of this cell culture disintegration, thy so-called cytopathic effect, then, only then you would prove that this is the determining variable.

But, of course, as they never have isolated the virus in the first place, they cannot even do this control experiment. It's impossible.

And this is the big scientific problem.

I am willing to say that on some levels this is also fraud because they know. Because we asked them.

The virologists. Most of them know that the control experiments are missing and are important. They are trying to find excuses why they are not doing them, so they know exactly they should do them.

It's not that they are unconscious. So I can say that this is basically fraud. Maybe not for everyone, but certainly for many virologists. They know exactly about this this issue.

Katie:

So in the court, you are going to point at this exactly – the lack of controls.

Marvin:

The center of the argumentation is the lack of control. And this is the reason why the first paragraph which states that everything should be done according to the scientific method, the recent scientific techniques and so on. And we have the German Association of Science which says that in order to work according to the scientific method, everything has to be controlled, right? Every experimental step has to be controlled and so on.

So this is very easy to then demonstrate to the judge that it has not been done in virology ever.

And I have many proof. Not not only me, many people have done that.

But for my case I have asked the University of Melbourne, in the Doherty Institute, which is their virology institute, basically, and they have published one of the first SARS-Cov-2 isolation publications. And it was the first publication outside of China.

And I asked them very early on if they did the control experiments for every step, including the genome sequencing. And they clearly answered that they did not do it. Very clearly. No excuse. Very, very straightforward. They said no, we didn't do it for any of the steps.

And then I asked them why did you not perform the controls. And they told me very, very straightforward again. 'We didn't have the resources to do it. We were just focusing on the positive culture. And we had to work quickly. And we had no time.' Basically, this was their answer.

So everyone can see that this is extremely unscientific. And the German Association of Science even clearly states quoting – I'm quoting them basically that they say that nobody should issue any sort of scientific paper, unless they have followed all the scientific steps, even if economic factors, monetary factors or the economic pressure is high. So you should not publish anything before following all the scientific steps.

And I think everyone would agree. So this is, as a proof, is a very good proof. Because usually if you ask virologists around the world, if you ask the official institutions – CDC, RKI, Pasteur Institute and so on – it is very unlikely to get a straightforward answer like this. It's very rare to get it. I was very lucky to get this straightforward answer. And this is what I'm using as a main proof. But then I use other proofs as well.

Katie:

Yes. Another question that I had is that there is this group you are working with that is called The Next Level and they

help you.

Could you talk a little bit about them, who they are?

Marvin:

So, basically, next level is like a joint venture. We are basically coming out of two different telegram groups or channels that have evolved during covid and we are now working together with different scientists, doctors, engineers (like I am), mathematicians, computer scientists, and so on.

So we are quite a diverse team and what our main focus is basically health topics. So we try to dig deep into virology, germ theory, medications, disease in general, biology and so on. And our focus is the scientific area.

So we try to be very scientific in our articles and our work. And we try to read through papers and explain to the audience why a certain paper, or why a certain scientific document, is methodically not good, or what is the problem with it, why is it not scientific. Or we try to also educate on other health topics. This is what we are doing.

Katie:

This sounds amazing. And I also noticed that Germany specifically, and German-speaking countries are extremely active in this area.

Like there are so many knowledgeable people, a lot of activists, a lot of channels and people talking about it.

I really noticed in Germany, I even had one of my videos, that was translated in German... I think, around 1,000,000 people watched it in German.

I noticed how this topic is really popular and a lot of people are working towards solutions. So we really need to also take example from them.

Marvin:

I'm not really sure why that is in Germany. As in every other country, in Germany you have a lot of people that are just following the western medicine blindly. But you have a lot of people also that are very critical and trying to dig deep into the topics, and educate themselves, and doing the research.

So I think we have just had a history. Many, many scientists – so-called scientists of the past – of these areas came from Germany. Or from Europe basically.

And, we had – with Doctor Stefan Lanka we had a very prominent biologist/virologist who came out to the public and tried to educate and spread the truth basically about the practices, scientific practices, in virology. So that gave the whole movement a boost, I would say, in Germany.

And also he was working together with the Perth Group in Australia, which in the 80s, 90s, were very, very clearly doing a lot of good work in HIV research. So I think this is also part of the reason why, specifically in German-speaking countries, many people are already aware of these topics.

Katie:

So how people can support you and what you are doing this court case and everything that you require to do?

Marvin:

So one support would, of course, to be there at the day. So for everyone maybe who is around Hamburg could come there and just – at the 26th of April – think it's at 10:45 am. I can share the address later, but that would be great for sure.

And then, of course, you can support our Next Level, so our work what we are doing. We have a website and we also have a magazine that comes out regularly. So you can do any sort of donation.

You can buy the magazine and you can also interact with other critical thinkers in the online forums – telegram – and just support this community. That would be also very great because we are doing a lot of work.

Basically all of us do this in our free time. So we have all our main jobs, and apart from that, we do this in our free time because we are very passionate about this.

We don't want a future for our families and friends and children and so on that is continuing with this craziness basically. And with these pandemics over and over again, with vaccinations and medical drugs and so on.

It is all going against, basically, our health and is not based on science.

This people really should understand that this is not really scientific.

If you take your time, some hours, weeks, and you really try to figure it out, you will quickly understand that this is not based on science.

This is based on fraud. Sometimes on misinterpretation. OK? Misinterpretation. Very often, due to lacking control experiments, they misinterpreted the results they get. They don't know what exactly is cause and effect because they don't have any controls. So they just take it for granted; and this is also unscientific.

See Related:

[*Dr. Stefan Lanka & Dr. Tom Cowan: How We Got Into This Mess – The History of Virology & Deep Medical Deceptions*](#)

[The Path Paved by Dr. Lanka: Exposing the Lies of Virology](#)

**Part 1: The New Body Soul Biology (English voice over)
Dr Stefan Lanka**

The Path Paved by Dr. Lanka: Exposing the Lies of Virology

[The Path Paved by Dr. Lanka: Exposing the Lies of Virology](#)

[The Path Paved by Dr. Lanka](#)

by [Mike Stone](#), [ViroLIEgy](#)

August 16, 2022

I remember early on in 2017, when I first started unraveling the “virus” lie through the examination of HIV/AIDS, to being introduced to the work of Dr. Stefan Lanka. If memory serves me correctly, my first encounter was through the brilliant [House of Numbers](#) documentary by Brent Leung. I was simply amazed that Dr. Lanka, an ex-virologist, was actually

calling out the methods of his own profession. His testimony, along with that of Kary Mullis, the inventor of the misused and abused [PCR technique](#), carried much weight with me in those early days. Their words lent credibility to the argument that the evidence for the [existence of HIV](#) and other “viruses” was entirely absent and fraudulent.

During that time of intense research where I was desperately seeking out any and all information that I could find, I fortunately stumbled onto a few of Dr. Lanka’s articles through the [VirusMyth.com](#) website. I was engrossed in his work and absorbed much of what he had to say on the subject, especially in regards to the [lack of purification and isolation](#) of any “viruses,” the faults of the [cell culture method](#), and the problems related to [electron microscope imagery](#). As it did for many others, Dr. Lanka’s work formed much of the foundation for my understanding of the lies of virology. It is rare to gain such critical insight from someone who was involved in the industry. It is even more rare for someone in his position to set out and actually prove what he was saying correct yet that is exactly what Dr. Lanka has done numerous times.

Without Dr. Lanka’s enormous contributions to unraveling the lies of germ theory, many of us speaking out today may not have been doing so. As his work was instrumental in helping me along on my own journey towards uncovering the truth, I want to highlight what I consider Dr. Lanka’s three biggest contributions to proving the fraud of virology along with many of the papers he has written on the subject. My hope is that you will be able to come away with a greater appreciation for Dr. Lanka’s monumental work as well as a clearer understanding of the deceptive practices used by virologists.

1. The Measles Trial

Early on in my journey, I found my way to the infamous measles trial saga while researching Dr. Lanka’s work. Back in 2017,

it was difficult to find out much accurate information on what had really transpired. For those who are unaware, Dr. Lanka set forth a challenge in his own magazine calling upon anyone to come forward with a single paper providing the scientific evidence which proved the existence of a measles "virus." If this challenge was met, the person would receive a \$100,000 financial reward. A physician named David Bardens came forward with six papers spanning six decades which he claimed together proved the existence of the measles "virus." Dr. Lanka refused to pay as he specifically requested one publication providing the entire proof necessary. Dr. Bardens sued and while Dr. Lanka lost the initial case in the lower courts, he won on appeal in the higher courts. At the time I originally came upon this story, the internet was (and still is) full of stories claiming that Dr. Lanka lost the case. However, to anyone interested in the truth, it is obvious that those lies do not hold up under scrutiny. Presented below is a great overview of how the events actually played out:

"On November 24, 2011, Dr. Lanka announced on his website that he would offer a prize of € 100,000 to anyone who could prove the existence of the measles virus. The announcement read as follows: "The reward will be paid, if a scientific publication is presented, in which the existence of the measles virus is not only asserted, but also proven and in which, among other things, the diameter of the measles virus is determined.

In January 2012, Dr. David Bardens took Dr. Lanka up on his pledge. He offered six papers on the subject and asked Dr. Lanka to transfer the € 100,000 to his bank account.

The six publications are:

1. Enders JF, Peebles TC. Propagation in tissue cultures of cytopathogenic agents from patients with measles. Proc Soc Exp Biol Med. 1954 Jun;86(2):277-286.

2. Bech V, Magnus Pv. Studies on measles virus in monkey kidney tissue cultures. Acta Pathol Microbiol Scand. 1959; 42(1): 75–85
3. Horikami SM, Moyer SA. Structure, Transcription, and Replication of Measles Virus. Curr Top Microbiol Immunol. 1995; 191: 35–50.
4. Nakai M, Imagawa DT. Electron microscopy of measles virus replication. J Virol. 1969 Feb; 3(2): 187–97.
5. Lund GA, Tyrell, DL, Bradley RD, Scraba DG. The molecular length of measles virus RNA and the structural organization of measles nucleocapsids. J Gen Virol. 1984 Sep;65 (Pt 9):1535–
6. Daikoku E, Morita C, Kohno T, Sano K. Analysis of Morphology and Infectivity of Measles Virus Particles. Bulletin of the Osaka Medical College. 2007; 53(2): 107–14.

Dr. Lanka refused to pay the money since in his opinion these publications did not provide adequate evidence. Subsequently, Dr. Bardens took Dr. Lanka to court.

On March 12, 2015, the District Court Ravensburg in southern Germany ruled that the criteria of the advertisement had been fulfilled ordering Dr. Lanka to pay up. Dr. Lanka appealed the ruling.

On February 16, 2016, the Higher Regional Court of Stuttgart (OLG) re-evaluated the first ruling, judging that Dr. Bardens did not meet the criteria since he failed to provide proof for the existence of the measles virus presented in one publication, as asked by Dr. Lanka in his announcement. Therefore, Dr. Lanka does not have to pay the prize money.

On January 16, 2017, the First Civil Senate of the German Federal Court of Justice (BGH) confirmed the ruling of the

OLG Stuttgart.

Critics of the judicial verdict argue that Dr. Lanka's victory is solely based on how he had formulated the offer of reward, namely to pay the € 100,000 for the presentation of a single publication of evidence (which Dr. Bardens was unable to provide). This argument, however, distracts the attention from the essential points.

According to the minutes of the court proceedings (page 7/ first paragraph), Andreas Podbielski, head of the Department of Medical Microbiology, Virology and Hygiene at the University Hospital in Rostock, who was one of the appointed experts at the trial, stated that even though the existence of the measles virus could be concluded from the summary of the six papers submitted by Dr. Bardens, none of the authors had conducted any controlled experiments in accordance with internationally defined rules and principles of good scientific practice (see also the method of "indirect evidence"). Professor Podbielski considers this lack of control experiments explicitly as a "methodological weakness" of these publications, which are after all the relevant studies on the subject (there are no other publications trying to attempt to prove the existence of the "measles virus"). Thus, at this point, a publication about the existence of the measles virus that stands the test of good science has yet to be delivered.

Furthermore, at the trial it was noted that contrary to its legal remit as per § 4 Infection Protection Act (IfSG) the Robert Koch Institute (RKI), the highest German authority in the field of infectious diseases, has failed to perform tests for the alleged measles virus and to publish these. The RKI claims that it made internal studies on the measles virus, however, refuses to hand over or publish the results."

[Click to access Lanka_Bardens_Trial_E.pdf](#)

For an even more in-depth analysis of what really occurred during the trial, I always recommend this article by Feli Popescu, who was actually present during the proceedings:

<https://feli-popescu.blogspot.com/2018/09/still-no-proof-for-measles-virus.html?m=1>

When I think of Dr. Lanka's work, the measles trial stands out as the most significant moment and the most pivotal accomplishment. We had an epic head-to-head clash between the medical establishment and an ex-virologist taking place in a court of law over the legitimacy of the evidence for the measles "virus." It was determined through this trial that the foundational paper claiming the existence and isolation of the measles "virus," [the 1954 paper by John Franklin Enders](#), was unworthy by itself for proving the existence of the "virus." As all other papers and virology itself owe their evidence to the cell culture methods developed by Enders in that paper, it is an astonishingly damning admission that the evidence presented by virology is invalid.

2. The 7 Steps Proving "Viruses" Don't Exist

More recently, Dr. Lanka put together what he felt were the main points that bring the house of cards known as virology tumbling down. These 7 steps were formulated over many years of painstaking research into the faults of virology. As he did with the measles trial, Dr. Lanka compiled a very convincing case for why "viruses" do not exist and why virology is a pseudoscience built upon fraudulent foundations.

The 7 steps to prove "viruses" do not exist:

1. Virologists interpret the death of cells in the laboratory as viral. Due to the lack of control attempts (experiments), they overlook the fact that they kill the cells in the laboratory themselves and unintentionally by starving and poisoning the cells. This misinterpretation is based on a single publication by John Franklin Enders and a

colleague from June 1, 1954. This publication was ruled by the highest court in Germany in the measles virus trial that it contained no evidence of a virus. This publication became the exclusive basis not only for measles virology, but for all virology since 1954 and corona hysteria.

2. Virologists mentally assemble the shortest pieces of so-called genetic information from dying cells to form a very long genetic strand, which they output as the genetic strand of a virus. This conceptual/computational process is called alignment. In doing so, they did not make the control attempts, the attempt to conceptually/computationally construct the desired genetic strand even from short pieces of so-called genetic information from non-infected sources.

3. For the alignment of a virus, virologists always need a given genetic strand of a virus. For this, however, they always use a genetically/computationally generated genetic strand and never a real one, one found in reality. In doing so, they never attempt to check whether or not so-called genetic information could also be constructed from the existing data set, including "viral" genetic material strands of completely different viruses.

4. Virologists have never seen or isolated "viruses" in humans, animals, plants or their fluids. They only did it seemingly, indirectly, and only ever by means of very special and artificial cell systems in the laboratory. They never mentioned the control attempts or documented whether they succeeded in depicting and isolating viruses in and from humans, animals, plants or their fluids.

5. Virologists have never isolated, biochemically characterized or obtained their supposed genetic material from the supposed viruses that they photograph using electron microscope images. They have never conducted or published control experiments as to whether, after

isolating these structures, it was actually possible to detect “viral” proteins (the envelope of the virus) and, above all, the viral genome, which is supposed to be the central component and characteristic of a virus.

6. Virologists report typical artifacts of dying tissue/cells and typical structures that arise when the cell’s own components such as proteins, fats and the solvents used are swirled, as viruses or viral components. Here, too, there are no control experiments with cells/tissues that were not infected but were also treated.

7. The so-called transmission attempts that virologists make to prove the transmission and pathogenicity of the suspected viruses refute the entire virology. Obviously, it is the experiments themselves that trigger the symptoms, which animal experiments provide as evidence of the existence and effectiveness of the suspected viruses. Here, too, there are no control attempts in which exactly the same thing is done, only with non-infected or sterilized materials.

<https://nateserg808.wixsite.com/my-site/post/the-controls>

Dr. Lanka explained the 7 steps himself in this short excerpt from an interview with Dr. Tom Cowan where he offered additional insight:

3. The Control Experiments

During this current “pandemic,” Dr. Lanka decided to carry out and recreate for “SARS-COV-2” the control experiments he had done during the measles trial. The experiments were conducted in three phases:

Phase 1 – The cytopathic effect

In the first control experiment, Dr. Stefan Lanka showed that what virologists attribute to the presence of a

pathogenic virus can be achieved without infectious material.

Phase 2 – Construction of the SARS-CoV-2 genome

In the second control experiment, Dr. Lanka showed that what virologists call “viral genetic material actually comes from a healthy human tissue.

Phase 3 – Structural analysis of sequence data in virology

In the third control experiment, we show that with the same technique that virologists use and using nucleic acids, which are not from supposedly infectious material but from healthy human tissue, animals and plants, can construct the genome of any “virus.”

[Kontrollexperiment Phase 1 – Mehrere Labore bestätigen die Widerlegung der Virologie durch den cytopathischen Effekt](#)

Phase 1: The Cytopathic Effect

Phase 1 of Dr. Lanka’s experiments was designed to show that the [cytopathogenic effect](#), the very criteria used to determine a “virus” is present in a cell culture, can be caused by the experimental conditions themselves without “infectious” material present. The article linked above contains the study by the independent laboratory testing the cytopathogenic effect for Dr. Lanka. It is in German but it can be easily translated into English. However, as it is a rather long study, I wanted to provide my favorite breakdown of the CPE experiments from Dr. Tom Cowan’s excellent book [Breaking the Spell](#):

“Here is the essence of Lanka’s experiment, **done by an independent professional laboratory that specializes in cell culturing**. As seen in this series of photographs, each of the four vertical columns is a separate experiment. The top photo in each column was taken on day one, and the bottom photo was taken on day five.

In vertical column one, normal cells were cultured with normal nutrient medium and only a small amount of antibiotics. As you can see, on neither day one nor day five was any CPE found; the cells continued their normal, healthy growth.

In vertical column two, normal cells were again grown on normal nutrient medium and a small amount of antibiotics, but this time, 10% fetal calf serum was added to enrich the medium. Still, the cells in the culture grew normally, both on day one and day five.

The third vertical column shows what happened when Dr. Lanka's group used the same procedures that have been used in every modern isolation experiment of every pathogenic virus that I have seen. This included changing the nutrient medium to "minimal nutrient medium"—meaning lowering the percentage of fetal calf serum from the usual 10% to 1%, which lowers the nutrients available for the cells to grow, thereby stressing them—and tripling the antibiotic concentration. As you can see, on day five of the experiment, the characteristic CPE occurred, "proving" the existence and pathogenicity of the virus—except, at no point was a pathogenic virus added to the culture. This outcome can only mean that the CPE was a result of the way the culture experiment was done and not from any virus.

The fourth and final vertical column is the same as vertical column three, except that to this culture, a solution of pure RNA from yeast was added. This produced the same result as column three, again proving that it is the culture technique—and not a virus—that is causing the CPE."

For Dr. Lanka's own breakdown of the phase 1 results, please see this interview with Dean Braus:

Phase 2: Construction of the “SARS-CoV-2” genome

Phase two of the control experiments looked to show that the “viral” material in the “SARS-COV-2” genome actually comes from healthy human tissue. Dr. Lanka joined Kate Sugak to discuss the findings in the below video:

Phase 3: Structural analysis of sequence data in virology

Phase 3 was designed to show that by using materials from many different sources (healthy humans, animals, plants, and synthetic nucleic acids), the PCR amplification process can create the genomes for any “virus.” I’ve provided the abstract from the study performed by the independent researchers working with Dr. Lanka to give a short overview of what was found:

Structural analysis of sequence data in virology: An elementary approach using SARS-CoV-2 as an example

“De novo meta-transcriptomic sequencing or whole genome sequencing are accepted methods in virology for the detection of claimed pathogenic viruses. In this process, no virus particles (virions) are detected and in the sense of the word isolation, isolated and biochemically characterized. In the case of SARS-CoV-2, total RNA is often extracted from patient samples (e.g.: bronchoalveolar lavage fluid (BALF) or throat-nose swabs) and sequenced. **Notably, there is no evidence that the RNA fragments used to calculate viral genome sequences are of viral origin.**

We therefore examined the publication “A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China” [1] and the associated published sequence data with bioproject ID PRJNA603194 dated 27/01/2020 for the original gene sequence proposal for SARS-CoV-2 (GenBank: MN908947.3). A repeat of the de novo assembly with Megahit (v.1.2.9) showed that the published results could not be reproduced. We may have detected (ribosomal) ribonucleic acids of human origin,

contrary to what was reported in [1]. **Further analysis provided evidence for possible nonspecific amplification of reads during PCR confirmation and determination of genomic termini not associated with SARS-CoV-2 (MN908947.3).**

Finally, we performed some reference-based assemblies with additional genome sequences such as SARS-CoV, Human immunodeficiency virus, Hepatitis delta virus, Measles virus, Zika virus, Ebola virus, or Marburg virus to study the structural similarity of the present sequence data with the respective sequences. **We have obtained preliminary hints that some of the viral genome sequences we have studied in the present work may be obtained from the RNA of unsuspected human samples."**

Download

PDF:

[structural_analysis_of_sequence_data_in_virology \(1\)](#)

To hear Dr. Lanka's explanation of this phase, please see this excellent interview once again with Kate Sugak:

Drs. Sam and Mark Bailey's Tribute to Dr. Lanka

For an even greater in-depth look at the brilliant work of Dr. Lanka, please see [this excellent video tribute](#) by the Baileys. From an outline provided by Dr. Mark Bailey, in this 30 minute video they cover:

- Dr. Lanka's early discoveries that bacteriophages and giant "viruses" are able to be truly isolated but are not pathogenic
- Dr. Lanka's path as a virologist and the realization that the model was wrong
- How Dr. Lanka spoke out from the very early stages against the HIV/AIDS dogma
- Dr. Lanka's discovery that the germ theory and disease entity models are incorrect
- A look at Dr. Lanka's 7 points that refute virology on

their own terms

- The 3 phases of the “SARS-CoV-2” control experiments performed in 2021 that were used to refute the “virus” hypothesis
- And the optimism for the future as many of us are now standing on his shoulders to spread the knowledge he has given us

[Stefan Lanka: “Virus, It’s Time To Go.”](#)

The Road Less Traveled

Sadly, it is often a lonely road for anyone willing to break away from tradition and speak out about the troubling state of their chosen profession, especially in a field with ties to a highly lucrative pharmaceutical conglomerate. More often than not, anyone who is willing to sound the alarm has their work smeared and their reputations tarnished by colleagues and the mainstream media in order to discredit the information and the charges that have been brought forth. We are fortunate enough that there were a few brave men and women who were able to see through the indoctrination of their training and push through the often painful cognitive dissonance which comes with having to change long held beliefs ingrained from birth.

Dr. Lanka helped to pave the path against virology and many of us are walking in his footsteps today. His refutation of the germ theory paradigm using their own history and methods was highly influential to myself and others. His status as an ex-virologist not only gave him an invaluable insiders look at the fraud the field is entrenched in but also the clout necessary for those hesitant about the information shared to actually listen up and to start asking the hard questions themselves. We are greatly indebted to Dr. Lanka for his trailblazing work. Without his herculean efforts, I highly doubt that we would be able to attack this fraudulent field as

successfully as we are able to do so now.

Essential Reading:

I wanted to provide a list of Dr. Lanka's work which I consider essential reading for anyone questioning the germ theory lies and/or looking to gain more knowledge of the foundational problems that the field of virology is built upon. Many of these were sources I read initially in my own journey which I found extremely helpful in broadening my own understanding. I am positive that this list will be a benefit to others as well:

[Dr. Stefan Lanka Debunks Pictures of Isolated "Viruses"](#)

[HIV Pictures: What They Really Show](#)

[HIV: Reality or Artefact?](#)

[INTERVIEW STEFAN LANKA: Challenging BOTH Mainstream and Alternative AIDS Views](#)

[Virologists](#)

[The Virus Misconception Part 1](#)

[The Virus Misconception Part 2](#)

[The Virus Misconception Part 3](#)

[The Misinterpretation of Antibodies](#)

[Connect with Mike Stone](#)

cover image is screenshot from [Kate Sugak video](#)