

Vitamins: A Good Hypothesis From the Beginning, but Long Since Refuted

[Vitamins: A Good Hypothesis From the Beginning, but Long Since Refuted](#)

by [Next Level](#)

translated from German via telegram translate

July 14, 2024

What Are Vitamines?

Studies and Experiments Which Cast Some Light on These Mysterious Elements of Nutrition
By Harry A. Mount

cause their function was not understood. These new experiments indicate that the action of the glands, and consequently many bodily functions, depend in part or entirely upon an element of food, which, although it has not yet been isolated, has been arbitrarily named vitamines.

The case against vitamines might well be first considered, for it is based upon the fact that they are mysterious. No one has ever seen a vitamine; the existence of vitamines has only been surmised from the very definite effects upon the animal organism when lavishly fed with vitamines and when deprived of them.

It has not been possible to isolate positively these vitamines, and their chemical composition is unknown.

other curative agents. We ought to be warned in advance, then not to be too hopeful of what the exploration of this new field will reveal.

Quelle: What Are Vitamines?
Studies and Experiments Which Cast Some Light on These Mysterious Elements of Nutrition
By Harry A. Mount
<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/what-are-vitamines/>



In 1921, Scientific American published an article pointing out that vitamins have never been isolated or seen and their chemical composition is unknown .

One might think that science has advanced further today and that vitamins are now proven facts – but whoever believes this is mistaken:

The parallels to disproven virology are frightening. In both cases, these are thought models without controlled evidence according to the scientific method.

Reality:

According to current studies, the symptoms associated with “vitamin deficiency” are the result of ongoing stress caused by poor nutrition.

Logic:

If a deficiency is supposed to cause disease, why do people who go without eating for a long time not get scurvy or beriberi?

NL BIO-LOGISCH [Next Level Bio-Logical] can accurately classify and explain the causes of these “diseases”.

[Connect with Next Level](#) [German language] at telegram

Cover image credit: [CDD20](#)

See Related:

[*Toxic Brews?: A Close-Up Look at the Source of Nutritional Supplements*](#)

Error of Science? The Truth About Proteins and Antibodies

[Error of Science? The Truth About Proteins and Antibodies](#)

by [Next Level](#)

translated from German via telegram translate

May 21, 2024

It is a fact that to date no three-dimensional resolution and biochemical characterization of an isolated protein is possible, and thus its unequivocal existence as an independent molecule and effect is still pending. In current science, proteins are not defined as solid structures, but are constantly changing their three-dimensional shape. This continuous “wobbling” means that assumed proteins never remain stable long enough to serve as constant target structures for antibodies.

Even the smallest changes in the tissue environment can lead to completely different forms of an assumed protein. We are talking about intrinsic randomness here!

- So how can antibodies be specific when their target is constantly changing shape?
- How can the specificity of a protein be asserted if it can neither be isolated nor clearly characterized in three dimensions?
- How is it possible to distinguish a not clearly characterized and constantly changing protein from other proteins and assign it to a specific, never isolated virus?

Tests and diagnoses based on the assumption that antibodies can specifically recognize a constantly changing protein are therefore scientifically untenable.

In a laboratory test tube, where environmental variables are meticulously controlled, specific reactions can be forced under certain circumstances – but the smallest deviations or disturbances in the conditions lead to different results! In a natural organism or in natural environments, these laboratory conditions are impossible simply because of the constant interaction and reciprocity with nature.

[Connect with Next Level at telegram](#)

Cover image credit: [geralt](#)

Toxic Brews?: A Close-Up Look at the Source of Nutritional Supplements

[Toxic Brews?: A Close-Up Look at the Source of Nutritional Supplements](#)

Truth Comes to Light editor's note: Many readers of this site (myself included) have long avoided pharmaceuticals. However, many of us have spent a lot of money on supplements over the years as we attempt to understand the cause of body imbalances. Below you will find a series of posts (translated from German) by Next Level taking a close look at the science behind "vitamins" and the production of supplements. As we are constantly being reminded these days, we must question everything. ~ Kathleen

[The Vitamin Fraud – When Toxic Brew Is Sold as Effective](#)

by [Next Level](#)

translated from German via Telegram translate

February 11, 2024

Preface

The concept of vitamins is a purely human invention. There are no published, controlled experiments in the scientific literature that confirm their natural existence. In fact, no

“vitamin” has ever been directly observed in food. The only places where they are “detectable” are the results of laboratory processes (the bottom of a test tube) after a witch’s brew of poisonous chemicals is mixed, leaving a dregs of the substance.

False idea of proof

Vitamins, whose size is estimated to be around 1 to 2 nanometers, are probably 50 to 100 times smaller than the claimed SARS-CoV-2 virus, which has not been isolated and detected to date. If one were to enlarge a vitamin molecule to the size of a tennis ball, at the same scale this would correspond to a tennis ball that would be more than three times the diameter of the Earth. However, the presumed separate structures of these molecules have never been clearly isolated and clearly separated from other components.

There is no real gold standard

There is no single study that documents the clean isolation and biochemical characterization of a vitamin molecule to establish it as a pure, isolated standard for comparison. Instead, it analyzes the dregs of a byproduct of food that has been broken down by numerous harsh and toxic chemicals.

The extraction process (“isolation”) of a vitamin molecule

To isolate vitamin C from lemon juice, you start with a simple glass of juice and take it through an alchemical odyssey: first it is charged with lead, only to laboriously remove the lead later. Then you juggle with ammonia, acetic acid and a parade of solvents – from butyl to ethyl alcohol, to acetone to petroleum ether. After it has been heated, dried, reheated and dried again, the whole thing is served to the animals. If they don’t get scurvy, you’ve got it: ascorbic acid, better known as vitamin C, extracted through an impressive party of chemicals. Voila, science!

Synthetic production of vitamin supplements – a toxic chemical cocktail

The synthetic vitamins are made from petrochemicals (chemical products obtained from petroleum and natural gas), heavy metals and other toxic substances!

Professor Goran Nicolic and Dr. In 2015, Dragana Markovic explained some of the ingredients in commercially available vitamin pills.

- Vitamin A = methanol, benzene, petroleum sulfonates; Acetylene; refined oils
- Beta-carotene = methanol, benzene, petroleum sulfonates; Acetylene; refined oils
- Vitamin B-1 = coal tar derivatives, hydrochloric acid; Acetonitrile with ammonia
- Vitamin B-6 = Petroleum esters & hydrochloric acid mixed with formaldehyde
- Vitamin B-12 = Cobalamin reacts with cyanide (salt of hydrogen cyanide)
- Vitamin D = Irradiated animal fat/bovine brain or solvent extracted
- etc

Reasons for a positive experience?

Some experience positive effects when taking vitamin supplements, in part because of the placebo effect, which is reinforced by the expectation of a positive effect. But the variety and type of chemicals in the manufacturing process result in a complex mixture, not a pure vitamin molecule. This mixture contains harsh chemicals and byproducts that the body must neutralize. A state of high alert. This sympathicotonic state can interrupt other regenerative processes, where symptoms are present through the recovery phase (see UniversalBiology), often resembling a feeling of exhaustion. Taking vitamin supplements can lead to a short-term feeling of improvement, similar to taking antibiotics. However, in the

long term, exposure to these substances can be harmful.

The vitamin fraud – a billion dollar business without evidence

by [Next Level](#)

translated from German via Telegram translate

February 11, 2024

Cochrane Collaboration: No positive effect from taking specific “vitamins”

Critics in particular like to cite the renowned Cochrane Collaboration in other cases to support their statements. You must have missed this extensive meta-study on antioxidants & vitamins.

The results of the Cochrane Collaboration study on antioxidant supplements is further evidence and deserves special attention, not only because of its size, but also because of the quality and methodology of the research included. With 78 randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and a total of 296,707 participants, it is one of the most comprehensive analyzes on this topic. Its particular value lies in its exclusive consideration of RCTs , the gold standard of clinical research , all of which were conducted with control groups . This guarantees high reliability and accuracy of the results.

Another notable highlight of this study is the finding that antioxidant supplements, including beta-carotene, vitamin A, vitamin C, vitamin E and selenium , had no positive effect on health. On the contrary, the results suggested that certain antioxidants such as beta-carotene and vitamin E may even significantly increase mortality . These findings are particularly important because they challenge the common assumption that antioxidants are beneficial to health.

Source: [Cochrane Collaboration](#) (study)

“Vitamin molecule” – A misleading term

The term “vitamin” is misleading. It suggests the idea of a specific, single molecule that is about 1 to 2 nanometers in size. However, the assumption that these molecules exist in an isolated form and occur precisely in nature is a misinterpretation forced by the concept of molecules.

In reality, natural foods like apples, cucumbers, fish, etc. work in their entirety – not through the idea of isolated molecules like “vitamins”. The idea that vitamins act as single, isolated molecules is a simplistic and therefore misleading concept.

What is sold as “vitamins” is actually a newly created product. It is created through a manufacturing process that uses numerous toxic and aggressive chemicals and is based on a raw material.

The artificial product “Vitamin”

A key problem in the current debate is that many people’s molecular understanding is not sufficiently developed. There is often a misconception that the end product – actually a completely new product that has never existed in natural food – is a single, pure molecule. This molecule, so the misconception goes, was isolated from a food source through extensive purification procedures, and its effects have been unequivocally proven in randomized controlled trials (RCTs). In reality, the final product is the result of a complex, multi-stage manufacturing process. The result is a new product or even a by-product that is created through many complex processes with toxic chemicals and through processes such as cooking, steaming and drying – in short, a kind of “substance residue.”

The Vitamin Swindle – If it's not a vitamin molecule, then what is it

by [Next Level](#)

translated from German via Telegram translate

February 14, 2024

Misconception of a vitamin product

Many users of vitamin supplements mistakenly assume that the extraction process is very simple: they imagine that specific “vitamin molecules” – similar to the seeds of a watermelon – are gently isolated from a fruit and then collected together to form a pure concentrate. In their imagination, these molecules then exist in an unmixed form in the end product and, detached from any other fruit tissue, have the same effect as in their natural state.

But this assumption is far from reality!

What is really the final product?

When people talk about “vitamins” and talk about individual molecules that are only 1 to 2 nanometers in size, it is more of a theoretical idea.

Let's take the production of ascorbic acid (vitamin C) for dietary supplements as an example: In the laboratory, a process called the Reichstein process is often used, which involves several complex steps:

1. First, D-glucose , obtained from genetically modified corn (properly created through breeding), is converted into D-sorbitol using nickel as a catalyst.
2. This D-sorbitol is converted into L-sorbose by the bacterium *Acetobacter* .
3. L-sorbose is then converted into diacetone L-sorbose using acetone (known from nail polish remover) and an acid .
4. In the next step , potassium permanganate converts the

diacetone-L-sorbose into diprogulic acid.

5. The diprogulic acid is converted into gulonic acid by heating and adding water .

6. This gulonic acid is ultimately converted into ascorbic acid via a reaction catalyzed by platinum .

7. The resulting ascorbic acid is then mixed with other excipients to produce vitamin C powder and tablets.

In short: The end product does not represent the pure isolation of individual molecules – comparable to the seeds of a watermelon – but is a completely new product or a by-product. It is a mixture (substance) that is created from a raw material through numerous processing steps with sometimes toxic and aggressive chemicals – basically the residue in a test tube.

Synthetically produced ascorbic acid cannot possibly resemble the postulated model of a “vitamin” of natural origin in an organism. Therefore, eating real food is the best choice.

To think about:

While formaldehyde in vaccines is rightly criticized, it is accepted completely uncritically in the production of “vitamins”.

The vitamin fraud – How safe are the supplements really?

by [Next Level](#)

translated from German via Telegram translate

February 16, 2024

Why “Vitamin D3 (cholecalciferol)” is also known as rat poison ([source](#))

Did you know that “Vitamin D3” – an often praised “miracle

cure” for health and well-being – can have an extremely toxic effect in quantities of just 1.5 ml (equivalent to around 300,000 IU)? In comparison, ibuprofen, an everyday painkiller that no one would claim is good for the body in small amounts daily, seems almost harmless.

Imagine: For a rat, a dose of just 8 drops of a “vitamin D3 supplement” containing 10,000 IU per drop can be fatal . In humans, 30 drops, i.e. just 1.5 ml, can lead to dangerous toxicity. But with ibuprofen we are talking about more than 2400 mg that is needed to be potentially dangerous – an amount that is the equivalent of 320 times higher!

How can it be that we talk so lightly about the health benefits of “vitamin D3” when the line to toxicity is so narrow?

Isn't it paradoxical that we are cautious about the dosage of a drug like ibuprofen, but often consider uncritically high doses of “vitamin D3” to be harmless or even healthy?

To think about

The creation of a synthetic substance “Vitamin D3” is obtained by irradiating animal fat using toxic solvents such as hexane, acetone, ethanol and aggressive catalysts such as palladium, a process that does not mimic the reality in the biological organism, but that of the natural one The body's balance with questionable chemicals is disrupted.

There is a saying: “The dose makes the poison.” But the fact is that poison always remains poison – even in smaller doses. The only thing that varies is the damage caused and the amount of effort the body has to clean. From a health perspective, it is definitely not advisable to take a toxic substance.

The vitamin fraud – A critical look at the irony of the health market

by [Next Level](#)

translated from German via Telegram translate

February 19, 2024

In today's society, where distrust of the pharmaceutical industry is growing, many tend to turn to alternative health products in the hope of making a more natural choice. Ironically, however, many of these alternatives, including vitamin supplements, are in the hands of the same pharmaceutical companies that have come under increasing criticism.

The irony of consumer behavior

There is a remarkable discrepancy between the desire to understand the machinations of the big pharmaceutical companies and purchasing behavior. Many consumers invest in vitamin pills that are manufactured by the same corporations they believe they are against. The belief that just because a product is labeled 'natural' or 'organic' it is automatically better or healthier often overlooks the reality of the manufacturing processes. These products are not manufactured in an idyllic natural landscape, but in laboratories – the same ones that work for pharmaceutical companies.

What is really in vitamin supplements?

The production of vitamins uses a variety of chemicals, including those used in the production of military chemical weapons or known as industrial toxicants – formaldehyde, cyanide (hydrocyanic acid), sulfuric acid, ammonia, acetone, palladium, to name a few. This information is publicly available and can be found in scientific publications on the synthesis or extraction process of these substances.

The intertwining of pharmaceuticals and nutritional supplements

It is a fallacy to believe that all companies operate exclusively under the name of the group to which they belong. Reality shows that large pharmaceutical companies play a significant role in the nutritional supplements market:

– Pfizer and Wyeth : With the acquisition of Wyeth, Pfizer has expanded its portfolio to include the Centrum brand, a leading multivitamin brand worldwide.

– BASF and Cognis : By purchasing Cognis, BASF specialized in specialty chemicals for health products, including nutritional supplements.

– Nestlé Health Science : Nestlé has invested in the medical nutrition and dietary supplements market through its Nestlé Health Science division, including through the acquisition of Atrium Innovations, whose brands include Garden of Life and Pure Encapsulations.

These examples illustrate how closely pharmaceutical companies and the nutritional supplement market are intertwined. It shows that the search for a more “natural” alternative often leads to the same actors from whom many want to distance themselves.

Conclusion

The decision for health products and nutritional supplements should be based on sound knowledge and a critical assessment of the origin and production of these products. The irony of opposing the pharmaceutical industry while remaining loyal to its products underscores the need for informed choice and a deeper exploration of health and wellness.

[Connect with Next Level at Telegram](#)

Cover image credit: [stevepb](#)

The Graphene Market: The Truth Behind the Myth

[The Graphene Market: The Truth Behind the Myth](#)

by [Next Level](#) (Knowledge Rethought)

translated from German via Telegram translate

February 6, 2024

Graphite sold as graphene: A critical look

The sale of products touted as graphene reveals a profound disconnect between marketing promises and scientific reality. These products, often described as miracle materials, turn out to be nothing more than conventional graphite upon closer inspection.

Note: This applies to "graphene", "graphene oxide" and the made-up term "graphene hydroxide"

Circular reasoning and refutation

Circular Reasoning: The assumption that the mere ability to purchase a product proves its existence is misleading. Following this logic, "Wi-Fi cables" on eBay or "isolated pathogenic viruses" that are offered for sale must also be real.

Refutation: The marketing of graphene is based on an overestimation of its properties. What is sold as "graphene" is merely thin sheets or particles of graphite that do not meet the definition of true graphene.

Why the product sold cannot be real graphene

Definition of graphene: Real graphene is said to consist of a one- to nine-layer structure of carbon atoms. Beyond this limit we no longer speak of graphene, but of graphite.

Commercial Products: Often sold in powder form, “graphene sheets,” or as a dispersion, these “graphene” products imply processing beyond the definition of graphene. They are effectively no longer graphene.

Material properties and number of layers: In theory, the unique properties of graphene only apply to structures with up to nine layers . Products on the market contain materials that do not meet these criteria and therefore must technically be classified as graphite.

Final note

Graphene, scientifically defined as a layer up to nine atoms thick, is a maximum of 0.9 nanometers thick – invisibly small and 1200 times thinner than the structure of SARS-CoV-2, which has never been isolated . Logically speaking, any visible and purchaseable “graphene” product cannot be real graphene. From the tenth layer onwards, graphene turns into graphite, with completely different properties.

What we see and buy cannot be graphene by scientific definition.

In other words, graphene does not exist not only because it cannot be produced or isolated under normal conditions, but also because scientific experiments and laboratory studies – such as with transmission electron microscopy (TEM) – have shown that it does not have the extraordinary properties which are theoretically attributed to it, namely extreme hardness and resistance. This raises the question of how graphene, theoretically known as the hardest and most resilient material, can break and deform beyond repair under the microscope’s electron beam or in a conventional oxidation-

reduction process.

[Connect with Next Level at Telegram \(German language\)](#)

Cover image credit: [HanJae](#)

See related:

[Next Level Researchers Challenge the Theory That Graphene Oxide Has Been Found in Vaccines](#)

Next Level Researchers Challenge the Theory That Graphene Oxide Has Been Found in Vaccines

[Next Level Researchers Challenge the Theory That Graphene Oxide Has Been Found in Vaccines](#)

Graphene Oxide in Vaccines: Why They Don't Exist!

by [Next Level](#) (Knowledge Rethought)

translated from German via Telegram translate

February 4, 2024

The claimed existence of graphene oxide in vaccines has been mainly reported by La Quinta Columna (Campra) and Dr. Noack spread. From razor blades to antennas for a global cloud in the style of the fourth industrial revolution à la Klaus Schwab.

Introduction

Claim: Graphene is theoretically composed of an invisibly thin, 0.1 nanometer-thick layer of carbon atoms in a hexagonal pattern, making it a two-dimensional material. If the number of layers exceeds nine, graphite with different properties is created instead.

Graphene vs. graphite

The debate surrounding graphene tends to mistakenly confuse it with graphite. While graphite, known from pencils, is a fragile, natural structure with no special properties, graphene is described as being 200 times stronger than steel and harder than diamond. However, studies have never clearly identified graphene; observed materials are often just thin layers of graphite, incorrectly interpreted as graphene.

La Quinta Columna (Campra) Missing evidence

1. Conflicting interpretations : In one place it is said that larger peaks in micro-Raman spectroscopy indicate graphite, in another place the opposite (narrower peaks).
2. Subjective selection of data: Out of 110 objects, only 28 were selected based on the contradictory peaks of micro-Raman spectroscopy, which showed inconsistency, without performing further biochemical analysis.
3. Impossible distribution of graphene in vaccines: The statement that graphene was present selectively in certain aliquots of vaccines contradicts the understanding of solution behavior and distribution in liquids and suggests measurement

errors.

Scientific contradictions

High-resolution TEM images of materials claimed to be graphene reveal significant defects in the structure. Instead of a perfect hexagonal arrangement of carbon atoms, as should be characteristic of graphene, one observes large holes and a distortion of the hexagonal structure towards round or even heptagonal patterns. These observations directly contradict theoretical assumptions about graphene as extremely hard and resilient. If graphene were actually 200 times stronger than steel and harder than diamond, such structural changes and defects should not occur under the influence of an electron beam.

The invisibility of graphene and atoms

The idea of isolating and manipulating “graphene” has no basis when the 3D representation of molecules such as “proteins” is an impossible task and even much larger structures such as SARS-COV-2 (1200 times larger) were never isolated. Considering that atoms, estimated at 0.1 nanometers, have never been seen directly and their “solid” part, the proton, is still tens of thousands of times smaller, and electron spins are said to be so tiny that they cannot even be considered “solid” particles can be viewed in the traditional sense, but rather as quantum states, the use of graphene appears to be pure fiction.

Conclusion

In our three-dimensional world, the idea of a two-dimensional layer, as assumed in graphene, is more of a theoretical construct than a physical reality. The idea that two-dimensional structures exist outside of mathematical models represents a logical stretch. Categorizing graphene as a “two-dimensional semimetal” therefore stretches the boundaries of what can exist in our real, three-dimensional environment.

To date, there is no method that makes it possible to specifically reconstruct a large piece of graphite in the sense of a macroscopic, three-dimensional block from the claimed isolated graphene layers smaller than 1 nanometer.

[Connect with Next Level at Telegram](#)

Cover image credit: [PhotoLizM](#)

Next Level: An Analysis of “Spike Protect” Product

[Next Level: An Analysis of “Spike Protect” Product](#)

Truth Comes to Light editor’s note:

In the post shared below, Next Level takes a look at “Spike Protect” products being sold to supposedly protect and/or repair damage from “spike proteins”. (For more information on Next Level, [see their magazine here.](#))

[This is the “Spike Protect” product promoted by Dr. Bodo Schiffmann as mentioned in the Next Level post. Ingredients: nattokinase, astaxanthin, black pepper extract and curcuma extract. Dr. Bodo Schiffman’s channels are published in German: \[Telegram\]\(#\) and \[YouTube\]\(#\).](#)

You will likely have seen a few versions of “Spike Protect” capsules offered for purchase by some of the natural healing or medical freedom channels that you follow. A

quick web search found several with varying ingredients.

- **Here**

Ingredients: black cumin seed extract, dandelion root, n-acetyl cysteine, green tea providing EGCG, nattokinase, selenium.

- **Here**

This site also mentions “shedding” protection. Their product comes in a bundle of products that include: selenium, glutathione, turmeric, quercetin, hesperidin, nattokinase, black seed oil, dandelion root, Irish moss, vitamin A, vitamin C, vitamin E, zinc, selenium, proteases, bromelain, papain, kelp, rutin, grape seed, ALA, citrus bioflavonoid, rose hips, Asian ginseng, eleuthero [Siberian ginseng], ginkgo biloba, CoQ10, green tea, catalase, flaxseed, lutein, SOD, parsley.

- **Here**

Ingredients: quercetin, schisandra, ginkgo leaf, serrapeptase, nattokinase.

- **Here**

Ingredients: nattokinase, dandelion root, selenium, black sativa, green tea extract, Irish sea moss.

- and **Here**

Ingredients: dandelion leaf, juniper berry, slippery elm, ginger root.

These same ingredients have been recommended for many of the symptoms related to upper respiratory issues and blood clots – in other words, for all things “covid” and “covid jab” side effects.

In the post below, Next Level challenges the idea that “spike proteins” are the culprit in causing these symptoms.

Product advertising for “Spike Protect” is based on evidence-free studies.

by [Next Level](#)

translated from German via telegram translate

January 25, 2024

The community has requested a critical analysis of the studies used as the basis for the Spike Protect product.

It is important to emphasize that no serious scientist – regardless of his critical attitude – would use such study results as a reliable evidence base. The product’s arguments against supposed “spike proteins” are based on a number of studies that do not provide sufficient evidence. This product has not yet been tested for effectiveness in controlled scientific studies.

Critical assessment of one of these studies (Post Bodo Schiffmann.)

1. Incomplete data presentation

Of the 81 long COVID patients (undefined diagnosis) examined, only data from 70 patients were presented. The missing information on 11 patients could represent bias if their results did not meet expectations.

2. Questionable evidence of “spike protein” fragments

The study found weak signals of “vaccine spike protein” fragments in only 2 of 81 patients and a fragment of the alleged “viral spike protein” in one patient.

3. Analysis of fragments instead of whole proteins

Only fragments and not whole “spike proteins” were

analyzed, which increases the risk of misclassification.

4. Possible artifact formation due to trypsin

The samples were treated with trypsin to generate fragments, raising the question of whether the identified fragments may be artifacts of trypsin use. This becomes particularly relevant with the mention of Australian virologists who reported that visible 'spikes' under the electron microscope could only be created by using trypsin. This highlights the importance of comparative controls with untreated samples. Controls without trypsin were not performed.

5. Variability of detection limit

The limit of detection in mass spectrometry is not standardized (similar to the CT value in PCR), meaning that other laboratories might have interpreted the authors' 2 weak signals differently. Both as an artifact and undetectable.

6. Interpretation of mass spectrometry results

The results are based solely on the indirect method of mass spectrometry. However, this technique does not provide clear yes or no answers but requires interpretation of the results. In mass spectrometry, so-called 'peaks' are created in the mass spectrum, which provide information about the presence of certain molecules. However, the very weak signals of these peaks identified in the study have not been confirmed by other independent methods, calling their reliability into question.

7. Lack of positive controls

Positive controls, i.e. samples known to contain the target molecule (in this case the "spike protein"), are not mentioned in the study.

8. Insufficient information on negative controls

Although unvaccinated samples are mentioned as negative controls, there are no specific details about how many negative control samples were used, how exactly these samples were analyzed, or what specific criteria were used for their selection. (Theoretically, this could be a single case).

9. Mass spectrometry and database dependency

In mass spectrometry, molecules are interpreted by comparing their mass-to-charge ratio (m/z) with database values. Incorrect database entries, such as incorrectly defining a harmless protein as a “spike protein,” can lead to misinterpretations, for example, with syncytin being mistakenly identified as a spike protein.

An article analyzing the other studies used to sell “Spike Protect” will be published in the next few weeks on NEXT LEVEL.

[Reference]

[Presence of viral spike protein and vaccinal spike protein in the blood serum of patients with long-COVID syndrome](#)

[Connect with Next Level at telegram](#)

Cover image credit: [Frank_Reppold](#)

See Related:

[What Does – and Doesn't – Make Us Sick](#)

[*Drs. Tom Cowan, Andy Kaufman & Stefan Lanka: On the Myth That Virology Is Real Science & What We Don't Yet Know About These Highly Toxic Covid "Vaccines"*](#)

[*Dr. Tom Cowan on the "Spiked Protein Toxin" & "Virus Created in a Lab" Stories*](#)

[*Fake Science Vs Science – Be Cautious*](#)

[*The Contagion Fairy Tale*](#)

Vaccine Damage Has Three Known Causes

[Vaccine Damage Has Three Known Causes](#)

by [Next Level](#) (New Medicine)

translated from German via telegram translate

January 6, 2024

Harmful effects of toxic adjuvants and preservatives in vaccines

Since the poisons in the vaccine mixture are defined as auxiliary substances, as an adjuvant to the protein component of the vaccine, they are considered harmless substances and are not subject to strict pharmaceutical law.

The known and typical effects of these poisons are systematically ignored when assessing vaccine damage because the vaccine is only considered to have an immunological effect. The actual vaccine, the little protein in the vaccination mixtures, actually has no toxic potential.

Allergies to the “protein” components in the vaccination mixtures

All protein components in all vaccines are misinterpreted as parts of pathogens or as weakened viruses. In reality, the proteins in the vaccination mixtures are components of completely normal and harmless bacteria and their “waste products” that occur in every human being.

Also included are components of chicken embryos, human and animal tissues/cells and their cell organelles. Under certain circumstances, allergies to these proteins can be triggered in anyone. Allergies can cause processes called autoimmune reactions.

Brain psychosomatic processes through the personal feelings accompanying the act of vaccination

These processes – originally designed as meaningful biological special programs – are triggered when the act of vaccination is perceived as existentially threatening and overwhelming. The brain-psychosomatic triggers and processes were determined by Dr. Hamer discovered and described.

The allergic and toxic reactions of the vaccine mixtures can chronicle the brain psychosomatic programs, intensify them and make therapy more difficult. Typical examples of these brain psychosomatic programs triggered by vaccinations are autism, depression, mania, epilepsy, convulsions and others.

[Connect with Next Level at telegram \(German\)](#)

Cover image credit: [RichardsDrawings](#)

Blood Types: A Myth Debunked

[Blood Types: A Myth Debunked](#)

From mutants to blood subgroups: How constant reinventions support theories that have long been disproven

[See Part 1 of this series](#)

by [Next Level – Wissen neu gedacht](#)

translation from German via telegram translate

October 15, 2023

Blood Types: A Myth Debunked

It is a common misconception that blood types are genetically determined and unchangeable. In fact, blood types are nothing more than an illusion, influenced by environmental factors, diet and individual life experiences, medications and shocks. The idea of fixed blood types only serves to perpetuate the myths of special “bloodlines” and to boost the blood business.

Virology and Genetics: The Art of Distraction

The introduction of blood groups and the Rhesus factor has contributed more to confusion than enlightenment. Instead of providing clear answers, new subgroups are constantly being introduced to circumvent existing contradictions. This approach is very reminiscent of virology, where new mutations are constantly being postulated to support the basic assumptions. It is obvious that financial interests and not scientific accuracy are the priority here.

Blood Transfusions: A Risky Business

Blood transfusions are often presented as a safe medical practice. But reality looks different. The risks are significant and the mortality rate for patients receiving a transfusion is alarmingly high. The question arises as to whether the quality of the blood reserves is guaranteed at all. Figures suggest the risk of mortality is six times higher in patients who receive a blood transfusion than those who do not.

Interest groups: profit over truth

It is clear that certain interest groups benefit from perpetuating these myths. The virus existence question serves as a catalyst to expose the misinterpretations and unscientific nature of medicine. It is high time we let go of outdated assumptions and accept the real facts.

Genetics and Blood Types: The Fallacious Path of Uncontrolled Interpretation

In genetics we encounter a familiar pattern that is reminiscent of the debate over blood types. Instead of offering clear answers, science tends to arbitrarily interpret and assign genes.

When a genetic theory is questioned, instead of reassessment, even more complex assumptions are added. What was once thought to be a single gene is now presented as a complex combination of multiple genes, splicing and other factors. Such convoluted interpretations often only serve to support old, debunked theories.

To make matters worse, markers in genetics similar to "blood groups" can be defined and even patented without sufficient verification. It is becoming increasingly clear that financial interests overshadow scientific integrity. It is high time that we look critically at these uncontrolled interpretations and turn to sound scientific findings.

Conclusion: The déjà vu of scientific interpretation

Once you understand the mechanism of scientific interpretation, you realize that it is a recurring pattern. This mechanism is based on the practice of supporting unclear or refuted theories with increasingly complex assumptions and interpretations instead of critically reconsidering or correcting them. This often happens without sufficient scientific control and is driven by financial interests. Once this process is recognized, it appears like déjà vu in many areas of science.

The virus existence question serves as an eye-opener and shows how profound and far-reaching such uncontrolled interpretations are anchored in science. It is time we move away from such practices and adopt a truly scientific approach.

[Connect with Next Level at telegram](#)

Cover image credit: [PublicDomainPictures](#)

Contrary to What We've Been Told, Blood Groups Are Not the Immutable Witness to Our Genetic Ancestry and History

[Contrary to What We've Been Told, Blood Groups Are Not](#)

[the Immutable Witness to Our Genetic Ancestry and History](#)

[Bloodline Revealed: Your Family Tree Is More Than Just a Blood Type!](#)

by [Next Level – Wissen neu gedacht](#)

translation from German via telegram translate

October 14, 2023

Do you really believe that a simple blood test can reveal your genetic history and heritage? Let us show you why common ideas about blood groups and bloodlines are far from scientific reality.

Blood: The Liquid Enigma of Our Existence

Have you ever stopped and thought about the mysterious fluid that runs through our veins? Blood, often seen as a reflection of our ancestry and identity, holds secrets far beyond what we have previously been told.

Dozens of blood groups and subgroup systems

Let's start with a startling fact: there is not just the ABO and Rhesus blood group system that we are so familiar with. There are DOZENS of blood group systems! Each system with its own binding reactions.

What does that mean? It shows that the idea of a "specific" blood type that makes us unique is actually much more complex and non-specific than we thought.

Change in blood group

Now for an even more amazing fact: our blood type can change throughout our lives.

Yes, you've read correctly.

What is often viewed as an immutable marker of our identity can actually change. And not only that, scientists can artificially change blood types in laboratories!

But why is this so important? Because it challenges the common idea that our blood is an immutable witness to our genetic ancestry and history.

Lack of ideas: When blood is mixed wildly

If rabbits and monkeys were involved in the discovery of the Rh factor, how reliable is our understanding of blood groups and their meaning?

Theoretical expansion of the system: If we continue to rely on non-specific experiments, such as the monkey-rabbit experiment, we could theoretically "discover" an infinite number of new blood group systems.

Imagine if we injected monkey blood into frogs and then transferred this antiserum to human blood. This could lead to a hypothetical "Rhesus frog system". And if we pursue this approach, we could create a new system with each combination of animals.

This shows how easy it is to develop complex and potentially misleading systems on unsound foundations.

The truth is that blood is constantly moving and changing, just like us. It is a living, breathing system that responds to our environment, our choices and our health. The idea that it divides us into simple categories is an illusion.

Own blood vs. foreign blood: Same challenges when it comes to compatibility

It is a common misconception that using your own blood in transfusions is automatically safer than using donor blood. In fact, both variants have similar challenges in terms of

tolerability.

Need for compatibility testing

The fact is that blood group determination alone is not sufficient to ensure the tolerability of a blood transfusion. There are many subgroups and other factors such as the unscientific Rhesus factor that are taken into account. Therefore, a compatibility test is carried out before each transfusion to ensure that the donor and recipient are compatible.

What are blood groups?

The claim of blood groups is an attempt to explain the phenomenon of “incompatibility” of blood from different people in terms of Mendelian genetics.

Since the energy content of the cell membranes and the proteins dissolved in the body and blood are constantly changing, the blood groups also change. There are currently 29 “officially” approved, diverse blood group systems.

[\[update – October 15, 2023 – see follow up post to this series\]](#)

[Connect with Next Level at telegram](#)

Cover image credit: [OpenClipart-Vectors](#)

The Madness of Genetics: On

“DNA Contamination” & the Bizarre Claim That “Specific” DNA Can Precisely Change Human Genetics and Cause Cancer

[The Madness of Genetics: On “DNA Contamination” & the Bizarre Claim That “Specific” DNA Can Precisely Change Human Genetics and Cause Cancer](#)



Instead of focusing on the DNA-contaminated mRNA vaccines, the central question should be: Has the basic assumption about “pathogenic particles (viruses)” ever been scientifically proven/confirmed? The answer is NO , and therefore every vaccination is inherently illegal and dangerous.



[DNA Contamination: The Amusing Irony and Theoretical Trap](#)

by [Next Level – Wissen Neu Gedacht](#)

translation from German via Telegram translate

October 2, 2023

It is ironic that if the assumptions of genetic theory were

correct, critics would be right. This irony shows that pharmaceuticals are paradoxically finding themselves caught in the crossfire due to theses held by both critics and the mainstream.

What does that mean?

The idea that DNA is the unchanging blueprint of life has been promoted for over 40 years. But in 2006, leading researchers confirmed: This idea was naive. DNA is dynamic and constantly changing.

The human genome

Complete decoding of the human genome (in reality just reading rows of letters that are not understood) is impossible. No two people are “genetically” alike, not even one cell is another. When you consider that the individual genomes of less than 0.0003% of the 8 billion people have been sequenced (and incompletely), one thing becomes clear: assignments of genetic letter orders for cancer, eye color, height, etc. are impossible.

An example: the color of the eyes

It was believed that it was simply genetically determined. This idea turned out to be a forced interpretation of the current data, which was refuted by more recent data. So parents with blue eyes can have a child with brown eyes. This makes it clear that the idea of a fixed genetic section has been scientifically refuted.

Plain language: If every genome is unique, we only know a tiny fraction of all genomes (0.0003%) and they are constantly changing themselves, then the attempt to define fixed gene sections for certain characteristics such as eye color or cancer is worth it, like trying to catch a river with a sieve – it’s not only inaccurate, it’s simply unattainable.

The madness of genetics

When even simple examples such as eye color cannot be assigned, it seems bizarre when parties claim that foreign “specific” DNA can precisely change human genetics and cause cancer. Dr. Kary Mullis summed it up well: With PCR you can find everything in every person if you do it right. This means that every DNA or RNA sequence can be found in every person, whether healthy, sick, vaccinated or unvaccinated.

The strategy of fighting like with like may seem promising at first glance. But on closer inspection it turns out to be a theoretical trap. Instead of focusing on the DNA-contaminated mRNA vaccines, the central question should be: Has the basic assumption about “pathogenic particles (viruses)” ever been scientifically proven/confirmed? The answer is NO , and therefore every vaccination is inherently illegal and dangerous.

The current approach offers the pharmaceutical apparatus a back door: they could argue that there are better, uncontaminated vaccines or present other methods that would then have to be accepted within the long-refuted genetics thesis.

The technical implementation of the laboratory in Magdeburg is vulnerable even within the narrative

The detection is based on non-exact methods such as Qubit Flex Fluorometer and qPCR that have been performed. Neither the plasmids were directly isolated and detected nor were they properly sequenced.

- First, we lack detailed information about the exact conditions and protocols under which these experiments were conducted.
- Secondly, we know nothing about the negative and positive controls carried out.

- Third, no sequencing or isolation of the plasmids was performed. This means that we do not know exactly which DNA sequences were present in the samples. Sequencing would have been necessary to determine the “theoretically” accurate nature of the DNA detected and to ensure that it was in fact plasmid DNA and not other forms of DNA.

[Connect with Next Level at Telegram](#)

Cover image credit: [sujo26](#)

Dangerous Nanoparticles Hidden in Vaccines & Our Environment”: “Nanoparticles Are Extremely Reactive, Can Hardly Be Degraded, and Disrupt and Destroy All Tissues They Come in Contact With.”

[Dangerous Nanoparticles Hidden in Vaccines & Our Environment](#)

“Nanoparticles Are Extremely Reactive, Can Hardly Be Degraded, and Disrupt and Destroy All Tissues They Come in Contact With.”

TCTL editor's note: As a service to our readers, this article, written in German, has been translated to English with the aid of translation software. Please understand that this is not a perfect translation. I do not speak German. However, the key concepts come through very clearly.

The work of Stefan Lanka and 'Next Level – Knowledge Reconsidered' challenges the entire paradigm around western medicine's understand of biology (and the make-believe “science” of virology).

It is vitally important that we come to understand the danger of this long-planned, destructive transformation and total control of humanity and all living beings. We need to awaken to the truth about our own biology and the totality of our multi-dimensional existence. The quality of life for all who inhabit earth depends on sharing real knowledge, questioning the old paradigms built on lies, and the rise of empowered humanity. ~ Kathleen

Nanoparticles: So Small and Yet So Dangerous

by **Next Level – Knowledge Reconsidered**

As has already been learned, the new corona vaccines come with accompanying substances declared as “additives”, the so-called nanoparticles.

Although their high risk potential has already been sufficiently investigated in the past, this is accepted with approval. No consideration is given to the health of the individual, and even possible long-term consequences for those affected are accepted.

By means of continuously running the epidemic mind-frame through clever propaganda, expensive advertising and the generation of social pressure, one pulls out all the stops to get each individual to “roll up their sleeves”.

Yes – to indulge in this vaccine!

One protects even scarcity, in order to awaken needs in the people. And all this despite the fact that it cannot be called effective, let alone safe.

In this article, I share with you various information revolving around the issue of nanoparticles, and can only appeal to your sanity to keep your hands (arm ☐) off this vaccine and let others know this as well.

In a nutshell:

Real biochemistry: nanoparticles are extremely reactive, can hardly be degraded and disrupt and destroy all tissues they come in contact with. The body reacts to this disruption for repair purposes by forming globulins, which are misinterpreted by conventional medicine as antibodies.

Why do those responsible claim that nanoparticles are necessary as an additive?

Of special importance are the RNA vaccines, which are additionally equipped with nanoparticles.

So it says in [Focus-Arztsuche](#):

Nanoparticles as mini-transporters. But making the right RNA molecule does not mean you have a working vaccine.

" It is difficult to get the RNA into the human body cells," says Cichutek.

Gene shuttles with nanoparticles are supposed to solve the problem. Measuring only a few millionths of a centimeter, they carry the packaged strands of genetic material through the cell wall and prevent the vaccine from degrading too quickly in the body.

One of the problems in the preparation and administration of mRNA vaccines is the natural instability of mRNA.

In order to prevent, or at least delay, the degradation of mRNA and to deliver the administered (e.g., injected) mRNA to the site of the claimed effect (i.e., into the cells where the ribosomes then carry out the desired protein synthesis), a variety of highly complex additives are used.

So far, meaningful safety studies are available for very few of these additives (Roier S. 2019. [Trillium Immunology 3/2019](#). Retrieved 03.05.2020), and some of the most commonly used adjuvants are related to nanotechnology (e.g., lipid nanoparticles/LNPs), for which in any case only very limited and contradictory experience in human use is available.

The danger of nanoparticles used in food, vaccines and others

The fact that these nanoparticles are extremely controversial and known to pose a high risk is strangely swept under the rug.

But what shocks me personally the most: How can scientists, whose job it is to check how dangerous the use of these nanoparticles and other toxins is in a person's organism, completely play this down and even endorse it, as if we were dealing with the most normal thing in the world?

-In [Der Spiegel](#) it says:

Federal Environment Agency warns against nanotechnology, quote:

"In animal experiments, the particles have migrated right into the nucleus of body cells and damaged the genetic information there,"

or

"Their tininess, however, also poses the risk that they are much more likely to overcome natural barriers in the body – such as the blood-brain barrier."

-The [mdr – Nanoparticles can cause cancer](#) reported:

"It has already been established that when nanoparticles are inhaled, they cause inflammatory reactions in the lungs."

[Rolf Buschmann, Technical Environmental Protection Officer, BUND]

[...]

"You always have to ask yourself the question: what happens to it in the organism then? That's why we are particularly skeptical."

[Rolf Buschmann, Technical Environmental Protection Officer, BUND]

-In a study published in the International Council on Nanotechnology (ICON).

["Exposure to nanoparticles is related to pleural effusion, pulmonary fibrosis and granuloma"](#) states:

"Using transmission electron microscopy, nanoparticles were observed to settle in the cytoplasm and karyoplasm of lung epithelial and mesothelial cells, but were also found in the mammary fluid. These cases raise concerns that long-term exposure to some nanoparticles can cause severe damage

to human lungs without protective measures. Pulmonary fibrosis and foreign body granulomas of the pleura.”

The [Federal Ministry of Education and Research – BMBF](#) knows about their dangerousness and writes itself:

“Can these substances also make us sick?

“There is increasing evidence that nanoparticles in polluted air can have a negative effect on our brains.

“Observational studies have shown, for example, that people who live near busy roads and breathe this air permanently have an increased risk of Alzheimer’s disease. Toxicological studies must now prove whether there is a direct causal relationship.

“We are currently investigating this at our institute. But we are also wondering whether nanoparticles in products can have harmful effects on our brains.”

[...]

“We have studied several nanomaterials. We were able to detect conspicuous features in nanosilver. This substance is used for detergents or toothbrushes, for example, because it kills bacteria.”

[...]

“Of course, we can’t yet say whether this can lead to illness.”

[...]

“Too little is known yet about whether nanoparticles are toxic to nerve cells and tissue. We would like to help close this knowledge gap.”

[...]

“Toxicological tests unfortunately cannot always provide one hundred percent certainty. We are dealing here with complex mechanisms of action, some of which have not yet been elucidated. So it can’t be ruled out that a new substance comes onto the market that only afterwards proves to be harmful to health.”

This article from the Federal Ministry of Education and Research is dated 04/06/2019.

The Federal Government has knowledge of all this and yet – without regard for just one single life – has approved the new mRNA vaccine and is vaccinating people with it at this very moment and intends to use it on our youngest children as well.

Please forgive me, but the deliberate ignoring of such clear facts, which are known to all involved, can only be glossed over with a heavy heart as an oversight on the part of those responsible.

In this context, I would like to refer to the vaccine Pandemrix, which was used in the so-called “swine flu” pandemic and [caused considerable side effects](#). [[Cf. WDR](#)]

Dr. Stefan Lanka (molecular biologist, virologist and winner of the measles trial [[See our video](#)]), had already warned in 2009, before the use of the then vaccine Pandemrix, shortly before its market launch:

“The strong destructive power of cells by nanoparticles, such as the so-called “auxiliary substance” (adjuvant) MF59 in the flu vaccine for the elderly, is based on the known fact that transport between cells in organs and tissues occurs with particles of this size and the cell cannot distinguish between ‘foreign’ and ‘own’.

“The penetration of the nanoparticles into the cell envelopes damages them and destroys the cells.

“Due to the fact that these nanoparticles are also very stable in the body, it is known that, for a longer time, cells in the body are destroyed. And this reacts with the formation of globulins as a sealing substance of the cells. And this increase of the globulin concentration is claimed by vaccine [manufacturers], against better knowledge, as antibodies and as protection against freely invented pathogens.

“When globulins are present in greater concentration, their binding to all kinds of proteins is detectable.”

The Paul Ehrlich Institute suppressed as long as possible the devastating and inconceivable fact that nanoparticles were already present in other vaccines. Only after diverse pressure was exerted, the PEI had to admit this fact.

[The Paul Ehrlich Institute indirectly admits that this is the case](#), stating there:

“Even if some of these components are located in a size range that is in the nanometer range, they are not technologically targeted nanoparticles, especially not nanoparticles made of metals or plastics.”

Regulatory agencies, including the German Paul Ehrlich Institute (PEI), completely ignore this issue.

[Measles vaccine genetically contaminated: PEI refuses to investigate](#)

Note: Amazing that they first denied that nanoparticles were present at all and then, caught, manipulatively tried to wriggle out of it by pretending that they were “not purposefully” manufactured.

Let me tell you something: The task of the Paul Ehrlich Institute is to check from the outset whether harmful substances are present in a vaccination and not to determine only after the child has fallen into the well!

How can we continue to believe such institutions when it comes to our precious health? It is best to leave it alone. I don't even want to mention the other outrages of the PEI, such as the concealment of the many [dead vaccinated babies by the vaccine](#) Hexavac (How safe are vaccines really? – Dr. med [medical doctor] Klaus Hartmann) ...

The BioNTech mRNA vaccine is a danger for mankind, for whose side effects including death. [Uğur Şahin](#) is personally responsible.

From the point of view of orthodox medicine, the vaccination should not be used.

- Because RNA is transformed into DNA by several mechanisms and damages chromosomes.
- Because it will hit the body's own enzymes, which are misinterpreted as components of the virus.

Strictly speaking, the BioNTech RNA vaccine is even more dangerous than nanoparticles themselves, because the RNA to be vaccinated is encased in lipid nanoparticles, and here we find a double-reactive mixture that will accumulate mainly in the brain and cause much more narcolepsy than was the case with the swine flu vaccine.

2. QUALITATIVE UND QUANTITATIVE ZUSAMMENSETZUNG

Dies ist eine Mehrdosendurchstechflasche, deren Inhalt vor der Verwendung verdünnt werden muss.

Eine Durchstechflasche (0,45 ml) enthält nach dem Verdünnen 6 Dosen von je 0,3 ml, siehe Abschnitte 4.2 und 6.6.

1 Dosis (0,3 ml) enthält 30 Mikrogramm COVID-19-mRNA-Impfstoff (**eingebettet in Lipid-Nanopartikel**).

Einzelsträngige, 5'-gekapselte Boten-RNA (mRNA), die unter Verwendung einer zellfreien *in-vitro*-Transkription aus den entsprechenden DNA-Vorlagen hergestellt wird und das virale Spike (S)-Protein von SARS-CoV-2 kodiert.

Vollständige Auflistung der sonstigen Bestandteile, siehe Abschnitt 6.1.

The vaccine from Mainz (mRNA) contains fats in their non-dissolvable and constantly-very-reactive nano-particle form, including the known allergen, the solvent PEG (polyethanol glycol).

In addition, the vaccine will cause chromosome strand breaks in an unknown number of people, resulting in energy depletion, infertility and disability of offspring if the chromosome breaks also happen in the “germ line” of males and females.

This is the shortest possible description of the vaccine damage for which Uğur Şahin is personally responsible. For sure, there will be an observable number of deaths, which will then be said to have happened as a result of the virus.

With the engrained belief in an evil biology (orthodox medicine), coupled with the collective compulsion for return on investment, one might almost assume that medical professionals actually believe that vaccination could help.

Most practicing physicians have never studied this information and trust the responsible scientists themselves and [do so] completely blindly.

So our task should not be to demonize those responsible, but to point out to them their error.

One of the simplest ways is to look to see if any studies at all have been done on the so-called pharmacokinetic properties.

“Pharmacokinetics describes the totality of processes that a drug undergoes in the body. This includes the drug’s uptake (absorption), distribution in the body (distribution), biochemical conversion and degradation (metabolization), and excretion (excretion).”

In short, what happens to all toxins (disguised as additives) within the organism?

Dieses Arzneimittel wurde unter „Besonderen Bedingungen“ zugelassen. Das bedeutet, dass weitere Nachweise für den Nutzen des Arzneimittels erwartet werden.

Die Europäische Arzneimittel-Agentur wird neue Informationen zu diesem Arzneimittel mindestens jährlich bewerten und, falls erforderlich, wird die Zusammenfassung der Merkmale des Arzneimittels aktualisiert werden.

5.2 Pharmakokinetische Eigenschaften

Nicht zutreffend.

5.3 Präklinische Daten zur Sicherheit

Nichtklinische Daten zeigten auf der Grundlage konventioneller Studien zur Toxizität bei wiederholter Verabreichung sowie zur Reproduktions- und Entwicklungstoxizität keine besondere Gefahr für den Menschen.

Auszug aus dem BioNTech-Impfstoff https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/comirnaty-epar-product-information_de.pdf

We see that a simple “not applicable” was noted in the SUMMARY OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MEDICINE.

These studies are omitted for just about all vaccines. A statement about whether this vaccine potentially harms the body and how the mixture of the injected material behaves in the body is simply left to fate by those responsible!

If this information does not take your breath away, then I suspect you are not taking it very seriously in other respects either :).

New studies confirm: Various vaccines are contaminated by micro- and nanoscale particles and described as non-biodegradable and non-biocompatible.

Volume 4 Issue 1 - 2017

Antonietta M Gatti^{1,2*} and Stefano Montanari³

¹National Council of Research of Italy, Institute for the Science and Technology of Ceramics, Italy

²International Clean Water Institute, USA

³Nanodiagnosics srl, Italy

***Corresponding author:** Dr. Antonietta Gatti, National Council of Research of Italy, c/o Nanodiagnosics
Via E. Fermi, 1/L, 41057 San Vito (MO), Italy, Tel:
059798778; Email: gatti@nanodiagnosics.it

Received: November 30, 2016 | **Published:** January 23, 2017

Unknown to most people is the fact that today's vaccines are already contaminated with nanoparticles, as random tests have shown:

[New Quality-Control Investigations on Vaccines: Micro- and Nanocontamination.](#) [This article was published in English. Download the PDF [here.](#)]

Among other things, it states:

"The quantity of foreign bodies detected and, in some cases, their unusual chemical compositions baffled us. The inorganic particles identified are neither biocompatible nor biodegradable, that means that they are biopersistent and can induce effects that can become evident either immediately close to injection time or after a certain time from administration. It is important to remember that particles (crystals and not molecules) are bodies foreign

to the organism and they behave as such. More in particular, their toxicity is in some respects different from that of the chemical elements composing them, adding to that toxicity which, in any case, is still there, that typical of foreign bodies. For that reason, they induce an inflammatory reaction.”

[...]

“After injection, these microparticles, nanoparticles, and aggregates can remain at the injection site and form swellings and granulomas ... However, they can also be transported through the bloodstream, eluding any attempt to guess their final destination ... As with all foreign bodies, especially those so small, they trigger an inflammatory response that is chronic because most of these particles cannot be broken down. In addition, the protein corona effect can ... due to a nano-bio interaction ... generate organic/inorganic composite particles that can stimulate the immune system in undesirable ways...It is impossible not to add that particles of the size commonly observed in vaccines can enter cell nuclei and interact with DNA ...”

“After being injected, those microparticles, nanoparticles and aggregates can stay around the injection site forming swellings and granulomas.¹⁷ But they can also be carried by the blood circulation, escaping any attempt to guess what will be their final destination...

“As happens with all foreign bodies, particularly that small, they induce an inflammatory reaction that is chronic because most of those particles cannot be degraded. Furthermore, the protein-corona effect (due to a nanobio-interaction can produce organic/inorganic composite particles capable of stimulating the immune system in an undesirable ways. It is impossible not to add that particles, **the size often observed in vaccines, can enter cell nuclei and interact with the DNA.**”

Several important questions arise from the results of this 2017 study that demand answers:

- Are some of these nanoparticles intentionally introduced into vaccines?
- Does the standard manufacturing process for conventional vaccines UNFORTUNATELY lead to dangerous and destructive nano-contamination?
- New nanotechnology is already being used to manufacture several vaccines – ostensibly to “improve efficacy.” In fact, the upcoming COVID-19 vaccine may be a nano-vaccine. Does this manufacturing process bring with it the inevitable effect of a hurricane of nanoparticle contamination?
- How many cases of brain damage and autism in children can open the door to [seeing] nanoparticle contamination?
- Finally, where are these contaminated vaccines being manufactured?

The above study did not attempt to find out. It was outside the scope of the research. It is common knowledge that, for example, in the case of the U.S., vaccines or their ingredients are not domestically produced in many cases. Where does this lead to control safety? For example, in China, where there have been numerous pharmaceutical scandals related to product contamination?

- The vaccine company is not showing the slightest interest in answering any of these questions. They are busy pretending that the questions do not exist.
- It would be suicidal to trust the establishment.

Even more explosive in connection with RNA and nano-vaccines is the reference to the Gene Drive Files, which the Heinrich Böll Foundation uncovered a few years ago. These show that the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation commissioned a PR firm to secretly undermine an important UN process on [the subject of](#)

[synthetic biology](#).

Although all this is well known, Christian Drosten (Berlin Charité) comes up with the following words: "[Gene-based vaccines have potential](#)".

The only conclusion can be: Prof. Drosten does not know what he is talking about!

The Medical Research Center for Prophylaxis and Health Protection in Industrial Workers confirms "nanotoxicity" on human health

Combined subchronic toxicity of aluminum (III), titanium (IV), and silicon (IV) oxide nanoparticles and their alleviation with a complex of bioprotectors

Summary

"The use of nanoparticles-including metallic nanoparticles-has exploded in industry, commerce, and medicine in recent decades. A Russian research team studied the 'nanotoxicity' of three types of metal nanoparticles (titanium, silicon, and aluminum oxide) alone and in combination. Repeated injections in rats showed that all three were "toxic to multiple target organs."

"For the majority of these effects," however, the alumina nanoparticles were found to be "most harmful," even though the aluminum dose was only half that of titanium and silicon. No other publications have reported on the combined toxicity of these metal nanoparticles, despite their 'potentially hazardous nano-effects on human health'."

Source: [IA Minigalieva, BA Katsnelson, LI Privalova et al. International Journal of Molecular Sciences , March 2018; 19 \(3\): 837.](#)

The HELMHOLTZ Center for Infection Research has been exploring

other avenues for years: [Vaccination without a syringe](#) via nanoparticles through creams to be applied to the skin or application via nasal spray.

Quote:

“The nanoparticles penetrate the skin through the hair follicles and trigger an immune response in the body,” says Hanzey Yasar of HIPS. “Such a vaccine would be very easy to administer and would certainly be well received by the population.”

Veteran physician [Dr. Larry Palevsky confirmed to Connecticut’s Public Health Committee on Feb. 19, 2020](#), that the aluminum nanoparticles in vaccines cause massive damage.

In it, he describes not only how the safety claims of pharmaceutical manufacturers are made without any scientific study, but also how they can be completely refuted based on scientific evidence.

It is known from medicine that a high concentration of nanoparticles leads to fibrotic changes in lung tissue.

There is also evidence that these particles are associated with respiratory diseases as well as an increase in inflammatory markers and an increased tendency to blood clotting disorders, which can increase the incidence of cardiac arrhythmias, heart attacks and strokes.

Nanoparticles cross the blood-brain barrier and it is unexplored what may be triggered by this.

With the background knowledge that all vaccines are based on a false foundation and do little harm at best – adding to the fact that the dangers of the nanoparticles used are known to the entire science bench as well as to critical colleagues – these dangers must be addressed and cannot continue to be ignored, or suppressed.

Act. If not for yourself, then for the children!

The entire NEXT LEVEL – Knowledge Reconsidered team will support you and answer your questions.

NEXT LEVEL – Knowledge Reconsidered is present on various social media platforms, including. [Telegram](#), [Youtube](#), [Odysee](#), [Twitter](#) and [Facebook](#).

[Connect with Next Level \(German language\)](#)

Cover image credit: [waldryano](#)