

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 sequencing 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 sequency 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.”**

[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](#)