

Article in DIAMOND - MAGAZINE The magazine for freedom and for a self-determined life, published on 4 July 2020

Leading Corona researchers admit that they have no scientific proof of the existence of a virus

[Original article in German here <http://diamanten-magazin.com/wordpress/2020/07/04/fuehrende-corona-forscher-geben-zu-dass-sie-keinen-wissenschaftlichen-beweis-fuer-die-existenz-eines-virus-haben/>]



My first words of the article are: *"Fasten your seat belt, the shock will be intense"*.

What you will experience in this article will blow your horizon. The latest information has the explosive power to expose the greatest fraud against humanity. According to this information every citizen should support the people who fought for this important information. It is finally out, **all the leading scientists on COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) have admitted that the scientific rules to prove COVID-19 have not been produced.**

But one by one. I will explain to you what this means. I ask you to read this article to the end. Spread this article. The

Plandemie [<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zv9J0fKlhA0&feature=youtu.be>] |(Telegram Post [<https://t.me/s/ExpressZeitung/4996>]) would have to be ended by these statements with immediate effect, even more, with this the complete virology must be questioned!

The detection method of PCR tests is completely meaningless

I have already covered the topic of PCR testing in two of my articles [The PCR test is not validated <https://telegra.ph/Der-PCR-Test-ist-nicht-validiert-06-25>] [PCR: A DNA test is treated as a manipulation instrument <https://telegra.ph/PCR-Ein-DNA-Test-wird-zum-Manipulationsinstrument-06-28>]. There I prove beyond doubt that the PCR test, which is considered the "gold standard" for COVID tests, is completely "meaningless".

Now the question is: What is required first for the isolation / detection of viruses? We need to know where the RNA comes from for which the PCR tests are calibrated.

From textbooks (e.g., White/Fenner. Medical Virology, 1986, p. 9), as well as from leading virus researchers such as Luc Montagnier or Dominic Dwyer [<https://www.torstenengelbrecht.com/en/home/>], it is clear that particle cleaning - i.e., the separation of an object from everything that is not that object, such as the Nobel Prize winner Marie Curie in 1898 purified 100 mg of radium chloride by extraction from tons of pitchblende - is an essential prerequisite for proving the existence of a virus and thus proving that the RNA of the particle in question originates from a new virus.

The reason for this is that PCR is extremely sensitive, i.e. it can detect even the smallest pieces of DNA or RNA - but it cannot determine where these particles originate. This must be determined beforehand.

And because the PCR tests are calibrated for gene sequences (in this case RNA sequences, because SARS-CoV-2 is probably an RNA virus), we need to know that these gene snippets are part of the virus we are looking for. And in order to know this, a correct isolation and purification of the suspected virus must be carried out.

Koch's postulates are the decisive criteria for the scientific detection of a virus

Before the invention of the electron microscope in the 1930s, it was not possible to see such small particles. With the electron microscope, the new generation of virologists began to examine unclean materials and claimed they could detect the viruses. The problem is that just by looking at a particle one cannot tell what it is or what it does without fulfilling Koch's postulates.

Koch's postulates were established by the great German bacteriologist Robert Koch in the 19th century.

Definition:

Four requirements set forth by Robert Koch that must be met for a

micro-organism may be called the causative agent of a specific disease.

Koch's postulate

- The micro-organism must be detectable in all cases of disease with the same symptoms, but not in healthy individuals.

Koch's postulate

- The microorganism can be transferred from the diseased individual to a pure culture (isolation)

Koch's postulate

- A previously healthy individual, after infection with the micro-organism from the pure culture, shows the same symptoms as the one from which the micro-organism originally originated.

Koch's postulate

- The microorganism can be transferred from the infected and diseased individuals back into a pure culture.

The leading scientists admit that none of you has isolated a virus!

Torsten Engelbrecht (award-winning journalist) and **Konstantin Demeter** (independent researcher) have asked the scientific teams of the relevant papers referred to in connection with SARS-CoV-2 to prove **whether the electron microscope images shown in their in vitro experiments show purified viruses.**

But not a single team was able to answer this question with "yes" - and nobody said that purification was not a necessary step. We only

received answers such as *"No, we did not receive an electron microscope image showing the degree of purification"* (see below).

We asked several study authors, "Do your electron microscopic images show the purified virus (an insulation)?", **and they gave the following answers:**

Study 1: Leo L. M. Poon; Malik Peiris. "Emergence of a novel human coronavirus threatening human health" *Nature Medicine*, March 2020 [[Nature](#)]

Responding author: Malik Peiris

Date: May 12, 2020

Answer: *"The image is the virus budding from an infected cell. It is not purified virus."*

Study 2: Myung-Guk Han et al. "Identification of Coronavirus Isolated from a Patient in Korea with COVID-19", *Osong Public Health and Research Perspectives*, February 2020 [[Pubmed ncbi](#)]

Answering author: Myung-Guk Han

Date: May 6, 2020

Answer: *"We could not estimate the degree of purification because we do not purify and concentrate the virus cultured in cells."*

Study 3: Wan Beom Park et al. "Virus Isolation from the First Patient with SARS-CoV-2 in Korea", *Journal of Korean Medical Science*, February 24, 2020 [[Pubmed ncbi](#)]

Responding author: Wan Beom Park

Date: March 19, 2020

"We did not obtain an electron micrograph showing the degree of purification."

Translation: *"We did not obtain an electron micrograph showing the degree of purification."*

Study 4: Na Zhu et al, "A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China," 2019, *New England Journal of Medicine*, February 20, 2020. [<https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/nejmoa2001017>]

Responding author: Wenjie Tan

Date: March 18, 2020

Answer: *"[We show] an image of sedimented virus particles, not purified ones."*

Note: This publication would not have been necessary, the authors openly admit "our study does not fulfill Koch's postulates".

Translation: *"our study does not fulfill the postulates of Koch"*

Source: [COVID19 PCR Tests are Scientifically Meaningless](#)

With regard to the work mentioned above, it is clear that what is shown in the electron microscope images (EMs) is the final result of the experiment, **i.e. there is no other result from which they could have produced EMs.**

In other words, if the authors of these studies admit that their published EMs **show no purified particles**, then they definitely do not have any purified particles that are claimed to be viral. (In this context, it should be noted that some researchers **use the term "isolation"** in their work, but the procedures described therein do not constitute a proper isolation (purification) process. Consequently, the term "isolation" is misused in this context).

For example, the authors of four of the most important papers published in early 2020 claiming the discovery of a new coronavirus **admit that they had no proof that the origin of the virus genome was virus-like particles or cell debris, pure or impure, or particles of any kind.** In other words, the existence of SARS CoV-2 RNA is **based on faith**, not on facts.

Torsten Engelbrecht (award-winning journalist) and **Konstantin Demeter** (independent researcher) have contacted Dr. Charles Calisher, who is an experienced virologist. In 2001, Science published a "passionate plea... to the younger generation" by several veteran virologists, including Dr. Charles Calisher

[Modern virus detection methods such as] the smooth polymerase chain reaction [...] say little or nothing about how a virus multiplies, which animals carry it, [or] how it makes people sick. It is like trying to tell if someone has bad breath by looking at their fingerprint" [1].

And that's why the two asked Dr. Calisher if he knew of a single paper in which SARS-CoV-2 was isolated and then actually cleaned. His answer:

"I know of no such a publication. I have kept an eye out for one." [2]

What does that mean?

In short: **NO ONLY KOCH'S POSTULATE WAS INCLUDED!**

To put it longer:

This actually means that it is not possible to conclude that the RNA gene sequences that the scientists took from the tissue samples prepared in the above-mentioned in vitro experiments, and for those who are finally "calibrated" for PCR tests, belong to a specific virus - in this case SARS-CoV-2.

Furthermore, there is no scientific evidence that these RNA sequences are the pathogens of the so-called COVID-19.

In order to establish a causal link in one way or another, i.e. beyond virus isolation and purification, it would have been absolutely necessary to carry out an experiment that fulfilled the four Koch postulates. But such an experiment does not exist, as **Amory Devereux and Rosemary Frei recently demonstrated for OffGuardian.**

The need to fulfil these postulates regarding SARS-CoV-2 is demonstrated not least by the fact that attempts have been made to fulfil them. But even researchers who claimed to have done so **were in fact unsuccessful.**

Sources:

[1] Martin Enserink. Virology. Old guard urges virologists to go back to basics, Science, July 6, 2001, p. 24

Addition: [Science](#)

[2] E-mail from Charles Calisher from May 10, 2020

These can be requested from Torsten Engelbrecht and Konstantin Demeter.

3] Main source: [COVID19 PCR Tests are Scientifically Meaningless](#)

[The publication in Nature](#) "The pathogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 in hACE2 transgenic mice" also does not fulfill any of Koch's postulates

One example of this is a study published in Nature on 7 May. This study, along with other procedures that invalidate the study, did not meet any of the postulates.

For example, the allegedly "infected" laboratory mice **did not show any relevant clinical symptoms that could clearly be attributed to pneumonia**, which, according to the third postulate, should actually occur if a dangerous and potentially deadly virus was actually at work there. And the light bristles and weight loss that were temporarily observed in the animals are negligible, not only because they could have been caused by the procedure itself, but also because the weight returned to normal.

Nor did any animal die except those that they killed to perform the autopsies. And let us not forget that these experiments should have been carried out before a test was developed, which is not the case.

None of the leading German representatives of the official theory on SARS-Cov-2/COVID-19 could answer the question of how they can be sure, without having a purified virus, that the RNA gene sequences of these particles belong to a certain new virus?

Torsten Engelbrecht (award-winning journalist) and Konstantin Demeter

(independent researcher) **have interviewed the leading German representative** of the official theory on SARS-Cov-2/COVID-19 - the **Robert Koch Institute (RKI), Alexander S. Kekulé (University of Halle)**, Hartmut Hengel and Ralf Bartenschlager (German Society for Virology), the aforementioned **Thomas Löscher, Ulrich Dirnagl (Charité Berlin) or Georg Bornkamm (virologist and professor emeritus at Helmholtz Zentrum München)** asked the following question:

"If the particles that are supposed to be SARS-CoV-2 have not been purified, how can you be sure that the RNA gene sequences of these particles belong to a specific new virus?"

*Especially if there are studies that show that substances such as antibiotics, which are added to the test tubes during in vitro experiments for virus detection, can "stress" the cell culture in such a way that new gene sequences are formed **that were previously undetectable** - an aspect that Nobel Prize winner Barbara McClintock pointed out **as early as 1983 in her Nobel Lecture**".*

It should not go unmentioned that we were finally able to get the Charité - the employer of Christian Drosten, Germany's most influential virologist with regard to COVID-19, advisor to the German government and co-developer of the PCR test, which was the first to be "accepted" (**not validated!**) by the WHO worldwide - to answer questions on this topic.

But we did not receive answers until **18 June 2020**, after months of non-response. In the end, we only managed it **with the help of Berlin lawyer Viviane Fischer**.

To our question: *"Did the Charité make sure that an appropriate particle cleaning was carried out"*, the Charité admits that **it did not use cleaned particles**.

And although they claim that *"the virologists at the Charité are sure that they are testing for the virus"*, they state in their work (**Corman et al.**) *"RNA was extracted from clinical samples with the MagNA Pure 96 system (Roche, Penzberg, Germany) and from cell culture supernatants with the viral RNA mini kit (QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany)"*

This means that they simply assumed that the RNA was viral.

By the way, the paper published on 23rd January 2020 by **Corman et al.** **did not even undergo a proper peer review process**, and the procedures described in it were not accompanied by controls - although scientific work only becomes really sound through these two things.

But it is much worse, the test of the Charité was prepared before the first publication of the Chinese. So there was no clinical data available to develop a test at all. Drosten even admits it!

Please read my previously summarized chronological publication "[The Science Scam by Prof. Christian Drosten](#)" or the complete article in the [Wissenschaftsplus Magazine by Dr. Stefan Lanka](#). Please also read a newsflash in Dr. Stefan Lanka's [newsletter](#) of June 13th, where you will learn that **Dr. Stefan Lanka has reported Prof. Drosten for crimes against humanity!**

Dr. Stefan Lanka has shown in an unbelievably good analysis that Covid-19 has not been proven at any time.

[Excerpt from the Wissenschaftsplus magazine 1st issue 2020:](#)

Now follows an excerpt from the magazine, which Dr. Stefan Lanka (molecular biologist and virologist) wrote in connection with the false assumption about SARS-CoV-2. It is worthwhile to purchase its complete issue!

"From the components of the dead tissues and cells, individual components are removed, misinterpreted as components of a virus and mentally combined to form a virus model. A real and complete virus does not appear in the entire "scientific" literature. The consensus-building process, in which the participants argued about what belongs to the virus and what does not, lasted for decades in the case of the measles virus. In the case of the allegedly new China Coronavirus-2019 (2019-nCoV, now renamed), this consensus-building process took only a few mouse clicks: With a few mouse clicks, a program that was constructed from the molecular sequence of short pieces of the nucleic acids of the dead tissues and cells, whose composition was determined biochemically, was used to construct the much longer, now allegedly complete and supposed genetic material of a certain old or even a new virus, depending on the specifications. In reality, not even these manipulations, called "alignment" (an alignment procedure), result in the desired genetic material,

a "complete" genetic material of a virus, called its genome. During the process of the mental construction of the "viral genome strand", unsuitable sequences are "smoothed" and missing sequences are added. In this way, a "hereditary substance sequence" is invented which does not exist, which has never been discovered and proven as a whole. In summary: From short pieces, mentally and aligned with a model of a

viral genome strand, a larger piece is mentally constructed, which does not exist in reality. For example, the only "mental" construction of the measles virus genome strand lacks

in the case of the short fragments of the cell's own molecules that are actually present, far more than half of the molecular sequences that are supposed to constitute a whole virus. Some of these are artificially biochemically created and the rest are simply fictitious."

Anyone who is fluent in English can directly recognise the fact that the construction of the "virus genome" (Complete genome) is only a mental construction in this publication, in which the RKI was significantly involved: "Complete Genome Sequence of a Wild-Type Measles Virus Isolated during the Spring 2013 Epidemic in Germany", to be found at [RKI](#)

Prof. Mankertz, co-author of this publication and director of the National Reference Institute for Measles, Mumps and Rubella at the Robert Koch Institute

(RKI), has claimed, in response to inquiries, that control experiments were carried out for this study, which exclude the possibility that typical cell components are misinterpreted as virus components. However, it refused to release the documentation of these control experiments. In her complaint, Prof. Mankertz replied that she had no control experiments after all and that her Munich colleagues had certainly carried out and documented these control experiments. Dr. Stefan Lanka wrote to all authors and their laboratory managers and asked about the control experiments, which have been mandatory since 1998. None of the authors wrote to him has replied. Also the rectors of the addressed institutes did not answer and so the complaint procedure went to nothing

Dr. Stefan Lanka analyzed the first two authoritative publications of the CCDC on Covid-19

In the first authoritative publication of the authors of CCDC ([A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019](#)) on the results of their research, "A New Coronavirus con Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019", no accumulation of cases of atypical pneumonia ("*patient with pneumonia of unknown cause*") is reported. They report that the patients found can be grouped into a "*cluster*", a

group with common characteristics. The common characteristic was the more or less frequent visit of a seafood wholesale market in Wuhan. How small the group of patients with atypical pneumonia actually was can be seen from the fact that the CCDC of only four patients took smears and fluids of the lower respiratory tract in order to search for known and unknown pathogens.

In this study, which is regarded as authoritative, **the discussion states:**

"our study does not fulfill Koch's postulates"

This clearly proves that this study can never be a proof for a novel virus!

Source: [Dr. Stefan Lanka - Wissenschaftplus-fehldeutung-virus-teil-2](#)

The five people documented in the two publications relevant to the corona crisis [1] [2] were not investigated for the possible presence or history, signs, mechanisms and effects of these known causes of atypical pneumonia. Virologists usually do not do this anyway, and the members of the CCDC were not able to do so even under the given circumstances of panic. Excluding the mention of atypical pneumonia proves a serious medical malpractice and prevents correct treatment of patients. Those affected therefore run the risk of being mishandled with a cocktail of antibiotic substances rich in side-effects, which is capable of independently causing the death of patients, especially in the case of overdose. [This is what happened and documented in the Lancet.](#) The virologists of the CCDC state in both publications that there is still no evidence that these sequence suggestions can actually cause diseases. On 10.01 and 12.01.2020, the Chinese sequence proposals were still provisional and had not yet been subjected to the strict process of scientifically prescribed review.

1] [A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019](#)

2] [A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China](#)

Further source: [Dr. Stefan Lanka - Wissenschaftplus-fehldeutung-virus-teil-2](#)

Other authors were honest enough to admit that they did not follow Koch's postulates

In the publication of 24.01.2020 [Huang C et al Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. Lancet.](#) the authors openly admit

"we did not perform tests for detecting infectious virus in blood"

(Again, this by no means fulfils Koch's postulates)

For a comprehensive analysis of the publications and further studies on Covid-19 I strongly recommend the gigantic summary of [David Crowe - Flaws in Coronavirus Pandemic Theory.](#)

This work is constantly updated with the latest findings. It offers one of the most comprehensive analyses available.

[Matthew B. Frieman, Phd](#) Associate Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, and Virologist at the School of Medicine at the University of Maryland, was skeptical! he said, "I am stunned by the timeline and speed of this isolation and characterization, if it's all true," and he said, "[I am stunned by the timeline and speed of this isolation and characterization, if it's all true,](#)".

Translated "I am amazed at the timing and pace of this isolation and characterization, if all this is true"

[Dr. Andrew Kaufman](#) also analyzed the studies on SARS

Andrew Kaufman MD references:

-Bachelors of Science in Biology MIT

-Doctor of Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina

-Psychiatric Residence, Duke University

-former medical lecturer in Hematology and Oncology, Medical University of South Carolina

-former Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, SUNY Upstate Medical University

-Licensed and certified by the board in psychiatry and forensic psychiatry

Kaufman not only dealt with the publications of the new coronavirus

SARS-CoV-2, but also with its predecessor from 2003 (SARS-CoV-1).

He recognized that not only is SARS-CoV-2 not scientifically proven, but he noted that the same mistakes were also made with the alleged SARS-CoV-1 virus. Just to be clear:

For all publications:

-> Koch's postulates were not followed!

-> The postulates according to River were not kept (modified postulates)

Ergo: not a single scientific proof of a pathogenic virus.

If you prefer to watch a video to get all the details (I will only list some information in writing) you should do so in one of the following two videos.

The video by Andrew Kaufmann ([German](#)) | (English[it has been removed]) Backups are available.

SARS 2003

In the publication in [NATURE - Koch's postulates fulfilled for SARS virus](#) the headline suggests, as so often, that Koch's postulates have been fulfilled.

There 5 relevant studies are given.

However, under **MAIN** it says *"According to Koch's postulates, as modified by Rivers for viral diseases, six criteria are required to establish a virus as the cause of a disease"*.

So here it becomes clear that these are not Koch's postulates, but modified postulates.

In the video by Dr. Andrew Kaufmann the Koch's postulates are compared with those of RIVER, so you can understand the differences.

River's postulates do not consist of 4 (Koch's postulates), but of 6.

Koch vs Rivers

Koch (1884)

1. The microorganism found in the ill but not the healthy
2. The microorganism must be isolated from a diseased organism and grown in pure culture.
3. Produce same disease in host
4. Re-isolation of microorganism

Rivers (1937)

1. Isolation of virus from diseased host
2. Cultivation of virus in host cells
3. Proof of filterability
4. Produce same disease in host
5. Re-isolation of virus
6. Detection of a specific immune response to virus

Rivers, T. M. J. *Bacteriol.* 33, 1–12 (1937).

- Genetic material (DNA, RNA) is not mentioned in any criterion

English

-...now it is possible to bring excellent evidence that an organism is the cause of a malady without the complete satisfaction of the [Koch's] postulates. (page 3)

-...especially those [diseases] caused by viruses, the blind adherence to Koch's postulates may act as a hindrance instead of an aid. (page 4)

-It is obvious that Koch's postulates have not been satisfied in viral diseases. (page 6)

-In the first place, it is not obligatory to demonstrate the presence of a virus in every case of the disease produced by it. (page 6)

-...Viruses, regardless of whether they are parasites or the fabrications of autocatalytic processes, are intimately associated with host cells (page 6)

-... "by means of inoculation of material... obtained from patients with the natural disease" (page 11)

-If the inoculated animals become sick or die in a characteristic manner, and, if the disease in them can be transmitted from animal to animal by means of inoculations with blood or emulsions of **involved tissues** free from ordinary microbes or rickettsiae, one is **fairly confident** that the malady in the experimental animals is induced by a virus (page 7)

German

-...Now it is possible to produce excellent evidence that an organism is the cause of a disease without completely fulfilling the postulates [Kochs]. (page 3)

-...Especially in the case of [diseases] caused by viruses, blind adherence to Koch's postulates can be more of a hindrance than a help. (page 4)

-It is obvious that Koch's postulates were not fulfilled in the case of the viral diseases. (Page 6)

-...Firstly, it is not compulsory to prove the presence of a virus in every case of the disease it causes. (page 6)

-...viruses, whether they are parasites or autocatalytic processes, are closely linked to the host cells. (page 6)

-...viruses, whether they are parasites or autocatalytic processes, are closely linked to the host cells. (page 6)

-... by inoculating material derived from patients with the natural disease. (page 11) (So not that was made in or from a laboratory, but from another patient with the natural disease, understanding this is very important)

-...If the vaccinated animals become sick or in a characteristic way, and if the disease is spread in them from animal to animal by vaccination with blood or emulsions of involved tissues that are free of common microbes or rickettsia, one is quite sure that the disease in the laboratory animals is caused by a virus. (page 7)

So he says in summary, if you apply his criteria and keep all of them, it is not certain, but you can be pretty confident that a virus caused this disease. In other words, even if all 6 criteria have been applied, this only

leads to them being quite confident, **not conclusive, not certain, not 100%, just quite confident.**

In the Nature article it is claimed that the first 3 criteria (River) have been met for subsequent publications.

The first three criteria - isolation of virus from diseased hosts, cultivation in host cells, and proof of filterability - have been met for SCV by several groups 2,3,4,5.

Now I will briefly summarise what Dr. Kaufman has analysed, please remember that this is only brief information and you should really see the video (see above).

First of all, I would like to say that none of the following studies (not even the one by Prof. Drosten) meets even one of the Postulate Rivers.

2. Poutanen, S. M. et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (in the press).

- No positive isolation of a virus (actually an attempt was made to isolate, but this was negative).
- They did not cultivate in host cells (they took verocells from monkeys) These produce in combination with antibiotics (exosomes = the body's own RNA!).
- proved no filterability. Instead, they used various screening tests for the presence of bacteria and other viruses.

3. drosten, C. et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (in the press).

- No isolation of a virus, interestingly, they found particles that looked like another virus (paramyxovirus) in one sample but not in other samples.
- They did not cultivate in host cells (they took verocells from monkeys).
- No filterability was found.

So also the work of Prof. Christian Drosten does not even comply with the modified lighter postulates of River.

4. Ksiazek, T. G. et al. N. Engl. J. Med. (in the press).

- No isolation of a virus (again only, as in Drosten's work, only extracted genetic material).
- They did not cultivate in host cells (they took different cells from Vero E6, NCIH292, MDCK, LLC-MK2 and B95-8 cells).
- Did not prove filterability. Instead, they used different screening tests for the presence of bacteria and other viruses.

5 Peiris, J. S. M. et al Lancet 361, 1319-1325 (2003).

- No isolation of a virus (again, as in Drosten's work, only extracted genetic material was used)
- They did not cultivate in host cells (they took fetal resuspended monkey cells)
- Did not prove filterability, instead they used various screening tests for the presence of bacteria and other viruses

Summarised (SARS 2003):

In none of these studies were even the first 3 criteria met and therefore cannot be claimed as evidence of a pathogenic virus.

SARS-CoV-2 (2019)

So let's take the River's criteria for Covid-19 and check if they were met in the publications.

First of all: none of the following studies

- 1. met the first 3 criteria**
- 2. tried to meet the 4th and 5th criteria**

The fact that no attempt was even made to comply with the 4th and 5th criteria allows the conclusion to be drawn that it is not possible to say that this could be a new pathogen.

In advance: none of the following studies

1. fulfilled the first 3 criteria
2. tried to address the 4th and 5th criteria at all

The fact that no attempt was even made to comply with the 4th and 5th criteria allows the conclusion to be drawn that nothing can be said to be the cause

1 Peng Zhou - Discovery of a novel coronavirus associated with the recent pneumonia outbreak in humans and its potential bat origin

- No isolation of a virus (only obtained genetic material).
- They did not cultivate in host cells (they took verocells and Huh7 cells, they only did this in 1/7th patient).
- Proved not to be filterable

You admitted in your study that this study cannot provide evidence, but that many more clinical trials are needed to make a statement.

You assumed through a PCR sequence test that the one found was similar to the 2003 coronavirus, because the test showed an 80% match. The DNA of a human is 96% identical to that of a chimpanzee ...

2 Na Zhu - A Novel Coronavirus From Patients With Pneumonia in China, 2019 (2020 Feb 20;382(8):727-733)

- No isolation of a virus (only obtained genetic material).
- They have not cultivated in host cells (they took lung cancer cells).
- Did not prove filterability (they used centrifugation).

You admit in your publication under Discussion:

"our study does not fulfill Koch's

"our study does not fulfill the postulates of Koch"

3 Jeong-Min Kim - Identification of Coronavirus Isolated from a Patient in Korea with COVID-19 () 2020 Feb; 11(1): 3-7

- No isolation of a virus (only obtained genetic material).
 - They did not cultivate in host cells (they took verocells and also used antibiotics)
 - proved no filterability
-

4th McMaster University Canada

Very little information is available on this study. Since only a fraction has been published.

- No isolation of a virus (only genetic material obtained).
 - They did not cultivate in host cells (they used a different type of mammalian cells).
-

In summary:

Dr. Andrew Kaufmann comes to the same conclusion as everyone else, that there is no scientific proof of a pathogenic virus. (SARS-CoV-1 and 2)

In spite of the claim to fulfill the Koch postulates in (**NATURE**)

in none of the publications on SARS-CoV-1/2, the Koch'sche, nor the River Postulates were fulfilled (0/6 criteria).

only one of the criteria for 2019 was fulfilled. The 6th criterion, the most unimportant of all criteria.

Rumours and lies have created a pandemic, although there was no evidence!

Please watch the video of Dr. Andrew Kaufman linked above!

The Rotterdam Monkey Experiment (SARS) Issue 32, May 2020
ExpressZeitung (p. 66 - 69)

SARS: Corona-Virus erster Akt



Am 10. Februar 2003 meldete CNN, dass eine «mysteriöse Krankheit» in der südchinesischen Provinz Guangdong fünf Menschen getötet habe und seit November mindestens 305 Menschen erkrankt seien. Laut Meldungen der Hongkonger Presse habe es sich um Vogelgrippe gehandelt. ⁶⁶ Am 5. März 2003 rief der in Hanoi, Vietnam, stationierte italienische WHO-Arzt Dr. Carlo Urbani seinen Vorgesetzten Dr. Shigeru Omi, den Westpazifik-Beauftragten der WHO, in Manila an und bat telefonisch um technische Unterstützung. In seinem Krankenhaus in Hanoi seien viele Patienten und Personal an einer von ihm vermuteten Infektionskrankheit erkrankt. Er nahm an, die Betroffenen könnten sich bei einem aus Hongkong eingeflogenen Patienten angesteckt haben. Omi registrierte dies, doch drängte Urbani, am 09.03. an einer Tagung in Bangkok (Thailand) teilzunehmen. Eigentlich aufgrund der Ansteckungsgefahr ein Akt völliger Verantwortungslosigkeit – zumindest wenn man an das offizielle SARS-Theoriegebäude glaubt. Trotz aller Bedenken sass Urbani am 11. März im Flugzeug nach Bangkok. Und siehe da: Noch während des Fluges erkrankte auch er:

«Am 11. März zeigten sich bei ihm die ersten Symptome während des Fluges nach Bangkok. Bei seiner Ankunft bat er einen Kollegen vom CDC, der ihn am Flughafen begrüßte, sich ihm nicht zu nähern. Sie setzten sich mit einem Abstand voneinander und warteten schweigend auf eine Ambulanz mit der notwendigen Schutzausrüstung.» ⁶⁷

Urbani wurde vom Flughafen aus direkt in die Isolierstation eines Hospitals in Bangkok eingeliefert. Ob seine Symptome eine Folge der von ihm vermuteten Infektionskrankheit waren, war jedoch nicht klar.

Hongkong: Ursprungsort?

Jetzt setzte die SARS-Kampagne ein: Kaum hatte Urbani Hanoi verlassen, gab Dr. Shigeru Omi am 12. März im Namen der WHO einen Bericht heraus und warnte vor einem «Schweren akutem Atemwegssyndrom» «unbekannter Ursache», kurz: SARS. Vorher hatte man noch von einer Vogelgrippe gesprochen. Die WHO schrieb auf ihrer Webseite: «Bisher konnte keine Verbindung zwischen diesen Ausbrüchen von akuten Atemwegserkrankungen in Hanoi und Hongkong und den Ausbrüchen von Vogelgrippe (H₅N₁) hergestellt werden, die am 10. Februar aus Hongkong berichtet wurden. Die Untersuchungen dauern an, und Laboruntersuchungen der Proben aus Vietnam



Bild aus Hongkong während der ersten «SARS-Epidemie» 2003.



Genau wie der «SARS-Entdecker» Carlo Urbani verstarb auch der mutmaßliche Entdecker von COVID-19, der chinesische Augenarzt Li Wenliang, an der von ihm gefundenen Krankheit. Warum gerade ein Wuhaner Augenarzt auf die Idee kommt, bei einer Krankheit, die mit keinerlei neuen oder anderweitig besonderen Symptomen daherkommt, einen neuen Virus zu vermuten und sich auf die Suche nach diesem zu machen, bleibt ein Rätsel. Das Ableben des Mannes sorgte auf der ganzen Welt für Schlagzeilen. Das junge Gesicht des 34-jährigen Arztes wurde genutzt, um zu vermitteln, die neu gefundene Krankheit sei sehr gefährlich.

und Hongkong werden durch mit der WHO kooperierenden Zentren in Japan und USA vorgenommen.»

Hongkong wurde ohne Beweise zum Ursprungsort von SARS gemacht, weil Urbani sich bei einem Patienten aus Hongkong angesteckt habe: Aus Hongkong einreisende Personen, die Grippe-symptome aufwiesen, waren fast auf der ganzen Welt ab sofort mögliche SARS-Fälle. In Europa wurden erste Verdachtsfälle mit SARS in Verbindung gebracht, ausserdem erste «Todesfälle» in Kanada. Auch in Deutschland traten die ersten Verdachtsfälle auf. Allein Symptome und ein kürzlicher Besuch Hongkongs reichten für den SARS-Verdacht aus. Am 15. März 2003 gab die WHO eine weltweite Reise-Warnung aus.

SARS-Verdächtige wurden in der Regel sofort, selbst wenn sie keine Symptome zeigten, unter strenge Quarantäne gestellt und mit starken antiviralen Medikamenten behandelt. Mitunter auch mit Antibiotika. Ob erst diese Behandlung die Beschwerden verursachte oder verschlimmerte, wurde nicht untersucht. So starb der italienische Arzt Carlo Urbani, der als Entdecker der Krankheit gilt, in Bangkok möglicherweise an einer Überbehandlung (siehe S.69).

Nichts als eine Vermutung

Mitte März 2003 war das globale Wettrennen der epidemiologischen Institute um die «Entdeckung» des geheimnisvollen SARS-Virus jedenfalls in vollem Gange. Dem erfolgreichen Institut winkten nicht nur weltweiter Ruhm, sondern auch grosszügige Zuschüsse zur Finanzierung weiterer Forschungen, Studien und Publikationen. Das Virus blieb einstweilen nichts weiter als eine Vermutung.

Erst drei Wochen später hiess es: «Alle elf Laboratorien, die an SARS arbeiten, stimmen darin überein, dass ein Corona-Virus die primäre Ursache ist», so der WHO-Sprecher Peter Cordingley im Wissenschaftsmagazin New Scientist vom 7. April. Einen Tag später veröffentlichten Wissenschaftler aus Hongkong in der renommierten Fachzeitschrift Lancet einen Beitrag über das



Der mittlerweile als Held gefeierte Entdecker von SARS-CoV-2, der italienische Arzt Carlo Urbani, starb möglicherweise an den Folgen einer Überbehandlung.

Corona-Virus als mögliche Ursache von SARS. In zwei von 50 Patienten seien mittels genetischer Testverfahren (PCR, siehe S. 52 ff.) Corona-Viren nachgewiesen worden, bei 35 weiteren Patienten spezifische Antikörper. In einer Probe habe man das Bakterium «Escherichia Coli» gefunden und bei zwei anderen Patienten die Bakterien «Klebsiella pneumoniae» und «Haemophilus influenzae». ¹⁹ Diese Spuren wurden nicht weiterverfolgt, obwohl sie letztlich als Ursprung einer Krankheit nicht viel unwahrscheinlicher waren als die Coronaviren – von anderen Ursachen wie Luftverschmutzung usw., die niemals zur Diskussion standen, ganz zu schweigen. Die Entscheidung war gefallen: Das weltweite Labornetz der WHO würde sich jetzt nur noch mit dem Corona-Virus als mögliche Ursache von SARS beschäftigen.

Drosten lässt grüssen

Zwei Tage später veröffentlichten Wissenschaftler des Hamburger Bernhard-Nocht-Instituts im «New England Journal of Medicine» (NEJM) eine Untersuchung, wonach in SARS-Patienten mittels der PCR-Methode Coronaviren nachgewiesen worden waren. Die gefundenen genetischen Sequenzen ähnelten, so das BNI, den bekannten Corona-Viren jedoch nur zu etwa 50 bis 60%. Mit dabei: Christian Drosten, heute der vielleicht wichtigste Regierungsberater in Sachen COVID-19.

Schlussfolgerung der Publikation: Das neue Corona-Virus, auf dessen Existenz man aufgrund der gefundenen Gensequenzen schloss, «könnte» eine Rolle bei der Verursachung von SARS spielen. ²⁰ Am gleichen Tag erschien im NEJM eine weitere wichtige Publikation der US-Seuchenbehörde CDC, die eine Identifizierung des Corona-Virus als Krankheitsursache für sich in Anspruch nahm. ²¹

Jetzt grätschte ein Kritiker dazwischen: Frank Plummer, führender SARS-Forscher Kanadas und Direktor eines der WHO-Laboratorien. Am 27. April berichtete U.S. News & World Report, dass laut Plummer in nur 40% der kanadischen SARS-Patienten das Coronavirus zu finden gewesen sei. Bei einer früheren Krankheitswelle seien es ebenfalls nur fünf von neun Fällen gewesen. Gleichzeitig hätten 20% der völlig gesunden Kanadier, die kürzlich in Asien waren, das Virus in sich gehabt. Plummer zeigte sich sehr irritiert von den Ergebnissen und kündigte weitere Untersuchungen an. Weiter hiess es: «Vertreter des CDC halten Plummers Daten für wenig überzeugend gegenüber den unveröffentlichten Studien aus den Niederlanden, wonach die Injektion des Virus in Affen zu SARS-ähnlichen Symptomen führte.» ²²

Das Rotterdamer Affen-Experiment

Um welche Studie ging es? Die Erfüllung der Koch-Postulate wurde erstmals von den Forschern der Universität Rotterdam Ende April in Anspruch genommen. Der Schuldspruch gegen das vermutete Virus war zu diesem Zeitpunkt jedoch schon längst gefällt, ohne dass auch nur der geringste wissenschaftliche Beweis vorlag, dass die Atemwegssymptome der angeblichen SARS-Patienten etwas mit einem unbekanntem neuen Corona-Virus zu tun hatten. Am 22. Juli publizierte das renommierte Fachmagazin Lancet einen Artikel mit dem «endgültigen Beweis», dass ein bislang unbekanntes spezifisches Corona-Virus der Verursacher der neuen Krankheit SARS sei. ²³ Eine Forschergruppe an der Rotterdamer Erasmus-Universität kam darin zu dem Ergebnis, dass die Koch-Postulate durch ihre Experimente mit Affen erfüllt worden seien und damit die Rolle eines spezifischen Virus als Krankheitsverursacher bewiesen sei.

Die Wissenschaftler nahmen eine in einem komplexen Verfahren weitergezüchtete Zellkultur, die ursprünglich von einem angeblich an «SARS» verstorbenen Patienten stammte, und verabreichten sie vier Makakenaffen in den Rachen, die Nase und unter die Augenlider. Die Tiere wurden täglich auf klinische Symptome hin untersucht. Kurz vor der Infektion und jeweils am zweiten, vierten und sechsten nachfolgenden Tag wurden den Affen 10 ml Blut aus den Leistenvenen sowie Abstriche von Nase, Mund, Rachen und After entnommen. Die Tiere zeigten unterschiedliche Symptome wie Lethargie, Hautausschlag und Atemnot, allerdings nicht einheitlich. Das Lungen- und Lymphgewebe mancher Affen zeigte Anomalien.



Ausgabe Nr. 9

Unterschiedliche Themen, aber gleiche Massnahmen!

Einschnitte in die Freiheit wie Flug- und Reiseverbote, die Gängelung der Wirtschaft, das Unterbinden von kritischen Stimmen und die Bevormundung der Bürger zeichneten sich schon vor «Ausbruch» der «Corona-Pandemie» am Horizont ab oder waren teilweise auch schon in vollem Gange. Forderungen nach Massnahmen, wie man sie heute bei Corona sieht, waren eigentlich lange vor allem im Namen des Klimaschutzes bekannt. In einigen Punkten scheint es fast so, als habe das «Corona-Virus» innerhalb kürzester Zeit das «erreicht», was zuvor vergleichsweise zäh von «Klimarettern» vorangetrieben wurde. Zufall? Wohl kaum: Erfahren Sie in den Ausgaben Nr. 9 und 27 mehr über die globalen Ziele, die unter dem Deckmantel des Klimaschutzes verfolgt werden. Die Gemeinsamkeiten zur momentanen «Corona-Krise» sind nicht zu übersehen. Auch in der wissenschaftlichen Fragwürdigkeit steht die «menschgemachte Klimaerwärmung»

Ausgabe Nr. 27



Grober wissenschaftlicher Unfug

Wie schon erwähnt (siehe S.47 ff.), ist die Zuordnung der aufgetretenen Symptome nur möglich, wenn das Virus in Reinkultur vorliegt und seine Zusammensetzung eindeutig bestimmt wurde. Dazu lag jedoch keine wissenschaftliche Publikation vor – auch die Rotterdamer Forscher nahmen dies nicht für sich in Anspruch. Die Affen wurden während der Entnahmeprozedur insgesamt vier Mal mit Ketamin betäubt. Mögliche Nebenwirkungen dieses Medikaments beim Menschen: Lethargie, Hautausschlag und Atemnot, also das, was die Affen auch zeigten. Diese beim Menschen bekannten Nebenwirkungen können sich beim Affen zudem schwächer, stärker oder verändert lösen. Die möglichen Nebenwirkungen von Ketamin wurden in dem Artikel jedoch merkwürdigerweise nicht thematisiert! Im Grunde genommen haben wir es hier mit grober Stümpererei zu tun – auf «hochwissenschaftlicher Ebene», versteht sich.

Aufgrund von nur vier Versuchstieren, die noch nicht einmal durchgehend die gleichen Symptome zeigten, von typischen SARS- oder Grippe-symptomen wie Fieber und Husten ganz zu schweigen, kamen die Forscher zu der Schlussfolgerung, Corona-Viren seien die Verursacher einer schweren Krankheit. Ein ehrlicher Wissenschaftler würde bei einem solchen Experiment versuchen, alle Einflussfaktoren zu erfassen, die das Ergebnis verfälschen könnten. Dies geschieht üblicherweise durch eine Kontrollgruppe, die man den exakt (möglicherweise traumatischen) gleichen Haltebedingungen und Behandlungen aussetzt, inklusive der Betäubung mit Ketamin. Warum war dies unterblieben? Die im Lancet veröffentlichten Experimente der Rotterdamer Universität waren nicht geeignet, eine virale Ursache von SARS-Symptomen zu beweisen. Der Versuchsaufbau war nicht nur wissenschaftlich fragwürdig, sondern grober Unfug!

Weitere Ungereimtheiten

- Die Hälfte der in Peking gemeldeten Neuerkrankungen hatte zuvor keinerlei Kontakt mit SARS-Verdachtsfällen.⁴⁶
- Am 3. Juni fiel der Märkischen Oderzeitung auf, dass die WHO immer nur von «wahrscheinlichen» SARS-Fällen sprach, niemals aber von bewiesenen Fällen. Es gebe keine WHO-Definition für echte SARS-Fälle, sondern «Verdachtsfälle» und «wahrscheinliche Fälle». Die Kategorie «wahrscheinlich» sei die höchste von der WHO vergebene für SARS-Patienten.⁴⁷

SARS versetzte die Welt 2003 in Schockstarre. Alles blickte gespannt nach China. Am Ende waren die Zahlen verschwindend gering. Ohne Medienkampagne wäre SARS niemandem aufgefallen.



Das Rotterdamer Affenexperiment 2003

Vier Makakenaffen..

..kriegen (nicht-isolierten) vermeintlichen SARS-Erreger in Rachen, Nase und Augen.

..werden gleichzeitig mit Ketamin betäubt.

..werden wenige Tage beobachtet.

..zeigen Symptome, die typisch sind für eine Ketamin-Betäubung.

Keine Kontrollgruppe

**Ergebnis:
Das SARS-Corona-Virus ist der Verursacher einer schlimmen Krankheit.**

Wissenschaftlich vollkommen wertlos, dennoch im Fachmagazin Lancet veröffentlicht!

Fotos: Emswato

Die verwendeten Virentests waren in ihrer Aussagekraft mehr als fragwürdig: Wie die Weltgesundheitsbehörde WHO in einer Pressemitteilung am 22. Oktober 2003 mitteilte, gab es für den Nachweis des angeblichen SARS-Virus immer noch keinen «Goldstandard».⁴⁸ Da war die «Epidemie» schon längst vorbei.

Im Sommer 2003 ging die Zahl der «Neuinfizierten» weltweit beständig zurück, das behauptete man zumindest. Offiziell endete die «SARS-Epidemie» mit 8096 Erkrankten und 774 Verstorbenen. Verschwindend geringe Zahlen. Bei aller Tragik für die Betroffenen und ihre Familien war das Gefahrenpotential, das SARS darstellte, geradezu lächerlich. Ohne die weltweite Durchführung von Tests wäre SARS niemandem aufgefallen.

Ob viele der offiziellen SARS-Toten eigentlich an den Medikamenten starben, die man ihnen verabreichte, wurde nie untersucht. Die Süddeutsche Zeitung beschrieb die Behandlung des berühmten Falles Carlo Urbani (siehe S.66) so:

«Sie hatten alles ausprobiert, Antibiotika, neue Medikamente gegen Influenza, ein Virusantikum, mit dem Hongkonger Ärzte angeblich Erfolge erzielt hatten. Geholfen hat nichts. Carlo Urbani war in einem fremden Land, umgeben von sechs verummantelten Gestalten mit Masken, Brillen, Anzügen, Schuhüberziehern, doppelten Handschuhen. Menschen, die ihn nicht berühren durften. Um 12:45 Uhr gaben die Ärzte nach dem vierten Herzinfarkt mit den Wiederbelebungsversuchen auf.»¹⁰

Wie viele der 734 «SARS-Opfer» in Wahrheit auf Kosten der Nebenwirkungen dieser Behandlung gingen, werden wir nie erfahren.

Armut- und Umweltfaktoren als Ursachen?

Als Ausgangspunkt der «SARS-Epidemie» gelten Fälle von schweren Pneumonien in der chinesischen Provinz Guangdong bei Hongkong. Eine verantwortungsbewusste Anamnese (siehe S.12 ff.) hätte natürlich die Lebensverhältnisse der Erkrankten miteinbeziehen müssen. Deshalb wären nähere Informationen über die Zustände in Guangdong von Relevanz gewesen. Nur wer sich dem virologischen Tunnelblick (siehe S.45 f.) verschrieben hat, dem wird dabei entgehen, dass die katastrophalen Lebens- und Umweltbedingungen in Guangdong wohl noch heute einen chronischen Erkrankungsrisikofaktor darstellen. Die Provinz Guangdong ist eine Sonderwirtschaftszone und erlebt einen High-Tech-Boom ohnegleichen. Die Schattenseiten dieser rasanten Entwicklung sind jedoch extreme Umweltverschmutzung, niedrige Sicherheitsstandards am Arbeitsplatz und die Entstehung von Slums mit menschenunwürdigen Lebensbedingungen. In Guangdong landet der Computerschrott des reichen Westens und wird dort ohne Schutzmaßnahmen und von Hand in seine zum Teil hochgiftigen Bestandteile zerlegt. Hier reichen die Lebensbedingungen völlig aus, um das vermehrte Auftreten von Atemwegsenerkrankungen zu erklären. Doch diese Lebensbedingungen wurden weder von Virologen noch Politikern oder Behörden als ein zu beachtender Faktor diskutiert – auch 2020 in Wuhan nicht. (GB: M)



Trotz aller medizinischer Errungenschaften werden wir immer häufiger von neuen «Pandemien» heimgesucht – behauptet man zumindest. Gesundheitsdretter, Mikrobiologen und nicht zuletzt die Medien versetzen die Bevölkerung regelmäßig mit der Entdeckung neuer «Killer-Keime» in Angst und Schrecken. Doch aufmerksamen Zeitgenossen sind spätestens im Zuge der sogenannten «Schweinegrippe» zahlreiche Widersprüche der Experten und Behörden aufgefallen. Hans U.P. Topp, Medizinerjournalist und Herausgeber der kritischen Zeitschrift «Ingl-report», geht diesen in seinem akribisch recherchierten Buch «Die Seuchen-Erfinder» auf den Grund.

Quellen:

1. TIMES, Special Report -The Truth about SARS-, Mai 2003
2. NEJM, 15. Mai 2003
3. Peiris et. al., The Lancet, 8. April 2003
4. Driscoll et. al., NEJM, 10. April 2003
5. Kozak et. al., nejm.org, 10. April 2003
6. U.S. News & World Report vom 27. April 2003
7. thelancet.com, Newly discovered coronavirus as the primary cause of severe acute respiratory syndrome
8. Epidemiologisches Bulletin des RKI Nr. 20/2003 vom 16. Mai 2003
9. Märkische Oderzeitung online, 3.6.2003
10. Deutsches Ärzteblatt, 23. Okt. 2003
11. Süddeutsche Zeitung, 8. April 2003

Conclusion to the article

My appeal to you is the following, the burden of proof is so devastating that it should end the pandemic from one day to the next, please support all those who can get us out of this plight. Even a simple word of encouragement helps.

This article was first published [here](#)



The book Klimasozialismus - in a new and updated edition now available again.

+++++Find out now the whole truth behind the swindle of the "man-made climate change".+++++

The book is a real blast! Dr. Wolfgang Thüne, meteorologist

Now available [here](#) as e-book for 9,99 € or order as paperback for 17,90 Euro via [Amazon](#)

Mass poverty - millions dead - decline of cultures. What is the real purpose of the worldwide CO2 scam? The updated and expanded edition was supplemented with a new article by the former ZDF weather man Dr. Wolfgang Thüne. In addition, some new contributions by the authors take a closer look at the current situation and the VW exhaust gas scandal. In memoriam, the new issue contains the particularly noteworthy last article by our dear friend and publisher Susanne Kablitz

Author web317

Published on 4 July 2020

[Original article in German here <http://diamanten-magazin.com/wordpress/2020/07/04/fuehrende-corona-forscher-geben-zu-dass-sie-keinen-wissenschaftlichen-beweis-fuer-die-existenz-eines->

virus-haben/]