

MEASLES VIRUS PUT TO THE TEST

Dr. Stefan Lanka wins in court...

Caroline Markolin, Ph.D.



Dr. Lanka meets the press

Since the early 1990s, German biologist Dr. Stefan Lanka has been at the forefront of challenging the medical theory stating that viruses are the cause of infectious diseases such as hepatitis, AIDS, the flu, polio, herpes, or measles. Caroline Markolin has presented Dr. Lanka's activities in her lecture video "Virus Mania" in great details (watch Part 2 of the recordings on this website – starting at 08:08).

Based on his studies in virology, Dr. Lanka discovered that viruses are vital components of simple life-forms that do not exist in complex organisms such as humans, animals, or plants. His research shows that the viruses believed to cause "viral infections" are in reality ordinary cell particles that have been misinterpreted as constituents of the viruses in question. Dr. Lanka also determined that viruses don't have a destructive effect on the host, as commonly believed. These findings are in full accordance with the discoveries of Dr. Ryke Geerd Hamer who demonstrated already in the 1980s that contrary to the standard theory, microbes do not harm the organism but play instead a supportive role during the healing process of diseases (see Fourth Biological Law of the New Medicine).

The "**measles virus trial**" between Dr. Stefan Lanka and German medical doctor David Bardens has by now received international attention (see the 2015 reports in CTV News Canada and BBC News). The court case has not only heated up the ongoing "virus debate". It also fuelled the discussion about the justification of childhood vaccination and of vaccination in general.

Here is a brief overview of the court proceedings:

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):1535–42.
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.

Dr. Lanka: “With the Supreme Court judgment in the measles virus trial any national and international statements on the alleged measles virus, the infectivity of measles, and on the benefit and safety of vaccination against measles, are since then of no scientific character and have thus been deprived of their legal basis.”

Source: www.LearningGNM.com