

Federal Minister of Health Jens Spahn
Friedrichstraße 108
10117 Berlin

Urgent need for action on SARS-CoV-2 and mandatory measles vaccination.

Dear Mr. Jens Spahn, Federal Minister of Health,

In Germany, you are the main person responsible for establishing the legal corona/covid measures and the measles vaccination obligation. The Infection Protection Act (IfSG/InfektionsSchutzGesetz) interferes with several otherwise inalienable fundamental rights. For example, the right to life, physical integrity and freedom according to the German Basic Law (GG/GrundGesetz) Article 2 (2): "Everyone has the right to life and physical integrity. The freedom of the person is inviolable. These rights may only be interfered with on the basis of a law."

Section 1 (2) of the IfSG requires all parties involved with the review, planning, and implementation of corona/covid interventions and measles vaccination requirements to "design and support those in accordance with the respective state of medical and epidemiological science and technology."

You have omitted to check the statements of the virology about the existence claims of an alleged new SARS-CoV-2 and a measles virus for scientificity, the compliance with the rules of scientific work or to have them checked. These rules of scientific work, in order to be allowed to be called scientific, have been fixed in writing since 1998, are international and valid for all disciplines. These rules are part of the employment contracts of scientists who use taxpayers' money.

These rules of scientific work are obviously violated by virology. **The mandatory control experiments to exclude errors and self-deception were never carried out and published.**

This easily verifiable fact proves that the statements of virologists are not scientific, but must be called anti-scientific. Since the basis of our democracy is science in the most essential areas, this anti-scientific behavior of virology must be called anti-democratic and unconstitutional in your responsibility. I refer here to Article GG 5 (3): "Art and science, research and education are free. The freedom of science does not release from loyalty to the constitution." Science is what you and others pass off in public as scientific facts.

This leads to the logical conclusion that the requirement by the IfSG to effectively interfere with fundamental rights is not given. Since the scientificity is not fulfilled, which the IfSG demands in § 1 (2), but which has been silently, carelessly to grossly negligent assumed or claimed against better knowledge so far, all following paragraphs of the IfSG are ineffective and not binding.

This means that all Corona/Covid measures and the measles vaccination obligation have no legal force, but are unlawful, i.e. illegal. I point out to you that I have already personally pointed out these and other relevant facts to you on 17.3.2020 and subsequently.

Based on these easily identifiable and verifiable facts, I urge you to immediately withdraw all Corona/Covid measures and the measles vaccination requirement, hold the responsible national, international virologists, other "scientists" involved accountable, and take responsibility for what happened.

Due to the fact of the lack of control experiments in virology since 1954 and the fact of a purely mathematical construction of the so-called gene sequence of the alleged SARS-CoV-2 and/or due to the legally binding judgment of the Higher Regional Court of Stuttgart (Oberlandesgericht Stuttgart/OLG Stgt) of 16.2.2016, AZ: 12 U 63/15, in the so-called measles virus trial, the following applies:

It is with this finding of fact that the legal force of all Corona/Covid measures and that of the measles vaccination requirement ceases immediately, even individually.

I point out that extensive "other remedies" to which Article 20 (4) of the Basic Law calls have not yet been successful.

Comments to:

I. The existence claims of the SARS-CoV-2 genetic strand.

On Jan. 10, 2020, Prof. Zhang's research group in Shanghai published a genetic sequence, which was later named SARS-CoV-2, on a website accessible to virologists. This sequence alignment was published in the science journal Nature on Feb. 3, 2020 (citation at end). After the announcement of this sequence sequence ALL following virologists repeated this once given construction manual for the purely mathematical creation of a sequence and came to similar results. This aroused in the public and obviously also with you the impression that this result is a scientifically proven fact, the proof of the existence of a genetic strand of an alleged new virus, the SARS-Cov-2.

From reading this and all other publications that confirm the sequence strand once given, three facts clearly emerge:

1. A genetic strand that would correspond to the published sequence has never been detected. No genetic strand of a virus was found in the mixture of nucleic acids obtained from a human with pneumonia (and later from other humans). Even after the

first round of artificial, extremely strong and non-specific propagation by PCR technique of millions of short fragments of nucleic acids, no sequences were ever discovered that, when put together, would match the sequence of a genetic strand of a virus finally presented to the public.

2. Based on the sequence data generated in the first round of nucleic acid propagation, short pieces of nucleic acids are biochemically generated for the propagation of nucleic acids by PCR, so-called primers. These artificially generated primers themselves yield, depending on the protocol, approximately 4-20% of the sequence alignment of what is ultimately presented, after this second step of PCR propagation, as the sequence alignment of SARS-CoV-2. This second PCR propagation step for the subsequent mathematical, called bioinformatic formation of the sequence is called, among other things, deep meta-transcriptomic sequencing. The fact that an extremely unscientifically high number of cycles of PCR is applied here (35-45, so-called Ct value), in which artificial nucleic acid sequences are automatically generated that do not exist in reality, is further proof of the anti-scientific nature of virology, but plays no role in the argumentation presented here.

It is evident from points 1. and 2. that no genetic strand of a virus was ever found. Instead, existing fragments of nucleic acids were first multiplied biochemically, by means of double PCR, strongly and with an extremely high error rate. The sequences of these millionfold artificially generated nucleic acids were determined, subsequently subdivided mathematically into even much shorter sequences, and these were arbitrarily combined with each other. From the multitude of these arbitrary combination products, special software programs are used to select those that match a nucleic acid once it has been specified. The resulting mathematical construct is output as the genetic strand of a virus.

This proves that it has never been possible to mathematically construct the alleged genetic strand of the alleged virus from actually existing sequences of nucleic acids. The mathematical construction of the alleged genetic strand of the alleged SARS-Cov-2 succeeds only after two rounds of unspecific and extreme propagation by PCR technique.

3. The anti-scientificness of all involved virologists is proven by the fact that in the very publication of Prof. Yong-Zhen Zhang from Shanghai, who together with his co-workers discovered and specified the alleged sequence of the viral genome of the alleged SARS-CoV-2, the compelling control experiments are missing and this striking omission was and is tolerated. The compelling control experiments here are the attempt to construct the sequence of a genetic strand of claimed or suspected new viruses using nucleic acids from healthy humans and a wide variety of organisms. They are the requirement to be allowed to call a statement scientific. They also have the duty to recognize and avoid misinterpretations.

In none of the following publications, with which the sequence given by Prof. Yong-Zhen Zhang was repeated, control experiments are found, even the words "control" or "negative control" are missing. Not only have the virologists disproved themselves with their actions, they themselves have proven their anti-scientific nature and documented it in each of their numerous publications.

II. Verdict Oberlandesgericht Stuttgart, AZ: 12 U 63/15, 16.2.2016 in measles virus trial

The measles virus trial, initiated by me in 2011, achieved in 2017 the goal to generate a legally effective proof that the entire virology, not only measles virology, acts anti-scientifically. Since 2017, it has been part of German jurisprudence that all virology lacks scientific basis. Within the measles virus trial it has been documented that the mandatory control experiments in science have never been performed and documented since 1954. Therefore, all virologists involved have overlooked the fact that they themselves create effects they interpret as viral by means of applied techniques. Thus, as exemplified by SARS-Cov-2, typical bio-molecules are mentally assembled into virus models that do not exist in reality.

In the lawsuit, a medical doctor claimed the €100,000 prize money offered for scientific proof of the measles virus. His claim was upheld in 2014 because he submitted six publications, each of which claimed to prove the existence of the measles virus. The forensic expert appointed by the court of first instance, the ruling court, the Ravensburg Regional Court, found that none of the publications submitted contained evidence of the existence of a virus. This fact was confirmed by the Higher Regional Court of Stuttgart in its judgment of February 16, 2016, which became final in 2017 and by which I was acquitted of having to pay the plaintiff the €100,000 that had been awarded.

In the protocol of the hearing of the first court level at the Landgericht Ravensburg of 12.3.2015, AZ: 4 O 346/13 is documented that the court-appointed expert states that none of the six publications contains the control experiments mandatory in science, which are also called negative controls. Thus, the court-appointed expert has proven - which has also been confirmed by four other expert reports that I submitted - that the entire field of virology is acting in an anti-scientific manner. The logical conclusion: All statements of virology are neither practically nor legally usable, but must be rejected as self-deception and deception of others.

In addition, the oldest of the six publications, which was submitted and which was legally established as containing no evidence for the existence of a virus, has become the exclusive basis of the entire virology since 1954. This means that with the verdict of the Oberlandesgericht Stuttgart of 16.2.2016, which has become final, the entire virology, which claims the existence of disease-causing viruses, is deprived of its scientific and legal basis.

The details of this can be found in my article "The Federal Court of Justice lets the belief in viruses perish" in the magazine w+ 2/2017, which is in your files since 17.3.2020 and can be found freely on the Internet, on my page www.wissenschaftplus.de under "Important texts".

As a human being, I ask you,

as an active scientist, a virologist with a PhD, and the discoverer of a useful structure now called "giant viruses" and "viro-plankton",
I urge you,

As a citizen and sovereign of the FRG (Federal Republic of Germany), I hereby insist on you as my public servant,

that you immediately withdraw the Corona/Covid measures and the measles vaccination requirement.

I expect you to admit your shortcomings to the population and to cooperate in repairing the damage done in your responsibility to the body and soul of the population and the economy by the unjustifiable Corona/Covid measures and by the measles vaccination obligation.

With kind regards from Lake Constance

Dr. Stefan Lanka

Langenargen, 5.10.2021

The publication used to specify the mathematically generated sequence alignment, which is given as the hereditary strand of the SARS-Cov-2:

A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory disease in China.

Fan Wu, Su Zhao, Bin Yu, Yan-Mei Chen, Wen Wang, Zhi-Gang Song, Yi Hu, Zhao-Wu Tao, Jun-Hua Tian, Yuan-Yuan Pei, Ming-Li Yuan, Yu-Ling Zhang, Fa-Hui Dai, Yi Liu, Qi-Min Wang, Jiao-Jiao Zheng, Lin Xu, Edward C. Holmes & Yong-Zhen Zhang.

Nature | Vol 579 | 12 March 2020 | 265-269. Internet: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2008-3>.
Received: 7 January 2020. Accepted: 28 January 2020. Published online: 3 February 2020