

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

translated by Corona Investigative • July 31, 2020

What you will read in this article is the scientific evidence that it has never been proven that the "deadly" COVID-19 virus exists. In fact, all of the leading scientists on COVID-19 (SARS-CoV-2) have admitted that the scientific rules to prove COVID-19 have not been established. The global corona pandemic is simply based on assumptions and on agreed consensus and not science at all. This may sound unbelievable at first, but please read for yourself and see the facts that prove this irrevocably. Only after you have read this article will you be able to make a good judgement about the current COVID-19 Plandemic.



The detection method of the PCR tests is completely meaningless


I have already covered the topic of PCR testing in two of my articles. [\(1\)](#) [\(2\)](#) There I prove beyond doubt that the PCR test, which is considered the "gold standard" for COVID tests, is completely "meaningless".

The question now 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, (3) it has been found 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 come from. 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 sequences are part of the virus we are looking for. And in order to know this, we must carry out a correct isolation and purification of the suspected virus.



Robert Koch

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 by Robert Koch that must be met in order to have microorganism may be called the causative agent of a specific disease.

1. Koch's postulate

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

2. Koch's postulate

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

3. 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.

4. 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!

Award-winning journalist Torsten Engelbrecht (4) and independent researcher Konstantin Demeter (5) 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 could answer this question with "yes" - and no one said that cleaning 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] (6)

Replying 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] (7)

Replying 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] (8)

Replying Author: Wan Beom Park

Date: March 19, 2020**Answer:** *“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 [nejm] (9)

Replying Author: Wenjie Tan

Date: March 18, 2020

Answer: *“We show an image of sedimented virus particles, not purified ones.”*

Remark: This publication would not have needed the inquiry, the authors openly admit here to “our study does not fulfill Koch's postulates

Source: COVID19 PCR Tests are Scientifically Meaningless (10)

With regard to the work mentioned, 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 made EMs.**

In other words, if the authors of these studies admit that their published EMs do not show purified particles, then they definitely do not have 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 and Konstantin Demeter have contacted Dr. Charles Calisher, who is an experienced virologist. In 2001, Science published a “passionate plea... to the younger gene-

ration" 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 is why the two asked Dr. Calisher if he knew of a single paper in which SARS-CoV-2 was isolated and finally really 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 SINGLE KOCH'S POSTULATE WAS OBTAINED!**

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 conduct 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. (11)

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

Source:

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

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

Email 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 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 and Konstantin Demeter have invited the leading German representative (12) of the official theory of SARS-Cov-2/COVID-19 - **the Robert Koch**

Institute (13), 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 were not purified, how can you be sure that the RNA gene sequences of these particles belong to a particular new virus?

Especially when 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 Laureate Barbara McClintock pointed out as early as 1983 in her Nobel Lecture." (14) (15)

It should not go unmentioned that we finally managed to get 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" (16) 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 assure itself 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 Charité are certain that they are testing for the virus,"* they state in their work:

"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)" (17)

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

Incidentally, the paper published on 23 January 2020 by Corman et al (18) **did not even undergo a proper peer review process,** and the procedures described therein

were not accompanied by controls - although it is only through these two things that scientific work becomes truly sound.

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 also the articles

"The Science Fraud by Prof. Christian Drosten" ([19](#)) or the complete article Misinterpretation of virus - 2 by Dr. Stefan Lanka. ([20](#)) 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!** ([21](#))



Dr. Stefan Lanka during an interview after measles Trial

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

Now follows an excerpt from German magazine Wissenschaftplus 1st issue 2020, which Dr. Stefan Lanka (molecular biologist and virologist) wrote in connection with the false assumption about SARS-CoV-2. ([22](#))

"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. 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."

One can directly recognize 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. (23)

Madam 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 CCDC publications on Covid-19

In the first authoritative publication of the authors of CCDC on the results of their research, "A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019", (24) 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, it states under **discussion**:

„our study does not fulfill Koch’s postulates“

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

Source: Misinterpretation of virus - 2 by Dr. Stefan Lanka (24)

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. (25)

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: Misinterpretation of virus - 2 by Dr. Stefan Lanka (26)

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*" (27) (Again, this by no means fulfills 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. (28)

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,*" (29) (30)



Dr. Andrew Kaufman

Dr Andrew Kaufman also analysed 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 noted that the same mistakes were also made with the alleged SARS-CoV-1 virus. Just to be clear:

For all publications applies:

-> **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 the following video on Bitchute ([31](#)) or Telegram ([32](#)).

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. ([33](#))

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 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

Koch vs Rivers Postulate

1. Rivers, T. M. J. *Bacteriol.* 33, 1–12 (1937). (34)

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

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

... particularly 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)

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 summarize what Dr. Kaufman has analyzed, 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 (an attempt was actually 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 Drostens 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 Drostens 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.

1. Peng Zhou – Discovery of a novel coronavirus associated with the recent pneumonia outbreak in humans and its potential bat origin (35)

- 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

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

They 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) (36)

- 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).

They admit in their publication under discussion:

"our study does not fulfill Koch's Postulates

3. Jeong-Min Kim – Identification of Coronavirus Isolated from a Patient in Korea with COVID-19 () 2020 Feb; 11(1): 3–7 (37)

- 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

4. McMaster University Canada (38)

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).
-

To sum up:

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** (39) 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!

Evidence that Viruses Cause Disease or The Rooster in the River of Rats



The Rotterdam Monkey Experiment (SARS) - Read full Article → [here](#)

Conclusion to the article

My appeal to you is the following, the burden of proof is so devastating that it should end the plan-demic 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.

Translated & reblogged Version - Original [here](#)

Telegraph main page with overview of all articles: [Link](#)

Visit our Telegram Channel for additional news & information: [Link](#)

Chat with like-minded in our Telegram Chat Group: [Link](#)

Please support to keep this blog alive: [paypal](#)

References:

- (1) The PCR test is not validated
- (2) PCR: A DNA test becomes a instrument for manipulation
- (3) What world-famous researchers like Luc Montagnier have to say
- (4) Thorsten Engelbrecht Biography
- (5) Konstantin Demeter Profile
- (6) Emergence of a novel human coronavirus threatening human health
- (7) Identification of Coronavirus Isolated from a Patient in Korea with COVID-19
- (8) Virus Isolation from the First Patient with SARS-CoV-2 in Korea
- (9) A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019
- (10) COVID19 PCR Tests are Scientifically Meaningless
- (11) Scientists Have Utterly Failed to Prove that the Coronavirus Fulfills Koch's Postulates
- (12) see 10
- (13) Robert Koch Institute: Mission Statement
- (14) Antibiotic-induced release of small extracellular vesicles (exosomes) with surface-associated DNA
- (15) The signifiante of responses of the genome to challenge
- (16) see 1
- (17) Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR
- (18) Complete Genome Sequence of a Wild-Type Measles Virus Isolated during the Spring 2013 Epidemic in Germany
- (19) The science fraud by Prof. Christian Drosten

- (20) Misinterpretation of virus - 2
- (21) Virologist Dr. Lanka press charges against Christian Drosten
- (22) Wissenschaftplus.de - Homepage of Dr. Stefan Lanka
- (23) see 18
- (24) see 20
- (25) Pathological findings of COVID-19 associated with acute respiratory distress syndrome
- (26) see 20
- (27) Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China
- (28) Flaws in Coronavirus Pandemic Theory
- (29) Featured Experts - Matthew Frieman, PhD
- (30) New Coronavirus Identified in Central China Pneumonia Outbreak
- (31) Evidence that Viruses Cause Disease or The Rooster in the River of Rats - watch on Bitchute
- (32) Evidence that Viruses Cause Disease or The Rooster in the River of Rats - watch on Telegram
- (33) Koch's postulates fulfilled for SARS virus
- (34) Viruses and Koch's Postulates
- (35) Discovery of a novel coronavirus associated with the recent pneumonia outbreak in humans and its potential bat origin
- (36) see 9
- (37) Identification of Coronavirus Isolated from a Patient in Korea with COVID-19
- (38) I study viruses: How our team isolated the new coronavirus to fight the global pandemic
- (39) see 33

