

Below is an English language translation of a presentation given in German by Prof. Stefan Homburg during a press conference at the German Bundestag on Nov 2nd 2024.

Stefan Homburg is a German retired professor of economics who was the director of the Institute of Public Finance at the Leibniz University of Hannover.

His presentation is a summary of the key findings obtained from a whistleblower leak of the Robert Koch Institute's (RKI) written records including meeting minutes (simply referred to as 'records' in the translation below) covering the duration of the Covid 'health emergency'.

The RKI is the German equivalent of the US Centre for Disease Control (CDC) and as such is tasked with advising the government based upon its scientific risk assessment of disease and appropriate measures.

In the translation, we have highlighted in yellow certain parts for emphasis. Video time markers have been added to aid orientation.

The video of this presentation (with English subtitles) can be viewed here:

<https://odysee.com/@LongXXvids:c/Prof-Homburg-RKI-Leak---summary:4>

### Presentation

**00:00** "Thank you very much for the invitation. This is my second lecture to this group, and compared to last year we've made significant progress it must be said. Because in Germany we were lucky that a whistleblower provided us with data that the whole world envies us for.

This is the RKI-leak. Please do not mix this up with RKI-files which refers to redacted records. The RKI-leak encompasses much more. Almost ten gigabytes. Namely, ALL records and not just some of them. All are completely unredacted, and we obtained a lot of additional material such as letters. For example a letter from President Macron to Germany, suggesting that both countries should conduct lock-downs in a similar fashion.

We also got Excel sheets, E-mails, Power Point presentations and so on. The significance of the RKI-leak is not so much that it reveals something new that has not been said by critics. Rather, these documents are probative. Hence, they've already been accepted as evidence in a court of law which based its decision on the RKI-leak.

Clearly, if anyone writes on Facebook that something is not right, then this basically has little effect. Even scientific articles are often dismissed and refuted by opposing articles. However, if the RKI internally affirms certain facts, then these facts can be used as evidence in courts.

**01:50** As lockdowns and the entire Corona policies were internationally coordinated, what we found here in Germany is important for all countries and not just Germany. The most

important question posed in the preceding years was: Has the RKI, whose statements were authoritative and used by the courts, worked independently, or was it politically influenced?

In March, our Federal Minister of Health [Karl Lauterbach] made a crystal-clear statement, and I quote:

**02:29** *"Media speculates that the RKI has received political instructions rather than worked scientifically and independently. This is wrong. The redacted parts are mainly employees' names, to protect them from hate speech."*

This is a typical victim/offender reversal. When making his allegation, Lauterbach had published only a few records, and not a single one from his own term in office, and that is still true today, and the records were redacted maximally as you can see here.

The documents were not telephone books, but simply records with only a few names. No one believes that only the names were redacted. However, Minister Lauterbach got away with his allegation for months. As usual, newspapers simply repeated his lies in articles and editorials.

This continued until 23 July of 2024 when the following happened: At 4am, about 10 Gigabytes of information were unlocked on the internet. At 6am, a press conference in Berlin was announced, which was attended by about 30 journalists. It started at 10am and the journalists learned what we found after thousands of people had already downloaded the data.

**04:05** We arranged it this way so as to avoid arrests or home searches by police. Of course the leak was certainly important for the authorities, but police did not react since they knew it was pointless. Shortly after the unredacted protocols were discussed in public, our Federal Minister of health changed his opinion. I quote:

**04:28** *"Lauterbach admits that Corona experts were politically influenced."*

*So he kept up his allegation for five months, and then he said exactly the opposite of what he had said originally but, as always, his lie had no consequences.*

In which respect has RKI been influenced politically? I will now show you some examples. The following slides are designed so that on the left you find the RKI records, and on the right, what was happening in the real world at the same time.

Let's start with examples of political influence. On 5 May, 2020 the RKI writes, and I quote:

**05:12** *"If the RKI does not meet policy makers' demands, there is a risk that policy makers themselves develop indicators and/or that RKI will no longer be integrated."*

You see a typo here since these are all literal quotes including typos and comma mistakes. [translator's comment: only visible in original German text]

We learn that the institute thinks that either we do what we are told to do, or policy makers will put us on the sidelines. Two days later we read:

*“Testing, testing, testing is basically an implicit strategy that was dictated by politics. Overall tricky, because politics has set guidelines.”*

**06:02** In May 2020 it was obvious that there were no medical risks, and rising PCR numbers were only employed to prolong the illusion of a pandemic. The directive from then Minister Spahn was key here. He ordered testing of not only sick people, but also the healthy, which had never been done before. And a media journal added that people with health insurance have to bear the financial burden.

My second example of political influence is from 5 March, 2020: *“It would be good to get the oral orders from the Federal Ministry of Health in written form.”* This is what the wise official demands when he receives illegal instructions and fears disciplinary action or criminal prosecution. If the “public servant” has written instructions from the ministry, then he is largely off the hook.

Conversely, we see from the material that the ministry hesitated in issuing written instructions. Next quote from 26 May, 2020:

**07:21** *“How should RKI deal with political orders from, for example, the Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Labor, etc.?”* Here we learn that there were not only orders from the Federal Ministry of Health, but from other ministries that interfered with the work of RKI.

And now I present the most disturbing quote from the entire RKI-leak, 28 September, 2020:

*“An approval of the mRNA vaccine by the FDA before US elections is not desired. The same holds true for European authorities.”* This quote reveals it was all about politics rather than health. They told the public that they wanted to save as many lives as possible via vaccination, but it was even more important for them that Biden would win the US presidential election.

**08:28** Recall that Trump sponsored Project Warp Speed and tied his fate to an early mRNA approval, desirably before the US election. He wanted an approval by 1 November, 2020, but the political forces behind the Corona scam wanted Biden. We then read on CNN, after the votes were counted and original ambiguities in vote counting were resolved, that the FDA granted Emergency Use Authorisation for Pfizer-BioNTech in December.

A second important point relates to the possibility of a medical emergency. We find already in March of 2020 some remarkable quotations. The first relates to findings of AGI, a working group within RKI that monitors infectious diseases and has statistics over years and decades, unlike these new PCR statistics, and I quote:

**09:34** *“The AGI sentinel results suggest that SARS-CoV-2 does not circulate widely.”* This report is from the second day of the first lockdown. One day later they write: *“The trends are best not formulated (or communicated) because otherwise it would become difficult to justify further measures.”*

**09:55** This demonstrates how RKI thought. A way that is visible in all the records. They subordinated themselves to politics, and tried to promote measures. The measures were the true objective, and they knitted together justifications to legitimize them.

Next quote: *"The number of free and occupied beds are almost equal."*, meaning 50% vacancy in our hospitals, and RKI adds that usual vacancy is less than 10%. .....

and now comes a red sentence that was removed from the official records. We found it as a residual, i.e. as the original version of the record was forgotten. This record from 25 March, 2020 was finally redacted in 2023, notably by an employee of the legal department, who herself had not taken part in the meeting, and was responsible for rejecting requests under the Freedom Of Information Act.

The employee says she did not change the file, but stored it only by accident. As RKI does not have a registration system complying with BMI [Federal Ministry for the Interior] requirements, this can neither be proven nor disproven. I quote: *"It is risky to say that causation exists (between measures and the decline of the wave). After all, we are at the end of the flu season."*

**11:28** In addition, ladies and gentlemen, the RKI saw the following graph, the most important graph of the entire Corona crisis, in my view. However, it is somewhat complex. Therefore, I explain in detail and emphasize that the graph was not made afterwards. So, this is not a matter of hindsight bias. They had the graph at their disposal at the beginning of the first lockdown, and they saw the following:

On the x-axis are the calendar weeks, from mid-year to mid-year, and on the y-axis are the so-called ILIs [Influenza-Like-Illnesses] - colds with fever, so somewhat stronger colds. Every single curve represents a specific year, and you recognize the same pattern every year: At first the number of colds is low, i.e. mid-summer. This number then grows until winter, and in the months of January and February these colds explode, and then return to the original value. That is why people speak of cold or flu "waves".

**12:35** What is interesting now is the black curve which represents the year 2020. First you see that the number of feverish colds, including SARS, i.e. independent of the specific virus that causes colds, was abnormally low in 2020 for that time of year. More importantly, it started declining in February where you recognize the peak of the black curve. In February, however, politicians told us that: a) Corona was harmless, or b) a conspiracy of right-wingers. They also told us that we should celebrate Carnival. These three assertions were made up to the end of February.

It was only in the first week of March that the political mood changed for unknown reasons. When the mood changed, the number of common colds was already in free fall. That also means that excuses such as, *"Yes, of course, colds already receded before the lockdown, but only because school closures worked, or prohibitions of large gatherings worked."* All these excuses are inconsistent with the data, as all these measures started from the 10th week onwards. ...., but colds receded, as you see in the graph, already in the 6th calendar week.

**13:59** The next topic concerns vaccination. I have several slides here because these records were particularly heavily redacted. We first read on 15 April, 2020, when we learned from newspapers that no vaccines are available at all, and that there will be none for a long time, since development takes ten years, and if vaccination becomes possible, it will be voluntary.

We read the following in April of 2020: *"There is currently no experience with RNA and DNA vaccines, EMA and Pfizer are considering whether to skip phase 3 trials."*

Two weeks later: "A number of vaccines will become available that have been tested in quick succession. Relevant data will be collected post-marketing." Put differently: Let's first vaccinate the entire population, and then afterwards let's learn whether the stuff helps or harms. That was the plan, and that's how it was implemented.

**15:07** On 27 December, 2020 vaccination started in Germany. On 8 January, 2021, in the very early phase we read: *"Vaccine effectiveness is not yet known. The duration of protection is also unknown."* That just repeats what we could read in the EMA approval, namely, that only protection from a positive PCR test was really confirmed. Everything else like protection from severe illnesses, death and the like was not confirmed in the approval process.

In March (2021) we find the first signs of scepticism: *"It is not yet clear that after vaccination, fewer old people are dying. Do vaccinated people die?"* On the right side you see material from state TV, demonstrating how vaccine development works normally: R&D takes up to 17 years. This time it was conducted in just a few months. The result, as we know now, was devastating.

**16:16** What about protection against transmission? This question is extremely important because vaccination mandates were based on the claim that vaccinated persons also protect others. **If it was just about self protection, then mandates vaccination would have been out of the question.** (emphasis mine)

What did the RKI think about protection of others? Very early, in February 2021 we read: *"It is to be expected, (but not certain, because it has never been shown) that vaccines protect from severe illness, but they cannot stop local proliferation of viruses"*.

In August we read: *"The benefit of 2G (a scheme excluding unvaccinated people from social life) is not greater protection of others, but greater self-protection."*, and in 2022 we read: *"There is no indication that vaccination has an effect on transmission, no change in evidence."*

**17:18** To summarise, there existed a crystal-clear and consistent position, in accordance with the literature, and especially with Pfizer's approval study that made no respective claim: *"There exists no protection of others."*

What did that mean for communication? Public communication had it that *"The whole country was being held hostage by these people, that is, the unvaccinated"*. Karl Lauterbach threw this at the other members of the Bundestag in a debate about comprehensive

vaccination mandates. His proposal, as we now know, failed narrowly, and if we are honest, it failed only since government and CDU/CSU had different ideas of how to implement comprehensive vaccination mandates and opposed each other with their different proposals. It was a very narrow decision. Overall this slide proves that what was communicated to the outside world totally contradicted what was known internally.

**18:26** The next slide concerns vaccine safety. Now things are getting serious, and if you have weak nerves, just go outside for a moment. I start with 29 March, 2021, at which time vaccination had been going on for almost three months: *"Astra Zeneca, a lot of hype in general. Now twelve cases of sinus-vein thrombosis. Paul Ehrlich Institute, pharmacovigilance offices can't keep up well. Sinus thrombosis, also in men have a twenty-fold higher incidence."* This means that if you have been vaccinated with Astra Zeneca, you had a twenty-fold higher risk than an unvaccinated person of developing sinus vein thrombosis, a really severe and life-threatening illness.

17 May: *"Side-effect reports, Paul Ehrlich Institute had 45,000 in the last weeks, myocarditis in young men, sinus-vein thrombosis, and so on."*

In the only hearing that has taken place so far, by the Brandenburg's investigative committee, the security department head of Paul Ehrlich Institute, Dr. Keller Stanislawski testified: *"There were people who only focussed on the deceased, and others who only noted myocarditis cases. We had much more work than ever before, only through this vaccine."*

**19:53** Now, before looking at the most shocking slide, please recall the dates: In March, April and May of 2021, the devastating effects of the Astra Zeneca vaccine became clear. Even ordinary citizens who had no access to the scientific literature became suspicious. They had unreliable but convincing information from what they saw in their neighborhood.

How did Germany's leading politicians respond to these unmistakable warnings? They produced the following headlines: *"Federal President Steinmeier vaccinated with Astra Zeneca", "Chancellor Merkel and Vice Chancellor Scholtz vaccinated with Astra Zeneca", "Karl Lauterbach vaccinated with Astra Zeneca", and finally in May: "Health Minister Joseph Spahn gets vaccinated with Astra Zeneca"*. Never before have I heard of politicians announcing what medical treatment they receive. With Mrs. Merkel, the highlight was even showing her vaccine certificate. My interpretation of that is that they wanted to avoid Astra Zeneca being unused and then becoming accused of wasting taxpayers' money.

**21:12** People were still afraid of that back then. Meanwhile it has become common knowledge that billions are spent every year on vaccine doses that are thrown away later, but back then politicians were still afraid. Whether they really got vaccinated, everyone can decide for themselves. If you have an IQ above 90 you can only come to one conclusion.

Now to the topic of children.

**21:46** On 11 March, 2020 we read: *"School closures in areas that are not particularly affected are not recommended"*. Five days later politicians shut down all schools, daycare centers, and kindergartens. Also on 11 March, 2020 another crisis team had already made a decision. Hence on 16 March all schools etc. closed against the RKI's advice.

21 March, 2021: *"Pediatrics professional associations are reluctant to vaccinate children. Politicians are preparing vaccination campaigns."* A little later, almost pleadingly: *"Children, when compared with other respiratory diseases, have a lower risk of severe disease progression"*. We recognise an internal resistance which, however, was never communicated to the outside world.

At the end of 2021, we read: *"The Health Ministry plans a booster scheme for children although there is no recommendation, and partly no approval."*

**23:07** The Health Minister posted on Twitter the following:

*"In children 12 to 15, BioNTech was 100% effective against Covid without side effects. (So again, allegedly free of side effects!) Everything speaks in favor of vaccinating children"*.

If you are not blocked, like me, you can open Lauterbach's Tweet and click on his source. You will find a blog sharing a press release from Pfizer and BioNTech. So, the minister is acting as an advertising agency for the pharmaceutical industry. No scientific article is behind his post.

**23:51** Let me conclude. This last slide, the most complex, is divided into three parts, and it is also the most important one. It first shows the so-called RKI risk assessment, on which our lives depended for three years. Green bars indicate that we were allowed to live like people have done the last hundreds of thousands of years with viruses. Yellow and especially red bars indicate lockdowns, school and kindergarten closures, curfews, 15 kilometers restrictions, mask requirements and direct and indirect forms of compulsory vaccination.

**24:40** In March of 2020 the RKI suddenly increased the risk level. The bars changed from green to yellow. This remained so until the beginning of 2023, when the bars returned to green.

Now let's take a look at statistics from the RKI and the Federal Ministry of Health, showing ICU [Intensive Care Unit] bed occupancy in Germany. The green line below is the recommended occupation of intensive care units. You can see the following: In 2020 we had a significant under utilization. Totally abnormal. This is what the RKI stated in its records for total clinical occupation. At the time billions of euros had to be earmarked to avoid hospital bankruptcies. This was also the time when dances were performed by hospital staff and broadcast everywhere on social media.

**25:40** Then you see that in 2021, 2022 and 2023 the total ICU bed occupation hardly fluctuates anymore, and that has now no longer to do with any special actions. The most interesting thing in this graph is the dotted line at the bottom. These are the PCR cases. They include people who have contracted Covid, as well as people who, for example, have arrived after a traffic accident and were required to take a PCR test at admission. (I would call these fluctuations varying numbers of false positives, but I'm not a doctor. I don't even play one on TV.)

Obviously the PCR curve fluctuates enormously, but without any impact on the total ICU occupation. The crux of the matter is that the media only showed PCR curves for three years with an alleged exponential growth, and whatever they called it. If you now compare the two, it is completely incomprehensible why RKI indicates high risk whereas the lower graph indicates complete normality. Clearly one cannot understand that, but you will soon understand it using the RKI-Leak.

**26:57** Here on the left we have the explanation. I quote from 16 March, 2020: *“During the weekend a new risk assessment was prepared”*. Before a court the RKI stated the assessment was prepared outside, so it was not based on a scientific evaluation. Further quote: *“Risk is scheduled to be scaled up this week.”* One day later the RKI report stated that there was a high risk, and we went into lockdown.

In June of 2020, not only were the number of colds low, as is typical for the season, but even the PCR numbers approached the zero line. ...., and in the prelude to the record shown here, RKI members thought that now the official risk level could be reduced again, ...

**27:53** ...but then we read about NATO General Holtherm, who was top boss of the RKI, two hierarchy levels above Mr. Wieler, the figure head or mouth piece. Holtherm decided on Tuesday that the risk assessment in the next week must not be changed. Next week looked harmless, but as you see on the top right it lasted three years.

Then on 25 February, 2022, the Federal Ministry of health declined to reduce the risk level from very high to high. That was shortly before parliament’s vote on comprehensive vaccine mandates. The only really funny part that I found in the RKI-leak is this one from 26 April, 2023. At the start of April the minister had declared that the pandemic was over, as RKI learned from the newspapers, and I quote: *“Setting the risk assessment to low might be considered.”*

**28:54** That is what they had forgotten to do, and it proves the whole thing was about politics, and not medicine. From start to finish.

The following conclusions emerge:

The RKI case reveals a fundamental problem of the rule of law: According to Montesquieu, courts shall control the executive, but courts mainly dealt with authorities, or believed mainly or only authorities, in almost all trials regarding vaccination mandates, lockdowns, or school closures, the RKI and PEI acted as witnesses, and the courts found all restrictions OK.

Because all authorities are bound by instructions, the government is its own witness, which is contradictory to the separation of powers.

You have to be lucky and have a good willed whistle blower to achieve better results.

**29:51** So, I will now quote a sentence from a recent court ruling. *“This recommendation for vaccination mandates, based on assessments of the Robert Koch Institute, is now refuted by the published internal records of the institute.”* **This means that the Administrative Courts of Osnabrück, in a trial concerning the mandate to vaccinate a nursing employee, has**



**withdrawn the mandate and has submitted the whole case to the Federal Constitutional Court.**

In my opinion we have the same problem with other agencies such as the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution and the Federal Environment Agency. They are always given say even though they are not independent.

Thank you very much for your attention.”

-----

Translation: Howard R Steen & Paul Charles Gregory

Nov 16 2024