

Epoch Times article on KBV data revelations <https://www.epochtimes.de/politik/streit-um-analyse-warum-drei-juristen-und-ein-mathematiker-bedenken-haben-a4089062.html>

English translation by CoronaCases.wiki

EPOCH-TIMES 20 December 2022 - POLITICS

RISE IN "SUDDEN AND UNEXPECTED DEATHS"

Dispute over analysis: why three lawyers and a mathematician have concerns

By Patrick Reitler 20th December 2022

The dispute that has been going on for days about the correctness of a data analysis on possible vaccine damage leaves many questions unanswered. The contradictory nature of statements by the **PEI**, the **KBV** and the **Zi** have meanwhile also brought together three lawyers and a mathematician.

The Epoch Times asked them about their doubts.

After Martin Sichert of the AfD and the data analyst Tom Lausen made serious accusations against the Paul Ehrlich Institute (PEI) on 12 December, a dispute has arisen about the correctness of the data basis of the PEI, the correctness of the data used by the National Association of Statutory Health Insurance Physicians (KBV), their interpretation and the role of the authorities in clarifying possible vaccine damage.

The **KBV** and the **Zentralinstitut für die kassenärztliche Versorgung (Zi)** reacted to the analysis with incomprehension and criticism - and gave completely different reasons for the occurrence of diagnoses and deaths.

Also, the parliamentary groups in the Bundestag - with the exception of the AfD - also rejected Lausen's conclusions on 16 December, some of them in harsh terms.

PEI: Waiting for the health insurers

On the same day as the Bundestag session, the PEI issued a statement. They explained that until recently, not a single German health insurer had cooperated for a study on "rare and/or serious side effects" of the COVID-19 vaccines. That is why it has not yet been possible to carry out a corresponding study.

The data of the health insurance funds are "much more suitable" for an evaluation than, for example, the data of the KBV on which basis data analyst Lausen had made his evaluation of vaccination side effects and "sudden and unexpected deaths".

However, some of the statements made by the PEI, KBV and Zi raised doubts among interested observers.

Some lawyers have already contacted the Paul Ehrlich Institute to finally shed some light on the matter. Who is right? Who is wrong and on which point? Who has failed to fulfil which obligations?

What is to be done now? The Epoch Times has asked three lawyers and a mathematician about the reasons for their concerns.

Prof. Martin Schwab: Sleight of hand?

For Bielefeld law professor Martin Schwab, the statements by KBV head Dr. Andreas Gassen, according to which "the rise in deaths is probably due to the pandemic" and that "the excess mortality without vaccination would probably have been much higher" was "in no way conclusive".

"If Gassen is right," Schwab asked the Epoch Times, "why didn't we already have excess mortality in 2020, when vaccination didn't even exist?"

Why do the large increases in certain diseases or sudden and unexpected deaths, according to the 90-page **KBV** raw data set occur in the first quarter of 2021, i.e. when the vaccinations started?"

Schwab also criticised the **Central Institute of Statutory Health Insurance Physicians (Zi)**: "If Dr. von Stillfried from the **Zi** assumes that there are errors in the input or transmission of data, then you have to ask yourself: What kind of a junk shop is this that can't record its data properly? According to a report in the online magazine "[The Blaze](#)", this reminds him of a "[sleight of hand](#)" that the US military had already used: "After the start of the vaccinations, they had also recorded strong increases in myocarditis, turbo cancer, etc. They argued at the time that all of this had already occurred in the years from 2016 to 2020, but that the cases had not been fully recorded at the time. So, either the US military is full of multimorbid people or full of incompetent data collectors," says Schwab.

He had advised the data analyst Tom Lausen to think about filing a criminal complaint against the members of the Bundestag who had insulted him on 16 December during the "[Aktuelle Stunde](#)". Statements such as "data Salafist" (Tino Sorge, CDU), "pseudo-expert" (Herbert Wollmann, SPD) or "charlatan" (Heike Engelhardt, SPD) had, in his opinion, "already crossed the line into insult".

All in all, Schwab said, it seemed to him as if "the supporters of the vaccination campaign are becoming more and more nervous and their statements more and more contradictory". In his view, this is also shown by "the increasingly strong verbal outbursts".

Friedemann Däblitz: "Absurd assumptions".

The Hamburg lawyer Friedemann Däblitz has, by his own admission, been "campaigning for the preservation of basic rights in times of pandemics" for two and a half years. Now he has also taken on the Paul Ehrlich Institute. In an official letter, he called on the PEI to ensure

that the available data are checked and, if necessary, verified by 21 December - and that the vaccines against COVID-19 are withdrawn from the market immediately if necessary.

Däblitz refers to the official figures of the cause of death statistics of the Federal Statistical Office, "because there are no more official figures than those of the Federal Statistical Office", he says. The PEI has so far not contradicted the "explosive development" of vaccination deaths caused by COVID-19. In addition, the Institute had assumed "in its observed-versus-expected analysis" that "all cases of vaccination side effects had been reported to it", "especially the severe ones".

Däblitz considers this assumption "absurd": "In 2002, the PEI itself still published an unreported rate of serious side effect reports of 95 per cent and still in 2018 drew attention to the problem of a lack of compliance by doctors with regard to their reporting obligations under the Infection Protection Act." "To now pretend that one only needs to assess the incoming suspected cases of side effects can hardly be explained by incompetence," Däblitz is convinced.

However, the lawyer does not expect the PEI to follow his call: "Nobody wants to lose face," says Däblitz. "But if now, in the knowledge of the latest official figures, lives continue to be endangered by vaccination without need, it becomes criminally relevant." Possibly the behaviour of the PEI touches on paragraph 211 of the Criminal Code, intent to conceal.

Frank Großenbach: Insinuations and insults

Frank Großenbach, a lawyer from Frankfurt, is also of the opinion that there is an "initial suspicion" because of the excess mortality "of at least 30,000 in 2021, the year of the vaccinations", which is proven by data. This is not only sufficient, but even obligatory, to "withdraw the mRNA active substances from circulation" until it can be "safely excluded" that the excess mortality is due to the vaccinations. According to section 69 of the Medicines Act and due to the legal mandate according to section 13, paragraph 5 of the Infection Protection Act, the occurrence of a "warning signal" is sufficient to immediately withdraw the mRNA active substances from the market. He considers this warning signal to be given after Lausen's analysis.

At the very least, however, "the population must be informed about the factual connections", "so that everyone can act in a self-determined manner in their own knowledge of the data on their body", demanded Großenbach. On 12 December, the day of the AfD press conference, he had already made a statement to the PEI on behalf of Tom Lausen ([video at Odysee](#)).

In his estimation, the statements of KBV head Andreas Gassen had even strengthened the position of the vaccination campaign sceptics: "He explains that the presented increased mortality would represent a normal pandemic event. This is a simple assessment of the figures. This assessment is not plausible". With his statement, Gassen had indirectly "confirmed that the excess mortality determined by Tom Lausen was statistically correct. It is just that his conclusions from the figures presented are different", explained Großenbach.

A little later, Dr von Stillfried, head of Zi, explained "that the data had been evaluated incorrectly due to a certain selection". Only those patient data had been evaluated for which a medical diagnosis had been made again in 2021. "With this, Dr. von Stillfried has made an unfounded insinuation about the data evaluation," says Großenbach. From his point of view, it is an "erroneous statement of fact". He assumes that von Stillfried acted in this way "because he was well aware of the explosive power of the data presented if it were also confirmed by him".

In general, it was "incomprehensible" to him why "absurd theses that contradict common sense" should be suitable to categorically exclude a connection between the reported excess mortality and vaccinations. There may well be other, much less suitable causal connections - but these are "by no means suitable to exclude another cause, which is even much more plausible".

Those members of the Bundestag who "insulted Tom Lausen with foul-mouthed verbal jargon" would, in his opinion, do well to take the fundamental confirmation of the excess mortality figures by Andreas Gassen as an opportunity to "examine the facts in more detail before making sweeping insults". "Instead of enquiring with Tom Lausen himself and making himself knowledgeable, insinuations were simply followed that are baseless," Großenbach explained.

The lawyer announced that he would ask the three members of parliament to issue a cease-and-desist declaration. In it, they should undertake to refrain from insults and not to continue to "make incorrect factual claims that the data are 'fake data' or 'falsified'".

The PEI's press statement of 16 December had confirmed that the "legal mandate according to § 13 para. 5 of the Infection Protection Act is still not being fulfilled". Moreover, the PEI had left it at "taking over Dr von Stillfried's insinuation" instead of "independently evaluating" Tom Lausen's figures, which he himself had already asked the PEI to do.

Mathematician Özoguz: contradictions everywhere

A few days after the official presentation of the data analysis, Huseyin Özoguz, a mathematician from Bremen, had also looked at the figures for his own interest - and posted his view of things on [YouTube](#). He explained to the Epoch Times that his main concern was "open-ended research into vaccination side effects in general". He also wanted to clarify "the contradictory statements of the KBV and the Zi".

The Zi had published its own data, which contradicted the KBV, Özoguz said. Nevertheless, the KBV and the Zi had stuck to their interpretations: The KBV still sees the "pandemic as the cause for the increase", the Zi insists on the "assertion that there are only very, very few errors in the KBV data that would explain the death settlements before 2021".

In the meantime, the Federal Statistical Office had published [death figures](#) that contradicted both the KBV and the Zi data. And the PEI has admitted "that it has neither received nor analysed the data so far, despite the legal mandate". Özoguz thinks that none of this fits together. Moreover, despite a request from the PEI, he has not yet received an answer to

his statement. The KBV has also not yet responded to Özoguz's request to provide him with complete data sets.

For the Epoch Times, neither the PEI nor the health insurance funds were able to provide an up-to-date statement on the criticism or on future cooperation by 20 December.

What happened?

On Monday, 12 December, Tom Lausen and Martin Sichert, the AfD's health policy spokesperson, had presented an [evaluation of the KBV data sets](#) from 2016 to 2021 at a press conference in the Bundestag ([video on YouTube](#); [PDF document of the presentation](#)).

Their focus was particularly on the increase in "sudden and unexpected deaths" with the beginning of 2021. Sichert and Lausen leveled serious accusations against the government's official bodies: both the Paul Ehrlich Institute (PEI) and the Robert Koch Institute, which is superior to it, as well as the Federal Ministry of Health had failed in their duty to carry out such an analysis themselves and to investigate the background. They would have been obliged to do so according to paragraph 13, section 5 of the Vaccination Protection Act. Nothing had happened for months.

At the press conference, Sichert and Lausen stressed that they could not say "that the increase in sudden and unexpected deaths was directly caused by the vaccination". There is only a suspicion that this could be the case. Until there is clarity on the causes of the outliers, the administration of Corona vaccines must be stopped, according to one of Sichert's demands.
