W i l f r i e d S c h m i t z

Rechtsanwalt

RA Wilfried Schmitz, Mitglied der RA-Kammer Köln

Büro in 52538 Selfkant:

De-Plevitz-Str. 2
Telefon: 02456-5085590
Telefax: 02456-5085591
Mobil: 01578–7035614
Mobile Festnetz-Nr.: 02456-9539054
Email:
info@rechtsanwalt-wilfried-

Homepage abrufbar unter:
Rechtsanwalt-Wilfried-Schmitz.de
beA:
Schmitz, Wilfried (52538 Selfkant)

Steuernummer: 210/5145/1944
USt.-IdNr.: DE268254583

An das

Bundesverwaltungsgericht
Geschäftsstelle 1. Wehrdienstsenat

schmitz.de
04107 Leipzig

Zustellung über das beA

Bei Zahlungen bitte stets angeben:
Rechn.-Nr.:

Bei Antworten bitte stets angeben:
Aktenzeichen: 37 + 58 / 2022

Selfkant, den 24.3.2022

In the military appeal proceedings

of the Lord ...

AZ. ....

and

of the Lord ...

AZ. ...

the BVMg's brief of 23.3.2022 is really very irritating for several reasons.

So BVMg apparently wants to refuse to give us the requested information.

What quote does this refusal to withhold such data and truth from the people themselves remind me of?

"There is a direct connection between people's right to know the truth and to have their voices heard, and freedom itself. But in the media age, ignorance is trump and concealment of the truth is the order of the day." (from: John Pilger, Covert Targets, p. 13)

This morning's talk is meant to be factual, but I want to mention that I had a hard time sleeping last night after taking note yesterday of the shocking development of the numbers from the US military's DMED database since the start of the coronavirus "vaccination" campaign in the US.
The exact data will be sent to the discerning senate very soon in the separate pleading of a colleague.

A US lawyer speaks of a "planned genocide" based on this data from the DMED database of the US military. The video on this has been going through social media for a few days, see:

https://t.me/fragunsdoch_WWG1WGA/18664

I wonder how those responsible at the BMVg can still find their sleep in the face of such catastrophe reports. Off the top of my head, I can think of a whole series of criminal offences that would have been committed here if alarming data had been withheld to the detriment of all Bundeswehr soldiers.

So BVMg wants to keep quiet about the US military data as well?

In that case, the submission on this side can already be treated as conceded.

But BVMg please explain immediately why it assumes that the US military data is not representative, if applicable, of all militaries in the world, including the Bundeswehr, if applicable, who have also participated in these coronavirus vaccinations with high vaccination coverage? In other words: Why should there not have been comparable devastating consequential damages in the Bundeswehr due to these coronavirus "vaccinations"?

Why does the BVMg believe that it can still escape the request for information by the colleague Beate Bahner by means of a reference requested by it from the recognizing senate or that the justification of this request for information depends on the recognizing senate?

Does BVMg want to admit that its internal data is so revealing, or even shocking, that it would finally shatter its own presentation by doing so?

Or does the BVMg not want to concede that the data in the Bundeswehr is just as alarming as the data that emerges from the records of the Department of Defence of the USA?

Or does the BVMg want to admit that it has even omitted to conduct such surveys, which would make it possible to answer our questions, in breach of its duty of care?

If this were the case, it would be tantamount to foregoing the earliest possible detection of an alarming development in "vaccination" complications that might even endanger the operational capability of the Bundeswehr.

In this case, the interim motions of the complainants - which we will soon reconsider - would (also) already be justified for this reason!

Because of the non-disclosure of this data, the obligation to tolerate would have to be suspended until the BMVg has collected, evaluated and assessed this data as requested by Mrs. Beate Bahner.

Whoever does not take any protective measures to the detriment of the soldiers, or even deliberately does without them, has not only grossly failed and literally played Russian

roulette with the life and limb of the soldiers. He would have to suspend the obligation to tolerate of his own accord until he has - demonstrably - finally fulfilled his duty of care.

We will go into more detail on the opinion of the senior staff physician Prof. Dr. med. K. Kehe of 22.3.2022 in a separate written submission, especially since the "Legal Advice Note" of the "Command Medical Operational Support" of August 2021 and, above all, the "Clarification Leaflet on Vaccination against COVID-19 (Corona Virus Disease **2019**) with mRNA Vaccines - of the Federal Armed Forces (Status: 17.1.2022) still deserve special appreciation. In conclusion, however, I will already make a few comments on this.

But I want to make sure that the discerning Senate doesn't let itself be led up the garden path by BVMg's reference to such unserious pseudo-"fact-checkers" as Correctiv.

The BVMg demands scientificity and "reputable" sources and then quotes Correctiv of all people as a source? Then it might as well refer to the announcements of the PR departments of the big corporations and NGOs as a "reputable" source, so "independent" and purely "fact-oriented" are these fact-checker mushrooms that have been growing everywhere for some years, not by chance, out of the soil of mass media-propagandistic influence and manipulate the formation of public opinion.

Before I would like to discuss the international network of these "fact checkers" and their sponsors, I would first like to state that the - very often very unobjective - way in which highly deserving personalities such as Prof. Dr. Bhakdi have been criticized and also personally attacked by such pseudo "fact checkers" in the last two years is very reminiscent of the sufficiently well-known methods of propaganda.

Here is a small digression:

"Arthur Ponsonby, 1st Baron Ponsonby of Shulbrede (b. 16 February 1871; † 23 March 1946), a British civil servant, politician, writer, and pacifist, was arguably one of the first to alert the public to the methods of wartime propaganda.

"In his book *Falsehood in Wartime (*1928) he examined and described the methods of war propaganda used by the belligerents in the First World War. It contains the famous remark: *"When war is declared, truth is the first* casualty."). Anne Morelli systematized and updated his account in *The Principles of War Propaganda*:[1]

1. We don't want war.
2. The opposing camp bears sole responsibility for the war.
3. The leader of the enemy has demonic traits ("the bad guy on duty").
4. We're fighting for a good cause.
5. The enemy fights with forbidden weapons.
6. The opponent commits atrocities on purpose, with us they are errors by mistake.
7. Our losses are low, the enemy's are enormous.
8. Respected personalities, scientists, artists and intellectuals support our cause.
9. Our mission is sacred.
10. Anyone who doubts our reporting is on the side of the enemy and is a traitor."

(Source: Wikipedia)

If you were to replace the above list of principles of war propaganda with a few terms from the past vaccination campaign, you would have quite aptly described the methods by which, over the past two years, highly respected scientists have ultimately been discredited and antagonized simply for contradicting the official narratives of politics and the pharmaceutical industry on the "Corona Pandemic".

The causes of these anti-democratic developments, however, go much deeper.

For example, Prof. Dr. Rainer Mausfeld, Professor Emeritus of General Psychology, has argued in his book **"Warum schweigen die Lämmer?"** that democracy has been undermined in an unprecedented way over the past decades. Democracy, he argues, has been replaced by the illusion of democracy, free public debate by opinion and outrage management, the guiding ideal of the responsible citizen by that of the politically apathetic consumer. Elections would meanwhile play practically no role for fundamental political questions. The important political decisions would be made by political-economic groupings that are neither democratically legitimate nor democratically accountable. The destructive ecological, social and psychological consequences of this form of elite rule would increasingly threaten our society and our livelihoods.

There are several YouTube videos with lectures and interviews by and with Prof. Rainer Mausfeld in which he addresses the contents of his aforementioned book, see among others:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rk6I9gXwack&t=343s

So after this little introduction to the world of media manipulation and propaganda, I now come to the bizarre world of "fact checkers".

The article from the portal "ANTI-SPIEGEL" from 14.1.2022 with the title "A message and its history: Fact checkers demand stricter censorship measures from YouTube" is very informative in this regard. There it says among other things (quote):

"On January 12, 80 international fact-checkers issued an open letter calling for YouTube to take "effective action" to more effectively combat disinformation. One of the signatories is correctiv.

Self-appointed fact-checkers have become the new Ministry of Truth today, as they determine what is true and what is not. Correctiv has just embarrassed itself by accusing me of making a false statement and then confirming my core statement at the end of its article, you can find the details here.

It is not necessary to go into the claims in detail, more interesting is the question of who is behind the open letter. Every fact checker has founders and backers, who in turn have interests. In the case of correctiv, these are the German media groups. They founded correctiv, finance correctiv, sit in the leadership of correctiv - in other words, they completely steer correctiv, the details of which can be found here.

Nevertheless, correctiv is presented as an independent network of journalists that supposedly looks critically at the media and checks facts. In reality, the German media corporations have only created a useful tool that they can use to confirm the accuracy of their own reports and narratives, because the average media consumer has never heard of all this and naturally thinks: If an independent journalist network confirms it, then it must be true.

Nobody needs to know that the supposedly independent journalists' network is in fact founded, financed and controlled by the media.

This is how self-proclaimed fact checkers work all over the world: someone sets up a small organization, gives it a nice name, and then appoints himself a fact checker who knows exactly what is true and what is fake. And to top it all off, they even set up an international umbrella organization that certifies fact checkers internationally so that the fraud looks even more serious, because the average media consumer then thinks that clear and objective quality standards are being applied. This is not true, the certificate is not for quality, but for the right attitude.

The International Fact-Checking Network

In the US, a Florida newspaper founded its own fact-checker back in 1975, called the Poynter Institute. Today, this is a powerful organization in the circle of self-proclaimed truth-checkers, and in 2015, Poynter founded the International Fact-Checking Network, which claims to give international fact-checkers an accolade. It currently lists 102 "verified" members on its site. But the list is unlikely to be complete, as we will see in a moment.

Poynter is funded by various NGOs and foundations that use the fact checkers to ensure that the projects they support are put in the right light. Particularly interesting is the list of Poynter's partners, who are supposed to help the fact checkers with media literacy. Among them are: Facebook, Google, Microsoft and also daughters of those, such as WhatsApp. We'll get to more media literacy supporters later, let's stick with those for now.

If you pay attention to fact checkers, you will find that a great many of them are paid for and supported by the internet corporations. The internet corporations direct many fact checkers and they also direct them through their umbrella organization, which Poynter has declared himself to be.

The open letter to YouTube

So it's interesting to look at who signed the open letter in which 80 fact-checkers from around the world called for more censorship of YouTube. I cross-checked the list of signatories with the list of 102 members of Poynter's fact-checking network, and unsurprisingly, almost all of the signatories of the letter to YouTube are organized at Poynter.

However, the list of Poynter is not complete, as I have already mentioned. The reason: correctiv has been a member there since 2017, but is not mentioned in Poynter's list. The vast majority of the signatories of the open letter are on Poynter's list, and because of the example of correctiv signing the letter but not being listed on Poynter, I assume that (almost) all other signatories who are not on Poynter's list are nevertheless members of the Poynter network.

The letter to himself

So we have a situation where internet corporations like Google pay an umbrella organisation and also many of their members and then those members write an open letter demanding that Google's subsidiary YouTube ensure that there is more censorship on YouTube. Google could have written the letter to itself.

But that's how the game works: Google can now play coy for a bit and then cave in to pressure from the truth-only international fact-checkers and tighten its censorship. Google can wash its hands of the matter, since it was pressured by the truth-checkers to crack down on what they (who are paid by Google) consider to be misinformation..." (end quote)

Source:

https://www.anti-spiegel.ru/2022/eine-meldung-und-ihre-geschichte-faktenchecker-fordern-von-youtube-strengere-zensurmassnahmen/

In another article published on the portal "ANTI-SPIEGEL" on 20.3.2022 with the headline "Who at Facebook decides what is true and what is not" it says:

"And if you look at their website, it gives the impression of an independent and critical organization, and that's how the media likes to report on them. Problem: **correctiv is neither independent nor critical.** They are closely linked to the German press and thus swim along in the mainstream, even more: **correctiv was founded by the press itself** so that the press can cite a supposedly neutral group of "activists" as confirmation for their own reports.

Sounds absurd? But it is. The foundation was financed by the Brost Foundation with three million euros. You've never heard of the Brost Foundation? The Brost Foundation was founded by the billionaire Brost family and what did they do with their money? They own the WAZ Group, one of Germany's leading media groups, which owns a large proportion of the regional newspapers in Germany, has stakes in radio and television stations and also owns Germany-wide magazines.

With this, a media oligarch in Germany has founded a small "critical" platform, which is now supposed to critically observe the media. And so that no one believes that only the WAZ Group is behind correctiv, here are some of the members of the supervisory board, ethics council and management of correctiv:

Founder and managing director is David Schraven, who held a high post in the WAZ Group until the founding of correctiv. Oliver Schröm is editor-in-chief and was previously at Welt, Stern, ARD and others.
Nikolaus Brender was formerly editor-in-chief at ZDF and is on correctiv 's ethics board.
Also on the ethics council is Ulrich Reitz, former editor-in-chief of Focus.
Through Peter Schaar, the German government is also connected to correctiv, as he used to be the Federal Government Commissioner for Data Protection and is now also on the Board of Trustees. Stefan Willeke, the editor-in-chief of Die Zeit, also sits on the Ethics Board.

And those were just a few examples..."

Source:

https://www.anti-spiegel.ru/2019/wer-bei-facebook-entscheidet-was-wahr-ist-und-was-nicht/

Also really worth reading is the two-part article "**Fact Check with the Fact Checkers**", which was published on the portal "Achgut.com":

https://www.achgut.com/artikel/faktencheck_bei_den_faktencheckern_folge_1

https://www.achgut.com/artikel/faktencheckbei_den_faktencheckern_2_die_finanzen

So these fact-checkers are obviously just propaganda tools funded and directed by those whose agenda they're supposed to support, sort of like, "So everyone believes me when

I say I'm just telling the truth, I'll give someone money to confirm it." It doesn't get much more complicated than that.

The discerning Senate had better not assume either, certainly not unchecked, that it is being truthfully informed by the public law ones.

Former public broadcasting employees say so themselves.

In early October 2021, ARD employee Ole Skambraks addressed this situation in an open letter published at

https://multipolar-magazin.de/artikel/ich-kann-nicht-mehr

has been published, emphatically confirmed, and in this open letter immediately stated by way of introduction (quote):

"I can no longer remain silent. I can no longer accept without a word what has been happening for a year and a half now at my employer, the public broadcaster. Things like 'balance', 'social cohesion' and 'diversity' in reporting are enshrined in the statutes and media state contracts. **What is practiced is the exact opposite. A true discourse and exchange in which all parts of society can find each other does not exist...**"

Ole Skambraks is not the only one - Karin Seibold has done the same and has given several interviews about it, see e.g. :

https://auf1.tv/elsa-auf1/unfrei-unehrlich-ungerecht-zdf-3sat-moderatorin-rechnet-mit-ehemaligem-arbeitgeber-ab/

To begin a differentiated appraisal of "mainstream media", I can recommend the following study by Swiss Policy Research, among others:

https://swprs.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/die-propaganda-matrix-spr-hdv.pdf

For further deepening, a free excerpt from the book "**Meinungsmacht**" (**Power of Opinion)** by Dr. Uwe Krüger is available under the following link. In the context of his dissertation, Krüger investigated the question of why the pronouncements of the most important representatives of the so-called "mainstream" press always coincide in content, not infrequently down to the last word:

https://www.halem-verlag.de/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/9783869624594_le.pdf

Contrary to the view of the first two instances of administrative jurisdiction, the "independence of the broadcasters and the diversity of their programmes" is evidently not only dependent on "financing" or on the revenue of the contributors.

The independence of broadcasters depends to a large extent on who makes a career there and with what personal background, and who is allowed to occupy the most important key positions (in particular: Intendant, editor-in-chief of news programmes, news anchor).

However, to go into this in more detail would go beyond the scope of this brief. Let us rather stay with the area of "health policy".

In any case, there are real treasure troves on the distortions in health policy and the seemingly omnipotent influence of pharmaceutical companies on the politics of many countries, such as the above-mentioned book "**Deadly Medicine and Organized Crime - How the Pharmaceutical Industry Corrupts the Health System**" by Peter C. Gotzsche, where some of the worst frauds of the pharmaceutical giants are appropriately acknowledged in the chapter "The 'Hall of Shame' of the Pharmaceutical Giants" (ibid. from p. 59).

For example, the US lawyer Robert F. Kennedy Jr. has publicly criticized the corruption in the health care system time and again, including in his article "Vaccination policy like a stool on the deck of the Titanic", which is quoted in the book "Virus Delusion" by Köhnlein et al. starting on page 269. There it says among other things (quote):

"CDC, FDA and WHO under the spell of Big Pharma and long time dishonest.

I became skeptical of official views on vaccination after spending 15 years researching the issue and arguing it in court. I have watched as financial conflicts and institutional self-interest have turned key sectors of our public health agencies into appendages of the very pharmaceutical companies that Congress has charged with regulating them.

Multiple investigations by Congress and the Inspector General of HHS - the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services - have consistently found that an overwhelming majority of FDA officials directly charged with approving vaccines, and CDC officials directly charged with. Approval of vaccines, and of CDC officials who then make those vaccines mandatory for children, are personally financially involved with vaccine manufacturers.

These officials are often shareholders, grant recipients, and paid consultants to vaccine manufacturers, and occasionally patent holders of the vaccines they vote to approve. These conflicts motivate them to recommend more and more vaccines, and that this can be solidly justified by the scientific data.

The pharmaceutical industry also exerts pressure via agency budgets. The FDA, for example, receives 45 percent of its annual budget from industry. The World Health Organization (WHO) gets about half of its budget from private sources, including Big Pharma and its foundations. And the CDC, let's face it, is a lot like a vaccine company; it owns 56 vaccine patents, and through its Vaccines for Children program, it buys and distributes $4.6 billion worth of vaccines annually, accounting for more than 40 percent of its total budget.

Further, Big Pharma directly funds and controls dozens of CDC programs through the CDC Foundation....

In 1986, Congress - awash in pharmaceutical money (the pharmaceutical industry has been number one in both political donations and lobbying expenditures for the past 20 years) - enacted a law giving vaccine manufacturers blanket immunity (exemption) when it comes to liability for damages caused by vaccines. If vaccines were so safe.... , would we have to grant such immunity to pharmaceutical companies? The gold rush that ensued for pharmaceutical companies in the wake of this law increased the number of recommended vaccinations from 12 vaccinations with five vaccines in 1986 to 54 vaccinations with 13 vaccines today. A billion-dollar sideline has become a $50 billion giant in the vaccine industry.

So since vaccines carry no liability risks for Big Pharma - and are virtually mandatory for 76 million U.S. children - there's little incentive for companies to make them safe..." (end quote)

We can easily prove that things are no better in Germany and Europe, that institutional corruption has thus also taken hold of German and European health authorities.

One could probably fill volumes with this topic. The already mentioned book "The Intensive Mafia" describes only the tip of the iceberg.

Perhaps we will devote a separate brief to this topic.

In 2009 the channel ARTE still produced the contribution "The Profiteers of Fear", which can still be found on YouTube, see:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9KqpWeeizxU

But whoever is currently looking for sources to find concrete evidence and proof of conflicts of interest at the current and previous Federal Minister of Health and the PEI and the RKI, has to make do with so-called "alternative" media.

There, critical articles on the entanglements of the pharmaceutical industry and politics were addressed very early on, including in the Rubicon article "The Vaccination Campaign" from 4/26/2020:

https://www.rubikon.news/artikel/die-impfkampagne

If even on aerzteblatt.de it says "EMA director was for years a lobbyist for the largest European pharmaceutical organisation", then this is probably only because this fact has long since become common knowledge and can simply no longer be denied.

Source:

https://www.aerzteblatt.de/studieren/forum/143033

So please keep that in mind when BVMg refers to pronouncements from the CDC, FDA, WHO, EMA, and national authorities as well.

In view of such machinations, as Peter C. Gotzsche and many others have uncovered, no one should wonder why some of these pharmaceutical giants now want to "save" the whole world with hastily produced Corona vaccines. It is a well-known truth: The business with the "disease" is promoted most sustainably by playing with fear and on a large scale by neatly worked out shock strategies.

And the facts that have become known about gain-of-function research feed the suspicion that we are ultimately to be saved with the "vaccination" by the circles that previously created the virus so that they can now pose as saviours.

Incidentally, it would not be the first time that a vaccination campaign was probably at least partly responsible for the deaths of millions.

So it says in the book "Virus-Wahn" by Köhnlein et al. on the "Spanish flu" pandemic of 1918 on page 261:

"In fact, there are numerous sources that tell of mass vaccination being a key contributor to the pandemic."

And these sources can be read in this very book from page 261 onwards

And on page 264 it says:

"Also, the rate of illness among vaccinated soldiers was seven times higher than among unvaccinated civilians."

We hold:

When Herr Oberstarzt Prof. Dr. med. K. Kehe quotes correcitv, he does not quote an independent, scientific source, but obviously bought and directed propaganda helpers.

I have given detailed reasons why an mRNA vaccination is in fact a gene therapy. Prof. Dr. med. Kehe does not even make an attempt to shake this lecture. He simply makes a sweeping assertion to the contrary, as if that were enough. However, as is well known, substantiated statements cannot be invalidated by blanket denials.

We will soon hear expert testimony on the toxicity of the spike proteins, their detection by immunohistochemistry, and the "unusual inflammatory reactions" associated with the timing of these "vaccinations."

Have those responsible at BVMg not yet noticed that since the beginning of the coronavirus "vaccination campaign" all over the world, very young "vaccinated" athletes have collapsed "suddenly and unexpectedly", with cardiovascular problems playing a role?

During the European Championship match between Denmark and Norway, the whole world was able to watch live as a Danish national player collapsed on the pitch and doctors desperately fought for his life, see among others:

https://www.t-online.de/sport/id_90210370/fussball-em-em-drama-in-kopenhagen-daenen-star-eriksen-kollabiert.html

So says the Rubicon article "Suddenly and Unexpectedly" dated 12/1/2022 (quote):

"...It's dangerous living these days as a celebrity, local politician or athlete. In 2021, the number of those "in the spotlight" who died "suddenly and unexpectedly" noticeably skyrocketed. This was not only the case in Germany, but could be observed globally. The cases are not limited to these groups of people, but represent only a small section of the total population.
Of course, people die from time to time, sometimes unexpectedly. But dying "suddenly and unexpectedly" seems to have reached new dimensions in 2021. This usually means that people die who would have been expected to live another decade or two. It does not only affect old people. Young fathers in the middle of life or even children and young people are also among them.
It is also striking how often athletes suddenly collapse. The special thing about it is that these collapses always occur at about the same time as cardiovascular problems, from which many of the affected people of different ages ultimately die. Whether it is the 13-year-old amateur footballer or the 20-year-old professional athlete - these young men and women usually have an extremely healthy organism and would certainly not be capable of great physical achievements with existing, known heart problems. In 2021, however, cardiovascular disease appears to be clustered among athletes..."

Source:

https://www.rubikon.news/artikel/plotzlich-und-unerwartet

The BVMg asks itself why Prof. Burkhardt and other experts have created a "pathology conference".
The reason was that the pathologists in Germany, and thus also those who are organised in the German Society of Pathology or the Federal Association of German Pathologists, have carried out far too few post-mortem examinations in the last two years to clarify the matter,

whether people really died "of" or "with" the coronavirus,

whether people who died in temporal connection with a coronavirus "vaccination" died causally from this "vaccination".

Autopsies would have been essential to reliably clarify these important issues.

So says the Rubicon article "The Fear of Clarity" from 9/2/2020.

"Only autopsies provide clarity on how dangerous a virus is. It is all the more strange that they are still a rarity in a society so entirely focused on Corona. The Petitions Committee of the Bundestag recently released a petition "autopsies as a compulsory measure in epidemics". A chance for experts like Dr. Wodarg and Prof. Bhakdi to end the hysteria? Jörg Gastmann talked about this in an interview with petitioner Dirk Westerheide.

Jörg Gastmann: Mr. Westerheide, why did you submit a petition to the Petitions Committee of the Bundestag on the compulsory autopsy of Corona dead bodies?
Dirk Westerheide: I was already surprised at the beginning of the Corona crisis that almost no autopsies took place. Only autopsies provide reliable data and knowledge about the danger and treatment options for Covid-19, and thus a valid basis for political decisions. The fact that politicians and the media instead spread fear about a general danger of death without any valid basis drives people crazy. The all-important policy question of the decade, therefore, is whether the dead associated with COVID-19 died from or with Sars-CoV-2 infection. More specifically, how many actually died from it. Because the official statistics are devoid of any meaning due to the definition "positive PCR test at the time of death or sometime before".
Autopsies have two possible outcomes. Either Covid-19 is the extremely dangerous new disease, as politicians and the media claim. Or Covid-19 is no more dangerous than the influenza virus. Then the house of cards of the literal reign of terror would collapse. Either way, we would finally have clarity.

In addition, the only way the government can fulfill its duty of care is through autopsies, because that way the optimal treatment options can be researched in the shortest possible time. Since the federal government does not do this, it is guilty, in my opinion, of at least failing to provide assistance.

...Why are there not more autopsies than with Professor Klaus Püschel of the Hamburg University Hospital?
There were more, but not many. In my research, I found few reports of corona obductions. Pathology professor Gustavo Baretton of Dresden University Hospital stated in April at. Punkt.Preradovicthat even in the midst of the corona wave, the number of corona obductions averaged only zero to five at each of Germany's 36 university hospitals (the only exception being Hamburg), a small single-digit percentage of all deaths.

At the University Hospital in Aachen there has been an autopsy register since April, but it does not disclose any results to the public, even though the virus is crippling the world. Why do 35 university hospitals keep their results secret, while Professor Püschel of the Hamburg University Hospital reported on SWR 1 about his results after far more than 200 autopsies? What other explanation of this secrecy makes sense than that there were instructions from politics not to publish any results that would endanger the government's horror narrative?
This is precisely the result of the Hamburg autopsies. Professor Püschel explained literally: **"No one has ever died of Covid-19 in Hamburg without a previous illness. This virus is a fatal disease only in exceptional cases, but in most cases it is a predominantly harmless viral infection. All speculations about individual deaths, which have not been expertly verified, only fuel fears**."...**Which brings us to the main topic: What's the progress on the autopsies that have taken place so far?**

According to Professor Püschel, of "well over 200" official Hamburg Corona deaths, not a single one died from Covid-19, but all from fatal pre-existing conditions. "(End quote)

Source:https://www.rubikon.news/artikel/die-furcht-vor-der-klarheit

Prof. Dr. med. Burkhardt, when asked, will certainly confirm that the lack of autopsies was the reason for the foundation of the pathology conference.

It is remarkable that the pathologists of all people, who missed important autopsies in the last two years and did not do their job properly, are now pointing the finger at Prof. Dr. med. Burkhardt.

We will then also ask Prof. Burkhardt whether and why his findings were not "independently" scientifically reviewed and "published".
Perhaps this was because the influence of the pharmaceutical industry has made independent scientific work and publishing almost impossible in many fields.

The "serious" autopsy study of the Forensic Medicine Münster on possible vaccine-associated deaths quoted by Prof. Dr. med. K. Kehe at least confirms that there was a possible connection with a gene-based "vaccination" in 5 of 18 (!) cases examined, which is very impressive.

However, it remains unclear according to which criteria these 18 cases were selected and how old these persons were and which methods were used by forensic medicine to verify

whether the myocarditis detected in one case was a causal consequence of this vaccination or not.

And how the phenomenon described above, that all over the world especially young athletes collapse after vaccination, is explained by this analysis of Sessa et al. and studies denying a similarity between "the spike protein encoded in the vaccine and myocarditis-associated antigens of the heart muscle"?

So many deaths among young athletes is very unusual, that can't be denied.

And this phenomenon is certainly comprehended by the findings of Prof. Dr. Burkhardt and Prof. Dr. Bhakdi.

The questioning of Prof. Dr. Burkhardt will then also reveal whether he really prepared his findings "without information on previous illnesses" and even partly with "erroneous diagnostic terms". This is denied.

The reproaches of Prof. Dr. med. K. Kehe in this respect are so sweeping that they cannot be replied to.

So if the decisions of the Bundeswehr Medical Service were really based on "evidence-based findings", then there is no reason why the BVMg refuses to answer the questions of my colleague Bahner and myself and why it does not then also take into account the data of the US military.

In any case, pseudo-fact checkers like correctiv are "not suitable as a basis." when the BVMg would like to refer to reputable sources.

Schmitz
Rechsanwalt