

## **Transcript of the press conference by Prof. Stefan Homburg, Aya Velasquez and Bastian Barucker on the fully leaked RKI files**

Transcribed by Robert Meier

### **Presenter**

Good morning here in the conference room in Berlin, dear members of the media, ladies and gentlemen, interested, concerned, perhaps outraged citizens for a press conference on the subject of rki-transparenzbericht.de. The conference room in Berlin is a short walk away from the very institute, the Robert Koch Institute, which is the subject of today's discussion.

And I am delighted to welcome Aya Velazquez, a freelance journalist, to the podium, I welcome Professor Stefan Homburg, former professor of public finance at the Leibniz University of Hanover, and I warmly welcome Bastian Barucker, another freelance journalist who has been working in the education sector for around 20 years. I would like to extend a warm welcome.

rki-transparenzbericht.de, what is it all about? Most of you are here because you already know. Aya Velazquez, please explain to us what is piling up so impressively behind you.

### **Velasquez**

What's behind me is basically just a small snippet of material that was leaked to me by a male / female whistleblower slash from the Robert Koch Institute. The person no longer works at the institute, but had access to these protocols and from what I can tell, it was a matter of conscience. In other words, the person did not agree with the federal government's coronavirus policy, did not agree with the way in which her institute had rushed to comply with certain political directives and had also betrayed her own scientific principles to a certain extent and approached me. Several months ago, there were various meetings and various handovers of material, and the material has been complete since yesterday. This includes not only the RKI crisis team protocols from 2020 to 2023, but also all the additional material on the meetings, which is about ten gigabytes of material. The lion's share of the material is actually in the additional material and the nice thing about it is that we can now review the decisions of the Federal Government and also the RKI, i.e. the scientific recommendations of the RKI, for their scientific basis. And if, for example, decisions were changed very, very quickly, for example when the RKI suddenly recommended something completely opposite to what it had recommended two weeks previously, then you can now look in the additional material to see what the scientific basis was.

### **Presenter**

Aya Velazquez, Stefan Homburg and Bastian Barucker took on the Augias work,

to look through these protocols that Ms. Velazquez had distributed to them. They were not able to do this in their entirety due to the wealth of material. Ms. Velazquez, can you tell us how you divided up your work and how the scope of these protocols should be assessed?

### **Velasquez**

To be honest, I don't have the total number of pages in my head. The largest volume describes the communication in the first year, which is around 2000 pages. The second year is a little less, 1600 pages, I think. Now we're looking at data from the third year, but it gets less and less from year to year. In the last year, it's only about 600 pages and only goes up to June 2023. What's behind me here is only May to December in 2021. That's picked out because I've simply got this far in reading it to date. I started reading it page by page in May 2021 because the part before that was already declassified and so I was particularly interested in what came after that in preparation for today. What came after that, should I go into detail now?

### **Presenter**

I just wanted to say very briefly as an overview, in case you don't know, - you probably already do – that the RKI protocols have already been partially declassified. Thankfully, Paul Schreyer has done this, but not to its full extent. So we are here today to present this major event in which the last redactions have been removed. So we can, any of you, by going to [rki-transparenzbericht.de](https://rki-transparenzbericht.de), download all of these transcripts and the supplementary material.

And my question now would be, what were these last remaining redactions primarily?

### **Homburg**

Let's go back to the scope. Originally it was said on television that over 1000 pages had been released. That was somehow true, but it was two and a half thousand pages. If you take the material we have now, then it's just over 4000 pages. It has become much more material because the period from May 2021 to the end of 2023, when it breaks off in the summer, has been added. So we now not only have completely unredacted pages that have been released, but the leak also includes around one and a half thousand pages that have never been shown before, neither redacted nor unredacted. I have prepared a few passages for you, just a few appetizers, so to speak, which I have divided into two subject areas.

Firstly, ministerial directives and secondly, deception of the public.

Both are important because the public thinks that the more than 1000 RKI employees have done science, have advised politicians and that politicians have then acted on this science. In reality, however, it was exactly the opposite. The following Protocol is from September 2021 and was therefore never seen before today, except by the whistleblower and us. I quote:

*“The minister's authority to issue directives for technical documents of the RKI is currently under legal review.”*

This concerns technical documents, i.e. technical, not political recommendations, and the RKI is currently having a legal review carried out to determine whether the minister can issue instructions at all. The fact that you are having this checked indicates that you are not happy with it and that you are being given guidelines that you do not think are right. It goes on:

*“The current assessment of the RKI management is that the recommendations are made by the RKI in the role of a federal authority and that a ministerial directive must be complied with, as the Ministry of Health has technical supervision over the RKI.”*

That is true. The RKI is not an independent authority, but must follow the instructions of the superior authority, just like a lower water authority. October 2021:

*“The minister has advised everyone to get a booster vaccination.” In brackets: “but is not yet recommended by STIKO. And the minister has recommended the double vaccination of recovered people. In brackets, our specialist area 33 and the WHO do not yet have any data on this.”*

March 2022:

*“Mr. Lauterbach is talking about a possible summer wave. There is a decline in immunity and the seasonal effect will not be enough.”*

That's particularly curious. Remember, in 2020 Mr. Drosten said that the peak of the wave would come in the summer. In the summer, these incidences were practically zero. This was repeated in 2021. And in 2022, Mr. Lauterbach says the summer wave is coming. Very topical, because at the moment there are also rumors based on some wastewater values that we are currently in a bad situation. The curious thing is that there is this clinical data from the RKI, i.e. the flu web, working group, influenza. There you can see that there is nothing at all – all the time. But these PCR tests give the opposite impression.

On April 6th 2022, the RKI notes:

*“on the resolutions of the Conference of Health Ministers and the Lauterbach U-turn on quarantine and isolation.”*

So you yourself learn from the press that the minister has made a U-turn. You yourself did not suggest this.

Second topic, deception of the public.

On November 5th, 2021, which is two days after the start of the wavebreaker, if

you remember. The wave breaker, which then transitioned into the Christmas calm, the New Year's Eve calm, the Easter lockdown, the Whitsun lockdown and then escalated with a nationwide curfew with a low PCR value. So on November 5th, it reads:

*"There is talk in the media of a pandemic of the unvaccinated. From a technical point of view, this is not correct. The entire population is contributing. Should this be taken up in communication?"*

And then the answer:

*"No, the minister says that at every press conference, presumably deliberately, he cannot be corrected."*

In other words, you know that the minister is lying in public, that is to say deliberately, but you don't dare to set the record straight. December 8th, 2021:

*"Intensive care capacity is at an all-time low and keeps going back."*

I checked this with the DIVI data. In fact, by December 2021, the intensive care capacities had fallen from 40,000 to 30,000, but with a constant capacity of free requests.

At the time this was written, there were around 2,000 free beds and this is also the case at the moment because intensive care capacity is a breathing system. Staff can always be transferred from normal to intensive care, and that's how it's always been done. So the intensive care capacity is at its lowest point at the beginning of the wave breaker.

And now one of the last protocols, so it's relatively fresh, from April 26th, 2023: to me, this is the highlight of the whole collection:

*"Minister Lauterbach declared the pandemic over for Germany at the beginning of April. How do we deal with it? There is no country-specific end to a global pandemic."*

Yes, as you can see, they have gotten themselves into this pandemic and they can basically make out the following tendency as a concluding remark at the RKI. In the protocols from March 2020, they are clearly disconcerted by what is happening politically. They point out that there suddenly is a 50% vacancy rate in the clinics, which has never happened before. They write that 10 percent vacancy is normal. They say based on their clinical monitoring systems, sentinel and so on, that the number of colds overall is completely normal. You can see that they are taking a detached view of the whole thing. But that's changing and I interpret it as meaning that many RKI employees have gotten themselves into the psychosis they've created and in the end are shocked to find out, oops, now they're saying the pandemic is over. But why? It's all the same as before. Yes, that's right. There was never a pandemic in the medical sense, in the sense of a state of emergency, but there was only a declaration, a political declaration of a pandemic, which was ended when it was no longer politically expedient.

## **Presenter**

Thank you very much, Professor Homburg, on the subject of ministerial guidelines and deception of the public. So we see an institution that is wrangling, that is somehow trying to keep the upper hand, that often doesn't seem to be able to do so and that is subsequently much more comfortable if all the results of these discussions are not publicly scrutinized.

Aya Velazquez, what did you focus on when reviewing the protocols?

## **Velasquez**

So I concentrated particularly on the part from May 2021 to December 2021, but only because I didn't get any further. It really is a lot of material. What I also looked at were the passages that were still blacked out in 2020, i.e. in the part that Paul Schreyer cleared. And I would like to start by looking at the two passages on Christian Drosten, which I think are potentially explosive. Some of you may have noticed that Paul Schreyer recently had a court hearing about the last redaction of the RKI protocols. Notice: only until April 2021, for the part that he had already cleared. And in court, a passage from Christian Drosten's book was then read out as evidence, in which Christian Drosten clearly states in a dialog with Georg Maskolo that he expressly agreed to his name being redacted from the records.

Now we have the following problem. There was a period in which Christian Drosten was asked, explicitly by the RKI, whether his name should be redacted, whether he agreed to this. And he let the response deadline pass. When asked by DIE ZEIT and WELT, Christian Drosten's office then said that they had thought that not answer meant consent. Of course, everyone will grab their legal head and say, no, definitely not. In legal proceedings, not answering does not mean consent. And the RKI and the Chancellery's lawyers cannot simply redact Christian Drosten's statements. In his book, however, he presented it to his readers as if he were expressly in favor of transparency. Notice: he was not even a member of the RKI crisis team, but is only talked about in various places. And especially a lot in the first year. I'll read the two passages that I think are controversial first. Or First the conclusion I drew from them:

Christian Drosten advocated external isolation for those who tested positive. Proof, June 22nd, 2020, page 13:

*"A consultation between the Berlin Senate and Mr. Drosten resulted in the proposal to take sick people living in overcrowded apartments out of their home environment for four days and isolate them in another location."*

Secondly: In the summer of 2020, Christian Drosten withdrew a draft text with recommendations for the fall on the testing strategy because it, quote:

*"[...] contradicts government action."*

The passage is from July 29th, 2020, page 9, where it says verbatim:

*“Draft text Christian Drosten, recommendation for the fall, presentation of ideas and assessment. Context: The article is confidential. Mr. Drosten has since decided not to publish the paper, as untargeted testing in the text is not considered useful and this contradicts government action.”*

Now this has a few implications and none of them are good. Firstly, a conflict of interest. Drosten's friend Olferd Land has made money from the federal government's undifferentiated testing strategy. Secondly, scientific fraud. He didn't publish something that he actually thought was technically correct because it contradicted government action. You really have to let that sink in.

Thirdly, a waste of taxpayers' money to the tune of at least 10 billion euros, because if there had been a differentiated, targeted testing strategy, i.e. if healthy people had not been tested in rows, then this taxpayers' money would not have had to be thrown out the window.

Now we come to the point from the first part of 2020, where there has already been a lot of puzzlement about the passage, because what follows already allows for implications as to what might be under the redacted sentence. However, it has to be said that the redaction is not based on explosiveness. In other words, what some people thought: Oh, now the passages that the RKI or the Federal Government might consider particularly explosive have been redacted. That is legally impossible, but redaction is always permitted on the basis of very specific parameters. These would be, for example, business and trade secrets, the names of RKI employees below the level of department and division heads and the third would be bilateral relationships, but these did not play as big a role in this data set as they did in the expert council protocols, for example.

This is about a company and the EMA. The RKI did not object when the EMA and Pfizer simply planned to skip the phase 3 trials in order to speed up the emergency authorization process. Proof: April 15th, 2020, page 10. Normally you plan 12 to 18 months from the start of phase 1. Now comes the sentence that was blacked out:

*“EMA and Pfizer are considering whether to skip Phase 3 trials if necessary and go straight to broad use. If this is decided by the regulators, it could be quicker than 12 to 18 months.”*

We can see very clearly from this passage that the RKI was also aware of the risk of such an approach, as it goes on to say at this point.

*“For us, such a decision means good risk communication in appropriate post-marketing surveillance so that significant vaccination complications can be recognized quickly. Immune enhancement is currently being discussed in the literature, (serious illness due to vaccination).”*

As the highest epidemic protection authority, it is not enough to protect the population from the dangers of viruses, but also from irresponsible medication. In my opinion, the RKI should have clearly contradicted this statement and not simply nodded it off.

I'll take a short break so that it doesn't get too monotonous and then add more bullet points later.

### **Presenter**

You have already mentioned the nature of the redactions. When you reviewed the documents, you were able to understand the legal justifications. Can you say what the official redaction strategy of the remaining bodies was?

### **Velasquez**

In the case of the data set of the RKI protocols, it was actually, so I was present at the court hearing of Paul Schreyer and this document was really never, not at all about bilateral relationships in the last remaining redactions, but it was mainly about the names of public authority employees, just below the department and department head level, who do not have to accept a redaction. So to speak: The personal protection interest, their data protection outweighs the legitimate interest of the public in information. The second point was always business and trade secrets, and at this point, where the Pfizer company has just been mentioned, Pfizer clearly claimed in a third-party participation procedure that it did not want this information to be redacted. In other words, the third party proceedings with Pfizer have already taken place, i.e. the third party proceedings have already taken place with all the companies that were blacked out in the first part, and the parts that are still blacked out are the parts which the companies did not agree to be cleared.

### **Presenter**

With this opening step, it is now becoming clear how the RKI was facing two fronts, namely Pfizer and politics, as they explicitly say: Pfizer and politics want this and that. Can this be summarized in such a way that we can now focus more on this actor with these protocols?

### **Verlasquez**

That's a good question and it also ties in with the next bullet point that I wanted to highlight.

My next thesis is that the calls for booster vaccination, at least that can be proven really well in the protocols, came initially from Pfizer and politics and not from science. Proof, July 30th, 2021, page 9:

*“Recommendations for boosters are complex (various basic immunizations, immunodeficient, older, ETC), also discussed in WHO, Sage working group, Covid-19, Vaccination, so far only recommended for Sinovac and Sinopharm. Mainly demanded by politicians and Pfizer, not enough data available so far, Israel is an exception with booster recommendation, if necessary by very narrow vaccination schedule.”*

So here you can see quite clearly: recommendations for boosters are actually complex, the data situation is insufficient, but boosters are demanded by Pfizer and politicians. Another passage underlines that, this is September 3rd, 2021, page 13:

*“Many discussions nationally and internationally on booster vaccination, different opinions, is very politically influenced. ECDC report sees no urgency for booster vaccinations. Better to increase vaccination offers in developing countries.”*

### **Presenter**

Bastian Barucker, let's come to you. You have been working with children and young people for many, many years and in the course of recent history you have suddenly found a new mission with regard to hygiene policy. You are known to the public as a producer of interviews and as a translator of scientific texts that had otherwise not found their way into the German national discourse. And you have now joined in here with a focus on children. Can you tell us what you have found?

### **Barucker**

With pleasure. Thank you for the invitation. I would like to just read my statement:

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your interest. First of all, I would like to thank the courageous person with a backbone who has made the RKI protocols, including comprehensive accompanying documents, available to the public. I would also like to thank Aya Velazquez in particular for her good journalistic work, so that this person could turn to someone and know that he is in good hands. That definitely needs to be emphasized. I would like to focus my remarks on the usefulness of the coronavirus measures for children and young people. The current Minister of Health, Mr. Lauterbach, has already admitted that children and young people have made the most or greatest sacrifices in the course of the pandemic policy. The Federal Minister for Family Affairs speaks of 73% of children and young people who have suffered psychological stress as a result of the measures and not because of a virus. The damage caused is far-reaching, in some cases irreversible and enormous, and will keep us busy for decades. What has happened? Germany had some of the longest school closures in the whole of Europe - hours of compulsory mask-wearing for months, sometimes outdoors, regular testing without cause - we have just heard how useful this is - of healthy children, the cordoning off of playgrounds, the child's need for contact, completely contradictory distancing rules and then the promotion of a new and untested vaccine.



Not to be forgotten is the strategy developed by the Ministry of the Interior to deliberately frighten children and suggest that they are to blame for the death of their parents if they do not comply with the hygiene rules. However, according to federal law, the best interests of the child must be given priority in all political decisions. Therefore, there is an urgent need for clarification, especially for this group, meaning our future, as to whether or not the decision-makers based their containment measures on scientific facts and had the best interests of the child in mind as a priority. To do this, we need to focus on whether children were ever significantly at risk according to the Robert Koch Institute's report. Let's take a look at excerpts from the protocols of the crisis team, which are now freely accessible to anyone who is interested. An employee of the RKI returns from China on February 26th, 2020 before any school closures and states the following. I quote:

*“Children 2% of cases in large study. Pediatric hospital confirmed all without complication. Also not prevalent in transmission chains. Schools, daycare centers are not in the foreground. Children not important links in transmission chains. Role of children rather atypically subordinate. Unlike influenza. More studies must follow.”*

Mid-March. It is about the school closures and the RKI reads the following. March 11th:

*“Reactive school closures in areas that are not particularly affected are not recommended.”*

March 12th. Christian Drosten. Quote.

*“No more events. Underclosing schools. That's something we have to do now.”*

March 13th: Mr. Spahn has “ordered” - you should always enter this word in the search bar in the protocols - that a passage on school closures be inserted into the criteria for the risk assessment of major events. Politicians wanted this.

In another publication, cited by Mr. Drosten, the effectiveness of school closures was modeled. This publication, please note, refers to influenza.

You may already recognize the contradiction. Corona, and this was confirmed in the coming months, was less dangerous for children than influenza, visits to the swimming pool or road traffic.

In April 2020, so, after the first school closures, a review paper is cited in the RKI protocols. Quote:

*“School closures are unlikely to have had a major impact on controlling the epidemic.”*

Also in August 2021, it remains the same, quote:

*“Children have a low risk of severe disease progression compared to other respiratory diseases.”*

This in turn means that children have been obliged to take measures to protect the well-being of others at the expense of their own health. A historic breach of taboo. And also highly controversial, because in the fall of 2021, the protocols, which we can now read, state, quote:

*“Younger children are very rarely index persons. They are infected within the family.” That was November 27th, 2021.*

Let's move on to the measures that children were obliged to take. The mask. November 20th:

*“It is unfavorable and dangerous when masks are used by laymen. It is not possible to exert influence. The consultations take place at the same time. RKI was not consulted in advance. The mask requirements were introduced anyway and, as was to be expected, had no medical effect. However, there were significant side effects, especially in children and young people.”*

When the topic of FFP2 masks came up, the RKI said:

*“From a professional point of view, it is not unproblematic to generally recommend FFP2 masks. A general FFP2 mask requirement is not considered useful.” January 13th, 2021.*

Nevertheless, the RKI in branch 21 wonders whether FFP2 masks should be recommended for schools. Quote:

*“So far, there is no convincing evidence that FFP2 is better, especially not for children.”*

In October 2022, FFP2 masks were made compulsory on public transport for children aged 6 to 13. Now, how effective were these measures? Generally speaking, as early as the fall of 2020, quote:

*„The success of measures cannot be answered satisfactorily with RKI data. We know which factors are driving up incidence rates and we know of useful measures, but we will not be able to prove this with RKI data.”*

An incredible statement. In January 2021:

*“Measures in schools and daycare centers cannot prevent outbreaks from occurring.”*

July 7th, 2021 - Increase in consultations for respiratory diseases, which of course includes corona. Quote:

*“This is an indication that infection control measures in schools are not preventing the transmission of respiratory diseases.”*

## The vaccination of children

Since Corona did not pose a significant risk to children, there was never a medical reason for a conditionally approved and experimental vaccination, which, as was clear from the beginning, offered little ton o self-protection. What do the protocols say about this?

May 21st, 2021: *“Pediatric professional associations are reluctant to vaccinate children. Politicians are already preparing vaccination campaigns so that the relevant age groups are vaccinated by the end of the vacations.”*

The protocols state that the STIKO, the Standing Committee on Vaccination, still does not rate the benefit of vaccination higher than the risk of the disease.

August 6th, 2021. The vaccination recommendation for all 12 to 17-year-olds comes on August 16th. The RKI also recognizes this and looks for explanations to justify the vaccination of children. Suddenly they change tactics and try to explain the, quote,

*“long-term effects the disease can have on children”.*

On July 30th, 2021 they talk about changing the vaccination target. Quote:

*“If prevention of mild cases, psychological consequences due to the measures etc. are also included as an objective, this would change the assessment. Modeling: by vaccinating adolescents, no influence on the course of the fourth wave.”*

There was then, and still is today, no valid database showing that SARS-CoV-2 infections in children lead to particularly long-term effects. The STIKO chairman himself said that there is no „Long Covid“ in children.

On the same day regarding the booster vaccination – that has already been quoted, but you can do it twice - quote:

*„Recommendation on boosters are complex, mainly demanded by politics and Pfizer, not enough data available so far.”*

July 21st, Target group: Younger people and the vaccination. Quote:

*“For example, Influencer Vaccination Challenge on YouTube.”* Quote:

*“It must be cool to get vaccinated.”*

There are further references to the influence of politics. Quote:

*“At present, booster vaccination of children is also being considered from a ministerial point of view, although there is no recommendation and in some cases no approval for this.”*

With regard to monitoring the safety of previously advertised vaccines, it says in January 2023 quote:

“Monthly reports and vaccination dashboard will be discontinued by May. Assessment of vaccination side effects will no longer be possible. This must be accompanied by very good communication so that it does not fall back on the RKI.”

Conclusion: In principle, none of these medical facts are new. Doctors and internationally renowned scientists pointed out early on, but mostly in vain, that the measures pose a greater risk to children than the virus. The RKI was also aware of this. An unbiased look at Sweden was enough to consider these indications as proven. However, these voices were removed from the debate right from the start. It is now clear that the RKI was also aware of this medical madness. Now it is finally time for the press to do its job, meticulously work through the protocols and inform the public objectively and fully. Anything else would be a further betrayal of the children and young people of this country after the politically driven anti-children pandemic policy that was supported by so many educators, associations, doctors, parents and journalists.

### **Presenter**

Thank you very much, Bastian Barucker. These selected passages, which you have now heard about, speak of the tribulations to which we as a society, especially children and young people, have been subjected for several years. Few people have been able to counter this arbitrariness with anything. Forbearance would be the word that was at least floating around in my head. Now we don't have a lawyer here. I assume the forums will soon be dealing with this intensively. But nevertheless, Professor Homburg, the question to you:

Omission is the least you can accuse Wieler and Co. of. Unless they have actively tried to conceal their actions, they have never really said what the RKI should have said internally and what common sense dictates. Do you see any possibility of applying legal injunctive relief there?

### **Homburg**

As a civil servant, Mr. Wieler was obliged to remonstrate, as it is called. If you receive an unlawful instruction as a civil servant, you have to tell your superior that you consider it unlawful. If you are asked to commit a criminal offense, you must refuse completely. Instead, Mr. Wieler and Mr. Schade have been very compliant. Incidentally, so has the Paul Ehrlich Institute. We don't have their protocols, but we obviously have the parallel. So for me, the worst part of all these protocols is not to be found by just reading the protocol, i.e. even if you go through the 4000 pages in full, you would not notice it, but the worst part from my point of view, which shows the whole inhumanity of this policy, is the following:

This concerns the AstraZeneca vaccine. And the protocol is already dated March 19th, 2021, so the vaccination campaign had just started. So the younger people weren't even on it yet and the RKI made an internal note:

*“AstraZeneca, now twelve cases of sinus vein thrombosis, all after vaccination. Paul-Ehrlich-Institut and the pharmacovigilance offices of the countries are not keeping up. Norway is suspending AstraZeneca until further notice.”*

And two weeks later it says:

*“Sinus thrombosis as a side effect of the AstraZeneca vaccine, now also increasingly affecting men.” Women - that was already known beforehand.*

*“This means that there is now also a 20-fold incidence in men compared to the background incidence.”*

This means that a man's risk of developing sinus vein thrombosis, which is a very dangerous disease of the veins, is 20 times higher if he is vaccinated with AstraZeneca than if he is not vaccinated. And the really bad things, ladies and gentlemen, the really bad things, are now four newspaper articles that appeared in the then following weeks. Think again, the RKI recognized exactly what a high risk AstraZeneca posed. It was then no longer recommended for younger people, then not recommended for older people and has now been completely withdrawn from the market. And after these two RKI meetings, you can see from them: The RKI has clearly recognized the high risks of this AstraZeneca vaccine, we find on the homepage of the Federal President:

*“Federal President Steinmeier vaccinated with AstraZeneca”.*

In the Medical Doctor's Journal: *“Chancellor Merkel and Vice-Chancellor Scholz vaccinated with AstraZeneca”.*

In Der Spiegel: *“Karl Lauterbach has been vaccinated with AstraZeneca.”*

And in the Pharmacy Journal: *“Spahn gets vaccinated with AstraZeneca”.*

So, in my opinion, it is completely far-fetched that, if a health authority is aware of these dangers, the responsible politicians are kept in the dark and then have themselves vaccinated with this very AstraZeneca vaccine.

Once again, Steinmeier, Scholz, Merkel, Lauterbach, Spahn. So one obvious interpretation is that even the normal population, which was ill-informed and misled, had by now realized so much through their own experience and those around them that the willingness to be vaccinated with AstraZeneca was practically zero. However, politicians had signed huge supply contracts and were afraid that reports would be made about stockpiles and wasted tax billions. And so, in my view, they simply let people go under the knife.

And only - as the last sentence - in 2023, for example, when it was far too late, a ZDF report did come out about a young lawyer who now has a steel plate in his skull because he had suffered this sinus vein thrombosis according to AstraZeneca. But by then it was much too late.

### **Presenter**

The head of the authority, Lothar Wieler, can be quoted with his quasi-lyrical statement on the subject:

*„Nothing would make me happier than being allowed to enjoy the AstraZeneca vaccine.“*

And even if I can't place this in time, he never corrected himself on this statement.

### **Homburg**

But he had also said shortly beforehand, as documented on public television, that there will be new vaccines. We don't know how they will work, we don't know whether they will work.

### **Viewer**

The measures must not be questioned.

### **Presenter**

The audience has its say. Shall we make this official at this point? May I invite you to ask questions? I see a finger pointing, so I'll run through to the inside. Would you introduce yourself briefly?

### **Viewer**

My name is Christian Deppe. I have two questions. May I take the microphone? Thank you.

In the Schreyer vs. BMG trial, three dates were mentioned, three meetings of the RKI that were not recorded or whose protocols were not available.

### **Homburg**

May I interrupt you briefly: You are now talking about the BMI protocols.

### **Velasquez**

Three sessions were also missing from the RKI protocols, the gentleman is right. And I can answer at this point. It really is the case that these three sessions are not in the data set. We really did receive them in full and there was nothing more.

These are also two meetings from January 2020, I think January 6th and 8th. And on these dates, so early in January 2020, there is practically no major conflict of interest in my eyes as to why the RKI should now make something disappear here. So something probably happened, but there was no protocol like that yet. I think it was May 9th, if I'm not mistaken, 2020, when a meeting was held and there were no protocols. Something similar happened with the Expert Council.

### **Homburg**

May I say something about this: I believe there was no meeting because this May was a public holiday, which nobody knows, because this holiday only existed in Berlin and only once.

### **Viewer**

May I ask a second question? A completely different complex. At the end of 2020, Minister Spahn boasted that he had presumably been cured of a coronavirus infection by taking vitamin D, zinc and so on, or that it had not reached him because it had not affected him as much. Are there any indications in the protocols that are now available, in the entire documents, that vaccination, meaning that strengthening the immune system through measures other than vaccination, lockdown and so on, has never been discussed?

### **Homburg**

That's an interesting tip, I'll look into it. Also into alternatives like ivermectin and so on, methods, you would have to search everything again in detail. I will gladly take that as a hint. But anyone can also search it themselves, because it is available for download, 4,000 pages of protocols plus 10 GB of accompanying material.

### **Barucker**

Control F and the term you are looking for. (laughter)

### **Viewer**

Warweg, Florian, Nachdenkseiten. A question of a more general nature. I would be interested to know whether you have gained a deeper insight into the machine room from the protocols, perhaps also from the conversation with the whistleblower, without putting him or her at risk. So, how much "actual" resistance was there, at least behind the scenes at the RKI? Can this be ascertained in any way?

### **Velasquez**

In fact, we talked about it and that would probably have decreased. So, at the beginning it was about 20 percent who also said: Vaccination is coming now.

That's complete nonsense and we're definitely not going to get vaccinated. And then over time it became less and less and more and more behind closed doors. So the whole climate at the institute changed to the extent that it became increasingly difficult to speak your mind and in the end it was also the case that the 3G regulations applied there, and employees who weren't vaccinated either had to show a test in the morning or sneak through the door with another employee. And the way I heard it, it also caused resentment among the unvaccinated employees at the institute, but at the same time they didn't dare to say so publicly.

## **Homburg**

But I think it's so clear from the texts: if the RKI suddenly has it checked whether the minister has the authority to issue directives, I've never heard that before. And it can't have anything to do with the fact that they are happy with the directives. Or even this very striking passage, which you know half of, but not entirely. So on March 16th, 2020 it says:

*"A new risk assessment was prepared at the weekend."* - then, when asked, not coming from the RKI. *"It is to be scaled up this week"* - then comes the lockdown. End of June 2020:

*"Still high risk, specification from the Federal Ministry of Health: Nothing will be changed until July 1st."*

And July 10th: *"RKI may now downgrade risk according to Federal Ministry of Health."*

In other words, they were given orders from the ministry on how to assess the risk. And this risk assessment was the linchpin for all measures. And the curious thing is, and I didn't find this explained in the later protocols either: After December 22nd, we had the highest death figures of the entire period and also exceptionally high infection figures. Shortly afterwards, at the beginning of February 2023, the risk was suddenly downgraded to low for the first time in three years. Completely inexplicable.

## **Barucker**

I would also like to say something about this, but unfortunately I no longer have the quote in front of me. But it is worthwhile. There is a passage in the protocols where it is mentioned that Mr. Lauterbach makes statements in public, so to speak, and that a distinction must be made between statements made by Mr. Lauterbach and scientific facts. And they point this out internally and make a note of it, perhaps also to make it clear that there is a big difference. I would like to quote it, but I don't have it in my hand, but it's worth typing in the name Lauterbach and simply finding this passage. And it's striking because it's like a distancing from the statements that are being made, because, of course, the RKI, we can see that here too, more so at the beginning than later, knew about the huge gap between statements in politics and existing medical science or facts. And that, I think, makes sense to browse and read again afterwards and also to publish these individual passages.



## **Presenter**

Very briefly from me before we move on to the next question.

## **Velasquez**

May I add something to what Mr. Homburg has just said? Namely on the risk level, risk assessment. You said that this was very much a political issue. However, I have also found passages that clearly indicate that the RKI had to a certain extent taken on a life of its own, meaning that they wanted it themselves to a certain extent. June 25th, 2021:

“Current risk assessment moderate, question mark, community transmission, discussion. Opponents of downgrading the risk level argue with the expected increase in the number of cases in the fall. A downgrading of the risk level could be seen as a signal that the pandemic is coming to an end. However, supporters of a downgrade fear that without a downgrade, there would no longer be any scope for escalation given the current low number of cases. Decision: Retention of the current risk assessment, i.e. no downgrading of the risk situation to moderate.”

It can therefore be concluded that the risk level was kept high, that is to say maintained, because a downgrade could have been interpreted as a false signal for the end of the pandemic from the RKI's point of view. And this downgrading would only have been made in order to have room for escalation afterwards. And here it reads as if the RKI itself was in favor of this. In any case, I don't read anything here about a ministerial directive. So it can be observed in the course of the protocols that the RKI has learned to a certain extent how the game is played. It certainly followed scientific standards at the beginning, more so in the first year, but then escalated into this way of thinking itself, I would perhaps put it that way.

## **Presenter**

Let me take this opportunity to point to the website: [www.rki-transparenzbericht.de](http://www.rki-transparenzbericht.de). This trio of heroes has struggled through the jumble of meeting protocols. If you can't or don't want to do that now, and if you don't necessarily have a specific search term, is there a way to get a condensate of what you've read?

## **Homburg**

I have now started a small Twitter series or X-series, you would have to say, with part 1 today. And it will continue over the next few days. It's always called “RKI leak” and is organised by a Roman numeral - and these are the best of. I have the best from the earlier period in a YouTube video, RKI der Abgrund, which has been viewed around 200,000 times so far.

## **Barucker**

What already exists: An article was published today by the journalist Philippe Debionne. It contains important statements. I would also like to point out that there will soon be a website called coronaminusprotokolle.net, where all government protocols on corona will be clearly presented, because even journalists are now finding it difficult to tell which committee met when and with who- I sometimes have the same problem. And we are also collecting articles and reports there, media reports that pick up on individual things – and we are explicitly calling on citizens, journalists and interested people, to search through the protocols and send texts to corona-protokolle.net, who will also be paid and who will then pick out individual details and put them in relation to the pandemic policy, so that the public does not have to look through these 4000 pages and more, but can see that a contradiction has been revealed here. So anyone who is interested can take a look at the website and give feedback, because we now need a relatively large number of people, I would say, to work through this well. Corona-protokolle.net.

## **Presenter**

Thank you very much, there is another interim question.

## **Spectator**

Hello, Yannick Darbo, freelance journalist. You said that the transcripts were redacted and have now been leaked to you, so to speak, and that there are also 10 gigabytes of additional material, which sounds as if they are not just text documents. Can you say something more about these 10 gigabytes, please? Thank you very much.

## **Velasquez**

I can say very little about these 10 gigabytes for now. However, the few things I saw last night while editing the material are very explosive. For example, there are sometimes specific responses to MPK decisions. So there is also the MPK decision to which the RKI has to respond. This means that we will probably find very specific instructions from politicians in the additional material, and about the conversation with the RKI about this. What makes the volume so large is above all the many PowerPoint presentations. What is very important are the research studies that ultimately made up the entire scientific evidence base of the RKI. I can give you one example, where I would be very surprised if we found the scientific evidence. That was in June 2021, when the RKI first advocated that the state of Schleswig-Holstein, for example, should relax the measures – in this case the mask requirement for children, depending on the incidence. The RKI says that the incidence is now below 35, so it is correct that the federal state of Schleswig-Holstein is now abolishing the mask requirement for children depending on the incidence. And two weeks later, the RKI then says that there should please be an incidence-independent mask requirement for children.

And at this point we really need the additional material to look at what studies have been published to show that the RKI has turned its opinion 180 degrees within two weeks on an issue that was really extremely detrimental to the everyday lives of millions of children in this country.

### **Barucker**

I would like to add, on April 9th, 2020: *"The incidence limits are arbitrary political values"*.

### **Viewer**

I also have a question. Are there places in the protocols where it is admitted that it is not a pandemic at all and that the vaccination is not a vaccination at all? Because then you could actually save yourself all this and you could explain a lot about why they acted the way they did at some points. For example, the suppression of vitamin D or hydroxychloroquine - these are much better drugs than this vaccination. But that's not what they wanted. Then the whole pandemic would have been for nothing. So are there places where you can find them admitting this or do they always talk as if it's all a mistake and next time they'll do everything right?

### **Homburg**

Once again on this important point. It depends on the month. In March 2020, in the time of the first lockdown, the RKI writes, quoted verbatim:

*"There are currently an equal number of free beds and occupied beds in hospitals, i.e. 50 percent vacancy. Normally, the proportion of free beds is less than ten percent."*

On the same day:

*"The positive PCR trends should better not be formulated for the time being, otherwise it may be difficult to justify further measures."*

So this is now two days after the start of the first lockdown. Many people remember from back then that colds go down in March. They're called colds because they occur when it's cold. When spring comes, like in March 2020, they go down. The RKI people saw that too. And then they warned against telling the public, because then the public would have asked, can't we reopen stores and schools? To answer your first question clearly: nowhere does it say that there is no pandemic. And I wouldn't say there was no pandemic either. The word is just not clearly defined. And the way the WHO has recently defined it, there is actually always a pandemic. The decisive factor is not whether there is a pandemic in some acrobatic sense of the word, but rather: Is there a medical emergency? Are hospitals overcrowded? Are there significantly more colds than usual? That was never the case. And, of course, those who work there full-time and produce these statistics on a weekly basis have also recognized this.

## Viewer

Yes, Erik Rusch from the Epoch Times. Hello, today's focus is more on looking back. But I would like to put a question to the panel, looking forward. Not all 4000 pages have been worked through yet, but you already have a clear impression. If you look ahead now, some people are already saying: "The next pandemic is sure to come." Avian influenza, i.e. a vaccine against avian influenza is already being purchased on a large scale. So what can these RKI files do for the future and what can we do as a society to prevent a similar situation from arising? There was also talk of making certain authorities independent of the government, so to speak. What do you see there? An intensive legal investigation, even more commitment from the press to bring this into society?

## Homburg

I don't think it depends on the RKI at all whether we get another pandemic. So at the moment, bird flu, but also with corona, the language is being turned up again in the newspapers at the moment, that is to say tied to Berlin's wastewater. So I think it depends entirely on the population whether there will be another pandemic. Just think back to the summer of 2022. Exactly two years ago, the WHO declared a FASEC for the first and so far only time after coronavirus, that means: a warning on the highest level, which it colloquially calls a pandemic. And that was monkeypox.

So, you've seen practically nothing about it on TV here. There were one or two listless articles in the newspapers and the WHO let it run for a few months. Worldwide, outside of New York, there was a monkeypox lockdown, but outside of New York there was no reaction. And then the WHO said, well, no more Monkeypox. In other words, if you take this seriously, it didn't go from a scientific consultation to the political top, but it went from the political top down. And politics, of course, always acts in a way that maximizes votes. That is quite natural. And in the beginning, politicians got incredible approval for their lockdown measures.

If you think about it, Mr. Söder had the best poll ratings of any politician in Germany since these measurements have been taken. And he was the toughest on lockdown.

When these Monday walks came along at some point, politics switched gears. And then, as I read to you earlier, at some point Mr. Lauterbach told the newspapers and not even his own institute: the pandemic is over. And then they didn't know what to make of it. In other words, it depends on the level of maturity of the population and therefore, of course, largely on the journalistic work, because most of what we have presented to you is completely unknown to the normal population.

## **Presenter**

The next question please.

## **Viewer**

Thank you very much. Marcel Luthe. I also found a sentence again in Mr. Debionne's Article in the Schwäbische Zeitung - it refers to the protocol of december 10th, 2022. And it seems to me to be a very central one – as far as the political and legal consequences are concerned:

*“There is no evidence that vaccination changes anything about transmission. The technical recommendation will be maintained as long as there is no instruction to the contrary from the BMG.”*

This sentence implies that the Federal Constitutional Court was simply lied to in its decision on the facility-based vaccination requirement, which was based exclusively on the RKI and the information that came from the RKI. In other words, it was a case of coercive medical treatment and not prevention, but purely coercive medical treatment of people in the healthcare system. In my opinion, this is incredibly controversial, both legally and politically. In particular, I myself asked parliamentary questions on the subject at the time and received answers to the contrary. So the Robert Koch Institute deliberately lied to politicians and the Federal Constitutional Court. Have you found any other evidence of this kind?

## **Homburg**

It's true. For example, if you think about the ruling of the Federal Administrative Court on the vaccination of soldiers. It is essentially based on the fact that the RKI and the PEI, as the only experts who are taken seriously by the courts, have said that there is protection against transmission. And the ruling states that the soldiers have to be kept so close together in the barracks. And that is why such serious interference with physical integrity is appropriate. What you are saying now is important for the following reason. Originally, before the RKI protocols, we only knew that the RKI and the PEI had made false statements to the courts. This was because the manufacturers' approval studies did not provide any protection against transmission. That is the most important thing. As a manufacturer, you would say that my product has protection against transmission if it did. But if you look at the Pfizer approval study: That wasn't even tested, let alone claimed. Until then, we only knew that our federal authorities had made false statements. But thanks to the passage you mentioned from the RKI protocols, we now also know that these were deliberate false statements or lies. So they knew that what they were saying was not true. Nevertheless, they lied in court. In my view, the whole thing is a criminal offense. It's a false, unsworn statement that had huge consequences for the soldiers. And for the rest of the population indirectly too, when it came to whether something like 2G and 3G is constitutional.

## **Velasquez**

I would like to chime in here. So, about 2G and 3G. Reading the protocols from May to December 2021 made me realize what actually happened at this institute. The RKI was faced with the following dilemma. Politicians wanted certain benefits for the vaccinated as an incentive for the unvaccinated to get vaccinated. The RKI realized from the data – that this was not technically tenable. In other words, that the vaccinated spread and shed just as much as the unvaccinated. And the argument that was politically circulated with 2G, namely that a high level of external protection would be generated, because then only people who practically no longer spread the virus would be completely among themselves, was something that the RKI itself considered to be wrong internally, but did not know how to communicate politically. There is one passage that I would like to read out. This is the first place where 2G is even discussed in the protocols. It is from August 27th, 2021:

“Please provide an easy-to-understand assessment, is 2G safer than 3G with regard to the objective of protecting others at events? Objective simple calculation that is easy to understand. The actual effect of 2G is not greater external protection, but greater self-protection. External protection effects of vaccination and testing are presumably in a similar range at 60 to 70 percent. 2G will be superior for protection against serious diseases. One can expect different effectiveness of vaccination and different rates of non-detection of infections by antigen tests. With 2G, the distance rule no longer applies. This would also have to be calculated. Elimination of the distance rule for 2G is not necessary and is not recommended by the RKI. Is 2G a suitable escalation measure compared to 3G in the event of rising incidences? Yes, because of self-protection. With 2G, people are protected from serious illness.”

Well, of course that's technically contestable, but it's already coming out. There's more to it, but perhaps everyone can take a look at it later in this mobile exhibition. The argument that was publicly put forward in favor of 2G was: The RKI knew it wasn't true. The problem was that the RKI had to allow these benefits for vaccinated people for a while because politicians wanted more vaccination incentives. That's why the RKI was faced with this dilemma, but in the long term we have to go back to measures for vaccinated people, because the RKI knew very well that vaccinated people shed the virus in the same way as unvaccinated people. That means for the reader the dilemma became very clear. They were a bit caught between two stools, but if something like this is the case, they have to communicate it clearly. Then you can't just say what politicians want to hear, and I also have the impression that the RKI has never really made it clear in public that 2G does not protect others.

## **Homburg**

Vaccinated people will only notice this when they are forced to wear a mask.

## **Velasquez**

Exactly.

## **Presenter**

Another question.

## **Viewer**

Thank you, Graf, that's my name. I have a question for Mr. Homburg. You said whether the next pandemic will come, with a whole catalog of measures and that we will have to comply with all kinds of orders again, depends on how mature a population is. I recently had a conversation with a neighbor, two weeks ago, who said: Yes, there's something going around and Corona and he's thinking to himself, maybe I'll have to get vaccinated again and I just said very carefully: But I wouldn't recommend that. And I mean, it seems to be clear to everyone in this room that it's perhaps better not to do it and that the contraindications are much greater than the benefits, but in the general population, so this was an educated man, architect, has his own company, it doesn't seem to have gotten through to him either, even after four years. So my question is, I've just heard the Epoch Times here, the Nachdenkseiten are present, but will what you've revealed here somehow reach the mainstream, so that the average viewer of Tagesschau and Tagesthemen and reader of the Tagesspiegel will perhaps realize what a mess has actually been made of it.

And that's why the question remains, you've now put all this online. You say: Please help yourself, do a search, enter your parameters – have you also contacted certain media, perhaps to make a story out of it? There have also been approaches here and there, Ms. Spiekermann comes to mind on ZDF and a critical report on MDR about the contamination of the vaccine, the DNA contamination, which was then depublished again. So there are critical minds here and there, even among public broadcasters or the big media houses, who dare to come out of the woodwork and publish relevant reports. So, are you in contact with them and is there any hope that they won't say again, as they did with ARD. Well, it's just around the corner. It would have been easy for the ARD representatives to be here today. So that they don't say: “The scandal that isn't a scandal” when it came to the original publication of the first data set, but that a bit more happens now and that the politicians and the people involved come under pressure.

## **Homburg**

I'll just say very briefly, I wasn't hoping for anything from ARD. Pascal Siggelkow, notorious for the Nord Stream plant explosive (quiet laughter), did a fact check last week that it was all lies about Biden's poor health, and yesterday his new fact check came out that lies are being spread about Kamala Harris. So they won't pick us up, but apart from that, we're offering the press conference here to achieve a broad impact.

## **Velasquez**

Of course, we also wrote to a few journalists from larger media outlets, but we have to say apologetically that it was really a very short notice today and that was, of course, also due to the nature of the matter. The leak was practically published this morning at 4 o'clock.

That was also the plan, but I didn't expect masses of capital city journalists to be on their way, so I didn't expect that today either. Yes, I know that on other occasions you might be able to manage it, but I'll say that people like us haven't been able to get anyone out from behind the stove for the last three years. The protocols themselves, I believe, are not so easy to ignore. And a good factor in this current story may also be the way in which they have now seen the light of day. After all, this is a point that you have to report on if you don't want to make a complete fool of yourself.

### **Barucker**

I want to add something, I think that ... I feel like it makes little sense for me to focus on the disappointment of others, so to speak. I can only do the best I can with these protocols and if I keep expecting something but it doesn't come and then I'm disappointed again, then it's more my business. Years ago I stood in front of the ARD, handed in 110,000 signatures and said, let's sit down at a table together. That was canceled because „talk shows are not a format for medical topics.“ And that means it's also good to recognize what works and what doesn't. And now we have that. So, I'm talking about myself: I've now done the best I can with this publication, which is relatively important and then at some point it's no longer in my own hands what the others do. But what I do is in my hands and I think that's where the focus needs to be directed.

### **Velasquez**

Absolutely, and I would also add that formerly Twitter, now Platform X, has now reached a very critical number of people in Germany. We are now at 16 million users. The figures come from Statista – we had 5 million users in 2020. In other words, we are making great strides towards a critical public that uses this platform, where you can theoretically reach a quarter of the German population. I also noticed this recently with a tweet from the not very popular politician Katrin Göring-Eckardt, from the Green Party, who made a somewhat unsuccessful post about the skin colors in our national soccer team. And this post reached 1.5 million impressions, meaning views, in a few hours – very negative, so she reaped a so-called shitstorm, but the number was really impressive when you think about it, in a country with 80 million inhabitants, 1.5 million have now seen this really unsuccessful post in a few hours. Of course, that's something that can also be frightening and intimidating, the numbers, the critical mass that can now be reached via this medium, bypassing the established old media. And I think we really shouldn't underestimate what's happening right now.

### **Homburg**

And the post by Aya Velasquez, who invited people to this press conference at 4 o'clock this morning, was already at over half a million before the start of the press conference and will certainly reach over a million. And I've already got over 100,000 as a later addition. Everyone is tweeting this, so it will ... this action that we're doing today will be registered by several million people and then it won't matter whether it's on the news or not.



**Presenter**

To the next question.

**Viewer**

I don't have a question, I just want to make a very brief plea and I mean it seriously, even if it may sound funny. I would like to plead that we call on the employees of the services present and the constitutional protection agencies themselves to no longer turn to the people who have shaped, identified and advanced the criticism scene in the last four years, but to turn to the facts that are being discussed here and perhaps also to perceive a different direction of their constitutional protection task.

**Presenter**

And one more question.

**Viewer**

Yes, Wolpert, just a brief suggestion, since it has also massively affected the children, is it planned to somehow bring a TikTok format for this event, so that it also gets around to the young people, so that pressure is being built, that the parents, who perhaps still refuse it today, think about it. So I think a TikTok format on this topic would be great.

**Barucker**

Yes, do it.

**Viewer**

Who volunteers? Let's go.

**Presenter**

Thank you very much for your participation, for your interest. I wish you not only a good day, but also an excellent Internet connection. As I said, over ten gigabytes. Happy downloading and browsing. Thank you very much and see you again.