

Most attacks on PCR tests are narrowly focused on technicalities, as if it takes one lucky punch to take out Drosten and with him knock out the entire pandemic. That's not only simplistic, but dangerous. Drosten is a tool. He did not concoct any of this, he is just executing what is being asked of him. Apparently someone convinced him that the West is done, and that he should try and save his own skin, and that of his partner and young child.

I'm aware that many researchers, journalists and critics on our side have chosen to discard any and all conspiracy theories, as they call them. For the better part of 2020 they have chosen to attribute all of what's happening to incompetence, but when this position was no longer tenable they switched to attributing everything to coincidence. Hence the term "coincidence theorist":

A person who believes that everything happens by sheer coincidence, there's no such thing as corruption, deceit or back room deals & mankind just "got over" the desire for world domination.

But let's leave aside obvious coincidence candidates such as Event 201, and let's have a look how the pandemic actually started. More specifically, who started it, and when.

Klaus Schwab is not a creative mind. The reason why most of his 4IR plot sounds crazy is because he just copy'n'pasted it from various sources he deemed hip and current at the time. A bit like an old fart trying to stay relevant by mimicking, in a very embarrassing way, what he perceives as being modern without understanding what it actually is, eg. nanotech or brain-machine interfaces.

If you go here:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fourth_Industrial_Revolution

you'll see the authors claim that Schwab invented the concept:

The phrase Fourth Industrial Revolution was **first introduced by Klaus Schwab, executive chairman of the World Economic Forum, in a 2015 article** published by Foreign Affairs,[2] "Mastering the Fourth Industrial Revolution" was the 2016 theme of the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting, in Davos-Klosters, Switzerland.

That's untrue. You can switch the article to the German version and get the real story:

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrie_4.0

Google translation:

The term was **coined by Henning Kagermann, Wolf-Dieter Lukas and Wolfgang Wahlster and first presented to the public at the 2011 Hanover Fair.** [11] In October 2012 the federal government received recommendations for implementation. On April 14, 2013, the final report entitled Implementation

Recommendations for the Industry 4.0 Future Project of the Industry 4.0 Working Group was presented at the Hanover Fair. The working group was chaired by Siegfried Dais (Robert Bosch GmbH) and Henning Kagermann (acatech).

The responsible promoter group of the Research Union remained active even after the report was submitted, including in the Industry 4.0 working group of the Industrie 4.0 platform of the same name, a merger of the industry associations Bitkom, VDMA and ZVEI. The Industry 4.0 platform has since been expanded and is now under the direction of the Federal Ministries for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi) and Education and Research (BMBF). **The aim of the platform is to further develop the content associated with the term Industry 4.0 in dialogue with trade unions, business associations, companies, science and politics.**

This is a crucial point, and buried in most discussions of the 4IR - it really is a German project pushed heavily by the German government and German companies. Schwab basically committed IP theft from former SAP CEO Kagermann, but the German government is fine with it as long as Schwab's organisations advance the concept.

The Merkel's EU recently signed a trade deal with the CCP:

<https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/aktuelles/presseerklaerung-von-europaeischem-rat-und-europaeischer-kommission-vom-30-12-2020-1833410>

The article is not available in English (unlike other articles on their portal).

Translation:

<https://translate.google.com/translate?sl=de&tl=en&u=https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/aktuelles/presseerklaerung-von-europaeischem-rat-und-europaeischer-kommission-vom-30-12-2020-1833410>

After intensive negotiations on the part of the EU by the European Commission, the EU and China have in principle concluded negotiations on a comprehensive investment agreement. This corresponds to the **commitment to conclude negotiations by the end of 2020 that the two sides agreed at the EU-China summit in April 2019.**

The participants welcomed the **active role played by the German Presidency and in particular Chancellor Angela Merkel, who placed particular emphasis on EU-China relations and fully supported the EU's negotiations with China.** (...)

China is committed to effectively implementing the ILO conventions it has ratified and **to work towards the ratification of the core ILO conventions**, including those on forced labor. (...)

Continuous **high-level political contacts with China will be required** for the successful implementation of the agreement once it is concluded. (...)

With regard to COVID-19, EU leaders have stressed the need to continue

supporting the **Covax Facility** and strengthening international cooperation **so that possible future pandemics can be better anticipated and managed.**

In other words, this is not containment but a new axis.

Now let's go back to November 2020. The authors of this article in the Washington Post were either obfuscating, or oblivious to certain facts.

The "Industry 4.0" the article below mentions is actually the WEF's 4th Industrial Revolution, 100% adopted and evangelized by the Merkel government. Adopted, or more like created? Who set the WEF's Great Reset agenda?

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/11/16/how-china-germany-became-partners-technical-standardization/>

Going to quote extensively to show how far-reaching Germany's betrayal of the West is:

The U.S. is waging war on China's tech sector. Germany chose another route.

China's focus on moving from standard-taker to standard-maker is a major source of unease for political and economic elites in much of the global north. Our research shows that, amid rising geopolitical tensions, **Germany and China are swimming against the tide by cooperating closely** on high-tech standardization. (...)

From 2015 to 2018, for instance, Zhang Xiaogang served as the first Chinese president of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). In January, Shu Yinbiao started his three-year term as president of the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC). **Occupying these leadership positions has strengthened China's ability** to shape new standards for cutting-edge technologies.

China's standards ambitions are also increasingly prominent in **Beijing's geostrategic initiatives**. Set for release by the end of 2020, the China Standards 2035 plan is expected to establish a Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) Standards Forum to promote Chinese standards among BRI countries. **Nations that seek Chinese infrastructure investments will come under pressure to adopt Chinese standards** — in Turkmenistan, for example, investment was tied to adoption of Chinese industrial standards.

Although many Western countries strive to contain and counter China's growing technological prowess, **Germany and China are cooperating closely on high-tech standardization**. This collaboration is embedded in a larger multi-actor partnership **linking the two countries in the domain of Industrie 4.0** — Germany's catchphrase for "the intelligent networking of machines and processes with the help of information and communication technology."

Bilateral cooperation on technical standardization in smart manufacturing dates to 2015. It falls under the political oversight of Germany's Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi), as well as China's Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT) and the Standardization Administration of China (SAC).

This effort — which involves **technical and strategic elements** — brings together standardization experts from both countries. It began with a **commitment to submit mutually supported standardization proposals** to global standardization bodies. **The two countries have submitted eight such proposals on various Industrie 4.0 technologies.** In 2019, a new Strategy Dialogue Group added another layer to the **partnership** to discuss ways to **generate support, and counter opposition**, from other ISO members in standardization processes.

Our research illuminates the factors behind this partnership — and **the benefits both parties see in cooperating.** By partnering with Germany, one of the world's leading standards powers, China hopes to cultivate **a powerful ally** in an increasingly contentious arena, as well as master the subtleties of standardization practice **by working with an insider.**

Germany's outsize influence in standardization is evident in its dominance of leadership positions in technical committees, subcommittees and working groups within the ISO and the IEC. **Chinese participants hope that their partnership with Germany will offset pressure against China** in global standardization bodies.

Chinese officials we interviewed also emphasized the value of **learning about how to push standards more effectively at the global level.** As a latecomer, China's standardization proposals have sometimes struggled to get off the ground, partly because of **difficulties in presenting arguments fluently** and in line with established practices. **Working jointly on standardization projects with German standard-setters is an opportunity to learn the tricks of the trade.**

German standard-setters see supporting China's entry into global standardization as ultimately a matter of self-interest. They worry that if China were to go it alone through a BRI Standards Forum, they themselves would lose capacity to steer global standardization processes. Germany's "hidden champions" — midsize, low-profile yet world-leading firms in industries such as mechanical engineering — back the **bilateral cooperation** because being excluded from standardization relevant to the Chinese market would be costly to German companies.

Some German government officials consider China's keen interest in cooperation on smart manufacturing a valuable bargaining chip that ultimately will benefit German industry in China. **Germany has already deployed the Industrie 4.0 partnership strategically** to resolve a dispute with China over new energy vehicles. In 2017, while communication on high-tech standard-setting continued, the German government temporarily withdrew from most aspects of the Industrie 4.0 cooperation until Beijing agreed to a resolution that appeased German automakers.

Despite **strong political backing by the federal government in Berlin**, the partnership has sparked controversy in Germany. Berlin think tank MERICS, along with the country's leading industry association, the Bundesverband der Deutschen Industrie (BDI), has warned that Germany is in a "system competition" with China. They view Germany's liberal market order as under threat from **the "China model" of state-led, authoritarian economic governance** — and caution against working closely with the Chinese government and firms in strategic sectors.

If the global tech wars continue to heat up, Germany probably will face increasing pressure, both at home and abroad, to blunt China's growing influence in technical standardization. **German Chancellor Angela Merkel has prioritized close ties between Berlin and Beijing**, but her retirement in 2021 could prompt new questioning of this partnership. For the time being, however, the **Sino-German alliance** in high-tech standardization remains a **little-known but important example of mutually beneficial cooperation**.

And to show that this isn't an isolated Merkel calling the shots all by herself, here is Markus Soeder, Bavaria's Prime Minister, and a lockdown zealot who more than anyone else pushed for restrictions in Germany and elsewhere:

<https://asiatimes.com/2020/08/china-germany-tight-ties-will-face-post-merkel-test/>

Röttgen's opposite number in tone and likelihood **to succeed Merkel is Markus Söder**, the current odds-on favorite to become the next chancellor and **arguably the most pro-China of Merkel's possible successors**.

Söder, the leader of the Christian Social Union in Bavaria (CSU), the regional counterpart of Merkel's CDU and minister-president of Germany's industrial heartland of Bavaria, is known for speaking in the same muted tones as Merkel and **putting German business interests first in dealing with China**. **Some see him as even more pro-China than Merkel.**

Some of Germany's most important firms, including BMW, Audi and Siemens, are based in Söder's Bavaria and **all have extensive operations and ties in China**. Meanwhile, Germany's exports to China have quintupled since Merkel became chancellor in 2005, hitting US\$108 billion last year, according to the World Bank.

As one of Europe's most export-reliant nations, **Germany is more dependent on China's market than any other European state**. **In 2018, Germany accounted for almost half of all EU exports to China.**

Some suggest that's one big money reason for Merkel's comparatively softer stance on Beijing. So, too, could be a Chinese government threat by Chinese Ambassador to Germany Wu Ken's threat in December to punish German automakers if Berlin is perceived to be overly critical of Beijing's actions or policies.

Whether Söder's current perceived soft-peddling on China owes to protecting Bavarian businesses interests, and whether he will seek to do the same for all German firms if he succeeds Merkel as chancellor, is yet to be seen. (...)

Possible successors are thus shying from making pronouncements on foreign policy matters, especially when Merkel's gentle approach is still in the forefront, says Noah Barkin, an expert on Europe-China relations at Rhodium Group, a New York-based independent research provider.

“Germany's relationship with China and its positioning in the US-China

conflict will be absolutely central to the country's future. So one has to hope that this debate picks up as we get closer to the end of the year," he added.

And this is Markus Soeder on his personal Facebook account boasting about his meet-up with Schwab at the WEF conference in Davos:

<https://www.facebook.com/markus.soder.75/posts/3428959153844404/>

This isn't some random blogger creating an artificial guilt by association. Soeder himself did. If Merkel steps down as Chancellor before or after the general election in September 2021, Soeder will carry the torch for the WEF and the CCP. All polls in Germany now predict that Markus Soeder will become the next Chancellor.

When, not if, this happens, a CCP asset will be heading NATO's most important ally in Europe.

Merkel and Soeder also happen to be the most fervent lockdown supporters in Germany. Of course this article from April 2020 tries to frame it in a positive light:

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/04/16/markus-soder-soeder-germany-strongman-coronavirus-crisis/>

Opponents of lockdowns got it slightly wrong. It's not that there's a correlation between politicians enforcing lockdowns, and their strive for closer economic ties with China. It's not a correlation, but a causality.

In September 2019, Merkel visited Wuhan during a 3-day visit in China. Here's the official summary of that visit:

<https://www.bundestkanzlerin.de/bkin-en/news/merkel-besucht-china-1668820>

And this is the full speech she actually gave, conveniently not translated to English:

<https://www.bundestkanzlerin.de/bkin-de/aktuelles/rede-von-bundestkanzlerin-merkel-an-der-huazhong-university-of-science-and-technology-am-7-september-2019-in-wuhan-1668736>

Google translate:

<https://translate.google.com/translate?sl=de&tl=en&u=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.bundestkanzlerin.de%2Fbkin-de%2Faktuelles%2Frede-von-bundestkanzlerin-merkel-an-der-huazhong-university-of-science-and-technology-am-7-september-2019-in-wuhan-1668736>

Emphasis added:

We Germans are looking at China with great interest and **how many good ideas are developing here**. Wuhan and your university also have a close relationship and

connection to Germany. Towards the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, Germany was very present in what was then Hankou. Even today, buildings in the German style bear witness to that time. Since 1982, a town twinning has linked Wuhan with Duisburg. The mayor of Duisburg had written to me before this trip and told me about this town twinning. The stimulus for this first Sino-German city partnership came primarily from business. **Because Wuhan is an important business location for German companies such as Bosch, Siemens and ThyssenKrupp.** But not only well-known companies are active here, but also many innovative medium-sized companies.

The exchange in science is particularly important to me. Technological development is rapid. It offers possibilities that we could only dream of before. Let's just think of artificial intelligence. Today, in medicine, for example, this is used to search through and evaluate millions of images and data in order to better diagnose and treat cancer. Whether in science, medicine, business or in other areas - machine learning will shape our work, life and **coexistence** more and more. You as young people are of course much more affected by this than we, the older ones.

However, technological upheavals are not always just about knowledge, application and economic value creation. Rather, new knowledge also means new challenges in the area of ethics. **Artificial intelligence, big data, advances in genetic engineering must always be accompanied by a debate about ethical and legal standards. Is everything that is possible actually desirable? Where exactly do we draw the limits of the application? How do we maintain the dignity of every single person?**

Is it really a coincidence that she'd be in Wuhan just a couple months before the outbreak, and talk about good ideas being developed there and Wuhan being such an important hub for Germany, or how genetic engineering and big data must be debated? If Bosch, Siemens and Thyssen-Krupp are in Wuhan, three companies that are Too Big To Fail in Germany, and that are very closely entangled with the federal government, often accompanying Merkel right in the Chancellor's jet when traveling the globe, wouldn't the German government have very direct information from the ground what was happening in Wuhan in January? Why did the German government claim up to the lockdown mid-March that there's nothing going on in China that should concern anyone, when in reality Merkel personally was in Wuhan just a few months earlier, and when she made a point how Wuhan is an important business location for German companies? More on that later.

To recap:

German Chancellor Angela Merkel is driving the fear campaign in Europe.
Dr Christian Drosten created the blueprint for RT-PCR "diagnosis" of COVID-19.

Drosten is a virologist, he does not have any background in epidemiology, infectiology, nor has he ever worked in the civil service. He does not have a background in public health, he's a nerd who's looking through microscopes all day long. Before January 2020 Drosten was just a virologist at the Berlin Charite, not even involved in cutting-edge research of, say, Ebola or HIV. Virology is not an

exciting field, and thus does not attract the brightest minds, so logically virologists should not and are not revered in any country. Worth keeping in mind.

This is a conference from May 2019:

<https://www.cducsu.de/veranstaltungen/globale-gesundheit-st-rken-un-nachhaltigkeitsziel-umsetzen/programm>

Look at the participants and their affiliations:

<https://www.cducsu.de/veranstaltungen/globale-gesundheit-st-rken-un-nachhaltigkeitsziel-umsetzen/referenten>

Angela Merkel
Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus
Dr Christian Drosten
Joe Cerrell, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
Jeremy Farrar, Director Wellcome Trust

Worth noting that Dr Drosten is not and was not the designated scientist for pandemic response in Germany. Until January he was a nobody in Germany, and before that Germany was not hit by any virus worth noting. Germany doesn't have an issue with vaccinations, either, with one of the highest levels of flu and general vaccinations in the world. In light of the absence of any pandemic activity in Germany in or before May 2019, why would the head of the WHO, the Director of the Wellcome Trust, a director of the Bill Gates Foundation, attend such a tiny conference organized by Merkel's party? Look at the video. Just a few dozen attendees, the whole thing organized at local party level. Vaccination is common in Germany, viruses are a non-issue in Germany at that point. But notice the "global" in global health.

All drivers of the pandemic on the same stage, in May 2019. I'll come back to this point.

The other German on that stage, Ilona Kickbusch, who used to work closely with Drosten, is a so-called "Agenda Contributor" for the WEF:

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/authors/ilona-kickbusch>

and references WEF material:

<https://twitter.com/IlonaKickbusch/status/1330053491528753153>

She's working in Geneva ... next to the HQ of the WEF. Her qualification? She's a political "scientist" with no background in medicine:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ilona_Kickbusch

Let's jump back 9 years, and take a closer look at the Gates/WEF connection:

<https://globalwa.org/2011/02/global-development-aligns-with-business-goals-at-davos-and-beyond/>

In a recent Reuters blog post called “Global Development crashes the Davos party,” Cerrell discusses the increasing presence of a **global development agenda** at the World Economic Forum’s (WEF) annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland.

Cerrell briefly traces the **history of this trend in Davos over the last 10 years starting when Bill Gates launched the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) in 2000**. While the forum has perhaps moved away from the years when celebrities like Bono, Sharon Stone, and Angelina Jolie could steal the Davos spotlight to push forward development issues, Cerrell thinks that these years have brought about a lasting shift; global development is now accepted as a normal part of the WEF’s conversation on business and economics.

Cerrell hopes to see global development “crashing” more and more gatherings to which it was previously uninvited.

The Gates Foundation has an office in Beijing:

<https://www.gatesfoundation.org/Where-We-Work/China-Office>

Steve Davis is senior China strategy advisor and interim director for the China Country Office. (...) He is a **lecturer in social innovation at the Stanford University Graduate School of Business** and serves as a **Distinguished Fellow with the World Economic Forum**. He also co-chairs the **WHO’s Digital Health Advisory Group** serves on the boards of Philanthropy University and The Trinity Challenge, and sits on the advisory board or consults with a range of institutions and initiatives, including the **Rockefeller Foundation**, the New York University School of Global Public Health, Challenge Seattle, the International Digital Health & Artificial Intelligence Research Collaborative (I-DAIR), and the World Economic Forum. (...) He **studied at Peking University** in the early 1980s.

Who else studied at the Stanford University Graduate School of Business? Tomas Pueyo:

<https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/experience/news-history/tomas-pueyo-mba-10-his-viral-post-coronavirus-why-you-must-act-now>

Isn't it fascinating how all these global organizations and people who do not, or rather did not have any visibility or impact on our lives pre-January 2020, somehow coalesced at the same meeting last year?

Now let's turn to German publisher Mathias Doepfner:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathias_D%C3%B6pfner

You probably never heard of him. He's the "good twin" version of Rupert Murdoch. He's heir to the Axel Springer empire, which owns many international news and entertainment companies:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axel_Springer_SE

Take note of this:

2020: Friede Springer transferred \$1.5 billion of Axel Springer shares to CEO Mathias Doepfner, effectively making him heir of the media group. Doepfner now has control of 44% of the voting rights.

Which makes Doepfner the most well-connected publisher and billionaire on the planet. Bezos might have the Washington Post, but Doepfner has 10 Washington Posts.

In March he wrote this piece, right after the beginning of the lockdown in Germany:

<https://www.welt.de/debatte/kommentare/plus206754791/Mathias-Doepfner-zur-Corona-Krise-Ich-habe-Zweifel.html>

It's paywalled, but basically he says on March 23rd that there's no reason to give up constitutional rights for something that probably won't kill many people. March 23rd. How would he know on March 23rd that the restrictions were here to stay when officially the government said it's only a temporary measure to be reverted soon? And how would he know of the, ultimately, low death count in Germany in advance?

It's very unusual that Doepfner would pen an op-ed in one of his papers. Even more unusual that the article stayed on the front page for several days.

But then in May he wrote this piece, even more curious:

<https://www.welt.de/debatte/kommentare/plus207687477/Mathias-Doepfner-Wir-muessen-uns-zwischen-Amerika-und-China-entscheiden.html>

Title: "We have to decide between America and China".

Opening paragraph in German:

Krisen haben etwas Klärendes. So auch die Corona-Krise. Wenn eine Therapie gegen das Virus gefunden ist, die Shutdown- und Lockerungsdebatten verklungen sind und die Rezession ihr hässliches Gesicht zeigt, muss nichts Geringeres geklärt werden als die Weltordnung. Konkreter: die Bündnisfrage. Wo steht Europa? An der Seite Amerikas oder an der Seite Chinas?

Google translation of the opening paragraph, not editing the grammar, emphasis added:

There is something clearing about crises. So also the corona crisis. When therapy for the virus has been found, the shutdown and easing debates have subsided and

the recession is showing its ugly face, nothing less than the **world order** needs to be clarified. More specifically: the **alliance** question. Where does Europe stand? On the side of America or **on the side of China?**

What's interesting here is that this came out of nowhere. There was no international congress, no official consultations, nothing that could've prompted this.

It's safe to assume that Doepfner is well-connected beyond your average pundit or investigative journalist. Why did he write this?

Who developed the first PCR test that's yielding all these false positives across the globe, with the exception of China? A German virologist. Who developed the first commercial screening kit for SARS-CoV-2? A German company, Tib-Molbiol, headquartered in Berlin.

How would the German government finance such an operation without budget offices noticing? Bribing officials, organising travels, funding fake research, kickstarting media campaigns ...

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wirecard_scandal

Wikipedia doesn't mention it, but there's more involvement by Merkel:

<https://www.ft.com/content/81779b15-7b1d-404f-b523-d61510397dd4>

Why, for example, did **Ms Merkel lobby for Wirecard while on an official trip to China in September last year** when her own finance minister was aware of continuing investigations into the company? Why did **deputy finance minister Jörg Kukies visit Wirecard boss Markus Braun at his Munich headquarters last November**, on the day of the chief executive's 50th birthday? Why did **BaFin appear so reluctant to investigate a company** that had been generating negative headlines for months? Why were **BaFin employees able to trade Wirecard shares** while the agency was investigating the payments group? And why did **BaFin respond to FT articles alleging accounting fraud by banning investors from betting against the company's shares for two months, and later filing a criminal complaint against two FT journalists who had authored the reports?**

That "official trip to China in September" was actually the official visit in Wuhan. And the answer to all those questions is: because the German government and their intelligence agencies were building a front for funneling money into geopolitical activities, and for this chose a payment processor with deep ties in the Middle East and Asia. And for that you need shady figures like this one:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jan_Marsalek

Very thin resume, but the FT has the full picture:

<https://www.ft.com/content/511ecf86-ab40-486c-8f76-b8ebda4cc669>

Merkel hates the West. But what motivates the hundreds if not thousands of water carriers and helpers who don't necessarily seek the West's destruction? Money. How would the CCP and Merkel transfer money to these individuals?

Through a company such as Wirecard with deep ties into supposedly neutral territory such as the Middle East, where the CCP is known to operate businesses. When Wirecard went bankrupt in summer 2020, it turned out that 2 billion Euros were missing from the balance sheets. 2 billion Euros spent somewhere, somehow.

Let's look into Ursula von der Leyen, the head of the European Union:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ursula_von_der_Leyen

When she left office **she was the only minister to have served continuously in Angela Merkel's cabinet since Merkel became Chancellor**. She served as a deputy leader of the CDU from 2010 to 2019, and has previously been regarded as a leading contender to succeed Merkel as Chancellor and as the favourite to become Secretary-General of NATO.

On 2 July 2019, Von der Leyen was proposed by the European Council as the candidate for President of the European Commission.[2][3] She was then elected by the European Parliament on 16 July;[4][nb 1] she took office on 1 December, becoming the first woman in such role.

Von der Leyen is included in Time magazine's 100 Most Influential People of 2020.

Worth keeping in mind that von der Leyen is a close confidante of Merkel. Of course von der Leyen is also highly problematic:

<https://www.politico.eu/article/ursula-von-der-leyen-biography-career-inconvenient-truth/>

And of course she'd endorse the Great Reset:

<https://twitter.com/geisteslicht/status/1330074543440932864>

Translations:

The corona crisis is a great acceleration for necessary changes in the climate crisis, digitization, geopolitics and the global economy.

The need for globalization and accelerated digitization will both be the drivers of the "Great Reset".

Von der Leyen has not been elected into this position, but selected by EU governments.

<https://www.spiegel.de/netzwelt/netzpolitik/ursula-von-der-leyen-die-methode-zensursula-a-1275545.html>

Google translation:

Ursula von der Leyen is to become the new head of the EU Commission - or, as many say on the Internet: censorship. It owes its nickname to the network blocking debate that once drove it - with a disturbing political style. (...) Von der Leyen does not shy away from drastic measures. In interviews she uses phrases such as " children's souls and children's bodies are torn apart ". When performing, it becomes clear that such words also reflect their own dismay. Not surprising with this dramatic topic, but the question arises as to whether politics should be made so sensible. At a press event in January 2009, she lets the journalist - seriously! - show child pornography recordings. A complaint against the minister for distributing child pornography has therefore been discontinued. Nobody doubts that sexual violence needs to be destroyed and fought against children, but this radicalism of PR emotionalisation is new. (...) Von der Leyen also provokes such violent reactions because she always seems to fight dirty. In the debate about network blocking, it spreads false or completely unproven statistics on several occasions. A video clip of an election campaign appearance emerges on which she badly defamed the opponents of the network blocking with false claims.

Again, notice the pattern: all main drivers of this fake pandemic outside China are German. Merkel. Drosten. Schwab. Von der Leyen. And a German payments processor, endorsed by Merkel on her China trip, protected by the German government against allegations of fraud, that somehow loses 2 billion Euros.

In the past few years Peter Altmaier, Federal Minister for Economic Affairs and Energy, pushed the concept of so-called national or European champions:

<https://www.euractiv.de/section/finanzen-und-wirtschaft/news/industriestrategie-2030-altmaier-setzt-auf-european-champions/>

Google translation:

But Altmaier does not want to leave the fate of German industry to the rules of the free market economy. It provides for **government intervention to enable large corporate mergers**. Because in some industries such as aviation, railways or large plant engineering, the reference point is not the national but the world market. What the Minister of Economic Affairs has in mind are so-called "European champions", ie mergers of several large EU companies. "The question is whether we will voluntarily forego this market segment and allow it to be served by the USA and China alone, or whether we have the right to be in this market as well. But that is only possible if you allow mergers **so that existing companies reach the necessary size**, "says Altmaier

It is not about intervening in the business decisions of the company, says Altmaier's strategy. Nobody should be forced to innovate. However, in the case of "**challenges that are existential for an economy**", the state should be able to acquire shares in companies for a limited period of time or provide financial aid to promote necessary mergers.

But although the majority of industrial representatives welcomed Altmaier's

initiative, the idea of state intervention met with resistance. State intervention should "not be used to defend against company takeovers, but only to promote new technology projects," says the Federation of German Industries.

And at the German Institute for Economic Research, Dr. Tomaso Duso, the Ministry of Economic Affairs is on the wrong track: **"The idea that the state knows better than the market what the technology, the sectors and the markets of the future are is quite absurd. Protectionism and massive subsidization may work in China at the moment. But the strategy of making a bad and scaled-down copy of it in Europe will not be successful."**

This article is from February 2019 when Altmeier presented his plans to turn the German economy into a copy of China.

Flash-forward to June 2020. After sabotaging the aviation industry with travel bans, the German federal government buys a voting majority of Lufthansa shares:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lufthansa#2020s: COVID-19 pandemic and recovery>

and plenty more across all sectors.

Altmeier is not just some random dude who happened to get a cabinet position from Merkel:

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_Altmaier

Google translation:

On December 17, 2013 he became Federal Minister for Special Tasks and Head of the Federal Chancellery [i.e. Chief of Staff]. (...) Altmaier is the most important confidant of Chancellor Angela Merkel and is one of the few who is allowed to say the informal "you" [i.e. in German "Du"] to Merkel.

Now on to Klaus Schwab's son.

<https://www.handelszeitung.ch/unternehmen/der-westen-kann-von-china-viel-lernen-728165>

Google translation:

An advantage that your name is Schwab?

The name helps, yes. It also underscores our appreciation and the importance that China has for the WEF. In addition, **my father is regularly on site, in particular he is always at our meeting in Dalian or Tianjin in September.**

China's Prime Minister Li Keqiang was the keynote speaker - it's your merit?

No, that would definitely be an exaggeration. In 2009 Prime Minister Wen Jiabao was already in Davos, Li Keqiang was here in 2010, at that time in his function as

vice-premier. Now he's back as prime minister. Around 100 entrepreneurs from China traveled with him to Davos, including **Jack Ma, founder of Alibaba, and Ren Zhengfei, founder of Huawei.**

Li was a speaker at the summer Davos in China - a special relationship?

He gave the opening speech in Tianjin. I interpret his appearances at the annual meeting as a sign that China wants to play a more important role in the world. **We are of course proud that we can offer our guests this platform.** It helps that we come from Switzerland and that the **World Economic Forum has been in China since the early 1980s is active.** At that time we organized meetings between European business leaders and **those in charge of Chinese state-owned companies.** The Chinese wanted to know how to organize state-owned companies more efficiently. This means that the **forum has had good relations with the central government in Beijing for over 30 years,** but also with regions and universities.

China is no longer the extended workbench of the West?

Chinese entrepreneurs are not only world champions in achieving economies of scale. They also have tremendous abilities to adapt to global markets. Today many companies are long out of the status of copying, but this innovative strength is completely underestimated in the West. We'll soon see Chinese industry champions operating globally. I am convinced that **the West can learn just as much from China** today as China can from the West.

Olivier Schwab studied engineering in Lausanne , Boston and San Francisco. He worked for the management consultant Mercer Management and was assistant to the industrialist Alfred Schindler. Since 2011 he has been heading the WEF office in China and organizing the summer WEF there. **He is married to a Chinese woman and has two children.**

Again, who else was in China in September 2020? None other than Chancellor Merkel, who just happened to visit Wuhan. Did she meet the Schwab family, too?

But back to Drosten. The point about Drosten is not so much what he did, but when, and that also applies to many other players. The things they did at the time were not a reaction to actual events happening at the time, but they were following a script.

Which company did Merkel visit in Wuhan in September 2019? Webasto:

<https://www.webasto-group.com/de/presse/pressemitteilungen/pressemitteilung/bundeskanzlerin-angela-merkel-eroeffnet-neuen-webasto-standort-im-chinesischen-wuhan/>

At which company did the Chinese woman work when she returned from China and brought back the very first case of SARS-CoV-2 to Germany, the so-called patient zero? Webasto:

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-germany-defences-idUSKCN21R1DB>

Let's look at the bigger picture:

According to his own son, Klaus Schwab is in China every September. Chancellor Merkel also happened to be in China in September 2019. She happened to visit Wuhan and give a public speech. She happened to visit Webasto's subsidiary in Wuhan. A Chinese employee of Webasto happened to travel from China to Webasto's facility in Bavaria in January while carrying the pathogen into Germany and thus becoming patient zero. German authorities happened to quickly identify that woman, somehow, and created the start of a pandemic in Germany, with help from a screening kit for SARS-CoV-2 that German scientist Drosten happened to develop in January, just in time. Drosten and Merkel happened to run into each other at that conference about global health in May 2019 where Drosten had no business being at.

This also answers why Eurosurveillance peer-reviewed the Drosten paper on RT-PCR screening for SARS-CoV-2 so fast: because the Webasto employee was already scripted to arrive in Bavaria in late January, because travel restrictions would be enacted soon and the Chinese Webasto employee had to be in Bavaria before that, because the PCR testing regime needed the veneer of peer review as legitimation to kickstart mass testing of healthy people. And most importantly, because respiratory illnesses retreat with rising temperatures, higher levels of vitamin D through natural sun, and higher humidity, so waiting the usual 2 months until a proper peer review was done would have meant missing this window of opportunity. Which is precisely how Schwab, in a Freudian slip, framed it: a narrow window of opportunity. As researchers noticed, by end-March the virus was already retreating, so the lockdowns across Europe mid-March were actually the last chance to enact them.

This imperfect start to the fake pandemic was a major blunder by Merkel, Schwab, the CCP, and the globalists, and Merkel mostly blames Drosten for messing up the timing, which is the real reason why she stopped at one point using him to move this ahead, and instead resorted to third-rate theoretical modellers.

But let's look at the details:

Most media reports claimed that the Chinese Webasto employee was asymptomatic, which helped build the lie that SARS-CoV-2 spreads in asymptomatic carriers. Not so:

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-02-04/german-coronavirus-outbreak-began-with-patient-who-had-symptoms>

A Chinese woman who touched off a cluster of coronavirus cases in Germany last month **was experiencing symptoms during her visit, contrary to previous reports**, according to health officials in Berlin.

Authorities from the Robert Koch Institute, a German government biomedical agency, and the Bavarian health ministry have interviewed the Chinese woman since she flew back to China on Jan. 22. **The woman described having had symptoms including back pain while in Germany and said she had taken fever-subduing medication**, a spokeswoman for the institute said.

The organization reported the findings late last week to the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. The information hasn't been published in a medical journal, although Science Magazine reported on it Monday evening.

The information differs from a paper published in the New England Journal of Medicine on Thursday, which stated that the woman appeared to have transmitted the virus while still in the incubation phase. That ratcheted up fears about how easily the coronavirus from Wuhan, China, could spread. There have been **other reports of asymptomatic transmission in China**, however.

Nonetheless, Drosten continued to peddle the false narrative that SARS-CoV-2 spreads in asymptomatic patients, i.e. in persons who got a false-positive test result. The only source outside China that claimed SARS-CoV-2 spreads in asymptomatic carriers is Drosten.

But let's examine this one level deeper:

In January 2020 Drosten just happened to browse an online database where he happened to take notice of a RNA sequence of a new pathogen uploaded by Chinese scientists. He immediately started to develop a PCR screening kit for this sequence even though at this point not a single person had died from this pathogen outside China, and even though Drosten was on record in an interview just a few years ago explaining in great detail that PCR can not and must not be used for detecting disease. The WHO quickly approved the kit at a point in time when not a single person outside China had died of it, and when the only manufacturer of the kit was Drosten's own company in Berlin that had no intention of shipping the kit to China.

Also in January 2020, a Chinese woman who happened to work for Webasto's branch in Wuhan - the one Merkel happened to visit just a few months earlier -, happened to travel to Webasto's HQ in Bavaria, Germany from Hong Kong. At the HQ she spread the pathogen to colleagues, and a handful experienced flu-like symptoms in the following days.

<https://www.thelocal.de/20200128/first-coronavirus-case-confirmed-in-germany-bavarian-health-ministry>

Germany has a population of 83 million. 42 million are regularly employed. Around 4-8 million people in Germany visit doctors with flu- or cold-like symptoms every winter. Webasto is employing around 1000 people at the HQ. A handful had flu-like

symptoms, just like the hundreds of thousands of employees throughout Germany on the same day.

And yet, the RKI, Germany's CDC-equivalent, descended only on this company with a dozen researchers, and Drosten just happened to be among them. They ignored the hundreds of thousands of other German employees who had cold- or flu-like symptoms on that day. They also happened to have access to Drosten's SARS-CoV-2 screening kit, and collected swabs from these employees - the process which Drosten himself had explained is not suitable for detecting an infection in a lengthy interview just a few years ago -, but not from any other employee in Germany who on the same day had cold- or flu-like symptoms. Drosten then co-authored a report for the WHO - the head of which Drosten had met just 8 months earlier at a conference about global health where Drosten had no business being at -, and in which Drosten included as findings a second-hand interview of the Chinese woman where he stated that she had no symptoms and therefore spread must be asymptomatic. When it later emerged that indeed she had flu-like symptoms throughout her flight, and actually said so in the interview with the scientist from the RKI, Drosten claimed that he couldn't know because he never spoke with her personally, and that he would try and rectify the situation by pointing this out to the WHO. He never did, but instead, to this day, claims that the pathogen is spread asymptotically even though he never had met a single patient from which the pathogen could be isolated and cultivated, and who was actually asymptomatic.

Drosten is the perpetrator, but not the mastermind behind this fraud.

Back to Merkel:

She grew up in the GDR, and was 35 when the Berlin wall came down. She was never part of any resistance movement in the GDR, but instead she did make a career, which was not possible until she supported the regime. There is also this:

After the Berlin wall came down, the Stasi tried to shred all archives, but didn't quite succeed. Apart from missing tons of copies they apparently forgot about, the shredding machines were not granular enough, and in one of the first sophisticated uses of OCR technology a team of researchers restored millions of shredded pages. Not the full archives, though.

It turned out that in the GDR there were only 2 types of citizens: Stasi officials and informants, and then citizens under surveillance. For every adult in the GDR there was a record: either in the archive of regime collaborators, or in the archive of the resistance and victims of surveillance.

Before Merkel became Chancellor, of course they searched for records in the collaborator archive, but found none. However, before they could search in the victims archive they'd first need to obtain Merkel's agreement - which she refused to give. Why? If she was a victim, a part of some resistance, or under surveillance, surely some records must exist, right?

The truth is that no records of Merkel exist as a victim, as being under surveillance, as being part of the resistance. Which can only mean one thing: she was a

collaborator, and her records were not found yet, probably because most records did not use the real names but handles.

<https://www.rainews.it/tgr/tagesschau/articoli/2019/06/tag-Angela-Merkel-Stasi-Spitzel-6966a699-5060-4c74-9aea-9d05de339b64.html>

Google translation:

Angela Merkel herself reported that the Stasi wanted to recruit her in 1978. But she refused. The State Security Service kept a detailed record of these events. However, according to the law, anyone who wants to view these documents needs the consent of the person concerned. **Merkel has never agreed that her Stasi files be published.**

Merkel is also given various trips abroad, including in 1986 and 1989 to the Federal Republic. From these trips it is concluded that **she must have cooperated with the Stasi**. Traveling to the west was actually a great privilege in the GDR. (...)

Merkel's trips to Poland in the early 1980s also give rise to speculation. On her last return trip, GDR customs found some documents from the independent Polish trade union "Solidarnosc" from Merkel. A report was sent to the Stasi headquarters about the incident, but **Merkel evidently did not have any disadvantages.**

More proof that Merkel was an enemy of the West until the Berlin wall came down:

https://www.focus.de/politik/deutschland/tid-31300/titel-das-leben-der-anderen-angela-merkel-reform-kommunistin_aid_994337.html

Google translation:

In September 1989 she attended the pastoral college in Templin. In addition to her father, who had since distanced himself from the SED, her brother Marcus and Günter Nooke, who later became a board member of the "Democratic Awakening", discussed the political situation there. "A reunified Germany," says the new biography, was "beyond their imagination at that time, not only because it did not fit into the bipolar world, but because they strictly rejected the Western social system." Angela Merkel is said to have said to the wife of the Bochum theology professor Christofer Frey: **"If we reform the GDR, then not in the West German sense."**

https://www.focus.de/politik/deutschland/tid-31300/titel-das-leben-der-anderen-angela-merkel-wo-stand-angela-merkel-in-dieser-entscheidenden-frage_aid_994338.html

Google translation:

Left-wing intellectuals, including the writers Christa Wolf and Stefan Heym, published the appeal "For our country" in November 1989, in which they gave the population a choice: either a "solidary society" on the soil of the GDR or a "sell-out of our material and moral values", that is, takeover by the West. **Merkel responded in an open letter** to Christa Wolf: "If you still believe in the future of socialism, then it

would have been necessary to put forward a draft for its realization and not just polemicize. There is currently a lack of viable and insightful visions of the future. Incidentally, **40 years of the GDR have spoiled the once so hopeful word socialism** for many. We believe, that you have done this country in the current situation no good service by collecting signatures, no matter how forced. "

How could Angela Merkel, who in December 1989 urged "viable visions of the future" for socialism, move into the Helmut Kohl cabinet as Family Minister only 13 months later? How did the "reform communist" become the chairwoman of the CDU within a decade and now, as Chancellor, even become the "most powerful woman in the world" according to "Forbes"?

"How much GDR is in Angela Merkel?" Asked several biographers of the Chancellor without being able to provide a conclusive answer. She herself would probably not establish a decisive connection between her first life and her later political career. "Nothing at all connected me with this country. I have never seen the GDR as my home country," she explained years later.

Ralf Georg Reuth and Günther Lachmann show in "The First Life of Angela M." that **today's Chancellor was probably a lot closer to the GDR and her system and served it with more commitment than was previously known**. How much of the old life is actually still in her, only Angela Merkel can answer that herself.

Merkel never had a proper majority in parliament, instead relying on the social-democrats in a 2/3 supermajority coalition. When Fukushima "exploded", she used it as a pretext to shut down all nuclear power plants and increase German dependence on Russian gas. When the Greens were rising in opinion polls, she used it as a pretext to shut down all coal power plants and make Germany ever more dependent on Russian gas. And when a common cold was imported by a Chinese woman from a city she visited just a few months earlier, she used it as a pretext to transform Germany into GDR 2.0.

In the end, it's really simple: Merkel never really liked West Germany or the complexity of modern life in a Western democracy, and always wished to come home to the good old days of the GDR, with simple rules and an omnipotent state that shot citizens in the back when they tried to make it over the wall:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_deaths_at_the_Berlin_Wall

Merkel's recent remarks on China:

<https://www.welt.de/politik/deutschland/article221568228/Corona-Wo-landet-Europa-nach-dieser-Pandemie-fragt-sich-Merkel.html>

In her own words, Google translation:

If they [i.e. the Chinese] all **wear their masks much better and don't have so many Querdenker protests**, but meanwhile an economic upswing, then the question arises where Europe ends up after this pandemic.

"Querdenker" refers to lockdown protestors, ie. people who'd like to have their constitutional rights back.

One must **ask oneself where Europe stands after the crisis**, said Merkel on Tuesday at the online digital summit of the federal government, alluding to the high number of corona infections and the associated restrictions. "That will be another reorganization of the regions, I believe," added Merkel.

"Reorganization of regions" is what Google translate makes of "Neuordnung der Regionen", but a better translation would be "Realignment of power".

Now scroll back to the remarks of Mathias Doepfner about alignment with China. Is this what Doepfner was referring to, Merkel's plot to become the CCP's ally in Europe, and push a narrative that transforms the EU to become compatible with the CCP's vision of social control?

One of the achievements of Merkel:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Network_Enforcement_Act

Reporters Without Borders and other critics spoke of a "rush job" that "could massively damage the basic right to freedom of the press and freedom of expression". Decisions on the legality of contributions would be privatised. The UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression criticized the planned law as endangering human rights. At a hearing in the Bundestag, almost all experts considered the draft unconstitutional. (...) The Bundestag passed the amended draft on 30 June 2017 with a majority of votes of the government factions against the votes of the Left and Iris Eberl from the CSU with the abstention of Alliance 90/The Greens.

If a Twitter user is in Germany, attached to every tweet they're reading there is a button that says "Report this tweet as a violation of the NetzDG", which usually will result in this tweet being deleted if originating from Germany, or being hidden to German users.

That all happened years ago under Merkel, and with every year of Merkel ruling Germany she transformed the country more and more into a mini-me of China.

Now let's circle in on the Merkel/Drosten connection:

One of the most probable theories is that the "start of the global pandemic" in March was actually the tail of the spread of a pathogen that's harmless to most adults, at least in the Northern hemisphere. Corroborated by reports that samples from patients in France dating back to November 2019 were testing positive once screening kits for SARS-CoV-2 became available. It was only the mass-deployment of PCR tests in March that detected an already prevalent respiratory virus, a virus that did not result in noticeable excess mortality in the months prior.

But when considering that Wuhan, and the whole of China, apparently are not that dependent on free travel, the speculation that a mostly harmless virus was spread

from Wuhan in January 2020 doesn't hold water, especially when considering that the US enacted a travel ban early on. The conclusion in Western nations - not the perpetrators, but the victims - was that the shutdown of travel not inhibiting the spread could only mean that SARS-CoV-2 is way more contagious than other coronaviruses. This is untrue, and the real reason is that by January the virus was already present in all corners of the world, not causing a blip on any public health radar.

So how and when exactly did the virus spread in autumn 2019 to the world?

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2019_Military_World_Games

The 2019 Military World Games (Chinese: 2019年世界军人运动会; pinyin: 2019 Nián shìjiè jūnrén yùndònghuì), officially known as the 7th CISM Military World Games (Chinese: 第七届世界军人运动会; pinyin: Dì qī jiè shìjiè jūnrén yùndònghuì) and commonly known as Wuhan 2019, was held from October 18–27, 2019 in **Wuhan, Hubei, China**. The 7th Military World Games was the first international military multi-sport event to be held in China and also it was the largest military sports event ever to be held in China, with nearly **10,000 athletes from over 100 countries** competing in 27 sports.

The smoking gun:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2019_Military_World_Games#Controversies

A large number of athletes from different delegations around the world **had fallen ill with unusual symptoms during the games which some attribute to COVID-19**, including returning French athletes Élodie Clouvel and Valentin Belaud; most have not been tested, and are under suppression orders as military authorities asserted that it would be impossible in any event to determine exactly when the infection had occurred.[31][32][33][34] **U.S. intelligence reportedly shared information regarding the ongoing threat of "potential pandemic from Wuhan outbreak" in November 2019.**

<https://www.taiwannews.com.tw/en/news/3932712>

According to a report by Radio Free Asia (RFA), French pentathlon world champion Elodie Clouvel said that when she and her boyfriend Valentin Belaud took part in the 2019 Military World Games in Wuhan in last October, many French athletes, including herself, fell ill. At the time they all assumed it to be the flu, but she said that some of them were quite sick.

She went on to say that she had recently visited **a military doctor who told her she may have had coronavirus**, as many on the French team had been ill at the same time, according to CNA.

The RFA report pointed out that former Italian fencing Olympian Matteo Tagliariol also said that **when he participated in the Military World Games, he and five roommates all got sick with symptoms often seen in COVID-19 patients and**

experienced a long recovery time afterward. He said his fever and difficulty breathing continued even a week after returning home.

<https://www.insidethegames.biz/articles/1094347/world-military-games-illness-covid-19>

Speaking to the Mail on Sunday, German volleyball player Jacqueline Brock alleged that she got COVID-19 despite no cases being reported until December.

She said: "After a few days, some athletes from my team got ill, I got sick in the last two days.

"I have never felt so sick, either it was a very bad cold or COVID-19, **I think it was COVID-19.**"

The pathogen was spread from Wuhan a month after Merkel's 3-day visit, but did not register on the radar throughout the winter season until a German virologist who just happened to meet Merkel, the WHO head, the Gates guy, the Wellcome Trust guy, then just happened to develop a PCR test for the pathogen, that was then deployed at the tail of the winter season so that the lockdown could be credited with declining cases when in reality the spring season leads to declining cases for all respiratory viruses, which nonetheless gave Merkel and other governments cover to enact the same lockdown again in the next winter season now that the concept of lockdowns and testing of healthy people with fraudulent PCR tests was established, and after Merkel and Soeder had convinced Europe that it was the lockdown that led to fewer hospitalizations, not the change of seasons.

Now let's look into the rationale for lockdowns that various CCP assets created in early 2020:

<https://twitter.com/OBusybody/status/1302627449398865920>

Notice the timeline.

<https://tomaspueyo.medium.com/coronavirus-the-hammer-and-the-dance-be9337092b56>

Tomas Pueyo published this article on March 19th.

Searching for "hammer dance" in the context of epidemiology or infectiology only yields this single article, published on March 19th. It is not an established containment strategy in epidemiology. After extensive research nobody has found any mention of these metaphors outside this article by Pueyo.

Here's a leaked framing document from the German federal government sent to all government departments and civil servants at the federal level in March 2020:

<https://www.abgeordnetenwatch.de/blog/informationsfreiheit/das-interne-strategiepapier-des-innenministeriums-zur-corona-pandemie>

This framing document was released internally as a classified paper. Classified as in:

<https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Verschlusssache>

In English: "Classified information". Why would it be classified if it's the government's strategy to tackle a virus outbreak? It's not like the German government, or any government, has been careful not to sow panic in the general population since March. According to the website publishing the leak, the framing paper was distributed before or on March 18th.

Have a look at page 7, quote:

Szenario "Hammer and Dance"

Have a look at page 8, second last paragraph, quote:

So lange das nicht geschehen ist, bleibt nur der "Holzhammer" ("**The Hammer**") der starken sozialen Distanzierung, ungeachtet des genauen Infektionszustands aller Betroffenen.

To understand how vile that classified framing document was that the Merkel government crafted with help from CCP assets, here's a few Google translations, emphasis added:

Most virologists, epidemiologists, doctors, economists and political scientists answer the question "what happens if nothing is done" with a worst-case scenario of **over a million deaths in 2020 - for Germany alone**. A team of experts from RKI, RWI, IW, SWP, University of Bonn, University of Nottingham, **Ningbo China**, University of Lausanne and University of Kassel confirmed these figures with an overall model developed for Germany.

We have to switch from the method "we test to confirm the situation" to the method "we test to get ahead of the situation" (**South Korea** proves this impressively).

Step-by-step intervention in economic and social processes that is appropriate to the situation is only made possible in this way and the acceptance and meaningfulness of **measures that restrict freedom** is increased.

The situation will worsen because not only intensive medical care for the seriously ill with ventilators, but also for those with moderate illnesses, an outpatient and inpatient oxygen supply will be necessary (**China** proves this).

We assume that 5% of infected people have to be hospitalized and of these, 30% require intensive medical care and a further 20% require at least ventilation using the appropriate equipment.

If the measures proposed here to contain and control the Covid 19 epidemic do not work, the entire system could be called into question in the sense of a "**meltdown**". There is a risk that this will change the community into a completely

different basic state, **leading to anarchy**.

We need to get away from communication that is centered on the case mortality rate. With a case mortality rate that sounds insignificant in percentage terms and affects the elderly in particular, many then unconsciously and unacknowledged think to themselves: "Well, this is how we get rid of the old people who are dragging our economy, we are already too many on earth and with a little luck, I will inherit a little earlier ». These mechanisms have certainly contributed to **downplaying the epidemic in the past**.

In order to achieve the desired shock effect, the concrete effects of a disease on human society must be amplified:

1) Many seriously ill people are hospitalized by their loved ones, but turned away, and **die in agony at home gasping for breath. *Suffocating or not getting enough air is a primal fear for everyone***. Likewise, the situation in which there is nothing you can do to help relatives who are in mortal danger. **The pictures from Italy are disturbing.**

2) "Children are unlikely to suffer from the epidemic": Wrong. Children are easily infected, even with exit restrictions, e.g. with the neighborhood **children**. If they then infect their parents, and one of them **dies in agony at home and they feel that they are to blame** because they e.g. forget to wash their hands after playing, it is **the most terrifying thing a child can ever experience**.

3) Long-term damage: Even if we have only had reports on individual cases so far, they paint an alarming picture. Even those who seem cured after a mild course can apparently experience **relapses at any time**, which then suddenly end fatally, due to a heart attack or lung failure because the virus has found its way into the lungs or heart without being noticed. These may be isolated cases, but **will constantly hover like the sword of Damocles over those who were once infected**. A much more common consequence is fatigue that lasts for months and probably years and reduced lung capacity, as has been reported many times by SARS survivors and is also the case now with COVID-19, although the duration cannot of course be estimated yet

In order to make testing faster and more efficient, the **use of big data and location tracking** is essential in the long term.

They have been following this script to the letter.

Pueyo published his article first on Medium on March 19th. The classified framing document was distributed on March 18th, or even earlier. It's not plausible that someone might have read about "The Hammer and Dance" in public and incorporated it in this framing document within the few days after Pueyo, an unknown person with no history or credibility in the field, published it in an obscure corner of the internet.

Let's dive into the genesis of the framing document:

<https://zeitung.faz.net/faz/politik/2020-04-02/f8e7cfb89e5590d367435a9fa8a0a702/?GEPC=s5>

Google translation:

After the paper by seven economists on the economic implications of the crisis was on the table on March 10th, Seehofer asked his State Secretary Markus Kerber, himself an economist and former General Manager of the Federation of German Industries, **to draw up a strategy paper - one that illuminates the worst-case scenario**. Kerber put together a group of around ten experts. Michael Hüther and Hubertus Bardt from the Institute of German Economy, as well as Christoph M. Schmidt and Boris Augurzky from the RWI Leibniz Institute for Economic Research. The scientists worked around the clock for three days, and the paper was ready on March 22nd. That was the Sunday on which the Prime Ministers and the **Chancellor decided on the lockdown restrictions**. The next day the head of the Chancellery had the paper on the table.

So now they're saying that the paper was finished on March 22nd, contradicting the whistleblower website, and that leaves two possibilities:

1. The paper was not distributed on March 18th, but 4 days later, after Pueyo's article was first published on Medium.

- or -

2. The paper was distributed on March 18th, and the authors had advance knowledge of Pueyo's article.

Both possibilities are what one would call a conspiracy: either it's a conspiracy to fake research when in reality the German authors just copy'n'pasted from Pueyo's article, or it's a conspiracy to push a lockdown strategy simultaneously through the federal framing document and through an unrelated Stanford graduate on Medium.

According to a freedom of information request, these are the "scientists" who wrote that internal framing document for the German federal government:

<https://clubderklarenworte.de/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/BMI-Dokument-incl.-Autoren.pdf>

None of the authors listed above are epidemiologists or virologists. They aren't even from the field of medicine.

The framing document lists the following university, which calls itself "University of Nottingham" but is actually located in China, as a contributor:

<https://www.nottingham.edu.cn/en/index.aspx>

As was revealed recently, the former Chancellor of the UK Nottingham university - not the subsidiary in China, but the original university in the UK - was a senior CCP

party member. After 12 years as Chancellor of Nottingham UK he co-founded the Ningbo subsidiary:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yang_Fujia

In 2004, Yang was one of the 3 prime movers behind the creation of the University of Nottingham Ningbo China – along with Sir Colin Campbell and Madame Xu Yafen.

But in the classified paper they mention specifically contributions from the Ningbo branch. Why would the German federal government seek contributions from a Chinese university founded by the CCP for use in a classified framing document that's supposed to be distributed only within federal departments?

Because the Merkel government collaborated with the CCP and its world-wide assets to fake the pandemic. It really is that simple.

Now let's look at this thread:

<https://twitter.com/MichaelThau/status/1319287194746449920>

Why would Pueyo write on March 10th that the entire world would be in lockdown 2 to 4 weeks later when lockdowns, or "the hammer", are not a thing in epidemiology?

And why would the WHO declare it a pandemic a day after Pueyo wrote his first article? The WHO headed by the guy Merkel met at a conference about global health a short time before? And the same WHO that quickly approved Drosten's test - the same virologist the head of the WHO happened to meet at the exact same conference in Germany where Merkel also was, and the guy from the Gates Foundation, and the guy from the Wellcome Trust - as a blueprint for all PCR tests that terrorize societies across the planet to this day?

And even assuming the case that the German state officials wrote their internal framing document after the publication of Pueyo's second article on March 19th, why would they find and fully adopt Pueyo's article in the first place, considering that Medium, or the English language in general, are not the preferred research fields for civil servants in Germany?

How many federal strategy papers or framing papers ever incorporated articles published just a few days earlier on Medium by unknown non-scientists as central points of public health strategy? The same amount of papers Eurosurveillance peer-reviewed in less than two days: exactly one.