

Book review Helmut Sterz: The Vaccination Mafia

Description

I have read Helmut Sterzâ??s new book and will discuss it briefly here. It will be published on 1 December and is the most important book on coronavirus awareness that I am aware of (though I havenâ??t read them all). I highly recommend it to the readers of my blog. The book is only available in German, but I still want to convey the most essential aspects with my discussion for my English language readers.

> Helmut Sterz: Die Impf-Mafia (The Vaccine Mafia). Pfizerâ??s former chief toxicologist proves how toxic substances were illegally sold to us as a cure for Covid-19. Basel: Rubikon. 240 pages. Â£24, ISBN 978-3-907606-00-1

The most significant part of this book on the coronavirus comes at the very end, on pages 206â??210: â?? *Demands for the investigation of the global pharmaceutical scandal*â??. There, the author makes 18 demands. In my opinion, the following are particularly noteworthy (in my own words â?? where not indicated by quotations, which are literal translations from the book):

- He calls for an independent parliamentary committee of inquiry that does not include any compromised individuals.
- He calls for a general amnesty for all those who came into conflict with the state in any way during the coronavirus pandemic. This is because all measures, especially vaccinations, were either nonsensical, not scientifically sound or harmful. Therefore, protesting or disobeying these measures was a civic duty.
- Courts have handed down politically motivated judgements, which must therefore be overturned.
- â??The penalties for the perpetrators must be commensurate with the consequences of the crimes and the injustice caused, even if they are people who hold or have held the highest political offices (â?¦ Merkel, â?¦ Spahn, â?¦ Scholz, â?¦ Lauterbachâ?¦) and who believe they can claim immunity because of their office. They have broken their oath of office to the people and their country, acted unilaterally in the interests of vaccine manufacturers, and tolerated or even encouraged breaches of official duty by the health authorities under their control.â??
- â??All persons who have decided on and implemented senseless and dangerous â??pandemic measuresâ?• must be immediately removed from office and held accountable.â??
- â??All scientific advisers to the government, such as Prof. Drosten, should be held accountable in court for their misconduct.â??

- â??The protection of vaccine manufacturers from recourse claims should be lifted due to serious, in some cases intentional, misconduct.â??
- BioNTechâ??s profits should go to a foundation to compensate vaccine victims.
- â??The manipulation and falsification of clinical data and the cover-up of vaccine safety issues is criminal. Those responsible at the â?¦ manufacturers â?¦ must be held accountable in court.â??
- Those responsible (Paul Ehrlich Institute, RKI, BioNTech) who had insight into the increasing number of side effects of the coronavirus vaccinations and did not warn the public must be held accountable for failure to render assistance.
- Medical professionals who continue to vaccinate despite the available knowledge should have their licences revoked.
- Politicians must not dictate to doctors.

For those who still believe the official narrative of COVID-19 and the beneficial vaccinations, these demands sound abstruse, even outrageous. The point is: this is not some â??conspiracy theoristâ?? or â??denierâ?? speaking.

Helmut Sterz is a highly accomplished toxicologist who for many years was responsible for toxicology testing in Europe for the pharmaceutical giant that brought the COVID-19 vaccines developed by BioNTech to market, namely Pfizer. Sterz knows the business of development, approval and toxicology testing, which must be carried out *before* approval, inside out. Sterz retired before the coronavirus crisis and parted ways with his employer on good terms. So you canâ??t accuse him of wanting revenge, like they often do with whistleblower books, to downplay the message. This is *not* a whistleblower book. It was written by someone who spent his entire life working in various pharmaceutical companies as a toxicologist, i.e. conducting the preclinical studies that *must* be carried out before a substance can enter clinical trials and ultimately be approved. He also holds a patent for toxicological testing. When the coronavirus crisis hit, he watched with astonishment, then horror. Everything he knew and had done himself was ignored in order to rush completely novel substances, the mod-RNA vaccines, onto the market without safety testing and at high speed.

Sterz uses the 200 pages preceding these demands to justify why he has come to these conclusions. He does this by describing the normal standards for safety testing and the various legal norms. This shows that they were either not applied at all or, where they were applied, violated. Sterz proves that the toxicology study that BioNTech finally presented was structured in such a way that it did not allow any conclusions to be drawn. For example, no careful assessment of the toxicology of the mod-RNA vaccines was carried out with regard to the triggering of cancer, genetics or abnormalities in offspring. This toxicology study was a fig leaf to tick the necessary box. But it was obvious to any expert that it was useless.

The relevant legal regulations and framework conditions for toxicological testing were disregarded across the board. Sterz proves this in great detail. Not every reader will be interested in the details, and it is sometimes a bit tedious and redundant to read, but it is important in order to understand the rigour of his demands. This implies that the experts in the authorities must have noticed this. After all, they reacted accordingly to other substances and medicines in the period before Corona, e.g. by refusing to approve them or by withdrawing a substance that had already been approved. So it cannot have been incompetence or stupidity that prevented them from seeing the shortcomings in this dossier on mod-RNA vaccinations. What then? It was political will. The evidence leaves little room for any other conclusion. Therefore, those politically responsible must also be held accountable. And their agents in the authorities must be held accountable because they neglected their duty, which would have required them, if necessary, to disregard instructions from above, keep the welfare of citizens in mind and pull the ripcord.

Because these vaccinations were dangerous, and anyone who can read the signatures of the pharmacovigilance databases should have noticed this very early on. We saw this, for example, and tried to publish a warning [1]. The study was published, withdrawn, republished, but the message fell on deaf ears [2]. The products would then have had to be taken off the market, and the population would have had to be protected from them. Sterz proves this very precisely with data. He also shows that the panic that was spread to make the population willing to be vaccinated was unfounded. Our own recently published study [3] proves that if you track how infections spread in Germany, even without any intervention, by the end of 2021 there would have been virtually universal natural immunity among the German population. Critics would say: Yes, but at what cost? Exorbitant deaths! Suffering! No. Sterz argues that this would not have been expected. The study by my colleagues, who analysed the mortality data in Germany very carefully, shows [4]: In 2020, when the alleged killer virus was â??ragingâ?? without vaccination, there was no excess mortality, but rather under-mortality. It was only in 2021 and beyond, when the supposedly life-saving vaccination campaign had begun, that there was excess mortality, as confirmed by an independent study [5]. Why is that? Sterzâ??s analysis provides the answer: because the vaccines were dangerous. This is because all safety standards had been disregarded. Therefore, according to Sterzâ??s conclusion, the marketing, aggressive advertising, political propaganda and continued approval despite dangerous signals were criminal.

The author gives readers a little peek into the witchâ??s kitchen of Sahinâ??s BioNTech. He doesnâ??t say it directly, but indirectly: an ambitious but insufficiently qualified researcher was at work here, who had previously developed mainly cancer drugs that were not successful. Thatâ??s why the company was practically bankrupt before the coronavirus crisis. Then, conveniently, coronavirus came along. Sterz shows that this company was not in a position to even begin to meet the complex requirements of the safety tests. So why didnâ??t Pfizer step into the breach? One might ask. There were good strategists at work there who apparently sensed that problems were lurking. So they let their junior partnerâ??s incompetent toxicology programme go uncommented, hoping that the political authorities would play along. As we know, they did.

Sterz demonstrates all this with good evidence and his internal corporate experience in such a way that even if one is sceptical about his thesis, one can hardly help but agree with him. At least on the substance. Whether one then accepts his conclusions is another story. But we know that people are inventive when it comes to avoiding consequences of thinking that they do not like.

Incidentally, it is wise of him not to disparage his former employer in any way. Sterz says: Pharmaceutical companies are simply doing what their raison dâ??Ãªtre is: selling medicines. And if the regulatory authorities do not intervene, they will do so, even with poor products. Therefore, it is not primarily the companies â?? although they are also responsible, but only secondarily â?? that should be held accountable, but rather the authorities and political leaders. For it would have been their job to prevent such dangerous substances from coming onto the market through robust regulation, which we actually have.

This book deserves to be widely read. Perhaps a sponsor will be found to buy it for all members of parliament and put it on their desks. Because they should read it. Doctors too. Patients who have suffered from the vaccine or even serious side effects. Pregnant women who have suffered miscarriages. Those who have contracted â??long Covidâ?? and have not yet understood that in many cases this is a consequence of the vaccine.

For those who have died from it, it is too late. But perhaps not for their relatives. By the end of February 2021, the normally accepted threshold of 1 death per 1 million doses of vaccine had already been exceeded. Because â??1223 deaths had been registeredâ?? â?¦ â??without any reaction from the manufacturer or the competent authorities!â?? (p. 113) Deaths also occurred in clinical trials, which Pfizer and BioNTech did not report to the authorities, â??which constitutes a criminal offenceâ?? (p. 113). Therefore, these substances should never have been approved and should have been immediately withdrawn from the market in accordance with all applicable

standards and laws, at least in the period before Corona. But after Corona, different rules applied. Who made these new rules? The zeitgeist, somehow, right? Fuelled by its standard-bearers in politics and the media, who prepared the mood in such a way that reasonable insight was dismissed as heresy and professional competence as mumbo jumbo.

This book by Helmut Sterz could help to finally put an end to this nightmare and ensure that no one else of this ilk dares to come forward. That is, if it were read, especially by those who bear responsibility in this country, who shape public opinion and administer justice. In St Augustineâ??s case, these words came to him: â??tolle, legeâ??, â??Take it, readâ?? â?? a sudden prompting that sent him to the Bible. Sterz has not written a Bible. But he has written an important handbook. The style is dry and the subject is gruesome. And if I were the author, I would put the essential conclusions at the beginning of a second edition so that readers know why they should read the book. But these are minor details in the face of an indispensable, if not the most important, work on this dark period.

Sources and literature

1. Walach H, Klement RJ, Aukema W. Retracted: The Safety of COVID-19 Vaccinationsâ??We Should Rethink the Policy. Vaccines. 2021;9(7):693. doi: 10.3390/vaccines9070693. PubMed PMID: doi: https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9070693.
2. Walach H, Klement RJ, Aukema W. The Safety of COVID-19 Vaccinations â?? Should We Rethink the Policy? Science, Public Health Policy, and the Law. 2021;3:87-99. doi: https://www.publichealthpolicyjournal.com/general-5.
3. GÃ¼nther M, Rockenfeller R, Walach H. A calibration of nucleic acid (PCR) by antibody (IgG) tests in Germany: the course of SARS-CoV-2 infections estimated. Frontiers in Epidemiology. 2025;Volume 5 â?? 2025. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fepid.2025.1592629.
4. Rockenfeller R, GÃ¼nther M, MÃ¶rl F. Reports of deaths are an exaggeration: All-cause and NAA-test-conditional mortality in Germany during the SARS-CoV-2 era. Royal Society Open Science. 2023;10:221551. doi: https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.221551.
5. Kuhbandner C, Reitzner M. Regional patterns of excess mortality in Germany during the COVID-19 pandemic: a state-level analysis. Royal Society Open Science. 2025;12(11):250790. doi: https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.250790.

Date Created
27.11.2025