

Topic: Lockdown and Coercive Measures

Criticism of mandatory and compulsory injections in the Federal Republic of Germany

By V a l v o, Claudio VISCORSOL LLC, 20.01.2026



I. Introduction

In light of the public assertion by the Federal Minister of Health of the Federal Republic of Germany¹, Nina Warken, regarding the letter and speech by US Secretary of Health Robert Kennedy, that doctors were at no point obligated to administer so-called *vaccinations* against *Corona* during the *pandemic*, we would like to revisit the topic of coercive measures.

¹ See to this topic: „Tagesschau“ under following link: <https://www.tagesschau.de/inland/innenpolitik/warken-kennedy-100.html> .



The US Secretary of Health, Robert Kennedy, had accused the federal government in a letter and a speech² of continuing to politically persecute doctors and patients, despite existing exemption certificates from the coercive measures during the *pandemic*, particularly with regard to *vaccination*.

We at VISCORSOL LLC have taken this public dispute as an opportunity to request a statement from the Federal Minister of Health on the matter, particularly given that her claim is untrue. In doing so, we have exercised our right to petition.

We received the statement from the Federal Ministry of Health unexpectedly quickly, in which the statement by the Federal Minister of Health was once again confirmed. Furthermore, the statement asserted that there was never an obligation for medical doctors to administer *vaccinations* during the *Corona pandemic*.

The text continues: “Those who did not wish to offer *vaccination* for medical, ethical, or personal reasons were neither committing a crime nor did they face sanctions. There was no professional ban or fine for not administering *vaccinations*. Criminal prosecution only occurred in cases of fraud and forgery, such as issuing false *vaccination* certificates or fake mask exemption certificates.”.

We at VISCORSOL LLC have decided to bring clarity and awareness to the discussion through this article, and to encourage an open and honest approach.

II. The Definition and Control over the Terminology

First, clarity in terminology is needed, and yes, it is permissible to define terms in order to achieve clarity. As you can already see from reading this, we have initially written the essential terms in italics.

Terms and concepts create an understanding of what is to be said and how it is to be understood by the recipient of the information. Just like the coercive measures themselves, the terms have been imposed on us by those in charge of the entire scenario. In our view, however, these terms require objectification in order to eliminate the political polarizations expressed in them and, in the truest sense of the word, to make concepts objectively comprehensible again.

² See to this topic: The magazin „Zeit“ under following link: <https://www.zeit.de/politik/2026-01/usa-deutschland-gesundheitsminister-kennedy-kritik-corona>; see furthermore on „Newsweek“ under following link: <https://www.newsweek.com/rfk-jr-clash-germany-health-minister-11341916> .



1. The objective naming of the term vaccination as injection

Firstly, the issue concerns the term "vaccination." As we know today, the use of so-called vaccination as a coercive measure was a political decision³. Therefore, based on this understanding alone, it cannot be considered vaccination in the classical sense, and the objective term "injection" should be used. Ultimately, it involved establishing a connection between the human body and a pharmaceutical substance through administration via injection. Speculation about the specific pharmaceutical substance administered should be avoided initially, so as not to fuel political polarization, especially since there were various manufacturers distributing the same substance.

2. The objective definition of the term pandemic as a lockdown period

Furthermore, the term "pandemic" requires clarification. We do not wish to speak of a "pandemic," but rather of the lockdown period or phase, because it was never a pandemic or epidemic in the medical sense, but rather a shutdown of the economy, public life, and medical care through coercive measures, and under the pretext of a putative public emergency.

3. The objective naming of the term Corona as C* or as a politically and scientifically grounded narrative

Another term that requires objectification is the name of the virus itself, as it appears under different names. Sometimes it's called Corona, then COVID-19, and then SARS-CoV-2.

As we know today, it was never about a virus or a disease, but about the political justification of the coercive measures and their consequences, using a scientifically sanctioned narrative about a disease-causing virus and fear and panic spread through the media. We will refer to this as C* or the politically sanctioned scientific narrative from now on.

4. The coercive measures and their naming

For the sake of completeness, we would like to list the other coercive measures that were imposed during the lockdown period, in order to further emphasize their scope. The following coercive measures can be identified: mandatory social distancing, mandatory mask-wearing, mandatory PCR testing, mandatory isolation, forced medical treatment, and mandatory injections.

³ See the RKI-Files and the COVID-Leaks of the White House of the United States .



III. The doctors' free choice regarding the application of mandatory injections

Now, the Federal Government, specifically Federal Health Minister Nina Warken, has made the following claim: "During the Corona pandemic, there was never an obligation for doctors to administer COVID-19 vaccinations. Anyone who did not want to offer vaccinations for medical, ethical, or personal reasons was neither committing a crime nor did they have to fear sanctions. There was no professional ban or fine for not vaccinating."⁴.

1. Facility-specific injection requirement

However, this claim completely contradicts reality and the facts⁵. Firstly, the German Bundestag passed a mandatory injection requirement for COVID-19 in facilities⁶.

This facility-specific injection requirement, enshrined in law—specifically the Infection Protection Act—particularly affected employees in facilities with vulnerable individuals, such as nursing homes, hospitals, and facilities for people with disabilities. Staff members who refused to comply with the injection requirement were removed from their jobs and dismissed without notice.

2. Mandatory injections due to occupational safety regulations

Furthermore, in companies where services requiring human presence or human-to-human contact were provided, mandatory injections were imposed, citing the Infection Protection Act and occupational safety regulations⁷. A company that failed to comply with this regulation would have faced sanctions for violating occupational safety regulations. Furthermore, there was social pressure, as no company wanted to fail to live up to its role model status as a cooperative and compliant employer. And here, too, employees who resisted mandatory injections or even opposed other coercive measures, such as mandatory masks and testing, were dismissed.

⁴ See Attachement about Statement of Federal Ministry of Health regarding to petition by VISCORSOL of 13th January 2026.

⁵ The population of the Federal Republic of Germany was witness seeing what happened in public.

⁶ See to this topic: BGBl. 2021 Teil I Nr. 83, 11 December, Law to strengthen vaccination prevention against COVID-19 and change of further regulations regarding COVID-19 Pandemic; see also § 20a, § 20b a. F. German Infection Protection Act.

⁷ SARS-CoV-2 Occupational Health and Safety Ordinance announced on September 28, 2022 by the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs on the basis of Section 18 Paragraph 3 Sentence 2 No. 2 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act.



3. The German Federal Court of Justice's (BGH) view on mandatory injections and coercive measures according to the BGH sentence of October 9, 2025 - III ZR 180/24

Meanwhile, the Federal Court of Justice (BGH) has also dealt with the coercive measures, in particular with liability in the case of administering an injection that has led to health damage.

Even the Federal Court of Justice (BGH) could no longer conceal in its decision that the mandatory injection was an act of interventionist administration and had to concede this fact⁸. Although the Federal Court of Justice (BGH) speaks of a claim to benefits in the social law sense, it cannot simultaneously be a claim to benefits and an act of interventionist administration, because the two are mutually exclusive both logically and legally.

Given the list of sanctions, it is clear that the mandatory injections constituted an act of administrative intervention, which also extended to the other coercive measures implemented during the lockdown. Furthermore, the Federal Court of Justice (BGH) stated that the physicians, and at times also the pharmacists, veterinarians, and dentists, acted in the exercise of a public office entrusted to them. Consequently, the physicians, among other things, implemented the mandatory injections as administrative assistants in the performance of a sovereign task.

Consequently, the Federal Ministry of Health, represented by Federal Minister Nina Warken, lied. The doctors were thus obligated, in the course of their duties and as public officials, to comply with the mandatory injection requirement. Had a doctor defied these regulations, they would have faced significant consequences, such as a professional ban up to and including the revocation of their medical license, in addition to social ostracism.

⁸ Federal Court of Justice (BGH) sentence of October 9, 2025 - III ZR 180/24, para. 19 et seq.; verbatim: "Furthermore, the right to vaccination under Section 1 of the Corona Vaccination Ordinance (CoronaImpfV) had, at least temporarily, a close connection to administrative intervention... However, the refusal of vaccination could have adverse consequences, such as, for example, at the time of the plaintiff's vaccination on December 15, 2021, in the form of access and contact restrictions subject to fines, the requirement, subject to fines, of proof of a negative test result for entering the workplace, or the imposition of a ban on entering or working in certain facilities and companies."



III. Result

In conclusion, it can be stated that US Health Secretary Robert Kennedy, with his criticism of the German Federal Ministry of Health's stance, made a significant contribution and provided important impetus to clarifying and processing the lockdown period and the imposed coercive measures, especially mandatory injections. He brought realism and truth to an uncomfortable debate.

The reaction of the Federal Ministry of Health speaks for itself and has shown that it is unwilling to deviate from its previous course and to admit mistakes in dealing with people who resisted coercive measures, especially mandatory injections, or people who protected others from health risks.

The fake virus narrative continues to be maintained and paraded like a sacred relic, even though the virus narrative has long since been exposed as a lie. A lack of public awareness and critical examination of the facts is hampered by this refusal to acknowledge them, despite an understanding of the truth.

Given that it has become clear that the coercive measures were political in nature, at least leniency should be shown to critics and people who evaded the coercive measures, instead of continuing to respond with repression.

Instead of criminalizing those who protected people from health damage caused by coercive measures, attention should be focused on those who profited from a public putative emergency and participated in unjustified wealth transfers.

Ultimately, a further step of changing consciousness is needed, both individually and within society itself, to enable a rational understanding and processing of the lockdown period, including the coercive measures. This also includes clarifying and depoliticizing the terms and concepts we have addressed in this article.

We at VISCORSOL LLC have contributed to this effort with our petition and this article, and we hope for more courage and a greater willingness to educate and address past issues among companies, in society, and among every individual. Often, a sheet of paper and a pen are all it takes to bring about change through the power of words, even if it's just to create a shift in awareness among the recipient.

- END OF THE ARTICLE -

*Freigeist-Zeitschrift der
VISCORSOL LLC
Ausgabe 02/01/2026*



Postscript: An article based on human thought and will by the author mentioned above at the beginning of the article, without the use of digitally autonomous or other will-replacing procedures.

Source of the picture: CANVA / Author of the article V a l v o, Claudio VISCORSOL LLC



Bundesministerium für Gesundheit, 53107 Bonn

Viscorsol LLC
CAYA-Postbox 795119
D-96035 Bamberg

Rochusstraße 1
53123 Bonn

Postanschrift:
53107 Bonn

Tel. +49 228 [REDACTED]

bearbeitet von:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@bmg.bund.de

poststelle@bmg.bund.de

www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de

Betreff: Kritik des US-Gesundheitsministers Kennedy vom 10. Januar 2026

Bezug: Ihr Schreiben (Fax) vom 12. Januar 2026
Geschäftszeichen: 613-96/Viscorsol LLC
Bonn, 23.01.2026
Seite 1 von 1

Sehr geehrter Herr Valvo,

vielen Dank für Ihr Schreiben an Frau Bundesgesundheitsministerin Warken vom 12. Januar 2026. Ich bin gebeten worden, Ihnen zu antworten.

Nach hiesiger Kenntnis ist Ihr Schreiben mit E-Mail des Referates L9 am 13. Januar 2026 beantwortet worden. Das Schreiben wurde an die von Ihnen genannte E-Mail-Adresse viscorsol@proton.me gesandt. Ein Ausdruck dieser Mail füge ich diesem Schreiben anbei.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen
im Auftrag

6

Von: Bürgerservice BMG
Gesendet: Dienstag, 13. Januar 2026 14:39
An: Viscorsol@proton.me
Betreff: Ihre Nachricht vom 12. Januar 2026 an das Bundesministerium für Gesundheit

Sehr geehrte Frau Sauer, sehr geehrter Herr Valvo,

vielen Dank für Ihre Nachricht vom 12. Januar 2026, in der Sie die Aussagen des US-amerikanischen Gesundheitsministers, Robert F. Kennedy Jr., aufgreifen, dass es in Deutschland politisch motivierte Verfahren gegen Ärztinnen bzw. Ärzte und Patientinnen und Patienten gebe. Gerne nehmen wir hierzu wie folgt Stellung:

Die Einlassungen des US-amerikanischen Gesundheitsministers entbehren jeglicher Grundlage, sie sind faktisch falsch und zurückzuweisen.


In Deutschland gilt grundsätzlich die verfassungsrechtlich geschützte ärztliche Therapiefreiheit. Ärztinnen und Ärzte entscheiden selbstständig und eigenverantwortlich über die Behandlung von Patientinnen und Patienten. Der Leistungsumfang der gesetzlichen Krankenversicherung basiert auf nachgewiesener wissenschaftlicher Evidenz und wird nicht von der Politik festgelegt. Ebenso sind Patientinnen und Patienten frei in ihrer Entscheidung, welche Therapie sie in Anspruch nehmen.

Während der Corona-Pandemie gab es zu keiner Zeit eine Verpflichtung der Ärzteschaft, Impfungen gegen COVID-19 durchzuführen. Wer aus medizinischen, ethischen oder persönlichen Gründen keine Impfungen anbieten wollte, machte sich weder strafbar, noch mussten Sanktionen befürchtet werden. Es gab kein Berufsverbot oder Geldstrafe, wenn nicht geimpft wurde.

Strafrechtliche Verfolgung gab es ausschließlich in Fällen von Betrug und Urkundenfälschung, etwa bei der Ausstellung falscher Impfpässe oder unechter Maskenatteste.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Ihr Bürgerservice



Referat L 9 – Beratung und Information
für Versicherte und Leistungserbringer
Bundesministerium für Gesundheit

Mauerstraße 29, 10117 Berlin

Postanschrift: 11055 Berlin

Bürgertelefon: www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/service/buergertelefon.html

Fax: +49 (0)30 18441-4900

Buergerservice.bmg@bmg.bund.de

www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de

Bitte sparen Sie Papier und Energie, indem Sie diese E-Mail nicht ausdrucken.

Informationen zur Verarbeitung Ihrer personenbezogenen Daten finden Sie hier:

<https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/datenschutz.html>

Von: VISCORSOL LLC <Viscorsol@proton.me>

Gesendet: Montag, 12. Januar 2026 15:16

An: Poststelle BMG <Poststelle@bm.bund.de>; poststelle@hmf.g.hessen.de


Cc:

Betreff: Verlangen nach Stellungnahme und Abhilfe durch das Bundesgesundheitsministerium und das Hessisches Ministerium für Familie, Senioren, Sport, Gesundheit und Pflege auf die öffentliche Rede des US-Gesundheitsministers Robert F. Kennedy

Sehr geehrte Damen und Herren,

anbei im Anhang das Schreiben über das Verlangen nach einer Stellungnahme in Bezug auf die öffentliche Rede von R. Kennedy und dessen Kritik an der Bundesgesundheitsministerin Nina Warken, wegen ihrer Haltung zu den C*Maßnahmen, insbesondere dem Injektionszwang. Alles weitere entnehmen Sie bitte aus dem im Anhang beigefügten Schreiben.

Hochachtungsvoll



VISCORSOL^{LLC}

Valvo, Claudio

Wirtschaftsjurist und Wirtschaftsberater
Economic lawyer and economic consultant

Sauer, Sandra Ingeborg

Homöopathin und Transformationscoach
Homeopath and transformation coach

Postbox-Kontaktanschrift
VISCORSOL LLC
CAYA-Postbox 795119
D-96035 Bamberg (Deutschland)

"Diese E-Mail kann vertrauliche und/oder gesetzlich geschützte Informationen enthalten. Wenn Sie nicht der bestimmungsgemäße Adressat sind oder diese E-Mail irrtümlich erhalten haben, unterrichten Sie bitte den Absender und vernichten Sie diese E-Mail. Anderen als dem bestimmungsgemäßen Adressaten ist untersagt, diese E-Mail zu speichern, weiterzuleiten oder ihren Inhalt auf welche Weise auch immer zu verwenden."

4 K4000 00075



53107 Bonn



4D 1614 5939
00 00DC 6D24

