Transcript

Dr. David Martin – The History of Coronaviruses and Their Vaccines

Dr. David Martin- Chairman of MCAM International Innovative Risk Management

As aired on rumble the Praying Medic - July 28, 2021

Note: transcript not entirely verbatim as some words were not decipherable and some statements and points were summarized.

-Since 1998 - the world's largest underwriter of intangible assets used in finance in 168 countries in the majority of countries around the world

-Includes the entire corpus of patents, patent applications, federal grants, e-govt records procurement records

-they track what is happening as well as 'who' is happening.
They maintain 3 global equity indices-

-They monitor the innovation that is happening around the world and the degree to which those economics of those innovations-corporate interests being dislocated and financial interests being served

1. They have reviewed over 4000 patents that have been issued around SARS/ Coronavirus and the financing around all the manipulations of coronavirus that gave rise to SARS as the subclade of coronavirus

Document from MCAM published in spring of 2020 is publicly available. April 3, 2020 (saved)

1. They took the reported gene sequence that were reportedly novel by the ICTV and reviewed the 'novel' gene sequences and reviewed them against patent records that were available in the spring of 2020.
2. Found there were-over 120 patented pieces of evidence and countless modifications of coronavirus sequences that have been uploaded.
3. They found records within the patent records that 'novel' sequences were sought as early as 1999
4. There was no single identified record of a novel coronavirus at all

Short journey through the patent landscape:

The patenting landscape prior to 1999 was uniquely applied to veterinary science
First patent sought was by Pfizer for the S-spike protein was Jan. 28, 2000

Jan 28, 2000 – US Patent #6372224 spike protein virus vaccine canine coronavirus patent

(Ralph Baric) work on rabbits and cardiomyopathy = and canine coronavirus work within Pfizer

It was not a pathogen of interest with respect to the spike proteins behavior at the time being relegated to animals

More problematic and egregious:
NIAID and Fauci found the malleability of the coronavirus to be a potential candidate for HIV vaccines

So, SARS is not a natural progression of a zoonotic modification of a coronavirus-
because in 1999 Fauci funded research at the UNC Chapel Hill specifically to create:

patent filing date April 19, 2002- NIAID **"built an infectious replication defective coronavirus that was specifically targeted for human lung epithelium…..in other words WE MADE SARS"** and **"we patented it on April 19, 2002".** Before there was ever any alleged outbreak in Asia which followed a few months later.

US Patent #7279327- clearly lays out in specific gene sequencing, that we knew the Ace receptor – ACE 2 binding domain, and the S1 spike protein and other elements were not only engineered, but could be synthetically modified in the laboratory using nothing more than gene sequencing technologies, taking computer code and turning it into the pathogen or an intermediate of the pathogen. Funded exclusively in the early days as a means why which to:

- harness coronavirus as a vector to distribute HIV vaccine.

BUT, IT GETS WORSE.

M-CAM was monitoring biological and chemical weapons treaty violations in the early 2000s. after 9/11. They were part of an investigation which gave rise to the Congressional exploration into the origin of anthrax and a treatment for anthrax poisoning. Throughout the fall of 2001 they began monitoring an enormous number of bacterial and viral pathogens that were being patented through NIAID, NIH, US AMRID and other agencies internationally that collaborated with them……and our concern was that CV was being seen as a not only a potentially manipulated agent for potential use as a vaccine vector but also being clearly being considered as a biological weapon candidate in 2001.

M-CAM's first reporting on this took place in the later part of 2001, before the SARS outbreak in China.

After the alleged outbreak in 2002…"I will always say alleged" in China. (Coronavirus as a circulating pathogen inside the viral model that we have; it's not new to the human body.) It's part of the natural gene sequencing…but the alleged outbreak gave rise to a very problematic filing:

April 2003 filing by the US CDC-
In addition to filing the entire GENE SEQUENCE on what later became SARS coronavirus (which violates 35 US Code Sec. 101) (you cannot patent a naturally occurring substance)
US Patent # 7220852 – it had a series of derivative patents along with it.
US#46592703P – which is a very interesting designation
US#776521

These patents not only covered the gene sequence of SARS Coronavirus but also covered the MEANS of DETECTING it using R2PCR
The reason this is a problem:
If you own the patent on the gene itself and you own the patent for its detection you have all the providence over it.
They had entire scientific and message control by the CDC.
CDC justified this by their public relations team-saying everyone would be free to research the coronavirus.

It's a lie.

It's a lie because the patent office rejected this filing on the gene sequence TWICE-because it was UNPATENTABLE….because the gene sequence was already in the public domain. Prior to the CDC's filing for a patent, the patent office found 99.9% IDENTITY WITH THE ALREADY EXISTING CORONAVIRUS recorded in the public domain.

AFTER paying an appeal fine AND against the patent examiner objection- the CDC overrode the patent office rejection and got the patent on SARS Coronavirus in 2007. This was a PAID BRIBE to the patent office.

THEY PAID AN ADDITIONAL FEE TO KEEP THEIR APPICATION PRIVATE.

Last time I checked if you're trying to make information available to the public, you don't pay a fee to keep it private.

I wish I could have made up anything of which I just said….but all of this is available in the public patent archive record which any member of the public can review. They have the evidence and actual documents-which he also has in his possession. It's available for anyone to review.

FACTCHECKERS have repeatedly stated SARS CoV2 is distinct from what's already been patented.
Here's the genetic and patent problem:
2003, 2005, 2006 what you find is identity in somewhere between 89-99% gene sequence overlap.

The CORE designation of SARS Coronavirus…..the subclade SARS COV2 have to overlap from a taxonomic point of view. It has to first BE SARS to receive a designation AS SARS.

So, the disingenuous 'factchecking' of this patent or pathogen is beyond the literal credibility of the published sequences and beyond credulity of the ICTV taxonomy.

Another problematic date:

April 28th, 2003 - 3 days after the CDC filed this patent on the SARS Coronavirus- Sequoia Pharmaceuticals , set up in MD filed a patent on anti-viral agents of treatment and control of infections

by Coronavirus…..Sequoia was rolled into proprietary holdings of Pfizer, Crucell and J&J. CDC filed 3 days earlier and the treatment was filed 3 days later.

How does one file a treatment patent on a virus that was invented 3 days earlier?

US Patent # 7151163 issued to Sequoia Pharmaceuticals has another problem:

It was issued and published before the CDC patent on Coronavirus was actually allowed. So, the degree to which the information could have been known by any means other than insider information between those parties is ZERO. **It is not physically possible to patent a thing that treats a thing that had not been published because the CDC had paid to keep it SECRET.**

THIS MY FRIENDS IS THE DEFINITION OF CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY, RACUETERING AND COLLUSION. THIS IS NOT A THEORY-THIS IS EVIDENCE. YOU CANNOT HAVE INFOMRATION IN THE FUTURE INFORM A TREATMENT FOR A THING THAT DID NOT EXIST.

THIS IS A RICO CASE.

The Rico pattern which was established in 2003 is played out to exactly the same schedule when we see SARS COV2 show up, when we see Moderna getting the spike protein sequence by phone from the vaccine research center at NIAID prior to the definition of the novel subclade.

How do you treat a thing before you actually have the thing?

IT'S GOING TO GET WORSE HERE.

June 5, 2008- this is an important date because it's around the time DARPA took an active interest in coronavirus as a biological weapon.

ABLINKS (now part of synophy) filed a series of patents that specifically targeted what we have been told is the novel 'feature' of the SARS COV2 virus. This is June 5, 2008.
They targeted the poly basic cleavage site for SARS/COV, novel spike protein, the Ace2 Receptor binding domain:
All of that was patented in sequence on June 5, 2008.
Nov 24 2015, # 9193780 *this came AFTER the Gain of Function moratorium, AFTER the MERS outbreak in the Middle East,
2016, 2017, 2019 a series of patents all covering not only the RNA strands but also the sub components of the gene strands were all issued to ABLINKS and synophy.
Crucell, Rubious Therapeutics, Children's Medical corp. Ludwig Maximillians, U of Iowa, University of Hong Kong, Protein Science Corp, Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Chinese Human Genome Center in Shanghai,
2008-2017 every attribute that was allegedly uniquely published by the single reference publication **The novel bat coronavirus;** Reveals Natural insertions of the S1S2 insertion cleavage site- the S spike protein……the paper routinely used to identify the novel coronavirus… if you take what they report as

novel; you find 73 patents issued between 2008 and 2019 with have the elements that were allegedly novel in the SARS COV2.
Specifically, as it relates to the polybasic cleavage site, the Ace2 Receptor binding domain and the spike protein.

The clinically novel components, clinically unique, clinically contagious…..there was no outbreak of SARS because:
We had engineered all of the elements so that by 2016, the paper that was funded during the gain of Function moratorium, that said the SARS CV was poised for human emergence written by Ralph Baric, was not only poised for human emergence it was patented for human exploitation… 73 times.

Baric has made a lot of money doing this.

For those who want to live in the illusion that this is somehow or another the end of the story be prepared for even greater disappointment.

Somebody knew something in 2015 and 2016 which gave rise to my favorite quote of this entire pandemic. And by that I'm not being cute.

A statement made in 2015 by Peter Dazic- Reported in the National Academies of Press publication- 2016. He is the head of Eco Health Alliance.

"We need to increase public understanding of the need for medical counter measures such as a pan coronavirus vaccine. A key driver is the media and the economics will follow the hype.
We need to use that hype to our advantage to get to the real issues. Investors will respond if they see profit at the end of the process."

He was Independently corroborating the Chinese non lab leak non theory. There wasn't a lab leak, because it was an intentional bio weaponization of spike proteins to inject into people to get them addicted to a pan coronavirus vaccine. This has nothing to do with a pathogen that was released and every study that has ever been launched trying to verify a lab leak is a red herring.

73 patents on everything that is clinically novel…..73 all issued before 2019.

The biggest bombshell of all- to prove that this was not a release of anything.

Because US Patent # 7279327- the recombinant nature of the lung targeting coronavirus was transferred mysteriously from U of NC Chapel Hill to the NIH in 2018.

Here's the problem with that; under the Buy? Dole Act…the US already has a March and Right provision.
That means if the US Govt. has paid for research they are entitled to benefit from that research at their demand or whim.

So, explain why in 2017 and 2018, suddenly the NIH has to take ownership of the patent that they already had rights to; held by the U of NC Chapel Hill, and how they had to file a Certificate of Correction so that it was legally enforceable, because there was a typographical error in the grant reference in the first filing.

They needed to make sure they got it right and but that every typographical error that was contained in the patent was correct.

On THE single patent required to develop the vaccine research institutes mandate which was shared between the U of NC Chapel Hill in November 2019 and Moderna in November 2019 when UNC Chapel Hill, NIAID and Moderna began the sequencing a Spike protein vaccine…. a month before an outbreak ever happened.

Q. You have all the evidence?

YUP.

It's always about money. The script for this was first written Jan 6, 2004 by Merck (later corrected to be Moderna)
SARS and Bioterrorism.

Merck introduced the notion of what they called the **New Normal**. Which is the language that became the branded campaign that was adopted by the WHO, The Global Preparedness Monitoring Board, The Chinese director for Center of Disease Control sat here , Anthony Fauci, & Dr. Elias of the Gates Foundation, sat on this board.
The first intro of the **New Normal Campaign,** which was about getting people to accept universal pan/influenza pan/coronavirus vaccine – was actually adopted Jan 6, 2004

Moderna knew it would be placed in the front to the line for developing a vaccine in March of 2019. This is a very important date.
In March 2019,for reasons which are not transparent; they amended a series of rejected patent filings, which is bizarre behavior which specifically make reference to intentional or "deliberate releasee" of coronavirus.
In March, they amended 4 failed applications to begin the process of coronavirus vaccine development.
They began dealing with a significant problem-
they relied on technology they did not own.
Two Canadian Cos. Arbutis Pharmaceuticals and Accuitis Pharmaceuticals actually own the patent on the lipid nano-particle envelope that is required to deliver the injection fof the mRNA fragment.
These patents were issued in Canada and the US and worldwide.
They began trying to negotiate with these companies to get the resolution of this lipid partical patented technology to be put into a vaccine.

In Nov. Moderna entered into a cooperative research and development agreement, with UNC Chapel Hill-with respect to getting a spike protein to put inside the lipid nano particle.

They had a candidate vaccine before we had a pathogen that was allegedly running around.

What makes this most problematic beyond the self evident nature, we know from 2016-2019 everyone one of the NIAIDI, Anthony Fauci lamented the fact he could not get the public to accept the universal influenza vaccine.
This was his favorite target. He wanted the public to engage in this process.

March 2019, in the amended patent filings by Moderna, we find an epiphany-

"What if there was an accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen?"

What makes this problematic: It's recited exactly from the book A WORLD AT RISK the scenario put together by the WHO in September 2019.
Months before there is an alleged pathogen, it says we need to have a **"coordinate global experience of a respiratory pathogen release which by sept 2020 must put in place a universal capacity for public relations management, crowd control, and the acceptance of a universal vaccine mandate. "**

That was Sept 2019, and the language of an intentional release of a respiratory pathogen was written into the scenario that must be completed by Sept 2020.

This is the Global Preparedness Monitoring Boards unified statement. Some have taken credit for this and then later backed away.

In answer to a question:

We have 117 patents with specifically the ACE2 Receptor targeting mechanism for SARS Coronavirus.

It is not new and has never been remotely new.

In Weaponization conferences that took place, DARPA, we've known about that since 2013. It's isolation and amplification.

In answer to another question:

The 4 Moderna revitalized/failed patent filings; were amended in March 2019, to include the "deliberate release of a pathogen" language.

The fact of the matter is:

Any assertions that this pathogen is somehow unique or novel falls apart on the actual gene sequences which are published in the patent records and the statements by Peter Dazic himself, that we have to create public hype.

What makes this most ludicrous-is the fact that the WHO declared coronavirus a dead interest- they said we had eradicated it in 2007 and 2008.
So, if eradicated why did we start spending billions of dollar on it?

Q.: This is a TOOL and in the interest of DARPA for a bioweapon and everything that latches onto it…and population control.

We have to stop falling for the even main stream narrative in our own narrative.

It was seen as a highly malleable bioweapon and by 2005 as a weapon of choice.
The illusion we continue to see people get trapped in is whether we're having a vaccine for a virus.

We're NOT.

WE'RE INJECTING A SPIKE PROTEIN mRNA SEQUENCE WHICH IS A COMPUTER SIMULATION . IT'S NOT DERIVED FROM NATURE. IT'S A SEQUENCE WHICH HAS BEEN KNOWN AND PATENETED FOR YEARS, AND WE KNOW THE SEQUENCE AS HAS BEEN REPORTED IS REPORTED BY SELF REPORT, ACROSS PHONE CONFERENCES SUCH MODERNA AND THE VACCINE RESEARCH CENTER BY SELF REPORT.

The ludicrous nature of the story that this is prophlactive or preventative…**there has bene NO effort by any pharmaceutical company to combat the virus.**
This is about getting people injected with the known to be harmful S1 Spike protein. The cover story is that if you get an expression of a spike protein, you get some kind of general symptomatic relief.

There has never been an attempt to vaccinate an entire population as defined by the vaccination universe.
Let's review just for the record. When Fauci tried desperately to get some of his synthetic RNA vaccines published. He had his own patents rejected. His mRNA 'vaccines' received the following:

QUOTE from the patent office: "These arguments are persuasive to the extent that an antigenic peptide stimulates and immune response that may produce antibodies that bind to a specific peptide or protein, but it is not persuasive in regards to a vaccine. The immune response produced by a vaccine must be more than merely some immune response, it must also be protective. As noted in the previous office action, the (?) recognizes that term vaccine to be a compound which prevents infection. Applicant has not demonstrated that the instantly claimed vaccine meets even the lower standard set forth in the specification, let alone the standard (?) definition for being operative in regards. Therefore, claims 5, 7, 9 are not operative as the anti-HIV vaccine is not patentable utility."

So Fauci was told by the patent office that what he was proposing as a vaccine does not meet patentable standard, the legal standard or the clinical standard of vaccine.

Here's the sad and sober irony. I raised these issues beginning in 2002 after the anthrax scare. The tragedy is we are now sitting in a world where hundreds of millions of people are being injected with pathogen stimulating computer sequence which is being sold under what the patent office, the medical profession and the FDA in its own clinical standards would not suggest is a vaccine.

But by using the term, we are now subjecting hundreds of millions of people to what was known to be by 2005 a biological weapon.

End of transcript.