

Dr. David Martin talk to EU Parliament , May 2023

transcribed by Amethyst

comments in red by Amethyst

Dr. David Martin: It's a particularly interesting location for me to be sitting today, given that over a decade ago, I sat in this very chair right here in the European Parliament, and at that time, I warned the world of what was coming.

During that conversation that was hosted at the time, by the Green and EFA and a number of the other parties of the European Union, and various representations, we were having a conversation on whether Europe should adopt the United States' policy of allowing for the patents on biologically-derived materials. At the time, I urged this body, and I urged people around the world that the weaponization of Nature against humanity had dire consequences. Tragically, I sit here today with that unfortunate line that I don't like to say, which is "I Told you so!"

But the fact of the matter is, we are here Not for a reprisal on past decisions. We are here to actually, once again, come to the face of the human condition, and ask the question, Who do we want to be? What do we want humanity to look like? And rather than seeing this as an exercise in futility, which is very easy from time to time, when you're in the position I'm in—I actually see this Not as an exercise in futility; I see this as one of the greatest opportunities that faces us, because we now have a public conversation, which is now front and center in people's minds. When this was an esoteric conversation about biological patents, nobody cared. But when that conversation came home, then it became something people can care about, so I'm actually quite grateful for this opportunity. I thank the members of Parliament for hosting this. I thank all of the translators (to whom) I apologize in advance, as I will use terminology that is probably very difficult to translate. So, my apologies. I'd also like to acknowledge the fact that many of you are aware of my involvement with this, in large part due to the work of my wonderful wife, Kim Martin, who encouraged me at the very early days of this pandemic to get on

front of the camera, and talk about all of the information I had been sharing, among very small groups around the world, and it was in fact, her encouragement that put me in a place where many of you have heard what I have to say.

Ironically, the world that I came from, that used to be very popular, like CNBC and Bloomberg presentations, which were televised on mainstream media around the world, was an audience that I lost. I can confidently say that COVID diminished my fame. But I can also confidently say that I'd rather stand among the people with whom I'm standing today, than any of the folks that were part of that previous world. So this is a much better place to be.

My role today is to set the stage for this conversation in a historical context, because this Did Not come in the last 3 years; it did Not come in the last 5 or 6 years. This is actually an ongoing question that probably began here in Europe in the early stages of the mid-1900s, but certainly, by 1913-1914, this conversation started right here in Central Europe. The pandemic that we alleged to have happen in the last few years, also did Not happen overnight. In fact, the very specific pandemic using Coronavirus, began in a very different time.

Most of you don't know that Coronavirus, as a model of a pathogen, was isolated in 1965. Coronavirus was identified in 1965 as one of the first infectious, replicate-able, viral models that could be used to modify a series of other experiences of the human condition. It was isolated at once upon a time associated with the common cold. But what's particularly interesting about its isolation in 1965, was that it was immediately identified as a pathogen that could be modified for a whole host of reasons. And you heard me correctly, that was 1965. (He was referring to and showing some slides in his presentation, which were Not shown on this video). And by the way, these slides are in the public domain. You are welcome to look at every single reference. Every comment that I made is based on published material, so do make sure that you look at those references.

But in 1966, the very first COV- Coronavirus model was used as a trans-atlantic biological experiment in human manipulation. And you heard the date---1966. I hope you're getting the point of what I'm saying.

This is Not an overnight thing; this is something that is actually Long in the making. A year before I was born, we had the first trans-atlantic Coronavirus data-sharing experiment between the United States and the United Kingdom. And in 1967, the year I was born, we did the first human trials on inoculating people with modified Coronavirus. Is that amazing? 56 years ago! The "overnight success" of a pathogen that has been 56 years in engineering. And I want that to chill with all of you. Where were we when we actually allowed, in violation of biological and chemical weapons treaties, where were we, as a human civilization, when we thought it was an acceptable thing to do, to take a pathogen for the United States, and infect the world with it? Where was that conversation? And what should have been that conversation in 1967? That conversation wasn't had.

Ironically, the common cold was turned into a chimera in the 1970s. And in 1975, 1976, 1977, we started figuring out how to modify Coronavirus by putting it into different animals—pigs, dogs, and not surprisingly, by the time we got to 1990, we found out that Coronavirus as an infectious agent, was an industrial problem for 2 primary industries: the industries of dogs and pigs. Dog and pig breeders found that Coronavirus created gastrointestinal problems. And that became the basis for Pfizer's first spike protein vaccine patent, filed in, are you ready for this? 1990. Did you hear what I just said? 1990? Operation Warp Speed? I'm sorry, where's the warp, and the speed?

Pfizer, 1990, and the very first spike protein for Coronavirus. Isn't that fascinating? Isn't that fascinating that we were told that the spike protein was a new thing. We just found out that that's the problem. No! As a matter of fact, we didn't just find out it was Not just now the problem. We found that out in 1990, and filed the first patents on vaccines in 1990 for the spike protein of Coronavirus! And who would have thought Pfizer? Clearly the innocent organization that does nothing but promote human health. Clearly, Pfizer! The organization that has Not bought the votes in this chamber, and in

every chamber of every government around the world. Not that Pfizer! Certainly, They wouldn't have had anything to do with this (Clearly, David Martin is being sarcastic here). But, oh yes, They did. But in 1990, They found out there was a problem with vaccines—They Didn't work! And you know why They didn't work? It turns out that Coronavirus is a very malleable model—it changes, and transforms, and mutates over time. As a matter of fact, every publication on vaccines for Coronavirus from 1990 until 2018, every single publication concluded that Coronavirus escapes the vaccine impulse, because it modifies and mutates too quickly for vaccines to be effective. And since 1990 to 2018, that is the published science, ladies and gentlemen, that is following the science. Following the science is Their own indictment of Their own programs that said, it doesn't work. And there are thousands of publications to that effect, Not a few hundred. And not paid for by pharmaceutical companies. These are publications that are independent, scientific research that shows unequivocally, including efforts of the chimera modifications made by Ralph Bearque (sp—guessing here) of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. All of them show: Vaccines DO NOT WORK on Coronavirus. That is the science, and that science has never been disputed.

But then we had an interesting development in 2002, and this date is most important. Because in 2002, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, patented, and I quote: “ an infectious replication defective Clone of Coronavirus.” Listen to those words: infectious replication defective. What does that phrase actually mean? For those not familiar with language, let me unpack it for you: Infectious replication defective means a weapon. It means something to target an individual, but not have collateral damage to other individuals. That's what infectious replication defective means. And that patent was filed in 2002, on work funded by NIAID's Anthony Fauci from 1999-2002, and that work, patented at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, mysteriously preceded SARS 1.0. by a year. David Martin did a Big gasp here. Dave, are you suggesting that SARS 1.0 wasn't from a wet market in Wuhan? Are you suggesting it may have come from a laboratory in the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill? No, I'm Not suggesting it; I'm telling you, That's the FACTS! We engineered SARS. SARS is Not a

naturally-occurring phenomenon. The naturally occurring phenomenon is called the common cold; it's called an influenza-like illness, it's called gastroenteritis. That is the naturally-occurring Coronavirus.

SARS is the research developed by humans weaponizing a life system model to actually attack human beings. And They patented it in 2002. (Applause).

And in 2003, the CDC filed a patent on Coronavirus isolated from humans, once again, in violation of biological and chemical weapons treaties, and laws that we have in the United States, and I'm very precise on this. The (the) United States likes to talk about its rights and everything else, and the rule of law, and all the nonsense that we like to talk about. But we don't ratify treaties about—I don't know—defending humans. We conspicuously avoid that. We actually have a great track record of advocating for human rights, and then denying them when it comes to actually being part of the international community, which is a slightly problematic thing.

But let's get something very clear—when the CDC in April of 2003, filed the patent on SARS/Coronavirus isolated from humans, what did They do? They downloaded a sequence from China, and filed a patent on it in the United States. Any of you familiar with biological and chemical weapons treaties knows that is a violation. That's a CRIME. That's Not an innocent "oops." That is a CRIME. And the United States Patent Office went as far as to reject that patent application on 2 occasions, until the CDC decided to Bribe the Patent Office to override the Patent Examiner to ultimately issue the patent in 2007 on SARS/Coronavirus. But let's not let that get away from us, because it turns out that the RTPCR, which was the test that we were allegedly going to use to identify the risks associated with Coronavirus, was actually identified as a bio-terrorism threat by me, in the European Union-sponsored events in 2002, and 2003, 20 years ago. That happened here in Brussels, and across Europe. In 2005, this particular pathogen was specifically labeled as a bio-terrorism and bio-weapon platform technology, described as such. That is Not my terminology. It was actually described as a bio-weapons platform technology in 2005. And from 2005 onward, it was actually a bio-warfare enabling agent, its official classification from 2005 forward. I don't know if that

sounds like public health to you. Does it? Biowarfare-enabling technology? That feels like Not public health, that feels like Not medicine. That feels like a weapon, designed to Take Out humanity! That's what it feels like. It feels like that, because that's Exactly what it is!

We have been lured into believing the Eco-Health Alliance, and DARPA, and all these organizations are what we should be pointing to, but we have been specifically requested to ignore the FACTS that over \$10 BILLION have been funneled through Black Operations, through the check of Anthony Fauci, and a side by side ledger, where NIAID has a balance sheet, and next to it is a bio defense balance sheet, equivalent dollar for dollar matching that No one in the media talks about! And it's been going on since 2005, our gain of function moratorium---the moratorium that was supposed to Freeze any gain of function research.

Conveniently, in the fall of 2014, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill received a letter from NIAID, saying that while the gain of function moratorium on Coronavirus in vivo should be suspended, because their grants had already been funded, they received an exemption. Did you hear what I just said?? A biological weapons lab facility at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill received an Exemption from the gain of function moratorium, so that by 2016, we could publish the journal article that said: SARS/Coronavirus is Poised for Human Emergence, in 2016. And what, you might ask, Dave, was the Coronavirus poised for human emergence? It was WIV-1. Wuhan Institute of Virology, Virus 1, poised for human emergence at the proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, such that, by the time we get to 2017 and 2018,

the following phrase entered into common parlance among the community: There is going to be an accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen. The operative word in that phrase, obviously, the word, "release."

Does that sound like a leak? Does that sound like a bat and a penguin went into a bar in the Wuhan market, and hung out and had sex, and lo and behold, we got SARS/COV-2? NO! "accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen," was the terminology used.

And 4 x in 2019, 7 months before the allegation of patient #1, 4 patent applications of Moderna were modified to include the term, “accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen,” as the justification for making a vaccine—the thing that did Not exist. (Applause).

Keep going. If you have not done so, please make sure that you make reference in every investigation, to the premeditation nature of this, because it was in Sept. of 2019 that the world was informed that we were going to have an accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen, so that by Sept. 2020, there would be a worldwide acceptance of a universal vaccine template! That’s THEIR words, right in front of you, on the screen. The intent was to get the world to accept a universal vaccine template, and the intent was to use Coronavirus to get there.

And the last slide: Let’s read this, because we have to read this into the record everywhere I go: Until an infectious disease crisis is very real, present, and at the emergency threshold that is often largely ignored, to sustain the funding base beyond the crisis, he said, we need to increase the public understanding for medical countermeasures, such as a pan-influenza or 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.

Sounds like public health? Sounds like the best of humanity? No, ladies and gentlemen, this was premeditated domestic terrorism, stated at the proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences in 2015, published in front of them! This is an act of biological and chemical warfare, perpetrated on the human race, and it was admitted to in writing, that this was a financial heist and a financial fraud--“investors will follow if they see Profit at the end of the process.”

Let me conclude by making 5 very brief recommendations—the last slide: Nature was hijacked. This whole story started in 1965, when we decided to hijack a natural model, and start manipulating it. Science was hijacked, when the only questions that could be asked were questions authorized under the

patent protection of the CDC, the FDA, the NIH, and their equivalent organizations around the world.

We didn't have independent science; we had hijacked science. And unfortunately, there was No moral oversight, in violation of all of the codes that we stand for. There was no independent, financially disinterested, independent review board ever impaneled around Coronavirus, not once! Not once, since 1965.

We do not have a single, independent, IRB paneled around Coronavirus. So, morality was suspended for medical countermeasures. And ultimately, humanity was lost, because we decided to allow it to happen.

Our job today is to say, No More gain of function research, PERIOD! No more weaponization of Nature, PERIOD! And most importantly, No more Corporate patronage of science for Their own self-interest, unless They assume 100% product liability for every injury and every death that They maintain. Thank you very much.

Applause. End of video