Dr. David Martin w/ Dr. Reiner Fuellmich: “This, My Friends, Is the Definition of Criminal Conspiracy…This Is Not a Theory. This Is Evidence.”

Dr. David Martin w/ Dr. Reiner Fuellmich: “This, My Friends, Is the Definition of Criminal Conspiracy…This Is Not a Theory. This Is Evidence.”

The video clip below is one interview from the 60th session of the Corona Investigative Committee, livestreamed on July 9, 2021, which can be found at Corona Ausschuss – Ausweichkanal channel.

In this interview, Dr. David Martin shares a summary of his decades of research related to this global takeover via “scientific and message control”, following a trail left via US patents. His company M-CAM has reviewed the over 4,000 patents that have been issued around SARS coronavirus, including a comprehensive review of the financing.

Contributing to the conversation are Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg, Attorney Viviane Fischer and Prof. Martin Schwab (legal advisor to Corona Investigative Committee). See below for partial transcript and links.

[As a service to protect truth from censorship and to share

widely, mirrored copies of this video are available at Truth Comes to Light BitChute, Brighteon, and Odysee channels. All credit, along with our sincere thanks, goes to the original source of this video. Please follow links provided to support their work.]

Partial transcript, provided by Truth Comes to Light editor.

Dr. David Martin:

> "…we took the reported gene sequence, which was reportedly isolated as a novel coronavirus – indicated as such by the ICTV (the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses of the World Health Organization). We took the actual genetic sequences that were reportedly "novel" and reviewed those against the patent records that were available as of the spring of 2020. And what we found, as you'll see in this report, are **over 120 patented pieces of evidence to suggest that the declaration of a novel coronavirus was actually entirely a fallacy**."
>
> ###
>
> "As a matter of fact, very specifically in 1999, Anthony Fauci funded research at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill… where the 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, as you know, followed that by several months. That patent – issued as US patent 7279327 – that patent clearly lays out in very specific gene sequencing the fact that we knew that the ACE receptor, the ACE-2 binding-domain, the S1 spike protein (and other elements of what we have come to know as this

scourge pathogen) was 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 a pathogen or an intermediate of the pathogen. And that technology was funded exclusively in the early days as a means by which we could actually harness coronavirus as a vector to distribute HIV vaccine."

###

"…my organization was asked to monitor biological and chemical weapons treaty violations in the very early days of 2000. You'll remember the anthrax events in September of 2001. And we were part of an investigation that gave rise to the congressional inquiry into not only the anthrax origins… And our concern was that coronavirus was being seen as not only a potential manipulable agent for potential use as a vaccine vector but it was also very clearly being considered as a biological weapon candidate. And so our first public reporting on this took place prior to the SARS outbreak in the latter part of 2001. So you can imagine how disappointed I am to be sitting here 20 years later, having 20 years earlier pointed that there was a problem looming on the horizon with respect to coronavirus.

But after the alleged outbreak…**I will always say alleged outbreak because I think it's important for us to understand that coronavirus as a circulating pathogen, inside of the viral model that we have, is actually not new to the human condition and is not new to the last two decades. It's actually been part of the sequence of proteins that circulates for quite a long time.**

But the alleged outbreak that took place in China in 2002 going into 2003 gave rise to a very problematic April 2003 filing by the United States Center for Disease Control and Prevention. And this topic is of critical importance to get the nuance very precise. Because in addition to filing the

entire gene sequence on what became SARS coronavirus, which is actually a violation of 35 US code section 101, you cannot patent a naturally occurring substance. The 35 US code section 101 violation was patent number 7220852. Now that patent also had a series of derivative patents associated with it. These are patent applications that were broken apart because they were of multiple patentable subject matter. But these include US patent 46592703P (which is actually a very interesting designation), US patent…7776521. These patents not only covered the gene sequence of SARS coronavirus but also covered the means of detecting it using RT-PCR.

Now the reason why that's a problem is **if you actually both own the patent on the gene itself, and you own the patent on its detection, you have a cunning advantage to being able to control 100 percent of the providence of not only the virus itself but also its detection – meaning you have the entire scientific and message control**.

And this patent sought by the CDC was allegedly justified by their public relations team as being sought so that everyone would be free to be able to research coronavirus. The only problem with that statement is it's a lie.

And the reason why it's a lie is because the patent office, not once but twice, rejected the patent on the gene sequence as unpatentable because the gene sequence was already in the public domain. In other words, prior to CDC's filing for a patent, the patent office found 99.9% identity with the already existing coronavirus recorded in the public domain. And, over the rejection of the patent examiner and after having to pay an appeal fine in 2006 and 2007, the CDC overrode the patent office's rejection of their patent and ultimately in 2007 got the patent on SARS coronavirus.

Every public statement that CDC has made that said that

this was in the public interest is falsifiable by their own paid bribe to the patent office. This is not something that's subtle. And, to make matters worse, they paid an additional fee to keep their application private. Last time I checked, if you're trying to make information available for the public research you would not pay a fee to keep the information private.

I wish I could have made up anything I just said, but all of that is available in the public patent archive record – which any member of the public can review. And the public PAIR, as it's called that the United States patent office, has not only the evidence but the actual documents which I have in my possession.

Now, this is this is critically important. It's critically important because fact-checkers have repeatedly stated that the novel coronavirus, designated as SARS-CoV-2, is, in fact, distinct from the CDC patent. And here's both the genetic and the patent problem. If you look at the gene sequence that is filed by CDC in 2003, again in 2005, and then again in 2006, what you find is identity in somewhere between 89 to 99 percent of the sequence overlaps that have been identified in what's called the novel subclade of SARS-CoV-2.

What we know is that the core designation of SARS coronavirus, which is actually the clade of the betacoronavirus family, and the subclade that is been called SARS-CoV-2 have to overlap from a taxonomate point of view. You cannot have SARS designation on a thing without it first being SARS. So the disingenuous fact-checking that has been done saying that, somehow or another, CDC has nothing to do with this particular patent or this particular pathogen is beyond both the literal credibility of the published sequences and it's also beyond credulity when it comes to the ICTV taxonomy – because it very clearly states that this is in fact a subclade of the

clade called SARS coronavirus.

Now, what's important is on the 28th of April – and listen to the date very carefully because this date is problematic. Three days after CDC filed the patent on the SARS coronavirus in 2003 – three days later Sequoia Pharmaceuticals, company that was set up in Maryland – Sequoia Pharmaceuticals on the 28th of April 2003 filed the patent on antiviral agents on treatment and control of infections by coronavirus. CDC filed three days earlier. And then, the treatment was available three days later.

…So ask yourself a simple question. **How would one have a patent on a treatment for a thing that had been invented three days earlier?**

…The patent in question, the April 28th 2003 patent 7151163, issued to Sequoia Pharmaceuticals, has another problem. The problem is, 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 for you to patent a thing that treats a thing that had not been published – because CDC had paid to keep it secret.

This, my friends, is the definition of criminal conspiracy, racketeering and collusion. This is not a theory. This is evidence."

###

Dr. Reiner Fuellmich:

"**This could well blow up into a RICO case ultimately.**"

###

Dr. David Martin:

"…It is a RICO case. And the RICO pattern, which was established in April of 2003 for the first coronavirus, was played out to exactly the same schedule when we see SARS-CoV-2 show up – when we have 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?"

###

"…the 5th of June 2008, which is an important date because it is actually around the time when DARPA, the Defense Advanced Research Program in the United States. actively took an interest in coronavirus as a biological weapon.

June 5th 2008, Ablynx, which as you know is now part of Sanofi, filed a series of patents that specifically targeted what we've been told is the novel feature of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. And you heard what I just said. This is the 5th of June 2008.

Specifically, they targeted what was called the polybasic cleavage site for SARS-CoV, the novel spike protein, and the ACE-2 receptor binding-domain, which is allegedly novel to SARS-CoV-2. And all of that was patented on the 5th of June 2008.

And those patents, in sequence, were issued between November 24 of 2015 – which was US patent 9193780. So that one came out after the gain of function moratorium. That one came after the MERS outbreak in the Middle East.

But what you find is that then in 2016, 2017, 2019 a series of patents all covering, not only the RNA strands, but also the subcomponents of the gene strands, were all issued to Ablynx and Sanofi…we have countless others…all identifying in patent filings that ranged from 2008 until 2017.

Every attribute that was allegedly uniquely published by the single reference publication, the novel bat coronavirus…the paper that has been routinely used to identify the novel virus, unfortunately, if you actually take what they report to be novel you find 73 patents issued between 2008 and 2019 which have the elements that were allegedly novel in the SARS-CoV-2 – specifically as it relates to the polybasic cleavage site, ACE-2 receptor binding-domain and the spike protein.

So the clinically novel components of the clinically unique, clinically contagious – you know where I'm going with this. Okay?

There was no outbreak of SARS because we had engineered all of the elements of that. And by 2016 the paper that was funded during the gain of function moratorium that said that the SARS coronavirus was poised for human emergence, written by none other than Ralph Baric, was not only poised for human emergence but it was patented for commercial exploitation – 73 times."

###

"My favorite quote of this pandemic was a statement made in 2015 by Peter Daszak…reported in the National Academies Press publicatio, February 12, 2016, and I'm quoting: **'We need to increase public understanding of the need for medical countermeasures 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.’“

###

“…every study that’s ever been launched to try to verify a lab leak is a red herring.”

###

“And I’m going to give you the biggest bombshell of all to prove that this was actually not a release of anything, because patent 7279327 – the patent on the recombinant nature of that lung-targeting coronavirus – was transferred mysteriously from the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill to the National Institutes of Health in 2018.

Now here’s the problem with that. Under the Bayh-Dole Act, the U. S. government already has what’s called a ‘march-in right’ provision. That means if the US government has paid for research, they are entitled to benefit from that research at their demand or at their whim.

So explain why in 2017 and 2018 suddenly the National Institutes of Health have to take ownership of the patent that they already had rights to, held by the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill. And how did they need to file a certificate of correction to make sure that it was legally enforceable? Because there was a typographical error in the grant reference in the first filing. So they needed to make sure that, not only did they get it right, but they need to make sure 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 University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, in November of 2019, and Moderna, in November of 2019, when UNC Chapel Hill, NIAID and Moderna began the sequencing of a spike protein vaccine – a month before an outbreak ever happened.”

###

“And just to answer a question that was asked slightly earlier, the script for this was written first January 6, 2004…At the conference called SARS and Bioterrorism… introduced the notion of what they called the New Normal… which is the language that became the branded campaign that was adopted by the World Health Organization… **The first introduction of the New Normal campaign, which was about getting people to accept a universal pan influenza, pan coronavirus, vaccine was actually adopted January 6, 2004**.

…I’m not going to belabor many more points other than to say that it was very clear that…Moderna knew that it was going to be placed in the front of the line with respect to the development of a vaccine in March of 2019. And this is a very important date because in March of 2019, for reasons that are not transparent, they suddenly amended a series of rejected patent filings, which is a very bizarre behavior. But they amended a number of patent filings to specifically make reference to an intentional or accidental release – I’m sorry – their term ‘deliberate release’ of coronavirus. So in March they amended four failed patent applications to begin the process of a coronavirus vaccine development…”

###

“…and we know, as I made reference to before that in November, they entered into a research and cooperative research development agreement with UNC Chapel Hill with respect to getting the spike protein to put inside of the lipid nanoparticle – so that they actually had a candidate vaccine before we had a pathogen allegedly that was running around.

What makes that story most problematic, beyond the self evident nature of it, is that we know that from 2016 until 2019, at every one of the NIAID Advisory Council board

meetings, Anthony Fauci lamented the fact that he could not find a way to get people to accept the universal influenza vaccine – which is what was his favorite target he was trying to get the population to engage in this process. And what becomes very evident with Peter Daszak, Ecohealth Alliance, UNC Chapel Hill and others – and then, most specifically by March of 2019 in the amended patent filings of Moderna, we see that there is a epiphany that says 'what if there was an accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen?'. And what makes that particular phrase problematic is it is exactly recited in the book 'A World at Risk' which is the scenario that was put together by the World Health Organization in September of 2019.

So, months before there's an alleged pathogen – which says that we need to have a coordinated global experience of a respiratory pathogen release – which by September 2020 must put in place a universal capacity for public relations management, crowd control and the acceptance of a universal vaccine mandate."

###

"That was September of 2019. And the language of an intentional release of a respiratory pathogen was written into the scenario that 'must be completed by September 2020'."

Download PDF:

The Fauci/COVID-19 Dossier

Learn more about the Corona Investigative Committee: https://corona-ausschuss.de

For anonymous reports: https://securewhistleblower.com
Connect with the Committee on Telegram: https://t.me/s/Corona_Ausschuss

Connect with OVAL Media on Telegram: https://t.me/s/OVALmedia

Connect with Dr. David Martin: https://www.davidmartin.world/

---

see related: ***Dr. David Martin Releases 'The Fauci/COVID-19 Dossier" | 205 Pages, 22 Years of Research***