

Patents, Biodiversity, and Genetic Ownership

[Patents, Biodiversity, and Genetic Ownership](#)

“Let’s assume some Dr. Neo Frankenfauci bent over a bubbling cauldron somewhere in the bowels of the International Technoapparatchikcrats’ Institute for Genetic Shenanigans is cooking up a potion that includes all sorts of secret ingredients in the recipe, things like heavy metals and parasites and a clever code in the messenger RNA to modify a body in such a way to produce proteins it otherwise wouldn’t have produced.

And let’s imagine the same said Dr. Frankenfauci inventing various means to introduce the potion into the food supply and touting it as a way to quackcinate people via their GMO food supply. And let’s imagine cows, birds, pigs, foxes and wolves eating said food supply (or each other), and voila, the modifications spread and start executing their programs in several different species.”

[Patents, Biodiversity, and Genetic Ownership](#)

by [Joseph P. Farrell](#), [Giza Death Star](#)

November 8, 2021

On this website [[Giza Death Star](#)] and in our members’ vidchats, a number of readers and contributors of articles have been wondering to what extent a patented synthetic life

form places a lien on an individual who may wittingly or unwittingly consume it. Well, if you have any doubts about the ultimate answer to that question and the lengths that Mr. Globaloney and his “technoapparatchikcrats” intend to go, check out the following article shared by V.S.:

[Global blueprint exposed: The takeover of all genetic material on Earth](#)

As the article notes, the “plan” was outlined in a United Nations-sponsored conference (who else?) known as the Brundtland Commission, which was later published by Oxford University Press (who else?), under the title *Our Common Future*.

The article is well worth reading in its entirety, especially for its focus on the hypocrisy of global and corporate elites when they express concern for “the environment”:

*The Rio conference proposed the question, what can be done to save the world from excessive development that causes pollution, global warming, loss of rain forests, etc. The answer was that **more development was needed and by the same actors that were previously wrecking habitats and plundering nations**. In other words, more development was needed to erase the effects of previous development. Brundtland convinced the UN that this somehow made sense, and it was subsequently adopted as “**the agenda for the 21st century**” in 1992.*

But then comes the crucial question:

*Others saw through the smoke and mirrors. Two environmental researchers and authors noted in their book, *The Earth Brokers*: “**free trade and its promoters came to be seen as the solution to the global ecological crisis.**”[3] They could not have been more blunt:*

“We argue that UNCED has boosted precisely the type of

industrial development that is destructive for the environment, the planet, and its inhabitants. We see how, as a result of UNCED, the rich will get richer, the poor poorer, while more and more of the planet is destroyed in the process.”[4]

In 2021, this result could not be more clearly seen: the rich are off the charts, the poor are in the gutters and the planet and its economic systems are in tatters.

How did we get here?

The answer is a stunner:

*“Neither Brundtland, nor the secretariat, nor the governments drafted plan to examine the pitfalls of free trade and industrial development. Instead, they wrote up a convention on **how to ‘develop’ the use of biodiversity through patents and biotechnology.**”[5]*

Note the buzzword “biodiversity”. This key term is the conceptual heart of a line of reasoning elegantly laid out in the article:

“The diversity of species is necessary for the normal functioning of ecosystems and the biosphere as a whole. The genetic material in wild species contributes billions of dollars yearly to the world economy in the form of improved crop species, new drugs and medicines, and raw materials for industry.”[6]

The specific development of biodiversity is seen in Chapter 6, Species and Ecosystems: Resources for Development:

“Species and their genetic materials promise to play an expanding role in development, and a powerful economic rationale is emerging to bolster the ethical, aesthetic,

and scientific case for preserving them. **The genetic variability and germplasm material of species** make contributions to agriculture, medicine, and industry **worth many billions of dollars per year...** If nations can ensure the survival of species, the world can look forward to new and improved foods, new drugs and medicines, and new raw materials for industry.”[7]

Further on, Brundtland states:

“Vast stocks of biological diversity are in danger of disappearing **just as science is leaning how to exploit genetic variability** through the advances of genetic engineering... It would be grim irony indeed if just as new genetic engineering techniques begin to let us peer into life’s diversity and use genes more efficiently to better human conditions, we looked and found this treasure sadly depleted.”[8]

Conclusion #1: The word “biodiversity” is explained to mean “genetic resources”. Genes are something to be exploited and used more efficiently than they are used in their natural state.

Turning back to *The Earth Brokers*, the authors’ observations provide an eye-witness account of what they actually saw at the UNCED and Biodiversity Convention summit:

“The convention implicitly equates the diversity of life – animals and plants – to the diversity of genetic codes, for which read genetic resources. **By doing so, diversity becomes something that modern science can manipulate.** Finally, the convention promotes biotechnology as being ‘essential for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.’[9]

If there is any doubt as to what the goal is, they conclude with this mind-blowing statement:

“The main stake raised by the Biodiversity Convention is the issue of ownership and control over biological diversity... the major concern was protecting the pharmaceutical and emerging biotechnology industries.”[10]

So note the steps of the “logic”: (1) the genetic diversity of of species on the planet is necessary to its survival; (2) this “bioiversity” is a source of great wealth; (3) this wealth can be increased by the “scientific manipulation” of that diversity; (4) that scientific manipulation in turn raises “the issue of ownership and control over biological diversity; and *that* in turn means that (5) the pharmaceutical and “biotechnology” industries would have to be protected.

How would these protected industries implement this ownership?

To reinforce the thought, the authors bluntly stated, “they wrote up a convention on how to ‘develop’ the use of biodiversity through patents and biotechnology.”[11]

In other words, to establish ownership over “biodiversity” it was only necessary to establish a patent lien on a species by the biotechnological or genetic manipulation of that species. The implication of this statement is that *every species on the planet* will have to be so modified in order to establish that lien. The process can be made much simpler by the introduction of genetic technologies capable of traveling from one species to another and executing biotechnological programming. Think of it as the next step in the Mon(ster)santo strategy of suing farmers whose property is discovered to have GMO plants growing on it, whether known to the farmer or not. Unlike the Mon(ster)santo strategy, it is no longer necessary to send out actual human spies, one can simply engineer the *tracking* of the modifications by including the tracking in the

modification. Think Baal Gates here.

Of course, there's an assumption implicit in all this "reasoning" and that is that the scientific manipulation of "biodiversity" will actually lead to more diversity and hence to "survivability" and "sustainability" (not to mention that the *limits* of the claim of patent liens on ownership as a legal issue impinging on fundamental God-given human rights are not mentioned at all). Let's do a bit of high octane speculation. Let's assume some Dr. Neo Frankenfauci bent over a bubbling cauldron somewhere in the bowels of the International Technoapparatchikcrats' Institute for Genetic Shenanigans is cooking up a potion that includes all sorts of secret ingredients in the recipe, things like heavy metals and parasites and a clever code in the messenger RNA to modify a body in such a way to produce proteins it otherwise wouldn't have produced. And let's imagine the same said Dr. Frankenfauci inventing various means to introduce the potion into the food supply and touting it as a way to quackcinate people via their GMO food supply. And let's imagine cows, birds, pigs, foxes and wolves eating said food supply (or each other), and *voila*, the modifications spread and start executing their programs in several different species.

As a result, what is happening is not *more* "biodiversity," but *less*. And at a certain threshold it may be that "biodiversity" sufficiently collapses due to the degradation of the genetic pool of a species, indeed, of several species through the spread of the engineered manipulation itself.

In short, all of this wonderful plan depends on the hubris of the manipulators that, indeed, they have sufficient wisdom in the current state of human knowledge to do it.

Sorry, but I'm not buying the product. We were (and are) constantly assured that the mRNA quackcines were (and are) entirely safe... while the strange adverse reactions keep growing, as hospital emergency rooms are overflowing with

people with respiratory and sudden heart problems, and so on.

Rather, what strikes me is that this is a reckless and desperate attempt to collateralize – to enslave – humanity itself via such a scheme.

And while we're talking about ownership, these modern doctors Frankenfaucis are gambling on something else: that the original owner(s) won't show up...

See you on the flip side...

Connect with Joseph P. Farrell

cover image credit: [pasja1000](#) / pixabay