

David Martin, PhD, is the chairman of

0:18

MCAM CNBC IQ100 index, international innovation risk

from a corporate standpoint we have since 1998 been the world's

0:33

largest underwriter of intangible assets

0:36

used in

0:36

finance in 168 countries so

0:40

in the majority of the countries around

0:43

the world

0:45

our underwriting systems which include

0:49

the entire corpus of all patents, patent

0:52

applications

0:53

federal grants procurement records

0:56

e-government records etc

0:59

we have the ability to

1:02

not only track what is happening and who

1:05

is

1:06

involved in what's happening but we

1:09

monitor a series of thematic interests

1:12

for a variety of organizations and

1:15

and individuals

1:16

as well as for our own commercial use

1:18

because as you

1:20

probably know we maintain three  
1:24  
global equity in the indices which are  
1:28  
the the top performing large cap  
1:31  
and mid-cap equity indexes worldwide so  
1:34  
our business  
1:36  
is to monitor the innovation  
1:40  
that's happening around the world and  
1:43  
specifically to monitor the economics of  
1:46  
that innovation the degree to which  
1:48  
um you know financial interests are  
1:50  
being served  
1:52  
you know corporate interests are being  
1:53  
dislocated etc so  
1:55  
our our business is the business of  
1:58  
innovation  
1:59  
and it's finance  
2:02  
um  
2:06  
foreign  
2:49  
finance industry of social innovation  
2:52  
okay i got that yeah so  
2:55  
so obviously from this the standpoint of  
2:59  
this  
3:01

presentation as you know we have  
3:04  
reviewed the over 4 000 patents  
3:07  
that have been issued around sara's  
3:10  
coronavirus  
3:13  
and we have done a very comprehensive  
3:16  
review  
3:16  
of the financing of all of the  
3:20  
manipulations  
3:21  
of coronavirus which gave rise to sars  
3:24  
as a subclade of the beta coronavirus  
3:28  
family  
3:30  
and so what i wanted to do was give you  
3:33  
a quick  
3:34  
overview timeline wise because we're not  
3:36  
going to go through 4 000  
3:38  
uh patents on this conversation but i  
3:41  
have sent to you and your team  
3:44  
a document that is exceptionally  
3:46  
important this was made public in the  
3:48  
spring of  
3:50  
2020 yes um this document  
3:53  
which which you do have and can be  
3:55

posted in the public record  
3:58  
um is is quite critical in that  
4:01  
we took the reported gene sequence  
4:05  
which was reportedly isolated as a novel  
4:08  
coronavirus  
4:10  
indicated as such by the ictv  
4:14  
the international committee on taxonomy  
4:16  
of viruses of the world health  
4:18  
organization  
4:19  
we took the actual genetic  
4:23  
sequences that were reportedly novel  
4:27  
and reviewed those against the patent  
4:30  
records  
4:31  
that were available as of  
4:35  
the spring of 2020  
4:39  
and what we found as you'll see in this  
4:41  
report  
4:42  
are over 120 patented  
4:46  
pieces of evidence to suggest that the  
4:49  
declaration of a novel coronavirus  
4:53  
was actually entirely a fallacy  
4:56  
there was no novel coronavirus  
4:59

there are countless very subtle  
5:04  
modifications of coronavirus sequences  
5:07  
that have been  
5:07  
uploaded but there was no single  
5:11  
identified  
5:12  
novel coronavirus at all as a matter of  
5:15  
fact  
5:16  
we found records in the patent records  
5:20  
of sequences attributed to novelty going  
5:23  
to patents  
5:24  
that were sought as early as 1999.  
5:29  
so not only was this not a novel  
5:32  
anything  
5:33  
it's actually not only not been novel  
5:36  
it's it's not been novel for over two  
5:38  
decades  
5:40  
but let's let's take a very short um  
5:43  
and and and what i'll do is i'll take  
5:46  
you on a very short  
5:48  
journey through the patent landscape to  
5:50  
make sure people understand  
5:52  
what happened but as you know up until  
5:55

1999  
5:56  
the topic of coronavirus vis-a-vis the  
5:59  
patenting activity around coronavirus  
6:02  
was uniquely applied to veterinary  
6:04  
sciences  
6:06  
6:06 the first vaccine ever patented  
6:10  
for coronavirus was actually  
6:14  
sought by pfizer  
6:19  
the application for the the the um the  
6:22  
first  
6:23  
um vaccine for coronavirus which was  
6:26  
specifically this  
6:27  
s-spike protein so the exact same thing  
6:30  
that allegedly we have  
6:32  
rushed into invention um the first  
6:35  
application was filed january  
6:37  
28 2000 21 years  
6:41  
ago um so the idea that we  
6:45  
we mysteriously stumbled on um  
6:48  
the the way to intervene on vaccines  
6:52  
is not only ludicrous it is incredulous  
6:56  
6:56 um because timothy miller sharon  
6:59

klepfer albert paul reed and elaine  
7:02  
jones on january 28  
7:06  
2000 filed what ultimately was issued  
7:09  
as u.s patent 6372-224  
7:16  
which was the spike protein  
7:19  
virus a vaccine for  
7:22  
the canine coronavirus which is actually  
7:25  
one of the multiple forms of coronavirus  
7:28  
but as i said the early work up until  
7:32  
1999 was largely focused  
7:35  
in the area of vaccines for animals  
7:38  
the two animals receiving the most  
7:40  
attention  
7:42  
were probably ralph barrack's work on  
7:44  
rabbits  
7:45  
and the rabbit cardiomyopathy that was  
7:48  
associated with  
7:49  
significant problems among rabbit  
7:51  
breeders  
7:53  
and then canine coronavirus in pfizer's  
7:56  
work  
7:57  
to identify how to develop s sp  
8:01

s and spike protein vaccine target  
8:03  
candidates  
8:04  
giving rise to the obvious  
8:08  
evidence that says that neither  
8:11  
the coronavirus concept of a vaccine nor  
8:14  
the principle of the coronavirus itself  
8:18  
um as a pathogen of interest with  
8:21  
respect to the spike protein's behavior  
8:23  
is anything uh novel at all as a matter  
8:26  
of fact it's 22 years old  
8:28  
based on patent filings what's more  
8:32  
problematic  
8:33  
8:33 and what is actually the most egregious  
8:37  
uh problem is that anthony fauci and  
8:40  
niaid  
8:42  
found the malleability of coronavirus to  
8:45  
be a potential  
8:46  
candidate for hiv vaccines  
8:51  
and so sars is actually not  
8:54  
a natural progression  
8:58  
of a genetic modification of coronavirus  
9:03  
as a matter of fact very specifically in  
9:06



1999  
9:08  
9:08 anthony fauci funded research at the  
9:11  
university of north carolina chapel hill  
9:14  
specifically to create and you cannot  
9:18  
you cannot help but but you know lament  
9:21  
what i'm about to read because this  
9:23  
comes directly from  
9:25  
a patent application filed on april 19  
9:28  
2002  
9:30  
and you heard the date correctly 2002  
9:35  
where the niaid  
9:38  
built an infectious  
9:42  
replication defective coronavirus  
9:47  
that was specifically targeted for human  
9:50  
lung  
9:50  
epithelium in other words  
9:54  
we made sars  
10:00  
and we patented it on april 19  
10:04  
2002 before  
10:07  
there was ever any alleged outbreak in  
10:10  
asia which as you know followed that  
10:14  
by several months  
10:17

that patent issued as u.s patent 7279327  
10:25  
that patent clearly lays out  
10:28  
in very specific gene sequencing  
10:33  
the fact that we knew that the ace  
10:34  
receptor the ace2 binding  
10:37  
domain the s1 spike protein  
10:42  
and other elements of what we have come  
10:44  
to know  
10:45  
as this scourge pathogen  
10:49  
was not only engineered but could be  
10:52  
synthetically modified  
10:53  
in the laboratory using nothing more  
10:56  
than gene sequencing technologies  
10:58  
taking computer code and turning it into  
11:02  
a pathogen or an intermediate of the  
11:05  
pathogen  
11:06  
and that technology was funded  
11:08  
exclusively  
11:09  
in the early days as a means by which  
11:13  
we could actually harness coronavirus  
11:17  
as a vector to distribute hiv vaccine  
11:26  
i'll let you translate that because  
11:28

that's a lot of material  
11:30  
11:30 okay okay so it gets worse  
11:34  
[Laughter]  
11:38  
um we were my organization  
11:42  
was asked to monitor biological and  
11:45  
chemical weapons treaty violations  
11:48  
in the very early days of 2000 you'll  
11:51  
remember  
11:52  
the anthrax events in september  
11:56  
of 2001 and we were part of an  
12:00  
investigation  
12:01  
that gave rise to the congressional  
12:04  
inquiry  
12:05  
into not only the anthrax origins but  
12:08  
also  
12:09  
into what was unusual behavior  
12:12  
around bayer's ciprofloxacin  
12:16  
drug which was a drug used as a  
12:19  
potential treatment  
12:21  
for anthrax poisoning and throughout the  
12:24  
fall  
12:25  
of 2001 we began monitoring an enormous  
12:29

number of bacterial and viral pathogens  
12:34  
that were being patented through  
12:37  
nih niaid u.s  
12:40  
amrit the u.s armed services  
12:44  
infectious disease program and  
12:47  
a number of other agencies  
12:50  
internationally that collaborated  
12:52  
with them and our concern  
12:55  
was that coronavirus was being  
12:58  
seen as not only a potential manipulable  
13:01  
agent for potential use as a vaccine  
13:06  
vector  
13:07  
but it was also very clearly being  
13:09  
considered as  
13:10  
a biological weapon candidate  
13:13  
13:13 um and so our first public reporting on  
13:17  
this  
13:17  
took place prior to the sars outbreak  
13:21  
in the latter part of 2001. so you can  
13:24  
imagine how  
13:25  
disappointed i am to be sitting here 20  
13:29  
years later  
13:30

having 20 years earlier pointed that  
13:34  
there was  
13:35  
a problem looming on the horizon with  
13:37  
respect to coronavirus  
13:39  
but after the  
13:42  
alleged outbreak and i'm i will always  
13:45  
say  
13:46  
alleged outbreak because i think it's  
13:48  
important for us to understand  
13:50  
that coronavirus as a circulating  
13:52  
pathogen  
13:53  
inside of the viral model that we have  
13:58  
is actually not new to the human  
14:00  
condition and is not new to the last two  
14:02  
decades  
14:02  
it's actually been part of the  
14:06  
sequence of proteins that that  
14:08  
circulates for quite a long time  
14:11  
but the alleged outbreak that took place  
14:13  
in china in 2002 going into 2003  
14:18  
gave rise to a very problematic april  
14:21  
2003  
14:22

filing by the united states center for

14:25

disease control and prevention

14:27

and this topic is of critical importance

14:30

to get the nuance

14:32

very precise because

14:35

in addition to filing the entire gene

14:38

sequence

14:39

on what became sars coronavirus

14:42

which is actually a violation of 35 us

14:45

code section 101.

14:48

you cannot patent a naturally occurring

14:50

substance

14:54

the 35 u.s code section 101 violation

14:58

was patent number 7220852

15:05

15:05 now that patent also had a series of

15:09

derivative patents associated with it

15:11

these

15:12

are are patent applications that were

15:16

broken apart because they were of

15:18

multiple

15:19

patentable subject matter but these

15:22

include

15:22

u.s patent 46592703p

15:26

designation

15:33

u.s patent 776521

these patents not only covered the

15:47

gene sequence of sars coronavirus

15:51

but also covered the means of detecting

15:54

it

15:55

using rtPCR

15:58

15:58 now the reason why that's a problem is

16:00

if you actually

16:01

both own the patent on the gene

16:04

itself and you own the patent

16:08

on its detection you have a cunning

16:11

advantage to being able to control

16:13

100 of the provenance of not only the

16:16

virus itself but also its detection

16:19

meaning you have entire scientific

16:23

and message control and this patent

16:28

sought by the cdc was allegedly

16:31

justified by their public relations

16:33

team as being sought so that

16:37

everyone would be free to be able to

16:39

research coronavirus

16:42  
16:42 the only problem with that statement is  
16:44  
16:44 it's a lie  
16:46  
16:46 and the reason why it's a lie is because  
16:48  
16:48 the patent office not once but  
16:50  
16:50 twice rejected the patent on the gene  
16:54  
16:54 sequence as  
16:55  
16:55 unpatentable because the gene sequence  
16:58  
16:58 was  
16:59  
16:59 already in the public domain  
17:02  
17:02 in other words prior to cdc's filing for  
17:06  
17:06 a patent  
17:07  
17:07 the patent office found 99.9  
17:11  
17:11 identity with the already existing  
17:15  
17:15 coronavirus recorded in the public  
17:17  
17:17 domain  
17:18  
17:18 and over the rejection of  
17:21  
17:21 the patent examiner and after having to  
17:25  
17:25 pay  
17:26  
17:26 an appeal fine in 2006 and 2007  
17:31  
17:31 the cdc overrode the patent office's  
17:34  
17:34 rejection of their patent and ultimately  
17:36  
17:36 in 2007



17:38  
got the patent on sars coronavirus  
17:42  
so every public statement that cdc has  
17:44  
made that said that this was  
17:46  
in the public interest is falsifiable by  
17:49  
their  
17:49  
own paid bribe to the patent office  
17:53  
this is not something that's subtle and  
17:55  
to make matters worse  
17:57  
they paid an additional fee to keep  
17:59  
their application  
18:00  
private last time i checked if you're  
18:03  
trying to make information available for  
18:05  
the public research you would not  
18:06  
pay a fee to keep the information  
18:12  
private  
18:14  
wish i could have made up anything i  
18:16  
just said but all of that is available  
18:18  
in the public  
18:19  
patent archive record which  
18:22  
any member of the public can review and  
18:26  
the public pair as it's called at the  
18:27  
united states patent office

18:29  
has not only the evidence but the actual  
18:32  
documents which i have in my possession  
18:36  
now this is this is critically important  
18:41  
18:41 it's critically important because fact  
18:43  
checkers  
18:44  
have repeatedly stated that the novel  
18:47  
coronavirus  
18:48  
designated as sars cov2  
18:52  
is in fact distinct from the cdc patent  
18:57  
and here's both the genetic and the  
19:00  
patent problem  
19:02  
if you look at the gene sequence that is  
19:04  
filed by cdc  
19:06  
in 2003 again in 2005  
19:10  
and then again in 2006 what you find  
19:13  
is identity in somewhere between 89 to  
19:17  
99  
19:19  
of the sequence overlaps that have been  
19:21  
identified  
19:22  
in what's called the novel subclade of  
19:25  
sars  
19:25  
cov2 what we know is that the

19:29  
the core designation of  
19:32  
sars coronavirus which is actually the  
19:36  
clade  
19:37  
of the beta coronavirus family and the  
19:40  
subclade that has been called  
19:42  
sar cov2 have to overlap  
19:45  
from a taxonomy point of view  
19:48  
you cannot have sars designation on a  
19:52  
thing  
19:52  
without it first being sars  
19:56  
so the the disingenuous fact checking  
19:59  
that has been done  
20:00  
saying that somehow or another cdc has  
20:02  
nothing to do  
20:04  
with this particular patent or this  
20:06  
particular pathogen  
20:08  
is beyond both the literal credibility  
20:11  
of the published sequences and it's also  
20:15  
beyond credulity when it comes to the  
20:18  
ictv  
20:19  
taxonomy because it very clearly states  
20:22  
that this is in fact a

20:23  
subclade of the clade called sars  
20:26  
coronavirus  
20:28  
now what's important is on the 28th of  
20:32  
april  
20:33  
20:33 and listen to the date very carefully  
20:35  
because this date is problematic  
20:37  
three days after cdc  
20:41  
filed the patent on the  
20:44  
sars coronavirus in 2003  
20:48  
three days later sequoia pharmaceuticals  
20:52  
a company that was set up in maryland  
20:56  
sequoia pharmaceuticals on the 28th of  
20:59  
april  
21:00  
2003. filed a patent  
21:04  
on anti-viral agents of treatment and  
21:06  
control  
21:07  
of infections by coronavirus cdc  
21:11  
filed three days earlier and then  
21:15  
the treatment was available three days  
21:17  
later  
21:19  
now just hold that thought for a second  
21:22  
who is the choir pharmaceuticals well

21:25  
there you go  
21:25  
that's a good question because sequoia  
21:27  
pharmaceuticals and  
21:28  
ultimately ab links pharmaceuticals  
21:31  
became rolled  
21:32  
into the proprietary holdings of pfizer  
21:35  
crusell and johnson and johnson  
21:42  
wow so ask yourself a simple question  
21:46  
how would one have a patent on a  
21:48  
treatment for a thing that had been  
21:50  
invented  
21:51  
three days earlier yeah  
21:56  
the patent in question the april 28  
22:00  
2003 patent 715  
22:06  
1163 issued to sequoia pharmaceuticals  
22:10  
has another problem the problem is  
22:14  
it was issued and published before the  
22:18  
cdc  
22:20  
patent on coronavirus was actually  
22:24  
allowed so the degree to which the  
22:27  
information  
22:28  
could have been known by any means other

22:31  
than insider information between those  
22:33  
parties  
22:34  
is zero it is not physically possible  
22:38  
for you to patent a thing that treats  
22:41  
a thing that had not been published  
22:44  
because  
22:45  
cdc had paid to keep it secret  
22:53  
22:53 this my friends is the definition  
22:56  
of criminal conspiracy racketeering and  
22:59  
collusion  
23:00  
this is not a theory this is  
23:04  
evidence you cannot have information  
23:09  
in the future inform a treatment for a  
23:12  
thing that did not exist  
23:15  
this could well blow up into a ricoh  
23:18  
case  
23:18  
ultimately this is the that's  
23:21  
that it is a ricoh case it's not could  
23:23  
blow up into it it is a ricoh case  
23:26  
23:26 and the rico pattern which was  
23:28  
established in april of 2003 for the  
23:31  
first coronavirus

23:33  
was played out to exactly the same

23:36  
schedule

23:38  
when we see sars cov2 show up

23:41

23:41 when we have moderna getting the spike

23:44

protein sequence by

23:45

phone from the vaccine research center

23:50

at niaid prior to

23:53

the definition of the novel subclade

23:56

how do you treat a thing before you

23:59

actually have the thing

24:04:00

yeah it's going to get worse here oh no

24:07:00

it can't get worse

24:08:00

oh it does um in

24:11:00

the 5th of june 2008 which is an

24:14:00

important date because it is actually

24:16:00

around the time when

24:17:00

darpa the defense advanced research

24:20:00

program in the united states

24:22:00

actively took an interest in coronavirus

24:26:00

as a biological weapon

24:29:00

june 5th 2008 ab links

24:32:00

which as you know is now part of sanofi

24:36:00  
filed a series of patents that  
24:38:00  
specifically  
24:39:00  
targeted what we've been told is the  
24:42:00  
novel feature of the sars cov2  
24:45:00  
virus and you heard what i just said  
24:48:00  
this is  
24:48:00  
the fifth of june 2008.  
24:53:00  
they found what specifically they  
24:56:00  
targeted  
24:56:00  
what was called the poly basic cleavage  
24:58:00  
site for  
25:00:00  
sars cov the novel spike protein and the  
25:03:00  
ace2 receptor binding domain which is  
25:05:00  
allegedly novel to sar cov2  
25:08:00  
and all of that was patented  
25:12:00  
on the 5th of june 2008  
25:15:00  
and those patents in sequence were  
25:18:00  
issued  
25:19:00  
25:19:00 between november 24th of 2015  
25:24:00  
which was u.s patent 9193780  
25:28:00  
so that one came out  
25:31:00  
after the gain of function moratorium



25:37:00  
that one came after the mers outbreak  
25:41:00  
in the middle east but what you find is  
25:45:00  
that then in 2016 2017  
25:50:00  
2019 a series of patents  
25:54:00  
all covering not only  
25:57:00  
the rna strands but also the sub  
26:01:00  
components of the gene strands  
26:05:00  
were all issued to ab links  
26:08:00  
and sanofi and then we have  
26:12:00  
crew cell we have rubios therapeutics  
26:17:00  
we have children's medical corporation  
26:21:00  
we have countless others that include  
26:26:00  
ludwig maximilians universitat  
26:29:00  
in munchen protein science corporation  
26:33:00  
dana-farber cancer institute  
26:35:00  
university of iowa university of hong  
26:38:00  
kong  
26:38:00  
chinese national genome human genome  
26:40:00  
center in  
26:41:00  
shanghai all identifying  
26:45:00  
in patent filings that ranged from  
26:49:00  
2008 until 2017

26:53:00  
26:53:00 every attribute that was allegedly  
26:57:00  
uniquely published  
26:59:00  
by the single reference publication the  
27:02:00  
novel bat coronavirus  
27:04:00  
reveals quote natural insertions at the  
27:07:00  
s1 s2  
27:08:00  
2 cleavage site of the spike protein and  
27:10:00  
possible recombinant 3 origin  
27:13:00  
of the cov2 virus the paper that has  
27:17:00  
been  
27:18:00  
routinely used to identify the novel  
27:22:00  
virus  
27:23:00  
unfortunately if you actually take what  
27:25:00  
they report to be novel  
27:27:00  
you find 73  
27:31:00  
patents issued between 2008  
27:34:00  
and 2019 which have  
27:38:00  
the elements that were allegedly novel  
27:43:00  
in the sars cov2  
27:46:00  
specifically as it relates to the poly  
27:49:00  
basic cleavage site  
27:51:00  
the h2 receptor binding domain and the

27:54:00

spike protein

27:56:00

so the clinically novel components

27:59:00

of the clinically unique clinically

28:03:00

contagious you know where i'm going with

28:07:00

this

28:09:00

28:09:00 okay there was no outbreak

28:12:00

of sars because

28:16:00

we had engineered all of the elements of

28:19:00

that

28:20:00

and by 2016

28:24:00

the paper that was funded during

28:27:00

28:27:00 the gain of function moratorium that

28:30:00

said that the sars coronavirus was

28:32:00

poised for human emergence

28:36:00

written by none other than ralph barrick

28:41:00

was not only poised for human emergence

28:44:00

but it was patented for commercial

28:46:00

exploitation

28:49:00

73 times

28:52:00

ralph barrack i think i saw a video clip

28:54:00

with him giving a speech in which he

28:56:00

explicitly told

28:58:00  
the audience that you can make a lot of  
28:59:00  
money with this  
29:01:00  
yes you can and he has made  
29:04:00  
a lot of money doing this oh  
29:09:00  
so for those who want to live  
29:12:00  
in the illusion that somehow or another  
29:16:00  
that's the end of the story be prepared  
29:19:00  
for  
29:20:00  
a greater disappointment because  
29:22:00  
somebody  
29:23:00  
knew something in 2015  
29:26:00

29:26:00 and 2016 which gave rise to my favorite  
29:30:00  
quote of this entire pandemic  
29:32:00  
and by that i'm not being cute my  
29:36:00  
**favorite quote of this pandemic**  
**29:38:00**  
**was a statement made in 2015**  
29:44:00  
**by peter dashik**  
29:48:00  
the statement that was made by peter  
29:51:00  
dashick in 2015  
29:52:00  
**reported in the national academies of**  
**29:55:00**  
**press publication**  
**29:56:00**  
**february 12 2016**

**30:00:00**

**and i'm quoting we need to**

**30:03:00**

**increase public understanding of the**

**30:05:00**

**need for medical**

**30:07:00**

**measures such as a pan corona virus**

**30:10:00**

**vaccine**

**30:12:00**

**a key driver is the media and the**

**30:15:00**

**economics will follow the hype**

**30:18:00**

**we need to use that hype to our**

**30:20:00**

**advantage**

**30:21:00**

**to get to the real issues**

**30:24:00**

**investors will respond if they see**

**30:27:00**

**profit**

**30:28:00**

**at the end of the process end quote**

**30:31:00**

that's quite shocking because i thought

**30:33:00**

let me let me just read that again just

**30:35:00**

because

**30:36:00**

i don't know if i might get lost in

**30:38:00**

translation so let me just go ahead and

**30:40:00**

read it

**30:41:00**

slowly yeah and as americans love to do

**30:44:00**

when speaking

**30:45:00**

to a multilingual audience maybe i

30:47:00

should say it louder

30:48:00

30:48:00 **i won't we need to increase**

**30:52:00**

**public understanding of the need for**

**30:55:00**

**medical countermeasures**

**30:57:00**

**such as a pan-coronavirus vaccine**

**31:01:00**

**a key driver is the media and the**

**31:04:00**

**economics will follow the hype**

**31:08:00**

**we need to use that hype to our**

**31:10:00**

**advantage**

**31:12:00**

**to get to the real issues investors**

**31:15:00**

**will respond if they see profit**

**31:18:00**

**at the end of the process end**

**31:21:00**

**quote**

31:26:00

that's really i mean peter doshi wasn't

31:28:00

31:28:00 **he the one who no no peter dashak**

31:30:00

oh

31:37:00

31:37:00 **the person who was independently**

**31:39:00**

**corroborating**

**31:40:00**

**the chinese non-lab leaked non-theory**

**31:44:00**

**because there wasn't**

**31:45:00**

**a lab leak this was an intentional**

**31:47:00**

**bioweaponization of spike proteins**

**31:50:00**

**to inject into people to get them**

**31:52:00**

**addicted to**

**31:53:00**

**a pan coronavirus vaccine**

**31:57:00**

**this has nothing to do with a pathogen**

**32:00:00**

**that was released and every study**

**32:03:00**

**that's ever been launched to try to**

**32:05:00**

**verify a lab leak**

**32:08:00**

**is a red herring and there's really**

**32:11:00**

**nothing that is new in this nothing**

**32:14:00**

**zero**

**32:17:00**

**73 patents on everything clinically**

**32:20:00**

**novel**

**32:21:00**

**73 all issued before 2019**

**32:25:00**

**32:25:00** and i'm going to give you the biggest

**32:27:00**

**bombshell of all to prove**

**32:29:00**

**that this was actually not a release of**

**32:31:00**

**anything because**

**32:33:00**

**patent 7279 327**

**32:38:00**

**the patent on the recombinant nature of**

**32:41:00**

**that**

**32:42:00**

**lung targeting coronavirus was**

**32:45:00**

**transferred mysteriously from the**

32:48:00  
university of north carolina chapel hill  
32:51:00  
to the national institutes of health in  
32:54:00  
2018  
32:56:00  
now here's the problem with that under  
33:00:00  
the buy dole act the u s government  
33:03:00  
already has what's called a march in  
33:05:00  
right provision  
33:06:00  
that means if the u s government has  
33:08:00  
paid for research they are entitled to  
33:10:00  
benefit from that research  
33:12:00  
at their demand or at their whim  
33:16:00  
so explain why in 2017 and 2018  
33:22:00  
suddenly the national institutes of  
33:24:00  
health have to take ownership  
33:27:00  
of the patent that they already had  
33:30:00  
rights to  
33:31:00  
held by the university of north carolina  
33:33:00  
chapel hill  
33:35:00  
and how did they need to file a  
33:37:00  
certificate of correction to make sure  
33:38:00  
that it was legally enforceable  
33:41:00  
because there was a typographical error



33:44:00

in the grant reference

33:45:00

in the first filing so they needed to

33:48:00

make sure that not only did they get it

33:49:00

right but they needed to make sure every

33:51:00

typographical error

33:53:00

that was contained in the patent was

33:55:00

correct on

33:56:00

the single patent required

34:01:00

to develop the vaccine research

34:02:00

institute's mandate

34:05:00

which was shared between the university

34:06:00

of north carolina chapel hill

34:08:00

in november of 2019

34:12:00

and moderna in november of 2019

34:17:00

when unc chapel hill niaid and moderna

34:21:00

began the sequencing of a spike protein

34:24:00

vaccine

34:28:00

a month before an outbreak ever happened

34:34:00

34:34:00 you you have all the evidence right

34:37:00

yeah so that's why my focal isn't it

34:42:00

i don't have to read it again no you

34:45:00

speaking german huh

34:47:00

yeah okay

34:50:00

34:50:00 so it's all about money it has always

34:52:00

been about money and just to answer a

34:54:00

question that was asked slightly earlier

34:57:00

34:57:00 the script for this was written first

35:01:00

january 6 2004

35:05:00

january 6 2004 who wrote the script

35:11:00

before a conference called sars

35:14:00

and bioterrorism

35:18:00

bioterrorism emerging infectious

35:20:00

diseases antimicrobials therapeutics and

35:22:00

immune modulators

35:24:00

merck introduced the notion of what they

35:27:00

called

35:28:00

the new normal

35:31:00

proper noun the new normal which is the

35:34:00

language that became the branded

35:36:00

campaign

35:37:00

that was adopted by the world health

35:38:00

organization

35:40:00

the global preparedness monitoring board

35:43:00

which was

35:44:00

the board upon which the chinese

35:46:00

director of center for disease control

35:50:00

bill gates's dr elias

35:53:00

of the gates foundation and anthony

35:56:00

fauci

35:56:00

sat together on that board of directors

36:00:00

but the the first introduction

36:03:00

**of the new normal campaign which was**

36:06:00

36:06:00 about getting people to accept

36:08:00

**a universal pan influenza pan**

36:11:00

coronavirus vaccine

36:13:00

was actually adopted january 6 2004

36:16:00

so it's been around

36:20:00

quite quite a long time

36:23:00

i'm not going to belabor many more

36:26:00

points other than to say

36:27:00

that it was very clear that merck

36:32:00

36:32:00 knew that sorry that moderna

36:36:00

knew that it was going to be placed in

36:38:00

the front of the line

36:40:00

with respect to the development of a

36:43:00

vaccine in march of 2019

36:48:00  
and this is a very important date  
36:51:00  
because in march of 2019  
36:54:00  
for reasons that are not transparent

36:58:00 they suddenly amended a series  
37:01:00  
of rejected patent filings which was a  
37:04:00  
very bizarre behavior  
37:06:00  
but they amended a number of patent  
37:08:00  
filings  
37:09:00  
to specifically make reference to  
37:13:00  
an intentional or accidental release  
37:17:00  
i'm sorry their term deliberate release  
37:20:00  
of coronavirus so  
37:23:00  
in march they amended four failed patent  
37:26:00  
applications  
37:29:00  
to begin the process  
37:32:00  
of a coronavirus vaccine development  
37:37:00  
and they began dealing with a very  
37:39:00  
significant  
37:40:00  
problem that they had which was they  
37:43:00  
relied on technology that they did not  
37:46:00  
own  
37:47:00  
two canadian companies arbutus

37:50:00

pharmaceuticals

37:51:00

and acuitous pharmaceuticals

37:55:00

actually own the patent on the lipid

37:57:00

nanoparticle envelope

38:00:00

that's required to deliver the injection

38:03:00

of the

38:04:00

mrna fragment and those patents have

38:08:00

been

38:08:00

issued both in canada and in the us and

38:10:00

then around the world in their

38:12:00

world intellectual property equivalents

38:15:00

38:15:00 moderna knew that they did not own the

38:17:00

rights and began

38:18:00

trying to negotiate with arbutus and

38:21:00

acuitis

38:22:00

to get the resolution of the lipid

38:25:00

nanoparticle patented technology

38:28:00

available to be put into a vaccine

38:32:00

and we know as i made reference to

38:34:00

before that in november

38:37:00

they entered into a research and

38:39:00

cooperative research and development

38:40:00

agreement

38:41:00

with unc chapel hill with respect

38:45:00

to getting the spike protein

38:49:00

to put inside of the lipid nanoparticle

38:52:00

so that they actually had a candidate

38:54:00

vaccine before we had

38:56:00

a pathogen allegedly that was running

38:59:00

around

39:00:00

39:00:00 what makes that story most problematic

39:03:00

beyond

39:03:00

the self-evident nature of it is that we

39:07:00

know that from 2016

39:10:00

until 2019

39:14:00

39:14:00 at every one of the niaid

39:17:00

advisory council board meetings

39:22:00

**anthony fauci lamented the fact that he**

39:25:00

**could not find a way to get**

39:26:00

**people to accept the universal influenza**

39:30:00

vaccine

39:31:00

which is what was his favorite target

39:34:00

he was trying to get the population to

39:38:00

engage in this process and what becomes

39:41:00  
very evident  
39:42:00  
with peter dashik uh eco health alliance  
39:45:00  
unc chapel hill and others  
39:47:00  
and then most specifically by march of  
39:50:00  
2019  
39:51:00  
in the amended patent filings of moderna  
39:55:00  
we see that there is a  
39:59:00  
epiphany that says what if there was an  
40:03:00  
accidental or an intentional release of  
40:05:00  
a respiratory pathogen  
40:07:00  
and what makes that particular phrase  
40:09:00  
problematic is it is exactly recited  
40:13:00  
in the book a world at risk which is  
40:16:00  
the scenario that was put together by  
40:19:00  
the world health organization in  
40:21:00  
september of 2019  
40:23:00  
so months before there's an alleged  
40:26:00  
pathogen  
40:28:00  
which says that we need to have a  
40:29:00  
coordinated global  
40:31:00  
experience of a

40:35:00  
respiratory pathogen release  
40:38:00  
which by september 2020 must  
40:42:00  
put in place a universal capacity  
40:46:00  
for public relations management crowd  
40:49:00  
control  
40:50:00  
and the acceptance of a universal  
40:53:00  
vaccine mandate  
40:55:00  
that was september of 2019  
40:58:00  
and the language of an intentional  
41:01:00  
release of a respiratory pathogen  
41:03:00  
was written into the scenario that quote  
41:06:00  
must be completed by september 2020

41:10:00  
41:10:00 this was the text where mrs brundtland  
41:13:00  
was heading this commission  
41:15:00  
isn't it well this is the global  
41:17:00  
preparedness monitoring board's  
41:19:00  
unified statement there there are a  
41:20:00  
number of people who have taken  
41:22:00  
credit and then backed away from credit  
41:24:00  
for it but yes you're right



41:26:00

41:26:00 am i right too when i say that also the

41:29:00

ac2

41:30:00

receptor that it was already

41:34:00

described in the patents before 2019

41:37:00

yes we have 117 patents with

41:40:00

specifically the ace2 receptor targeting

41:42:00

mechanism

41:43:00

for sars coronavirus

41:47:00

so because they always say this is the

41:49:00

new thing with the virus

41:50:00

no it's not new and it has not been even

41:53:00

remotely new it's in publications going

41:55:00

41:55:00 back to 2008

41:57:00

in the weaponization conferences that

41:59:00

took place

42:01:00

in slovenia in europe all across

42:04:00

europe and all across um the darpa

42:07:00

infrastructure

42:08:00

we've known about that since 2013

42:12:00

its isolation and amplification

42:16:00

and this um the amendment that merck did

42:18:00

to this the the rejected patterns

42:21:00  
applications so is was it only about the  
42:24:00  
fact that it's like deliberately  
42:26:00  
you know like um put into the  
42:28:00  
environment or something or did they add  
42:30:00  
anything else  
42:32:00  
well so these were fake there were four  
42:34:00  
failed patent applications  
42:36:00  
that were um essentially revitalized  
42:39:00  
in march of 2019  
42:42:00  
and it was moderna i misspoke i spoke  
42:44:00  
about merck it was moderna  
42:46:00  
and i tried to correct that i'm sorry  
42:48:00  
that that didn't come through  
42:49:00  
but it's moderna's patent applications  
42:51:00  
that were amended in march  
42:53:00  
of 2019 to include  
42:57:00  
the deliberate release of a respiratory  
42:59:00  
pathogen language  
43:01:00  
those had not been rejected for some  
43:04:00  
reason they were just  
43:05:00  
not they were just sitting there  
43:07:00  
basically no they

43:09:00  
they they do processes similar to other  
43:11:00  
pharmaceutical companies  
43:13:00  
where they ever green applications and  
43:15:00  
continually  
43:16:00  
modify modify applications to enjoy the  
43:20:00  
earliest priority dates available  
43:22:00  
but that's why you have to go back and  
43:24:00  
look at the amendment  
43:26:00  
of the application records to find out  
43:28:00  
when the actual amendment language was  
43:30:00  
put in place  
43:31:00  
but yes i mean the the fact of the  
43:33:00  
matter is um  
43:35:00  
and like i said i'm not going to belabor  
43:37:00  
all of the patent data but  
43:39:00  
43:39:00 but any assertion that this this  
43:43:00  
pathogen is somehow unique or novel  
43:47:00  
falls apart on the actual gene sequences  
43:50:00  
which are published in the patent record  
43:53:00  
and then more egregiously falls apart in  
43:56:00  
the fact  
43:56:00  
**that we have peter dashik himself**

43:58:00

stating that we have to create

44:01:00

**public hype to get the public to accept**

44:05:00

**the medical countermeasure of a pan**

44:07:00

**coronavirus vaccine**

44:09:00

and what makes that most ludicrous is

44:10:00

the fact that as we know world health

44:12:00

organization had declared coronavirus

44:15:00

um a a you know kind of a

44:19:00

44:19:00 **a dead a dead interest i mean they they**

**44:22:00**

**said that**

**44:22:00**

**that we had eradicated coronavirus as a**

**44:25:00**

**concern**

**44:26:00**

**so why having eradicated it in 2007 and**

**44:30:00**

**2008**

**44:31:00**

**why did we start spending billions of**

**44:34:00**

**dollars globally on a vaccine for a**

**44:36:00**

**thing that had been eradicated by**

**44:37:00**

**declaration in 2008**

44:40:00

um you know kind of kind of falls

44:44:00

into the zone of incredulity to say the

44:48:00

least doesn't that also mean if you if

44:51:00

you if you take the entirety of the

44:55:00  
evidence  
44:56:00  
then this is a tool the corona virus and  
44:58:00  
the vaccines  
45:00:00  
this is a tool and and the  
45:03:00  
interest of darpa in creating a  
45:05:00  
biological weapon out of this  
45:07:00  
this is a tool for everything else that  
45:10:00  
latches on to this  
45:11:00  
including um  
45:14:00  
population control for example well  
45:17:00  
listen this  
45:18:00  
this we we have to stop falling for even  
45:21:00  
the mainstream  
45:22:00  
narrative in our own line of questioning  
45:25:00  
um  
45:25:00  
because the fact of the matter is this  
45:27:00  
was seen as a  
45:29:00  
highly malleable bio weapon  
45:33:00  
there is no question that by 2005 it was  
45:37:00  
unquestionably a weapon of choice  
45:41:00  
and the illusion that we continue to  
45:44:00  
to unfortunately see very well-meaning

45:47:00  
people  
45:48:00  
get trapped in is conversations about  
45:52:00  
whether we're having a vaccine for a  
45:53:00  
virus the fact of the matter is we're  
45:55:00  
not  
45:56:00  
we are injecting a spike protein mrna  
46:00:00  
secret  
46:01:00  
mrna sequence which is a computer  
46:03:00  
simulation  
46:04:00  
it's not derived from nature it's a  
46:06:00  
computer simulation  
46:08:00  
of a sequence which has been known and  
46:12:00  
patented for years and what we know  
46:15:00  
is that that sequence as reported is  
46:18:00  
reported across  
46:19:00  
things like you know the very reliable  
46:22:00  
phone conversations that took place  
46:24:00  
between  
46:24:00  
moderna and the vaccine research center  
46:27:00  
by self  
46:28:00  
report where i don't know if you were on  
46:30:00  
a phone call and you heard a t

46:32:00

t c c g g t t c c g

46:35:00

a b b b you know is there any chance you

46:37:00

might get

46:38:00

a a a letter a val or a consonant

46:41:00

dropped here or there

46:42:00

the the the ludicrous nature of the

46:46:00

story that this is somehow prophylactic

46:50:00

or preventative flies in the face of a

46:53:00

hundred percent of the evidence because

46:55:00

the evidence makes it abundantly clear

46:57:00

that there has been no effort by any

46:59:00

pharmaceutical company

47:01:00

to combat the virus

47:04:00

this is about getting people injected

47:07:00

with the known to be harmful

47:11:00

s1 spike protein so

47:15:00

the the cover story is that if you get

47:17:00

an expression of a spike protein

47:20:00

you're going to have some sort of

47:21:00

general symptomatic relief

47:24:00

but the fact of the matter is there has

47:26:00

never been an

47:27:00  
intent to vaccinate a population as  
47:30:00  
defined by  
47:32:00  
the vaccination universe and and it's  
47:34:00  
important  
47:35:00  
i mean let's let's review just for the  
47:37:00  
record  
47:39:00  
when anthony fauci tried desperately  
47:42:00  
to get some of his quote synthetic rna  
47:46:00  
vaccines published he had his own  
47:49:00  
patents rejected by the patent office  
47:53:00  
and i want to read what the patent  
47:56:00  
office  
47:56:00  
told him when niaid's  
48:00:00  
own anthony fauci thought that he could  
48:02:00  
get an mrna-like  
48:05:00  
vaccine patented as a vaccine  
48:09:00  
and here's the quote these arguments are  
48:13:00  
persuasive to the extent that an  
48:15:00  
antigenic peptide stimulates an immune  
48:18:00  
response  
48:19:00  
that may produce antibodies that bind to  
48:21:00  
a specific peptide or protein



48:23:00  
but it is not persuasive in regards to a  
48:26:00  
vaccine  
48:28:00  
okay this is the patent office this is  
48:30:00  
not some sort of public health agency  
48:32:00  
this is the patent office  
48:34:00  
the immune response produced by a  
48:36:00  
vaccine must  
48:38:00  
be more than merely some immune response  
48:41:00  
but must also be protective as  
48:45:00  
noted in the previous office action the  
48:47:00  
art recognizes the term vaccine  
48:49:00  
to be a compound which prevents  
48:52:00  
infection  
48:54:00  
applicant has not demonstrated that the  
48:58:00  
instantly claimed vaccine meets even the  
49:01:00  
lower standard set forth in the  
49:02:00  
specification  
49:04:00  
let alone the standard definition for  
49:06:00  
being operative  
49:07:00  
in regards therefore claims five  
49:10:00  
seven and nine are not operative as the  
49:13:00  
anti-hiv vaccine which is what he was

49:15:00  
working on  
49:17:00  
is not patentable utility  
49:20:00  
so so anthony fauci himself was told by  
49:24:00  
the patent office themselves  
49:26:00  
that what he was proposing as a vaccine  
49:29:00  
does  
49:30:00  
not meet the patentable standard the  
49:32:00  
legal standard or the clinical standard  
49:37:00  
i know that david i know a lot of our  
49:40:00  
viewers are really shocked i can see  
49:42:00  
that from the responses one of  
49:44:00  
our viewers is uh our pcr test  
49:46:00  
specialist  
49:47:00  
professor camera she can't believe  
49:51:00  
what's going on here  
49:53:00  
well um here here's  
49:57:00  
this the sad and sober irony  
50:00:00  
is that i raised these issues beginning  
50:03:00  
in 2002  
50:07:00  
after the anthrax scare  
50:11:00  
and the tragedy is we are now  
50:14:00  
sitting in a world where we have

50:17:00  
hundreds of millions of people  
50:19:00  
who are being injected with a pathogen  
50:22:00  
stimulating  
50:24:00  
computer sequence which is being  
50:28:00  
sold under what the patent office  
50:31:00  
what the medical profession and what the  
50:34:00  
fda in its own clinical standards  
50:38:00  
would not suggest is a vaccine but by  
50:41:00  
using the term  
50:43:00  
we actually are now subjecting hundreds  
50:46:00  
of millions of people  
50:48:00  
to what was known to be by 2005  
50:52:00  
a biological  
51:46:00  
so i have i obviously have hundreds of  
51:49:00  
hours of  
51:50:00  
of this stuff committed to memory  
51:51:00  
because i've been doing it for two  
51:53:00  
decades but  
51:54:00  
if you have any questions i'd be happy  
51:55:00  
to answer them  
51:57:00  
there i'm sure they're going to be  
51:58:00  
hundreds of questions david

52:00:00  
we're going to be in touch i think  
52:02:00  
you're going to be flooded by people  
52:04:00  
by people's uh emails etc i'm just going  
52:07:00  
to forward  
52:07:00  
what comes in or we're going to forward  
52:09:00  
what comes in but i do think  
52:12:00  
but oh yeah we have martin schwab he  
52:14:00  
probably has  
52:15:00  
has a really serious question  
52:18:00  
and after me uh wolfgang too okay  
52:22:00  
uh um i'm a legal professor with the  
52:25:00  
faculty of law here in budapest and uh  
52:30:00  
um  
52:32:00  
uh i have to tell you that  
52:35:00  
the constitutional protection unit  
52:39:00  
of the ministry of interior affairs  
52:43:00  
observes the so-called corona denial  
52:46:00  
scene  
52:47:00  
uh corona denier is everyone who dares  
52:50:00  
to uh disagree to the  
52:54:00  
uh with the official line  
52:58:00  
with the official line yes um

53:02:00  
if this constitutional protection unit  
53:06:00  
takes notice of me taking part in  
53:09:00  
discussion  
53:10:00  
that this pandemic was put on  
53:14:00  
stage intentionally  
53:17:00  
they will probably try to fire me from  
53:20:00  
my job  
53:20:00  
so i have to at least ask some questions  
53:26:00  
while i heard you talking i am  
53:31:00  
i took a look at patent number um  
53:35:00  
what's which one was it uh  
53:40:00  
72208 five two  
53:43:00  
and seven uh one five one one six three  
53:47:00  
and uh uh seven  
53:50:00  
two two o eight five two was filed in  
53:53:00  
12-Apr  
53:54:00  
and 715 and so on was filed in  
53:58:00  
april 28 of 2004 i see a difference  
54:01:00  
between  
54:02:00  
16 not three days what did i  
54:04:00  
misunderstand  
54:06:00  
now april 23rd 2003 was the cdc

54:10:00  
master filing date okay okay

54:14:00  
uh i asked this question because uh

54:18:00  
if they um try to make me redundant for

54:22:00  
my job i have to provide strong evidence

54:24:00  
now we have all of this sent

54:28:00  
to um i know uh

54:31:00  
dr flumix has the um has the entire

54:35:00  
record

54:36:00  
in um the fouchy dossier 100

54:39:00  
of this record is in there um the

54:41:00  
additional addendum that i sent across

54:43:00  
all has the records in there including

54:46:00  
all the priority filing dates as well as

54:49:00  
the issue dates so 100

54:51:00  
of this is in written published records

54:53:00  
and you have the written records

54:55:00  
okay i have created my own file and it's

54:58:00  
labeled david martin

55:00:00  
okay okay okay

55:03:00  
um there's a i did a analysis of media

55:07:00  
reportings here

55:08:00  
uh and i can um confirm that

55:11:00  
they give a very one-sided account uh on  
55:14:00  
uh  
55:16:00  
on the pandemic uh everyone who dares to  
55:19:00  
declare  
55:20:00  
uh the threat uh less dangerous than uh  
55:24:00  
the government does will be uh denounced  
55:26:00  
as conspiracy theorists as tin foil and  
55:28:00  
so on  
55:29:00  
you know so the media exactly did what  
55:32:00  
you  
55:33:00  
pointed out in the sentence you  
55:36:00  
you you repeated twice uh before no  
55:40:00  
uh actually uh they tell us the story of  
55:43:00  
the delta variant  
55:45:00  
which is told to be much more contagious  
55:48:00  
that  
55:50:00  
everything else um experts i  
55:53:00  
have spoken to told me that  
55:56:00  
uh the databases uh contain uh  
56:00:00  
as many as more or 40 000 virus strains  
56:04:00  
so could this could this delta variant  
56:08:00  
uh uh be uh um

56:11:00  
some kind of media have you told us  
56:13:00  
about before  
56:15:00  
there there is no such thing as an alpha  
56:18:00  
or a beta or gamma delta variant  
56:21:00  
this is a this is a means by which  
56:25:00  
what is desperately sought  
56:29:00  
a degree to which individuals can be  
56:33:00  
coerced  
56:34:00  
into accepting something that they would  
56:36:00  
not otherwise accept  
56:38:00  
there has not been in  
56:41:00  
any of the published studies on what has  
56:44:00  
been reportedly the delta variant  
56:46:00  
there has not been a population  
56:49:00  
are not calculated which is the actual  
56:52:00  
replication rate  
56:54:00  
what has been estimated are computer  
56:57:00  
simulations  
56:59:00  
but unfortunately if you look at  
57:02:00  
GIS aid which is the public  
57:06:00  
source of uploading any one  
57:09:00  
of a number of variations what you'll



57:12:00  
find  
57:12:00  
is that there has been no ability to  
57:15:00  
identify  
57:17:00  
any clinically altered  
57:20:00  
gene sequence which has then a  
57:23:00  
clinically expressed  
57:24:00  
variation and this is the problem all  
57:27:00  
along this is the problem going back to  
57:29:00  
the very beginning of what's alleged to  
57:31:00  
be a pandemic  
57:33:00  
is we do not have any evidence that the  
57:36:00  
gene sequence alteration had any  
57:39:00  
clinical significance whatsoever there  
57:42:00  
has not been a  
57:43:00  
single paper published by anyone  
57:46:00  
that has actually established that  
57:49:00  
anything  
57:49:00  
novel since november of 2019  
57:53:00  
has clinical distinction from anything  
57:57:00  
that predates november of 2019  
58:00:00  
the problem with the 73 patents that i  
58:03:00  
described

58:04:00  
is that those 73 patents all contain  
58:08:00  
what was reported to be novel  
58:12:00  
in december and january of 2019 and 2020  
58:15:00  
respectively  
58:17:00  
so the problem is that even if we were  
58:20:00  
to  
58:21:00  
accept that there are idiopathic  
58:25:00  
pneumonias even if we were to accept  
58:29:00  
that there are some set of  
58:32:00  
pathogen-induced  
58:34:00  
symptoms we do not have  
58:36:00  
a single piece of published evidence  
58:39:00  
that tells us  
58:40:00  
that anything about the subclade sars  
58:43:00  
cov2 has  
58:44:00  
clinical distinction from anything that  
58:47:00  
was known and published prior to  
58:49:00  
Nov-19  
58:51:00  
in 73 patents dating  
58:54:00  
to 2008.  
58:58:00  
but could it be that the delta variant  
59:01:00  
sort of

59:01:00  
is that just the difference is you know  
59:03:00  
that the clinical symptoms are the same  
59:05:00  
but that it has the  
59:06:00  
the you know the capability of like um  
59:10:00  
infecting someone who'd already gone  
59:12:00  
who's already gone through  
59:14:00  
like variant b better well  
59:17:00  
so so this is where we see an enormous  
59:20:00  
amount  
59:20:00  
of response and reflexive behavior  
59:24:00  
to media hype  
59:28:00  
there is no and i'm going to repeat this  
59:31:00  
there is no evidence that the delta  
59:34:00  
variant  
59:35:00  
is somehow distinct from anything else  
59:38:00  
on gis aid  
59:42:00  
the fact that we are now looking for a  
59:44:00  
thing doesn't mean that it is a thing  
59:46:00  
because we are looking at fragments of  
59:49:00  
things  
59:50:00  
and the fact is that if we choose any  
59:53:00  
fragment

59:53:00  
i could come up with you know i could  
59:56:00  
come up with  
59:57:00  
variant tomorrow yes  
60:01:00  
and i could come up with variant omega  
60:03:00  
and i could say i'm looking for this  
60:05:00  
sub strand of either dna or rna  
60:10:00  
or even a protein and i could run around  
60:14:00  
the world  
60:14:00  
going oh my gosh fear the omega variant  
60:17:00  
yes and and the problem is that  
60:21:00  
because of the nature of the way in  
60:24:00  
which  
60:24:00  
we currently sequence genomes  
60:27:00  
which is actually a compositing process  
60:30:00  
it's what we'd call in mathematics and  
60:33:00  
interleaving  
60:34:00  
we don't have any point of reference to  
60:38:00  
actually know whether or not the thing  
60:39:00  
we're looking at  
60:40:00  
is in fact distinct from either clinical  
60:44:00  
or even genomic sense and so  
60:47:00  
we're trapped in a world where

60:50:00  
unfortunately  
60:51:00  
if you go and look as i have at the  
60:54:00  
papers that  
60:54:00  
isolated the delta variant and actually  
60:58:00  
asked the question  
60:59:00  
is the delta variant anything other than  
61:02:00  
the selection of a sequence  
61:06:00  
in a systematic shift of an already  
61:09:00  
disclosed  
61:10:00  
other sequence the answer is it's just  
61:14:00  
an alteration in when you start and stop  
61:17:00  
what you call the reading frame  
61:19:00  
there is no novel anything  
61:22:00  
yes wolfgang i'll make a  
61:25:00  
long story very short he's he's in full  
61:28:00  
agreement with your  
61:29:00  
analysis he understands your anguish  
61:33:00  
with respect to you having told the  
61:36:00  
world about this uh  
61:38:00  
20 years ago almost and he admires your  
61:41:00  
tenacity and he's extremely grateful  
61:45:00  
for you having taken this very close

61:47:00  
look  
61:48:00  
at the problem through patent law  
61:53:00  
it's dr vodak  
61:57:00  
believes that patents are really  
61:59:00  
problematic  
62:00:00  
because it turns out that it is probably  
62:04:00  
five times more expensive to patent  
62:07:00  
drugs as opposed to having  
62:10:00  
public i mean not public private but  
62:13:00  
public  
62:14:00  
universities uh getting the stipends  
62:17:00  
getting the money that they need in  
62:18:00  
order to develop these  
62:20:00  
vaccines yeah let me i'm going to do  
62:23:00  
something that's very  
62:24:00  
unfair but i'm going to hold the  
62:26:00  
document very close to the screen  
62:29:00  
and it's only for representational  
62:31:00  
purposes but i want you to see that this  
62:33:00  
this is  
62:34:00  
this is the um this is the barrack  
62:37:00  
patent that

62:38:00  
that um that  
62:41:00  
nih needed to have returned to them for  
62:44:00  
mysterious reasons in 2018 this is seven  
62:46:00  
to and people can look this up on their  
62:50:00  
own  
62:51:00  
but if you actually look at the the  
62:53:00  
sequences that are patented  
62:55:00  
which is one of the things that we've  
62:56:00  
done  
62:58:00  
we actually look at um the published  
63:00:00  
sequences and realize that depending on  
63:03:00  
where you clip  
63:04:00  
the actual sequence string  
63:07:00  
you will have the same thing or you'll  
63:09:00  
have a different thing based  
63:10:00  
nothing more than on where you decide to  
63:13:00  
parse  
63:14:00  
the clip and and i want to i want to  
63:17:00  
read you  
63:17:00  
i mean this is something that comes  
63:20:00  
directly  
63:21:00  
from their patent application when they

63:24:00  
actually  
63:24:00  
talk about the dna strands which they  
63:27:00  
call sequence  
63:28:00  
id numbers they actually specifically  
63:31:00  
say the organism  
63:33:00  
is an artificial sequence  
63:36:00  
an artificial sequence meaning that it  
63:38:00  
is not a sequence that has a  
63:40:00  
rule base in nature it is not something  
63:43:00  
that was manifest  
63:45:00  
for a particular natural derivative  
63:48:00  
protein or natural derivative mrna  
63:50:00  
sequence that was isolated  
63:52:00  
every one of these is in fact  
63:55:00  
a synthetic artificial sequence  
63:59:00  
and if you go back and you look at each  
64:01:00  
one of them which we have done  
64:03:00  
what you'll find is that the sequences  
64:05:00  
in fact are contiguous  
64:07:00  
in many instances but are overlapping in  
64:10:00  
others  
64:12:00  
where it is merely a caprice



64:14:00  
determination  
64:16:00  
that says something is or is not part of  
64:18:00  
an open reading frame or it  
64:20:00  
is or is not part of a  
64:24:00  
particular oligonucleide sequence now  
64:27:00  
the reason why that's important  
64:29:00  
is because if we are going to examine  
64:34:00  
what ultimately is being injected into  
64:36:00  
individuals  
64:38:00  
we need the exact sequence  
64:42:00  
not a kind of similar  
64:45:00  
two we need the exact sequence  
64:49:00  
and if you look at the fda's requirement  
64:54:00  
and if you look at the european  
64:55:00  
regulatory environment and if you look  
64:57:00  
at the rest of the world's regulatory  
64:58:00  
environment  
65:00:00  
for reasons that cannot be explained the  
65:03:00  
exact sequence  
65:05:00  
that has gone into what is amplified  
65:08:00  
inside of the injection seems to be  
65:12:00  
elusive it seems to be something that

65:15:00  
someone cannot  
65:17:00  
in fact state with a hundred percent  
65:21:00  
the sequence is x  
65:25:00  
the problem that that presents is that  
65:27:00  
at this point in time  
65:28:00  
as much as we can be told that there are  
65:32:00  
you know clinical trials going on and  
65:33:00  
there are all sorts of other things  
65:35:00  
going on we have no way of verifying  
65:38:00  
that a complete sequence  
65:41:00  
has been is or potentially even could be  
65:45:00  
[Music]  
65:47:00  
manufactured into what ultimately  
65:50:00  
becomes  
65:51:00  
the lipid nanoparticle that is is the  
65:54:00  
carrier  
65:55:00  
frequency into which the injection is is  
65:57:00  
delivered  
65:58:00  
and it's important for people to  
66:00:00  
understand that as far back as 2002  
66:03:00  
and all the way through the patent  
66:05:00  
filings of 2003

66:06:00  
and then the weaponization patents that  
66:09:00  
began in 2008  
66:11:00  
in every one of these instances  
66:14:00  
fragments are identified  
66:15:00  
but they are identified without  
66:18:00  
specificity  
66:19:00  
so we don't have direct terminal ends of  
66:23:00  
the fragments we have  
66:24:00  
fragments which have you know  
66:26:00  
essentially  
66:28:00  
hypothecated gaps into which anything  
66:32:00  
can be placed and that's the reason why  
66:34:00  
i find  
66:36:00  
the fact checking around the patent  
66:38:00  
situation to be most  
66:40:00  
disappointing because  
66:43:00  
the reason why fact checkers  
66:47:00  
among their general lazy attributes the  
66:49:00  
reason why fact  
66:51:00  
checkers are not actually checking facts  
66:53:00  
when it comes to the patent matters  
66:56:00  
is because the actual sequences

67:00:00  
are not represented in a digital form  
67:03:00  
that makes it easy to do this comparison  
67:06:00  
we literally had to take images of  
67:10:00  
submitted typed paper  
67:13:00  
and then code those in to do our own  
67:16:00  
assessment you cannot do this  
67:19:00  
on the epos patent site you cannot do  
67:21:00  
this with  
67:22:00  
wipo data from geneva you cannot do this  
67:24:00  
with the u.s patent office data  
67:26:00  
you actually have to go in and  
67:28:00  
reconstruct  
67:30:00  
the actual gene sequences by hand and  
67:32:00  
then you compare them  
67:34:00  
to what has been uploaded on the public  
67:36:00  
servers and that's where you find  
67:39:00  
that the question of novelty is  
67:41:00  
something that was not addressed  
67:42:00  
this was a manufactured illusion  
67:46:00  
i had one more question is it possible  
67:50:00  
that we have we see  
67:51:00  
that the the influencer has has vanished

67:55:00  
is gone we don't have influenza anymore  
67:59:00  
the influenza for sure is the viruses  
68:01:00  
are also sequenced  
68:03:00  
and is it possible that those that those  
68:06:00  
parts sequences we now speak about  
68:09:00  
that they may they may exist in in both  
68:12:00  
of  
68:13:00  
the virus types so that it's just  
68:16:00  
a matter of testing and matter of  
68:19:00  
instruments to observe  
68:20:00  
what we find whether we find influenza  
68:22:00  
or whether we find  
68:23:00  
corona if we if we have a certain if you  
68:26:00  
have a book  
68:27:00  
you have a word with with five letters  
68:30:00  
and you will find this  
68:31:00  
five letters in many books right exactly  
68:34:00  
and  
68:35:00  
yeah yeah wolfgang your question is is a  
68:38:00  
beautiful metaphor  
68:40:00  
of exactly the problem the problem is  
68:43:00  
if what we're looking for is something

68:46:00  
we've decided  
68:47:00  
we've decided is worth looking for  
68:50:00  
then we'll find it and the good news is  
68:53:00  
we'll find it a bunch of places  
68:55:00  
and if we've decided that we're no  
68:56:00  
longer looking for a thing  
68:58:00  
it's not entirely surprising that we  
69:00:00  
don't find it because we're not looking  
69:02:00  
for it  
69:04:00  
the fact of the matter is whether it's  
69:05:00  
the rtPCR tests that we  
69:07:00  
decided that there are fragments which  
69:09:00  
by the way  
69:11:00  
i have looked at every one of the  
69:13:00  
regulatory submissions  
69:16:00  
that has been submitted to the fda  
69:19:00  
to try to figure out what was the gold  
69:21:00  
standard  
69:23:00  
to get the emergency use authorization  
69:27:00  
and what fragment of sars cov2 was  
69:30:00  
officially the official fragment that  
69:32:00  
was the comparator standard

69:35:00  
and the problem is that you can't get a  
69:38:00  
single standard  
69:41:00  
so the question becomes in a world where  
69:44:00  
there is no single standard  
69:47:00  
what is it that you actually find  
69:50:00  
because  
69:50:00  
if i'm looking for and why don't i just  
69:53:00  
read this  
69:54:00  
if i'm looking for c c a c g c  
69:57:00  
t t t g  
70:01:00  
do i add the next strand g or do i go no  
70:04:00  
no no the next bit is  
70:06:00  
g t t t a g t t c g  
70:09:00  
and you get the point the point is that  
70:11:00  
where i choose to start and stop  
70:14:00  
i can actually say i found it oh i  
70:16:00  
didn't find it  
70:17:00  
yeah and and i didn't find  
70:21:00  
the match that i projected onto the data  
70:25:00  
because i chose to look at the data in a  
70:28:00  
way that i could not find the match  
70:31:00  
influenza did not leave the human

70:33:00  
population  
70:36:00  
influenza was a failed decade-long  
70:41:00  
pan-influenza vaccine mandate that was  
70:44:00  
desperately desperately desperately  
70:47:00  
promoted by governments around the world  
70:49:00  
they failed and they decided if  
70:52:00  
influenza doesn't deliver  
70:54:00  
on the public promise of getting  
70:56:00  
everybody to get an  
70:58:00  
injection let's change the pathogen  
71:03:00  
there are many more they can change oh  
71:05:00  
goodness we've got tons more to come  
71:08:00  
yes but now we're on to them  
71:11:00  
i would like to to tell you something  
71:13:00  
about this development of the  
71:14:00  
the the drosten pcr test you know  
71:18:00  
because we  
71:18:00  
looked at it i mean just briefly not to  
71:20:00  
that extent that you now  
71:22:00  
looked at the patterns that you just  
71:25:00  
described but we looked at this kind of  
71:27:00  
miracle or like i mean strange aspect of



71:29:00  
like the the drosten  
71:31:00  
um test development because he  
71:34:00  
um in in despite the fact that he would  
71:38:00  
have  
71:38:00  
needed to basically through his employer  
71:40:00  
the charity who would be entitled to  
71:43:00  
holding the patents on this  
71:45:00  
this uh you know his invention um he  
71:48:00  
just published the instruction  
71:50:00  
to the vehicle so everyone could see it  
71:52:00  
so basically the the whole invention  
71:54:00  
lost its uh you know deca uh the  
71:57:00  
possibility to be patented and that's  
71:59:00  
kind of strange you know when you look  
72:01:00  
at it so we asked the charity  
72:03:00  
in a freedom of information act  
72:06:00  
request and so they they said well  
72:10:00  
um you know because it there was so much  
72:12:00  
uh rush  
72:13:00  
to get get the um you know this um the  
72:15:00  
test out because there was this uh  
72:18:00  
pandemic going on so it was like we

72:20:00  
didn't look at the finances you know we  
72:22:00  
just didn't care  
72:23:00  
so that's kind of strange as a as a  
72:25:00  
procedure because i mean  
72:27:00  
basically this this test is worth worth  
72:29:00  
like  
72:30:00  
uh billions you know how could you just  
72:32:00  
i mean this is a publicly financed  
72:35:00  
hospital how can they just give you know  
72:39:00  
give away all this this whole thing and  
72:42:00  
then because he was also in close  
72:43:00  
cooperation with the private company tip  
72:45:00  
mulbiol  
72:46:00  
it's the same with hi with which he had  
72:48:00  
developed all  
72:50:00  
the pcr tests from 2002 from the first  
72:53:00  
size and the mass sticker and so on and  
72:55:00  
so on  
72:56:00  
um so it's very strange you know because  
72:58:00  
he was basically like  
73:00:00  
functioning as a door opener for this  
73:03:00  
company

73:04:00  
you know because they also said to us um  
73:06:00  
so basically  
73:07:00  
um it was justin who decided to which um  
73:11:00  
possible country or like uh laboratory  
73:14:00  
or whatever  
73:15:00  
the test uh this you know tip mulberry  
73:17:00  
oil company would send out  
73:19:00  
the uh the test kits in order to then of  
73:21:00  
course make more money because  
73:23:00  
he was basically like he had a first  
73:25:00  
mover advantage  
73:26:00  
you know trust and or this company so  
73:29:00  
it's clear now i mean maybe there was  
73:31:00  
nothing  
73:32:00  
at that point because there was so many  
73:34:00  
patterns already going on so  
73:35:00  
basically from this not novel virus or  
73:39:00  
pcr test he couldn't patent anything  
73:42:00  
that would have been new  
73:43:00  
so basically was really like a a very  
73:45:00  
logical to  
73:46:00  
thing to do then to to use the whole

73:49:00  
thing as a  
73:50:00  
just to you know make um uh  
73:53:00  
profit from this first mover advantage  
73:55:00  
and maybe justin is  
73:56:00  
somehow involved in this whole legal  
73:59:00  
he's one of the most important people in  
74:01:00  
this scheme because he's the one who's  
74:03:00  
whose strings they pulled first yeah you  
74:06:00  
need you need to create the illusion of  
74:08:00  
demand  
74:10:00  
and there is nothing right now that does  
74:13:00  
a better job of creating the illusion of  
74:14:00  
demand  
74:16:00  
than the urgency of  
74:19:00  
an event that you've manufactured  
74:21:00  
[Laughter]  
74:27:00  
this sounds almost like comedy but it is  
74:29:00  
not  
74:31:00  
well it it it is in that  
74:34:00  
we we have to realize that part of the  
74:37:00  
reason why it was so  
74:38:00  
easy for us to monitor and track this

74:41:00  
particular  
74:42:00  
you know campaign of coercion and terror  
74:46:00  
was because we've done it before  
74:49:00  
you know i i started my comments by  
74:51:00  
making sure people remember that  
74:54:00  
when it came to solving for  
74:57:00  
the anthrax outbreak  
75:00:00  
now remember that while we had  
75:03:00  
hundreds of thousands of military people  
75:06:00  
in the middle east  
75:07:00  
allegedly getting even for the events of  
75:10:00  
september of 2001  
75:13:00  
we had two postal inspectors  
75:15:00  
investigating anthrax  
75:17:00  
two the largest alleged bioweapons  
75:21:00  
attack  
75:21:00  
on u.s soil and we had two postal  
75:24:00  
inspectors  
75:26:00  
you can't genuinely believe that two  
75:29:00  
postal inspectors  
75:31:00  
are the you know the crime stopping  
75:35:00  
you know mind mind

75:38:00  
you know bendingly powerful individuals  
75:40:00  
in the universe now i have nothing  
75:41:00  
against postal inspectors  
75:43:00  
but but i can guarantee you that if i  
75:46:00  
was investigating a bioterror attack  
75:48:00  
i would not have the post office having  
75:51:00  
two postal inspectors  
75:53:00  
as their crack team doing the  
75:56:00  
investigation  
75:58:00  
um you know it was disingenuous and  
76:02:00  
congress knew it  
76:03:00  
and that's the reason why you know we  
76:06:00  
we publish a thing that's that that  
76:09:00  
is not necessarily a bestseller but  
76:12:00  
we publish an intelligence briefing on  
76:14:00  
every violation of the biological and  
76:17:00  
chemical weapons treaties that people  
76:18:00  
have signed around the world  
76:20:00  
and it's a phone book that tells you  
76:23:00  
where and who and  
76:24:00  
who's funding and and and  
76:28:00  
so for us it wasn't hard to figure out

76:31:00  
that this was not  
76:33:00  
a public health crisis this was an  
76:36:00  
opportunistic marketing campaign to  
76:39:00  
address  
76:40:00  
a stated objective and that's why this  
76:43:00  
is occam's razor  
76:45:00  
it's the easiest thing to describe  
76:47:00  
because they're the ones that said it  
76:50:00  
and the occam's razor reality is they  
76:52:00  
said they needed to get the public to  
76:55:00  
accept  
76:56:00  
a pan coronavirus vaccine counter  
76:58:00  
measure  
77:00:00  
and they needed the media to create the  
77:02:00  
hype and  
77:03:00  
investors would follow where they see  
77:06:00  
profit  
77:07:00  
you do not have anything else you need  
77:10:00  
to rely on  
77:11:00  
to explain the events of the last 20  
77:13:00  
months  
77:14:00  
then the actual statement of the actual

77:18:00  
perpetrator  
77:19:00  
and i don't do the naval gazing exercise  
77:22:00  
of going in to try to understand whether  
77:24:00  
there were mommy issues behind a bank  
77:26:00  
robber  
77:27:00  
if they're holding a bag of money  
77:29:00  
outside of a bank  
77:31:00  
i actually make the crazy assumption  
77:34:00  
that maybe they're a bank robber  
77:37:00  
similarly if i have somebody who says  
77:40:00  
we need to use the media to hype a metal  
77:43:00  
medical countermeasure which is in fact  
77:46:00  
the injection of a synthetic recombinant  
77:50:00  
chimeric protein developed off of a  
77:53:00  
computer simulation  
77:56:00  
if i'm actually going to listen to the  
77:58:00  
motivation for why that might be being  
78:00:00  
done  
78:01:00  
i will listen to the person doing the  
78:03:00  
manipulation  
78:05:00  
who says investors will follow where  
78:07:00  
they see profit



78:09:00  
i don't need more explanation me neither  
78:15:00  
okay this is uh  
78:19:00  
mind-boggling i'm i'm really glad david  
78:22:00  
that  
78:22:00  
we spoke a couple of months ago maybe  
78:24:00  
three three four months  
78:26:00  
ago um and uh we were introduced to each  
78:30:00  
other by  
78:31:00  
um david i'm i'm sorry um  
78:34:00  
james henry right and i was  
78:37:00  
trying to find  
78:40:00  
patent lawyers in this country who might  
78:43:00  
be interested in this case  
78:45:00  
now there are a few patent lawyers who  
78:47:00  
understand about it but there's  
78:49:00  
no one apparently up till now but maybe  
78:51:00  
this is going to change  
78:53:00  
uh but there was no one willing to  
78:56:00  
tackle this  
78:57:00  
in the context of corona that's the  
78:59:00  
problem  
79:00:00  
but this is not new i've tried to find

79:03:00  
such a lawyer too

79:04:00  
specialized on patents for the

79:06:00  
commission for the german bundestag

79:09:00  
some 10 years ago of more than 15 years

79:11:00  
ago

79:12:00  
and we did not find because they were

79:14:00  
all afraid to be critical on the system

79:16:00  
yes they wouldn't be they would be

79:18:00  
distracted they would destroy their

79:19:00  
own job this was very difficult yeah

79:22:00  
bear in mind bear in mind that this is

79:25:00  
an old problem

79:26:00  
uh uh because the

79:30:00  
here's here's where the problem comes in

79:32:00  
ever since the establishment of the

79:34:00  
european patent office

79:36:00  
the germans and the french not

79:38:00  
surprisingly

79:40:00  
have maintained animosity that has

79:43:00  
you know been just this newest version

79:45:00  
of

79:46:00  
of animosity that goes back centuries

79:49:00  
but when when the epo was set up  
79:54:00  
the role of the patent office in munich  
79:58:00  
became a very nationalistic  
80:01:00  
issue for germany and the notion  
80:05:00  
that german patent examiners and german  
80:08:00  
patent professionals  
80:09:00  
still enjoyed supremacy over the rest of  
80:12:00  
europe  
80:13:00  
became dogmatic in 2003 and 2004 when  
80:18:00  
the european patent office was first  
80:20:00  
audited by my organization  
80:22:00  
and where we showed that somewhere  
80:24:00  
between 20 and 30 percent of the patents  
80:26:00  
in europe  
80:27:00  
were functional forgeries meaning that  
80:29:00  
they were copied from  
80:31:00  
previous patents the the german  
80:35:00  
representation of the european patent  
80:37:00  
office  
80:38:00  
lost their mind at the notion that they  
80:41:00  
were doing anything remotely wrong  
80:43:00  
when the european union commissioned us

80:46:00  
to do an examination  
80:48:00  
into software patents a few years later  
80:52:00  
at the request of the swedish delegation  
80:54:00  
to the european union  
80:56:00  
and we showed hundreds and hundreds of  
80:58:00  
software patents which were illegally  
81:00:00  
granted by the european union  
81:03:00  
through the epo and then we found out  
81:06:00  
that it was german patent examiners and  
81:08:00  
german  
81:08:00  
patent practitioners who were the ones  
81:12:00  
who were responsible for their filing  
81:15:00  
we once again saw that there was an  
81:17:00  
enormous outcry  
81:18:00  
and so what happens is that we have a  
81:21:00  
dogmatically held position  
81:24:00  
which says that even though the european  
81:26:00  
patent office is supposed to be  
81:28:00  
pan-european  
81:30:00  
there is still in the minds of the  
81:32:00  
german patent establishment  
81:35:00  
a supremacy over the rest of europe

81:38:00  
and if you call into question anything  
81:41:00  
including  
81:42:00  
patents granted on a bio weapon  
81:46:00  
you are treading on ground that there is  
81:49:00  
no forgiveness for  
81:52:00  
yes we have we had some questions  
81:56:00  
from transparency international and we  
81:58:00  
were  
81:59:00  
wiped out the topic was not followed yep  
82:03:00  
you just can't it's not it's not  
82:05:00  
accessible  
82:06:00  
and and that's just the tragedy of what  
82:10:00  
has  
82:10:00  
unfortunately become a  
82:12:00  
[Music]  
82:13:00  
a regulatory capture organization um  
82:16:00  
it's actually not doing the public  
82:18:00  
service  
82:29:00  
well thank you thank you for the time  
82:32:00  
that you've spent  
82:32:00  
and i hope that it was helpful it was  
82:34:00  
very helpful

82:36:00

thank you very much we're going to hear

82:38:00

a lot of echoes

82:41:00

thank you david and have a great weekend

82:44:00

okay take care everybody

82:45:00

yeah you too bye-bye