

TRANSCRIPT Of Dr David E.Martin's Speech At The European Union Parliament MAY 2023

It is a, it is a particularly interesting location for B to be sitting today, given that over a decade ago I sat in this very chair right here in the European Union Parliament.

And at that time I warned the world of what was coming, during that conversation that was hosted at the time by the Green and EFA and a number of the other parties of the European Unions, of various representations.

We were having a conversation on whether Europe should adopt the United States policy of allowing for the patents on biologically derived materials. And at the time I urged this body and I urged people around the world that the weaponization of nature against humanity had dire consequences.

Tragically, I sit here today, with that unfortunate line that I don't like to say, which is "I told you so." But the fact of the matter is, we're here not for a reprisal on past decisions. We're here to actually, once again, come to the face of the human condition and ask the question, who do we want to be?

What do we want humanity to look like?

And rather than seeing this as an exercise in futility, which is very easy from time to time when you're in the position I'm in, I actually see this not as an exercise in futility. I see this as one of the greatest opportunities that faces us because we now have a public conversation, which is now front and center in people's minds. When this was an esoteric conversation about biological patents, nobody cared. But when that conversation came home, then it became something people can care about.

So I'm actually quite grateful for this opportunity. I thank the members of Parliament for hosting this. I thank all of the translators who I apologize in advance. I will use terminology that is probably very difficult to translate, so my apologies, and I'd also like to acknowledge the fact that many of you are aware of my involvement with this in large part due to the amazing work of my wonderful wife, Kim Martin, who encouraged me at the very early days of this pandemic to get on front of the camera and talk about all the information that I had been sharing among very small groups around the world.

And it was in fact her encouragement that put me in a place where many of you have heard what I have to say. Ironically, the world that I came from that used to be very popular, my CNBC and Bloomberg presentations, which were televised on mainstream media around the world, was an audience that I lost.

I can confidently say Covid diminished my fame, but I can also confidently say that I'd rather stand among the people with whom I'm standing today than any of the folks that were part of that previous world. So, this is a much better place to be. My role today is to set the stage for this conversation in a historical context, because this did not come in the last three years. This did not come in the last five or six years.

This actually is an ongoing question that probably began here in Europe in the early stages of the mid 19 hundreds, but certainly by 1913, 1914, this conversation started right here in Central Europe. The pandemic that we alleged to have happen in the last few years also did not happen overnight. In fact, the very specific pandemic using coronavirus began in a very different time.

Most of you don't know that Coronavirus as a model of a pathogen was isolated in 1965. Coronavirus was identified in 1965 as one of the first infectious, replicatable viral models that could be used to modify a series of other experiences of human condition. It was isolated once upon a time associated with the common cold. But what's particularly interesting about its isolation in 1965 was that it was immediately identified as a pathogen that could be used and modified for a whole host of reasons.

And you heard me correctly, that was 1965. And by the way, these slides are public domain. You're welcome to look at every single reference. Every comment that I made is based on published material. So do make sure that you look at those references.

But in 1966, the very first COV Coronavirus model was used as a transatlantic biological experiment in human manipulation, and you heard the date 1966. I hope you're getting the point of what I'm saying. This is not an overnight thing. This is actually something that's been long in the making.

A year before I was born, we had the first Trans-Atlantic coronavirus data sharing experiment between the United States and the United Kingdom. And in 1967, the year I was born, we did the first human trials on inoculating people with modified coronavirus.

Isn't that amazing? 56 years ago, the overnight success of a pathogen that's been 56 years in engineering, and I want that to chill with all of you. Where were we when we actually allowed in violation of biological and chemical weapons treaties?

Where were we as a human civilization when we thought it was an acceptable thing to do to take a pathogen for the United States and infect the world with it? Where was that conversation and what should have been that conversation in 1967? That conversation wasn't had. Ironically, the common cold was turned into a chimera in the 1970s, and in 1975, 1976 and 1977, we started figuring out

how to modify coronavirus by putting it into different animals - Pigs and dogs. And not surprisingly, by the time we got to 1990, we found out that coronavirus as an infectious agent was an industrial problem for two primary industries, the industries of dogs and pigs. Dog breeders and pigs found that Coronavirus created gastrointestinal problems, and that became the basis for Pfizer's first spike protein vaccine.

Patent filed. Are you ready for this in 1990? Did you hear what I just said? 1990. Operation Warp-speed! I'm sorry - Where's the warp and the speed?

Pfizer 1990 - The very first spike protein vaccine for Coronavirus. Isn't that fascinating? Isn't it fascinating that we were, we were told that, well, the spike protein is a new thing. We just found out that that's the problem.

No. As a matter of fact, we didn't just find out it was not just now. Now the problem, we found that out in 1990 and filed the first patents on vaccines in 1990 for the spike protein of Coronavirus. And who would've thought Pfizer? Clearly the innocent organization that does nothing but promote human health.

Clearly, Pfizer, the organization that has not bought the votes in this chamber, in every chamber of every government around the world, not that Pfizer, certainly they wouldn't have had anything to do with this, but oh yes, they did. And in 1990 they found out that there was a problem with vaccines.

They didn't work. You know why they didn't work?

It turns out that Coronavirus is a very malleable model. It transforms and it changes, and it mutates over time. As a matter of fact, every publication on vaccines for Coronavirus from 1990 until 2018, every single publication concluded that Coronavirus escapes the vaccine impulse because it modifies and mutates too quickly for vaccines to be effective.

And since 1990 to 2018, that is the published science ladies and gentlemen, that's following the science, following the science is their own indictment of their own programs that said, it doesn't work. And there are thousands of publications to that effect, not a few hundred. And not paid for by pharmaceutical companies. These are publications that are independent scientific research that shows unequivocally including efforts of the chimera modifications made by Ralph Bair in the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill.

All of them show vaccines do not work on coronavirus. That's the science, and that science has never been disputed.

But then we had an interesting development in 2002, and this date is most important because in 2002, the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill patented, and I quote, an infectious replication defective clone of coronavirus.

Listen to those words ... Infectious replication, defective. What does that phrase actually mean?

For those of you not familiar with language, let me unpack it for you. Infectious replication. Defective means a weapon. It means something meant to target an individual but not have collateral damage to other individuals. That's what infectious replication defective means.

And that patent was filed in 2002 on work funded by NIAD's Anthony Fauci from 1999 to 2002, and that work patented at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill mysteriously preceded SARS 1.0 by a year.

“Dave, are you suggesting that SARS 1.0 wasn't from a wet market in Wuhan?”
“Are you suggesting it might have come from a laboratory in the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill?”

No, I'm not suggesting it. I'm telling you that's the facts we engineered SARS. SARS is not a naturally occurring phenomenon. The naturally occurring phenomenon is called the common cold. It's called influenza-like illness. It's called gastroenteritis.

That's the naturally occurring coronavirus. SARS is the research developed by humans weaponizing a life system model to actually attack human beings, and they patented it in 2002. And in 2003, giant surprise, the CDC filed the patent on Coronavirus isolated from humans in violation once again of biological and chemical weapons, treaties and laws that we have in the United States, and I'm very, very precise on this.

United States likes to talk about its rights and everything else, and the rule of law and all the nonsense that we like to talk about, but we don't ratify treaties about, I don't know, defending humans. We conspicuously avoid that we actually have a great track record of advocating for human rights and then denying them when it comes to actually being part of the international community, which is a slightly problematic thing.

But let's get something very clear. When the CDC, in April of 2003 filed the patent on SARS Coronavirus isolated from humans, what did they do? They downloaded a sequence from China, and filed a patent on it in the United States. Any of you familiar with biological and chemical weapons treaties knows that's a violation. That's a crime. That's not an innocent, oops; that's a crime.

And the United States Patent Office went as far as to reject that patent application on two occasions until the CDC decided to bribe the patent office to override the patent examiner to ultimately issue the patent in 2007 on SARS Coronavirus. But let's not let that get away from us, because it turns out that the RT PCR, which was the test that we allegedly were going to use to identify the

risks associated with coronavirus, was actually identified as a bioterrorism threat by me in the European Union sponsored events in 2002 and 2003, 20 years ago that happened here in Brussels and across Europe.

In 2005, this particular pathogen was specifically labelled as a bioterrorism and bioweapon platform technology, described as such. That's not my terminology that I'm applying to it. It was actually described as a bioweapons platform technology in 2005. And from 2005 onwards, it was actually a bio warfare enabling agent.

It's official classification from 2005 forward.

I don't know if that sounds like public health to you, does it? Biological warfare enabling technology that feels like not public health, that feels like not medicine, that feels like a weapon, designed to take out humanity. That's what it feels like, and it feels like that because that's exactly what it is.

We have been lured into believing that EcoHealth Alliance and DARPA and all of these organizations are what we should be pointing to. But we've been specifically requested to ignore the facts that over \$10 billion have been funnelled through black operations, through the check of Anthony Fauci and a side-by-side ledger where NIAD has a balance sheet, and next to it is a biodefense balance sheet.

Equivalent dollar for dollar matching that no one in the media talks about, and it's been going on since 2005. Our gain of function moratorium. The moratorium that was supposed to freeze any efforts to do gain of function research.

Conveniently, in the fall of 2014, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill received a letter from NIAD saying that while the gain of function moratorium on coronavirus in vivo should be suspended, because their grants had already been funded, they received an exemption.

Did you hear what I just said?

A biological weapons lab facility at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill received an exemption from the gain of function moratorium so that by 2016 we could publish the journal article that said SARS Coronavirus is poised for human emergence in 2016 and what, you might ask Dave, was the coronavirus poised for human emergence? It was WIV ONE - Wuhan Institute of Virology Virus One. Poised for human emergence in 2016 at the proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, such that by the time we get to 2017 and 2018, the following phrase entered into common parlance among the community, there is going to be an accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen.

The operative word, obviously in that phrase, the word release, does that sound like leak? Does that sound like a bat and a Pangolin went into a bar in the Wuhan market and hung out and had sex?

And, and lo and behold, we got SARS Cov-2. No accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen was the terminology used.

And four times in April of 2019, seven months before the allegation of patient number one, four patent applications of Moderna were modified to include the term accidental or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen as the justification for making a vaccine for a thing that did not exist.

If you have not done so, please make sure that you make reference in every investigation to the premeditation nature of this, because it was in September of 2019 that the world was informed. That we were going to have an accident or intentional release of a respiratory pathogen so that by September, 2020 there would be a worldwide acceptance of a universal vaccine template.

That's their words right in front of you on the screen. The intent was to get the world to accept a universal vaccine template, and the intent was to use coronavirus to get there. Let's, let's read this because we have to read this into the record everywhere I go.

“Until an infectious disease crisis is very real present and at the emergency threshold that is often largely ignored to sustain the funding base beyond the crisis.”

He said, “we need to increase the public understanding for the need for medical countermeasures, such as a pan influenza or pan coronavirus vaccine.” “A key driver is the media and the economics will follow the hype. We need to use that hype to our advantage to get to the real issues. Investors will respond if they see profit at the end of the process.”

Sounds like public health. Sounds like the best of humanity. No.

Ladies and gentlemen, this was premeditated domestic terrorism stated at the proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences in 2015, published in front of them. This is an act of biological and chemical warfare perpetrated on the human race, and it was admitted to in writing that this was a financial heist and a financial fraud.

“Investors will follow if they see profit at the end of the process.”

Let me conclude by making five very brief recommendations. The last slide, nature was hijacked.

This whole story started in 1965 when we decided to hijack a natural model and decide to start manipulating it. Science was hijacked when the only questions that could be asked were questions authorized under the patent protection of the CDC, the FDA, the NIH, and their equivalent organizations around the world. We didn't have independent science.

We had hijacked science, and unfortunately there was no moral oversight in violation of all of the codes that we stand for. There was no independent,

financially disinterested independent review board ever empanelled around coronavirus. Not once, not once, not since 1965.

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

Our job today is to say, no more gain of function research period. No more weaponization of nature period. And most importantly, no more corporate patronage of science for their own self-interest unless they assume 100% product liability for every injury and every death that they maintain.

Thank you very much.

Dr David E. Martin

Speaker - Covid Summit – European Union Parliament – May 2023