

The Plandemic: How the Government Manipulates COVID-19

A Special Interview With David Martin, Ph.D.

By Dr. Joseph Mercola

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Welcome, everyone. This is Dr. Mercola helping you take control of your health, and we're continuing in our coverage of this "Plandemic" with Dr. David Martin, and I suspect many of you have heard of who he is. But for those of you who haven't he'll describe his background briefly in a moment. But he, in my view, has done the best job of really uncovering the paper trail for two decades that led to where we're at now. This includes government grants, patents, funding, the whole nine yards. That this just didn't just happen a year and a half ago. So, he's covered it. He's covered it so well, so eloquently. He was featured in Mickey Willis' "Plandemic 2." I'm not sure if that's the exact title, but it's the second version after [crosstalk 00:00:49]-

David Martin:

Yeah, "Indoctrination." That's right.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. If you've seen that you know a lot of his work, and we will reread some of that here and give us some good updates, hopefully. But I'm just really excited to have him because he's just an enormous fountain of information. So, welcome and thank you for joining us today.

David Martin:

You are most welcome. Thanks, Joe. It's lovely to be here.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Okay. So, if you can briefly describe your history, which sounds like you were really working for the federal government as one of their people and you're on all over mainstream media and really well-accepted as an expert in your field. So, just briefly condense that so that we can understand your history and then how and why you made the transition about two years ago?

David Martin:

Well, yeah, back in 1995 when I finished my doctorate at the University of Virginia, I joined the medical school faculty in radiology and orthopedic surgery, but most notably then I was running the first medical device clinical trials organization for the University of Virginia, a company called IDEAmEd. What we did then was we did medical device clinical trials for FDA submission. So I had a very long tradition of working with FDA clinical trials. Did a lot of work in diagnostics and therapeutics of a variety of forms. And in 1998, when I started M-CAM, which is the company that I also founded and have operated since then, we began working very closely with finding ways to bring intellectual property into conventional finance.

David Martin:

So, our background, in addition to the medical background was figuring out ways to bring innovation to the marketplace and dropping the cost of capital so that innovative companies could get much less expensive capital. It was through that, Joe, that an interesting hole opened up. That was we were starting to audit the United States Patent system. We were asked to do that by Congress. And quite alarmingly, we found an enormous number of patents on biological and chemical weapon violations. Now, that was not something we were looking for. I let people know this was not something we set out to find. This is something that landed in our lap.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

How did you identify these? Was it some type of digital scanning system or was it a manual review?

David Martin:

Yeah, so I developed a technology a decade earlier called Linguistic Genomics, which is a means by which you can look at unstructured text data and find the metaphoric meaning inside of what is being communicated. As you can imagine, if people of ill intent are trying to do something, they often hide what they're doing in plain sight, but they use language that is not conventional. So when you find a patent, for example, on a blast-resistant pathogen from a rocket-propelled grenade, did you hear what I just said? A blast-resistant pathogen from a rocket-propelled grenade. Does that sound like it's a common way to inoculate a population or does that sound like it sounds?

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Sounds like it sounds. A bioweapon.

David Martin:

Yeah. And so, finding a number of bioweapons patents, we started taking into account some very serious things. And I published once a year, I have a copy of the book here. I published once a year, the literal global phonebook of every biological and chemical weapon violation.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Wow.

David Martin:

That took place anywhere in the world, and it is the who's to it. It's the who, it's the where, it's the who funded it, it's what their addresses are. It was actually quite an interesting document that was what was used by U.S. law enforcement, intelligence communities and elsewhere around the world to track things that were being done inappropriately. And it was in fact, in 1999 when we started detecting that there seemed to be an alarming event around coronavirus, which we're going to get into.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

So, was this report directed towards governmental agencies primarily?

David Martin:

That's exactly right. It was in addition to being directed at government agencies. It was also shared with law enforcement around the world to try to neutralize this into not a single party kind of information disclosure. As a matter of fact, at its peak of circulation we had the regular updates recorded at the Library of Alexandria in Egypt as a neutral party holding this information. So that posterity would know that we built laws around the prohibition of biological and chemical weapons with the full intention of breaking those laws routinely, and having a published record of the who did it, when they did it and who financed it was very important.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Okay, so I interrupted you with a question and you were beginning to tell us about this transition to the coronavirus that you identify.

David Martin:

Well, in 1999, Anthony Fauci's NIAID (National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases) saw the possibility of using coronavirus as a possible vaccine vector. He actually thought that there would be a way to co-op nature to be able to be used as a way to inoculate a population. And at the time, the disclosed rationale for this was to try to come up with an HIV (human immunodeficiency virus) vaccine. As you're familiar he was obsessed about HIV as well as influenza vaccines. And as a result, what he was looking for was to see if there was a way to make – and now I'm quoting from the funded research, “An infectious replication defective recombinant coronavirus.” Now, it's important for you guys to realize that this was 1999. This was not... We hadn't had SARS (severe acute respiratory syndrome) yet. We didn't even know SARS was a thing. But in 1999, that project got funded by NIAID. In 2002, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hills Ralph Baric and his colleagues filed a patent on recombinant coronavirus, and a year later the world got SARS.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. So, I just want to take a step back because you alluded to the Fauci's involvement with HIV. I just want to wonder if you can give a brief comment on that because Robert Kennedy's written a book about him called “The Real Tony Fauci” that highlights his nefarious strategies in the '80s. I mean, he was put into office, longest applied office for 50 years, and set up NIAID. And basically killed hundreds of thousands of peoples with this promotion of AZT (azidothymidine).

David Martin:

Yes.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

So, this pattern that we're seeing with coronavirus is actually a repeat of previous behavior.

David Martin:

Yes, and as a matter of fact, when he joined NIAID as its director in 1984 appointed by the Reagan administration, it's important to realize that at the time we were transitioning from

largely an STD (sexually transmitted diseases) environment in which syphilis and gonorrhea and those types of STDs were the things that we were concerned about, obviously, herpes and things like that. HIV became, as you well know, a political and social hot potato because it was associated in many respects with lifestyle branding, and as a result it became a political issue to essentially identify a class of the population that could be the basis for research without consideration. The notion by Anthony Fauci was people with HIV already had made decisions that somehow entitled them to less humanity. And as a result, the clinical trials around developing both management techniques as well as potential treatments became quite fashionable, but it was done in a very reckless fashion, and numerous people died in clinical trials, and by the way, still are.

David Martin:

As recently as September of 2020, when the NIAID Advisory Committee met, Anthony Fauci reported on several clinical trials involving three different continents not specified, where in phase one trials the alleged proposed treatment was "unsuccessful" and there were loss of life involved in these trials. So, the fact of the matter is he hasn't stopped this. This was something that he started in 1984. But he has literally been obsessed about this HIV situation as a platform to essentially use humans that he determines to be some form of subhuman for clinical trials. And it is a horrific blight on the United States medical establishment that we have been willing to allow this to go on in the name of science, in the name of health promotion, since 1984, without any significant disruption or check.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

All right. Well, thank you for that historical perspective because it's so important and most people have no clue that this is repeat behavior for his motives [crosstalk 00:10:00]. So, when I interrupted you with a question, you were starting to explain how this developed in the late '90s with Ralph Baric at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. This is even before we had the first coronavirus epidemic.

David Martin:

Yeah, the first outbreak, as you know is late 2002 going into 2003 in China. So, SARS as a thing, was not a thing until we made recombinant infectious replication-defective coronavirus. And it's so critical that we understand that I'm not drawing a causal relationship. I'm making an observation that humans and what we call coronavirus seem to cohabit on this earth for hundreds of thousands of years. And then we manipulate that in 1999, we do a number of things to actually start playing around with putting it into different animals, and in different human cell line models. And then in 2003, we have SARS. Like a lot of other things it's an observation worth noting.

David Martin:

What makes the observation more problematic, obviously, is this was happening during the unfortunate results of the 2001 anthrax attack, which as you know came out of federal labs. The whole notion that somehow or another we had domestic terror by bioweapons from some sort of bad actor became very clear that this was not a bad actor, per se, this was medical and defense research gone bad that got into the public and real people really died. But as you know, Joe, the

real benefit, if you will, for the anthrax attack was the passage of the PREP (Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness) Act. [crosstalk 00:11:49].

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

It persists till today. That's persistent [crosstalk 00:11:52]-

David Martin:

Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. Because we didn't have in the 1986 act something that covered medical countermeasures. What we had was childhood vaccines. Inside of the PREP Act, we now have the effective carte blanche removal of liability to manufacturers of medical countermeasures, and that carte blanche liability needed an event horizon to create it, and it turns out that the anthrax scare was the raison d'être to actually get that coverage expanded to medical countermeasures.

David Martin:

I think most people don't understand that the '86 act is really not overly relevant in the coronavirus situation simply because this is a medical countermeasure under the PREP Act. And as a result, the breadth of coverage and the accountability for responsibility, including the PREP Act, does not have a VAERS (Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System) requirement. So, there's a lot of things that are inside of the PREP Act that made pharmaceutical companies much more capable of instilling terror in the population, coercing a population into taking an untested measure, and doing so with absolute impunity.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Now, so you were compiling this information. And at the time, it sounds like you're still working for the federal government. And I'm wondering if you can, I guess – I want to go into more detail what you've compiled because you've only touched the surface of the paper trail. So, maybe you do that, and then in your response help us understand when you made the transition away from the federal government to informing the public?

David Martin:

Well, I've always seen that my role as the person who actually took the time and effort to aggregate all of this data. I've always seen a public interest as part of our mission. And so, we did not work for the federal government. The federal government was a beneficiary of the information we provided as were a number of other organizations. As you and your listeners can go back and review, I testified in Congress for the very first time on the audit of the United States Patent System back in the early 2000s. Did a lot of work with the Senate Banking Committee. We were a contractor for the United States Treasury to break open a lot of white collar criminal activity around intellectual property and its abuses, and tax fraud. So, we've had a number of engagements where we were contracted by the federal government to do projects. But the work on bioweapons was something I did because I felt, as a citizen of the world, it was absolutely essential that we have public visibility into the violations of biological and chemical weapons laws and treaties.

David Martin:

And as a result of that, in the mid-early and mid-2000s, the Bush administration asked me on several occasions to be part of both individual delegations as well as groups of delegations in the biological weapons conventions programs around the world. And so, I was in Slovenia for the EUROTOX Conference. I was in the Islamic Republic of Iran and Tehran for the National Genetic Engineering and Bioengineering conferences that were about the proliferation of these technologies in the early and mid-2000s. And I was doing all those things at the request of the federal government.

David Martin:

But always, as a public citizen, my goal has always been to make sure that information that we have is shared with the authorities who are in fact charged with accountability. Now, as you well know, the bad news is when other people are doing it we're more than happy to go off and do investigations. When we're doing it, there seems to be a little bit of a blowback, and in 2005 and 2006, a lot of what I uncovered turned out to be the Bush-Cheney administration's abuses of a number of things around the wars in the Middle East. And this "War on Terror," which was kind of like Reagan's War on Drugs.

David Martin:

The fact of the matter is we were just using conflict as a convenient way to move money around without really having a whole lot of evidence or justification. And so, some of what I uncovered was not warmly received by the Bureau, by intelligence agencies and whatnot. But by and large, without exception from 2001 until the present situation, the information that I have provided has been used in international law enforcement and intelligence operations, and it has been warmly received, which is the reason why this one stands out so remarkably because all of a sudden no one not in the U.S., none of our allies. None of the people who are not really our allies seem to be willing to look at the fact that beginning in 2016 we started seeing very alarming language being used, which was "coronavirus poised for human emergence." Now, I'm not a-

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Where were you seeing this, in the patents?

David Martin:

This was in patents, but it was also in scientific publications.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Okay.

David Martin:

And when you start referring to a coronavirus allegedly poised for human emergence after the World Health Organization has declared SARS eradicated, there's something desperately wrong with that picture. As I have said many, many times, and I can't help myself. I have to remind your listeners that the biggest alarm bell was published February 12, 2016, when Peter Daszak, the veterinarian-in-chief who has been the money-laundering agent to get coronavirus research after the gain of function moratorium here in the U.S. moved over to China said, "To sustain the funding base beyond the crisis, we need to increase the public understanding of the need for

medical countermeasures, such as a pan-influenza or a pan-coronavirus vaccine. A key driver is the media and the economics will follow the hype. We need to use that hype to our advantage to get to the real issues. Investors will respond if they see profit at the end of the process."

David Martin:

That statement made in 2015, published in the spring of 2016 set off alarm bells very loudly within my organization because when you actually have somebody who is promoting gainer function research, and clearly blurring the line on what is even legal because at that time it was illegal to conduct this kind of research in the U.S. Saying that we needed, "Media to create the hype. And we need to use the hype to our advantage and investors will follow if they see profit at the end of the process." Joe, that doesn't sound like public health to me. That sounds like organized crime. That sounds like racketeering, and we need to raise this issue.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. So, especially in conjunction with the earlier information you uncovered at the patent history. Maybe you can take in this direction is it really provides a very powerful evidence. It would have likely stand up in a court of law of the motivation behind this and the deep historical records that support that.

David Martin:

Well, listen, from 2002, which is when we have the recombinant coronavirus patent filed by UNC, Chapel Hill. The 4,000-plus patents that were filed on the genome, on vaccines, and on detection since 2002 is quite alarming because you don't file patents on something that you don't intend to commercialize. I mean, it's just not a thing. We don't have an enormous number of patents on a number of other pathogens, but for some reason coronavirus becomes this target, which is commercially, exceptionally rich. And what we find is that a couple things were quite problematic. In 2003, April 28th of 2003, and I want you to listen to the date really important because the April 23rd, 2003 CDC patent on the genome of the SARS coronavirus, which is actually something that I've talked about before. Somehow or another, five days later, Sequoia Pharmaceuticals got a \$935,000 grant and filed U.S. Patent 7151163. So this is five days after allegedly the coronavirus has been isolated. Five days later, they file a patent on the treatment of a thing that had been discovered five days earlier.

David Martin:

Now, call me old-fashioned, but that doesn't sound like my bowtie speaking. That sounds like an inside job because you cannot have a disease identified, a pathogen identified, and a cure for it in five days' period of time when all of the information was held from the public because when the CDC filed its patent on the genome of coronavirus, it paid to keep that patent secret. So, somebody somewhere knows that this thing was going to turn out to be a moneymaker. Dana Farber had a monoclonal antibody patent system that came out of three NIH (National Institutes of Health) grants. Their patent 7750123 on the monoclonal antibody for SARS-CoV treatment took place in 2003. We have the January 6, 2004 Bioterrorism Conference where the promise of coronavirus as a bioterrorism tool becomes popularized, and all of a sudden we have an enormous number of new treatments being patented. And before long, we have over 4,000 patents and patent applications filed.

David Martin:

Joe, 4,000 patents and patent applications on a thing where quite literally we're saying it's new. We're saying it's novel. But if we go back in history, we realize that Pfizer filed the first S1 spike protein vaccine patent on coronavirus in 1990, 30 years ago. So, even what we're being told is new, whether it's the pathogen, whether it's the vaccine, whether it's the mechanism of blocking the vaccine using the spike protein, regardless of what part of the story we look at, the patent record is full of thousands, not hundreds, thousands of patents where commercial interests funded by NIAID and funded by the National Institutes of Health have been building the economic cabal around coronavirus. This is not a new thing, hasn't been a new thing. And regrettably, we're being told continuously that somehow or another there's something novel about this experience despite the fact that every single part of what we are told is being detected with PCR and everything we're told that we are intervening with the injections. Every single one of those things has been known and isolated for over 30 years.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah, that's just, it's just so outrageous. Can you compare the number of patents and patent applications with coronavirus, which is over 4,000 to any other pathogen. I mean, what's number two or does this exceed all other pathogens combined?

David Martin:

Oh, this is an order of magnitude more. I mean, we're not even in the same ballpark. So, when we had Ebola outbreak, for example, it got a lot of national attention. When we had H1N1, if you remember all the bird flus and the avian influenzas and all of those sorts of things. We've had an enormous number of other pathogens that have been identified and have been worked on with respect to diagnostics and therapeutics. Coronavirus runs away as a commercial boom for the industrial and the funding complexes that have supported its promotion. That's why it's so important for us to go back and look at the fact that whether it is the SARS coronavirus, whether it is coronavirus generally, which throughout the '90s was almost exclusively a veterinary concern. It was for dogs. It was for rabbit cardiomyopathy. It was things that were actually involved in veterinary sciences. From then until now, the proliferation of proprietary controls around SARS coronavirus probably exceeds at least by two or three times most other pathogens.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Okay, that's good for perspective. So, I wanted to delve back bit to Fauci because I know you're not a big fan of his as am I. Fauci, with respect to the whole process of the system that's evolved, which started with HIV, of course, and that he's got these principal investigators at all the major universities and Pharma that he assigns in the 50 years he's been in office over \$1 trillion in grants, so that these grant money from the federal government, ultimately the U.S. taxpayer, get recycled into creating these patents and patent rewards and compensation and whole structures that reward these people and provide a clear motivation for their behavior. So, that's a poor description of it, but I'm sure you can describe it in far more articulate terms.

David Martin:

Well, a terrible thing happened in 1980. A law called the Bayh–Dole Act, which was a law signed into law, which allowed the beneficiaries of federal grants to file patents on the work

that's derived from federally funded research was passed allegedly to support the notion of entrepreneurship and the development of the biotech and the high-tech industries in the United States. The principle of the Act was this notion that somehow or another, we would benefit our economy by having our scientists become first and foremost entrepreneurs rather than publish their research [crosstalk 00:26:34]-

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Which sounds rational, absolutely.

David Martin:

It sounds like a brilliant idea, sounds like a lovely idea, and it was the worst piece of legislation we could have possibly done for the future of health care in the United States because what it did was it brought the United States Patent Office, the FDA and CDC into an unholy trinity where effectively what they did was they served as the bench science department for private pharmaceutical concerns. So, essentially, what happened is we outsourced the basic research that used to be the responsibility of industry, we outsourced it to the private sector. And the private sector wound up becoming this unbelievably insidious funding loop. Because here's what happens.

David Martin:

Corporations, Pharma, lobby to get people elected. Once they're elected, the lobbyists flow surprisingly an enormous amount of money into the various NIH programs. In the case of NIAID itself, since Fauci took over, \$191 billion has gone through his fingers. Now, is that because he's successful? No, as a matter of fact, objectively, if you look at it, National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Disease on his watch, allergies and infectious diseases have increased over 60 times.

David Martin:

And somehow or another, he's still the CEO of a failed company that's gotten \$191 billion to solve a problem that is getting worse every single year. If it was a company, we would have fired him. But the problem is, it's not a company. What it is, is a money-laundering agency, which actually moves public funds through the hands of a federal agency into the research laboratories, which ultimately are going to conduct research then licensed back to the benefactors, which are the pharmaceutical companies that paid to get people into office in the first place.

David Martin:

So, this is a revolving door problem, and the Bayh–Dole Act created an insidious incentive that said that the only research that was going to be conducted was going to be research that ultimately would flow back to the pharmaceutical industry and create juggernauts where the risk of R&D was taken by the public and the benefit for that R&D was taken by the private. That's a horrible thing, and that is exactly what Fauci has run.

David Martin:

It's amazing to realize, and Joe I've mentioned this in the Fauci dossier that I published, that during this pandemic, Congress and the Congressional Budget Office asked for an accounting of

NIH owned patents where they had potential commercial interest in the drugs that were being produced. Do you realize that Anthony Fauci lied in that federal filing by failing to disclose any of the NIAID commercial patents associated with anything to do with any of the work he's doing? Not a single disclosure. That is constructive lying to Congress. And he submitted, in the fall of 2020, he submitted a report to Congress at Congress's request to be accountable for the public funds that he benefits from, and his response was to lie and say there wasn't any.

David Martin:

The evidence is stacked a mile long because inside of the patent filings with the exception of the illegal acts of Moderna in their 141 patents that have been issued. Moderna stands alone as the only recipient of NIAID funding that fails to comply with the law and fails to disclose the federal government interest in their intellectual property. Despite that, and this is where it becomes important. Despite the fact that everyone that Moderna failed to disclose the federal government interest in its research Anthony Fauci picked Moderna to be the front runner for an untested, commercially unsuccessful and entirely unproven mRNA vaccine technology in the spring of 2020.

David Martin:

There was no rational justification for that, and there would have been less rational justification given the fact that Moderna is on record as having violated the federal law, the Bayh–Dole Act 141 times at the time they were picked to be the winner. This is a known, known fact, and it was overlooked entirely and not a single law enforcement agent anywhere in the United States has decided that having a criminal organization supply a product sounds like a bad idea.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. So, thank you for explaining that so well. Many people ascribe the nickname to Fauci as “Teflon Tony” because he's so effective at displacing, not displacing, but deflecting the accusations directed at him. So, I wonder, there's not many people better qualified to answer this than you and it is pure speculation. I mean, but you can't criticize Fauci for not being spectacularly slippery and sophisticated in his strategies to evade detection. So my guess is that he is a billionaire, a multi-billionaire, probably, because of his relationships with industry and his ability to effectively cover these assets. Do you have any thoughts on that? I mean, it's probably a powerful motivation, but it's pure speculation. There's probably no evidence, and he would hide it.

David Martin:

Joe, I think it's a fascinating question. I think many of us probably forget that if you, as an unelected and the highest paid public servant in the federal government, if you have the ability to stand in front of the president and dictate the future of the country. It's not money you're after, it's actually something else.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Okay, perfect. What is it?

David Martin:

I think that this is pure 100% unadulterated, sociopathic tyranny. I think this is a guy who clearly has a contempt for humanity that is probably unrivaled by most, if not all, historical figures.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Wow.

David Martin:

And the fact of the matter is, if you have the audacity – I mean, let's face it, and Joe you know this. You know this from your own experience. There's a thing called the False Claims Act by the Federal Trade Commission. False Claims Act is when you promote something that doesn't have at least two independent peer-reviewed clinical trials to justify your claims of either safety or efficacy, and everybody in the health care industry knows what this thing is. In April of 2020, the Journal of the American Medical Association official publication said that face coverings and masks should not be worn by a general population because there was, "No evidence that they actually provided any benefit."

David Martin:

As a matter of fact, the only randomized clinical trial that was done by CR McIntyre actually stated that wearing cloth face coverings increase the risk of influenza-like illness. So the only study we had was it was potentially bad for you. But in contempt for the Federal Trade Commission Act, suddenly we were all supposed to put on a thing, which quite literally the data said not to do. Now, when you have the audacity to not only change your own policy, which he has now admitted to lie, but he goes one step further, and says that the lie was justified. Those are definitional criteria for sociopathic behavior.

David Martin:

When you not only don't see the error of your ways, but you actually celebrate the corruption that says, "I can have contempt for the truth, and I can do it in the best interest of some sort of self-serving agenda." And the fact of the matter is like Ralph Baric who if you go on to Google Earth, you can see he lives in a modest home. This guy has a modest lab when you look at the pictures of his lab at UNC, Chapel Hill, he has a modest lab. But all of a sudden you realize that he is invited to be what? The guest of honor here, the guest of honor there, he doesn't need billions of dollars to live a billionaire's lifestyle. Ralph Baric and Tony Fauci share a common objective, which is they both have a desire to be most powerful and have 100% immunity from public accountability. And the fact of the matter is most billionaires would aspire to the control and power those guys have because it turns out they have something money can't buy. They have something that can only be acquired through fear and blackmail, which is exactly what they actually trafficking.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yeah, well, that is brilliant. I don't really think I've ever heard it put that way before my perspective, but it makes perfect sense. So, thank you for sharing your observations and assessments, that's great. But clearly there are financial motivations.

David Martin:

Oh, yes, absolutely.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

And not necessarily to them. But I think the sociopathic behavior might be more relevant as an explanation, but I'm wondering if you can walk us through the tens, and more likely hundreds of billions of dollars that are going to accrue to the vaccine manufacturers, and what's more egregious and unbelievable beyond sociopathic behavior is that any and every injury and death will never be compensated for. I mean, to me that is one of the most egregious criminal behaviors that they instigated in this. And then, on top of that they are mandated by unconstitutional executive orders to get this vaccine.

David Martin:

Well, remember that under 21 Code of Federal Regulations, section 50, about 23 and 24, no one can be forced or coerced into a clinical trial of an experimental, even medical countermeasures. So it's not legal to do it. That's very clear. It's black and white, and this clinical trial does not end until 2023 in the first best instance. So, there is no such thing as an approved or even authorized use of a thing that can be compelled on the population. That doesn't mean that people aren't trying to do it.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Excuse me to interrupt, and compounding that to make it even worse is they eliminated all the controls of this trial. Go on.

David Martin:

So, there is not a clinical trial. That's why if we go back and we look at the 21 Code of Federal Regulations, we see that we have a number of things that fail. We did not have an independent investigational review board. We did not have any of the statutorily required approval processes for the protocol. And the companies themselves made determinations about modifying the protocol midstream. We do not have a clinical trial on this particular injection.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Right. Totally agree.

David Martin:

It's just really pure and simple. And so, once again, violating the Federal Trade Act. All right, somebody in law enforcement, somebody in the legal community should actually bring them up on the same thing that they throw against clinicians time and time again. There's not a chiropractor, an osteopath anywhere in this country that hasn't had some sort of False Claims Act shakedown from the Federal Trade Commission. But you know what's fascinating? The federal government is doing the same violation. They're telling you a thing works. They're telling you a thing is curative. They're telling you a thing is therapeutic, and they're violating the Federal Trade Act, and no one is doing a single thing.

David Martin:

But back to your question. What we have is a situation where the deaths are actually considered to be acceptable. I want you to hear that word. Let that settle in, “acceptable death.” I don't know Joe, what world do you have to come from to find that term even remotely speakable. I think the utterance of that phrase is horrific. The idea that we think it is acceptable to have enough deaths to justify an intervention, which has not been proven, has not been tested, and for which a clinical trial was disrupted and interrupted so the clinical trial could never happen. We are killing people willfully, and we are doing it with impunity in the name of what we call a love affair with science.

David Martin:

The only problem is we've desecrated science in the process, too. Because it turns out that when I did randomized, double blind, placebo-controlled trials, you know what I had to do? I had to keep the populations blinded. I had to keep the placebo controlled for the whole clinical trial. And the reason I had to do that is because that's what the statute requires. This entire process has been willful acts of harm to humanity. And the only hope, by the way, that we have is a very small note in the Department of Justice opinion that took place under the Trump administration that says that if this was based on felony acts, then the entire emergency use authorization and all its benefits would collapse.

David Martin:

In other words, if we can show that racketeering, that lying to Congress, that the public coercion under Section 802 of the Patriot Act, if we can show that any felony has occurred, which by the way you know in the Fauci dossier, I outline dozens of evidence of these felony violations. Any one of those would bring this entire thing to its knees because the moment the PREP act protection falls away from Pfizer, and Moderna, and Johnson and Johnson, and AstraZeneca, and others, the moment that protection collapses, I can guarantee you who will not be promoting a vaccine. If they are liable for a single injury or death they'll pull the plug on what they know to be unsafe. That requires law enforcement to do its job. And somewhere there has to be a prosecutor who's willing to do their job.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. Well, that would make logical rational sense. And you are very well-studied in this and really have a deep, clear thinking process going on. So, I want to ask you the obvious question is what is it that co-opted or captured the federal regulatory agency responsible for this obvious violations of multiple criminal behaviors, why are they not engaging? Is it because industry captured them or there's some other reason that you believe might be a contribution?

David Martin:

Well, people have talked for years about what's happened at the federal judiciary where the benches have been stacked by people of limited qualification or ideological affiliation or fill in the blank. People have been finger-pointing all along. But the fact of the matter is that the problem is that back when the picture behind me, which by the way is Cornwallis in Washington. I just happened to fly the flag of liberty and the flag of pharma, and I'm letting you decide [crosstalk 00:42:26].

David Martin:

The interesting thing is that we have a situation where you and I were taught when we were in school that we had three legs of the government. We had the legislative, we had the executive, and we had the judiciary. And the fact of the matter is that somewhere along the line in probably the 1980s we started having the judiciary undermined while none of us were paying attention. Where courts were routinely being co-opted for political objectives. And when you have the executive branch of the government willfully violating laws and making sure that they can be done with impunity. I mean, go back to Iran-Contra, and people forget that, but those were felonies, those were laws being broken.

David Martin:

And when we have an executive that says that those crimes can be done with impunity, and then when we go in, and we start doing other things, like we start doing financial fraud, and we start covering up the fact that we're robbing the Social Security Administration, and we're doing all sorts of things. What we do is we undermine the judiciary to the point where right now I genuinely do not think we have three tiers of government. I don't think there is a Department of Justice.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

So, they've effectively collapsed the judicial branch?

David Martin:

That's correct. The judiciary is functionally gone. And whether it happened with the various election scandals, which go back to hanging chads once upon a time. You guys remember the hanging chads conversations in Florida during Bush's election? I mean, when we allow the judiciary to be an arm of the executive then what happens is we've actually lost the three-tiered structure of government. And as a result, the system collapses. And what's happened is because the judiciary was the only thing that had – and Joe, this is really important. The judiciary was the only thing that was explicitly independent.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah, that's right.

David Martin:

We don't allow judges to get sponsorship in campaign finance. We don't allow judges to be elected. We appoint them, we go through an approval process. We do all sorts of things to try to make sure the judiciary is independent. So, the only risk to the pharmaceutical industry, the only risk to an executive out of control was the judiciary. So, by collapsing the judicial system in the United States, we have effectively made the government a servant of its benefactors. And that is industry and not just any industry. As you know the most lucrative sponsor of government right now is the pharmaceutical industry by almost twice what is paid by Big Oil and defense combined.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Wow. That is one of the best analysis that I've ever heard as to the explanation of why this was allowed to happen, but it makes perfect sense.

David Martin:

Yeah, I mean, if you follow the money, this is not even an open question. This is a willful act. And not surprisingly, how was it done? It was hidden under the guise of the War on Drugs. How funny? How funny that drug companies actually use the marketing the War on Drugs to pull this off?

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. So, that really helps a lot. I think it provides a framework for people to easily comprehend and understand what has happened and why it's happened. So, I'd like to, and if you want to fill in more details you can. I mean, you have such a wealth of information you can go on for five to 10 hours and not even skip a beat. I get that. But I want – I can't wait to hear your assessment or predictions of what's going to happen as a result of this collapse of the judicial branch because it looks like they've got everything in place for the implementation of global tyranny. I can't see anything stopping it, and I can't wait to hear your expansion on that on that concept because I think that's the key issue that everyone needs to understand.

David Martin:

Well, there is a tiny fly in the ointment.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Okay, let's hear it.

David Martin:

The fly in the ointment is 2000 and probably '28 best case scenario, 2027 in a more worst case scenario. You have to have currency to buy off politicians. You have to have money to politicians work. And what unfortunately took place was that during the last decade and a half, and we can go back to certainly 2008 for most people's memory, so I'll try to keep it civilian. The fundamentals happened before this. But back in 2008, when we had the Global Financial Crisis, what most people failed to understand was we instituted a policy then, which was going to functionally bankrupt our entitlement program in 2028. Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid officially empty the trust fund, according to the most recent study that was done by the actuaries at Social Security ministration. They say in 2033, but that assumes that we have a 21% reduction in benefits starting now. You know that that's not happening. So, the best math we have is that the annuities and pension programs of the United States functionally run out of their trust fund in 2028.

David Martin:

Now, what does that mean? Well, one of the things that people overlook is there's an unholy alliance between the insurance company and what we call health care. Insurance companies are long-dated asset holders. These are the people who have to have money today to cover issues in the future. That's what a long-dated asset holder is. And the problem is that the Fed and the European Central Bank and other central banks have suppressed the value of the return on funds

so that the funds are running out of money faster than expected. In other words, what's happening is that 2033 window is shrinking. Now, you know as well as anybody else that for a politician to stand up and say, "I'm going to abolish or significantly alter Social Security," is the death knell to any political aspiration. Tiny problem. Whether they say it or not, the trust fund runs out of money in 2028.

David Martin:

Now, here comes the kicker — so does the pharmaceutical industry. Because it turns out that the money that's going into that system is actually paying for the drug dependency of this country. And if we go all the way back to 1604 to the establishment of the British East India Company, and the establishment of the Virginia Company, we'll realize that the 400-plus year tradition that we have running where we have built nation states on the back of drug trade is coming to its end. And the good news for all of us is it's going to end around 2028 because we have a convergence that they didn't figure out how to cover up.

David Martin:

The convergence is that the people with the money, the big pharmaceutical players are the beneficiaries of a system that is going to bankrupt itself by virtue of their actions. This is the Brontosaurus that ate too much because it was the biggest dinosaur. And the great news is they have the brain the size of a pea, just like the Brontosaurus. They are not smart. They're huge. And the best thing we have going for us furry humans is that we actually are nimble. Now, does that mean that we are not going to have an ounce of pain through the process? Absolutely not. There is social disruption that we can't even imagine that's on the horizon in 2026, 2027, and 2028, because as we see 86 million people lose what they thought was going to be their retirement funds.

David Martin:

As we see 86 million people lose what we thought were going to be the things we were entitled to receive so that we could actually have that sunset of the American Dream. When we see that number now go to 100 million people and the 100 million people are more sick because of what we've injected today. They are more impaired by virtue of the medical countermeasures being used today. Those people who are going to require greater health care then are going to be faced with a bankrupt system incapable of supporting their life and their livelihood. And that is the death knell of this story.

David Martin:

The great news is, Joe, we're having this conversation in 2021. The best news about this is we have time if people of good conscience get together and say, "We're not going to let that apocalypse arrive because we have time to start building communities that actually care for each other. We have time to start building accountability structures. We have time to start doing things that bring our social fabric together so that when that system designed in the 1930s collapses, we can come back to a rational view of what life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness is." Because until we can reclaim the sovereignty of our health, we cannot celebrate the sovereignty of our life.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Okay, that's interesting. I've got some questions on it because if you look at the World Economic Forum, which many people believe is leading up this conspiracy trend. Obviously, they've had many times addressed the Great Reset. So, I agree with your mathematical inevitability of the collapse. It just cannot be sustained.

David Martin:

No.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

But they can change things and according to the World Economic Forum and everything I know that they're projecting is they are going to implement these CBDCs, the Central Bank Digital Currencies and have the Great Reset, and essentially use this, and essentially abolish the dollar, so it doesn't matter. We're going to do a reset, press Ctrl+Alt+Delete.

David Martin:

You know the bad news about Klaus Schwab is he's a terrible historian. I love the nefarious actions of our Dr. Evils that are out there in the world.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

He couldn't be a more perfect [inaudible 00:53:16], the absolute perfect bond villain.

David Martin:

Yeah, I mean, but like a good [James] Bond villain, he's actually ignorant of history. The reason why I'm so optimistic that the Great Reset doesn't have a chance at all to succeed is, oddly enough, the same reason why the picture behind me is the picture behind me. Cornwallis didn't lose to Washington. What happened was there were just too many privateers that made conducting a war from Britain in the United States financially unfeasible. And King George realized that he had a war on too many fronts, and he had to close one of those fronts. I mean, people forget that Napoleon was doing some pretty nasty things in the Mediterranean. He was doing some pretty nasty things in the Atlantic. And it turns out that the same thing is going to happen to Klaus Schwab because the digital currency illusion is the most bizarre and pathetic Dr. Evil plan anybody's ever concocted.

David Martin:

All you have to look at is the internet failures and the power outages that have already happened across this summer to realize that there is no way that the public is going to ever embrace a system that can be annihilated by something as simple as electromagnetic pulse, or an electromagnetic disruption, or a service disruption. The fact of the matter is as much as people like Klaus Schwab likes to live in their underground lairs under volcanoes with their submarines or whatever he likes to do. The fact of the matter is the digital currency craziness is merely one of those fantastical illusions that unfortunately has a single point failure. We live in a world where actors of both anarchist intent, and very, very laudable privateers and pirates are more

than happy to make sure that digital currency never sees the light of day because they will, in fact, hack, crack and disrupt every system that's out there.

David Martin:

And so, I look at the whole Great Reset as – it's great theater. It sells books. It does, in fact, make you the caricature of the Dr. Evil. I mean, you couldn't ask for a more perfect Austin Powers kind of looking – all he needs is a cat with no hair, and you've got it. But the fact of the matter is the entire illusion is being run because they're out of ideas. And the best thing that you can ever see people is when the incumbency is out of bad ideas they try desperately to force you into a behavior that you would not otherwise accept. All you have to do is just say no. Just don't play along.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

I would agree. But I'm wondering there are many people who've studied this very carefully and contend that one of the ulterior motivations for implementation is plandemic is a depopulation strategy.

David Martin:

There's no question that's the case.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

So, along those lines, and I really want to hear your thoughts on the likelihood of anyone who receives the COVID jab dying prematurely quickly within the next few years. I mean, theoretically, there's a potential that the majority of people who got the shot are going to be dead in a few years. So, I'm wondering your thoughts on that, and I'm wondering if, in fact, it is a very highly effective depopulation strategy, and resulting in loss of perhaps half the population or more if that impacts what you just said.

David Martin:

So, you're on to a very good point. And so, let's unpack the legs of the stool here. First of all, if you've made financial promises to senior citizens, or people who are going to be senior citizens, the fewer promises you have to keep the better. So, the financial interest for depopulation is a compelling and a very thoroughly compelling argument. I spent an entire hour on this at my lecture that I gave at the Church of Glad Tidings in Yuba City. If people want to go online, they can see that.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

We'll put a link to it.

David Martin:

I'm sorry?

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

We'll put a link to it.

David Martin:

Yeah, in that show, I actually went through the 1914 forward life insurance cabal that is actually running an enormous amount of what's happening right now. I've gotten to that in nauseating detail, and it turns out that there's an economic incentive to get a lot of people dead before 2028. There's an economic incentive. It's also a political incentive. If you have people over the age of 65 who have taken this shot who are already health compromised in one way or another, the likelihood that we've accelerated their loss of life is exceptionally high. If we look at the previous lipid nanoparticle and mRNA trials that were done in animal studies, we actually are not going to be surprised to see a mass-casualty event.

David Martin:

So there is no question that what's being done, jumped over animal trials for a very important reason. We've been told it was to save time, but it wasn't to save time. It was actually to put this particular pathogen into humanity, so that a lot of people suffer, and ultimately die of effects that we could have picked up if we had done it the traditional way, which is seven to eight years of safety studies before we decide to put it in the arms of humans. That's not what we did. And if we look at the safety data out of animal studies on mRNA, and on the lipid nanoparticle from Acuitas and Arbutus, there is no question, Joe, that there is going to be a fatality increase because of this.

David Martin:

Now, what percentage of the population is going to be a function of something that we do not discuss? Because as you are very aware, but your viewers probably not as much, there is a technology called CRISPR, which is the camel's nose that's been under this tent. And the CRISPR technology, which I've spent a lot of time looking at. We just did a couple shows with the several thousand CRISPR patents include a number of patents on clipping the effects of vaccines from people. So, there is a high probability that we're building a pathogen set that then goes into people so that we can introduce a more expensive technology, which allows us to then go fix the thing that we harm, which means that there's probably going to be an economic class distinction about whether you live or whether you die.

David Martin:

Now, I am not going to opine on the quality of life. Because if you are constantly dependent on CRISPR this and then vaccine that and then CRISPR this and then vaccine that, that's not much of a life. But the fact of the matter is I think we already see that the CRISPR approvals that have happened in the last even few weeks are pointing out the direction that we're planning on going here. What you are saying though, and I want to come back to this because the depopulation question is not a theoretical. This is something that has been explicitly part of an agenda since the Eugenics Office was started by the U.S. government in 1914 funded by Andrew Carnegie in collaboration, surprisingly, with Booker T. Washington, who's a great patron saint of people who don't want to read history.

David Martin:

But the fact of the matter is the getting rid of undesirables is actually something that's been around for 100-plus years here in the United States. This is a campaign that includes that, and the

fewer people that live to Social Security benefit, and the fewer people who live to the full maturity of their life insurance policies are quite problematic with respect to this particular reset. But I want to point out something that is something I mentioned a few months ago and seemed to be lost on a lot of people. We were told there were excess deaths. We were told that this whole coronavirus thing and COVID thing led to excess deaths. But there's a tiny technical problem. If you want real numbers, go to the people who are the real beneficiaries of death. And who are they? They're life insurance companies. I've got a nasty little secret to tell all of you who believe CDC's (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) numbers. We were told that more people died in 2020 than were supposed to die except for a tiny little problem that fewer life insurance claims were paid.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Smoking gun, the smoking gun.

David Martin:

Who's numbers are you going to believe?

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

The smoking gun.

David Martin:

Whose numbers are you going to believe? Are you going to believe the CDC who's trying to pump and dump this terror campaign of people dying, and therefore you need to have your mask on, you need to socially distance, you need to vaccinate? Are you going to believe those numbers or are you going to believe the numbers of the people who actually pay claims when real human life ends? And it turns out that if you look at the audited financial statements of the world's largest life insurance companies we can find no excess death evidence.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

That's a really powerful point.

David Martin:

Now, here's the question. Is COVID so damn smart that it only kills the uninsured? Is that what we're supposed to believe?

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

That's right. No. Yeah, that's brilliant. So, I'm wondering if you would care to speculate as to the range of lethality of the vaccine within a three-to-five-year time period?

David Martin:

Well, here's where it becomes a little hard because what we have is something that was not actually tried. Remember that what we've done is introduced as an alleged vaccine against a pathogen called SARS-CoV-2, we've introduced the synthetic computer simulation of the S1 spike protein. Now, what is so important about that? Let's start with the legal problem. The legal

problem is that when we say we have a vaccination against a virus, but we're not doing anything to vaccinate against the virus, what we're doing is we're injecting a simulated code to have the body produce a pathogen that then we hope the body will recognize and then build an immune response to.

David Martin:

So, this is a ridiculous proposition in the first place. But the vaccine itself has nothing to do with SARS-CoV-2, it has everything to do with the spike protein. And it's been mislabeled and misrepresented by every single clinician who's ever injected anybody with this thing because it does not protect you against a virus, it actually makes you stimulate a protein associated with one of the proteins associated with the model of the virus. And you followed all that you got a Ph.D. in genetics right there.

David Martin:

But here's the thing. What we don't know is we don't know whether or not the spike protein is going to have secondary effects that are also undesirable. We've already seen the concern that came out of the Booster review where the FDA's own scientists were concerned about myocarditis, they were concerned about Guillain-Barré syndrome, they were concerned about other adverse events. But what we know from a decade of research in dogs and in rabbits is we know that the spike protein is associated with increased cardiac and vascular and respiratory tissue damage. So, it is likely that we don't even have – Joe, at this point in time, it's likely we don't even have an idea other than we know the systems that we're going to watch fail.

David Martin:

We know we're going to have cardiomyopathy. We know we're going to have vascular damage, and we know we're going to have lung disorder. But what we do not know is whether those are lethal or they are simply morbidity events, meaning that your quality of life will functionally reduce to the fact that you will require some almost consistent palliative care. And what we'll have is probably a mix of actual deaths.

David Martin:

But the concern I have more egregious to the death as much as it sounds harsh when I say this, I think the malingering morbidity, which is the ongoing nature of people who require around-the-clock medical care is going to be a drain that will infect our economy so deeply that we may not recover. Because if we have people who have to stay at home with children who are sick, if we have people who have to care for elderly parents who are sick, if we have people who are caring for a spouse or a family member who are sick, that means that we do not have the ability to enjoy life and liberty. And the fact is that I think we're going to have a bigger morbidity than mortality event.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah, that's an interesting speculation. Especially, in light of the fact that the strong predictions are that they are going to approve this COVID jab, for infants, this year, which is one of the most reprehensible criminal behaviors in the history of medicine.

David Martin:

Yeah.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

It's just disgusting.

David Martin:

But bear in mind that this was something Congress approved in 2015. And people, you got to remember, these things matter. You need to be paying attention to what happens with your congressmen and women. You need to be paying attention to what happens in the Senate because we have been funding a universal infant pan-influenza vaccine program in Congress since 2015. Anthony Fauci has asked for more appropriations every year. They decided to turn the influenza authorization into a coronavirus authorization, but the fact of the matter is they are trying desperately to get this as an approved dependency that every single infant gets injected with at birth. And this is part of the official records of NIAID and the official records of Fauci's testimony in Congress. See, people before you knew the name Fauci was worth listening to he was sitting in front of congressmen and women advocating for a universal childhood influenza vaccine. And guess what Congress did? They appropriated it.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. It's so reprehensible because there's absolutely no clinical justification for this. It's even less clinically indicated in hepatitis B vaccine.

David Martin:

Yeah, I mean, that you're exactly right. There's not a shred of evidence that says that this is anything other than an economic grab to make sure the public is permanently dependent on genetically modified injections.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. Okay, I can't thank you enough. Deep expression of gratitude for your incredible insights into this window, and we've got to continually expose that brilliant information you're having. I would really like you to expand on what I think is clearly the conclusion, and the most important point here, which is what are we going to do? Hopefully, we can continue to educate, inspire and catalyze a large segment of the 80 million people in United States who have failed and refused to get the jab. So, I think we have to maintain this core of people who are insulated from the devastating morbidities you just described. So, I'd like to hear in detail as much as you want to expand on as to what you believed to be the community solutions that need to be implemented now while we still have some time to perform an effective alternative to global tyranny.

David Martin:

Well, listen, it starts with conversations like this, Joe. The fact of the matter is you and I have not had the pleasure of meeting each other and whether or not we have entered into lockstep on ideologies or anything else is neither here nor there. What we have to do is we have to engage in respectful conversation where the best and brightest of our minds can actually have open

dialogue. It's not surprising that one of the first things they did to implement this pandemic is separate people. And if you want to start I'll tell you exactly where to start. Invite somebody over for dinner and cook a homemade meal that doesn't have genetically altered ingredients in that meal.

David Martin:

The first thing to do is start informing yourself. Live in a way that says that this is something that matters and I have gone through and I just finished a course that a lot of people have taken on, integral accounting asset management, which is understanding the all in cost of what you're doing. If you have 11% of your retirement funds in Pfizer, can you actually say you're against the jab? I mean, let's start really addressing things people. Let's not pretend like we can turn a blind eye towards "Well, but we like the investment returns we're getting." If you actually are against the thing be against the thing.

David Martin:

The point is we have to start being conscious first because the minute we start being conscious we are going to make decisions that say, "We're going to choke off the money supply to the perpetrators of this evil." And we need to see that as a first step. As a community, we need to actually look at the labels of the food that we put into our mouths because it turns out that the genetic engineering that's happening in our food, which now 70% of what is sold in a grocery store, according to the most recent study that General Mills just published, 70% of what's sold in a grocery store is genetically engineered, 70%. Guess what? Get rid of the artificial sweeteners, get rid of the soft drinks, get rid of the things that are harming you, and start making the life decisions today, which actually show that you're actually concerned about this so that you're not waiting for a solution in the form of a tablet or a supplement or something else.

David Martin:

Start living correctly now, but do it in community, and community is not, let's all move into a commune somewhere. What I'm saying about community is get to know your neighbor. Engage in respectful dialogue with people who disagree with your point of view. Begin the process of having those conversations. And then what happens out of that is natural networks of economies are built. I have spent two decades of my life rebuilding post-conflict countries around the world. I've done work in 128 countries directly, many of which have gone through civil wars, many of which have gone through genocide. And what I have found, Joe, in every instance is the first step is to build micro-economies.

David Martin:

Micro economies are things that say as simple as if you have a car that you're not using, let somebody else rent the car. It doesn't have to be an Uber. Use local resources more effectively. Because what will happen out of this is that we'll start realizing that the promise of America, and the promise for humanity was not a car in every garage and a chicken in every pot. The promise of America was people being able to transport themselves, and having an extra seat at the table. That's what the promise of America was. That's what Thanksgiving was about. That's what all of these things are about.

David Martin:

We need to go back to what our real roots are because the fact is that we have built an illusion that says our success is defined by how much we consume for our singular benefit rather than how much do we steward so that everyone has the ability to experience the best and brightest? Do we all need a boat? Do we all need a car? Do we all need a tiller for our garden? Do we all need? No, we don't. What we need is the best used optimally.

David Martin:

So simple. But this is going to require a conscious shift in how we see our world. You all do not have to have a multimillion-dollar system that can understand the meaning of patents and do all that kind of thing. You need to know that there's a bald guy with a bowtie that is more than happy to share it with you whenever and however you need it. We don't need 10 of me. We need the one of me. And we don't need the 10 of Joes, we need the one of Joes, but what we need is we need to be in a world in which we see and value the values that people bring to the table and we reciprocate the values that we can share.

David Martin:

The fact is we have a very unique moment in human history, and it probably is as close to the story of Joseph in Egypt as you can get. You know the seven fat years and then the seven skinny years? Well, guess what? We have a couple years of fat years left. You know what we should be doing? We should be investing in our networks of relationship. We should be investing in our networks of community. We should be building those resilient fibers that hold us together because we know that there is a famine coming. And we are in the unique position right now ladies and gentlemen to actually do something about it.

David Martin:

So, start with yourself. Make sure that what you put into your body is aligned to your health. Make sure that what you do with your body is aligned to your health. And then as you do that invite other people into living a life that in fact models that behavior so that we start building communities of consciousness. And as we build those communities, we will start building currencies of consciousness. Those currencies are going to be the ability to create the micro, the organic Uber in your town, right? Wouldn't it be nice to actually know that you could borrow a car that wasn't vaccine? That you weren't going to have shedding of a freaking God knows what spike protein. Wouldn't it be great to be the first organic Uber in your town, the first organic Grubhub in your town? There are a bunch of ways that we can solve these problems, and we can do it using the market. We can do it using our consciousness, but we need our consciousness, we need our community, and we know our currency to be organically aligned to humanity again.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Oh, it's great. That's exactly what I was looking for. Couldn't agree more with respect to optimizing your health, and that's what I've been preaching for over nearly a quarter of a century. And helping people understand and that really helped hundreds of millions of people around the world. But the fly in the ointment in what you described, and definitely – I'd like you response to this and then we can sign off – is that in my view this is the most effective propaganda campaign in the history of humanity. And it has created a massive global psychosis that has brainwashed

the population so that dialogue you encourage us to have with our neighbors in their community is almost physically impossible. It has progressed to the point where they could have someone, their parent or their sibling die with the jab in their arm and believe it was just a coincidence. That is how bad it is. So, how do you address the most effective propaganda campaign in history that ever existed?

David Martin:

So, there's probably no better question to end on Joe. How do you ever convince people who bought propaganda to change their mind? Because the decision to buy it wasn't rational.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Absolutely.

David Martin:

Therefore, we cannot appeal to rationality to change it. But I'll tell you what you can do. You can actually live, and the funny thing about living is, I don't know if you remember the movie "When Harry Met Sally," but there's a beautiful scene in that movie where they're out at a restaurant-

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yes, a classic.

David Martin:

And the classic iconic scene where you know the end of it. "I'll have what she's having." The point is that that's the answer. The answer is live without constraint, without fear. And before long, what you'll find is people are going to say, "Hold on a minute, you mean you're not afraid? You mean, you're not doing something?" I think here's the problem. We see the short-term reflexive effectiveness of propaganda, and we think we've lost, but we haven't lost. Because it turns out people like me, people like you, I'm still traveling the country. I'm going all over the place. I'm doing things, I'm meeting with people. God forbid, I'm shaking hands, I'm doing selfies, I'm interacting with humanity. And it turns out that people are starting to go, "Well, but aren't you afraid?" I don't have to answer that question. The evidence is my life.

David Martin:

Listen people, propaganda cannot stand against the truth of a life well lived. It can never stand against that truth. What we're trying to do is the wrong energy. We're trying to confront with rationality and irrational reflex. But what we need to be doing is being persistent in showing up and living in a way that people look at and say, "I'll have what he's having. I'll have what she's having." This is your "Harry Met Sally" moment. This is that restaurant scene. This is your moment to be a person who outlasts the half-life of the propaganda reflex. And I've seen way too many people try to engage energetically in the debate where they enter into conflict and what it does is it destroys their well-being, it destroys their life, and they walk away being the miserable angry one. Well, don't be the miserable angry one. Be the one at the table who is the one worth looking at and going, "I'll have what he's having. I'll have what she's having." Live a life that is desirable and you'll see propaganda become emasculated instantaneously.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

So, the refinement of your early recommendation, engage in dialogue with people in your community is to do not engage with those who have drunk the Kool Aid. You just can't because you are speaking – you are hitting a head against a brick wall.

David Martin:

That's exactly right.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

It won't work. You're wasting time and effort. It's going to be highly counterproductive.

David Martin:

When they hear a picnic in your backyard, and they see lights well past the bedtime curfew. All the time while Governor Northam here in Virginia was telling us that we could not have gatherings. What we did was we continued our workshops. We had people in our house, we had our table full of 15, 20, 25 people, and our official policy was if you signed up for our workshop, for the moment you were in our home we adopted you as family because the legal exemption in Virginia was if you were family then you actually didn't count. So, what we did was we actually adopted everybody for the week or the four days or the five days. If anybody knocked on the door, we just had one of the most inclusive, gender-neutral, socially acceptable, panchromatic, you name it. We had every kind of cousin, uncle, aunt, brother, sister, child, granny. We had everybody and it was all family. And we actually went through the entire shutdown having a table full of fellowship. And you know what? Everybody in the neighborhood said, "I'd love to have what they're having."

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

Yeah. Well, I don't think there's a better point to end on. I can't thank you enough for sharing your insights. I don't think I've ever heard a more brilliant compilation of explanations and practical implementations of what to do in these challenging times. I mean, you've covered it from end to end. So, I'm just grateful that someone like you exists who's used his intellectual resources for the benefit of people.

David Martin:

Joe, it's an honor to be with you and I'm looking forward to the day that we get to break bread together and spend some time in each other's company.

Dr. Joseph Mercola:

All right. Well, thanks so much, and we'll definitely connect.

David Martin:

Very good.