



Is it Possible to Patent Genetically-Modified Humans?

Is it Possible to Patent Genetically-Modified Humans?

Description

“When we’re modifying the genome of an organism we can put our signature, our name, into the genome.” – “What is God? God creates. Well, we can create now.” – “We deserve to be credited for our work. We have lobbyists in politics and the courts to make sure the patenting and owning of parts of the human genome continues.”

Not word for word but, these are recollections by Dr. Carrie Madej of remarks made by Dr. Craig Venter of the Human Genome Project during a speech in 2014. Dr. Venter also talked about how vaccines could be useful to modify people’s genomes. Dr. Madej discussed this during an interview, watch [HERE](#) (starting at 45 mins).

In 2010, on creating the world’s first synthetic life form Dr. Venter said, “the achievement heralds the dawn of a new era in which new life is made to benefit humanity, starting with bacteria that churn out biofuels, soak up carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and even manufacture vaccines.” Dr. Venter’s technology paved the way for designer organisms to be built rather than be allowed to naturally evolve, and he owns the patent.

In 2018, Dr. Charles Morgan gave the presentation below to cadets at West Point, US Military Academy. He covered a range of topics including psychology, neurobiology, and the science of humans at war. It is a mind-blowing presentation and well worth the one-hour watch.

Modern War Institute: Dr. Charles Morgan on Psycho-Neurobiology and War, 15 July 2018 (56 mins)

Starting at around 28 mins, Dr. Morgan discusses work being done by Dr. Venter stating, “[his] work is, in my view, the equivalent of the development of nuclear weapons when you realise that he created life in a cell back in 2010.”

Dr. Venter’s technology paired with [CRISPR](#) enables “you to engineer anything you like,” for example: designer medicine and therapy, or, a unique thing that would only kill one person in the world. This is because “you put in a specific gene slicing, you program what you like, you put it in the cell and it can reproduce and make as much as you like.” Dr. Morgan continues, “You can create a designer

receptor. You can create a cell, you can put it somewhere in the body, and you can remotely activate it when the brain is exposed to the right signal.” Using this technology memories have been transferred from one fruit fly to another by signalling, through a light stimulus, into the retina.

DNA can hold a staggering amount of information. Between CRISPR, the storage capacity of DNA and programming cells the new way to hide information will be in DNA. Starting at around 36 mins, Dr Morgan shows a GIF file that had been “hidden” in the DNA of bacteria. When the bacteria reproduced, the offspring carried the DNA containing the GIF and produced the encoded movie. This idea was being developed further. “The Chinese are fairly convinced that DNA encryption encoding would be one tremendous challenge even for quantum computing. So, this is where the race is right now. Trying to merge quantum computing with what you call a wet hard drive, with DNA,” Dr. Morgan said.

Dr. Morgan’s presentation it is truly an eye-opener. It demonstrates how advanced technology was at the time and this is merely the information available in the public domain.

The SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein is Patented

Equally eye-opening is evidence gathered by Dr. David E. Martin regarding the SARS-CoV-2 virus. Governments, their advisors and legacy media would have us believe that SARS-CoV-2 is naturally occurring – it is a lie. Dr. Martin has conducted extensive research on coronavirus patents. During an interview with the Corona Investigative Committee, Dr. Martin revealed the true origins of SARS-CoV-2 and its infamous spike protein.

Over 4000 patents have been issued around SARS coronavirus. Until 1999 the patenting activity was uniquely applied to veterinary sciences. The NIAID made SARS, a coronavirus that specifically targets human lung epithelium, and patented it on 19 April 2002. Between 2008 and 2019 there were 73 patents issued, to numerous organisations, which have the elements that were allegedly novel to SARS-CoV-2, more specifically its spike protein. The Covid-19 injection was never intended to be a vaccine.

Click on the image below to watch the [video on Odysee](#).

Corona Investigative Committee: Session 60, Time is Not a Flat Circle | Dr. David E. Martin, 9 July 2021 (1 hr 51 mins)

You can read the transcript for the video above, including links to patents, [HERE](#).

Legal Implications of Patented Genes

In 2003 NBC News published an article titled ‘*Scientists race to patent SARS virus*’:

Researchers around the world are racing to patent the SARS virus and its genetic material, rekindling criticism of laws that allow people to claim intellectual property rights on living things.

Several biotechnology and pharmaceutical companies, the U.S. government and

researchers in Canada and Hong Kong have filed SARS-related patent applications in recent weeks, claiming ownership of everything from bits of genetic material to the virus itself.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, for instance, claims ownership of the virus and its entire genetic content.

The race to patent the SARS virus has revived the debate about the ethics of a pivotal US Supreme Court ruling in 1980 [see below] that cleared the way for the US Patent and Trademark Office to award patents for living things, most notably individual human genes.

“These are discoveries of nature and it’s baloney that we allow patents on living things,” said Jeremy Rifkin, a prominent anti-biotechnology author. “We didn’t allow chemists to patent the periodic table — there’s no patent on hydrogen and I don’t see why they can patent discoveries of nature.”

In the spring of 1980, PBC filed a legal brief before the US Supreme Court on the case *Diamond vs. Chakrabarty*. At issue was whether General Electric would be allowed to become the first US corporation to be granted a commercial patent on a genetically engineered living organism.

The US Supreme Court ruled, five to four, that human-made life forms may be patented. The decision gave companies the go-ahead to create new forms of life and the right to own and control that life for 17 years under patent law. The case before the court involved a new micro-organism created by a scientist working for General Electric. This particular life form had never before existed in nature – four plasmids were added to a bacterium, enabling the bacterium to break down various components of crude oil.

In the video below [Jeremy Rifkin](#) explained what happened.

A Patent on Living Things, [Mr. Smith on Twitter](#)

In 2013, *‘Pathology vs. Myriad Genetics’*, the US Supreme Court ruled complementary DNA (“cDNA”) could be patented: “the lab technician unquestionably creates something new when cDNA is made”. cDNA is a form of DNA artificially synthesised from a messenger RNA template. It is used in genetic engineering to produce gene clones.

The petitioners asked the US Supreme Court to address the legal question of whether human genes are patentable. Based on the Supreme Court’s analysis, the answer was a resounding and unanimous “no.”

However, the 2013 ruling is important in the context of Covid because it means the synthetic genes encoded in the injections, and consequently, the spike protein manufactured within people’s bodies, are owned by the patent holder and can be pursued for private gain. Additionally, if the genetic code for the spike protein integrates into human DNA, in legal terms, it is possible that people altered by it would be considered genetically modified organisms (“GMOs”). It may be that GMOs, or genetically modified human beings, are patented and could be placed under license agreements which could be negotiated without their knowledge. As James Corbett discussed in a 2020 podcast, It is unclear what the practical implications of the 2013 ruling for “vaccinated” people will be and further court rulings will

most likely be needed to clarify their legal position.

In a [Twitter thread](#), Alex Dalassio argued: “The Supreme Court ruled [in *Pathology vs. Myriad Genetics*] that you cannot patent human DNA as it was ‘a product of nature’. But at the end of the ruling the Supreme Court did rule that if you were to change a human’s genome by mRNA vaccines then the genome can be patented ... technically, anyone who receives these medical devices [mRNA vaccines] could no longer have any access to human rights. There have been a few legal papers discussing this recently, so clarification should be available on this soon.”

You can read Dalassio’s Twitter thread on Thread Reader App [HERE](#) and the Supreme Court ruling [HERE](#).

The truth is these scientists are not creating. They are corrupting what has already been created. Additionally, God did not create in order to own and then sell for profit. This is the very definition of slavery. These so-called scientists are far from being “like God”. Are all scientists and scientific endeavours evil? No. Has evil taken control of mainstream science? Yes.

Thinking logically, if it were impossible to patent and commercialise the building blocks of life – including any man-modified forms (cDNA, GMOs and synthetic life) – then the “pandemic” and the “vaccines” would never have happened. The world would never have known Covid-19. To bring this to an end and ensure it never happens again, could it really be as simple as a change to a man-made law? It would be interesting to hear the perspective from patent lawyers.

A word of warning to those scientists hoping to achieve godlike status: your arrogance will be your downfall and the higher you rise the harder you will fall. Because we, the people, with God on our side will no longer tolerate it.

by Rhoda Wilson

Category

1. Health-Wellness-Healing-Nutrition & Fitness
2. Main
3. NWO-Deep State-Dictatorship-Tyrrany
4. Science-Tech-AI-Medical & Gen. Research

Date Created

10/26/2022