

Vaccine (NOT a vaccine)

Was it this one:

Statement by Dr. David Martin on Jan 5th 2021

"Let's make sure we are clear... This is not a vaccine. They are using the term "vaccine" to sneak this thing under public health exemptions. This is not a vaccine."

"This is mRNA packaged in a fat envelope that is delivered to a cell. It is a medical device designed to stimulate the human cell into becoming a pathogen creator. It is not a vaccine. Vaccines actually are a legally defined term under public health law; they are a legally defined term under CDC and FDA standards [1]. And the vaccine specifically has to stimulate both the immunity within the person receiving it and it also has to disrupt transmission.

And that is not what this is. They (Moderna and Pfizer) have been abundantly clear in saying that the mRNA strand that is going into the cell is not to stop the transmission, it is a treatment. But if it was discussed as a treatment, it would not get the sympathetic ear of public health authorities because then people would say, "What other treatments are there?"

The use of the term vaccine is unconscionable for both the legal definition and also it is actually the sucker punch to open and free discourse... Moderna was started as a chemotherapy company for cancer, not a vaccine manufacturer for S.A.R.S.CO.V.2. If we said we are going to give people prophylactic chemotherapy for the cancer they don't yet have, we'd be laughed out of the room because it's a stupid idea. That's exactly what this is. This is a mechanical device in the form of a very small package of technology that is being inserted into the human system to activate the cell to become a pathogen manufacturing site.

And I refuse to stipulate in any conversations that this is in fact a vaccine issue. The only reason why the term is being used is to abuse the 1905 Jacobson case that has been misrepresented since it was written. And if we were honest with this, we would actually call it what it is: it is a chemical pathogen device that is actually meant to unleash a chemical pathogen production action within a cell. It is a medical device, not a drug because it meets the CDRH definition of a device. It is not a living system, it is not a biologic system, it is a physical technology - it happens to just come in the size of a molecular package.

So, we need to be really clear on making sure we don't fall for their game. Because their game is if we talk about it as a vaccine then we are going to get into a vaccine conversation but this is not, by their own admission, a vaccine. As a result it must be clear to everyone listening that we will not fall for this failed definition just like we will not fall for their industrial chemical definition of health. Both of them are functionally flawed and are an implicit violation of the legal construct that is being exploited. I get frustrated when I hear activists and lawyers say, "we are going to fight the vaccine". If you stipulate it's a vaccine you've already lost the battle. It's not a vaccine. It is made to make you sick.