

Tony Blair and The Iraq War: Digging Deeper into the Death of David Kelly with James Corbett.

Complete Transcript included

By [Michael Welch](#) and [James Corbett](#)

Global Research, June 30, 2023

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [GLOBAL RESEARCH NEWS HOUR](#),
[Intelligence](#), [Militarization and WMD](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in **51 languages** by activating the “**Translate Website**” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@crg_globalresearch](#).

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

[Click to download the audio \(MP3 format\)](#)

In little more than two weeks, we mark the 20th anniversary of the Welsh scientist and authority on biowarfare, **Dr David Kelly**. [1]

Listeners to this station will remember a discussion about the man in March 2023, the anniversary of the start of the Iraq War. Our past guest, **Dr David Halpin** outlined some of the reasons he, **Dr Stephen Frost**, and a list of determined skeptics doubted the official story of his passage due to suicide and were mobilizing in support of not just public hearings, but a public inquest to get to the bottom of his death, which they suspected was a murder which benefited the government of the UK, and **Prime Minister Tony Blair** in particular. [2]

The oft repeated assertion among many such skeptics, including Liberal-Democrat MP **Norman Baker**, was the claim that weapons of mass destruction was a key to a motive behind his elimination. Iraq supposedly still had WMDs. They could be launched at the insistence of Big Bad Saddam to cause tens of thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands of people in some innocent country – maybe even America! But **David Kelly**, acclaimed and high profile weapons instructor that he was, publicly challenged this claim. Hence, ripping away the fundamental reason for going to war with Iraq.

However, there may be another motive that could potentially lead to an even darker agenda. Dr. Kelly was the head of biological defence at the Government’s secretive military research establishment in Wiltshire, England. He was the brain behind much of the West’s germ warfare programmes. . [3]

If Dr. Kelly was knowledgeable of anything untoward, and was willing to blab to the public,

might that also be a reason for doing him in? After all, soon after the suspicious releases of anthrax letters post 9/11, followed an astonishing level of deaths of top scientists in the field of microbiology. Was Kelly a target? Or unfinished business? [4]

Joining us for the bulk of the show this week is Canadian born podcaster and investigative journalist **James Corbett**. A former member of the Global Research team bringing enlightening views on a variety of topics, **James Corbett** was entirely enrapt in the **David Kelly** affair, even before he was producing his video-work. He has also interviewed **Dr David Halpin** and put out a couple of informative documentaries on the mysterious incident. While he is convinced Kelly's murder is a "no-brainer" he tends to look at the murder as a little larger than eliminating a convenient Iraq's WMD truth-teller.

In this exquisite edition of the Global Research News Hour, James elaborates again on the fraudulent claim underlying the death by suicide fiasco, conjures evidence of biowarfare on the murderer's radar screen, and postulates some of the contemporary realities Dr. Kelly's death continues to shine a light on two decades later, particularly on the subject of the recent "pandemic."

***James Corbett** started [The Corbett Report](#) website in 2007 as an outlet for independent critical analysis of politics, society, history, and economics. An award-winning investigative journalist, he has lectured on geopolitics at the [University of Groningen's Studium Generale](#), and delivered presentations on open source journalism at The French Institute for Research in Computer Science and Automation's [fOSSa conference](#), at [TedXGroningen](#) and at [Ritsumeikan University](#) in Kyoto.*

(Global Research News Hour Episode 397)

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

[Click to download the audio \(MP3 format\)](#)

Transcript of James Corbett, June 27, 2023

Part One

Global Research: This happened before you set up the Corbett Report. Could you talk about how you became acquainted with it enough to spark an interest in investigating it yourself?

James Corbett: Absolutely, yes. So, as you indicate, I started the Corbett Report in 2007, but Dr. Kelly died in July of 2003. So, this did predate my work or even my research into what became the Corbett Report by a few years. And it was a – obviously, it was a big story at the time. I certainly recall hearing about it or reading about it at the time that it was happening and unfolding. It was a mainstream news story in Canada and elsewhere around the world.

But why? 'What was really going on with this story?' I think is the real question. And I think it's important just to refresh ourselves of what the official story is so that we can then debunk it.

On the note of, yes, the lone gunmen or the lone assassin idea being, in this case, well

I guess it was David Kelly himself who was the lone assassin, apparently, in terms of suicide. I employ the term “suicided” for this type of case where, someone is murdered in a way that is meant to look like suicide in order to, essentially, stop any further investigation into what this person was saying or what they believed. And I have an entire series of podcast episodes that I’ve done in the past on the Corbett Report called “Requiem for the Suicided” in which I’ve explored the deaths of several people like Danny Casolaro and Gary Webb and Dr. David Kelly. So, if people are interested in more of the meat and details of the official story and why it is obviously incorrect, they can go to my Requiem for the Suicided episode about this.

But yes, let’s set the table for people who don’t remember some of the specifics or why it was being covered at the time.

And you introduced David Kelly by saying he was a microbiologist and a weapons inspector, and I think most people at the time understood and thought of him as a weapons inspector. And of course, that was one of his roles. He was appointed to the United Nations Special Commission, the UNSCOM, in 1991 as one of its chief weapons inspectors going into Iraq. And he led ten missions to Iraq between May 1991 and December 1998. Obviously, at that time seeking to verify compliance with Saddam Hussein’s government’s disposal of their weapons of mass destruction, right? Which, of course, factored heavily into what came with the invasion in 2003.

He also worked with UNSCOM’s successor organization, the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspections Commission. And so, he was specifically looking at anthrax reduction programs in Saddam’s Iraq, as well as the bioweapons program that was being run at Al-Hakum. I think that’s the way that the public understands David Kelly: he was a weapons inspector. And so, it was in that context that in 2002, the UK government released this dossier on the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction which stated that Saddam had chemical and biological weapons that were deployable within 45 minutes.

And the 45-minute claim with the big sensational headline-generating claim at that time as – essentially it was being sold to the public as “Oh my God, Saddam Hussein is crazy. He has weapons of mass destruction. They could be used against us within 45 minutes.” And that was a big part of the UK version of the push towards the Iraq War in 2003.

Now, the BBC came out with a story from reporter Andrew Gilligan that claimed that the Downing Street Press officer had been pressured to include the 45-minute claim against the advisement of the weapons inspectors, who were saying this isn’t true. That you’re just ‘sexing up’ the dossier. So, the sexed-up dossier became a big question. The BBC’s report became a big scandal: “Is this true? If it is true, who was the source for this story?” And in the UK, at any rate, when there is parliamentary privilege about libel, and you can’t sue someone for libel against the Parliament. But they do have the right to demand the source of the accusation or something along those lines. At any rate, there was a judicial process to try – a parliamentary inquiry process, I believe – to try to get Andrew Gilligan to reveal his source. The BBC wouldn’t reveal the source. But it eventually came out that, apparently – although this was – I don’t know if this was ever definitely concluded, but at any rate, it became apparent that David Kelly was likely the source for Andrew Gilligan’s reporting.

And so, David Kelly was brought before this parliamentary inquiry process. And that we've all seen the footage of him at this inquiry being grilled by the various ministers on this panel, and they were talking about him and, 'Oh, you've been set up to take the - you're fall guy for this.' He looks very harried in the two-second clips that are generally played in the mainstream media when they talk about David Kelly. 'Look, he was under attack, he was so stressed, he ended up taking his own life.'

So, the story is that somewhere on or around the 17th of July 2003, Dr. Kelly took a pocket knife that he had had since childhood; took copious amounts of Co-proxamol tablets; and went out to the woods around his house in Oxfordshire, England and ended up slitting his own wrists and dying from, I believe - I will have to double-check this - but dying from exsanguination. Bleeding out, essentially. Well, a combination of factors, actually, related to the Co-proxamol tablets and, apparently, an undiagnosed coronary artery condition that he had. That is the official story. I won't do disservice to this by saying it is trivially true that this is not the case. But at any rate, we can summarize, as you already have, but we can just summarize the various threads through which we know that the official story is not true.

So, for example, David Kelly had a known aversion to swallowing pills at all, let alone the 26 tablets or whatever it is he was said to have swallowed. Which, by the way, this Co-proxamol, the amount that he had swallowed was not a lethal amount. And that was never even suggested that this was some sort of lethal amount of pills that he had taken.

As Dr. Halpin, who you have talked to, has talked about at length, the Hutton report that was issued from the inquiry - the public inquiry that eventually resulted as a result of this scandal around David Kelly's death - was looking at blood samples. And there is all sorts of questions about the blood samples that they were looking at. One of the doctors involved in that inquiry said that there were five blood samples that he had seen and had access to, but only one of which was actually labelled. Which is fairly important for an actual forensic examination. And of those five samples, only four ended up getting mentioned in the Hutton inquiry report which means one of them just kind of disappeared somewhere. And of those four samples, only one was directly connected: MCH47 was the blood sample that was apparently found to contain the elements that are the breakdown elements of this Co-proxamol. But of that, even in that one sample that apparently contained these elements, the elements that were found were 400 percent smaller than the amounts that were found in cases that actually resulted in death.

So, it wasn't the tablets. Kelly could not have killed himself in the manner suggested, because he had - according to his close confidant who is on record with this - he had difficulty using his right hand at all for strenuous activities, because of an injury that he had received to his elbow a number of years past. So, he had difficulty using his hand at all. Apparently, he had to use the pocket knife with his right hand to inflict the wound on the left arm, and apparently used the pocket knife the wrong way around because of the way the blade was designed.

So again, seems unlikely. The body changed position between the time that it was discovered and the time the police report was filed. The person who discovered the body claimed that the body was resting against a tree, propped up against the tree,

head and shoulders propped up. The police report describes the body was found lying completely flat. We do know that there was a helicopter that landed at the scene of the discovery of the body, just 90 minutes after the discovery of the body. We only know about this because of Freedom of Information Act requests for the helicopter flight logs which eventually were released. And although they were released heavily redacted, we do know that the helicopter came within 90 minutes of the discovery of the body, landed at the scene for five minutes, and then took off again. It has never been explained what that helicopter was; who was piloting it; what was on board; what they did; or why they were there. None of that information is available.

We do know that David Kelly – the last e-mail that he wrote before he was found dead was an e-mail to Judy Miller, who factors heavily into the whole Iraq story for her reporting on – for the New York Times, but is probably not very well remembered for the fact that, I believe, just one month before 9/11 she had a front-page New York Times story on the secret bio-weapons program that was illegally being run by the US Defense Department. Which had been going on for decades, but was now being reported on the front page of the New York Times involving anthrax. And this was one month before 9/11. At any rate, his last e-mail was to Judy Miller in which he said there were “Dark actors playing games.”

He had also mentioned that he was likely to be found dead in the woods at some point. And lo and behold, apparently, we are asked to believe that this weapons inspector, this seasoned veteran of the weapons inspections and all of this, who’d been obviously in a very stressful position for a very long time, couldn’t take the stress of being questioned before parliamentary members and decided to take his own life. Again, top to bottom, front to back, complete nonsense.

There is a lot more to say about that, but it has been said: you’ve talked about it, I’ve talked about it. People can look up more information about that or look at sources like Dr. David Halpin for more information about that. That’s ostensibly why this was such a big story at the time. It was a scandal. It was related to the Iraq invasion and the war and what was going on there, and that’s why it was covered at all, I think, by the mainstream media. And because it also involved the BBC. The Hutton inquiry that was then launched as a result of this scandal came to the conclusion that, actually, you know, the BBC was at fault for their story and it was just a suicide. And Gilligan, Andrew Gilligan, the BBC reporter and others, lost their positions at the BBC as a result of this. And the official story became “It was a suicide.” It has been ruled by the Hutton inquiry.

The Hutton inquiry, however, was a public inquiry, which is very different from a coroner’s inquest. And a public inquiry is a special type of – essentially a review of government actions that is set up by the UK government that doesn’t have any legal force or legal teeth to it whatsoever. All it can do is issue a report of recommendations which is what ultimately got released.

So, for several years there was a concerted attempt by Dr. David Halpin and others, who were involved in a process to try to bring an actual coroner’s inquest to the question of David Kelly’s death where there would be real forensic evidence examined. There would be real legal ramifications to the coroner’s findings. However, 2010 or was it 2011, the UK government considered for about 15 minutes the idea that they would hold an inquiry, and decided they would not. There will be no – sorry,

an inquest. There will be no inquest into David Kelly's death.

And that is essentially - essentially - where that story has remained for the past decade. And I guess the question might be, 'Okay, well so why was I interested in this story in the first place?' And now, 'Why do I think it is relevant to what we are living through today?' I will —

GR: Mm-hmm.

JC: — stop for a moment in case you have any further questions you want to ask before we get into those subjects.

Part Two

GR: The Iraq weapons of mass destruction are non-existent. That was all made up. That it was phony. And you know, this is the reason why he was killed, because he knew too much. But I don't know, I'm kind of the impression that that's kind of like a - like a limited hangout, kind of idea. Because, I mean, this man who worked at Porton Down which was kind of like the UK equivalent of Fort Dietrich in the United States. He was engaged with really, really high-level things like DNA sequencing, or at least the people he was coming into contact with did. It seems like there's a little bit more to it than that. I mean, very important, perhaps, but I mean I think a lot of people already knew the - maybe I'll ask you the question that Donald Sutherland's character in the movie - the Oliver Stone movie JFK put to Kevin Costner's character, you know, the three questions that you really have to ask to get to the bottom of it: why was David Kelly killed? Who benefited? And who had the ability to cover it up?

JC: Excellent, yes. Very, very, very good. Very important questions. Equally as important to the JFK assassination as to David Kelly's death, as to many other events that are going on. So, I'm glad you put it that way.

And I think you hit the nail on the head: yes, the official story, that this was a fundamentally, at base, about anthrax or weapons of mass destruction, biological weapons, and Iraq is a limited hangout. That is part, certainly, part of the story and part of what David Kelly was involved with. But David Kelly was involved in much more. And you hit the nail on the head, because as I say, the way that I understood David Kelly at the time that it was happening when I was just watching the mainstream news coverage of this back in 2003, was as a weapons inspector. And that was the context in which this was framed and that was who he was, that was what he did.

But actually, what David Kelly was, was the chief microbiologist at Porton Down. Now, for people who - in the audience who do not know about Porton Down, I really suggest they start taking a look at this. As you say, this is essentially the top bio-weapons lab in the UK government complex, a military installation, that has its fingers in a lot of different pies. For example, the Novichok discovery, the poisoning that took place a few years ago in the UK, apparently Russian agents or so we are asked to believe, spreading Novichok in a ham-handed, weirdly cookie crumb trail way in order to lead all signs of these assassination attempts back to Vladimir Putin. Interestingly enough, that was taking place literally there on the doorstep of Porton Down just miles away from that facility, where, oh yeah, they did have samples of Novichok and they were

working on it. There's many such examples that we could dig up from Porton Down's illustrious past about their involvement with biological weapons research, et cetera.

Again, research that is technically, supposedly banned and illegal under the Biological Weapons Treaty that supposedly bans this type of research. Except, of course, for defensive purposes and, 'Oh, well, we don't know what the Russians are doing, so we have to develop these weapons in order to counteract them and come up with antidotes and vaccines' and blah blah blah. That is an incredibly important part of this David Kelly story and what David Kelly was doing with regards to that. Now, I won't claim to know all of that, because a lot of it, of course, is classified and secret. But there are certain things that we do know, on the record, that David Kelly was involved with that do seem extremely interesting and relevant.

And I have a surprising source for at least some of this information. As a Canadian, you'll be able to appreciate the CBC's The Passionate Eye documentary series that they've been doing for decades. I believe it is still going on but I don't watch the CBC, so I wouldn't be able to know. But at any rate, back in 2000 - I don't know the exact date, but in the early-2000s, they had an investigation about - well, broadly speaking, about David Kelly and anthrax and biological weapons. It was called The Anthrax War and it is available, actually, up on YouTube even for free viewing if people are interested in it. And I would suggest they do so, because it's interesting to me, this exact documentary, the exact documentary - and I mean word-for-word - the exact documentary could be made by myself or yourself or any person out there today and would be immediately dismissed by all of the fact-checkers in the fact-checker universe as 'misinformation, disinformation,' likely 'Russian misinformation,' despite the fact that this was mainstream, this was broadcast on the CBC two decades ago. Hm, interesting.

But at any rate, there is some interesting information in that documentary including, for example, there is the story of Vladimir Pasechnik who was a defector from the Russian biological weapons program who had been working with, specifically with weaponizing anthrax and other biological agents for the Soviets in the Cold War. And in 1989, he defected to the West. And he, interestingly, was debriefed at Porton Down and was then offered a job. He was offered a weird position in which he could start a company that would be housed at Porton Down, conducting research into anthrax antidotes. Very interesting setup, especially for someone who was literally just working with the enemy in the Cold War.

At any rate, that arrangement is interesting in and of itself, but guess who was one of the debriefers of Vladimir Pasechnik when he came over? Of course, it was David Kelly. David Kelly was involved with that, and apparently he was the one who specifically gave that offer of allowing Pasechnik to work at Porton Down on his anthrax antidote research. Which again, as I intimated earlier, the defensive biological research is always also offensive research by its very nature. In order to understand how to counteract weaponized anthrax, you have to weaponize anthrax. So, there is of course the implication that Porton Down was working with weaponizing anthrax. And oh, by the way, Porton Down also had the Ames strain of anthrax which was the exact strain that was used in the 2001 attacks. So, there's that interesting connection, as well.

Here's another interesting connection: just days after the anthrax attacks began in the

United States - or at least when they were being reported in October of 2001 - Vladimir Pasechnik died of an apparent stroke. So, the man at Porton Down who was working on the anthrax antidotes and weaponization of anthrax died within days of the anthrax attacks in the United States being announced. And again, David Kelly we know was involved in that story in some manner, in some capacity.

Here's another interesting connection that David Kelly had: in the - well, in the 1990s during the Truth and Reconciliation proceedings in South Africa after the end of Apartheid - at which amnesty was given to government workers who would confess to the crimes that they had been involved with - the records were released around a very interesting project that the South African government had been engaged in for some time in the 1980s called "Project Coast." And the man who headed up Project Coast was a cardiologist by the name of Wouter Basson. And he was directing this program and according to the Post - I don't know which Post, this is Washington Post? - he "Spoke candidly to federal officials of global shopping sprees for pathogens and equipment. Of plans for epidemics to be sewn in black communities. And of cigarettes and letters that were laced with anthrax." And that he also revealed the development of a novel anthrax strain unknown to US officials. A kind of stealth anthrax that Basson claimed could fool tests used to detect the disease.

So, this was all part of this Project Coast that he was heading up from 1981 to 1993. The South African National Defence Force had created it and, according to multiple testimonies from multiple people, it was directed specifically to develop race-specific bio-weapons that could be directed at the black population in South Africa under Apartheid. For example, one person who was the director of Project Coast's research, Don Gustin, testified that he was ordered by Basson to develop ways, "To suppress population growth among blacks," and to, "Search for a black bomb, a biological weapon that would select targets based on skin colour." And -

GR: So, you're -

JC: - he also -

GR: - saying that - so, you're saying that all of these people - like, you have a certain genetic, ethnicity, you look for certain traits in the genes that race will have that others don't and that's basically how you separate them, right?

JC: That was, at least according to Gustin and others who were involved in Project Coast, that was the specific aim of Project Coast.

It was also confirmed in certain documents that were unearthed by the Truth and Reconciliation Committee. That was the aim. And they were talking about - and Basson has openly talked about attempts to develop a vaccine that would essentially immunize women against sperm, essentially, taking elements that are found in human semen and making it so that women would reject that by way of some sort of adjuvant or something inserted into a vaccine. Now, according to Basson, according to others, they didn't - this was never developed to the point where they had some working ability to do this.

However, it is interesting to note that there has been for decades, the accusation, at any rate, made by a number of groups, that the tetanus vaccines that were being

developed and delivered by the United Nations in The Philippines, in Kenya, in various other countries, has been specifically claimed to have been weaponized essentially in exactly that way. A fertility vaccine, essentially, that would make women spontaneously reject pregnancy. So, that claim, at any rate, has been out for a long time and there are various – I’ve talked about that before and the various reasons for believing that. At any rate, I’m not sure that was specifically related to Project Coast or what Wouter Basson had to do with that specifically. But at any rate, that idea has been around for many decades.

In fact, it was a Rockefeller Foundation project aim at some point, to develop a fertility vaccine, and vaccine to actually make women infertile. This is a known possibility. And race-specific bio-weapons, of course, was specifically mentioned in the Rebuilding America’s Defenses document released by PNAC, famously, infamously, the year before 9/11, in which they were also calling for the new Pearl Harbor to galvanize the American public behind this transformation of the American military. What transformation? Well, a number of proposals, but one of those proposals was for race-specific bio-weapons to be made a politically useful tool.

So, at any rate, that’s the type of thing that Project Coast and Basson was involved with. And that Anthrax War documentary that was, again, aired on the CBC a couple of decades ago, got Basson on the record to admit he had had multiple meetings with David Kelly. He wouldn’t confirm whether those meetings took place at Porton Down or who arranged them, et cetera. But at any rate, we know David Kelly had multiple meetings with Wouter Basson.

So, at any rate, Kelly knew something with regard to Project Coast and what was being worked on there. We do obviously do not – we are not privy to the details of those. Those are a couple of things that we know Kelly had some connection to. Pasechnik working on weaponization of anthrax, Basson working on these race-specific bio-weapons, fertility vaccines, anthrax letters and other such things. So, we know that Kelly had some sort of connection to that.

Here is the other thing that we know: so, the question then is, “Okay, who was interested in keeping this information suppressed? How do we know it? Who was capable of covering this up?” Well, here’s a couple of things that we do know: we know that David Kelly was exploring, shortly before his death he was exploring with publishers in Oxford the possibility of publishing a book, a tell-all essentially of his work. And we know this from multiple reporting, there’s reports that have been made about this. Also, in that Anthrax War documentary, they have author Gordon Thomas on the record saying that he had been approached by David Kelly to help in the writing of such a book. And when pressed on the fact that, ‘Well, you’re a government employee, you are privy to the Official Secrets Act in the UK, you can’t go public with this information. You know that, right?’ And Kelly, apparently, according to this source, claimed that, “Well, I know that. But if I get someone else to write this book, then it won’t be breaching the Official Secrets Act.” At any rate, that’s what was claimed to be saying – he was saying shortly before his death.

We also know that MI-5, the British internal intelligence service, the FBI equivalent, if you will, in the UK, had sent a letter to David Kelly one week before his death warning him, essentially, to keep his mouth shut. And we know this because that letter was found unopened, it must be admitted, unopened amongst his mail when he died.

However, friends and sources that were quoted by the Daily Mail in their report on this claimed that he absolutely did know the contents of that letter. This was not some sort of surprising thing to him. He had obviously, I am sure, received over the table and under the table warnings, as well as the official, formal letter that was actually written to him by MI-5 specifically warning him not to spill the secrets.

So, we know Kelly was very, very much involved in the biological weapons world of the '80s and '90s. And we know that he was being specifically threatened to keep his mouth shut. And we know that he was exploring the possibility of writing a book about his experiences. I think that has an awful lot to do with why we ended up - why he was discovered dead on Harrowdown Hill in July of 2003.

GR: And I also should point out, it's not just Vladimir Pasechnik who died mysteriously, but you had other people like Benito Que on November 12th, I think, was found comatose in the street near the laboratory where he worked at the University of Miami Medical School and then died on the 6th. And then on November 16th, Don C. Wiley vanished and his abandoned rental car was found on the, you know, on a bridge outside Memphis, Tennessee. And there were like a whole string of other people, world class microbiologists. These all seem to point to the idea that this was, in effect, protecting the reality of bio-warfare from prying eyes. Which, perhaps, leads to the last three-and-a-half years, right? I mean, would you say something like that is accurate? Or is this just a coincidence?

JC: No, I think this is absolutely accurate. And again, I don't mean to continue harping on this, but I just think that it's interesting, this anthrax war documentary that was made nearly two decades ago and broadcast on the CBC, did talk about, at that time, they were talking about the creation of biological weapons that could be used in bio-warfare.

The fact that this - there was an entire industry developing around the idea of bio-security in the wake of the anthrax attacks of 2001 and they were talking about the billions of dollars that were slushing around through the system for various private contractors at that time in order to, essentially, create an entire industry around this. And it is interesting that, as you say, not just David Kelly, but a number of whistle-blowers or potential whistle-blowers, people who knew about the inner workings of this nascent industry, ended up dying shortly - or around the time of or shortly after the creation of this bio-security feeding frenzy that was going on.

So, one example of an interesting connection that deserves further investigation is BioPort as it was originally known, which was a company that developed an anthrax vaccine that was being shoved in the arms of US military personnel in the 1990s and up to the 2000s. In which, their anthrax vaccine was linked by many researchers to, for example, the Gulf War Syndrome that many veterans were suffering from and a whole host of health issues that were taking place. And the question, of course, at the time before the anthrax attacks of 2001 was, "Why is the US government paying for these vaccines? Why are they trying to cover up the demonstrable ill health effects that these vaccines are producing? What is the real threat here? Do we think a vaccine is going to be effective against some sort of weaponized anthrax? What is the point of this?" All of those questions, of course, went away in the event of the anthrax attacks because, suddenly, there is - obviously, we need to have our troops vaccinated. At the

very least our troops and maybe the entire US population. And maybe the entire global population vaccinated against anthrax. Look, you saw what happened in 2001.

BioPort went on to become Emergent BioSolutions and was one of the companies involved in Operation Warp Speed. Of course, the US military operation to warp speed the completely untested vaccines, mRNA vaccines, into the veins of the American population and ultimately the people around the globe. So, yes, there is a definite through-line, a connecting through-line and historical continuity between the events that were developing around the death of David Kelly and the emergence of the bio-security grid. And what we have seen over the past few years involving many of the same players and many of the same companies that were involved at the time of Kelly's death.

Part Three

GR: The World Health Organization said recently, or maybe a month or two ago, that the public health emergency of emergency concern is over according to Tedros. But I'm worried by warnings that put forward, like, almost from the start by Bill Gates that - of all people - that the next virus to come is potentially going to be even worse. And they're preparing a pandemic treaty set to go into effect, I guess, in May of 2024. I know that you have researched bio-security as much as is possible, at least from an open source perspective. Could you maybe give us a hint as to what is coming? Because I know most of us are kind of distracted by the Russian war in Ukraine, and I mean, it is understandable that it's a distraction, right? But the thing is, if we keep our eye on that bio-security ball, something else, it seems to me, is coming. I mean...

JC: Yeah.

GR: Or maybe —

JC: Yeah.

GR: — I could ask you: how will this second pandemic be different from the last in —

JC: Yeah.

GR:— terms of effects and protocols?

JC: Excellent question. Well, I think that's obviously *the* question for our times, because it has been my - I've maintained this since the beginning of this generated crisis that we've been living under for the past few years - this was not about a virus, this was about setting up the global infrastructure for responding to any declared public health threat at any time. And that is exactly what is taking place. So, for people who don't know, please research it.

At this point, they are publicly stating and claiming that they are moving towards the ratification of a potential international pandemic health treaty, which they're not calling a treaty, and/or the amendments to the International Health Regulations which is an entire governing fabric that the World Health Organization uses to essentially impose its will upon all World Health Organization member states which is basically every nation state on the planet at the next World Health Assembly in May of 2024.

Now, of course, that could be a faint or a dupe. They may extend that deadline, they may spring it early. The International Health Regulations could be – the amendments could be adopted at any time, essentially, that they choose to do so. It may be two separate processes, they may merge these processes. It's deliberately left very confusing and it's hidden behind layers of gobbledygook. They're calling it the Proposed Agreements on International Health Concerns, blah blah blah. There's an inter-governmental negotiating body that's running this process. It's all happening behind closed doors.

I have talked about this quite – in quite deep – a lot of detail recently in my work, because I think it is important. Because they are setting up the infrastructure that will govern the response to whatever declared threat, public health threat comes in the future. Now that public health threat very well could be some sort of biological agent, biological weapon; a release of some sort of biological agent. The likes of which Porton Down and Fort Dietrich and others have been working on for many years. It could be a completely generated health scare that is not an actual public health concern, but they could pretend that it is one. And part of the amendments to the International Health Regulations and others is essentially to expand the powers of the World Health Organization to essentially declare anything, even a potential risk to public health can be declared as this type of public health emergency of international concern that can then basically spring into action the World Health Organization and whatever powers it gives itself under its new proposed treaty and/or amendments.

So, we're facing some very serious concerns. At the very, very best I think we are facing the possibility, the probability of the hard-wiring into global health – public health infrastructure, this multi-billion, perhaps multi-trillion dollar ultimately boondoggle of bio-security and big pharma manufacturers and others directly benefiting from this. But at very worst, we are facing the possibly of really widespread release of some actual biological agent in order to essentially justify this infrastructure that's being put in place.

And you raised the spectre, for example, of Bill Gates, who as people may or may not know was writing about, 'Oh yes, you know, this pandemic, we're treating it this way. But the next one –' and he was actually calling it "Pandemic II," as in Pandemic II like World War II, '- we're going to have to fight like our parents generation fought World War II.' Some very creepy rhetoric. But beyond the rhetoric, of course, people may or may not know, he wrote a book, which I reviewed on my podcast, about how to fight the next pandemic in which he was talking about the types of things that could be embedded in some sort of pandemic treaty like a global pandemic firefighter response team that could spring into action, be activated by the World Health Organization, and spring into action and go to whatever place that any sort of public health concern was developing, and well, do what they will: inject people, quarantine people. Whatever they need to do to – or whatever they declare they need to do in order to counteract the health crisis.

So, that's the type of threats that we are facing right now. And I think this does —

GR: Yeah.

JC: — definitely tie - it ties —

GR: We keep having —

JC: — into that —

GR: — NATO troops on the ground.

JC: — story of David Kelly.

GR: Yeah. Wow. Just a couple of minutes left. Do you think that there's at least a possibility that we can back away from it? I mean, through mass action or something like that, to keep this from falling into place?

JC: Yes, absolutely. There are signs that this - it is not inevitable. And I think sometimes in independent media spaces, the various organizations are portrayed as some sort of world bestriding conquerors that can do anything that they want. But that is not the case. Often it is Toto pulling back the curtain and finding it's just a withered old man pulling some strings back there.

And examples of that are - for example, from the 2009 conference of the parties that the UNFCCC - the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change - was running in Copenhagen in 2009. At that particular meeting, it was being proposed that this would be the unveiling of some sort of new global agreements that would form the basis for a new global governance infrastructure of some sort. The EU chief at that time was calling this the beginning of global government in Copenhagen, it's going to happen. That was derailed. It was derailed because of squabbling between developing nations and developed nations over who was going to fund essentially this takeover. But at any rate, it was derailed. In 2009, Copenhagen did not result in the type of agreement that was being planned at that time.

The UN is running something called Our Common Agenda right now, which was unveiled to the public in 2021 by Secretary General Antonio Guterres in which, essentially, it's the creation, the beefing up of the UN to give it more teeth in various aspects from cyberspace to outer space and everything in between. Literally, this is part of the remit of this common agenda. They had planned for a summit of the future to be held at the sidelines of the UN General Assembly in New York in September of 2023. But that has been now postponed to September of 2024 because they don't quite have all their ducks in a row yet.

So, I think there is a definite chance that we can derail, forestall, or otherwise throw roadblocks in the ways of these various agendas. These are not people who have the ability to dictate reality. They have to respond to reality. Now, there are political movements and currents that are developing in a number of countries to stop the WHO treaty, proposed treaty, in its tracks. Or even, to exit the WHO altogether. In fact, I note there was a couple of dozen congressmen and other high-ranking political officials in the US that was holding a press conference on the steps of the Capitol just a few weeks ago.

On that very note of we need to exit the WHO. This is building political momentum behind some very radical changes that could happen. And I do believe there is a chance at this. But only if people are aware of the gravity of the threat that we're facing.

GR: Thank you very much.

JC: Thank you for having me on.

GR: James Corbett is a filmmaker and a producer of the Corbett Report. Check out his productions, including a re-broadcast of the Requiem for the Suicided: David Kelly at corbettreport.com.

The [Global Research News Hour](#) airs every Friday at 1pm CT on [CKUW 95.9FM](#) out of the University of Winnipeg. The programme is also podcast at globalresearch.ca.

Other stations airing the show:

CIXX 106.9 FM, broadcasting from Fanshawe College in London, Ontario. It airs Sundays at 6am.

WZBC 90.3 FM in Newton Massachusetts is Boston College Radio and broadcasts to the greater Boston area. The Global Research News Hour airs during Truth and Justice Radio which starts Sunday at 6am.

Campus and community radio [CFMH 107.3fm](#) in Saint John, N.B. airs the Global Research News Hour Fridays at 7pm.

CJMP 90.1 FM, Powell River Community Radio, airs the Global Research News Hour every Saturday at 8am.

Caper Radio CJBU 107.3FM in Sydney, [Cape Breton](#), Nova Scotia airs the Global Research News Hour starting Wednesday afternoon from 3-4pm.

[Cowichan Valley Community Radio CICV 98.7 FM](#) serving the [Cowichan Lake](#) area of Vancouver Island, BC airs the program Thursdays at 9am pacific time.

Notes:

1. Lord Hutton (January 28, 2004), 'Report of the Inquiry into the Circumstances Surrounding the Death of Dr David Kelly C.M.G.'; <https://web.archive.org/web/20110813051142/http://www.the-hutton-inquiry.org.uk/content/report/huttonreport.pdf>
2. <https://www.globalresearch.ca/iraq-twenty-years-after-shock-and-awe-the-mysterious-death-of-david-kelly/5814227>
3. https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=cbc+anthrax+war
4. https://web.archive.org/web/20220126143051/https://www.fromthewilderness.net/free/ww3/02_14_02_microbio.html

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Michael Welch](#) and [James Corbett](#), Global Research, 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: **Michael Welch**
and **James Corbett**

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca