

Why Do the U.S. Centers for Disease Control (CDC) Own a Patent on Ebola “Invention?”

By [Mike Adams](#)

Global Research, August 12, 2014

[Natural News](#) 3 August 2014

Theme: [Science and Medicine](#)

The U.S. Centers for Disease Control owns a patent on a particular strain of Ebola known as “EboBun.” It’s patent No. CA2741523A1 and it was awarded in 2010. You can [view it here](#). (Thanks to Natural News readers who found this and brought it to our attention.)

Patent applicants are clearly described on the patent as including:

The Government Of The United States Of America As Represented By The Secretary, Department Of Health & Human Services, Center For Disease Control.

The patent summary says, “The invention provides the isolated human Ebola (hEbola) viruses denoted as Bundibugyo (EboBun) deposited with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”; Atlanta, Georgia, United States of America) on November 26, 2007 and accorded an accession number 200706291.”

It goes on to state, “The present invention is based upon the isolation and identification of a new human Ebola virus species, EboBun. EboBun was isolated from the patients suffering from hemorrhagic fever in a recent outbreak in Uganda.”

It’s worth noting, by the way, that EboBun is not the same variant currently believed to be circulating in West Africa. Clearly, the CDC needs to expand its patent portfolio to include more strains, and that may very well be why American Ebola victims have been brought to the United States in the first place. Read more below and decide for yourself...

Harvesting Ebola from victims to file patents

From the patent description on the EboBun virus, we know that the U.S. government:

- 1) Extracts Ebola viruses from patients.
- 2) Claims to have “invented” that virus.
- 3) Files for monopoly patent protection on the virus.

To understand why this is happening, you have to first understand what a patent really is and why it exists. A patent is **a government-enforced monopoly that is exclusively granted to persons or organizations**. It allows that person or organization to exclusively **profit from the “invention”** or deny others the ability to exploit the invention for their own profit.

It brings up the obvious question here: Why would the U.S. government claim to have “invented” Ebola and then claim an exclusively monopoly over its ownership?

U.S. Government claims exclusive ownership over its “invention” of Ebola

The “SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION” section of the patent document also clearly claims that the U.S. government is claiming “ownership” over all Ebola viruses that share as little as 70% similarity with the Ebola it “invented”:

...invention relates to the isolated EboBun virus that morphologically and phylogenetically relates to known members filoviridae... In another aspect, the invention provides an isolated hEbola EboBun virus comprising a nucleic acid molecule comprising a nucleotide sequence selected from the group consisting of: a) a nucleotide sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 1; b) a nucleotide sequence that hybridizes to the sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO: 1 under stringent conditions; and c) a nucleotide sequence that has at least 70%, 75%, 80%, 85%, 90%, 95%, 96%, 97%, 98%, or 99% identity to the SEQ ID NO:

1. In another aspect, the invention provides the complete genomic sequence of the hEbola virus EboBun.

Ebola vaccines and propagation

The CDC patent goes on to explain it specifically claims patent protection on a method for propagating the Ebola virus in host cells as well as treating infected hosts with vaccines:

In another aspect, the invention provides a method for propagating the hEbola virus in host cells comprising infecting the host cells with the inventive isolated hEbola virus described above, culturing the host cells to allow the virus to multiply, and harvesting the resulting virions.

In another aspect, the invention provides vaccine preparations, comprising the inventive hEbola virus, including recombinant and chimeric forms of the virus, nucleic acid molecules comprised by the virus, or protein subunits of the virus. The invention also provides a vaccine formulation comprising a therapeutically or prophylactically effective amount of the inventive hEbola virus described above, and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

No medical reason to bring Ebola to the United States

This patent may help explain why Ebola victims are being transported to the United States and put under the medical authority of the CDC. These patients are **carrying valuable intellectual property assets in the form of Ebola variants**, and the Centers for Disease Control clearly desires to expand its patent portfolio by harvesting, studying and potentially patenting new strains or variants.

Dr. Bob Arnot, an infectious disease specialist who spent time on the ground in developing nations saving lives, recently told Judge Jeanine, “There is no medical reason to bring them here, especially when you see how well Dr. Bradley was.” (2)

There is, however, an entirely different reason to bring Ebola patients to America: so they can be **exploited for medical experiments, military bioweapons harvesting or**

intellectual property claims.

Surely, medical authorities at Emory University and the CDC are working hard to save the lives of the two patients who have been transported to the U.S. But they are also pursuing something else at the same time: an agenda of isolating, identifying and patenting infectious disease agents for reasons that we can only imagine.

Only hoping to save lives?

On one hand, it's worth pointing out that the CDC's patent on Ebola is at least partially focused on methods for screening for Ebola and treating Ebola victims with drugs or vaccines. This seems like a worthwhile precaution against an infectious disease that clearly threatens lives.

On the other hand, **why the patent?** Patenting Ebola seems as odd as trying to patent cancer or diabetes. Why would a government organization claim to have "invented" this infectious disease and then claim a monopoly over its exploitation for commercial use?

Does the CDC hope to **collect a royalty on Ebola vaccines?** Is it looking to "invent" more variants and patent those too?

Make no mistake that billions of dollars in profits are at stake in all this. Shares of Tekmira surged over 11% last Friday as pressure was placed on the FDA to fast-track Ebola vaccine trials the company has set up. "Health campaigners have started a petition which has already been signed by approximately 15,500 people on change.org pressurizing FDA to approve the drug in the minimum possible time frame," reports BidnessEtc.com. (3)

Carefully scripted medical theater

With this, we start to see the structure of the elaborate medical theater coming together: A global pandemic panic, a government patent, the importation of Ebola into a major U.S. city, an experimental vaccine, the rise of a little-known pharmaceutical company and a public outcry for the FDA to fast-track the vaccine.

If Act II stays on course, this medical theater might someday involve a "laboratory accident" in a U.S. lab, the "escape" of Ebola into the population, and a **mandatory nationwide Ebola vaccination campaign** that enriches Tekmira and its investors while positioning the CDC with its virus patents as the "savior of the American people."

Yes, we've heard this music before, but the last time around it was called Swine Flu.

The formula is always the same: create alarm, bring a vaccine to market, then scare governments into buying billions of dollars worth of vaccines they don't need.

Watch the episode with Judge Jeanine here:

Sources for this article include:

(1) <http://www.google.com/patents/CA2741523A1?cl...>

(2) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SHAK6oX-JN4&feature=...>

(3) <http://www.bidnessetc.com/23519-tekmera-shar...>

The original source of this article is [Natural News](#)
Copyright © [Mike Adams](#), [Natural News](#), 2014

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mike Adams](#)

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