



‘Speed of Science’ — A Scandal Beyond Your Wildest Nightmare

Description

The premise behind COVID shot mandates and vaccine passports was that by taking the shot, you would protect others, as it would prevent infection and spread of COVID-19

In early October 2022, during a COVID hearing in the European Parliament, Dutch member Rob Roos questioned Pfizer’s president of international developed markets, Janine Small, about whether Pfizer had in fact tested and confirmed that their mRNA jab would prevent transmission prior to its rollout

Small admitted that Pfizer never tested whether their jab would prevent transmission because they had to “move at the speed of science to understand what is happening in the market ... and we had to do everything at risk”

We’ve known for well over two years that the shots were never tested for transmission interruption. In October 2020, Peter Doshi, associate editor of The BMJ, highlighted that trials were not designed to reveal whether the vaccines would prevent transmission. Yet everyone in government and media insisted they would do just that

It was never about science or protecting others. It was always about following a predetermined narrative that sought to get experimental mRNA technology into as many people as possible

*

February 9, 2021, I published an article that clarified the medical and legal [definitions of a “vaccine.”](#) In the article, I noted that mRNA COVID-19 jabs did not meet those definitions, in part because they don’t prevent infection or spread. In reality, they’re experimental gene therapies. In July that year, The New York Times published a hit piece on me citing that February 9 article:¹

“The article that appeared online on Feb. 9 began with a seemingly innocuous question about the legal definition of vaccines. Then over its next 3,400 words, it declared coronavirus vaccines were ‘a medical fraud’ and said the injections did not prevent infections, provide immunity or stop transmission of the disease.

Instead, the article claimed, the shots ‘alter your genetic coding, turning you into a viral protein factory that has no off-switch.’ Its assertions were easily disprovable ...”

Pfizer Moved ‘at the Speed of Science’

Fast-forward to early October 2022, and my claims were officially confirmed during a COVID hearing in the European Parliament. Dutch member Rob Roos questioned Pfizer’s president of international developed markets, Janine Small, about whether Pfizer had in fact tested and confirmed that their mRNA jab would prevent transmission prior to its rollout.

As noted by Roos, the entire premise behind COVID shot mandates and vaccine passports was that by taking the shot, you would protect others, as it would prevent infection and spread of COVID-19. Small replied:

“No. We had to really move at the speed of science to understand what is happening in the market ... and we had to do everything at risk.”²

This means the COVID passport was based on a big lie. The only purpose of the COVID passport: forcing people to get vaccinated. I find this shocking — even criminal. ~ Rob Roos, MEP

As noted by Roos, “This means the COVID passport was based on a big lie. The only purpose of the COVID passport: forcing people to get vaccinated.” Roos added that he found this deception “shocking — even criminal.”³

In the video below, biologist and nurse teacher John Campbell, Ph.D., reviews this growing scandal. He points out that U.K. government officials emphatically assured the public that everything that was normally done in clinical trials for a vaccine was done for the COVID shots. Now we’re told that was not the case after all.

The question is why? According to Small, these basic trials were not done because they “had to move at the speed of science.” But just what does that mean? As noted by Campbell, these are “just words without meaning.” It’s complete nonsense.

Moreover, what does it mean to “do everything at risk”? Campbell admits he has no idea what that means. I don’t either, but were I to venture a guess, I’d guess it means they knowingly skipped certain testing even though they knew the risks of doing so.

Government and Media Promulgated a Blatant Lie

Over the past three years, mainstream media have promulgated the lie that the COVID shots will prevent infection and transmission, telling us that anyone who doesn’t get the shot is selfish at best, and at worst, a potential murderer at large. Anyone who refuses poses a serious biomedical threat to society, hence the need for heavy-handedness.

Alas, it was all a lie from the start. The frustrating part is that we’ve KNOWN for well over two years that the shots were never tested for transmission interruption, yet everyone in government and media

insisted they would do just that.

In October 2020, Peter Doshi, associate editor of The BMJ, highlighted the fact that the trials were not designed to reveal whether the vaccines would prevent transmission, which is key if you want to end the pandemic. He wrote:⁴

“None of the trials currently under way are designed to detect a reduction in any serious outcome such as hospital admissions, use of intensive care, or deaths. Nor are the vaccines being studied to determine whether they can interrupt transmission of the virus.”

So, by October 2020, at the latest, it was clear that no studies had been done to determine whether the shots actually prevented transmission, which is a prerequisite for the claim that you'll save the lives of others if you take it.

By then, Moderna had also admitted they were not testing its jab's ability to prevent infection. Tal Zaks, chief medical officer at Moderna, stated that this kind of trial would require testing volunteers twice a week for long periods of time — a strategy he called “operationally untenable.”⁵

So, neither Pfizer nor Moderna had any clue whether their COVID shots would prevent transmission or spread, as that was never tested, yet with the aid of government officials and media, they led the public to believe they would. Below is just one example where Pfizer clearly obfuscated the truth.⁶ If stopping transmission was their “highest priority,” why didn't they test and confirm that their shot was accomplishing this priority?

pfizer inc tweet

Image not found or type unknown

Similarly, in an Israeli interview⁷ (below), Bourla stated that “The efficacy of our vaccine in children is 80%.” The reporter asked him to clarify, “Are you talking about efficacy to prevent severe disease or to prevent infection?” and Bourla replied, “To prevent infection.” How could he say that when preventing infection has never been tested? Is that not evidence of fraud, caught on camera?

– Pfizer CEO: “The efficacy of our vaccine in children is 80%”

– Reporter: “Are you talking about efficacy to prevent severe disease or to prevent infection?”

– Pfizer CEO: “?? ??????? ??????????”

Need more evidence of fraud? pic.twitter.com/OsVDmmSVvH

— Dr. Eli David (@DrEliDavid) [October 18, 2022](#)

COVID Shots Have Been Fraudulently Marketed

As I stated in February 2021, the shots are a medical fraud. A true vaccine prevents infection; COVID

shots don't. Hence, they've also been fraudulently marketed. Governments around the world enabled this marketing fraud and media promulgated it.

As a result of mandating COVID shots and vaccine passports based on a blatant lie, millions have suffered potentially permanent harm and/or have died. Millions have also lost their jobs, forfeited careers and missed out on educational opportunities. This all happened because we DIDN'T follow the science.

Massive Conflicts of Interest Have Been Allowed

Why did government agencies go along with what was, to anyone with a microgram of critical thinking skills, an apparent fraud? Probably, because they're in on it. As reported by investigative journalist Paul Thacker, the same PR company that serves Moderna and Pfizer also staffs the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Division of Viral Diseases team:⁸

"Early last month [September 2022], CDC Director Rochelle P. Walensky endorsed recommendations by the CDC Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) for updated COVID-19 boosters from Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna.

'This recommendation followed a comprehensive scientific evaluation and robust scientific discussion,' Dr. Walensky said in a statement. 'If you are eligible, there is no bad time to get your COVID-19 booster and I strongly encourage you to receive it' ...

[The] PR firm Weber Shandwick, which has long represented Pfizer and other pharmaceutical companies and began providing public relations support to Moderna sometime in 2020.

In an odd case of synchronicity — and let's be honest, a whiff of undue influence — Weber Shandwick employees are also embedded at the CDC's National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD), the CDC group that implements vaccine programs and oversees the work of ACIP [CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices] ...

The CDC has refused to respond to questions explaining this apparent conflict ... '[It] is irresponsible of CDC to issue a PR contract to Weber Shandwick, knowing that the firm also works for Moderna and Pfizer,' emailed Public Citizen's Craig Holman. 'It raises legitimate questions of whose interests Weber Shandwick will put first — their private sector clients or the public's interest at NCIRD.'"

Incidentally, Weber Shandwick was in 2016 found to have ghostwritten a drug study for Forest Pharmaceuticals — another unethical practice that has undermined the foundation of medical science for decades.

One PR Company, One Consistent Message

Weber Shandwick's responsibilities at the CDC include but are not limited to "generating story ideas, distributing articles and conducting outreach to news, media and entertainment organizations" to boost vaccination rates.⁹ The company provides similar services to Moderna.

For example, it helped generate 7,000 news articles internationally after Moderna applied for

emergency use authorization (EUA) for its jab.

In June 2022, Moderna announced a “cross-discipline team drawing on talent and expertise from Weber Shandwick” would “drive the brand’s narrative globally,” and “support Moderna in activating and engaging key internal and external audiences, including employees, consumers, health care providers, vaccine recipients and policymakers.”¹⁰

Considering the primary COVID jab makers have the same PR company as the CDC, is it any wonder that the messaging has been so consistently one-sided? As noted by Doshi in a recent interview on German television,¹¹ mainstream media have consistently ignored COVID jab data and have “not done a good job in providing balanced coverage” about the shots.

“We’re not getting the information we need to make better choices and to have a more informed understanding of risk and benefit,” he told the interviewer, adding:¹²

“It was very unfortunate that from the beginning, what was presented to us by public health officials was a picture of great certainty ... but the reality was that there were extremely important unknowns.

We entered a situation where essentially the stakes became too high to later present that uncertainty to people. I think that’s what set us off on the wrong foot. Public officials should have been a lot more forthright about the gaps in our knowledge.”

Reanalysis of Trial Data Confirms COVID Shot Dangers

In late September 2022, Doshi published a risk-benefit analysis focused on serious adverse events observed in Pfizer’s and Moderna’s COVID trials. Reanalysis of the data showed 1 in 800 who get a COVID shot suffers a serious injury. As detailed in Doshi’s paper:¹³

“Pfizer and Moderna mRNA COVID-19 vaccines were associated with an excess risk of serious adverse events of special interest of 10.1 and 15.1 per 10,000 vaccinated over placebo baselines of 17.6 and 42.2 respectively.

Combined, the mRNA vaccines were associated with an excess risk of serious adverse events of special interest of 12.5 per 10,000 vaccinated; risk ratio 1.43.

The Pfizer trial exhibited a 36 % higher risk of serious adverse events in the vaccine group ... The Moderna trial exhibited a 6 % higher risk of serious adverse events in the vaccine group ... Combined, there was a 16 % higher risk of serious adverse events in mRNA vaccine recipients ...”

Doshi and his coauthors also concluded that the increase in adverse events from the shots surpassed the reduction in risk of being hospitalized with COVID-19. So, in short, the shots confer more harm than good.

Sen. Rand Paul Promises Investigation

A spokesperson for Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., replied to an inquiry by Thacker stating, “[T]hat CDC had a contract with the same PR firm representing the manufacturers of the COVID-19 vaccine raises serious

concerns,” adding that “these conflicts of interest will be thoroughly investigated” by the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) — which oversees the CDC — sometime next year.

After the November midterms, Paul will be next in line as the top Republican on this committee. It’s well worth noting that, at bare minimum, this kind of conflict of interest should have been disclosed by both parties. At best, it should have been avoided altogether. The CDC did neither. It didn’t disclose its relationship with the PR firm and it didn’t prevent the conflict of interest from developing in the first place.

What Was the COVID Jab Push All About?

The rational take-home from all this is that the massive push to inject the global population with these experimental jabs was never about following science and protecting others.

It was always about promoting a false, invented narrative designed to allow for the implementation of a top-down directive to inject every person on the planet with a novel mRNA technology. This, in turn, brings up two central questions:

- Who’s at the top? — We don’t yet know. All we can say for sure is that they have a very powerful and global influence — powerful enough that government officials have willingly lied and sacrificed their own populations in an incredibly risky medical experiment.
- Why is injecting everyone with mRNA technology so important to the anonymous decision-makers? — Again, we don’t know, but it’s quite clear that there’s a reason for it, that it’s supposed to accomplish something.

As detailed in previous articles, the only rational reason for why the CDC is allowing COVID jab EUA’s for young children is because they’re assisting drug makers in their effort to obtain liability shielding by getting the shots onto the childhood vaccination schedule.

ACIP is poised to add COVID shots to the childhood vaccination schedule any day now,¹⁴ and once on the childhood schedule, vaccine makers will not be liable for injuries and deaths occurring from their shots, whether they occur in children or adults.

Also, remember that even though the U.S. Food and Drug Administration granted full approval to Pfizer’s Comirnaty COVID shot, Comirnaty was never released to the public. The Pfizer shot being given is still under EUA.

Why was Comirnaty never released? Probably because once the shot has full FDA approval, liability kicks in. It appears they’re trying to avoid liability by getting the EUA shot on the childhood schedule before Comirnaty is rolled out and starts injuring and killing people.

Now, if they’re concerned about liability, that means they know the shot is dangerous. And if they know it’s dangerous (which all available data clearly show it is), then why do they want every person on the planet to get it?

Following this line of questioning to its logical conclusion leads us to the shocking conclusion that even

though we don't know the reasons why, the injuries and deaths from these jabs are intentional.

Vaccine Makers Continue to Spread Lies

Despite Small's unequivocally clear admission that Pfizer has not tested its COVID shot to ascertain whether it prevents transmission, Pfizer's CEO still does not shy away from insinuating as much. Here's what he tweeted out October 12, 2022.¹⁵ He's not saying the shot has been confirmed to prevent COVID, but he insinuates that it does by saying the FDA authorized it for the prevention of COVID. This is also known as lying by omission.

albert bourla tweet

Image not found or type unknown

Meanwhile, so-called fact checkers are trying to salvage Pfizer's reputation by saying the company never actually stated the shot would stop transmission.¹⁶ That may be so, but government officials and media DID claim it would prevent both infection and spread, and Pfizer never corrected them, even as people were being fired and ostracized from society for not taking the jab.

If they were truly on the up-and-up, Pfizer officials would have clarified that the shot had not been tested to confirm it would prevent transmission, and until that was known, mandates and passports had no basis. Pfizer didn't do that. Instead, they went along with it.

The Jabs Were Always To Be Pushed — 'By Fair Means or Foul'

In conclusion, there's no reason to trust government ever again, at least not in the U.S., which stands alone in pushing the jab on toddlers. (The reason for that, as mentioned earlier, is probably to get the jabs onto the childhood vaccination schedule, which will shield the vaccine makers from financial liability for harms.)

As noted by GB News host Neil Oliver in the video above, the very basis for COVID mandates or vaccine passports — that everyone had to get jabbed for the greater good, to protect others and help end the pandemic — was a deliberate lie from the start.

Many of us realized this early on, but our voices were drowned out as government, Big Tech and media pulled out all the stops, censoring anyone who told the truth. And all who have participated in this grand deception remain unrepentant to this day.

In a recent Twitter thread, a Twitter user named Daniel Hadas lays out an excellent description of what the last three years were really about:¹⁷

“The debate over whether, when, and to what extent lies were told about COVID vaccines preventing transmission misses a central point: No matter what the trial data showed, the vaccines were ALWAYS going to be pushed on entire populations, by fair means or foul.

Very early on, the COVID response was locked into a specific narrative. The world would lock down and stay safe, while brave scientists hammered away at a vaccine ... You may recall that, in the first months of COVID, there was a lot of breathless talk about whether there would EVER be a vaccine.

This was all nonsense ... Our authorities would not have adopted the strategy of lockdown-till-vaccine unless they were certain a vaccine could and would be made ...

The purpose of sowing fear that there might never be a vaccine was to increase gratitude and enthusiasm when one came along. Indeed, every part of the early COVID response can be understood as (in part) pre-release marketing for the vaccine ...

That's why COVID risks for the young were wildly amplified. That's why there was unending obfuscation of the central role of infection-conferred immunity both in protecting individuals and in ending the pandemic.

The plan was that the vaccine would be met by a perfectly primed population: immunologically naive, desperate to be released from lockdowns, terrified of COVID, eager to do the right thing, i.e. protect others through taking the shots.

Once so much effort had gone into priming, it is UNIMAGINABLE that authorities would have pivoted to telling us ... ‘Well, actually, the vaccine’s safety profile is only so-so, efficacy is murky, and most people don’t need to worry about COVID anyway. So best most of you not take this ... Sorry about the lockdowns.’

That was not in the script. So it was inevitable that the vaccine be pushed on everyone, and inevitable that the best arguments for universal vaccination would be used. Those arguments were: COVID is super-dangerous for YOU. Distrust in this vaccine is distrust in science. Refusing to get vaccinated is immoral, because you will infect others.

The veracity of these claims didn’t matter: they were in the script, and it was too late to deviate ... Accordingly, the stage was also set for vaccine mandates.

None of this is conspiratorial. It is descriptive ... Clarifying the details won’t alter the essence of the

picture — The COVID response was determined by a script of vaccine salvation, and societies' investment in that script was too deep for mere realities to divert its execution."

The primary questions that still remain unanswered are: Why was this script created? What are its intended consequences? And, who created it? As mentioned earlier, the evidence suggests harm is an intended outcome — harm to our economy, our social order, our health, our life span and reproductive capacity.

As for "why," we can just look at what has been accomplished so far. Assuming the consequences were intentional, the "why" appears to be wealth transfer, depopulation and the creation of a one world government.

*

Notes

- 1 [New York Times July 24, 2021 \(Archived\)](#)
- 2 [News.com.au October 12, 2022](#)
- 3 [Twitter Rob Roos October 11, 2022](#)
- 4, 5 [The BMJ 2020;371:m4037](#)
- 6 [Twitter Pfizer January 13, 2021](#)
- 7 [Twitter Dr. Eli David October 18, 2022](#)
- 8, 9, 10 [Disinformation Chronicle October 11, 2022](#)
- 11, 12 [Marianne Demasi Substack October 17, 2022](#)
- 13 [Vaccine September 22, 2022; 40\(40\): 5798-5805](#)
- 14 [Steve Kirsch Substack October 17, 2022](#)
- 15 [Twitter Dr. Eli David October 13, 2022](#)
- 16 [Twitter Lewis U October 14, 2022](#)
- 17 [Twitter Daniel Hadas October 15, 2022](#)

Featured image is from Children's Health Defense

By Dr. Joseph Mercola

Category

1. Crime-Justice-Terrorism-Corruption
2. Disasters-Crisis-Depopulation-Genocide
3. Health-Wellness-Healing-Nutrition & Fitness

- 4. Main
- 5. NWO-Deep State-Dictatorship-Tyranny

Date Created
10/26/2022