

Medical Marvel or the Second Coming of Al Capone? Pfizer's Sins and Crimes. "We have a Vaccine which is Killing People"

So, what we are asking our governments to do is to withdraw this killer vaccine!

By [Michael Welch](#), [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#), and [Johnny Vedmore](#)

Global Research, February 18, 2023

Region: [Canada](#), [Europe](#), [USA](#)
Theme: [Biotechnology and GMO](#), [GLOBAL RESEARCH NEWS HOUR](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

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](#).

First published on February 6, 2022

.

"This is why I am pleased to announce that we have reached an agreement with BioNTech-Pfizer to, once again, speed up the delivery of vaccines. 50 million additional doses of BioNTech-Pfizer vaccines will be delivered in quarter 2 of this year, starting in April....I want to thank BioNTech-Pfizer. It has proven to be a reliable partner. It has delivered on its commitments, and it is responsive to our needs. This is to the immediate benefit of EU citizens."

- Ursula von der Leyen, president of the European Commission [1]

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

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

In a recent report, Albert Bourla, the chairman and chief executive of the global pharmaceutical giant Pfizer Inc accepted the prestigious Genesis award for his work leading to the very first vaccine for COVID-19 to be authorized for distribution in the U.S. and Europe. [2]

This prize is a million dollar U.S. award granted each year to an individual for "professional achievements, contributions to humanity and commitment to Jewish values." [3]

Cited among reasons expressed for this season's choice was Pfizer's decision to turn down funding from the U.S. government early on " a decision that helped the company reduce bureaucracy and expedite development of the vaccine." (Although this courtesy does not extend to all the booster shots many are being coerced into taking as we move forward.) [4][5]

But with all the praise this massive drug dispenser has been getting, there exists a disturbing reality at the heart of it. As researcher Dr Gary G. Kohls put it quite bluntly in a recent article, "Pfizer has faced thousands of lawsuits for fraudulent marketing and medical injuries caused by some of its most profitable, drugs." This includes a criminal record with the U.S. Department of Justice on charges of fraudulent marketing back in 2009! Pfizer had to pay \$2.3 billion in fines, penalties and settlements. [6]

In related news, according to a recent article for the Brussels Correspondent, the European Commission president Ursula von der Leyen refused to disclose the texts of a discussion with Bourla after a freedom of information request. The text exchange was connected with discussions to purchase \$1.8 billion COVID vaccines for the European population in April of 2021 - basically four shots for every man, woman and child in Europe - and long before Omicron! [7]

With a track record like this, one wonders how we keep this company operating as leaders let alone inheriting laurels!

Incidentally, the opposite is true of the Freedom Convoy 2022. Many thousands of Canadians and their vehicles have arrived in Ottawa to protest against the mandates to take the Pfizer and other vaccines for COVID-19. They are supported by countless Canadians who themselves are compelled and coerced into taking it.

The media and our politicians cannot express one fraction of concern for Pfizer given its record. Yet they cannot resist the impulse to shine the majority of the convoy in the spotlight of a few as yet unidentified individuals engaging in desecration of a war memorial, carrying a swastika, being rude to food banks and so forth. This in spite of the organizers themselves speaking out and condemning such acts!

What more can we find out about the pursuits of Pfizer within the COVID vaccine craze, Pfizer's goals in the industry, the media and ultimately in health care itself? These are a few of the challenging questions we will set a course to address in this week's Global Research News Hour.

In the first half hour, we speak with Professor Michel Chossudovsky about the document on early adverse effects of the Pfizer COVID vaccine and how this document itself acts as a "smoking gun" blasting away the safety assurances coming from Health Canada and the FDA. He also mentions the size of the company and how it uses its resources to dominate the industry as a whole.

In our second half hour, we are joined by Johnny Vedmore, who has studied extensively on Pfizer Inc and reveals the many tentacles of power it has extended into every facet of life.

Michel Chossudovsky is Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization in, Montreal, and Editor of Global Research. He is Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, and award winning author of 11 books including The Globalization of

War, America's Long War against Humanity (2015) .

Johnny Vedmore is a completely independent investigative journalist and musician from Cardiff, Wales. His work aims to expose the powerful people who are overlooked by other journalists and bring new information to his readers. He writes for UnlimitedHangout.com and for his own johnnyvedmore.com

(Global Research News Hour Episode 341)

LISTEN TO THE SHOW

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

Transcript – Interview with Professor Michel Chossudovsky, Jan. 25, 2022

Global Research: It's a pleasure to have you back Professor Chossudovsky! Maybe to start, you could point out the fact that Pfizer actually has a criminal record, and their account is sound...maybe you could relate to our listeners a little bit more about their whole rejection of being straightforward with their freedom of information.

Michael Chossudovsky: Let me first address the issue of this confidential Pfizer report which was released under freedom of information. It's a MASSIVE report. I've reviewed part of it, and I can say essentially this data revealed – refutes the official vaccine narrative peddled by the governments and the World Health Organization. It comes from the horse's mouth! It comes from Pfizer! And this means that in as much as what is presented in this report, which is drafted by Pfizer, pertaining to the impacts of the vaccine on mortality and morbidity, that data emanates from them! It can now be used, and it should be used to confront both Pfizer and the governments and the WHO and the media! And that report in a Court of Law should be presented as evidence.

And why is it irrefutable? Because it is THEIR data! And THEIR estimates! And not those of independent observers.

So, I think what is significant in this confidential report which is now in the public domain, is the fact that YES it is the #Killer virus! And it is a Mea Culpa on the part of Pfizer!

Now, let me revert to your question on Pfizer's criminal record. And not many people know about this because the media doesn't report on it. And I think it is of relevance that if you're going to be vaccinated by a company which has a criminal record, you should be informed!

And bear in mind, this is the ONLY company in the United States of America which has a criminal record with the U.S. Department of Justice! And we should distinguish between the class action lawsuits which are civilian – it's not criminal, okay? In other words there was a class action lawsuit against Johnson & Johnson – actually it's still ongoing.

But as far as Pfizer is concerned, they were accused in 2009 of fraudulent marketing. And they – well, there was an agreement with the company. Pfizer pays \$2.3 billion for fraudulent marketing. It goes to the Department of Justice. Okay? It's a criminal lawsuit! And it's a settlement.

Bear in mind that when you have a criminal lawsuit, normally you can arrest people. Okay?

They negotiated this with the lawyers. And what they had was a so-called “corporate integrity agreement” which essentially is equivalent to Pfizer on probation for a period of four years. In other words, it was the Department of Health and Human Services of the United States which was essentially acting as parole officer on behalf of the Department of Justice. And what was understood is that Pfizer would go back to a normal honest life, and that this entity of the U.S. government would be detecting misconduct on the part of Pfizer Inc.

Now, that is the background and very few people know about it. And it’s the only case!

And now we have a situation, which is far more serious in fraudulent marketing. We have a company marketing a killer vaccine, and I use this term because the confidential report which is now in the public domain confirms it! And all the data confirm it!

GR: Well, what about the idea that – I mean – you’ve got regulatory agencies, the FDA, Health Canada, they are saying “NO, this is not a killer vaccine. It’s safe!” Does that imply that Pfizer is somehow manipulating them in some way to get the vaccine (approved) to get the statements that they want to get?

MC: Well you know, Health Canada doesn’t publish the data on adverse events and mortality. The United States does it, it’s theirs. The European Union does it, it’s EMA, the European Medicines Agency. We have tons of information from these three – well, European Union, United Kingdom and United States – to say unequivocally that there is an upward trend in mortality and morbidity, and I can say that worldwide. We’re receiving reports from different countries.

Now, Health Canada, the first thing that we should ask Health Canada: reveal the data!

It’s not an issue of constitutional rights here. It goes much further! We have a vaccine which is killing people, and Health Canada has the responsibility to publish the data of vaccine related adverse events and mortality as is done in the United States, Britain and many other countries around the world.

Now I should mention this one very important element which has emerged in late December. Thailand has acknowledged not only the deaths and adverse events, it has implemented a program of compensating the victims of the vaccine! The data is available!

There was something of the order of 8000 complaints which were accepted by the Royal Thai government. At an earlier stage in my life, I worked for the Royal Thai government. A contract with CIDA. But bear in mind, a country like Thailand with a very large population – much larger than the population of Canada, very structured public sector, and so on – takes the decision – and it’s a member of the United Nations and it’s a member of the WHO – takes the decision to compensate the victims. It opens up a precedent.

It opens up a legal precedent. It opens up you might say a Pandora’s box because it is now setting a precedent that the government has actually accepted the fact that this is not a vaccine but a dangerous substance which threatens the lives of people in Thailand and, of course, worldwide.

GR: Yeah, it’ll be interesting to see if any other countries jump on board soon!

MC: I don’t see other countries jumping on board, and this revelation on Thailand has been

kept secret – well it's public but at the same time – and people know about it in Thailand – but it's not something which has been discussed worldwide. It's important!

But there are other elements which are emerging. There is a police investigation of the United Kingdom directed against the government of Boris Johnson. It's run by the London Metropolitan Police, okay?

GR: Yeah!

MC: And it is ongoing! And then there is also – also from the United Kingdom, there's a registered case with International Criminal Court of Justice in The Hague, and it is presenting the fact that this vaccine is a criminal undertaking inasmuch as the governments are fully aware of the data, they have access to the data of other countries which actually – I mean – Health Canada must have the data somewhere in. And it's a double crime there. They're not revealing it to the public, on the one hand, and they're ignoring the fact that adverse events are taking place. And they're forcing people to get vaccinated so this constitutes a whole series of criminal acts.

And I say it's not simply an issue of informed consent or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. We're beyond that!

GR: Yeah...

MC: And it's the first time in history that a vaccine has had that kind of impact. We could go back to the polio vaccine years back, which was actually discontinued because it was resulting in adverse events, paralysis and death and so on. But it was withdrawn!

So, what we are asking our governments to do is to withdraw this killer vaccine! To withdraw it! There's no other avenue, and it is not negotiable because it is a criminal act!

GR: Yeah. Okay, I just want to ask you one final point, not so much about the criminal behaviour of Pfizer but also its size. It's going to be getting into a merger soon with another company. This would make it a much more impressive in terms of – in relation to the other pharmaceutical corporations. You said that they were responsible for getting AstraZeneca (due to its adverse effects) in other countries to get in danger when in fact the same level of injuries – or in fact Pfizer had more injuries than AstraZeneca did. So how do you propose that Pfizer actually achieves that?

MC: Let me go back a little bit in history. And this is something that people don't know about.

Back in August of 2019, the two big giants, GlaxoSmithKline and Pfizer entered into an agreement. It wasn't a merger. But it was a commitment to collaborate. There you have the two big monopolies. GlaxoSithKline is not directly involved in marketing vaccines, but it of course produces various substances which are used in the vaccines, and it's worldwide and both these companies have partners in China and various other countries. But – there is certainly a big component of the Chinese pharmaceutical industry which is involved, but much more let's say in the production phase rather than at the level of intellectual property.

But, let me just refer to something which is absolutely fundamental. Back in April of last year, in fact it was March that Pfizer entered into negotiations with the European Union for the delivery of – and listen to that – for the delivery of 1.8 billion doses of their vaccine. And

if you look at the numbers, 1.8 billion doses is four times the population – exactly four times the population – of the European Union.

And that order came after an initial delivery of – I don't have all the figures on that – but we're talking about the fulfillment of contracts which are in the billions. Literally in the billions! Both in North America as well as in the European Union. And this was negotiated with Ursula von der Leyen who was president of the EU Commission. And she made a statement back in April that the negotiations had been launched. And she also thanked Pfizer and it's German partner BioNTech, and they said they were reliable partners of the European Union.

Of course, how can Pfizer be a reliable partner when just a few years earlier they were indicted by the U.S. Department of Justice for fraudulent marketing?

And incidentally, Al Capone was indicted for tax evasion!

There's a whole level of corruption, of blackmailing, underlying the relationship between the entities of the European Union and nation states and the pharmaceutical industries. And then of course in addition to the – to all this fraudulent behaviour, there is the substance of what is inside these vaccines. And what is inside the vaccines is a killer!

We are still in the process of investigating the vaccines. There's a whole issue of the graphene oxide or graphene hydra-oxide. There's the issue of magnetism within the vial of the vaccine. And so on, so forth. And the evidence is overwhelming! And the evidence is overwhelming both revealed by scientists but also revealed – and that's very important – by the official data of adverse events and mortality associated with this so-called mRNA vaccine which according to scientific opinion is not a vaccine.

GR: Well, Professor Chossudovsky, we really appreciate having you on again and elaborating a little bit on this bombshell of a report. Thank you so much for your time!

MC: Delighted to be on the program. Best wishes!

Transcript- Interview with Johnny Vedmore, Jan. 21, 2022

Part One

Global Research: Joining us to talk about some of the history of Pfizer and the way they operate we are joined by Johnny Vedmore. He's an independent investigative journalist as well as a musician. He's based in Cardiff Wales. He contributes to the Unlimited Hangout which is Whitney Webb's site. Johnny Vedmore welcome to the Global Research News Hour

Johnny Vedmore: Hi, nice to be here. Nice to speak to you. Finally.

GR: So I assume you followed the recent disclosure of the Pfizer documents? I need given what you've learned about them, does any of it surprise you?

JV: No and at the moment what we're going through is a time where we going to see lots of information come out constantly. And what I find incredible is that people can sift through this information so quickly and actually get to the relevant points and I think this does a service to the normal sifts and journalists out there the researchers who are really there – a load of researchers out there who are constantly doing work, and are really, really talented

at this stuff. They don't necessarily have the ability to get out there and go, but they're the ones who released this information, go through it, sift through it after the release and I find the really important points, and you'll see in these points echoed in loads of different things that are coming out at the moment including - I know there was a report in New Zealand that came out where they were saying that basically the mortality and the adverse reactions it's looking to be 30 times higher than any other vaccine.

Which where they've seen other figures recently that's been coming from these other deposits of information, I don't know what to call them because you always want to refer to them as leaks of information, because they're only being given up - like you said - only given up because people have put pressure on them.

So in a sense they are like leaks. They're leaks they just could not stop. They could not keep up those little bits, could not seal them off, and it's been really important to see what the problems are, and the problems range from anything from like nerve damage.

So we've got like myocarditis and pericarditis and all those different effects. Death of course which is the most severe that you can get, some would say, some others would say not when they're stuck on the wheelchair unable to speak for the rest of their life, as many as loads of other things like blood clots and lots of other problems. And these problems, they're going to leave people having to ask more questions.

What I find disappointing the most disappointing is that with all the flood of this information you're still seeing that the majority of people who have some form of profile and then experience the side effects after having a jab and then come out and say it, say in the same breath, "I'm really happy that these vaccines have saved a lot of lives. But this is what they've done to me."

And I always find that's when the saddest thing, the normal human reaction that often comes from, I believe comes from I want a self preservation of the ego so you don't feel like you've been tricked or duped or that something's gone wrong...because you can't have people who are fit and healthy having- including a lot of athletes and stuff- coming down with such bad side effects publicly and it does seem like a mass psychosis event. It does seem like that. It does seem like we're living in an imaginary world, and we think that's normal.

And a lot of this comes down to...a lot of the problem we have at the moment is that we're about to see that flood of information increase at such a level, because they will be creating document after document after document to make it harder for these many researchers to sift through it and actually get answers to any of the questions.

So Pfizer and their people will be looking into trying to flood the zone, as was said in Event 201 by I believe it was Matthew Harrington who said basically flooding the zone looks like putting out as much information as possible and making it impossible for any other news to come to the surface, you know, that sort of thing.

The other thing about a lot of the information that comes out one of the most concerning issues, I think, through the whole covid pandemic relating to these vaccinations, which a lot of people don't like to call them them vaccinations because they are answering the medical procedure, really. Or medical interventions, they're not really having to be there.

One of the most interesting things is that the batch types of these Pfizer vaccines had a different level of adverse side effects and death, and so batch types were sent to certain areas that will result in worse rates than other areas, and I find that information to be extremely suspicious because we know there's an agenda. We know, we've heard about the agenda to get rid of the useless eaters and all of this. We've heard about that. Now, we're always dealing with on the edge of rounds of conspiracy theory because it sounds like imaginary, it sounds like a silly imaginary thing, the idea that we could be entering again after all we've learned and all of this, That we'd be collectively entering into a point of mass extermination or depopulation by methods that seem underhand.

But when you're seeing batch numbers being sent to certain areas that will have a higher death rate, and you wonder how are those actually chosen, and who decides who gets who and what gets what, it reminds me of standing in one of those modern Tech Museums - I can't remember what it's called, but it was in Bristol, it was like an exhibition I was in. I looked up recently . And it had one of the oldest philosophical issues in front. And it's supposed to make you think, but to be honest the whole place seemed like it was manufacturing consent for doing rather than thinking about it, because these philosophical problems are not something that you should take, you should use as part of your toolkit unless you really have to. And this is what's being used.

But the philosophy that if you've got one old person and they do this - one old person on a train track and on another train track you've got five people and the trains approaching and what do you do? Do you allow the five people, do you change the track, so that it only kills the one person. And everybody's always going to say, well you change the track, and then it has, and gives you the idea, oh well actually I can make a decision that can save lives, but in return I have to take a life!

And that sort of fundamental idea that has entered into, I think it's ever prevalent, and not talked about that much, and it's really symbolic in that one philosophical idea of do you allow one person to die or five people to die and what's your basis on? Seeding that into the environment, I think has happened a lot. And this Pfizer jab being different, having different effects, different batch numbers is a real suspicious addition to the equation.

GR: Well yeah when Pfizer joined the race to get a covid vaccine, it intended to use the MRNA, a novice brand new thing which is not a DNA vaccine, by the way, but you do see a connection there. Could you just explain that?

JV: Yeah and it's really hard to research. As a researcher who goes into family histories, and the elite, the powerful sort of connections of the elites in the past and present, it's really difficult to look at a science of such complicated level, and really understand it. I did a lot of research into it.

My only think of it is that this vaccination works by, instead of, where messenger and mRNA, DNA splits into two, goes through a cell wall, because DNA can't fit through that cell wall, and then a piece of mRNA attaches to that and then it codes for a protein to be sent. Instead of doing the vaccination, working on that process of replacing that point, it skips to down the line and just calls for that protein to be brought. But that protein is a protein that is causing a lot of the effects.

So, I mean, this spike, this S spike protein, I think people discussed it a little bit at the start, and what the scientific consensus that wasn't from the mainstream, because the

mainstream was, oh, this came from a lab, or was from bat and etc, Even though the other scientists could provide evidence why that was obviously not. 99.9 percent of it came from an animal, but the 0.1 percent of it was a 12 nucleotide insert and that 12-Nucleotide insert is made up of a little bunch of things that's going to ask for a certain type of proteins to be made. That basically is the spike protein, the S Spike protei you hear so much about, I believe anyway. Put it into that virus, put it into an animal virus inside the laboratory they've inserted that - gain of function to make it no longer just in the animal but to allow it to cross over to humans.

And what that Spike protein apparently is, the S protein is from the HIV virus. So they've taken it out of there and they've placed it in there to make it so that it hooks on better. Because that's why HIV was so terrible. So that's what they wanted to do for some reason, that's what you want to do. You want to create a hook onto it . So that then creates that process, the vaccination creates this rolling process of you calling more of what's more likely to harm you. Now that's my understanding of it..

And they'll say, oh you're wrong, you don't understand anything. And it's true I don't understand a lot. You know there's elements of what they say is going to be true, but if you cannot explain to me the medical intervention and how it works so that I could understand it when I've got a lot of experience in going through scientific journals and scientific papers and understanding quite complicated stuff, through lots of like time of trying to learn it, if I can't understand it, then the average Joe on the street who doesn't take any notice of science is definitely not going to understand it, and that means it's not got factor of consent. You cannot consent to a medical intervention if you can't understand how it works and the person who makes it can't explain it to you in simple terms. It's simply that.

Because every time they have to try and explain it in too much detail, they have to try and explain where this bit come from or what that bit come from, Or how that's different or why it's different from this. Wait a minute, why is this different from this? Why is this? Well, they have to explain it because it's something they're discovering themselves. It's still an ongoing research project.

One thing you discover is as well is that in about 2014, 2015 maybe a little bit later than that, in Britain alone, there were something like a hundred different lab breaches, in, uh, whichever lab is their main Ministry of Defense lab at the moment. And so this is something that is really common all around the place. These guys are doing really dangerous research, really dangerous viruses, it's like one of those breaches in lab security was they were testing ebola, that they've given dead infected into animals. They've managed to create ebola in some bovines, some cows I believe they were, a cow, and they were testing it on what ebola does to a cow when it kills them.

Obviously it's like that sort of gain of function trans-species mutation of viruses in laboratories are happening in Britain, and that just should not be, we shouldn't be bringing these viruses ... I understand the idea, you have to do some research, okay, if a virus is in a country you send all your scientists to that country and you do your research while that virus is there in that country.

You don't create the viruses. I just do not believe in this. And a lot of this research is based on this mRNA technology which was, really, like, you know, fundamentally, like, all works apart from this one little bit we can't get a grasp on. We can't get an understanding of, which I think basically, something that, which I think it's called an agitator or something,

something that causes a response to your immune system. And you have to bond that, bond that onto something, and they couldn't find it, and they ended up with like those lipid nanoparticles and things like that. And all of that stuff is known for having some form of toxicity. That is a known.

Now the problem with a lot of these experiments nowadays, a lot of these companies, is that if it's unknown, that means it's fair game. So they do this as well with the response to the virus and how they calculate the adverse effects of a vaccine. So they say we're not going to count, we're not going to check, no one has to report it, it's not mandatory, you don't have to... 1 to 10 percent may report it if they want, we won't do any research into that, but we'll tell you, we'll tell you for sure that it's doing this that's the opposite of what the research would actually tell us if we do it. So it's like don't look, don't tell policy. We don't look at the research, we don't research it, we don't check the numbers, so it's not happening.

Intermission

Part Two

GR: Talk a bit about this scandalous behaviour of Pfizer. I mean there's a history of it that's documented in the court's record, I mean you talk about some of the more dynamic cases in their past that should raise a few flags about some of their products.

JV: Well I mean I, I've got to say I'm not the most knowledgeable person about everything in the world relating to Pfizer, but I did my research on them, and some of the things that you... One of the things I focused in on was the case in Nigeria.

I think it was in the nineties, where they come into test some medicine that was really potentially unnecessary, I think, on pregnant women. And then there was loads of birth defects. As soon as people started dying, I mean the birth defects weren't discovered till later, and other things weren't discovered till later, but the actual, as soon as people started dying, and things started going wrong, and people started noticing, and people started seeing it, the scientists just packed up the whole operation and left straight away. They had no intention

And did this would then - people would try and get justice for these people. And for the next like ten years, Pfizer would do everything in its power to put legal pressure on these people who were poor people from Nigeria community, and that's a lot different than what it's like living in the west, when you from... poor Nigerian town up north to be tested on by these guys and you've got some sort of, you're done for life, you know, you can't work anymore...these people have to work lots. They have to work much harder than us. They have to carry things, they have to look after people. Some of them were...obviously couldn't have kids or couldn't have a normal life so they're seen as sterile and their lives would be affected forever, that's a tragedy within itself.

But the Pfizer, Pfizer would do their best to obfuscate and to every point in court, to refuse to take any responsibility until eventually they said basically, "okay, we'll say that it could have been but we're not sure and we'll pay you like something." I don't know, it was like a pittance, each person got maybe a thousand pound if they were lucky or something.

You know oh, they really didn't get... And then they go on and act as though this is normal,

it's normal behaviour, this is what we do. So, a lot of the things about Pfizer, a lot of these things about these big pharmaceutical companies, they gain this, all of this behavior they do all of these different times, because that's just one of many.

I'm sure there's many people who can tell you every single thing that Pfizer has done, and I come across a lot of them, but I wouldn't want to speak about things, I'm not necessarily, like I'd make mistakes on, and a lot of the stuff I read I didn't go into in great detail because quite simply there was so much of it. These people they get - go on, sorry.

GR: Maybe you could talk a little bit about the role of Pfizer in contorting the regulation in the FDA. Because I mean, it's not just within Pfizer but it's going out, in fact I know, for example, a former Pfizer employee Patrizia Cavazzoni ended up as director at the FDA.

JV: Yeah, yeah well this is what they do, they swap in between. The other thing I discovered is when I did research on the Pfizer people, what you discover is that the people who were interviewing the Pfizer people back in the day, were given this manufactured version of events, and just like, you know, doing puff pieces for these people. These people would go on later to work for Pfizer and companies and vice versa when Pfizer employees caught three of them I think, in one of the cases, I think three of them got caught sending emails to each other that they were trying to play down and they got caught out.

And so those three actors step down and they all go into the media and then report doing the same thing! Going to there now the links with these pharmaceutical companies in the media then they're just representatives, or they go into the PR into the back offices. A lot of these people don't actually have any type of, like, punishment for their crimes this way. It's a big circle. It's a big circle.

And a lot of the funding, a lot of the funding in government etc, a lot of the adverts on TV and now you'll see are sponsored by the people who can pay for them easily because their earning so much money. And that's companies like Pfizer. Now a lot of these companies, big companies I've done research on, GlaxoSmithKline in the past - which was SmithKline Beecham and Glaxo Welcome or whatever, all of these different things - these companies merge, change, and they rebrand every, say, thirty years I'd say, it seems, because they need to. Because they come up to a point when the scandal's too much and they'd have to pay way too much money out, that they just have to say okay we're going to split the company in two, sell this off to this, sell this off to this, and that's happened multiple times throughout history and will happen again I believe.

Any of these companies, Pfizer or something, they'll get bought out by Eli Lilly or something like this, another company will come along, and really it'll still be the same people making the same money, owning it the same way, the same people will be on board running it the same way. Anybody who has to have their head on the chopping block of a company like Pfizer or one of the big pharmaceutical companies, we'll just be moved up into even another department which is never for you see a lot. It's often they say, yeah this person did bad, we're going to send them over to this department where they're out of the Limelight.

These people don't really take responsibility, or these big companies, and the people working inside them don't take responsibility for any of the actions-

GR: What's that going to do overtime, I mean if you're working in Pfizer, I mean, like a company that's able to avoid accountability as you say maybe there are attempts to cut

corners whatever, what does that do to them as individuals doing their work, I mean, is it-

JV: Well, I think to get into the talk of Big Pharma in the first place, you probably got to be pretty narcissistic with a massive ego.

So the people running down at the lower levels I always feel a bit sorry for a lot of the people, because you've seen good people work in these companies, like the people who have the same intentions as many nurses have when they go into work at a hospital, the idea that I'm going to do good, I'm going to help people, I'm going to look after people, but when they actually get into it, all they're doing is, their basic standard operating procedure. Research they're being funded for, the area that they focus on, and that area that those who they build up to be a bigger picture that's designed by someone else and for completely different reasons than altruism or humanity for the goodness of humanity, you know these people know how to work the small cogs so they don't even know their parts of the Cog in the machine.

So a lot of these people who work in Pfizer as well, I feel quite sorry for, because a lot of them would be like "I wanted to make a career out of it" and they got such a bad name, and that's not what my experience is. My lived experience, I go into work I produce nice and we're doing good for humanity. We're researching cancer, we're researching some irritable bowel syndrome or something like that. Lots of people, you know, really doing good work in all of these companies.

All of these companies use them and then there is this reckless top-level which seems completely, to be put in charge because they're willing to take the hit. So you don't get to be, like someone like the CEO Bourla you don't get to be someone like him in a position like he's in without having-knowing way that your head will be on the chopping block at some point. You are the front man. You are the front man for a company which is committing crimes.

GR: So do you see any success coming, I mean with the accountability again - basically getting away with things, what will happen to eventually come to a disclosure where the people can basically force the company to - I don't know - to stop their negative attacks or malfeasance or whatever. What can set the record straight?

JV: I got this really like, the more I look into these, how this whole network of pharmaceutical industries, of trusts, of academia through - fund the research of all these unaccountable bodies, I find it terrifying! What I see is, like, a kind of machine bureaucracy, akin to some sort of cyber hyper communism that's rolling out through the hole in the medical industry throughout the whole of the world. That it's unstoppable, that these people will remain unaccountable because they have this way too much power. They're in control now!

This is like a medical technocracy. None of them will be held to account. I say none of the people who will actually make the decision will be held to account...they'll have the...their people who have their head of the public chopping block and will then nothing will happen to them anyway. They'll just disappear into the scene.

I don't think there's any structure that can hold them to account because all these structures by what I've seen have been completely and utterly infiltrated for over three decades by masses and masses of government infiltration and other things that make it have that sort of, like, fascist sort of like public-private behemoth feel to it. I'm not sure

there is any way to do it apart from literally really big, really big change in the way we do politics and the way we hold people to account. Because I think what really needs to happen is that all of these companies, all of these people that are supposed to work for health have to be 100 percent transparent all of the time.

They should have no option to do anything other than that. They should be no wiggle room at all for them to hide anything. If they are giving their drugs to the public, which is what a drug company does if they're giving their medical stuff for use on the public, they need to be 100 percent open, accountable, every email scrutinized, every communication scrutinized, I think we need that throughout a lot of the top levels of society, of the people we can't trust. Not for the lower levels of society, I think the current path they are trying to create is what we need to flip.

What they're trying to create at the moment in the world is this idea that they will surveil everybody in the panopticonic type manner. We will all be prisoners in cells and they will sit in the centre and watch out on us. Well we need to reverse that paradigm really easily by making them the cell in the middle and us being all free on the outside and there being like a reverse Panopticon. We need to create some form of reverse panopticon.

GR: I'm afraid we've run out of time but I just want to add that you're writing a major article that's coming up soon and I think we'll have to watch for it. Maybe we can have another conversation on that article.

JV: I would love to- I think it relates in many different ways.

GR: Johnny, thank you for joining me

JV: Ah, it's been a pleasure! Good night!

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. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/STATEMENT_21_1741
2. Josef Federman (Jan. 19, 2022), 'Pfizer boss Albert Bourla wins Genesis Prize for vaccine development', Associated Press; <https://www.independent.ie/world-news/pfizer-boss-albert-bourla-wins-genesis-prize-for-vaccine-development-41255689.html>
3. ibid
4. ibid
5. <https://medicalxpress.com/news/2021-11-pfizer-biontech-moderna-profit-analysis.html>
6. <https://www.globalresearch.ca/why-pfizer-can-never-trusted/5767125>
7. Joe Barnes (January 28, 2022), 'Ursula von der Leyen hauled over the coals after refusing to publish text messages to Pfizer chief', Brussels Correspondent; <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/world-news/2022/01/28/ursula-von-der-leyen-accused-maladministration-refusing-publish/>

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Michael Welch](#), [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#), and [Johnny Vedmore](#), Global Research, 2023

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Michael Welch](#),
[Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#),
and [Johnny Vedmore](#)

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