

Pfizer's Unconscionable Crimes, Past and Present

By [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

Global Research, December 06, 2021

[Mercola](#) 4 December 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [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).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

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

In a November 9, 2021, interview with Atlantic Council CEO Frederick Kempe, Pfizer chairman and CEO Albert Bourla claimed “a small part of professionals” intentionally circulate “misinformation ... so that they will mislead those that have concerns.” Such medical professionals are not just bad people, Bourla said, “they’re criminals, because they have literally cost millions of lives”

The criminals’ playbook includes the dictum to always blame the other side for what they themselves are guilty of

Pfizer has a long history of criminal activity. The company has been sued in multiple venues over unethical drug testing, illegal marketing practices, bribery in multiple countries, environmental violations — including illegal dumping of PCBs and other toxic waste — labor and worker safety violations and more. It’s also been criticized for price gouging that threatens the lives of patients with chronic diseases such as epilepsy

Between 2002 and 2010, Pfizer was fined \$3 billion in criminal convictions, civil penalties and jury awards, including a \$2.3 billion fine in 2009, the then-largest health care fraud fine in American history. In 2011, Pfizer paid \$14.5 million to settle charges of illegal marketing, and in 2014 they settled charges relating to unlawful marketing of the kidney transplant drug Rapamune to the tune of \$35 million. None of it deterred future bad behavior

According to a whistleblower who worked on Pfizer’s Phase 3 COVID jab trial in the fall of 2020, data were falsified, patients were unblinded and follow-up on reported side effects lagged way behind

*

In a November 9, 2021, interview with Atlantic Council CEO Frederick Kempe,¹ Pfizer chairman and CEO Albert Bourla claimed “a small part of professionals” intentionally circulate “misinformation ... so that they will mislead those that have concerns.”²

Such medical professionals, Bourla said, are not just bad people, “they’re criminals, because they have literally cost millions of lives.” Bourla is one to talk, being the CEO of a company the name of which is synonymous with corporate crime.

Bourla’s comments were made on the same day Pfizer and its partner BioNTech asked the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to broaden its authorization for booster shots to everyone over the age of 18.³

Pot Calling the Kettle Black

I guess we can’t be too surprised, though, as the primary defense strategy people like Bourla have is to blame the opposition for their own misdeeds. He even claims the company is being targeted by “dark organizations,” meaning organizations that aren’t transparent about their funding.

This is precisely what the Center for Countering Digital Hate (CCDH) is, the fabrications⁴ of which are being used to prop up the official narrative that those who present evidence showing the COVID shots are dangerous are domestic terrorists⁵ out to worsen the pandemic death toll.

No one knows who funds this group, but it has plenty of connections to war hawks and Great Reset promoters — including the Atlantic Council, to which Bourla is making these statements.

By way of its board members, the CCDH can be linked to the Trilateral Commission, the Atlantic Council, the European Council of Foreign Relations, Save the Children Fund (funded by the Gates Foundation and a partner of Gates’ GAVI Vaccine Alliance), the British Parliament, CIA and Event 201,^{6,7} Microsoft,⁸ and the Center for American Progress⁹ (another organization funded by dark money¹⁰).

And Bourla wants us to believe Pfizer is under attack from dark money groups? Again, the playbook of these wolves includes the dictum to always blame the other side for what they themselves are guilty of.

More on the Atlantic Council

In August 2018, Facebook claimed an “influence campaign” by Russian “bad actors” had been carried out on its platform leading up to the 2018 midterm elections. However, it turned out these pages weren’t identified by Facebook. They came primarily from the Atlantic Council’s Digital Forensic Research Lab.

In her article, “Hysteria Over Newly Revealed Facebook ‘Influence Campaign’ Doesn’t Fit the Facts,”¹¹ investigative reporter Whitney Webb took a deep-dive into this inane propaganda effort, pointing out that:

“... despite the lawmakers’ claims, Facebook has established no links to the Russian government or even Russian nationals.

The only ‘evidence’ to back up the claim of Russian-involvement is that one of the pages identified ‘had an IRA [Internet Research Agency, a Russian ‘troll farm’ named in

a Mueller-probe indictment] account as one of its admins for ‘only seven minutes’ and ‘one of the IRA accounts we disabled in 2017 shared a Facebook Event hosted by’ one of the pages.

Beyond the fact that accusations of Russian involvement are highly politicized given the lack of current evidence, there is hardly any indication that this ‘influence campaign’ was even influential at all.

Indeed, most of the ‘bad actor’ pages and accounts had hardly any followers, with most of them having no followers. For instance, only four of the 32 total social-media pages and accounts had more than 10 followers, with all other pages — i.e., the remaining 28 — having between 10 and zero, according to Facebook’s statements.

All of the Instagram accounts identified had zero followers and, among those seven accounts, only one of them had made a single post on the platform. By Facebook’s own admission, only four of the pages named were even remotely significant in terms of followers and thus ‘influence.’”

Why do I mention this? Because this is the same tactic used to frame a small number of individuals with limited social media reach as domestic terrorists, simply for sharing counter-narratives about the COVID pandemic.

False Allegations Used to Quench Freedom of Speech

According to the CCDH,¹² a dozen individuals, including me, were responsible for 65% of all anti-vaccine content on social media and should therefore be banned from all platforms. Most social media companies have since complied, deplatforming most of us. This despite a public denouncement of the CCDH’s accusations by Monika Bickert, vice president of Facebook content policy, who stated that:¹³

“... these 12 people are responsible for about just 0.05% of all views of vaccine-related content on Facebook. This includes all vaccine-related posts they’ve shared, whether true or false, as well as URLs associated with these people.

The report¹⁴ upon which the faulty narrative is based analyzed only a narrow set of 483 pieces of content over six weeks from only 30 groups, some of which are as small as 2,500 users.

They are in no way representative of the hundreds of millions of posts that people have shared about COVID-19 vaccines in the past months on Facebook.

Further, there is no explanation for how the organization behind the report identified the content they describe as ‘anti-vax’ or how they chose the 30 groups they included in their analysis. There is no justification for their claim that their data constitute a ‘representative sample’ of the content shared across our apps.”

Information Warfare

Getting back to the Atlantic Council, Webb noted that:¹⁵

“Facebook officially partnered with the Atlantic Council this past May in order to tackle

so-called ‘fake news,’ adding that the hawkish think-tank would serve as its ‘eyes and ears’ in identifying alleged foreign-influence operations ...

The Atlantic Council itself is led by a mix of retired military officers, former politicians, and Western business elites. And the think-tank’s financial sponsors include top U.S. defense contractors; agencies aligned with Washington and the Pentagon; the United Arab Emirates; major transnational corporations; and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

One can think of several reasons why such a group would be interested in fomenting anti-Russian hysteria ... The Atlantic Council’s conflicts of interest are certainly worth keeping in mind ...”

The same must be said about the CCDH, and Pfizer too. Both are glaringly biased and in no position to judge what is misinformation and what isn’t. But then, this is war, after all. We’re in an information war, and the term “misinformation” is lobbed in lieu of grenades. Discernment and some basic wisdom is required to avoid becoming a victim.

Fact checking organizations are another weapon designed and deployed to control the narrative. They exist as gatekeepers to funnel readers and viewers to the official narrative and away from anything that might raise inconvenient questions. The largest and most influential fact checker is NewsGuard, which hands out “trustworthiness” ratings to websites.

NewsGuard cofounder Louis Crovitz is a member of the Council on Foreign relations — another Great Reset supporter — and primary advisers include Tom Ridge, former secretary of Homeland Security, and Ret. Gen. Michael Hayden, a former director of both the CIA and NSA.¹⁶

Knowing that, it makes it easier to understand how everyday people who share information that veers from the official narrative can be labeled and treated as a national security threat.

The COVID pandemic is a militarized operation. We’re at war, and the designated enemy (looking at it from the side that started this war without telling anyone) are the citizens of the world who want to hold on to their freedom and human rights.

Pfizer Has a Long History of Criminal Behavior

Pfizer is on the other side — the side that is seeking to install an unelected technocratic regime based on the idea that we need a global biosecurity, biosurveillance apparatus or we’ll all die.

This is not a new position for them. During the American Civil War, which began in 1862, the need for massive amounts of painkillers and antiseptics allowed Pfizer to flourish and expand during wartime.¹⁷ Today, the manufactured “need” for COVID-19 vaccine is allowing Pfizer to make out like a bandit yet again, and as I’ve already stated, we are again at war, albeit an undeclared one.

To achieve that, Pfizer is willing to “blackmail” countries into accepting its COVID shot terms, as reviewed in the Gravitas report above — terms that make sure Pfizer always comes out on top.

A key term is no liability, which is understandable considering the amount of harm Pfizer’s COVID jab is causing. Pfizer went so far as to bully nations into putting up sovereign assets like military bases as collateral to pay for any vaccine injury lawsuits that might result from their COVID jab.

While that might not be illegal, it’s unethical, and so is researching on people without informed consent. Everyone who gets these emergency use authorized injections are part of that research, while simultaneously being prevented from seeing anything but propaganda.

Without truthful and transparent disclosure of both risks and benefits, there is no informed consent. Pfizer is even experimenting on children and pregnant women without informed consent, two categories that historically have been off-limits for drug experimentation.

Whistleblower Claims Data Were Falsified

According to a whistleblower who worked on Pfizer’s Phase 3 COVID jab trial in the fall of 2020, data were falsified and patients were unblinded. Follow-up on reported side effects also lagged behind.¹⁸ This isn’t the first time such unsavory have been levied against Pfizer.

In 2014, Pfizer was ordered to pay \$75 million to settle charges relating to its unlawful testing of a new broad spectrum antibiotic on critically ill Nigerian children. As reported by the Independent¹⁹ at the time, Pfizer sent a team of doctors into Nigeria in the midst of a meningitis epidemic.

For two weeks, the team set up right next to a medical station run by Doctors Without Borders and began dispensing the experimental drug, Trovan. Of the 200 children picked, half got the experimental drug and the other half the already licensed antibiotic Rocephin.

Eleven of the children treated by the Pfizer team died, and many others suffered side effects such as brain damage and organ failure. Pfizer denied wrongdoing. According to the company, only five of the children given Trovan died, compared to six who received Rocephin, so their drug was not to blame.

The problem was they never told the parents that their children were being given an experimental drug, let alone ask them if they wanted their child to take part in the trial.

In his 2010 paper, “Tough on Crime? Pfizer and the CIHR,” Robert G. Evans, Ph.D., Emeritus Professor at Vancouver School of Economics, described Pfizer as “a ‘habitual offender,’ persistently engaging in illegal and corrupt marketing practices, bribing physicians and suppressing adverse trial results.”

What’s more, while Pfizer produced a permission letter from a Nigerian ethics committee, the letter turned out to have been backdated. The ethics committee itself wasn’t set up until a year after the trial had already taken place.

State Department cables also revealed Pfizer hired spies with a plan to frame a Nigerian

attorney general and get him to drop the parents' lawsuit.²⁰ Pfizer even tried to avoid responsibility by falsely accusing Doctors Without Borders of dispensing the experimental drug.²¹

An 'Habitual Offender'

In his 2010 paper,²² "Tough on Crime? Pfizer and the CIHR," Robert G. Evans, Ph.D., Emeritus Professor at Vancouver School of Economics, described Pfizer as "a 'habitual offender,' persistently engaging in illegal and corrupt marketing practices, bribing physicians and suppressing adverse trial results."

Pfizer has been sued in multiple venues over unethical drug testing, illegal marketing practices,²³ bribery in multiple countries,²⁴ environmental violations — including illegal dumping of PCBs and other toxic waste²⁵ — labor and worker safety violations and more.^{26,27,28} It's also been criticized for price gouging that threatens the lives of patients with chronic diseases such as epilepsy.²⁹

Between 2002 and 2010 alone, Pfizer and its subsidiaries were fined \$3 billion in criminal convictions, civil penalties and jury awards. This included \$2.3 billion for the illegal marketing of the arthritis drug, Bextra, levied in 2009.^{30,31} It was the largest health care fraud settlement in American history.

According to the Global Justice report, "The Horrible History of Big Pharma: Why We Can't Leave Pharmaceutical Corporations in the Driving Seat of the COVID-19 Response:"³²

"A whistleblower claimed that sales staff were incentivized to sell Bextra to doctors for conditions for which the drug wasn't approved and at doses up to eight times those recommended. 'At Pfizer I was expected to increase profits at all costs, even when sales meant endangering lives. I couldn't do that,' he stated."

In 2011, Pfizer agreed to pay another \$14.5 million to settle federal charges of illegal marketing,³³ and in 2014 they settled federal charges relating to improper marketing of the kidney transplant drug Rapamune to the tune of \$35 million.³⁴

None of those legal actions deterred future bad behavior. To Pfizer, paying fines to sweep illegalities under the rug has become part of the cost of doing business, and they can afford it. While the fines may sound extraordinary, they're tiny when compared to the company's profits.

Pfizer was among the top 30 most profitable companies in the world in 2020, with profits reaching \$16 billion, and its COVID job alone is predicted to make \$13 billion in 2021.³⁵

As noted by the law firm Matthews and Associates, "the history of Pfizer is rife with so much subterfuge and under-the-table dealing that the company will need all the help it can get to promote confidence in its hastily assembled COVID vaccine."³⁶ The key strategy to boost confidence, unfortunately, is censorship.

What 'New Way of Life' Is Pfizer Promising?

The fastest way to get back to normal, Bourla claims in his Atlantic Council interview, is for everyone to get vaccinated.

Considering how little things have changed despite massive vaccination rates, it seems clear the globalists in charge of The Great Reset — and Pfizer is part of that pack — have no intention of allowing anything go back to normal. It won't matter how many comply, or how many times we comply

Australia is perhaps the clearest illustration of what the whole world will face. Even though a majority are “vaccinated,” their freedoms have not been returned, and now they have to submit to boosters or lose what semblance of freedom the initial round of shots gave them. The Australian government is confiscating and blocking people's bank accounts, withholding unemployment benefits and more — all in the name of “public health.”

Bourla even indicates that there is no going back to the old normal when he states, “The only thing that stands between the new way of life and the current way of life is ... hesitancy to vaccinations.”

New way of life. What does this “new way of life” look like? It looks like Australia. It looks like Israel. It looks like Lithuania,³⁷ where your “right” to frequent restaurants, stores, shopping malls, beauty salons, libraries, banks, insurance agencies and universities, and your “right” to inpatient medical care and travel, all depend on your willingness to participate in a medical experiment that can kill or disable you.

The “new way of life” Bourla is talking about involves repeatedly playing lethal Russian Roulette just to “earn” the right to be part of society. No thank you. Bourla can keep his “new way of life.”

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Notes

¹ [Facebook Atlantic Council November 9, 2021](#)

² [Washington Post November 9, 2021](#)

³ [Washington Post November 9, 2021 Live Update](#)

^{4, 12, 14} [CCDH, The Disinformation Dozen](#)

⁵ [The Defender December 2, 2021](#)

⁶ [Eurasia Review May 21, 2021](#)

- ⁷ [Event 201](#)
- ⁸ [Computerworld September 14, 2007](#)
- ⁹ [Center for American Progress Simon Clark](#)
- ¹⁰ [New York Times May 3, 2021 \(Archived\)](#)
- ^{11, 15} [Mint Press News August 2, 2018](#)
- ¹³ [Facebook August 18, 2021](#)
- ¹⁶ [We Are Change May 15, 2020](#)
- ¹⁷ [Pharmaphoroum Pfizer History](#)
- ¹⁸ [The BMJ 2021; 375:n2635](#)
- ¹⁹ [The Independent March 23, 2014](#)
- ²⁰ [The Atlantic December 27, 2010](#)
- ^{21, 25, 27, 36} [Corporate Research Project February 3, 2017](#)
- ²² [Healthcare Policy 2010 May;5\(4\):16-25](#)
- ²³ [SGT Report January 7, 2021](#)
- ²⁴ [CorpWatch August 8, 2012](#)
- ²⁶ [Corporate Research Project Pfizer](#)
- ²⁸ [Matthews & Associates Pfizer Rap Sheet](#)
- ^{29, 32, 35} [Global Justice, The Horrible History of Big Pharma](#)
- ³⁰ [ProPublica Big Pharma's Big Fines](#)
- ³¹ [CNN April 2, 2010](#)
- ³³ [DOJ October 21, 2011](#)
- ³⁴ [Reuters August 6, 2014](#)
- ³⁷ [Twitter Gluboco Lietuva October 7, 2021](#)

Featured image is from Zero Hedge

The original source of this article is [Mercola](#)
Copyright © [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#), [Mercola](#), 2021

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

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