

Citerar artikel av 2021-01-02 som är av mycket stort allmänt intresse, sprid vidare i alla dina nätverk, citat

## **50 Percent of Healthcare Workers in Riverside County, California Refuse To Take COVID Vaccine**

### **IN BRIEF**

- **The Facts:**

50 percent of healthcare workers and hospital staff in Riverside County are refusing to take the COVID-19 vaccine.

- **Reflect On:**

Why are those who have concerns with vaccine safety ridiculed and labelled as anti-vax conspiracy theorists? Why are the concerns never really acknowledged or addressed? Is the COVID vaccine even able to stop/prevent infection and transmission?

**What Happened:** Riverside County, California has a population of approximately 2.4 million, and about 50 percent of healthcare workers in the county are refusing to take the COVID-19 vaccine despite the fact that they have top priority and access to it.

At Providence Holy Cross Medical Center in Mission Hills, one in five frontline nurses and doctors have declined the shot. Roughly 20% to 40% of L.A. County's frontline workers who were offered the vaccine did the same, according to county public health officials.

[According to](#) the L.A. Times, "The vaccine doubts swirling among healthcare workers across the country come as a surprise to researchers, who assumed hospital staff would be among those most in tune with the scientific data backing the vaccines."

**The "scientific data" as the L.A. Times puts it has also come into question by academicians, scientists and doctors.** For example, Dr. Peter Doshi, an associate editor at the British Medical Journal (BMJ) published a piece in the journal issuing a word of caution about the supposed "[95% Effective" COVID vaccines from Pfizer and Moderna.](#)"

**In it he outlines how there is no proof showing that the vaccine can and will prevent infection and/or transmission of the virus.**

[Another recent article](#) published in the BMJ by journalist Paul D. Thacker highlights the conflicts of interest that exist between the United Kingdom's COVID-19 advisors, which also seems to be a common theme around the globe.

Even Kamran Abbas, a doctor, executive editor of the BMJ and the editor of the Bulletin of the World Health Organization [published an article](#) about COVID-19, the

suppression of science and the politicization of medicine. This is evident by the fact that other cheap therapies have [shown a tremendous amount of promise and success](#) for treating COVID-19, yet they've been heavily ridiculed by the "medical-political complex," as Abbas calls it.

*The UK's pandemic response relies too heavily on scientists and other government appointees with worrying competing interests, including shareholdings in companies that manufacture covid-19 diagnostic tests, treatments, and vaccines. Government appointees are able to ignore or cherry pick science—another form of misuse—and indulge in anti-competitive practices that favour their own products and those of friends and associates. – Abbas*

**These are simply a few examples as to why it comes as no surprise to many that frontline health-care workers are refusing to take the vaccine.**

After all, how necessary is it really [for a virus that has a 99.95 percent](#) survival rate for people under the age of 70?

For people over the age of 70 the survival rate is still 95 percent. This data comes from more than 50 seroprevalence studies that have now been published. Let's not forget about the fact [that tens and thousands](#) of doctors have openly opposed lockdown measures as a means to combat the virus, citing a lot of information showing [the harms lockdowns are having](#) from deaths that could have been prevented, to economic impacts, starvation, poverty and much more.

The L.A. times [points out](#) that "The extent to which healthcare workers are refusing the vaccine is unclear, but reports of lower-than-expected participation rates are emerging around the country... To persuade reluctant workers, many hospitals are using instructional videos and interactive webinars showing staff getting vaccinated.

**At an Orange County hospital, Anthony Wilkinson, an intensive care nurse who cares for coronavirus patients, said he had co-workers who had "lost faith in big pharma and even the CDC."**

**Why This Is Important: Losing faith in "big pharma" does not come without good reason.**

For example, in 2010 Robert G. Evans, PhD, Centre for Health Services and Policy Research Emeritus Professor, Vancouver School of Economics, UBC, published a paper that's accessible in PubMed titled ["Tough on Crime? Pfizer and the CIHR."](#)

In it, he outlines the fact that,

***Pfizer has been a “habitual offender,” persistently engaging in illegal and corrupt marketing practices, bribing physicians and suppressing adverse trial results.***

***Since 2002 the company and its subsidiaries have been assessed \$3 billion in criminal convictions, civil penalties and jury awards.***

***The 2.3-billion settlement...set a new record for both criminal fines and total penalties. A link with Pfizer might well advance the commercialization of Canadian research.***

Suppressing clinical trial results is something I've come across multiple times with several different medicines. [Five years ago](#) I wrote about how big pharma did not share adverse reactions people had and harmful results from their clinical trials for commonly used antidepressant drugs.

Even scientists from within federal these health regulatory agencies have been sounding the alarm. For example, a few years ago more than a dozen scientists from within the CDC put out an anonymous public statement detailing the influence corporations have on government policies. They were referred to as the [Spider Papers](#).

*We are a group of scientists at CDC that are very concerned about the current state of ethics at our agency. It appears that our mission is being influenced and shaped by outside parties and rogue interests. It seems that our mission and Congressional intent for our agency is being circumvented by some of our leaders.*

***What concerns us most, is that it is becoming the norm and not the rare exception.***

*Some senior management officials at CDC are clearly aware and even condone these behaviours. Others see it and turn the other way. Some staff are intimidated and pressed to do things they know are not right.*

***We have representatives from across the agency that witness this unacceptable behaviour. It occurs at all levels and in all of our respective units. These questionable and unethical practices threaten to undermine our credibility and reputation as a trusted leader in public health. ([source](#))***

**When it comes to vaccines specifically**, a quote [from a paper](#) published in the International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy by professor Paddy Rawlinson, from Western Sydney University, provides some good insight into what I am referring to.

*Critical criminology repeatedly has drawn attention to the state-corporate nexus as a site of corruption and other forms of criminality, a scenario exacerbated by the intensification of neoliberalism in areas such as health.*

*The state-pharmaceutical relationship, which increasingly influences health policy, is no exception.*

***That is especially so when pharmaceutical products such as vaccines, a burgeoning sector of the industry, are mandated in direct violation of the principle of informed consent.***

*Such policies have provoked suspicion and dissent as critics question the integrity of the state-pharma alliance and its impact on vaccine safety.*

*However, rather than encouraging open debate, draconian modes of governance have been implemented to repress and silence any form of criticism, thereby protecting the activities of the state and pharmaceutical industry from independent scrutiny.*

*The article examines this relationship in the context of recent legislation in Australia to intensify its mandatory regime around vaccines. It argues that attempts to undermine freedom of speech, and to systematically excoriate those who criticise or dissent from mandatory vaccine programs, function as a corrupting process and, by extension, serve to provoke the notion that corruption does indeed exist within the state-pharma alliance.*

**Vaccine hesitancy is nothing new:** Vaccine hesitancy among physicians and academics is nothing new. To illustrate this I often point to a conference held at the end of 2019 put on by the World Health Organization (WHO).

At the conference, Dr. Heidi Larson a Professor of Anthropology and the Risk and Decision Scientist Director at the Vaccine Confidence Project Emphasized this point, having [stated](#),

*The other thing that's a trend, and an issue, is not just confidence in providers but confidence of health care providers.*

***We have a very wobbly health professional frontline that is starting to question vaccines and the safety of vaccines.***

*That's a huge problem, because to this day any study I've seen...still, the most trusted person on any study I've seen globally is the health care provider.*

A study published in the journal [EbioMedicine](#) as far back as 2013 outlines this point, stating in the introduction,

*Over the past two decades several vaccine controversies have emerged in various countries, including France, inducing worries about severe adverse effects and eroding confidence in health authorities, experts and science.*

*These two dimensions are at the core of vaccine hesitancy (VH) observed in the general population.*

*VH is defined as delay in acceptance of vaccination, or refusal, or even acceptance with doubts about its safety and benefits, with all these behaviours and attitudes varying according to context, vaccine and personal profile, despite the availability of vaccine services VH presents a challenge to physicians who must address their patients' concerns about vaccines and ensure satisfactory vaccination coverage.*

More data beyond the L.A. times article indicates widespread hesitancy.

Researchers from the University of California Los Angeles' Karin Fielding School of Public Health [surveyed](#) healthcare personnel working in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

As the Washington Post [reported](#), they found that two thirds (66.5%) of healthcare workers "intend to delay vaccination," meaning they do not intend to get the [COVID](#) vaccine when it becomes available. They plan instead on reviewing the data once it's widely administered and proven safe.

A recent [Gallup poll](#) showed that only 58% of Americans plan on getting the COVID vaccine when it's available. An October poll conducted by [Zogby](#) found that nearly 50% of Americans have [concerns about the safety](#) of the coming COVID vaccines.

Concerns about vaccines are not just rooted in a lack of trust, but sound science. You can read about one of many examples, aluminum, [here](#) if you're interested.

Vaccines are not a one size fits all product, in the US alone [nearly \\$4 billion](#) has been paid out to families of vaccine injured children, and a number of studies are calling into question their safety.

**The Takeaway:** Doubts surrounding the COVID -19 vaccine have been largely unacknowledged. When they are acknowledged within the mainstream media they are usually played off as ridiculous, or not based in sanity. For the most part anybody who is concerned about vaccine safety is usually dubbed an "anti-vax conspiracy theorist." Concerns that many scientists, doctors and people are bringing up with regards to vaccine safety are never really acknowledged or addressed, which brings me to my next point.

Why do we have such a hard time discussing controversial topics? Why are things always made out to seem so black and white? Why are we so polarized in our beliefs to the point where we can't look at another viewpoint that challenges our own? Why can't we understand why some people disagree with us and why they feel the way they do?

When it comes to vaccines, there is clearly an increased pressure for mandates in several different ways to the point where some of our rights and freedoms may be restricted if we don't comply.

Is all of this really justified? Is it really for the greater good or are we just made to believe it is?

Should freedom of choice always remain?

**Why do we give so much power over to governments and private institutions to the point where they can lockdown the world against the will of many people?**

Should governments simply recommend measures and present the science on both ends of the coin in an open and transparent way and let people do as they please?

Are we seeing basic freedoms and enjoyable experiences within life become inaccessible for those that don't wish to participate in extreme COVID measures? What is this fear driven approach saying about our general view of life at this time?

Slut citat

Källa till ovan citerat

<https://www.collective-evolution.com/2021/01/02/50-percent-of-healthcare-workers-in-riverside-county-california-refuse-to-take-covid-vaccine/>

Citerar artikel av datum 2021-01-06, som såklart ska spridas vidare i alla nätverk, läs om vilka Sveriges regering och deras medlöpare i Corona bedrägeriet/Brott mot mänskligheten och nationen Sveriges medborgare går hand i hand med på skattebetalarnas bekostnad, citat

## **Pfizer Caught Engaging In Illegal Marketing Practices & Assessed Billions In Criminal Convictions**

IN BRIEF

- The Facts:

A paper published in 2010 by Robert G. Evans, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Vancouver School of Economics, UBC titled "Tough on Crime? Pfizer and the CIHR" outlines the immoral, unethical and criminal activities of Pfizer up until 2010.

- Reflect On:

Is it hard to see why many doctors, scientists and citizens are hesitant to use products from this company? Is it hard to see why so many have lost their trust in these companies and government when it comes to doing what's best for our health?

What Happened: Pharmaceutical giant Pfizer, recently known for their development of a [COVID-19 vaccine](#), has been caught multiple times engaging in unethical and immoral behaviour.

This is no secret, yet over the years this fact continues to be brushed under the rug and remain mostly unacknowledged by mainstream media. Since mainstream media has such a large influence over the perception of the masses, it's no wonder why so many people respond to the word "big pharma" with "conspiracy theory."

**If one takes a closer look it's not hard to see why there is actually great cause for concern.**

There are many examples to choose from when bringing about awareness to unethical behaviour by big pharmaceutical companies, one comes [from a paper published in 2010](#) by Robert G. Evans, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Vancouver School of Economics, UBC.

**The paper, titled "Tough on Crime? Pfizer and the CIHR" is accessible through the National Library of Medicine (PubMed), and it outlines how Pfizer has been a "habitual offender" constantly engaging in illegal and criminal activities.**

This particular paper points out that from 2002 to 2010, Pfizer has been "assessed \$3 billion in criminal convictions, civil penalties and jury awards" and has set records for both criminal fines and total penalties. **Keep in mind we are now in 2021.**

Evans provides a number of examples, one coming from September of 2009 when the company settled a number of charges for a total of \$2.3 billion (O'Reilly and Capaccio 2009).

This particular settlement set a new record for a criminal fine as they pleaded guilty to one count of a felony and misbranding of a pharmaceutical. This means that multiple fraudulent marketing practices were used to promote various drugs.

In this case, the criminal charges focused on the "illegal promotion" of several Pfizer brands – Bextra (valdecoxib, a pain medication), Geodon (an atypical antipsychotic), Zyvox (linezolid, an antibiotic) and Lyrica (a seizure medication). These were promoted for uses that were not approved by the FDA and there were also kickbacks to physicians (meaning they got paid for prescribing these drugs).

*This was by no means Pfizer's first offence. In 2007, Pfizer subsidiary Pharmacia & Upjohn paid \$34 million and pleaded guilty to paying kickbacks for formulary placement of its drugs and entered into a Deferred Prosecution Agreement for off label distribution of Genotropin, its brand for the human growth hormone somatropin. In 2004 Pfizer subsidiary Warner-Lambert pleaded guilty and paid more than \$430 million to resolve criminal charges and civil liability arising from its fraudulent marketing practices with respect to Neurontin, its brand for the drug gabapentin. Originally developed for the treatment of epilepsy, Neurontin was illegally promoted off-label for the treatment of various forms of neurological pain, and in particular for migraine. -Evans ([Full paper](#))*

Evans goes on to explain how in 2010 Pfizer was ordered to pay \$142 million US in damages for fraudulently marketing an anti-seizure drug called gabapentin, which was marketed under the name Neurontin.

**Pfizer was caught “fraudulently” marketing the drug “and promoted it for unapproved use.”** It was discovered that the drug was promoted by the drug company as a treatment for pain, migraines and bipolar disorder, **even though it wasn’t effective in treating these conditions and was actually toxic.**

*The trials forced the company to release all of its studies on the drug, including the ones it kept hidden. A new analysis of those unpublished trials by the Therapeutics Initiative suggests that gabapentin works for one out of every six or eight people who use it, at best. The review also concluded that one in eight people had an adverse reaction to the drug.*

**It’s quite obvious why the company never wants to go to trial and always ends up paying large sums to settle.**

Apart from bribing and paying physicians and other medical professionals, the paper points out **that they dished out millions of dollars to more than 200 academic medical centers and other research groups for clinical trials.**

A great quote comes to mind here from Arnold Seymour Relman (1923-2014), Harvard Professor of medicine and former Editor in Chief of the New England Medical Journal.

***The medical profession is being bought by the pharmaceutical industry, not only in terms of the practice of medicine, but also in terms of teaching and research. The academic institutions of this country are allowing themselves to be the paid gents of the pharmaceutical industry. I think it’s disgraceful.”***[\(source\)](#)

Evans outlines another interesting point which shows why “justice” is never really done and these companies always seem free to engage in this type of criminal behaviour.

*A corporation may treat both criminal and civil penalties as simply business expenses, to be weighed against the revenues earned from illegal behaviour.*

***But human beings can be put in jail, and that is a whole other matter.***  
*Conceivably, convicting corporate executives of criminal behaviour and sentencing them to terms of imprisonment might be a more effective deterrent to the “repeat offender” behaviour demonstrated by Pfizer.*

**These companies are also protected from any harm that comes as a result of their vaccines.**



For example, the Canadian government [has announced](#) that it's implementing a pan-Canadian no-fault vaccine injury support program for all Health Canada approved vaccines.

**This means that pharmaceutical companies cannot be held liable for any vaccine injuries, and compensation from injuries do not come from the company, but from taxpayer money instead.**

It's similar to programs many countries already have in place, in the United States it's called the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Compensation Act. These measures shield and protect pharmaceutical companies and make many of their products, including vaccines, a liability free product.

In the US alone [nearly \\$4 billion](#) has been paid out to families of vaccine injured children, and a number of studies are calling into question their safety.

In all of these cases mentioned by Evans, the corporation itself, ie., its shareholders – incurred the financial penalties and the executives involved were presumed innocent. Evans states, “In the absence of such personal liability, both criminal and civil penalties appear to be, to Pfizer at least, a business expense worth incurring. **You have to spend money to make money.**”

***Fraud, misconduct, and illegal activity are well-known aspects of pharmaceutical companies' business practices.***

*Unlike other large industries, while business practices may be potentially unethical, but not illegal, those in the pharmaceutical industry routinely and flagrantly engage in illegal activity without facing any deterrent consequences.*

*The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the False Claims Act (FCA) deem pharmaceutical companies criminally and civilly liable for engaging in conduct including, but not limited to, misbranding and mislabeling products, promoting products for off-label or non-FDA approved uses, misrepresenting or adulterating data and clinical trial results, and failing to disclose or adequately warn consumers of potential risks and side effects. Violations of these laws and regulations are so widespread and regular, that it is difficult to argue that they are not purposeful. – Anastasia Morairty, [Journal of Health and Biomedical Law](#)*

**Keep in mind that this paper was published in 2010 and only deals with criminal actions of Pfizer from 2002-2010.**

We are now in 2021, and the problem has become so widespread that even scientists from within organizations like the Centres For Disease Control (CDC), for example, are blowing the whistle. For example, a few years ago more than a dozen senior scientists from within the agency [put out a letter stating the following](#):

*We are a group of scientists at CDC that are very concerned about the current state of ethics at our agency. It appears that our mission is being influenced and shaped by outside parties and rogue interests.*

*It seems that our mission and congressional intent for our agency is being circumvented by some of our leaders. What concerns us most, is that it is becoming the norm and not the rare exception.*

*Some senior management officials at CDC are clearly aware and even condone these behaviours. Others see it and turn the other way. Some staff are intimidated and pressed to do things they know are not right.*

*We have representatives from across the agency that witness this unacceptable behaviour. It occurs at all levels and in all our respective units.*

***These questionable and unethical practices threaten to undermine our credibility and reputation as a trusted leader in public health.***

***We would like to see high ethical standards and thoughtful, responsible management restored at CDC.***

If you'd like to read about how all this relates to the COVID-19 vaccine, you can do so in an article I recently published [here](#) which documents the concerns many doctors, scientists and people are having **when it comes to the vaccine**.

There are many examples, too many to write about. Monsanto, for instance, now a branch of Bayer Pharmaceuticals, [colluded with the Environmental Protection Agency](#) (EPA) to stifle cancer research and any connections to their products.

The European Union approved the use of glyphosate and their approval [was found to be based on plagiarized "science"](#) from Monsanto. Monsanto has been in and out of court, dealing with numerous cancer cases linked to their products, mainly glyphosate. Bayer has paid more than \$10 billion to end thousands of lawsuits filed over its Roundup weedkiller. ([source](#))

A study published in the British Medical Journal in 2016 by researchers at the Nordic Cochrane Center in Copenhagen showed that pharmaceutical companies were not disclosing all information regarding the results of their drug trials.

Researchers looked at documents from 70 different double-blind, placebo-controlled trials of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRI) and serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (SNRI) and found that the full extent of serious harm in clinical study reports went unreported. These are the reports sent to major health authorities like the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. You can read more about that story [here](#)

*Those of you who have been involved in the past in the battle to protect our children from poorly made vaccines or toxic chemicals in our food or in our water know the*

*power of these industries and how they've undermined every institution in our democracy that is supposed to protect little children from powerful, greedy corporations.*

*Even the pharmaceutical companies have been able to purchase congress. They're the largest lobbying entity in Washington D.C..*

***They have more lobbyists in Washington D.C. than there are congressman and senators combined.***

***They give twice to congress what the next largest lobbying entity is, which is oil and gas... Imagine the power they exercise over both republicans and democrats.***

***They've captured them (our regulatory agencies) and turned them into sock puppets. They've compromised the press... and they destroy the publications that publish real science. – [Robert F. Kennedy Jr.](#)***

Concealing evidence that calls into question various products put out by these companies is quite commonplace.

The Takeaway: The amount of power and control big companies, like Pfizer for example, seem to exercise over government, federal health regulatory agencies and big media is a huge concern. Why aren't there independent bodies working separately from government to insure that all products released by these entities are truly safe and effective?

**Why have we given so much power over to government, which in itself seems to have become a corporation tasked to maximize profit and control rather than actually execute the will of the people.**

Why do we have such a hard time discussing controversial topics? Why are things always made out to seem so black and white?

Why are we so polarized in our beliefs to the point where we can't look at another viewpoint that challenges our own? Why can't we understand why some people disagree with us and why they feel the way they do?

It's hard to know what the solution to tackle these problems is given the fact that these entities have amassed so much power that they are free to do what they want.

At the end of the day, awareness and sharing information is no doubt key, but something bigger needs to happen at this point to stop this kind of activity and behaviour.

Ultimately, we need to stop looking towards these companies and institutions with trust, we need to stop relying on them to tell us how to help us with our problems, in this case, health problems and we need to take these issues into our own hands and

receive help from those who actually have our best interests at heart Have we become to complacent and reliant?

**Why do so many people simply trust these companies and believe everything they say?**

Is it time to start seeing our world in a different light and look at the “negative” parts of it from a neutral perspective so we can begin to transform it?

Slut citat

Källa till ovan citerat

<https://www.collective-evolution.com/2021/01/06/pfizer-caught-engaging-in-illegal-marketing-practices-assessed-billions-in-criminal-convictions/>