

It All Makes Sense Once You Realize They Want to Kill Us

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, October 18, 2021

Theme: [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](#).

“It is now apparent that these products in the blood stream are toxic to humans. An immediate halt to the vaccination programme is required while an independent safety analysis is undertaken to investigate the full extent of the harms, which the UK Yellow Card data suggest includes thromboembolism, multi-system inflammatory disease, immune suppression, autoimmunity and anaphylaxis, as well as Antibody Dependent Enhancement (ADE).” [Tess Lawrie](#), Evidence-Based Medicine Consultancy

“For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.” Ephesians 6:12

Question- Have the mRNA vaccines been tested on animals?

Answer- Yes, they have.

Question- Were the animal trials successful?

Answer- Yes and no.

Yes, the experiments on mice showed that a low dose of the vaccine induces a robust antibody response to the infection.

But, no, the antibodies were not able to attack the spike protein from a different strain of the virus.

Question- I’m not sure what that means? Do you mean that the vaccine DOES provide some limited protection from the original (Wuhan) virus, but does not necessarily provide protection from the variants?

Answer- That’s right, but it’s a bit more complicated than that because- as the virus changes — the antibodies that helped to fight the original virus can actually enhance the

“infectivity” of the variant. In other words, vaccine-generated antibodies can switch-sides and increase the severity of the illness. Simply put, they can make you sicker or kill you. Scientists have known this for a long time. Check out this clip from a 2005 research paper:

“A jab against one strain might worsen infection with others....

In the.. study, Gary Nabel of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.. injected mice with spike protein from a SARS virus taken from a human patient infected in early 2003. They then collected the antibodies the animals produced.

In lab experiments, **they showed that these antibodies were unable to attack spike protein from a different strain of SARS**, isolated from a patient infected in late 2003....The team next tested whether the antibodies would attack spike proteins from two SARS strains isolated from civets, from which the virus is thought to have originally jumped into humans. **In this case, they found hints that the antibodies actually boosted the ability of the virus to infect cells....**

The results show that the virus changes over time, so that a strain that crops up in one outbreak might be quite different from that in a later outbreak. “This virus is not standing still and we need to take this into account,” Nabel says.

This raises the prospect that **a vaccine against one strain of SARS virus could prove ineffective against others. Worse, a jab against one strain might even aggravate an infection with SARS virus from civets or another species.** “It’s obviously a concern,” Nabel says..

This would not be the first case where exposure to one strain of a virus can worsen infection with another.” ([“Caution raised over SARS vaccine”](#), Nature)

Question- I’m still confused. Can you summarize what they’re saying?

Answer- Sure. They’re saying that **scientists have known for nearly two decades that vaccines narrowly aimed at just one protein are bound to fail.**They’re saying that the spike protein is highly-adaptable and capable of changing its shape to survive. They’re saying that **vaccines aimed at the spike protein will inevitably produce variants that evade vaccine-generated antibodies.**They’re saying that by narrowing the vaccine’s focus to the spike protein alone, the drug companies have ensured that previously helpful antibodies will do an about-face, allow the virus to enter healthy cells, replicate at will, and cause sickness or death. They are saying that **the current crop of vaccines is in fact perpetuating the pandemic.** And-since the science has been clear for the last 16 years- we can add one more observation to the list, that is, that the current approach to mass vaccination is neither haphazard, slapdash or random. It is intentional. **The vaccination campaign managers are deliberately ignoring the science in order to sustain a permanent state of crisis.** Science is being manipulated to achieve a political objective.

Question- I think you’re exaggerating, but I’d like to get back to the animal trials instead of arguing politics. As you probably know, the reports in the media do not square with your analysis, in fact, all of the articles in the MSM say the animal trials were a rousing success. Here’s a short blurb that I found today that confirms what I’ve been saying:

“...vaccination of nonhuman primates with the mRNA vaccine induced robust SARS-

CoV-2 neutralizing activity and notably, rapid protection in the upper and lower airways....” ([Covid-19, NIH.gov](#))

Question- Are you suggesting the authors are lying?

Answer- No, they are not lying. They’re just not telling you the whole truth, and you need to know the whole truth so you can make an informed decision. **The vaccines DO provide some (temporary) protection.** We don’t dispute that. They also trigger a strong immune response. We don’t dispute that either. **But what difference does it make?** Let me explain: Let’s say, you have a really bad head cold so you take a new medication that you think will relieve the pain. And-sure enough- an hour after taking the pills- Presto — your congestion and headache are completely gone. That’s fantastic, right? Wrong, because what you fail to realize is that the medication is laced with slow-acting strychnine that kills you three days later. Do you still think it was a good idea to take the medication?

Of course, not. And the same rule applies to **these vaccines which do, in fact, boost your antibodies and provide some fleeting “immunity”.** **But they can also kill you.** Don’t you think that should be factored in to your decision? Keep in mind, people have died 3, 4, 5 weeks after inoculation without any prior warning. Many of them might have even been bursting with antibodies, but they’re still dead. Can you see the problem?

Question- Okay, but there’s still this matter about the animal trials. The media says that the drug companies performed the animal trials and they were successful. Do you disagree with that?

Answer- They were not successful and the “fact checkers” that were hired to discredit vaccine critics like me, have deliberately mischaracterized what happened in the trials. For example, here’s a typical “fact checker” article titled [“COVID-19 vaccines did not skip animal trials because of animal deaths”](#) by Reuters. Here’s an excerpt:

“Posts claiming that COVID-19 vaccine producers skipped animal trials due to the animals in those trials dying are false. Pfizer-BioNTech, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson, which have been granted emergency authorization use by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in the United States, all conducted animal trials and had no significant safety concerns to report.”

Sounds reassuring, right? But then they say:

“Due to time constraints and the urgency to find a vaccine for COVID-19, Moderna and Pfizer did receive approval to run animal testing and early trials on humans at the same time, as opposed to fully completing animal trials before moving on to human trials. This, however, does not mean animal trials were skipped or that the safety of the vaccines were compromised.”

Let me see if I got this straight: The drug companies were in such a hurry that they conducted their minimalist animal trials at the same time as their human trials (which is unprecedented) and then rushed the results to the FDA so they could be rubber stamped and waved through under the Emergency Use Authority?

Is that how it went down?

Yes, it is.

But if they were rushed through in a couple months, then **the “fact checkers” are tacitly admitting that there is no long-term safety data.** And there IS no long-term safety data, **nor is there any attempt to disprove the research from the earlier trials where the ferrets, mice and other animals died following injection of mRNA vaccines.** They don't deny it, they just ignore it as if sweeping it under the rug will make it all go away. Here's a clip from the research paper that Reuters refers to in its article:

“We demonstrate that **the candidate vaccines... respectively—induce strong antigen-specific immune responses in mice and macaques....**Both (vaccines) protected 2–4-year-old macaques from challenge with infectious SARS-CoV-2, and there was reduced detection of viral RNA in immunized macaques as compared to those that received saline.” (Note–We've already acknowledged that the vaccines do produce a strong immune response. Here's more:)

“Neutralizing GMTs declined by day 56 (35 days after dose 2), consistent with the contraction phase; however, they remained well above the GMT of the human sera panel. The duration of **the study was not long enough** to assess the rate of decline during the plateau phase of the antibody response.” ([“BNT162b vaccines protect rhesus macaques from SARS-CoV-2”](#), Nature)

Can you see what's going on? The trial was only 56 days-long, in fact, **none of the animal trials exceeded 56 days.** Think about that for a minute. The reason the animals died in prior trials is because they were exposed to a mutated version of the (wild) virus that eventually killed them. That's how **ADE (antibody-dependent enhancement) works. It doesn't happen overnight and it doesn't happen in 56 days. It takes much longer than that for a mutated version of the virus to emerge and reinfect the host.** The drug companies know that. They're not stupid. So the fact that the animals mounted a strong immune response is completely irrelevant. We KNOW they mounted a strong immune response. We also know they died some months later when a different strain of the virus emerged. Bottom line: **The production of antibodies does not mean a drug is safe.**

The obvious purpose of the trials was to get the vaccines over the finish-line before anyone figured out what was going on. It's the same reason why the drug companies “unblinded” their human trials after the vaccines got the green light from the FDA. Shortly after the trials were concluded, the people in the placebo arm were allowed to get vaccinated.

Why would they do that? Why would they vaccinate the people who willingly allowed themselves to be guinea pigs for the sake of public health, only to vaccinate them shortly after, thus, eliminating any chance of finding out what the long-term safety issues might be? It makes no sense, does it?

Take a look at this short clip from the British Medical Journal whose scientists are equally bewildered:

“The (drug) companies say they have an ethical obligation to unblind volunteers so they can receive the vaccine. But some experts are concerned about a “disastrous” loss of critical information if volunteers on a trial's placebo arm are unblinded...

Although the FDA has granted the vaccines emergency use authorization, to get full license approval two years of follow-up data are needed. **The data are now likely to**

be scanty and less reliable given that the trials are effectively being unblinded.

Consumer representative Sheldon Toubman, a lawyer and FDA advisory panel member, said that Pfizer and BioNTech had not proved that their vaccine prevents severe covid-19. "The FDA says all we can do is suggest protection from severe covid disease; we need to know that it does that," he said.

He countered claims, based on experience with other vaccines, six weeks of follow-up was long enough to detect safety signals. Six weeks may not be long enough for this entirely new type of "untested" [mRNA] vaccine, Toubman said.

Goodman wants all companies to be held to the same standard and says they should not be allowed to make up their own rules about unblinding. He told The BMJ that, while he was "very optimistic" about the vaccines, **"blowing up the trials" by allowing unblinding "will set a de facto standard for all vaccine trials to come."** And that, he said, "is dangerous."

(["Covid-19: Should vaccine trials be unblinded?"](#) The British Medical Journal)

Do you like his choice of words: "blowing up the trials"? Do you think it is a fair description of what the drug companies did?

Yes, it is.

And what possible motive would the drug companies have to blow up the trials? I can see only two possibilities:

1. They think their vaccine is so terrific, it will save the lives of many of the people in the placebo group.
2. They expect a high percentage of the people in the vaccine group to get either severely sick or die, so they want to hide the evidence of vaccine-linked injury.

Which is it?

You know the answer. Everyone watching this farce knows the answer.

Question- Okay, so let's cut to the chase: Are the vaccines are safe or not?

No, they are not safe. The way we decide whether a drug is safe or not is by putting it through a rigorous process of testing and clinical trials. After the testing, the data is passed on to physicians, statisticians, chemists, pharmacologists, and other scientists who review the data and make their recommendations or criticisms. That didn't happen with the Covid vaccines, in fact, **all the normal standards and protocols were suspended in the name of "urgency"**. But many believe that the "urgency" was manufactured to push through vaccines that would never have been approved on their own merits. All you have to do is **look through the vaccine injury data (VAERS) and you'll see this is the most lethal medical intervention of all time** and, yet, the public health experts, the media and the government keep crowing that they're "safe and effective". It's nonsense and the drug companies know it's nonsense which is why they reject all liability for the people that are going to be killed by these "poison-death shots."

Do you know what goes on inside your body after you are injected with one of these “gene based” vaccines?

Once the vaccine enters the bloodstream it penetrates the cells that line the blood vessels forcing them to produce spike proteins that protrude into the bloodstream like millions of microscopic thorns. These thorns activate blood platelets which trigger blood clotting followed shortly after by an immune response that destroys the infected cells thus weakening the vascular system while draining the supply of killer lymphocytes. In this way, the vaccine launches a dual attack on the body’s critical infrastructure causing widespread tissue damage throughout the circulatory system while leaving the immune system less able to fend off future infection.

Now if you think you can have a long-and-happy without a functioning circulatory system, then none of this matters. But if you’re bright enough to realize that wreaking havoc on your vascular system is the fast-track to the graveyard, then you’ll probably understand that injecting these “poison-death shots” is a particularly bad idea.

By the way, it’s a real stretch to call these hybrid injections, “vaccines”. They have about as much in common with a traditional vaccine as a python does with a coffee table. Nothing. **The “vaccine” moniker was chosen in order to shore-up public confidence, that’s all. It’s part of a marketing strategy.** There is no real similarity. The majority of people trust vaccines and see them as a shining example of medical achievement. The drug companies wanted to tap into that trust and use it for their own purposes. That’s why they called it a “vaccine” instead of “gene therapy” which more accurately describes ‘what it does.’ But-like we said- it’s just a marketing strategy.

Have you ever wondered how the drug companies were able to roll out their own-individual vaccines just weeks apart from each other? That’s a pretty good trick, don’t you think; especially since vaccine development typically takes from 10 to 15 years. How do you think they managed that? Here’s an excerpt from an article which provides a little background on the topic:

“The virus behind the outbreak that began in Wuhan, China, was identified on Jan. 7. **Less than a week later — on Jan. 13 — researchers at Moderna and the NIH had a proposed sequence for an mRNA vaccine against it,** and, as the company wrote in government documents, “we mobilized toward clinical manufacture.” **By Feb. 24, the team was shipping vials from a plant in Norwood, Mass.,** to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, in Bethesda, Md., for a planned clinical trial to test its safety.” ([“Researchers rush to test coronavirus vaccine in people without knowing how well it works in animals”, Stat](#))

Got that? “The virus broke out in Wuhan...on Jan. 7, and less than a week later Moderna had a proposed sequence for an mRNA vaccine against it???

Really? Is that the same Moderna that had been playing-around with mRNA for over a decade but was never able to successfully bring a vaccine to market?

Yep, the very same company. Here’s more:

“And by Feb. 24, the team was shipping vials from a plant in Norwood, Mass???”

Wow! Another Covid miracle! You almost get whiplash watching these companies crank out

their “wonder drugs” at record-breaking speed.

Keep in mind, there’s a very high probability that the virus was man-made, (In other words, it’s a bioweapon.) and the people who have been implicated in the funding and creation of that bioweapon are also closely aligned with the big drug companies that have produced the antidote in record time that has already netted tens of billions of dollars in profits for a drug for which there was no reliable animal testing, no long-term safety data, and no formal regulatory approval.

So I’ll ask you again: Doesn’t that all sound a bit suspicious?

Is it really that hard to see the outline of a political agenda here? After all, aren’t the drug companies working with the regulatory agencies that are working with the public health officials that are working with the media that are working with the corrupted politicians that are working with the Intel agencies that are working with the meddling globalist billionaires that are working with the giant private equity firms that oversee the entire operation pulling the appropriate strings whenever needed?

It sure looks like it.

And, don’t the tectonic social changes we’ve seen in the last year have more to do with a broader scorched-earth campaign launched by the “parasite class” against the rest of humanity than they do with a fairly-mild virus that kills mainly old and frail people with multiple underlying health conditions?

Right, again. In fact, many have noticed the cracks in the pandemic artifice from the very beginning, just as many have pointed out that the virus-meme is just the mask behind which parasites continue to conduct their global restructuring project. In short, it’s all about politics; bare-knuckle, take-no-prisoners NWO politics.

Answer- You’ve asked a number of questions about the animal trials, but none about the biodistribution and the pharmacokinetics studies that were done at the same time. Why is that? (**Note--**Pharmacokinetics; “the branch of pharmacology concerned with the movement of drugs within the body.”)

Question- I didn’t know there were any. Did the media report on them?

Answer- No, they didn’t. They completely ignored them, even though they were produced by Pfizer and provide essential information about where the substance in the vaccine goes in the body, in what amounts, and for how long. By knowing how the drug is distributed, it is possible to make educated assumptions about its effect on the organs and other tissue. In other words, these studies are invaluable. The Doctors for Covid Ethics have done extensive research on the studies and written a report titled “The Pfizer mRNA vaccine: pharmacokinetics and toxicity”. Here’s a few excerpts that help to illustrate the dangers of the vaccines:

“As with any drug, a key consideration for the toxicity of the COVID mRNA vaccines is where exactly in the body they end up, and for how long they will stay there. Such questions, which are the subject of pharmacokinetics, are usually thoroughly investigated during drug development. Initial studies on pharmacokinetics and also on toxicity are carried out in animals... this document has rather far-reaching implications: **it shows that Pfizer—as well as the authorities that were apprised of these**

data— must have recognized the grave risks of adverse events after vaccination even before the onset of clinical trials. Nevertheless, **Pfizer’s own clinical trials failed to monitor any of the clinical risks that were clearly evident from these data, and the regulatory authorities failed to enforce proper standards of oversight.** This dual failure has caused the most grievous harm to the public....

What do Pfizer’s animal data presage for biological effects in humans?

- Rapid appearance of spike protein in the circulation.
- **Toxicity to organs with expected high rates of uptake, in particular placenta and lactating breast glands**
- Penetration of some organs might be higher with the real vaccine than with this luciferase model...The rapid entry of the model vaccine into the circulation means that we must expect the spike protein to be expressed within the circulation, particularly by endothelial cells. (Endothelial- The thin layer of cells lining the blood vessels) We have seen before that this will lead to activation of blood clotting through direct activation of platelets and also, probably more importantly, through immune attack on the endothelial cells....

Summary

Pfizer’s animal data clearly presaged the following risks and dangers:

- blood clotting shortly after vaccination, potentially leading to heart attacks, stroke, and venous thrombosis
- grave harm to female fertility
- grave harm to breastfed infants
- cumulative toxicity after multiple injections

With the exception of female fertility, which can simply not be evaluated within the short period of time for which the vaccines have been in use, **all of the above risks have been substantiated since the vaccines have been rolled out—all are manifest in the reports to the various adverse event registries. Those registries also contain a very considerable number of reports on abortions and stillbirths shortly after vaccination, which should have prompted urgent investigation.**

....

Of particularly grave concern is the very slow elimination of the toxic cationic lipids. In persons repeatedly injected with mRNA vaccines containing these lipids... this would result in cumulative toxicity. **There is a real possibility that cationic lipids will accumulate in the ovaries. The implied grave risk to female fertility demands the most urgent attention of the public and of the health authorities.**

Since the so-called clinical trials were carried out with such negligence, the real trials are occurring only now—on a massive scale, and with devastating results. ... **Calling off this failed experiment is long overdue.** Continuing or even mandating the use of this poisonous vaccine, and the apparently imminent issuance of full approval for it are crimes against humanity.” ([“The Pfizer mRNA vaccine: pharmacokinetics and toxicity”](#), The Doctors for Covid Ethics)

Don't you think people are entitled to know what the government wants to inject into their bodies? Don't you think they have a right to know how it will effect their immune systems, their vital organs and their overall health? Don't you think they have the right to decide for themselves which drugs they will take and which they will refuse to take?

Forcing someone to take a drug he does not want, is not just wrong. It's unAmerican. Which is why people should reject vaccine mandates as a matter of principle. They are an attack on personal liberty, the foundation of our constitutional system. It's a principle worth dying for.

As for the mass vaccination campaign, it is the most maniacally-genocidal project ever concocted by man. There's simply no way to calculate the amount of suffering and death we are about to face for trusting people whose policies were obviously shaped by their undiluted hatred of humanity. As German microbiologist Dr. Sucharit Bhakdi said:

"In the end, we're going to see mass illness and deaths among people who normally would have had wonderful lives ahead of them."

It is a great tragedy.

*

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.

This article was originally published on [The Unz Review](#).

Michael Whitney, renowned geopolitical and social analyst based in Washington State. He initiated his career as an independent citizen-journalist in 2002 with a commitment to honest journalism, social justice and World peace.

He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization.

Featured image is from The Unz Review

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Mike Whitney](#), Global Research, 2021

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mike Whitney](#)

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