

You Refuse to Get Vaccinated, But Are You Ready to be an Outcast?

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, March 28, 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#), [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).

“If behavioral psychologists helped to shape the government’s strategy on mass vaccination, then in what other policies were they involved? Were these the “professionals” who conjured up the pandemic restrictions? Were the masks, the social distancing and the lockdowns all promoted by “experts” as a way to undermine normal human relations and inflict the maximum psychological pain on the American people? Was the intention to create a weak and submissive population that would willingly accept the dismantling of democratic institutions and the imposition of a new political order? These questions need to be answered.” (From the text)

Let’s assume for a minute, that the vaccination campaign is led by people who genuinely want to end the current crisis and restore the country to “normal”. Let’s also assume, that they believe that mass vaccination is the best way to achieve that objective by preventing the spread of the virus and, thus, reducing the death toll. Is that sufficient justification for silencing vaccine critics and conducting a nation-wide brainwashing operation aimed at controlling public opinion?

No, it’s not. People need to hear both sides of the story, in fact, that’s the only way they can make an informed decision about how they wish to proceed. The media has no right to commandeer the airwaves and control whatever people hear and see. And they have no right to deliberately exclude the medical professionals and other experts whose views conflict with the official narrative. The only way that people can offer their informed consent for vaccination, is if they’re able to weigh the risks and benefits for themselves. But that’s only possible if they have access to many diverse sources of information which, at present, they don’t. Increasingly, the only message that most people hear is the one that is provided by the government in collaboration with industry honchos and other elites. Traditionally, this type of state media is called “propaganda” which is a term that certainly applies here.

It doesn’t take a genius to figure out how this has affected the debate on vaccines, namely, there isn’t one. The skeptics have been dismissed as antivaxx loonies while an entirely new regime of experimental vaccines is being praised as a “miracle drug”. At the same time, the government –which has aligned itself with the industry it’s supposed to regulate– is doing everything in its power to pressure people into getting vaccinated. What we’re seeing is the most extravagant Madison Avenue “product launch” in America’s 245-year history, and it’s

coming at us full-throttle from all sides. It's virtually impossible to turn on the TV or radio without being deluged by one emotive vignette after the other all of which are aimed at promoting vaccination. How does this respect the right of the individual to make his own informed decision free from government coercion?

It doesn't. This is flagrant indoctrination and yet no one talks about it. It's shocking. Have you noticed how the critics of the mRNA vaccines have been prevented from expressing their views in the media? Have you noticed how the doctors, scientists, virologists, epidemiologists and public health experts have all been blocked from appearing on the cable news channels or excluded from the nation's leading newspapers? Have you noticed how these critics been attacked on social media, censored on FaceBook and removed from Twitter? Have you noticed the lengths to which the media has gone to eliminate any challenge to the "official narrative" and to denounce, ridicule or blacklist anyone who dares to offer a conflicting opinion?

Why? Why is the media preventing these experts from articulating their reservations to the American people directly?

It's obvious, isn't it? It's because the people that are managing this campaign don't want anything that veers from the "official narrative". They don't want people thinking for themselves, they don't want people searching alternate websites that challenge the new prevailing doctrine on vaccines, they don't want people who read the details about the trials or the medical journals or the research papers. They don't want you to question their motives, or weigh the risks and benefits of getting vaccinated. They don't want you to notice that their vaccine never completed long-term trials or met the normal standards for product safety. They don't want you to consider the fact that mRNA is a relatively new technology with a checkered past that includes some very disturbing animal trials in which all the animals died. They don't want you to think about any of this. They want you to shut up, stand in line, turn off your brain, and roll up your sleeve. And, anyone who disagrees with that sentiment, is being censored.

Am I being unfair?

That's not my intention. And -believe it or not- my intention is not to criticize the vaccines themselves, but the manner by which they are being shoved down our throats. That, I object to strongly because it violates the people's right to informed consent. A lopsided, nationwide public relations blitz that relentlessly glorifies vaccines while deliberately excluding even the slightest criticism from respected professionals, does not respect the rights of the people. It's brainwashing, pure and simple.

And why have behavioral psychologists been employed by the government to promote the vaccination campaign? Why have they concocted a strategy designed "to change people's beliefs and feelings about vaccination" to inform "people about the prosocial benefits of vaccination", and to "intervene on behavior directly", which means that you're given an appointment, and told that you will be getting your vaccination at the end of the session." Psychologists call this a "presumptive recommendation" which effectively eliminates the element of personal choice by creating a scenario in which getting vaccinated is a fait accompli. How is this not coercion?

It is coercion, subconscious coercion. The doctor is strong-arming the patient into getting

vaccinated by making it look like its standard procedure. That puts pressure on the patient to follow the path of least resistance, which is compliance. It's a clever tactic, but it is also transparently manipulative.

The behavioral psychologists who have helped to shape the government's policy, believe that the emphasis should be placed on the "safety and effectiveness" of the vaccines. That's the cornerstone for building public support. At the same time, they show no interest in providing evidence that would support their claims, which suggests that "safe and effective" is nothing more than a meaningless bromide that is invoked to dupe the sheeple into getting inoculated.

You might have also heard the term "vaccine hesitancy" used to describe the people who have decided not to get vaccinated. The moniker is clearly intended to denigrate vaccine skeptics by suggesting that they have a mental condition, like paranoid schizophrenia. This is an effective way to discredit one's enemies, but it also shows the glaring weakness of the pro-vaccine position. If the proponents of vaccination had something of substance to offer, they would rely on facts and data rather than ad hominin attacks. As it happens, the facts do not support their position. Besides, "vaccine hesitancy" is not a character flaw or a mental condition, it's the sign of someone who has taken responsibility for his own health and welfare. Ask yourself this: Why would a normal, rational person be eager to have an experimental cocktail injected into his bloodstream potentially triggering all manner of long-term ailments or death? Is that the choice a normal person would make?

As far as I can see, behavioral psychologists are playing a critical role in this mass vaccination campaign. According to a report put out by the National Institutes of Health, it appears that **a rapid response team has been formed to attack the opinions of people who challenge the "official narrative"**. Check out this blurb from the report titled "COVID-19 Vaccination: Communication: Applying Behavioral and Social Science to Address Vaccine Hesitancy and Foster Vaccine Confidence":

Mitigate the impact of COVID-19-related misinformation...

The spread of health-related misinformation was a significant public health concern well before the COVID-19 pandemic. During the last decade, **vaccine-related discourse online and in the media has been plagued by misinformation. Anti-vaccine groups have leveraged political and social divisions to diminish trust in vaccines, pushed false narratives questioning the safety and effectiveness of vaccines, spread false claims about adverse outcomes, and downplayed the risks of the disease's vaccines protect against....**

COVID-19 vaccine **communication efforts cannot ignore misinformation and must take actions, informed by behavioral and communication research, to identify emerging rumors and respond in a way that is informed by behavioral science. Real-time, agile, and scalable monitoring of discourse concerning COVID 19 vaccination—including conspiracy theories, rumors, and myths—can support a swiftly developed and implemented response. "Misinformation surveillance"** efforts should identify the most prominent sources of misinformation, the tactics being used, and the groups most at risk of being exposed to and influenced by the rumors. This information, in addition to data regarding the dynamics and patterns of misinformation spread, could help inform the appropriate response and best targets for intervention efforts....

Correcting the false claim contained in the message, exposing the tactics used by **disinformation agents**, and inducing skepticism by highlighting **the ulterior motives of these actors** are all potentially effective strategies for mitigating the impact of misinformation..." (["COVID-19 Vaccination* Communication: Applying Behavioral and Social Science to Address Vaccine Hesitancy and Foster Vaccine Confidence"](#), the National Institutes of Health)

Repeat: "Misinformation surveillance"... "disinformation agents"... "the ulterior motives of these actors"??

Really? Now who's sounding paranoid?

This is very scary stuff. **Agents of the state now identify critics of the Covid vaccine as their mortal enemies. How did we get here?** And how did we get to the point where the government is targeting people who don't agree with them? This is way beyond Orwell. We have entered some creepy alternate universe.

Here's more on the topic from a statement by Arthur C. Evans Jr., PhD, CEO of the American Psychological Association, in response to the approval by an advisory panel of the Food and Drug Administration of a vaccine against COVID-19:

"We recognize that there are pockets of **resistance to vaccines**, distrust of the medical establishment and **misinformation about vaccines** generally....Some populations are understandably less likely to accept vaccinations due to a legacy of mistrust rooted in unethical public health practices.

"It is critical that leaders across the political spectrum unite behind messages of vaccine safety and transparency." ..

Enlist credible spokespeople who can connect with diverse communities, especially those where mistrust and skepticism run high. **When leaders talk about vaccines as standard practices, as opposed to options, people are more likely to accept them.** Research suggests building trust and providing clear information about vaccines can improve vaccination uptake rates. It is critical that leaders across the political spectrum unite behind vaccine safety and transparency, clearly explaining what is in the vaccine and what it does and doesn't do in the body.

Consider the wide variety of factors that motivate human behavior. **Behavioral science indicates that people are more likely to adhere to vaccine recommendations when they believe they are susceptible to the illness**, when they want to protect others, when they believe the vaccine is safe or at least safer than the illness, and when their concerns and questions are managed respectfully by doctors and experts." (["APA Welcomes Step Toward First U.S. Vaccine Approval"](#), American Psychological Association)

Is it really ethical for the APA to be involved in a mass vaccination campaign? Is this the role an organization like this should play in a democratic society? Should the APA use its unique understanding of human behavior to persuade people on behalf of the government and big pharma? And, more importantly, **if behavioral psychologists helped to shape the government's strategy on mass vaccination, then in what other policies were they involved? Were these the "professionals" who conjured up the pandemic restrictions? Were the masks, the social distancing and the lockdowns all**

promoted by “experts” as a way to undermine normal human relations and inflict the maximum psychological pain on the American people? Was the intention to create a weak and submissive population that would willingly accept the dismantling of democratic institutions, the dramatic restructuring of the economy, and the imposition of a new political order?”

These questions need to be answered.

Surprisingly, the resistance to vaccination is nearly as strong today as it was a year ago. According to PEW Research:

(only) **“69% of the public intends to get a vaccine** – or already has....

Those who do not currently plan to get a vaccine (30% of the public) list a range of reasons why. Majorities cite concerns about side effects (72%), a sense that vaccines were developed and tested too quickly (67%) and a desire to know more about how well they work (61%) as major reasons why they do not intend to get vaccinated.

Smaller shares of those not planning to get a vaccine say past mistakes by the medical care system (46%) or a sense they don’t need it (42%) are major reasons why they don’t plan to get a vaccine; 36% of this group (11% of all U.S. adults) say a major reason they would pass on receiving a coronavirus vaccine is that they don’t get vaccines generally.

The new national survey by Pew Research Center, conducted Feb. 16 to 21 among 10,121 U.S. adults. ([“Growing Share of Americans Say They Plan To Get a COVID-19 Vaccine – or Already Have”](#), PEW Research)

So, despite the nonstop propaganda blitz, a significant portion of the population remains unconvinced, unimpressed and steadfast. Go figure? Of course, this is just Round 1. Soon, persuasion will turn into coercion, and from coercion to outright force. It’s already clear that air-travel will require vaccine passports, and that public transit, concerts, libraries, restaurants and, perhaps, even grocery stores could follow soon after. Vaccination looks to be the defining issue of the next few years at least. And those who resist the edicts of the state will increasingly find themselves on the outside; outcasts in their own country.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

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

Mike Whitney is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

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