

# Former Pfizer Exec Believes Leaky Vaccine Was Intentional

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

July 02, 2022

## STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › Michael Yeadon, Ph.D., a former vice-president and chief scientific adviser for the drug company Pfizer, shares why he believes that the narratives around COVID-19 are false and were put into place deliberately to exert control over society
- › Yeadon says you've been lied to about the magnitude of the threat represented by this entity called SARS-CoV-2 and the disease COVID-19
- › The 2009 H1N1 (swine flu) pandemic was a “dress rehearsal” for the COVID-19 pandemic
- › The use of the spike protein in the shot was a diabolical mistake, as 90% of the immune response mounted after natural COVID-19 exposure is not to the spike protein
- › Spike protein is also toxic and mutates rapidly, which essentially destroys virtually any protection that the shot provides shortly after it's given
- › The fact that virtually every country worldwide followed suit in imposing ineffective lockdowns and other COVID-19 mandates suggests a coordinated, supranational effort was underway

**Michael Yeadon, Ph.D., a former vice-president and chief scientific adviser for the drug company Pfizer and founder and CEO of the biotech company Ziarco, now owned by Novartis, has become one of the most prominent critics of COVID mandates and COVID-19 shots. In this riveting interview with British radio presenter Maajid Nawaz, he shares why he believes that the narratives around COVID-19 are false and were put into place deliberately to exert control over society.**

Yeadon is uniquely positioned to speak on this topic, as he has degrees in biochemistry and toxicology, and studied respiratory pharmacology. You have likely seen Yeadon being interviewed many times previously, but I strongly encourage you to watch this one as he explains items I have never heard him previously discuss. He is one of the sharpest guys out there in this area and you will be glad you took the time to listen.

In the film, he says: "So, I understand ... inside of cells and how cells and tissues talk to each other, and how dangerous chemicals can affect and injure humans and others."<sup>1</sup> Not only does Yeadon explain why COVID-19 shots aren't effective, but he details why using spike protein in the vaccine was one of the most diabolical mistakes made.

"First," Yeadon says, "you've been lied to about the magnitude of the threat represented by this entity called SARS-CoV-2 and the disease COVID-19. Been lied to about that, in every way, shape and form ... the bottom line is, we've been lied to and it's deliberate, and they knew it, and no action was needed whatsoever, other than if you're sick, stay home."<sup>2</sup> Further, the wheel may have been set into motion in 2009, during the swine flu pandemic.

## **The 2009 Swine Flu Was the Final Dress Rehearsal for COVID**

During the 2009 H1N1 (swine flu) pandemic, secret agreements were made between Germany, Great Britain, Italy and France with the pharmaceutical industry before the H1N1 pandemic began, which stated that they would purchase H1N1 flu vaccinations — but only if a pandemic level 6 was declared by the World Health Organization.

Six weeks before the pandemic was declared, no one at WHO was worried about the virus, but the media were nonetheless exaggerating the dangers.<sup>3</sup> Then, in the month leading up to the 2009 H1N1 pandemic, WHO changed the official definition of pandemic, removing the severity and high mortality criteria and leaving the definition of a pandemic as "a worldwide epidemic of a disease."<sup>4</sup>

This switch in definition allowed WHO to declare swine flu a pandemic after only 144 people had died from the infection worldwide. In 2010, Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg, then head

of health at the Council of Europe, accused pharmaceutical companies of influencing WHO's pandemic declaration, calling swine flu a "false pandemic" that was driven by Big Pharma, which cashed in on the health scare.<sup>5</sup>

According to Wodarg, the swine flu pandemic was "one of the greatest medicine scandals of the century,"<sup>6</sup> – and it shares many similarities with the COVID-19 pandemic. Yeadon explained:<sup>7</sup>

*"He [Wodarg] was public health officer and a politician during the swine flu pandemic in 2009. And some very similar things that happened in COVID were happening in 2009. There's a very interesting experience here and I think 2009 was the final dress rehearsal for COVID.*

*They misused PCR, they overdiagnosed cases, they twisted the arms of governments all around the world to pay for billions of dollars' worth of vaccines, and not very good antivirals.*

*And then they all ran off. And Wodarg was the one that managed to point out in the second season that it was a false positive pseudo epidemic. It was all bad PCR testing. And as soon as they fix the PCR, it all went away. All went away."*

## **PCR Tests Labeled Healthy People Sick**

For the first time in history, during the COVID-19 pandemic the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) tests were used to dictate whether someone was healthy or sick. If the test was positive, then you'd be labeled as sick and counted as a case, even if you had no symptoms.

The PCR tests used for COVID-19 use a powerful amplification process that makes them so sensitive they can even detect the remains of a dead virus, long after infection.<sup>8</sup>

Wodarg said COVID-19 "was a 'test' pandemic. It was not a virus pandemic,"<sup>9</sup> because PCR tests may give a positive result when it detects coronaviruses that have been

around for 20 years.<sup>10</sup> PCR tests weren't meant to be used for clinical diagnoses, according to their inventor, the late Kary Mullis, Ph.D. Yeadon explained:<sup>11</sup>

*“And the reason is ... that the PCR test has a theoretical lower limit, that is, what's the smallest amount it might detect and give a positive result, the smallest amount is one, one virus, one piece of a virus.*

*... And then basically, every time you run a cycle of this polymerase chain reaction, like cranking a handle, it gets hot and cold, hot and cold, and it goes through basically a doubling, every cycle is a doubling ...*

*So basically, if there's an infinitesimally tiny amount of a piece of a virus, or the sequence you allege is a virus, in the sample, and then you run it 40 cycles, you could get a positive result even though there's only one piece of one virus – not enough to make you ill, not enough to make you infectious.”*

The same strategy was used in COVID as deaths characterized as being COVID related, but only because they had been falsely lumped into that category due to a positive test being recorded within 28 days of death. “If you die from something entirely unrelated but you've tested positive by a PCR test, and you die within that 28 days that's counted as a COVID death,” Nawaz noted.<sup>12</sup>

## **90% of COVID Immune Response Is Not to Spike Protein**

Yeadon stresses that there are “design errors” in COVID-19 shots. “The main problem with them is there's no dose where you can get obvious signs of benefit without attendant harms, that are much greater at a population level than any possible benefit.” Further, the use of the spike protein was a mistake, as it's been known for more than 10 years that it causes adverse effects in humans:<sup>13</sup>

*“There are no gene based vaccines on the market for very good reasons. And that's one of the problems. But let's see, you could like pull it pull it apart, you can pull the spike off, you could pull the ball in the middle of this virus, which bit*

*would you give to people? ... what you would do is ask, what's the toxicity of the bit I'm going to give to a person?*

*So if I told you that the spike protein, like a floating landmine in ... the sea with the spikes sticking out, I told you that we've known for more than a decade that the spike bits from related viruses had unwanted biology that could cause blood to coagulate and activate platelets and make blood clots. That's true.*

*And if you knew those things, you'd think well, probably a bad idea then to give them the spike to train on ... So the fact that they chose spike protein, gene for spike protein, make your body become a manufacturing center briefly to make that virus spike protein – that's the first mistake.”*

Further, according to Yeadon, the human body mounts its best immune responses after natural COVID-19 infection, not exposure to the spike protein in the shots. He states, “90% of the immune response to COVID are two bits of the virus that are not spike protein. So I think I am right that that was not the best bit to give, because it's not the thing your body likes to respond to.”<sup>14</sup>

## **Spike Protein Mutates Rapidly, Destroying Shots' Protection**

By choosing the spike protein on which to base COVID-19 shots, scientists picked a protein that was known to be toxic to humans and that was not the part of the virus that prompted the best immune response. On top of that, spike protein mutates rapidly, which essentially destroys virtually any protection that the shot provides shortly after it's given. The end result is a seemingly never-ending series of annual shots and boosters.

COVID-19 shots have been found to have dismally low effectiveness rates of 12% in children, according to research conducted by the New York State Department of Health.<sup>15</sup> Among adults, within four to five months post-booster, protection against emergency department and urgent care visits due to COVID-19 decreased to 66%, then fell to just 31% after five months or more post-booster.<sup>16</sup> Yeadon explained:<sup>17</sup>

*“What you should do is pick the bits of the virus that's genetically most stable. Now, I don't know that we knew it at the beginning, but it's certainly true now that the thing that undergoes variation most quickly is the spike protein ... now you've picked something that's going to rapidly go out of focus to rapidly evolve to a different variant, new vaccine won't work anymore.”*

Further, because the spike protein is similar to “lots of bits in humans,” it can prompt your body to make an immune response to human proteins — “that’s called an autoimmune response,” Yeadon says. Yet, scientists chose the spike protein anyway — even though it violated all of the “rules” when it comes to creating a safe and effective product. Yeadon believes this wasn’t a mistake at all; it was intentional:<sup>18</sup>

*“So just to say, again, you deselect things that are toxic in their own right, you pick things that are genetically stable, and you pick things that are most different from humans, all three of those, in the words of patents, they teach away, they will teach you away from picking spike protein.*

*But guess what? Moderna picks spike protein and so does Pfizer, and AstraZeneca, and Johnson & Johnson. So I put it to you, colleagues, any scientists out there or just logical people. How the hell would they pick?*

*No team I was ever part of would ever have picked bloody spike protein for this vaccine. And you know, what, if we did, and we have competing groups, we would not, all four of us, make the same mistake. Not possible. It's collusion and malfeasance. They did it on purpose, knowing it would hurt you.”*

## **For the Next Pandemic Understand Vaccines Are Not the Answer'**

Bill Gates has made it plain the next pandemic is inevitable, by stating publicly that COVID-19 was “pandemic one” and “pandemic two” is coming. “We’ll have to prepare for the next one. That will get attention this time,” he said — while smiling.<sup>19</sup> The implication is that “next time” another experimental mRNA shot will be available much quicker with

which to inject the population. But Yeadon wants the public to learn from COVID-19 and understand that the shots aren't the answer:<sup>20</sup>

*"It's really important that you listen to me here, that if there's another respiratory virus, you must know this time that whatever however they design, the damn vaccine is the wrong answer. It's the wrong answer for loads of reasons. One is, you will generate an immune response in your blood that cannot possibly affect infection, it doesn't matter what it is, it won't affect infection.*

*Secondly, if you if you design it using spike protein from some other virus, then if it has that same property of causing toxicity, it will cause toxicity because when you inject these gene based vaccines, it's like launching a go kart that has an accelerator, no steering wheel and no brakes ... there's nothing in the design of these vaccines that limits where they go.*

*Some of it will go into your brain, the back of your eyes, your ovaries or testes, your blood vessels or your heart ... you can't develop rapid vaccines, and then give them to billions of people, because you will never have enough safety data to allow you to know whether that was a good bet or not. And without that data, it's reckless. Don't do it."*

What else can be learned from the COVID-19 fiasco, Yeadon says, is that the nonpharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) — things like masks, lockdowns, border closures and mass testing of the population — were also useless in curbing the spread of the disease, and world leaders knew this in 2019, when a paper by WHO scientists showed that most NPIs were ineffective in stopping the spread of respiratory viruses.

"Of course, many of them have really serious side effects on the economy, psychology, social relationships and so on," he noted.<sup>21</sup>

## **Evidence of Supranational Coordination**

"Public health officials knew perfectly well those things didn't work," Yeadon said, but the fact that virtually every country worldwide followed suit nonetheless suggests a

coordinated effort was underway. "I think it's the strongest evidence of supranational coordination, something happening above the level of country," Yeadon said, and he wants to get the word out:<sup>22</sup>

*"They were doing it because there was pressure to do it ... They did not oppose what was happening. That's the most disappointing and frightening thing that why, why none of the scientists from Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal, Britain, why none of them, said, 'You know, this is absurd.*

*I'm not doing this. And if you're going to do it, I'm resigning, and then I shall go to the media.' Either that didn't happen or they tried to try this and BBC ... said, 'Well, we're not interviewing you.' That's possible.*

*... There was a supranational agreement or pressure to do it. I don't know whether that pressure was instantiated in spring of 2020, or whether they had already agreed to do it a few months ago, but either way, nobody spoke up. And as far as I know, nobody resigned even though what was being imposed on all of those countries was ... ineffective and would damage their economies. That's the kindest thing you can possibly say."*