

# Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

November 19, 2022

## STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › In “Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion,” a documentary by Oracle Films, COVID-19 shot injuries and deaths are highlighted, along with the systemic failings that allowed them to happen
- › Government, Big Tech companies and the media only added to the scandal by suppressing free speech and open debate about the safety and effectiveness of the shots
- › In November 2020, Pfizer claimed their COVID-19 shot was 95% effective against COVID-19, but this was highly misleading; the absolute risk was a mere 0.84%
- › The U.K.’s Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies (SAGE) had a “nudge” unit, also known as SPI-B, that researched and analyzed options for increasing adherence to COVID-19 lockdown measures
- › If open debate and the right to exercise voluntary, informed consent to getting the COVID shots had been allowed, it would have potentially resulted in fewer injuries but, instead, the population was subjected to psychological manipulation in an attempt to perpetuate the false assumption that the COVID shots are “safe and effective”
- › The film includes several tragic stories of lives lost or forever changed by these supposedly “safe” shots; their stories have also been largely suppressed and denied by governments and media

The global public has been assured COVID-19 jabs are safe and effective – but as deaths and disabilities mount, it’s time for a second opinion. In *Safe and Effective: A*

Second Opinion, a documentary by Oracle Films, COVID-19 shot injuries and deaths are highlighted, along with the systemic failings that allowed them to happen.

Big Tech companies and the media only added to the scandal by suppressing free speech and open debate on the shots. Cardiologist Dr. Aseem Malhotra has spoken openly about the shots' downfalls. He said in the film:<sup>1</sup>

*"Having been double jabbed and being one of the first to take the Pfizer vaccine, I have – after several months critically appraising the data, speaking to eminent scientists in Oxford, Stanford and Harvard, speaking to two investigative medical journalists and being contacted by two Pfizer whistleblowers – reluctantly concluded that this vaccine is not completely safe and has unprecedented harms, which leads me to conclude that it needs to be suspended until all the raw data has been released for independent analysis."*

## **Giving a Voice to Those Injured by COVID Jabs**

Federal governments have largely dismissed data suggesting COVID-19 shots cause harm. But the stories of those personally affected cannot be denied. While Big Tech has tried to censor these stories and keep them from getting out, eventually the truth will be heard. The film includes several tragic stories of lives lost or forever changed by these supposedly "safe" shots:

- **Georgia Segal, 35** – Collapsed after the second Pfizer jab, experienced ongoing tremors and couldn't walk properly without her legs giving out. As a result, she had to use a walker and wheelchair. "I still suffer now; I suffer with a lot of fainting. I suffer with my legs giving way as a result of the damage that the vaccine has done to me. I've ended up registered disabled."<sup>2</sup>
- **Alex Mitchell, 57** – Experienced blood clots after his first AstraZeneca jab. He was previously healthy. Doctors told him that the blood clots in his system should have been fatal. He lost his left leg as a result and now uses a wheelchair. "I'm now going

blind in my right eye,” he said. “Thanks AstraZeneca. It’s the gift that keeps on giving. That’s the honest answer.”<sup>3</sup>

- **Charlotte Wright** – Her husband Stephen, 32, died after his first AstraZeneca jab after suffering from a stroke. She received a vaccine damage payment from the British government, which accepts as some vindication. However, the amount – £120,000 (\$136,530) – isn’t nearly enough. She’s still awaiting an inquest.
- **Caroline Pover, 50** – Experienced multiple symptoms after her first AstraZeneca jab. “Life has completely changed. It’s unrecognizable compared to how it was,” she said.

*“For about five months, I did hardly anything, I couldn’t function at all. I was exhausted constantly. I was in constant pain. Head and eye pain was relentless. I couldn’t function. I couldn’t walk very far. I couldn’t read things ... I had trouble processing information ...*

*And I didn’t have any physical strength. I’ve now got to the stage where I can function at about 30% of how I could function before the vaccine. On a good day, I can maybe do a couple of hours in the kitchen. But then after a while I have such chest pain that I have to come and lie down.”<sup>4</sup>*

Across the U.K. coroners have confirmed deaths linked to the shots. “They are usually framed as very rare,” the film notes, “but how rare?”<sup>5</sup> Adverse reactions are supposed to be reported to the Yellow Card scheme operated by the U.K.’s Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA).

As of August 24, 2022, they reported 432,819 adverse reactions, of which 2,240 were fatal. In the U.S., the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) had received reports of 1,400,350 adverse reactions to the shots as of September 2, 2022, including 30,796 fatalities.<sup>6</sup>

“Not all these reports will be confirmed as vaccine-induced,” the film continued. “But then again, not all reactions are reported. The figures surely demand investigation.”<sup>7</sup> Dr.

Clare Craig, a diagnostic pathologist, explained:<sup>8</sup>

*"I don't think anybody can deny that there has been harm. You can argue about how much, but you can't deny that there has been harm. It's just a scandal of such epic proportions that I think people don't know where to begin with it. It's frightening to even approach it."*

Sir Christopher Chope, Member of Parliament (MP) in the U.K. is pursuing a bill to speed up compensation for victims and increase the maximum amount from £120,000. He said:<sup>9</sup>

*"Other jurisdictions have taken the view that ... those who do the right thing for public health reasons by having a bad vaccine should be looked after by the state if the consequences of having that vaccine result in disability or injury."*

*This approach is taken in order to promote vaccine confidence amongst those who might otherwise be hesitant about having a vaccine. This government's approach, however, seems to be to try and promote vaccine confidence by covering up the adverse consequences for some of having been vaccinated."*

## **Pfizer Shot – 119 People Jabbed to Prevent One COVID Case**

One mechanism of harm from the mRNA COVID-19 shots is the delivery of synthetic messenger RNA (mRNA) encapsulated in lipid nanoparticles that forces the body's cells to produce the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, which vaccine developers initially stated would remain localized to the arm. However, research shows that it actually migrates throughout the body to every major organ system, causing direct toxicity and/or autoimmune reactions.<sup>10</sup>

The development of the genetically engineered biological product was fast-tracked at an unprecedented pace without long-term clinical trials to assess the true extent and severity of adverse effects before the U.S. Food and Drug Administration granted Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna, the two mRNA COVID shot manufacturers, an Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) to distribute it.

At the same time, the U.S. and other governments indemnified the manufacturers against any liability for deaths and injuries caused by the COVID shots. In November 2020, Pfizer claimed their COVID-19 shot was 95% effective against COVID-19, but this was highly misleading and, according to Malhotra, based on flawed methodology:<sup>11</sup>

*“Relative risk reduction is a way of exaggerating the benefits of any intervention ... which would be in the interest of people trying to sell you something – in this case, the pharmaceutical industry.*

*So if, for example, you have 1,000 people in a trial that didn't have the vaccine versus 1,000 people that did in the placebo group ... you may have two people dying. And in the intervention group, you may have just one person dying. And that's a reduction of 50%. One over two is a 50% relative risk reduction. But actually, you've only saved one life out of 1,000.*

*So the absolute risk reduction is only 1 in 1,000. It's a big difference. The guidance has been for many years that we must always use absolute risk reduction in conversations with patients, not just relative risk reduction alone; otherwise, it's considered unethical,' Malhotra said.*

*The accusation is that governments acted on Pfizer's relative risk figure of 95% efficacy, when the absolute risk was a mere 0.84%. In other words, you'd have to vaccinate 119 people to prevent just one from catching COVID. 'So we were basically sold on something that ultimately, and in retrospect now, was very, very misleading.’”*

Raising more red flags, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and Pfizer attempted to hide the COVID-19 shot clinical trial data they did have for 75 years. But the FDA was ordered by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas to release redacted versions of trial documents on a much faster schedule. Alexandra Latypova, a research specialist in clinical trials, is one of a group of experts who studied the documents.

Her investigation revealed that Pfizer skipped major categories of safety testing, and the toxicity of the mRNA shots was not studied. “The FDA and Pfizer knew about major toxicities associated with the gene therapy class of medicines. The CDC, FDA and Pfizer lied about vaccine staying in the injection site. My examination of leaked Moderna documents also revealed that vaccine-induced antibody-enhanced disease was identified as a serious risk,” she said.<sup>12</sup>

## **Shots Saved 20 Million? ‘Implausible,’ ‘Science Fiction’**

Instead of commenting on the controversies over the shots’ effectiveness and serious adverse effects, most scientists, governments and media instead promote inaccurate and misleading information, such as stating COVID-19 shots have saved at least 20 million lives. This statistic is “science fiction, not scientific fact,” Malhotra said, as it’s based on a poor-quality observational study.<sup>13</sup>

“When you look at a higher quality level of evidence, in fact, even Pfizer’s own randomized controlled trial didn’t show any reduction in COVID mortality of statistical significance,” Malhotra said. “It showed no reduction in all-cause mortality. So this really this statement is almost implausible. To be honest, it sounds more like an advert from the drug industry than true science.”<sup>14</sup>

Meanwhile, the government continued to promote COVID-19 shots aggressively, even after data showed the product did not prevent infection or transmission – and the vast majority of the population wasn’t at risk of serious illness.<sup>15</sup> Even physicians who were typically pro-vaccination began to question it. One consultant pediatrician who spoke in the film warned, “Children are at low risk. They don’t need this vaccine, and the harms are real.”<sup>16</sup>

Data also show that deaths from any cause among 15- to 44-year-olds in England and Wales increased significantly in 2021, the year COVID-19 shots became widely available. There have been concerning reports of myocarditis (heart inflammation), including sudden deaths and collapse, that have occurred in young people and athletes aged 18 to 24.<sup>17</sup>

Data from the Office of National Statistics also reveal that more people than usual are dying in 2022. Deaths among 10- to 14-year-olds increased 11.75%, while deaths among 55- to 59-year-olds rose 15%. The film notes:<sup>18</sup>

*“Overall, that could equate to over 75,000 excess deaths in England and Wales this year, and not from COVID. The Daily Telegraph is reporting the deaths in the aftermath of lockdown could be greater than COVID itself.*

*There are calls for an investigation mentioning lack of health care, stress, long COVID, even the cost of living. Why on earth isn't COVID vaccination under suspicion when there are so many reports of adverse reactions here and around the world?”*

## **Psychological Techniques Used to Force Compliance**

The U.K.'s Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies (SAGE) had a “nudge” unit, also known as SPI-B, that researched and analyzed options for increasing adherence to COVID-19 social distancing and lockdown measures.<sup>19</sup> It discussed increasing the perceived level of personal threat using “hard-hitting emotional messaging” and “social approval for desired behaviors.”

The messaging must “emphasize and explain the duty to protect others,” and actions framed “in terms of protecting oneself and the community.” Those who don't comply could be faced with fines and other punishments.

“I think what's important to understand is, over the last two years, there has been the promotion of unethical psychological techniques to encourage behavioral change, such as the use of fear, artificially increasing the sense of being afraid, in order to get people to change their behaviors,” said Christian Buckland, a psychotherapist and counselor.<sup>20</sup>

The only way out, the government said, was to get the shots. The COVID-19 shot campaign went into overdrive, but when millions still avoided them, the threats began. Without a COVID-19 shot, you could lose your job, vaccine passports became required to

go about daily life, and anyone who spoke out against the shots was dubbed an anti-vaxxer. Buckland continued:<sup>21</sup>

*“When you use unethical psychology on a population, you actually start to see splits and divisions occurring. And that's really dangerous because you also encourage ‘othering,’ or the demonization of people. So we see ... not just fear being raised but also anger being raised as well.”*

When public protests and marches drawing thousands of people were organized to speak out against the threats to personal freedom, the media ignored the major events and even stated they would not debate with “anti-vaxxers” – even if they were right.<sup>22</sup> The Trusted News Initiative was formed, which included the BBC, Facebook, Google, YouTube, Twitter and Microsoft, to stop the spread of what the online platforms labeled “misinformation.”

“It sounds laudable,” the film notes. “But what it really means is that governments, the media, and the big tech companies are working to a common script, their script, their version of the truth ... The real truth is that anybody who questions the official narrative is generally suppressed and canceled or labeled as a spreader of disinformation on social media. And that includes eminent scientists, doctors and, disgracefully, the vaccine injured.”<sup>23</sup>

## **Open Debate That Could Have Led to the Truth Suppressed**

If open debate and the right to exercise voluntary, informed consent to getting the COVID shots had been allowed, it would have potentially resulted in fewer injuries. Instead, the population was subjected to psychological manipulation in an attempt to perpetuate the false assumption that the COVID shots are “safe and effective.” So what’s the truth? The film wraps up with some sobering facts and statistics that make it clear:<sup>24</sup>

- Between January 1 and May 31, 2022, 15,113 people died with COVID-19 in England – 90% of them had received at least one COVID-19 shot

- In 2021, Pfizer doubled its annual revenue to \$81 billion – it’s 2022 annual revenue is expected to surpass \$100 billion
- U.S. research revealed that up to 98 young people could be injured by COVID-19 shots for every one prevented from hospitalization<sup>25</sup> – one of the authors is the director of Harvard Medical School’s Center for Global Health Delivery
- A U.S. judge ruled that the White House must release correspondence regarding a “massive censorship enterprise” with Big Tech; it’s alleged that federal agencies communicated with social media companies to suppress private speech during the pandemic

## Sources and References

---

- <sup>1</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 1:51
- <sup>2, 7</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 5:06
- <sup>3</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 6:43
- <sup>4</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 10:45
- <sup>5</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 8:30
- <sup>6</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 8:35
- <sup>8</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 9:15
- <sup>9</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 9:51
- <sup>10</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 13:52
- <sup>11</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 15:11
- <sup>12</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 16:59
- <sup>13</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 18:09
- <sup>14</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 18:30
- <sup>15</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 21:52
- <sup>16</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 22:12
- <sup>17, 18</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 37:18
- <sup>19</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 43:23
- <sup>20</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 45:23
- <sup>21</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 47:38
- <sup>22</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 49:16
- <sup>23</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 50:01
- <sup>24</sup> Rumble, Safe and Effective: A Second Opinion September 28, 2022, 52:38
- <sup>25</sup> SSRN September 12, 2022