

# Two Things Mainstream Media Didn't Tell You About FDA's Approval of Pfizer Vaccine

By [Robert F. Kennedy Jr](#) and [Dr. Meryl Nass](#)

Global Research, August 25, 2021

[Children's Health Defense](#) 24 August 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [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](#).

\*\*\*

*Buried in the fine print of Monday's approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration of the Pfizer Comirnaty COVID vaccine are two critical facts that affect whether the vaccine can be mandated, and whether Pfizer can be held liable for injuries.*

Monday, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) [approved](#) a [biologics license application](#) for the Pfizer Comirnaty vaccine.

The press [reported](#) that [vaccine mandates](#) are now legal for military, healthcare workers, college students and employees in many industries. New York City **Mayor Bill de Blasio** has now [required](#) the vaccine for all teachers and school staff. The [Pentagon](#) is proceeding with its [mandate](#) for all military service members.

But there are several bizarre aspects to the FDA approval that will prove confusing to those not familiar with the pervasiveness of the FDA's regulatory capture, or the depths of the agency's cynicism.

First, the FDA acknowledges that while [Pfizer](#) has “insufficient stocks” of the newly licensed Comirnaty vaccine available, there is “a significant amount” of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID vaccine — produced under [Emergency Use Authorization](#) (EUA) — still available for use.

The FDA [decrees](#) that the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine under the EUA should remain unlicensed but can be used “interchangeably” ([page 2, footnote 8](#)) with the newly licensed Comirnaty product.

Second, the FDA pointed out that the licensed Pfizer Comirnaty vaccine and the existing, EUA Pfizer vaccine are “legally distinct,” but proclaims that their differences do not “impact safety or effectiveness.”

There is a huge real-world difference between products approved under EUA compared with those the FDA has fully licensed.

EUA products are [experimental](#) under U.S. law. Both the [Nuremberg Code](#) and federal

regulations provide that no one can force a human being to participate in this experiment. Under [21 U.S. Code Sec.360bbb-3\(e\)\(1\)\(A\)\(ii\)\(III\)](#), “authorization for medical products for use in emergencies,” it is unlawful to deny someone a job or an education because they refuse to be an experimental subject. Instead, potential recipients have an absolute right to refuse EUA vaccines.

U.S. laws, however, permit employers and schools to require students and workers to take licensed vaccines.

EUA-approved COVID vaccines have an extraordinary liability shield under the [2005 Public Readiness and Preparedness Act](#). Vaccine manufacturers, distributors, providers and government planners are immune from liability. The only way an injured party can sue is if he or she can prove willful misconduct, and if the U.S. government has also brought an enforcement action against the party for willful misconduct. No such lawsuit has ever succeeded.

The government has created an extremely stingy compensation program, the [Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program](#), to redress injuries from all EUA products. The program’s parsimonious administrators have compensated [under 4% of petitioners](#) to date — and not a single COVID vaccine injury — despite the fact that physicians, families and injured vaccine recipients have reported more than [600,000 COVID vaccine injuries](#).

At least for the moment, the Pfizer Comirnaty vaccine has no liability shield. Vials of the branded product, which say “Comirnaty” on the label, are subject to the same product liability laws as other U.S. products.

When the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) Advisory Committee for Immunization Practices places a vaccine on the mandatory schedule, a childhood vaccine benefits from a generous retinue of liability protections.

But licensed adult vaccines, including the new Comirnaty, do not enjoy any liability shield. Just as with Ford’s exploding Pinto, or [Monsanto’s herbicide Roundup](#), people injured by the Comirnaty vaccine could potentially sue for damages.

And because adults injured by the vaccine will be able to show that the manufacturer knew of the problems with the product, jury awards could be astronomical.

Pfizer is therefore unlikely to allow any American to take a Comirnaty vaccine until it can somehow arrange immunity for this product.

Given this background, the FDA’s acknowledgement in its approval letter that there are insufficient stocks of the licensed Comirnaty, but an abundant supply of the EUA Pfizer BioNTech jab, exposes the “approval” as a cynical scheme to encourage businesses and schools to impose illegal jab mandates.

The FDA’s clear motivation is to enable Pfizer to quickly unload inventories of a vaccine that science and the [Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System](#) have exposed as unreasonably dangerous, and that the [Delta variant](#) has rendered obsolete.

Americans, told that the Pfizer COVID vaccine is now licensed, will understandably assume COVID vaccine mandates are lawful. But only EUA-authorized vaccines, for which no one has any real liability, will be available during the next few weeks when many school mandate

deadlines occur.

The FDA appears to be purposefully tricking American citizens into giving up their right to refuse an experimental product.

While the media has trumpeted that the FDA has approved COVID vaccines, the FDA has not approved the Pfizer BioNTech vaccines, nor any COVID vaccines for the 12- to 15-year age group, nor any [booster doses](#) for anyone.

And the FDA has not licensed any [Moderna](#) vaccine, nor any vaccine from [Johnson & Johnson](#) — so the vast majority, if not all, of vaccines available in the U.S. remain unlicensed EUA products.

Here's what you need to know when somebody orders you to get the vaccine: Ask to see the vial. If it says "Comirnaty," it's a licensed product.

If it says "Pfizer-BioNTech," it's an experimental product, and under [21 U.S. Code 360bbb](#), you have the right to refuse.

If it comes from Moderna or Johnson & Johnson (marketed as Janssen), you have the right to refuse.

The FDA is playing bait and switch with the American public — but we don't have to play along. If it doesn't say Comirnaty, you have not been offered an approved vaccine.

\*

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.

**Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.** *'s reputation as a resolute defender of the environment stems from a litany of successful legal actions.*

**Meryl Nass, MD, ABIM,** *is an internist with special interests in vaccine-induced illnesses, chronic fatigue syndrome, Gulf War illness, fibromyalgia and toxicology.*

*Featured image is from CHD*

The original source of this article is [Children's Health Defense](#)

Copyright © [Robert F. Kennedy Jr](#) and [Dr. Meryl Nass](#), [Children's Health Defense](#), 2021

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Robert F. Kennedy Jr](#) and [Dr. Meryl Nass](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)