

FDA Advisers Are Angry at Moderna for Hiding Data

Are they pretending to be independent to save themselves?

By [Igor Chudov](#)

Global Research, January 16, 2023

[Igor's Newsletter](#) 12 January 2023

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Science and Medicine](#)


All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

The times are changing!

The FDA's "Independent advisers" are reportedly [disappointed and angry](#) at Moderna.



[We, the antivaxxers](#), have been disappointed and angry at Moderna for about two or three years based on mountains of data we unearthed, some of which the FDA tried to hide for 75 years. So, may we ask, what disappointed the FDA advisers so late in the game? This is

what it was:

That data – called Immunogenicity data – was based on blood work done on study participants to assess how well each vaccine elicited antibodies that fight off the Omicron strain of the virus that causes Covid-19.



Moderna president clarifies CEO's remarks on vaccine's efficacy against Omicron

The data that was not presented to the experts looked at actual infections: who caught Covid-19 and who did not.

It found that 1.9% of the study participants who received the original booster became infected. Among those who got the updated bivalent vaccine – the one that scientists hoped would work better – a higher percentage, 3.2%, became infected. Both versions of the shot were found to be safe.

It turns out that the FDA advisers approved Moderna booster shots based on “antibody counting,” a *quack medicine* approach called *immunobridging*.

The reason immunobridging is medical quackery is pointed at by the “laughing emoji” above. Despite having “*more antibodies*,” MORE people in the *bivalent group* caught Covid compared to people in the *monovalent* (old booster) group.

Despite being there in larger numbers, the antibodies *facilitated* the infection instead of *preventing* it. Thus, reliance on antibody counts is medical quackery, as the real-life experimental data proves them useless at best.

FDA charlatans approved the Moderna bivalent Covid booster for millions of people based on antibodies in TEN MICE (who [all got sick with Covid](#) when challenged with the virus).

And now, the FDA advisers are “angry” that Moderna did not present real-life data showing that bivalent-boosted people are 68% (3.2/1.9) more likely to get Covid.

Why did they not get angry several months before?

The data that was not presented was available in plain sight!

Despite these imperfections, the data was included in a preprint study that was posted

online in June, again in September in an FDA document and then later that month in a top medical journal – and advisers to the FDA and the CDC said the data should have been shared with them, too.

The FDA advisers are not reading the literature and top medical journals. What do they do in their spare time?


Michael Felberbaum, an FDA spokesman, told CNN in an email that “the FDA received the preprint less than a day prior to the advisory committee meeting,” and “the information was therefore not provided in an adequate timeframe for it to be included in the agency’s meeting materials, and generally the FDA only discusses data at advisory committee meetings that the agency has had the opportunity to substantively review.”

Hm. The FDA only discusses data at advisory committee meetings that the agency has had the opportunity to substantively review??? That’s a lie. The FDA approved the “Covid vaccine for babies” just TWO DAYS after receiving the submission.

The FDA was good at rubber stamping stuff while they considered themselves invincible.

Now that the public is asking pointed questions, FDA advisers are suddenly “angry” at Moderna. Are they trying to save themselves from repercussions and future prosecution?


Should we offer them “pandemic amnesty”?



*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Featured image is from [LifeSiteNews](https://www.livesite.com)



The Worldwide Corona Crisis, Global Coup d'Etat Against Humanity

by Michel Chossudovsky

Michel Chossudovsky reviews in detail how this insidious project “destroys people’s lives”. He provides a comprehensive analysis of everything you need to know about the “pandemic” — from the medical dimensions to the economic and social repercussions, political underpinnings, and mental and psychological impacts.

“My objective as an author is to inform people worldwide and refute the official narrative which has been used as a justification to destabilize the economic and social fabric of entire countries, followed by the imposition of the “deadly” COVID-19 “vaccine”. This crisis affects humanity in its entirety: almost 8 billion people. We stand in solidarity with our fellow human beings and our children worldwide. Truth is a powerful instrument.”

ISBN: 978-0-9879389-3-0, Year: 2022, PDF Ebook, Pages: 164, 15 Chapters

Price: ~~\$11.50~~ Get yours for FREE! [Click here to download.](#)

We encourage you to support the eBook project by making a donation through Global Research’s [DonorBox “Worldwide Corona Crisis” Campaign Page.](#)

The original source of this article is [Igor’s Newsletter](#)

Copyright © [Igor Chudov](#), [Igor’s Newsletter](#), 2023

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Igor Chudov](#)

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