

President Biden Wants Covid “Misinformants” to be Removed from Social Media Platforms

Analysis by Dr. Joseph Mercola

By [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

Global Research, July 26, 2021

[Mercola](#)

Region: [USA](#)

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

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](#).

In a July 16, 2021, White House press briefing, press secretary Jen Psaki admitted the Biden administration is violating the First Amendment by alerting social media companies to posts and accounts it believes is peddling “misinformation” about COVID injections

This kind of corporate-government collusion to censor free speech is illegal. As noted by Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas, “The government cannot accomplish through threats of adverse government action what the Constitution prohibits it from doing directly”

The Biden Administration wants COVID “misinformants” to be removed from all social media platforms, not just one or two

In that same press briefing, Psaki also referred to the COVID shots as “approved,” and having “gone through the gold standard of the FDA approval process.” This is verifiably false. All currently available COVID injections are authorized for emergency use only. None are approved and none have finalized their safety studies

The Biden Administration’s call to censor — through public utilities and private companies — anyone who shares information about risks and the lack of benefit of these COVID injections must be rejected on ethical, legal and Constitutional grounds

*

In a July 16, 2021, White House press briefing,¹ press secretary Jen Psaki admitted the Biden Administration is violating the First Amendment by alerting social media companies to posts and accounts it believes is peddling “misinformation” about COVID injections. When asked by a reporter to expound on how this flagging works, Psaki said:

“Well, I would say first, it shouldn’t come as any surprise that we’re in regular touch with social media platforms — just like we’re in regular touch with all of you and your media outlets — about areas where we have concern, information that might be useful,

information that may or may not be interesting to your viewers ...

So we are regularly making sure social media platforms are aware of the latest narratives dangerous to public health that we and many other Americans seeing ... And we work to engage with them to better understand the enforcement of social media platform policies.

So let me give you an example, just to illustrate it a little bit. The false narrative that remains active out there about COVID-19 vaccines causing infertility ... which has been disproven time and time again.

This is troubling, but a persistent narrative that we and many have seen, and we want to know that the social media platforms are taking steps to address it. That is inaccurate, false information ... And that is an example of the kind of information that we are flagging or raising ...

So a couple of the steps that ... could be constructive for the public health of the country are providing for Facebook or other platforms to measure and publicly share the impact of misinformation on their platform and the audience it's reaching ... with all of you to create robust enforcement strategies that bridge their properties and provide transparency about rules.

You shouldn't be banned from one platform and not others if you — for providing misinformation out there.”

In her July 15, 2021, press briefing,² Psaki cited “The Disinformation Dozen” report³ by the [Center for Countering Digital Hate](#) (CCDH), which claims 65% of anti-vaccine content on Facebook and Twitter comes from 12 individuals, including yours truly.

According to [Facebook](#), they have removed 18 million posts with “COVID misinformation,” and connected more than 2 billion users to “reliable information,” meaning state-sanctioned information. The Biden administration is not satisfied with these already staggering numbers and thinks more must be done. Specifically, as Psaki mentions, they want the “disinformation dozen” banned from all available social media platforms.

Psaki Disinforms Public About Vaccine Approval Status

In that same July 16 press briefing, Psaki also referred to the COVID shots as “approved,” and having “gone through the gold standard of the FDA approval process.”⁴ She said:

“The public has a right to know ... And we're dealing with a life-or-death issue here, and so everybody has a role to play in making sure there's accurate information ... It's clear there are more [steps] that can be taken ...

On the foreign government piece ... the State Department's Global Engagement Center has found that Russia and China have promoted their own vaccines through messaging that undermines Western origin vaccine development programs. So, you know, that is more than just competition about vaccines.

The risk and impact there is that this type of information magnifies, you know, the risk of potential side effects associated with Western vaccines. This is what they're — what

the information — some of this misinformation is doing — and misleads the public by falsely alleging that mRNA vaccines are untested and, thus, risky, even though many of them are approved and have gone through the gold standard of the FDA approval process.”

This is verifiably false. All currently available [COVID injections](#) are authorized for emergency use only. They are not licensed or approved. At present, the emergency use authorization applies to adults and children as young as 12.⁵ Those two terms, “authorized for emergency use” and “approved for use,” are not interchangeable.

Biden Administration Launches Illegal Attack on Free Speech

One wonders whether the admission that they’re flagging posts and accounts they don’t like so that social media companies can remove them is an attempt at normalizing illegal government overreach. It comes across that way.

But let’s be clear. This kind of corporate-government collusion to censor free speech violates the U.S. Constitution and is illegal. As noted by Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas in an April 5, 2021, ruling⁶ in which he weighed in on the ability of social media giants to control free speech:

“The government cannot accomplish through threats of adverse government action what the Constitution prohibits it from doing directly ... Under this doctrine, plaintiffs might have colorable claims against a digital platform if it took adverse action against them in response to government threats.”

Even if the Biden administration is not threatening social media companies with adverse action if they refuse to censor at the government’s whim, the government cannot use private companies to do something on its behalf that it is not legally allowed to do on its own.

Put another way, it is illegal for government officials to pressure private companies into censoring free speech on their behalf or at their request, since they as government officials do not themselves have the right to infringe on free speech.

The same goes for attorneys general that have publicly called for social media companies to ban posts and deplatform accounts,⁷ as well as the surgeon general, Dr. Vivek Murthy, who recently stated that an “epidemic of misinformation and disinformation” is putting people’s lives at risk.^{8,9} He too has illegally called for “technology and social media companies to address the way misinformation and disinformation spread on their platforms.”

To that end, he even released his own 22-page report,¹⁰ which advises addressing “misinformation super-spreaders” and using educational institutions, from elementary school settings through college, as well as private funders, to “monitor and address” false and misleading information. The Rockefeller Foundation wasted no time in responding by announcing \$13.5 million in new funding to help with the effort.

Again, these government officials have the right to their own opinion. But they do not have the right to censor other people’s opinion and/or information, least of all published research. And since they do not have the Constitutional right to censor Americans, they also cannot

ask private companies to do it for them.

Government officials are also breaking several laws by incentivizing Americans into participating in medical experimentation, and collaborating with private companies to require personnel to participate in medical experimentation. It's truly remarkable what's happening, and the fact that so many laws are blatantly broken in an effort to get a needle in every arm suggests something other than public health interest is at play.

Why Is Truth About Natural Immunity Banned?

I'm still on Twitter, and in recent times, the only post deleted was one in which I indicated that naturally-infected people developed robust and long-lasting immunity, and that health officials need to be honest and admit that this immunity is very powerful.¹¹

To my post, I had attached a paper¹² published in the peer-review journal Nature. However, Twitter does censor me in a different sort of way by posting a detailed warning to users who click on any links to Mercola.com that I post on Twitter that visiting my site "may be unsafe" — which is completely false.

Recovered COVID patients have robust immunity even if their symptoms were mild and subsequent antibody count is low, because latent antibody-producing cells called memory B cells for SARS-CoV-2 still exist in their bone marrow. This was shown in another Nature study.^{13,14} When they encounter the SARS-CoV-2 virus again, those memory cells start churning out new antibodies, which will raise the level again to eliminate the virus.

The National Institutes of Health's website¹⁵ even declares that recovery from COVID-19 provides "lasting immunity," and that the immune systems of more than 95% of people who recovered from COVID-19 had "at least 3 out of 5 immune-system components that could recognize SARS-CoV-2 up to eight months post-infection." This research was funded in part by the NIAID, and published in the journal Science.¹⁶

Clearly, the naturally-acquired immunity narrative poses a significant threat to the mass injection campaign. The information poses no threat to public health. Quite the contrary. The more people know about this, the less fearful they will feel. If they are the ones who recovered, they will know they now have good protection. If the former COVID patient is a family member or friend, they can be at ease with those people, knowing they pose no infection risk.

If it were really about keeping people safe from infection, natural immunity would be accepted and people would be encouraged to look at studies showing most places on earth have already achieved natural immunity. But when it comes to SARS-CoV-2, they insist even those who already have natural immunity should get a COVID shot. Why? They're already immune! And there's no added benefit to getting a COVID injection if you have antibodies.

Researchers at Cleveland Clinic looked at this issue, concluding that people who had tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 at least 42 days prior to vaccination reaped no additional protection from the jabs, over and above their natural immunity.^{17,18}

Zero Benefit and All Risk for Recovered COVID Patients

Meanwhile, the COVID injection may trigger an adverse immune response in those who have already been infected with the virus, putting them at significantly increased risk of injury and death.¹⁹ As explained by Dr. Hooman Noorhashm, a cardiac surgeon and patient advocate:²⁰

“Viral antigens persist in the tissues of the naturally infected for months. When the vaccine is used too early after a natural infection, or worse during an active infection, the vaccine force activates a powerful immune response that attacks the tissues where the natural viral antigens are persisting. This, I suggest, is the cause of the high level of adverse events and, likely deaths, we are seeing in the recently infected following vaccination.”

In early March 2021, researchers at King’s College confirmed the validity of Noorhashm’s concerns. They found people who have already had COVID-19 are three times more likely to experience vaccine side effects than those who have not been exposed to the virus, and this appears true for both [mRNA](#) and DNA versions of the vaccine.²¹

Using data from the Kings College ZOE app, which has logged more than 700,000 vaccinations, 35.7% of those given the Pfizer injection who had previously been infected reported side effects, compared to just 12.2% of those not previously infected.

Looking at the AstraZeneca vaccine, 52.7% of previously infected had side effects, compared to 31.9% of those who had not been previously infected. Despite these documented risks, the FDA continues to recommend the COVID shot for those with natural immunity.

Vaccination Versus Natural Immunity

Public Health England has published data showing only 44 of 6,614 previously infected persons tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection a second time.²² Of those 44, only 15 developed symptoms, so it’s quite possible the remainder were simply false positives.

Either way, the risk of reinfection after recovering from a bout of COVID-19 seems rare, and the risk of reinfection is far lower than the risk of infection faced by those who are fully “vaccinated.” As reported by Israel National News, July 13, 2021:²³

“Coronavirus patients who recovered from the virus were far less likely to become infected during the latest wave of the pandemic than people who were vaccinated against COVID ...

Health Ministry data on the wave of COVID outbreaks which began this May show that Israelis with immunity from natural infection were far less likely to become infected again in comparison to Israelis who only had immunity via vaccination.

More than 7,700 new cases of the virus have been detected during the most recent wave starting in May, but just 72 of the confirmed cases were reported in people who were known to have been infected previously — that is, less than 1% of the new cases. Roughly 40% of new cases — or more than 3,000 patients — involved people who had been infected despite being vaccinated.

With a total of 835,792 Israelis known to have recovered from the virus, the 72 instances of reinfection amount to 0.0086% of people who were already infected with COVID.

By contrast, Israelis who were vaccinated were 6.72 times more likely to get infected after the shot than after natural infection, with over 3,000 of the 5,193,499, or 0.0578%, of Israelis who were vaccinated getting infected in the latest wave."

Impossible for COVID Jabs to Have Favorable Impact

In a world of differing opinions and eternally evolving science, who can claim rights to the truth? The White House press secretary seems to think the Biden administration should have dibs on the truth, while in the same breath disinforming the public by referring to the COVID shots as FDA approved with "gold standard" safety studies behind them.

Health agencies and their officials also disinform the public every time they claim vaccine-induced immunity is better than natural immunity, as this runs counter to everything we've ever learned about virology. It may be accurate for some diseases, but it certainly cannot be said for COVID-19. There's far more data suggesting the COVID jab is an unnecessary risk that provides negligible benefit.

The overall noninstitutionalized infection fatality ratio is a mere 0.26%. Below 40 years of age, it's 0.01%. What's more, data shows the absolute risk reduction for all four COVID injections is between 0.7% and 1.3%. Since the absolute risk that needs to be overcome is lower than the benefit that these injections can provide, mass vaccination simply cannot have a favorable impact on the population. It's mathematically impossible.

Remember, healthy adults under 50, teens and children have a less than 1% chance of hospitalization and death from COVID-19, so they don't have a medical need for this experimental injection. The overall noninstitutionalized infection fatality ratio is a mere 0.26%. Below 40 years of age, it's 0.01%.²⁴ Those odds simply do not make a strong argument for mass injection with an experimental gene modification tool.

What's more, data show the absolute risk reduction for all four COVID injections is between 0.7% and 1.3%.^{25,26} (Efficacy rates of 67% to 95% all refer to the relative risk reduction.) Since the absolute risk that needs to be overcome is lower than the benefit that these injections can provide, mass vaccination simply cannot have a favorable impact on the population. It's mathematically impossible.

So, while government, public health leadership and pro-vaccine advocates insist we must follow the science, they themselves are doing anything but. For a year and a half, they've insisted pandemic measures like [lockdowns](#), [mask wearing](#) and [gene modification injections](#) are the only way forward, despite mountains of evidence against each and every one of those strategies.

So, it's not about science. If it were, they'd produce studies that overwhelmingly refute the counternarrative and prove demonstrable benefits. But they don't. Instead, they unleash personal attacks and smear campaigns to discourage people from listening to anything that doesn't come out of their propaganda machine.

Biden Administration Wants to Monitor Your Private Texts

The Biden Administration has now gone so far as to propose SMS carriers fact check private text messages to make sure Americans don't share inconvenient facts to friends and family.

Ironically, White House spokesperson Kevin Munoz told Politico that this move was part of the administration's "steadfast commitment to keep politics out of the vaccination efforts."²⁷ Backlash was swift, from legislators and private individuals alike, but time will tell whether it was enough to make the White House reconsider.²⁸

It's also not about public health, because if it were, they'd accept natural immunity, and they wouldn't be breaking the law at every turn. No, it's all about getting a needle in every arm — science, logic and common sense be damned. The question is why.

Many of my articles over the past year have detailed evidence pointing to this mass injection campaign being a tool to usher in a new world order of surveillance, worldwide poverty and the complete removal of medical and personal freedoms.

The Biden administration's call to censor — through public utilities and private companies — anyone who shares information about risks and the lack of benefit of these COVID injections is clearly part of that agenda, and must be rejected on ethical, legal and Constitutional grounds.

The National Vaccine Information Center (NVIC) recently posted more than 50 video presentations from the pay-for-view Fifth International Public Conference on Vaccination held online October 16 to 18, 2020, and made them available to everyone for free.

The conference's theme was "Protecting Health and Autonomy in the 21st Century" and it featured physicians, scientists and other health professionals, human rights activists, faith community leaders, constitutional and civil rights attorneys, authors and parents of vaccine injured children talking about vaccine science, policy, law and ethics and infectious diseases, including coronavirus and COVID-19 vaccines.

In December 2020, a U.K. company published false and misleading information about NVIC and its conference, which prompted NVIC to open up the whole conference for free viewing. The conference has everything you need to educate yourself and protect your personal freedoms and liberties with respect to your health.

Don't miss out on this incredible opportunity. I was a speaker at this empowering conference and urge you to watch these video presentations before they're censored and taken away by the technocratic elite.

*

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.

Notes

^{1, 4} [White House Press Briefing July 16, 2021](#)

² [White House Press Briefing July 15, 2021](#)

- ³ [CCDH, The Disinformation Dozen](#)
- ⁵ [FDA.gov May 10, 2021](#)
- ⁶ [Ruling for writ of certiorari, President Joe Biden v. Knight First Amendment Institute at Columbia University, April 5, 2021 \(PDF\)](#)
- ⁷ [Washington Post April 8, 2021](#)
- ⁸ [MSN July 16, 2021](#)
- ⁹ [HHS.gov July 15, 2021](#)
- ¹⁰ [HHS.gov, Confronting Health Misinformation \(PDF\)](#)
- ¹¹ [Twitter Dr. Joseph Mercola July 15, 2021](#)
- ¹² [Nature June 14, 2021](#)
- ¹³ [Nature May 24, 2021 DOI: 10.1038/s41586-02103647-4](#)
- ¹⁴ [Washington University School of Medicine May 24, 2021](#)
- ¹⁵ [NIH.gov NIH Research Matters January 26, 2021](#)
- ¹⁶ [Science February 5, 2021; 371\(6529\): eabf4063](#)
- ¹⁷ [medRxiv June 5, 2021 DOI: 10.1101/2021.06.01.21258176](#)
- ¹⁸ [News Medical Life Sciences June 8, 2021](#)
- ¹⁹ [Medium February 15, 2021](#)
- ²⁰ [The Defender March 23, 2021](#)
- ²¹ [The Telegraph March 5, 2021 \(Archived\)](#)
- ²² [Daily Mail January 13, 2021, Updated January 14, 2021](#)
- ²³ [Israel National News July 13, 2021](#)
- ²⁴ [Annals of Internal Medicine September 2, 2020 DOI: 10.7326/M20-5352](#)
- ²⁵ [Medicina 2021; 57: 199](#)
- ²⁶ [The Lancet Microbe July 1, 2021; 2\(7\): E279-E280](#)

²⁷ [Politico July 12, 2021, Updated July 13, 2021](#)

²⁸ [Fox News July 13, 2021](#)

Featured image is from Mercola

The original source of this article is [Mercola](#)
Copyright © [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#), [Mercola](#), 2021

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

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