

# Scientific Integrity Is Dead. Here's Proof.

By [Steve Kirsch](#)

Global Research, March 09, 2022

[Steve Kirsch's Newsletter](#) 8 March 2022

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [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).

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

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@globalresearch\\_crg](#) and Twitter at [@crglobalization](#).

\*\*\*

*Four examples show that scientific integrity is pretty much dead worldwide. There are only a few people left who support these principles and they’ve been marginalized by all mainstream leaders.*

In this article, I am going to show two simple, but very important, examples that I believe prove, without any doubt, that scientific integrity is dead. I cannot explain the lack of outrage from the mainstream scientific community any other way.

## **Example 1: mRNA COVID-19 Injections Are Killing Teenagers**

The Journal of the College of American Pathologists [published a shocking new report on Monday, Feb. 14, 2022](#) about the cases of two teenage boys who died following mRNA COVID-19 injections.

The report’s lead author is Dr. James Gill, the chief medical examiner for the state of Connecticut and the 2021 President of the National Association of Medical Examiners.

**Both boys died in their sleep less than a week after the second dose**, and neither had any known health conditions prior to death. In these cases, autopsies of the two teenagers found evidence of myocarditis.

“The myocardial injury seen in these post-vaccine hearts is different from typical myocarditis and has an appearance most closely resembling a catecholamine-mediated stress (toxic) cardiomyopathy. Understanding that these instances are different from typical myocarditis and that cytokine storm has a known feedback loop with catecholamines may help guide screening and therapy,” the report concludes.

This observation is confirmed in another recently published paper by Flavio Cadegiani, [“Catecholamines are the key trigger of mRNA SARS-CoV-2 and mRNA COVID-19 vaccine-induced myocarditis and sudden deaths: a compelling hypothesis supported by epidemiological, anatomopathological, molecular and physiological findings.”](#) **Dr. Peter McCullough** is familiar with Flavio’s work and told me he thought it was brilliant.

So the vaccine killed two kids in Connecticut which has around 1% of the population of the US.


Isn't it odd that we are seeing multiple reports from one small state and complete silence from everywhere else?

Did Connecticut just get unlucky? It appears not.

Let's extrapolate this to the US and estimate around 200 kids in the US have been killed by the vaccine.

Some people may say that that isn't a valid extrapolation.

OK, then try this one for size:



**National Vaccine Information Center**  
Your Health. Your Family. Your Choice.

[MedAlerts.org](https://www.MedAlerts.org)




## Search Results

From the 2/25/2022 release of VAERS data:

### Found 64 cases where Age is under-20 and Location is U.S., Territories, or Unknown and Vaccine is COVID19 and Patient Died

[Government Disclaimer on use of this data](#)

Table

 Age	Count	  Percent
< 3 Years	3	4.69%
3-5 Years	1	1.56%
6-8 Years	2	3.13%
9-11 Years	1	1.56%
12-16 Years	29	45.31%
17-43 Years	28	43.75%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100%</b>

VAERS is underreported by a factor of 41 based on my calculations. This number was recently confirmed by Joel Smalley who analyzed the Massachusetts death data. He got 40.9 (from 1759 actual deaths/43 VAERS reported deaths) which I think is close enough to my estimate.

So  $41 \times 64$  reported deaths = 2,624 actual excess deaths caused by the COVID vaccines.

Even if you take a very low-ball estimate of the underreporting factor (URF) of 20, you still end up with 1,280 child deaths, a very troubling figure.

So our simplistic 200 estimate just from linearly extrapolating the known myocarditis deaths in CT was an underestimate (as we expected).

Let's be clear. **Dr. Paul Offit** has said that [1 death per million vaccinated is unacceptable for a vaccine](#). Here, we have more than 1 *child* death per million vaccinated which is even worse than just 1 death.

Is anyone publicly calling for a halt to these vaccines for kids? No way. Not a chance. They are nearly all pushing for giving it to even younger kids.

Is anyone calling for amending the label on the vaccine to note this new information? Are you kidding? No way. AFAIK, the label hasn't been amended in over a year.

### **Example #2: The CDC has been withholding unfavorable vaccine data because it might be misinterpreted**

On February 20, 2022, [The New York Times confirmed that the CDC was withholding data](#) that is unfavorable to the safe and effective vaccine narrative.

Kristen Nordlund, a spokeswoman for the C.D.C., said the agency has been slow to release the different streams of data "because basically, at the end of the day, it's not yet ready for prime time." She said the agency's "priority when gathering any data is to ensure that it's accurate and actionable."

**Another reason is fear that the information might be misinterpreted, Ms. Nordlund said.**

Watch [this CBS news video at 7:39](#) where the New York Times reporter says clearly: "One of the big problems I've been hearing about here is that the CDC didn't want to get some of these data out because they were worried it would be misinterpreted. And **all the experts I spoke to said that this is a terrible reason** because when you hide data or when you keep data from being released it actually breeds more mistrust."

Where is the outrage?

Apparently only from misinformation spreaders like [Dr. Robert Malone, Dr. Peter McCullough and Dr. Paul Alexander](#).

I can't recall seeing Robert so upset (you can tell he's upset because he repeats himself over and over at how upset he is). Watch this [video](#) which has been viewed fewer than 100,000 times:

### **Example #3: The silencing of Dr. Peter Schirmacher**

I've written earlier about the [unethical silencing of one of the world's top pathologists, Dr. Peter Schirmacher](#).

Nobody in the scientific community spoke out how Schirmacher's family was threatened which caused him to be silenced about his stunning results.

Let's be clear: the lack of outrage from the scientific community is a tacit endorsement that **physical threats are acceptable for silencing scientists** who have evidence that is counter-narrative.

### **Example #4: The rejection of technical papers that don't support the narrative**

Jessica Rose had her paper on myocarditis retracted by the publisher (Elsevier) for no valid reason. Others have had their papers accepted, passed peer review, and then never get published.

Nobody is speaking out about these injustices. They just let them happen.

### **The CDC responds by doubling down on the deception**

The CDC just published a study in [The Lancet Infectious Disease](#) saying that there is no link between the vaccines and death.

I'm serious.

Check out the BBC story that just came out, "[Covid vaccines not linked to deaths, major US study finds](#)." The article goes on saying, "A major study of vaccine side-effects in the US found no link between two Covid jabs and the number of deaths recorded after vaccination."

No link?!?!

OK, then how do they explain:

1. The huge increase in deaths reported by [multiple insurance companies](#)
2. Up to a [93% incidence of telltale blood clots](#) noticed by an embalmer.
3. The deaths in Connecticut (noted above) which were determined to be caused by the vaccine. These kids died in their sleep. If it wasn't the vaccine, what caused these deaths?
4. The highly [unusual causes of deaths in the kids the CDC analyzed](#). Those kids did not die from normal causes. But the CDC never mentioned that in their analysis that the causes of death didn't line up statistically. They just said nothing, nothing! (reminding me of the famous line uttered by Sgt. Schultz of Hogan's Heroes fame).
5. [Dr. Peter Schirmacher's study](#) which found the vaccine caused the death in at least 30% of the cases examined (deaths within 2 weeks after being vaccinated).
6. Dr. Sucharit Bhakdi's study which found that the vaccine caused the death in over 90% of the cases examined
7. If it wasn't the vaccine, [what killed Jacob Clynick?](#)
8. If it wasn't the vaccine, what killed Ernest Ramirez Jr? The autopsy revealed it was clearly the vaccine. Obviously, the CDC disagrees. What was the cause?

The answer is they don't explain any of these things because they can't. And nobody is going to hold them accountable, especially the mainstream media. The mainstream press will not ask any of those questions. It is never going to happen.

One unusual side note is the choice of journal for their paper. In February 2021, the pro-vax editor of that journal, John McConnell [wrote an op-ed praising the safety of the COVID vaccines](#). Exactly one year later, the journal announced on February 25, 2022 that [he's dead](#). Did he die after the booster? What did the autopsy show was his cause of death? We are not allowed to know that. Nobody is talking. You gotta love the transparency.

### **The silence is deafening**

The silence on these issues and other evidence that is counter-narrative is deafening.

This just shows you how corrupt the systems are that so few people are speaking out publicly and showing their outrage like Malone did in the video above.

What Malone did is speak up for scientific integrity.

What others did is remain silent.

All of these institutions and individuals are keeping their mouths shut:

1. All members of the CDC and FDA outside committees; they don't want to get kicked off the committees.
2. Top universities that are supposed to be supporting scientific integrity like Harvard, MIT, Stanford, UCSF, ... There is nothing from the leaders of these institutions or any of the faculty members.
3. Top medical societies like the AMA and IDSA and all others
4. Top medical journals: not a single one spoke out about this.
5. Top medical thought leaders like Eric Topol, Monica Gandhi, ...
6. Congress
7. The mainstream news media
8. Even so-called "truth seekers" like Debunk The Funk, ZdoggMD, and Your Local Epidemiologist (Dr. Katelyn Jetelina) were silent on the matter. Amazing!

I don't think any of these institutions or individuals are going to object anytime in the near future due to fear of retribution.

So the CDC can continue to withhold all unfavorable data, continue to "study" any deaths that were clearly caused by the vaccine, and everyone will continue to ignore all the safety data that is released that is in plain sight (like the Connecticut study) that is contrary to the narrative.

### **When will this end?**

For scientific integrity to be restored, we need to have more than just Robert Malone, Peter McCullough, Paul Alexander, and several others who are outraged and not afraid to speak out.

We need people who have the courage to be on the right side of history.

I don't know when that will happen.

The pace of adoption seems pretty slow.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @globalresearch\_crg and Twitter at @crglobalization. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums, etc.

*Featured image: A hand holding an mRNA vaccine vial. (Spencer Davis / Unsplash)*

The original source of this article is [Steve Kirsch's Newsletter](#)

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

## [Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Steve Kirsch](#)

**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)