

Twitter Suspends Science Writer after He Posts Results of Pfizer Clinical Test

By [Jonathan Turley](#)

Global Research, August 02, 2021

[Jonathan Turley](#) 31 July 2021

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).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@crg_globalresearch](#).

*Just yesterday, we [discussed](#) the censoring of a commentator by Twitter for merely expressing an opinion over the need for a “pause” on any federal mandates on Covid-19 as new research is studied. Now, a former New York Times science reporter, **Alex Berenson**, has been suspended for simply citing the results from a clinical trial by Pfizer and raising questions over any vaccine mandate. In the meantime, the White House accused both the Washington Post and New York Times of irresponsible reporting on Covid, but surprisingly Twitter has not suspended those accounts. It is the license of the censor. Twitter is unwilling to let people read or discuss viewpoints that it disagrees with as a corporation. Many on the left, however, have embraced the concept of [corporate speech and censorship](#). It turns out that the problem with censorship for many was the failure to censor views that they opposed. With the “right” censors at work, the free speech concerns have been set aside.*

I have little ability to judge the science on such questions. Moreover, I was eager to be vaccinated as was my entire family. I would get the vaccination today with equal enthusiasm. However, I welcome the debate for data. Yet, rather than answer such critics and refute their arguments, many people focus on silencing anyone with dissenting viewpoints like Berenson.

Berenson has been effectively [confined to Substack](#) by Big Tech due to his discussing dissenting views on the science surrounding Covid-19. His latest offense against Big Tech came when he posted the results published by Pfizer of its own clinical data. He claimed that the research showed little difference in mortality between those in the trial with a vaccine and those given a placebo.



653

Your Twitter account h...



to COVID-19.

We understand that during times of crisis and instability, it is difficult to know what to do to keep yourself and your loved ones safe. Under this policy, we require the removal of content that may pose a risk to people's health, including content that goes directly against guidance from authoritative sources of global and local public health information.

For more information on COVID-19, as well as guidance from leading global health authorities, please refer to the following links:

[Coronavirus disease \(COVID-19\) advice for the public from the WHO](#)

[FAQs about COVID-19 from the WHO](#)



Alex Berenson

@AlexBerenson

The pivotal clinical trial for the @pfizer #Covid vaccine shows it does nothing to reduce the overall risk of death. ZERO. 15 patients who received the vaccine died; 14 who received placebo died. The end. The trial blind is broken now. This is all the data we will ever have. <https://t.co/0rVYHRTjpm> <https://t.co/0rVYHRTjpm>



In the meantime, the White House sent out an all caps condemnation for “completely irresponsible” reporting on the infliction of vaccinated people according to another study.

Ben Wakana, deputy director of strategic communications and engagement for the White House, blasted the Washington Post over its headline about a study of a COVID-19 outbreak in Provincetown, Massachusetts on July 4th. The [Post tweet](#) read “Vaccinated people made

up three-quarters of those infected in a massive Massachusetts covid-19 outbreak, pivotal CDC study finds.” Wakana responded “Completely irresponsible, 3 days ago the CDC made clear that vaccinated individuals represent a VERY SMALL amount of transmission occurring around the country. Virtually all hospitalizations and deaths continue to be among the unvaccinated. Unreal to not put that in context.”

Completely irresponsible.

3 days ago the CDC made clear that vaccinated individuals represent a VERY SMALL amount of transmission occurring around the country.

Virtually all hospitalizations and deaths continue to be among the unvaccinated.

Unreal to not put that in context. <https://t.co/BbmSNvQlrb>

— Ben Wakana (@benwakana46) [July 30, 2021](#)

Wakana addressed the same issue with a New York Times tweet stating “Breaking News: The Delta variant is as contagious as chickenpox and may be spread by vaccinated people as easily as the unvaccinated, an internal C.D.C. report said.” That sent Wakana into all caps: “VACCINATED PEOPLE DO NOT TRANSMIT THE VIRUS AT THE SAME RATE AS UNVACCINATED PEOPLE AND IF YOU FAIL TO INCLUDE THAT CONTEXT YOU’RE DOING IT WRONG.”

VACCINATED PEOPLE DO NOT TRANSMIT THE VIRUS AT THE SAME RATE AS UNVACCINATED PEOPLE AND IF YOU FAIL TO INCLUDE THAT CONTEXT YOU’RE DOING IT WRONG. <https://t.co/gBkDbj21xX>

— Ben Wakana (@benwakana46) [July 30, 2021](#)

Now all three posters (Berenson, The Post, and The Times) were citing studies and accused of not putting them into context. However, only Berenson was suspended.

Obviously, none of these posters should be suspended and Twitter should not be enforcing one of the largest censorship programs in history. However, the silence of free speech supports, academics, and journalists to this hypocrisy is deafening.

The rise of corporate censors has combined with a heavily pro-Biden media to create the fear of a de facto state media that controls information due to a shared ideology rather than state coercion. That concern has been magnified by demands from Democratic leaders for increased censorship, including censoring political speech, and now word that the Biden Administration has routinely been flagging material to be censored by Facebook.

This is why I [have described](#) myself as an Internet Originalist:

The alternative is “internet originalism” — no censorship. If social media companies returned to their original roles, there would be no slippery slope of political bias or opportunism; they would assume the same status as telephone companies. We do not

need companies to protect us from harmful or “misleading” thoughts. The solution to bad speech is more speech, not approved speech.

If Pelosi demanded that Verizon or Sprint interrupt calls to stop people saying false or misleading things, the public would be outraged. Twitter serves the same communicative function between consenting parties; it simply allows thousands of people to participate in such digital exchanges. Those people do not sign up to exchange thoughts only to have Dorsey or some other internet overlord monitor their conversations and “protect” them from errant or harmful thoughts.

*

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.

Featured image is from OneWorld

The original source of this article is [Jonathan Turley](#)
Copyright © [Jonathan Turley](#), [Jonathan Turley](#), 2021

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Jonathan Turley](#)

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