

Reuters death rattle – metastasizing COVID fakery

conservativenewsandviews.com/2022/01/27/accountability/news-media/reuters-death-rattle-covid/

John Anthony

January 27, 2022



Written by [John Anthony](#) on January 27, 2022. Posted in [Guest Columns](#), [Media](#).

Thomson Reuters describes itself as “the world’s leading source of news and information for professional markets.” Their Trust Principles were, “designed to preserve Thomson Reuters independence, integrity and freedom from bias in the gathering and dissemination of information and news.”

Recently I decided to see how well Reuters lives up to those principles.

The Steve Kirsch affair

September, 17, 2021, the FDA accepted a request by Steve Kirsch, a retired tech entrepreneur for an invitation to speak at the virtual public meeting of the FDA's vaccine advisory committee.

Kirsch proposed that vaccines kill 2X as many lives as they save and provided slides supporting his claim.

The presentation was distributed widely among internet platforms and Thomson Reuters used their fact checking team to verify the accuracy of one of the articles and Kirsch' statements ([here](#)).

As you will see, Reuters' factcheck is stunning in its revelations.

The Reuters' fact checkers rightly call out one publication for referring to Kirsch as an "FDA expert."

Firstly, Kirsch is not and has never been an FDA employee or member of the VRBPAC, the FDA told Reuters in an email.

At this point their fact check slides in a singular direction. Without comment they quote the FDA spokesperson's obvious attempt to discredit Kirsch.

Furthermore, the statements made by Mr. Kirsch during the open public hearing portion of the meeting were not based in science and go against FDA's public health mission.

It seems unusual that Reuters would accept the FDA's condemnation of Kirsch for failing to abide by science given that neither masks ([here](#)) and [here](#)), lockdowns ([here](#)), social distancing ([here](#)), nor processing of PCR tests at 40 cycles to detect the SARS2 virus ([here](#)), were ever based on science. All recommended by the CDC and/or the FDA.

Why is Reuters accepting FDA throwaway lines uncritically?

At best this is an FDA throwaway line, at worst intentional deceit to misdirect the public. For Reuters fact checking team to legitimize the deceit without exposing the irony is a disservice to readers.

Reuters continues:

Kirsch's presentation appears to cite research from a paper he co-authored ([here](#)). The analysis relies heavily on data from the U.S. Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS), which documents suspected reactions to COVID-19 shots to detect possible safety issues. It is managed by the FDA and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

[Click to access Deaths.pdf](#)

Reuters admits they are not sure where the research originated which again is odd, because Kirsch' presentation clearly states his data originated from Pfizer's 6 month trial report ([here](#)) and ([here](#)), a breakdown of the VAERS reporting system (which they did pick up) ([here](#)). A short search also shows he relied on data from the UK's Vaccine Surveillance Reports. ([here](#))

[Click to access 5.3.6-postmarketing-experience.pdf](#)

[Click to access Vaccine-surveillance-report-week-42.pdf](#)

Reuters ignores that CDC fails to support their stance on VAERS

The team did investigate Kirsch' claim that VAERS under reports by a factor of 41X. However, their research does not extend beyond asking the FDA and CDC their input.

FDA strongly disagrees with the analysis Mr. Kirsch put forth during the VRBPAC meeting, as we believe the data from VAERS that he referenced were not properly interpreted.

They added:

Although under reporting is a limitation in VAERS with regard to COVID-19 vaccine safety monitoring, there currently is not evidence to suggest it would underestimate the amount of COVID-19 vaccine-related deaths to such a large degree.

Reuters never questions that the CDC has failed to provide any "evidence" showing VAERS data is not underestimated to "such a large degree." ([here](#))

[Click to access anaphylaxisLetter.pdf](#)

- VAERS under reporting is well-documented by a 2010 Pilgrim Health study showing only 1% reporting, ([here](#))
- and a 2020 Anaphylaxis study which compared actual cases to those included in the VAERS report ([here](#)).
- Contrary to the FDA's and their own remarks, the CDC inadvertently admitted that of 13 verified vaccine related injury cases, just 2 were reported to VAERS. As Kirsch points out, that's 6.5X underreporting.

[Click to access r18hs017045-lazarus-final-report-20116.pdf](#)

Burying the lede

You can find this admission tucked away in this CDC's weekly report:

Fourteen (0.02%) children reportedly received care at a hospital; information regarding reason for hospitalization was available for five children and included appendicitis (two), vomiting and dehydration (one), respiratory infection (one), and retropharyngeal cellulitis (one). Parents and guardians of all hospitalized children were contacted; two parents completed VAERS reports, and one revealed hospitalization was reported in error.

([Here](#))

[Click to access mm705152a1-H.pdf](#)

While the CDC discounts VAERS data as a voluntary system anyone can complete, they ignore the posted threats of fines or imprisonment for false reporting and the difficulty in completing the reports ([here](#)).

Knowingly filing a false VAERS report is a violation of Federal law (18 U.S. Code § 1001) punishable by fine and imprisonment.

(Emphasis in the original text – Ed.)

Since each report clearly identifies the professional status of the reporting person it is easy enough for the CDC to verify if the entries are legitimate. To date, they have failed to do this in a transparent manner.

CDC and FDA go on to claim adverse effects are rare and cannot establish causality. ([Here](#))

CDC and FDA Vaccine Safety Datalink weak

They argue their use of multiple systems in addition to VAERS effectively monitors vaccine safety.

Given the COVID-19 vaccine is operated under “Emergency Use Authorization” in the United States, vaccine administrators and manufacturers are mandated to report all adverse reactions. This would likely result in increased recording of suspected deaths associated with the COVID-19 vaccine, the FDA spokesperson said.

Reuters seems OK with leaving it up to the same drug companies that polluted their own trial data ([here](#)) to report now on adverse vaccine events.

An analysis of safety surveillance data from Vaccine Safety Datalink that monitored more than 10 million people, including 6.2 million vaccinated, found no vaccine-outcome association met the requirement to signal serious adverse effects, including death ([here](#)). Vaccine Safety Datalink is a vaccine-monitoring effort by the CDC and nine healthcare organisations.

The FDA said:

A review of available clinical information, including death certificates, autopsy, and medical records, has not established a causal link to COVID-19 vaccines.

But a review of the Vaccine Safety Datalink shows it is not a randomized control study that could provide conclusive evidence of causality. Instead, it is a retrospective review of hospital records to create a mathematically derived Rate Ratio. ([here](#))

Retrospective studies are one of the least reliable methods of analysis and are subject to bias and confounding that can lead to misleading results. ([here](#))

[Click to access](#)

[Challenges%20of%20Retrospective%20Observational%20Studies_8March2017_Kim.pdf](#)

CDC and FDA fail to support “background death” theory

While VAERS raises compelling evidence of abnormal increases in deaths closely following vaccination. The agency claims the 10,000+ vaccine related deaths are “background deaths.” Such deaths routinely occur from other causes.

Yet that does not explain why the majority occur within 14 days of receiving the vaccine. If these were background events, they would create cycles and patterns. Instead, the only visible pattern is a surge of deaths within days of the being vaccinated. Reuters did not see fit to investigate.

In other words, the agencies said we disagree with detractors, we think they interpreted data incorrectly and if there is a problem the drug companies will tell us. Believe us, not VAERS. Thomson Reuters’ fact checkers unquestioningly accepted this meatless avoidance of the topic. ([here](#))

The clear pattern among Reuters fact checkers is to treat Kirsch’ remarks with skepticism while accepting CDC and FDA comments as higher truth.

A true fact find questions all issue sides seeking only the truth. Thomson Reuters’ fact checkers are at best inept researchers, at worst dangerously biased. Unfortunately, the results are the same. Tens of thousands of medical professionals and hundreds of thousands of Americans are duped into believing they can trust prejudiced and potentially rancid information.

Perhaps that is no surprise.

Massive conflicts erase Reuters’ credibility

James Smith, the former CEO of Thomson Reuters and current Chairman of the Thomson Reuters Foundation, ([here](#)) also sits on Pfizer’s Board of Directors, ([here](#)) has partnered with the unscrupulous Trusted News Initiative, and provides fact checking services for Facebook

and Twitter. ([here](#)) and ([here](#)).

[Click to access 2021.pdf](#)

If that role of policeman and promoter is not sufficient conflict of interests, consider Mr. Smith also sits on the board for the World Economic Forum ([here](#)). The WEF released this document that teaches health professionals and business owners “How to Build Trust in Vaccines” by changing their language and approach ([here](#)).

[Click to access How-to-Build-Trust-in-Vaccines.pdf](#)

That this serpentine network of self-interested elites exists at all is unsettling. That a once esteemed news source like Reuters should use its past reputation to prey on unsuspecting readers is dangerous.

How many readers torn between vaccinating their families or getting early COVID treatments rely on Reuters’ deception? How many business owners seeking the truth to set company policies unknowingly digest toxic propaganda with the potential to destroy families’ lives?

Kirsch and others like him may be right or may be wrong. This applies equally to government agencies. It is only by seeking the truth that Americans can rekindle unity and protect those we care about and those we love. Propagandists like Reuters offer no help in that search.

Editor’s Note:

Senator Ron Johnson (R-Wisc.) held a five-hour hearing on COVID and the lies so many have told. View it in its entirety here:

See also [this item](#) about OSHA backing down from their Rule.

About the featured image

This angle shot of the Reuters building at 30 South Colonnade, Canary Wharf, London, appeared from Wikimedia Commons courtesy of User GhostInTheMachine. This user has licensed it under a Creative Commons [Attribution-Share-alike 2.0 UK England and Wales license](#).

[John Anthony](#)

John Anthony, Founder of Sustainable Freedom Lab, LLC, is a nationally acclaimed speaker, researcher and writer. He is a leading expert on globalist impacts on local affairs and the effects of federal agency regulations on local rule and property rights. Mr. Anthony’s Property Value Defense Network informs public officials and attorneys nationwide of the dangers of regulatory laws. His



workshop, Shattering America's Trance, teaches conservatives effective techniques for cross-political communications and is now available as an online course.

[coronavirus](#), [media](#), [medical research](#), [medicine](#), [vaccine](#), [vaccine mandate](#)



John Anthony

John Anthony, Founder of Sustainable Freedom Lab, LLC, is a nationally acclaimed speaker, researcher and writer. He is a leading expert on globalist impacts on local affairs and the effects of federal agency regulations on local rule and property rights. Mr. Anthony's Property Value Defense Network informs public officials and attorneys nationwide of the dangers of regulatory laws. His workshop, Shattering America's Trance, teaches conservatives effective techniques for cross-political communications and is now available as an online course.
