

The Liberator®

SPRING 2024 Vol. 35, No. 2

QUARTERLY

Visit LC.org for the most up-to-date information



GIVE TODAY



Should the Largest COVID Shot Study Underscore the Call for a Global Moratorium? By Annemarie McLean

The largest COVID-19 shot study ever conducted revealed higher than expected cases of neurological, hematologic, and cardiovascular conditions post-vaccination. Conducted by the Global Vaccine Data Network (GVDN), the multinational cohort study, published in the *Vaccine* journal on February 12, 2024, evaluated over 99 million COVID-vaccinated individuals in eight nations to measure the risk of adverse events of special interest (AESI). The participating nations are Argentina, Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, New Zealand, and Scotland.

The methodology for the retrospective observational study was straightforward: Using a common protocol, scientists compared and analyzed observed vs. expected outcomes for 13 selected AESI across neurological, hematological, and cardiac outcomes up to 42 days after vaccination.

Findings [revealed](#) that both Pfizer and Moderna's mRNA COVID shots along with AstraZeneca's viral vector jab "confirmed pre-established safety signals for myocarditis, pericarditis, Guillain-Barré syndrome, and cerebral venous sinus thrombosis [CVST]." In fact, researchers recorded [12 times](#) when specific health conditions surpassed the safety signal threshold of >1.5 to indicate a potential harm or risk to a particular brand and dose of the COVID shot.

World-renowned researcher, cardiologist, and epidemiologist Dr. Peter McCullough implies in a [post](#) on X that the >1.5 threshold is not strict enough to protect against serious AESI risk to humans, writing, "Any relative risk >1.2 is worrisome — these risks are prohibitive for an ineffective vaccine."

Digging into the data further, scientists [reported](#) a 2x increased risk for Guillain-Barré syndrome, an

continued on page 2 >>

TOP NEWS:

- COVID Shot Study & Call for Global Moratorium
- Abortion Pill Case at SCOTUS
- SCOTUS Hears Government Censorship Case



Combating the Dystopian Rise of the 'Censorship Industrial Complex' By Mat Staver

The Censorship Industrial Complex initiated a constitutional crisis by infringing on our freedom of speech in the name of "public health" and for the perceived "greater good" during COVID and leading up to the 2020 election. This unprecedented breach of the Constitution inevitably prompted a lawsuit, and Liberty Counsel filed an [amicus brief](#) to the U.S. Supreme Court in *Murthy v. Missouri* (originally filed as *Missouri v. Biden*) to defend the First Amendment and stand up for victims of this government-initiated censorship

continued on page 3 >>

>>continued from page 1, Covid Study

autoimmune disorder that attacks the body's peripheral nervous system, a 3.78x increased chance of swelling of the brain and spinal cord after the first dose of Moderna, and higher-than-expected cases of Bell's palsy after the first dose of the Pfizer and Moderna shots.

Additionally, the risk of a brain-swelling and spinal cord-damaging condition called [Acute Disseminated Encephalomyelitis \(ADEM\)](#) was 3.7x greater after the first dose of the Moderna shot. And for the Pfizer-BioNTech version? Researchers anticipated two instances of ADEM following vaccination but recorded seven.

"A safe vaccine would be indistinguishable from a placebo. Does this look safe to you?" commented Steve Kirsch, founder of Vaccine Research Safety Foundation, regarding the study's findings. "They found clearly increased risk of the various AESI, but the end conclusion is that the risks after COVID infection are far higher, so people should take the shots. This is unbelievable."

Coincidence or Confirmation?

The GVDN global cohort study was released less than three weeks after McCullough joined former NIH epidemiologist M. Nathaniel Mead, MIT Senior Research Scientist Stephanie Seneff, and four other expert researchers to co-author a peer-reviewed paper for the *Cureus Journal of Medical Science*, entitled "COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines: Lessons Learned from the Registrational Trials and Global Vaccination Campaign." The paper has since been retracted by *Cureus* (more on that later). Reanalyzing data from Pfizer and Moderna's COVID-19 vaccine trials, it was the first paper to call for a "global moratorium on modified mRNA products."

In the paper, scientists found that COVID vaccine trials were rushed in a historically unprecedented manner while the "vaccines" themselves presented low efficacy, were contaminated with residual DNA impurities, and presented many "biological mechanisms" that could cause serious adverse events. The authors concluded that the FDA (Food and Drug Administration) gave a blanket thumbs-up for COVID mRNA shots that had no basis or support from an honest assessment of all relevant registrational data and proportionate consideration of risks vs. benefits.

Until Further Notice

McCullough went as far as to [say](#) that "mRNA should never have been authorized for human use." He and his co-authors insist



that a global moratorium is the appropriate action of governments given "the well-documented SAEs [serious adverse events] and unacceptable harm-to-reward ratio."

They are not alone in their beliefs. Joining them is Florida Surgeon General Dr. Joseph Ladapo, an outspoken critic of the mRNA vaccines and a prominent voice in calling out the FDA and the CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) for their failures in due diligence and transparency when it comes COVID vaccine safety.

In a post on X on January 3, 2024, Dr. Ladapo [wrote](#), "I am calling for a halt to the use of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have always played it fast and loose with COVID vaccine safety, but their failure to test for DNA integration into the human genome — as their own guidelines dictate — when the vaccines are known to be contaminated with foreign DNA is intolerable."

A few weeks later, on January 18, Ladapo held the CDC accountable for its lack of transparency by [reposting](#) an email the agency "failed to send" to alert the public on the dangers of myocarditis back in — wait for it — May 2021.

The newly published findings of 99+M cohort GVDN study simply reinforce and cement what Ladapo, McCullough, and Co. already knew: COVID vaccines carry a significant risk for myocarditis — so much so that Ladapo updated [COVID vaccine guidance](#) for Floridians back in the fall of 2022. Unfortunately, it's a risk that continues to be downplayed by the COVID Cartel, headed up by the WHO (World Health Organization) and carried out in America by its three-letter federal agency lackeys.

And it's not just myocarditis that's being whitewashed in much of the forthcoming research. It's pericarditis. It's Bell's palsy. It's horrific conditions like Guillain-Barré, CVST, and ADEM, not to mention the research that reveals nucleic acid contaminants have been measured in various shot batches with yet-to-be-fully-understood implications for human health.

Trivialized and Retracted for Reporting Real Science?


The findings from the GVDN study have been outright trivialized by much of the scientific community, while, in an astonishing move of scientific censorship, *Cureus* flat-out retracted the Mead article 32 days after publishing it. Something is rotten in the state of Denmark, for sure.

One fitting example of "trivializing" a new side effect discovered in the study — ADEM — can be found in Jacqui Wise's explanation in *British Medical Journal* (BMJ) calling it both "rare" and "small."

McCullough was having none of it. He [replied](#) on X, "Look for any relative risk, hazard ratio, odds ratio, or observed/expected risk >1.20 or upper bound of the 95% confidence limit >1.30. Those are clinically unacceptable risks for a mass market product. Not 'small,' or 'rare' as spun by Wise."

As for the *Cureus* takedown, never mind that the paper in the web-based publication drew global attention to the platform with record views/reads/downloads, topping >330,000 in a month as compared to an average *Cureus*-promoted paper that has only ~2,700 in a year. Ignore the fact that users gave it a >9.2 rating for clarity, scientific importance, study methods, novel conclusions, and data analysis — deeming it "groundbreaking" in its findings.

While the collusion among some scientists, federal regulatory agencies, and much of the mainstream media continues to downplay, discount, and otherwise dismiss data of importance to the entire global COVID-vaccinated population, papers like the one retracted by *Cureus* are not shying away from a distinctly different narrative. It's one that puts forth evidence that "for every life saved, there were nearly 14 times more deaths caused by the modified mRNA injections."

How much more research needs to come out to stop the shots? 

>>continued from page 1, *Dystopian Rise of Censorship*

campaign. This is the most pivotal free speech case in U.S. history and would be a landmark victory to protect the liberty to engage in discourse online without fear of being stifled.

Conservative individuals and organizations, including Liberty Counsel, were censored for online speech that opposed COVID orthodoxy and questioned the narrative pushed by Big Tech, Big Pharma, the mainstream media, and the federal government.

The First Amendment explicitly forbids the government from abridging the freedom of speech or freedom of the press, yet social media platforms, under the direction of the federal government, engaged in a coordinated censorship operation to silence dissenting voices and suppress what was deemed "misinformation," "disinformation," or "conspiracy."

History proves that mass censorship campaigns inevitably lead to human rights violations. Look no further than Adolf Hitler's [censorship](#) of speech and opposition to government in Nazi Germany to see how "book burning" and the silencing of free speech quickly dissolve into grave human rights atrocities.

Federal Government-Led Censorship Campaign

In [Murthy v. Missouri](#), attorneys general from Missouri and Louisiana, social media users, and an independent media outlet alleged that multiple federal agencies "coerced" social media companies to remove content the government viewed as unfavorable, such as posts that opposed the COVID narrative pushed by the government, research proving mRNA vaccines and lockdowns caused more harm than good, or online speech that questioned the validity of the 2020 election.

They revealed how the federal government coerced — and even threatened — social media platforms, including Facebook, Instagram, and X (formerly Twitter), to suppress opposition by censoring free speech and amplifying propaganda against opposing narratives.

In the first [ruling](#) in *Biden v. Missouri* on July 4, 2023, U.S. District Judge Terry Doughty determined "the alleged suppression has potentially resulted in millions of free speech

“ It is a sad day in this country when Americans fear that publishing conservative views on a public platform will be suppressed by government-influenced censorship.”

violations," and he issued an order limiting communications between the government and social media companies.

Calling Out the "Crusade to Censor Protected Expression"

The Supreme Court heard oral arguments in *Murthy v. Missouri* on March 18, 2024. In our brief, we argue that the "Biden

Administration's crusade to censor protected expression" is "emblematic of a broader global trend aiming to suppress speech deemed by authorities to be 'misinformation' and 'conspiracy theories.'"

We note that "instead of safeguarding Americans' First Amendment right to freely discuss the government's response to the pandemic in the marketplace of ideas, the Biden Administration engaged in a concerted effort to shut down debate, stifle doctors who questioned the prevailing orthodoxy about mandatory mRNA vaccines and threaten social media companies that did not censor content the White House disfavored."

The dystopian censorship in response to COVID is something expected in Communist China or George Orwell's 1984 novel — not in the United States of America.

The Law Is on Our Side

It is undeniable that the government grossly overstepped and violated the Constitution in colluding with Big Tech to silence free speech. The good news is that the law (and an overwhelming amount of information from a thorough investigation) is on our side. **The First Amendment doesn't end when disagreement with the government begins.**

Presenting a perspective contrary to the regime's narrative isn't criminal; it's a right protected by the U.S. Constitution, setting America apart as a bastion of freedom. Policing speech is a direct antithesis to the robust marketplace of ideas our Founders envisioned for the United States.

It is a sad day in this country when Americans fear that publishing conservative views on a public platform will be suppressed by government-influenced censorship intent on drowning out dissenting views. Liberty Counsel is committed to defending First Amendment freedom of speech and will continue engaging in the fight for free speech and against government suppression.

For all the freedom-loving Americans who have been flagged, censored, or shut down over the past few years for disagreeing with the government or questioning "the science," the U.S. Constitution is on our side, and we are fighting in courtrooms nationwide to preserve your voice. **LC**



Liberty Counsel Files Brief in SCOTUS Abortion Pill Case

Liberty Counsel filed one of many important briefs supporting the Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine's case against the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regarding the agency's removal of several critical safety guards for the abortion drug mifepristone.

An alliance of over 30,000 health care professionals is asking the U.S. Supreme Court to uphold an appeals court [ruling](#) that found the FDA acted unlawfully by removing the safeguards and determined the FDA should reinstate the restrictions. Meanwhile the Biden administration argues the decision should be overruled because the drug is "safe," and the loosening of restrictions has not been proven harmful.

SCOTUS has temporarily halted reinstatement of any mifepristone restrictions, allowing the drug to remain widely available until it reviews the case. Liberty Counsel argues for reinstating the drug's restrictions.

The facts speak for themselves. Even with serious side effects harmful to women's health, the FDA removed safety guardrails such as adverse event

“The FDA’s reckless actions have allowed near-unfettered access to mifepristone leading to an explosion of chemical abortions nationwide.”



reporting, in-person doctor visits, follow-up care, and mail-order restrictions. Under the current lax guidelines, a woman could receive abortion pills through the mail and abort a baby at home with zero medical supervision.

“The FDA's reckless actions have allowed near-unfettered access to mifepristone leading to an explosion of chemical abortions nationwide,” said Mat Staver, founder and chairman of Liberty Counsel. “Chemical abortions harm women physically and emotionally and cruelly kill defenseless children in the womb. The FDA can no longer be allowed to circumvent safety laws to allow this deadly drug to destroy more innocent lives.”

This is the first case where the Supreme Court will weigh in on the abortion issue since the 2022 *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* ruling, which overturned *Roe v. Wade* and recognized a constitutional right to abortion does not exist. The High Court heard oral arguments on the abortion pill case on March 26, 2024, and is expected to issue a decision in June. [L](#)

Liberty Counsel at Work



“This proposed abortion amendment is the most extreme because it will wipe out every law regulating abortion. Other than parental notification, no law will survive, not even health and safety regulations. We must mobilize Floridians to vote ‘No’ on this deceptive amendment.”

— Mat Staver, founder and chairman

Florida Supreme Court Rulings On April 1 Set Up Showdown over Unborn Life in Florida

After his Feb. 7 oral argument on the Florida abortion ballot initiative, Liberty Counsel Founder and Chairman Mat Staver shared remarks in front of the state Supreme Court in Tallahassee, Florida. He argued that the Court should reject the proposed amendment because the language violates voter requirements for being “broad, misleading, and deceptive.” By a slim 4-3 majority opinion released April 1, the Florida Supreme Court [ruled](#) that the amendment that proposes to codify unrestricted abortion in the state’s constitution may appear on the November ballot.

In other encouraging news: On the same day, the Court upheld Florida’s 15-week abortion ban in a case where Liberty Counsel filed a pro-life amicus brief. The decision overruled prior abortion opinions and established that there is no right to abortion in the Florida Constitution. Now that the 15-week ban has been upheld, the six-week ban will soon go into effect.