

# Avslöjat: 7 av 10 "vaccinerade" CDC-anställda fick covid

Analys av [Dr Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fakta kontrollerat

5 april 2022

## BERÄTTELSE I ETT ÖGONKAST

- › Data från Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) avslöjar att 70 % av de vaccinerade amerikanska Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-anställda fick genombrott i COVID-infektioner i augusti 2021
- › Den 3 mars 2022 höll CDC-chefen Dr. Rochelle Walensky en presentation vid Washington University, under vilken hon erkände att hon hade lärt sig om Pfizer-skottets effektivitet på 95 % från CNN, som baserades på ett pressmeddelande från Pfizer
- › Walensky hävdar att hon inte var medveten om att skotten kunde förlora effektivitet med tiden. Ändå har forskare runt om i världen länge vetat att coronavirus är mycket benägna att mutera, och mutationer är kända för att påverka ett vaccins effektivitet
- › Walensky har också anklagat allmänheten för att tro att "vetenskap är svart och vitt" när "vetenskapen är grå". Samtidigt har alla som har haft en åsikt som skiljer sig från den vanliga berättelsen censurerats för att kväva den vetenskapliga debatten, och Walensky har aldrig uttalat sig mot detta försök att förhindra en "svartvit" presentation av vetenskapen
- › Walensky har också offentligt misskrediterat Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS), som administreras samtidigt av FDA och CDC. VAERS avslöjar att COVID-jabs är de farligaste vaccinerna som någonsin skapats

Den 2 februari 2022 lämnade Informed Consent Action Network (ICAN) in en Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) begäran <sup>1</sup> till US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, och begärde register som visar "antal COVID-19-infektioner, och av dessa, antalet genombrottsinfektioner" bland CDC-anställda i augusti 2021.

Genombrottsinfektioner avser infektioner som uppstår hos dem som har fått en eller flera covid-jabs. Den 28 mars 2022 utfärdade ICAN en juridisk uppdatering, <sup>2</sup> om att de hade fått ett officiellt svar, <sup>3</sup> visar att cirka 70 % av alla fall av covid-19 bland CDC-anställda i augusti 2021 inträffade bland "vaccinerade" anställda.

## 7 av 10 "vaccinerade" CDC-anställda fick covid

Följande är de officiella siffrorna för juni, juli och augusti 2021, listade i FOIA-svaret: <sup>4</sup>

	Antal positiva rapporter	Antal genombrottsfall
juni 2021	4	0
juli 2021	18	10
augusti 2021	36	25

Som rapporterats av ICAN: <sup>5</sup>

*"Nu vet vi inte procentandelen av CDC-anställda som vaccinerades i augusti 2021, men om CDC:s vaccinationsfrekvens återspeglar den för vuxna i USA, var den mycket mindre än 70%.*

*Men även om mer än 70 % av CDC-anställda var vaccinerade, borde det faktum att i slutet av sommaren 2021, 70 % av deras covid-19-positiva anställda var vaccinerade, ha varit en chockerande siffra och borde ha fungerat som en väckarklocka till CDC om misslyckandet med dessa vacciner för att förhindra infektion."*

## "CYB ursäkter"

Enligt ICAN inkluderade CDC:s svar "en hel massa varningar, det vill säga "dölj din rumpa" ursäkter" för varför antalet genombrottsinfektioner var så hög, inklusive att många CDC-anställda distansarbetade vid den tiden och inte behövde rapportera sina vaccinationsstatus och/eller eventuella testresultat.

Enligt den amerikanska senatoren Bill Cassidy, som frågade CDC-chefen Dr. Rochelle Walensky om andelen vaccinerade CDC-anställda under en senatsutfrågning den 4 november 2021 (ovan), uppskattningsvis 75 % av CDC-anställda arbetade på distans under pandemin.

Walensky hävdade att hon inte visste det verkliga antalet, och FOIA-svaret angav inte heller hur många som faktiskt arbetade på distans. Hur som helst, "dessa ursäkter är inte övertygande", säger ICAN och tillägger: <sup>6</sup>

*"Det finns ingen anledning att tro att CDC-anställda inte skulle avslöja sin vaccinationsstatus. Det finns heller ingen anledning att tro att de vaccinerade skulle vara mer benägna att rapportera att de är covid-19-positiva. Om något skulle de vaccinerade ha varit mindre benägna att rapportera att de är covid-19-positiva med tanke på att, som CDC själv säger, "personer som har vaccinerats är möjligen mindre benägna att bli testade."*

## **Walensky insåg inte att COVID Jab-effektiviteten kunde avta**

Intressant nog, den 3 mars 2022 – samma dag som CDC svarade på ICAN:s FOIA-begäran om data om genombrottsinfektioner bland CDC-anställda – höll Walensky en presentation för medicinska studenter vid Washington University under vilken hon erkände att hon hade lärt sig om Pfizer-skottets effektivitet från CNN. <sup>7</sup>

CNN's report, in turn, was based on a press release from Pfizer, which stated that the jab was 95% effective. Walensky was not told, she said, that the shots might lose effectiveness over time (and a short amount of time, at that).

These are truly shocking admissions. Writing in The Disinformation Chronicle, investigative journalist Paul Thacker discussed the timeline of events that led to Walensky believing the Pfizer vaccine was 95% effective. <sup>8</sup>

He concluded Walensky was likely referring to a November 18, 2020, CNN report<sup>9</sup> by Maggie Fox and Amanda Sealy, who appear to have done little to augment the story after pulling information from a Pfizer press release published the same day.<sup>10</sup>

So, what we have here is a remarkable instance where a story in CNN, regurgitated from a press release, appears to have influenced Walensky's thinking about the injections and the future guidance from the CDC. As noted by Thacker:<sup>11</sup>

*"The Pfizer press release ... became CDC pandemic policy ... [Y]ou rarely get such direct evidence of a corporation influencing federal policy by laundering their press release through media outlets like CNN. Further, republishing press releases seems a pervasive practice in how the media covers COVID-19 vaccines – meaning, they don't do much reporting. This has been obvious since late 2020."*

## Does the CDC Rely on Science at All?

Walensky's apparent ignorance about the potential for waning effectiveness is equally shocking. Scientists around the world have long known that coronaviruses are very prone to mutation, and mutations are known to affect a vaccine's effectiveness.

Nearly every scientist in the world expected the virus to mutate, because that's what viruses do. Yet Walensky did not consider this possibility,<sup>12</sup> despite having been a professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School with years of experience dealing with viruses.<sup>13</sup>

Even those with no expertise in virology suspected mutations might impact the shot's effectiveness. For example, two days after Walensky's speech at Washington University, former New York Times reporter Alex Berenson wrote,<sup>14</sup> "She's right. Nobody could possibly have known variants might be a problem."

Underneath, he reposted a tweet dated January 20, 2021, in which he had stated, "Spoiler alert: the vaccines probably don't work against at least one new variant and they're going to want you to get vaccinated again next fall."

By August, Twitter had permanently banned Berenson for "repeated violations of our COVID-19 misinformation rules."<sup>15</sup> Ironically, the tweet that put Twitter over the edge compared the COVID jab to a "'therapeutic' with a limited window of efficacy ..." – a statement that I and many other experts would agree is 100% factual and true.

## Gaslighting at Its Finest

During her Washington University appearance, Walensky also alluded to people in the media who “reject evidence,” saying,<sup>16</sup> “There are a lot of people who are using their voice that may or may not be helpful for public health,” and that this “decreases public health in general.” For this reason, “we have to be clear” about our messaging, she added.

However, Walensky’s admissions during that talk really make one wonder who is making our public health decisions, and why. It’s difficult to imagine that one of the largest and most powerful health care agencies in the U.S. is led by a director who is basing her decisions on CNN reports and drug company press releases — and by doing so, is misleading the public. Consider that during this talk, she:

- Admitted learning about the Pfizer 95% efficacy — information which was then used to formulate CDC guidelines — from a CNN report, which was nothing more than a republished press release from Big Pharma.
- Claimed the CDC is transparently publishing data in a “pedal-to-the-metal” scenario<sup>17</sup> even though The New York Times, only days earlier, had revealed the CDC is withholding crucial data from the public.<sup>18</sup>
- Claimed “no one told her” that the virus might mutate and render the vaccine ineffective,<sup>19</sup> yet during a Pfizer earnings call, held February 2, 2021, a financial analyst was astute enough to ask Pfizer how the 95% efficacy rate might change in light of mutations.<sup>20</sup>

Walensky also accused the public of believing that “science is black and white,” when in fact, “science is gray.” Meanwhile, anyone who has held an opinion that differs from the mainstream narrative has been censored and fake “fact-checked” so the debate over science would never see the light of day. Walensky has never spoken out against this effort to prevent a “black and white” presentation of science.

Her colleague, Dr. Anthony Fauci — who as director of the National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious Diseases has been the face of COVID-19 for the White House — has even gone on record claiming that HE is the science, and that attacking his

recommendations is an attack on science itself.<sup>21</sup> Walensky, for some reason, never corrected him either.

## Walensky Has Tried to Undermine Confidence in VAERS

Walensky has also publicly discredited the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS), which is coadministered by the FDA and her own agency, the CDC.<sup>22</sup> During her January 11, 2022, testimony before the Senate,<sup>23</sup> Walensky stated that any death after a vaccine could be reported to VAERS.

Specifically, she used the example of an individual who gets vaccinated and then gets hit by a car and dies. She clearly implied that such a death would be recorded in VAERS and logged as an adverse reaction to the vaccine. But this is patently false.

First of all, adverse events are not automatically reported and, certainly, obvious accidents are not entered into the system as a suspected vaccine side effect.

As reported by Health Impact News,<sup>24</sup> there are about 18 reports in VAERS that include "road traffic accident," but most if not all relate to an adverse event, such as a heart attack, occurring while driving. They were not hit by someone else and then entered into the system. As noted by Pam Long in a January 12, 2022, Twitter thread:<sup>25</sup>

*"If anyone in public health utters 'a person can get hit by a car & report their death to VAERS' you need stop them, in any public meeting, and demand they explain what motive would a physician have to inflate VAERS reports with car accidents or any unrelated mortality?"*

*Despite Walensky's & Fauci's cliché testimony to Congress, not one person 'got hit by a car' & reported their own death to VAERS as a vaccine injury. Most reports are filed by medical professionals, using diagnostic language about drug reactions."*

VAERS was designed and created as an early warning system, and it works well for that. While it's true that anyone can file a report, it's time-consuming, requires knowledge of medical details that a patient oftentimes won't have, and there are

penalties for filing a false report. There's absolutely no reason to suspect, let alone assume, that people are filing false reports just to make the shots look bad.

The fact of the matter is that VAERS is showing the COVID shots are the most dangerous vaccines ever created. It's hard to imagine why Walensky would want to undermine confidence in this system – unless she wants everyone to simply ignore the warning signals it's giving us.

## **CDC Has Had a Clear Pro-Pharma Agenda**

During the November 4, 2021, Senate hearing, featured in the video at the top of this article, Cassidy also highlighted another area where the CDC has acted as if it's intentionally disregarding basic science, namely that of natural immunity.

Cassidy cited research showing 92% of those who recover from COVID have T-cells, B-cells and antibodies that provide robust immunity for at least six to eight months. Yet the CDC has refused to acknowledge natural immunity, saying those who recover still need to get a COVID shot.

Cassidy noted that the CDC has access to tens of thousands of electronic health records (EHRs) and patient identifiable data as to who tested positive and had symptomatic infection. With that data, they could easily confirm or disprove claims that natural infection confers adequate protection against reinfection. And, if confirmed, those who have had symptomatic infection could then be excluded from vaccine mandates.

So, why has the CDC not done any prospective studies when they have patient identifiable EHRs that they can use to precisely determine who gets reinfected and who doesn't? According to Cassidy, the only reason we don't know whether natural immunity is as good as the COVID jab is "because we decided not to look."

Walensky's replies to Cassidy's questions are as telling as the admissions in her Washington University presentation. There's an awful lot she and the CDC apparently don't know, including core basics.

Can a virus mutate? Walensky "wasn't told" it could and therefore didn't think it would. Can a mutation affect the effectiveness of the jab? Walensky wasn't aware of such a possibility and CDC recommendations have reflected that ignorance.

How many CDC personnel are working remotely? She has no idea. How many of the CDC's employees have been jabbed? She has no clue. Why has basic research not been done to determine whether natural immunity is as adequate as the jab? She provides some circular argument about not having unbiased correlative data, even though Cassidy just told her how the data they already have could be used to find this answer.

She pats herself on the back for her agency's transparency, while evidence is presented showing the CDC is intentionally withholding crucial vaccine data. She says science is a gray zone while simultaneously accusing people of spreading misinformation when they don't agree with her.

She lies about the types of adverse events that are reported to VAERS in what appears to be a blatant effort to undermine this valuable safety tool, and admits to making public health decisions based on Pfizer press releases instead. The fact that 7 in 10 vaccinated CDC employees got breakthrough infections didn't even clue Walensky in to the possibility that the COVID jab might be useless.

Som en sidoanteckning avslöjades fler bevis för detta nyligen av Princess Cruises, som rapporterade ett utbrott ombord på Ruby Princess i mars 2022, trots en 100 % vaccinationsfrekvens bland både besättning och passagerare, plus bevis på ett negativt covid-test före ombordstigning . <sup>26</sup>

Hur ska vi kunna lita på CDC när de till synes ingenting vet om något som betyder något, inte följer vetenskapen och skyddar Big Pharma till den grad att de undergräver förtroendet för sina egna säkerhetsverktyg? Jag låter dig vara domare.