

# **How the CDC Shows Complete Disregard for Science**

**Pamela A. Popper, President  
Wellness Forum Health**

I have said from the beginning of the COVID debacle that eventually the mainstream media would turn on its government and pharmaceutical masters in order to save themselves from extinction. While many of us are furious about censorship and the constant barrage of pandering propaganda, there is some satisfaction in knowing that the media has taken a major hit as a result of its skewed reporting. Ratings are down, numbers of viewers continue to decline, and since revenues are based on ratings and viewers, income is dropping too.

Thus, I was not surprised when the *New York Times* started shifting the narrative toward the end of 2021, publishing some truthful articles about topics that were previously highly censored like vaccines. One such article covered vaccine boosters and reported on some of the discomfort many scientists and health advisors expressed about the approval process.

## **The Approval Process**

The Centers for Disease Control Advisory Committee on Immunization Practice (or ACIP) meets periodically to provide advice and guidance on the use of vaccines in the U.S. It has met several times to discuss COVID vaccines and make recommendations.

According to the *Times*, many members of ACIP think that the vast majority of Americans do not need boosters. Some of them report that they had to make difficult choices about the Moderna and Johnson and Johnson boosters with limited information. Some scientists stated that they felt "...compelled to vote for the shots because of the way the federal agencies framed the questions they were asked to consider." Others said that they were afraid to confuse the public by dissenting, or that they voted not to approve based on the evidence but were overruled.

According to Dr. Sarah Long, a pediatric infectious disease expert and a member of the committee, "These are not evidence-based recommendations."

## **Evidence Really Does Not Matter**

The official position of the FDA and CDC is that older adults, people with certain health conditions, and those whose jobs and living conditions result in regular exposure to SARS-CoV-2 should get a booster dose of any of the three vaccines currently available in the U.S.

However Dr. Matthew Daley, senior investigator at Kaiser Permanente and a committee member says, "I don't think that we have evidence that everyone in those groups needs a booster today."

But lack of evidence did not stop Dr. Long or Dr. Daley from voting to recommend boosters. They stated that they were afraid that not doing so might lead some Americans to conclude that the vaccines are not effective. In other words, their decision had more to do with perpetuating the myth that vaccines are needed than following the scientific evidence to a logical conclusion to recommend against boosters.

Even when committee members vote based on evidence, the government often overrides them. For example, when ACIP reviewed evidence for the Pfizer-BioNTech booster in September 2021, the booster recommendation for people whose jobs placed them at higher risk did not pass. But Rochelle Walensky overruled her advisors and recommended that people with high-risk jobs get the booster anyway. Why? No explanation was provided.

### **Even Pro-Vax Docs Express Concern About the Process**

Paul Offit is a rabid promoter of vaccines, and once said that 10,000 doses of vaccines could be delivered to a baby without harm. His salary at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia is funded by vaccine maker Merck. He is a member of the FDA's vaccine advisory committee. Offit says, "You can see the hesitancy in all this. It's because in our hearts, I think people don't quite agree with this notion of a booster dose." He goes on to say, "The door just got bigger and bigger and bigger, it got wider and wider with each step. The companies got what they wanted, the administration got what they wanted."

Offit's statement was clear. This process had nothing to do with reviewing scientific evidence and everything to do with making vaccine makers richer and pleasing the Biden administration.

### **Everything But Evidence Was Considered**

Many experts were concerned about limited data on safety and efficacy of booster shots. Dr. Kathleen Dowling, a CDC scientist, stated that the data for Moderna and Johnson and Johnson vaccines was "of very low quality."

Some experts reported that they felt that they had to vote for booster shots for Moderna and J&J because they had already voted to recommend boosters of the Pfizer vaccine and did not want Americans who had the other shots to be left out.

Tufts University Professor Dr. Cory Meissner expressed his concerns, stating, "The problem that troubled me is that we don't know if boosters are necessary." However,

he adds that "if you are going to do it for one group, I think fairness kind of dictates you have to do it for all the groups."

Several panelists who did not want to be identified said that there was no choice but to approve the boosters since Biden had promised them to all adults. Dr. Long, who was willing to speak out said "We are in a very difficult position to do much of anything other than what everybody has already announced that we've done." She added that some members of the administration only "pay lip service to science and the evidence."

Other experts weighed in, agreeing that Biden's promise made it difficult for agencies to review data objectively. Dr. Celine Gounder, another infectious disease expert said, "The perception is that the horse is out of the barn, and there's not really much you can do at this point." She says that mixed signals between the White House and Federal scientists is not ok.

Apparently the scientific community has degenerated to the point that it acknowledges that its job is to agree with politicians, not to operate independently. and make decisions based on evidence.

### **A Disturbing Bottom Line**

The *New York Times* article reveals a highly flawed process. The primary factors influencing recommendations for boosters were:

- pleasing the president – after all, he said everyone could have a booster so it's important to deliver on his promise regardless of what the scientific evidence shows
- equal opportunity for boosters – if one is approved, then all should be, again regardless of what the scientific evidence shows
- their desire to do anything to make sure that the public remains confident in COVID vaccines – even if that meant approving boosters without solid evidence to support the decision

Personally, I'm furious about this and you should be too. These sycophants who call themselves scientists, abdicated their responsibility to the public while enriching drug companies and pandering to government bureaucrats. And while this is going on, those of us who do think critically have to endure being labeled as lunatic fringe who can't be reasoned with because we won't agree to the vaccines or the boosters due to lack of evidence.

There is no trust left in science because the term "science" has been perverted for commercial interests and to facilitate the takeover of the world by criminal globalists who hate humans. Thankfully, the corrupt media is waking up to the fact that something is terribly wrong. Maybe the sheep will wake up too. We can only hope.

Apoorva Mandavilli. Are Vaccine Boosters Widely Needed? Some Federal Advisors Have Misgivings. *New York Times* November 12 2021

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/25/health/covid-boosters-cdc-fda.html>

Sheryl Atkisson "How Independent Are Vaccine Defenders?"

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/how-independent-are-vaccine-defenders/>