

# The CDC Mandate Masks Study: Is the CDC About to be Canceled by Google and Facebook for “COVID Heresy”?

By [Simon Black](#)

Global Research, March 09, 2021  
[Sovereign Man](#) 8 March 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Media Disinformation](#),  
[Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles **can be read in 27 languages by activating the “Translate Website”** drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

\*\*\*

*On Friday afternoon, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (still called the CDC, even though they added a ‘P’) released [a heretical report](#) about mask-wearing and COVID-19.*

The report, authored by at least a dozen medical doctors, PhD researchers, and, bizarrely, a handful of attorneys, examined how mask mandates across the US affected COVID cases and death rates.

You’d think with all of the media propaganda about mask effectiveness... and all the virtue signaling, with politicians and reporters appearing on live TV wearing masks... that the data would prove incontrovertibly and overwhelmingly that masks have saved the world.

But that’s not what the report says.



Early Release / Vol. 70

Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report

March 5, 2021

## Association of State-Issued Mask Mandates and Allowing On-Premises Restaurant Dining with County-Level COVID-19 Case and Death Growth Rates — United States, March 1–December 31, 2020

Gery P. Guy Jr., PhD<sup>1</sup>; Florence C. Lee, MPH<sup>1</sup>; Gregory Sunshine, JD<sup>1</sup>; Russell McCord, JD<sup>1</sup>; Mara Howard-Williams, JD<sup>2</sup>; Lyudmyla Kompaniyets, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Christopher Dunphy, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Maxim Gakh, JD<sup>3</sup>; Regen Weber<sup>1</sup>; Erin Sauber-Schatz, PhD<sup>1</sup>; John D. Omura, MD<sup>1</sup>; Greta M. Massetti, PhD<sup>1</sup>; CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Mitigation Policy Analysis Unit; CDC Public Health Law Program

According to the CDC’s analysis, between March 1 and December 31 last year, statewide mask mandates were in effect in 2,313 of the 3,142 counties in the United States.

And, looking at the county-by-county data, the CDC concludes that mask mandates were associated with an average 1.32% decrease in the growth rates of COVID-19 cases and

deaths during the first 100 days after the mask policy was implemented.

Wait, what? Only 1.32%?

You read that correctly, they didn't misplace the decimal: according to the federal government agency that is responsible for managing the COVID-19 pandemic, the difference between mask mandates and no mask mandate is literally just a 1.32% difference.

And bear in mind, it's entirely possible that the real figure is even lower than that, given all the questionable COVID statistics.

For example, the CDC reports that influenza cases in the United States have dropped to almost zero in the 2020-2021 flu season, down from 56 MILLION the previous year.

It's amazing they expect anyone to take this data seriously.

Are we honestly supposed to believe that the flu has been eradicated? Or is it possible, that, maybe just maybe, at least *some* influenza cases have been misdiagnosed as COVID?

If that's the case, then the real impact of masks on COVID growth rates is potentially much lower than 1.32%.

Even the CDC seems to understand this, because at the end of its report, they inspidly conclude by stating that mask mandates "**have the potential** to slow the spread of COVID-19. . ." [the bold is mine, obviously]

Really? "Potential"? That's HERESY! And an obvious contradiction to WHO guidance. It makes me wonder whether Google and Facebook are gearing up to censor this report, given they have self-appointed themselves as the Ministry of Truth.

Frankly it's pretty incredible that the data was too weak for the CDC to make a clear assertion about the benefits of mask mandates.

(though I did say there were a couple of lawyers who co-authored this paper... and using non-committal language like "potential" certainly sounds like typical weasel lawyer-speak.)

Now, please don't misunderstand the point of this letter. I'm not here to bash masks or say that they don't work, or go on some anti-mask rant.

The point is that I'm pro-data. And pro-reason.

Public health policies come with consequences. There are always costs, and there are (hopefully) benefits.

The CDC has just published an official analysis of the benefits, quantified at precisely 1.32%.

What are the costs of their decisions? Well there's plenty of data about that too.

For example, [a recent study](#) published earlier this month in the premier scientific journal *Nature* shows that Americans who wear masks are more likely engage in riskier activities, like, you know, leaving the house.

The study conclude that mask mandates “lead to risk compensation behavior” and mask wearers “spend 11-24 fewer minutes at home on average and increase visits to some commercial locations- most notably restaurants, which are a high-risk location.”

Other consequences are more grim.

There have been several studies which chronicle the alarming rise in severe mental health issues, including a spike in youth suicide, as a result of various public health policies, including mask mandates and lockdowns.

For example, another study published in *Nature* from early January reported that, in late 2020, suicide rates among children in Japan jumped 49%.

And the US government’s Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service (SAMHSA) reported an incredible 890% increase in call volume to its nationwide suicide hotline last April.

Then there are the economic consequences to consider: Do mask mandates boost the economy by giving people more confidence to go out and spend? Or do mask mandates compel more people to stay home to avoid the hassle, and hence reduce economic activity?

There’s still no conclusive analysis on the subject. But you’d think that policymakers would want to know.

You’d think that they would look at all the data, all the pro’s and con’s, economic consequences, public health consequences, etc., and make an informed, rational decision.

But that doesn’t seem to happen anymore.

There can be no rational discourse on the topic. You’re not allowed to ask any questions or express any intellectual dissent, otherwise you’ll be denounced as a conspiracy theorist.

You have one job: obey. It’s not even about ‘trusting the science’ anymore, as we’ve been told to do over and over again during the pandemic. Because now the science tells us that mask mandates “have the potential” to reduce Covid growth rates by just 1.32%.

Not that you’ll hear this in the media.

There actually was a bonanza of coverage over the weekend about the CDC’s new report. The *Washington Post* headline read “After state lift restrictions, CDC says mask mandates can reduce deaths”.

The *New York Times* reported that “Wearing masks, the [CDC] study reported, was linked to fewer infections with the coronavirus and Covid-19 deaths.”

NBC called the report “strong evidence that mask mandates can slow the spread of the coronavirus. . .”

But very little of the media coverage bothered to mention the real data, i.e. the marginal 1.32% reduction in growth rates.

Just like the CDC’s influenza data, it’s incredible that the media expects to be taken seriously, or that they pass themselves off as an objective, unbiased source of information.

\*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

*James (aka Simon Black) is an international investor, entrepreneur, and founder of Sovereign Man. His free daily e-letter Notes from the Field is about using the experiences from his life and travels to help you achieve more freedom, make more money, keep more of it, and protect it all from bankrupt governments.*

The original source of this article is [Sovereign Man](#)  
Copyright © [Simon Black](#), [Sovereign Man](#), 2021

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Simon Black](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)