

CDC/FDA Smoking Gun of Smoking Guns

By [Jon Rappoport](#)

Global Research, March 10, 2022

[Jon Rappoport's Blog](#) 9 March 2022

Region: [USA](#)

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

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@globalresearch_crg](#) and Twitter at [@crglobalization](#).

They confess: they had no virus when they concocted the test for the virus; they “contrived” a model by pretending to find what they wanted to find; it’s called a self-fulfilling prophecy

This is the con and the crime that drove millions of lives, and economies, into ruin

Quiz: If an agency of the federal government revealed they had no basis for constructing a diagnostic test that was used on millions of people; but the test was the cornerstone of a national lockdown; and the lockdown drove the economy off a cliff; and destroyed millions of lives; however, NOW, that agency says, they DO have a basis for the test; would you buy what they’re selling?

If your answer is yes, you’re in good company; the company I call Blind, Ignorant, Denialist, Hoaxing Journalists.

The CDC issued a document that bulges with devastating admissions.

The release is titled, [“07/21/2021: Lab Alert: Changes to CDC RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 Testing.”](#) It begins explosively:

“After December 31, 2021, CDC will withdraw the request to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) of the CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel, the assay first introduced in February 2020 for detection of SARS-CoV-2 only. CDC is providing this advance notice for clinical laboratories to have adequate time to select and implement one of the many FDA-authorized alternatives.”

Many people believe this means the CDC is giving up on the PCR test as a means of “detecting the virus.” The CDC isn’t saying that at all.

They’re saying the PCR technology will continue to be used, but they’re replacing what the test is looking FOR with a better “reference sample.” A better marker. A better target. A better piece of RNA supposedly derived from SARS-CoV-2.

CDC/FDA are confessing there has been a PROBLEM with the PCR test which has been used to detect the virus, starting in February of 2020—right up to this minute.

In other words, the millions and millions of “COVID cases” based on the PCR test in use are all suspect. Actually, that statement is too generous. Every test result of every PCR test should be thrown out.

To confirm this, the CDC document links to an FDA release titled, [“SARS-CoV-2 Reference Panel Comparative Data.”](#) Here is a killer quote:

“During the early months of the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, clinical specimens [of the virus] were not readily available to developers of IVDs [in vitro diagnostics] to detect SARS-CoV-2. Therefore, the FDA authorized IVDs based on available data from contrived samples generated from a range of SARS-CoV-2 material sources (for example, gene specific RNA, synthetic RNA, or whole genome viral RNA) for analytical and clinical performance evaluation. While validation using these contrived specimens provided a measure of confidence in test performance at the beginning of the pandemic, it is not feasible to precisely compare the performance of various tests that used contrived specimens because each test validated performance using samples derived from different gene specific, synthetic, or genomic nucleic acid sources.”

Translation: We, at the CDC, did not have a specimen of the SARS-CoV-2 virus when we concocted the PCR test for SARS-CoV-2. Yes, it’s unbelievable, right? And that’s the test we’ve been using all along. So we CONTRIVED samples of the virus. We fabricated. We lied. We made up (invented) synthetic gene sequences and we SAID these sequences HAD TO BE close to the sequence of SARS-CoV-2, without having the faintest idea of what we were doing, because, again, we didn’t have an actual specimen of the virus. We had no proof THERE WAS something called SARS-CoV-2.

This amazing FDA document goes to say the Agency has granted emergency approval to 59 different PCR tests since the beginning of the (fake) pandemic. 59. And, “...it is not feasible to precisely compare the performance of various tests that used contrived specimens because each test validated performance using samples derived from different gene specific, synthetic, or genomic nucleic acid sources.”

Translation: Each of the 59 different PCR tests for SARS-CoV-2 told different lies and concocted different fabrications about the genetic makeup of the virus—the virus we didn’t have. Obviously, then, these tests would give unreliable results. THE PCR TESTS USED CONTRIVED SPECIMENS OF THE VIRUS WE DIDN’T HAVE.

BUT, don’t worry, be happy, because NOW, the CDC and the FDA say, they really do have actual virus samples of SARS-CoV-2 from patients; they have better targets for the PCR test, and labs should start gearing up for the new and improved tests.

In other words, they were lying THEN, but they’re not lying NOW. They were “contriving,” but now they’re telling the truth.

If you believe that, I have Fountain of Youth water for sale, extracted from the lead-contaminated system of Flint, Michigan.

Here, once again, I report virology’s version of “we isolated the virus”:

They have a soup they make in their labs.

This soup contains human and monkey cells, toxic chemicals and drugs, and all sorts of other random genetic material. Because the cells start to die, the researchers ASSUME a bit of mucus from a patient they dropped in the soup is doing the killing, and THE VIRUS must be the killer agent in the mucus.

This assumption is entirely unwarranted. The drugs and chemicals could be doing the cell-killing, and the researchers are also starving the cells of vital nutrients, and that starvation could kill the cells.

There is no proof that SARS-CoV-2 is in the soup, or that it is doing the cell-killing, or that it exists.

Yet the researchers call cell-death “isolation of the virus.”

To say this is a non-sequitur is a vast understatement. In their universe, “We assume, without proof, we have the virus buried in a soup in a dish in the lab” equals, “We’ve separated the virus from all surrounding material.”

Virology equals “how to spread bullshit for a living and scare the world.” Other than that, it’s perfect.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @globalresearch_crg and Twitter at @crglobalization. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums, etc.

The author of three explosive collections, [THE MATRIX REVEALED](#), [EXIT FROM THE MATRIX](#), and [POWER OUTSIDE THE MATRIX](#), Jon was a candidate for a US Congressional seat in the 29th District of California. He maintains a consulting practice for private clients, the purpose of which is the expansion of personal creative power. Nominated for a Pulitzer Prize, he has worked as an investigative reporter for 30 years, writing articles on politics, medicine, and health for CBS Healthwatch, LA Weekly, Spin Magazine, Stern, and other newspapers and magazines in the US and Europe. Jon has delivered lectures and seminars on global politics, health, logic, and creative power to audiences around the world. You can sign up for his free NoMoreFakeNews emails [here](#) or his free OutsideTheRealityMachine emails [here](#).

Featured image is from NaturalNews.com

The original source of this article is [Jon Rappoport's Blog](#)
Copyright © [Jon Rappoport](#), [Jon Rappoport's Blog](#), 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

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

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