

Surgical Face Masks: No Statistically Significant Benefit Against COVID-19. Danish Study in Annals of Internal Medicine

By [Daniel Horowitz](#)

Theme: [Science and Medicine](#)

Global Research, November 19, 2020

[The Blaze](#) 18 November 2020

Most Western elites are telegraphing the message that we will be forced to cover our humanity with cheap face masks indefinitely. They are mandating that even two-year-olds must wear masks. The [long-term effects on the lungs](#), emotional and behavioral problems, and development of infants and toddlers is enormous. For such an unconstitutional invasion of personal liberty, they are responsible to show us some amazing degree of effectiveness of this cultish ritual. In fact, the data show the opposite.

The much-vaunted Danish mask study was finally [published](#) today in the prestigious Annals of Internal Medicine. Now we know why three medical journals were so averse to publishing its findings. The study completely obliterates the cultish devotion to masks. The results of this massive real-life controlled experiment show that the group that wore surgical masks in April experienced a 0.38% lower infection rate than the control group that did not wear masks. That is about one-third of one percent, which is so low that it could just be statistically random variances that demonstrate no definitive efficacy even to that infinitesimal level.

“The recommendation to wear surgical masks to supplement other public health measures did not reduce the SARS-CoV-2 infection rate among wearers by more than 50% in a community with modest infection rates, some degree of social distancing, and uncommon general mask use,” concluded the authors. “The data were compatible with lesser degrees of self-protection.”

There was a total of roughly 3,000 people in each group of the study, which would make this the largest study ever conducted on the efficacy of mask-wearing. In October, Berlingske, Denmark’s oldest operating daily newspaper, [reported](#) that three major journals – JAMA, New England Journal of Medicine, and Lancet – refused to publish the study.

It appears that the study’s authors had to twist their tongues in order to get this study published by noting that “the estimates were imprecise and statistically compatible with an effect ranging from a 46% decrease to a 23% increase in infection.” They of course had to concede that their study doesn’t definitely rule out the idea that masks could be effective!

Double-negatives in science are just hilarious.

The Danish study had to eat a bunch of mouth worms to get the thing published.

Concluding line:

“...cannot statistically exclude no effect.” pic.twitter.com/xuyJRy4RS6

— Justin Hart (@justin_hart) [November 18, 2020](#)

So, we’ve gone from masks being more effective than a vaccine to no incontrovertible evidence that they will ever work in some way.

It’s important to note that several [studies](#) have theorized that the virus might have gotten more contagious in recent months than it was in the Spring. Assuming there is validity to that theory, this Danish study, which was conducted in April and May, would demonstrate that masks are ineffective even against the less contagious version of the virus.

Then again, there is nothing new about mask-wearing to anyone paying attention. It has long been the [policy of OSHA](#) that respirators, such as an N-95s, are the *minimum* standard for personal protective equipment. We have always known that surgical masks, which have pores [about 30 times larger than virus particles](#) and are not form-fitted around the edges, cannot protect against airborne viruses such as the flu. Plus, most people, especially those who are indoors for a long period of time, such as in school and business settings, will tend to wear more comfortable cloth masks, which are even less effective and risk spreading the virus even more.

Which is why nobody should pay attention to the disclaimer in the study, which the authors clearly had to write in order to get the study accepted:

The findings, however, should not be used to conclude that a recommendation for everyone to wear masks in the community would not be effective in reducing SARS-CoV-2 infections, because the trial did not test the role of masks in source control of SARS-CoV-2 infection. During the study period, authorities did not recommend face mask use outside hospital settings and mask use was rare in community settings. This means that study participants’ exposure was overwhelmingly to persons not wearing masks.

This is a fair point – that at the time, most other people outside of the study group in Denmark were not wearing masks. The problem is we’ve seen the virus spread to everyone in the ensuing months, including in places with 100% mask compliance. In a [recent CDC study](#), 85% of those convalescent COVID patients surveyed reported that they wore masks always or most of the time during the lead-up to their infection period. Thus, the Danish study results clearly corroborate what we see with our own eyes in all environments.

We have seen this result from over six months of real-life experience in the world and even in [the military](#) with 100% compliance. Mask-wearing is the only edict that can result in zero efficacy and then use that lack of efficacy against the virus, as witnessed by the massive spread, as further pretext ... to double down on mask-wearing! My son was yelled at for slipping his mask down in a dentist’s office for a few seconds when the doctor and hygienist would literally be in his mouth for a much longer period of time. Have we ever experienced something this destructive and illogical in our lifetimes?

*

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.

Featured image is by Engin Akyurt from Pixabay

The original source of this article is [The Blaze](#)
Copyright © [Daniel Horowitz](#), [The Blaze](#), 2020

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Daniel Horowitz](#)

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