

Smoking Gun: Dr. Fauci States COVID Test Has Fatal Flaw; Confession from the “Beloved” Expert of Experts

The COVID delusion is finished, blown apart

By [Jon Rappoport](#)

Global Research, July 16, 2022

[Jon Rappoport's Blog](#) 6 November 2020

Region: [USA](#)

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

This article was originally published on November 9, 2020

OK, here we go. Smoking gun. Jackpot.

Right from the horse's mouth. Right from the man we're told is the number-one COVID expert in the nation. What Fauci says is golden truth.

Well, how about THIS?

July 16, 2020, podcast, “*This Week in Virology*”: Tony Fauci makes a point of saying the PCR COVID test is useless and misleading when the test is run at “35 cycles or higher.” A positive result, indicating infection, cannot be accepted or believed.

Here, in techno-speak, is an excerpt from Fauci's key quote ([starting at about the 4-minute mark](#) [1]):

“...If you get [perform the test at] a cycle threshold of 35 or more...the chances of it being replication-confident [aka accurate] are miniscule...you almost never can culture virus [detect a true positive result] from a 37 threshold cycle...even 36...”

Each “cycle” of the test is a quantum leap in amplification and magnification of the test specimen taken from the patient.

Too many cycles, and the test will turn up all sorts of irrelevant material that will be wrongly interpreted as relevant.

That's called a false positive.

What Fauci failed to say on the video is: the FDA, which authorizes the test for public use, recommends the test should be run up to 40 cycles. Not 35.

Therefore, all labs in the US that follow the FDA guideline are knowingly or unknowingly participating in fraud. Fraud on a monstrous level, because...

Millions of Americans are being told they are infected with the virus on the basis of a false

positive result, and...

The total number of COVID cases in America—which is based on the test—is a gross falsity.

The lockdowns and other restraining measures are based on these fraudulent case numbers.

Let me back up and run that by you again. Fauci says the test is useless when it's run at 35 cycles or higher. The FDA says run the test up to 40 cycles, in order to determine whether the virus is there. This is the crime in a nutshell.

If anyone in the White House has a few brain cells to rub together, pick up a giant bullhorn and start revealing the truth to the American people.

"Hello, America, you've been tricked, lied to, conned, and taken for a devastating ride. On the basis of fake science, the country was locked down."

If anyone in the Congress has a few brain cells operating, pull Fauci into a televised hearing and, in ten minutes, make mincemeat out of the fake science that has driven this whole foul, stench-ridden assault on the US economy and its citizens.

All right, here are two chunks of evidence for what I've written above. First, we have a CDC quote on the FDA website, [in a document titled](#) [2]: "*CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel For Emergency Use Only.*" See page 35. This document is marked, "Effective: 07/13/20." That means, even though the virus is being referred to by its older name, the document is still relevant as of July 2020. "For Emergency Use Only" refers to the fact that the FDA has certified the PCR test under a traditional category called "Emergency Use Authorization."

FDA: "...a specimen is considered positive for 2019-nCoV [virus] if all 2019-nCoV marker (N1, N2) cycle threshold growth curves cross the threshold line within 40.00 cycles (< 40.00 Ct)."

Naturally, MANY testing labs reading this guideline would conclude, "Well, to see if the virus is there in a patient, we should run the test all the way to 40 cycles. That's the official advice."

Then we have a New York Times article (August 29/updated September 17) headlined: ["Your coronavirus test is positive. Maybe it shouldn't be."](#) [3] Here are money quotes:

"Most tests set the limit at 40 [cycles]. A few at 37."

"Set the limit" would usually mean, "We're going to look all the way to 40 cycles, to see if the virus is there."

The Times: "This number of amplification cycles needed to find the virus, called the cycle threshold, is never included in the results sent to doctors and coronavirus patients..."

Boom. That's the capper, the grand finale. Labs don't or won't reveal their collusion in this crime.

Get the picture?

I hope so.

If a lawyer won't go to court with all this, or if a judge won't pay attention and see the light, they should be stripped of their jobs and sent to the Arctic to sell snow.

*

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.

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](#).

Notes

[1] https://youtu.be/a_Vy6fgaBPE?t=260

[2] <https://www.fda.gov/media/134922/download>

[3] nytimes.com/2020/08/29/health/coronavirus-testing.html

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](#)

Articles by: [Jon Rappoport](#)

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