

Clueless CDC Admits They Never Suspected Waning Vaccines

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

✓ Fact Checked

March 21, 2022

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › March 3, 2022, CDC director Dr. Rochelle Walensky answered questions at Washington University, revealing she learned of the Pfizer shot efficacy data from CNN, which was a republished press release from the pharmaceutical company
- › Walensky was unaware that the virus may mutate, or that the vaccine would not be effective against mutations, which was a question a financial analyst was astute enough to ask Pfizer
- › Many of the talking points from the CDC originated from the same company that did President Biden's polling in the 2020 election, which indicates that at least some of the "science" driving public health policy came from Impact Research, who are the "proud pollsters for President Joe Biden"
- › Walensky admits that half the country doesn't believe what she's saying and that she's been warned not to predict what's happening next. She predicts the coronavirus will kill people every year and we'll learn to live with it and masks will be here for a while since she hasn't had a cold "in a really long time"

March 3, 2022, CDC director Dr. Rochelle Walensky answered questions in front of medical students at her alma mater, Washington University. This is an excerpt of the 45-minute presentation,¹ during which Walensky made several statements about the public health response to COVID-19 in the past two years, admitting the CDC had relied heavily

on vaccines, that she'd learned of the 95% efficacy from CNN and was not told the shots would lose effectiveness.

In fact, much of her presentation is riddled with statements that likely revealed more than she intended. She might not have realized the presentation was being taped or thought a taped presentation in front of medical students wouldn't be found. Or maybe, the CDC simply doesn't care that what they say in 2022 is the same information that caused many to be censored or maligned in 2020 and 2021.

It would be an interesting test to repeat her statements on social media today to see if the information would be tagged as misinformation or disinformation now that the CDC has publicly recognized what scientists have been saying for years.

Walensky Admits Her Source Was CNN

Walensky was invited to speak to the medical students at Washington University as the 2022 Gerald Medoff Visiting Professor in the Department of Medicine. During the interview conducted by Dr. William G. Powderly, co-director of the Division of Infectious Diseases, she was asked what the CDC got right and how that might affect the response to future pandemics. Three minutes into her answer, she said:²

"Where could we have improved? Well, you know, I think ... I can tell you where I was when the CNN feed came that it was 95% effective, um, the vaccine. So many of us wanted it to be helpful. Many of us wanted to say, "OK, this is our ticket out." Right? Now we're done."

This may be a mind-blowing admission — that the head of the CDC's information came from a CNN news report and not from Pfizer. It turns out the CNN report was a regurgitated Pfizer press release. Investigative journalist Paul Thacker, writing in *The Disinformation Chronicle*, discusses the timeline of events that led to Walensky believing the Pfizer vaccine was 95% effective.³

It is likely the CNN report Walensky is referring to was published November 18, 2020⁴ by Maggie Fox and Amanda Sealy, who it appears did little to augment the story after

pulling information from a Pfizer press release published the same day.⁵ What is remarkable, and unfortunate, is that a story in CNN influenced Walensky's thinking about the vaccine and future guidance from the CDC.

It turns out it is even more deplorable since it wasn't a story but a republished press release. Also interesting is that it took two CNN reporters to present one republished press release/story. As Thacker writes, "The Pfizer press release became CNN headline, became CDC pandemic policy." Walensky went on to say during the interview:⁶

"So I think we had perhaps too little caution and too much optimism for some good things that came our way. I really do. I think all of us wanted this to be done. Nobody said waning, when you know, oh this vaccine is going to work. Oh well, maybe it'll work – (laughs) it'll wear off. Nobody said what if the next variant doesn't, it doesn't, it's not as potent against the next variant."

Thacker dug into the published transcript⁷ of a Pfizer earnings call held February 2, 2021, in which an analyst from global financial services firm Cantor Fitzgerald asked four pointed questions.

1. If the COVID vaccine becomes routine, how do you think governments and physicians will choose among these vaccines that have received emergency use authorization?
2. And then how do you think about that 95% efficacy rate in light of mutations?
3. And the last question is on your PCV20, if it's approved, what do you expect the ACIP [Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices] recommendation to be your – what would you ideally like it to be?
4. And do you think there will be any upgrade for those 65-plus due to the additional serotypes?

It seems interesting that the analyst from Cantor Fitzgerald understood enough to ask about whether the vaccine would be effective against a virus nearly every scientist in the world expected to mutate. And yet, Walensky did not consider the possibility,⁸ despite

having been a professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School with years of experience dealing with viruses.⁹

Where Does the COVID 'Science' Come From?

When asked about the ACIP recommendation, Pfizer responded, “And then to your question about ACIP. Of course, we're working closely with the FDA for approval and with the CDC at the right moments in time to get the right recommendation.”¹⁰ Many believe that the “right recommendation” was not given, yet Pfizer likely got exactly what they wanted from the CDC.

Walensky has overruled or avoided asking the ACIP's advice on COVID booster issues at least three times, according to a STAT News report.¹¹ As Thacker writes, this sequence of events is:¹²

“... direct evidence of a corporation influencing federal policy by laundering their press release through media outlets like CNN. Further, republishing press releases seems a pervasive practice in how the media covers COVID-19 vaccines – meaning, they don't do much reporting. This has been obvious since late 2020.”

Walensky's presentation at Washington University was just days after it was revealed that Biden and the CDC are parroting talking points developed by the same firm that conducted polling for Biden's 2020 presidential campaign.¹³ The memo sent February 24, 2022, closely matches statements Biden used in the State of the Union Address.

In other words, it appears that at least some of the “science” driving public health policy for COVID-19 and destroying the economy is coming directly from Impact Research,¹⁴ who are “the proud pollsters for President Joe Biden” and whose marketing includes “electing Democrats in the toughest districts,” “electing presidents” and “crafting the most authentic and persuasive language for your communications.”

Two days after Walensky spoke at Washington University, former New York Times reporter Alex Berenson, wrote,¹⁵ “She's right. Nobody could possibly have known variants

might be a problem.” Under this, he posted a tweet dated January 20, 2021, in which he had posted, “Spoiler alert: the vaccines probably don't work against at least one new variant and they're going to want you to get vaccinated again next fall.”

By August, Twitter banned Berenson permanently for “repeated violations of our COVID-19 misinformation rules.”¹⁶ The tweet that put Twitter over the edge compared the vaccine to a “therapeutic ”with a limited window of efficacy and terrible side effect profile.” He also questioned vaccine mandates.”

Data supporting limited efficacy¹⁷ and terrible side effects^{18,19} are not difficult to find. In fact, Walensky admitted the vaccine has limited efficacy to Washington University – will Twitter ban her?

Walensky Knows She’s Wrong for Half the Country

Midway through the interview, Powderly asked how Walensky balances the risks of infectious disease against the mental health and economic risks from decisions the CDC has made. Her response was telling:²⁰

“This is such an important question. The easy answer is I know I'm going to be wrong for half the country (laugh) so now that I've accepted that um ... some fraction of people will be unhappy.

We are looking under the lamppost of all the cases and all the deaths and there have been so many other things that we're counting that don't make the headlines – opioid deaths, mental health challenges, cancer screening. I've heard from colleagues of people who came in whose elective surgeries were deferred who now come in with metastatic disease.”

Minutes before, she was asked what she thought the next couple of years would look like. She started by saying, “So this is a safe space because every piece of advice I've gotten is don't predict what's going to happen.”²¹ The implication appears to be that she didn't think what she said would be made public. She went on to predict that in the months ahead she believes:

“... [O]verall immunity is going to hold us in good stead. I don't know whether we're going to need another boost and I don't know when and I don't know what that's going to look like but I do think ultimately we will have a good level of population immunity for variants that come our way ... Ultimately we will have a coronavirus that will lead to death in some people every season, that we will tolerate in some way.”

This coronavirus that will lead to death every season sounds amazingly like seasonal flu. The final estimates by the CDC²² of the 2017-2018 flu season showed 41 million people were symptomatic with an estimated 18.9 million who received medical care, 710,572 who were hospitalized and 51,646 who died.

She also hinted that mask-wearing may be here to stay, saying, “I haven't had a cold in a really long time, and I suspect we don't miss those.”²³ Yet, Walensky has also admitted that the CDC's mask policy for public schools to reopen was influenced by teachers' unions who were against in-person learning.

In other words, the guidelines for children to wear masks throughout their school day were not developed based on science but, rather, on “hearing firsthand from parents and teachers directly about their experiences and concerns.” and “superintendents, principals, civil rights groups, and all sorts of other folks.”²⁴

Despite History, CDC Is Calling for Transparency

Anyone who has held an opinion that differs from the mainstream narrative has been censored, questioned and fake “fact-checked” so the debate over science would never see the light of day. Mainstream media outlets took up the banner, quashing any information that didn't neatly fit the story.

If data might demonstrate that the vaccine was not functioning the way it was promised, then the CDC²⁵ withheld the information and Health and Human Services²⁶ stopped tracking hospital deaths related to COVID-19. But they haven't been able to stop the data coming from Israel,²⁷ the U.K,²⁸ Germany²⁹ and insurance companies.³⁰

During Walensky's appearance, she said she was "proud of our ability to get data out,"³¹ in reference to the vaccine. She indicated that they used a "pedal-to-the-metal"³² system to analyze and assimilate data that was published, on average, every 48 hours. Yet, her comments are in direct contradiction to a recent investigative report published in The New York Times³³ that shows the CDC was not transparently publishing "large portions" of vaccine data.

In fact, Walensky has also publicly discredited the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS), which is co-administered³⁴ by the FDA and CDC. During her January 11, 2022, testimony before the Senate,³⁵ Walensky clearly stated that any death after a vaccine could be reported to VAERS using the example of an individual who gets vaccinated, hit by a car and dies.

She implied without outright stating that this death would also be recorded in VAERS and logged as a death related to the vaccine. In other words, she skirted the issue without having to outright lie to the Senate.

Just days before she declared her pride in the CDC's ability to publish accurate and informative data, The New York Times³⁶ revealed that the FDA had been aware the COVID shots were only 12% effective in children under the age of 5. However, they withheld the information before a scheduled meeting on February 15, 2022, which was subsequently canceled. According to the Times:³⁷

"Experts worried that the news would further dissuade hesitant parents from immunizing their children. Other studies have shown the vaccine was not powerfully protective against infection with the Omicron variant in adults, either."

Will the Gaslighting Stop?

During the interview, Walensky alluded to people in the media who "reject evidence," saying,³⁸ "You know in the media now, there are a lot of people who are using their voice

that may or may not be helpful for public health ... then that decreases public health in general so our messaging I think we have to be clear about."

The information that Walensky revealed during the interview makes you wonder about who's making public health decisions and why. It's difficult to imagine and scary to think that after two years, one of the largest and most powerful health care agencies in the U.S. is led by a director who is potentially uninformed, or worse, purposefully misleading the public.

In approximately 35 short minutes Walensky revealed much. While she characterizes those who reject her propaganda as "rejecting evidence" since scientific debate is no longer part of the scientific process according to the CDC, it's interesting to note that she:

- Admits learning about the Pfizer 95% efficacy – information which was then used to formulate CDC guidelines – from a CNN report,³⁹ which was nothing more than a republished press release from Big Pharma.⁴⁰
- Believes the CDC is transparently publishing data in a "pedal-to-the-metal" scenario⁴¹ even though The New York Times uncovered evidence the CDC is withholding data.⁴²
- Believes that no one told her or the CDC that a virus may mutate and render the vaccine ineffective,⁴³ yet a financial analyst was astute enough to ask the question.⁴⁴
- Isn't sure if we will need another booster⁴⁵ after Pfizer told the world last year that a fourth dose may be needed sooner than expected.⁴⁶
- Blames the "public" at large for believing "the science" is black and white despite her colleague, Dr. Anthony Fauci, who as director of the NIAID, has been the face of COVID-19 for the White House, claiming HE was the science.⁴⁷ Walensky now admits: "I think the public heard that science is black and white, science is immediate ... and the truth is, science is gray."⁴⁸

Sources and References

- ¹ YouTube, March 3, 2022
- ² YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 25:48 question 28:56 answer
- ^{3, 12, 40} The Disinformation Chronicle, March 8, 2022
- ⁴ CNN, November 18, 2020
- ⁵ Pfizer, November 18, 2020
- ⁶ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 29:11
- ^{7, 10} The Motley Fool, February 2, 2021
- ^{8, 43} YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 29:24
- ⁹ Mass General Hospital, Rochelle Walensky, MD, MPH Appointed CDC Director
- ¹¹ STAT News, December 9, 2021
- ¹³ The Defender, March 3, 2022
- ¹⁴ Impact Research
- ¹⁵ Unreported Truths, March 5, 2022
- ¹⁶ The Hill, August 29, 2021
- ^{17, 28} The Exposé, March 1, 2022
- ¹⁸ Mark Skidmore, How Many People Died from the Covid-19 Inoculations? An Estimate Based on a Survey of the United States Population
- ¹⁹ OpenVAERS, COVID Data
- ²⁰ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 34:34
- ²¹ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 30:46
- ²² Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, September 30, 2021, Table 1
- ²³ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 32:06
- ²⁴ The Federalist, February 15, 2021
- ^{25, 33, 42} The New York Times, February 20, 2022
- ²⁶ Health Data.gov, January 6, 2022
- ²⁷ NEJM, 2021; 385:2421
- ²⁹ Greater Mountain Publishing, February 27, 2022
- ³⁰ Zero Hedge, February 5, 2022, Search "lincoln" and "hardford" it's not spelled correctly in the article
- ³¹ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 27:01
- ³² YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 28:02 and 27:36
- ³⁴ VAERS, About
- ³⁵ YouTube, January 11, 2022, Min 2:49:30 to 2:52:00
- ^{36, 37} The New York Times, February 28, 2022
- ³⁸ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 41:00
- ³⁹ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 28:59
- ⁴¹ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 27:00
- ⁴⁴ The Motley Fool, February 2, 2021 50% down the page
- ⁴⁵ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 31:07

- ⁴⁶ CNBC, December 8, 2021
- ⁴⁷ National Review, November 29, 2021
- ⁴⁸ YouTube, March 3, 2022 Min 29:51