

Covid's Bad Actors - The Centers for Disease Control (CDC)

Compiled by Roger Golden Brown

This PDF and other Covid Related Specific Topic PDFs can be found [here on my website](#).

Also check out my Free eBook,

[The Covid / Lockdown Crisis - Alternative Information & Sources](#)

All bullet pointed excerpts and statements are from sources footnoted and linked to at the end of the PDF. Indented entries preceded by a dash (-) are quoted from the noted source.

The reader is urged to use the footnote links to further explore the material and to get context to what is stated in this PDF and to make up their own mind as to what is really going on.

Preface

The CDC (full name, The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) has a tremendous amount of power now. Personally I believe there are still good people in the CDC who are dutifully recording statistics (as far as that goes) even as those running the show are controlling the narrative and the messaging, which often does not comport with the data. They are using the leverage of their authority and taking advantage of people's general ignorance of who they are to manipulate the populace using fear.

We are told to trust the science. What that seems to have come to mean is trust the authorities; leave it to the professionals. Unfortunately the CDC is not very forthcoming and the mainstream media fails completely to educate the public about their shortcomings.

This PDF, while not intended to be a detailed comprehensive report on the CDC, will attempt to provide enough information about their history, what they do and don't do, and who they serve so that it should be clear that the organization lacks credibility.

For more about the CDC see my PDF, "Covid Lies and Deceptions by the CDC and the WHO".

Table of Contents

[The CDC is a Subsidiary of the Vaccine Industry](#)

[Vaccinated Vs. Unvaccinated: The Study The CDC Refused To Do](#)

[CDC Vaccination Propaganda Campaign Ahead of the Flu Season](#)

[The CDC and the 1976 Swine Flu Pandemic Scam](#)

[The Tuskegee Syphilis Study](#)

[The CDC's Conflicts of Interest](#)

[Final Thoughts](#)

[Footnotes](#)

[Relevant Links](#)

The CDC is a Subsidiary of the Vaccine Industry

The CDC is a government agency and is funded by Congress. (See the section on Conflicts of Interest for more information about their other sources of funding.) How they spend the money allotted to them tells a story. This section will look at their spending on vaccines through contracts and also for what they allocate funds in their raw budget, both from 2019.

- In a short 5 minute video, Robert Kennedy Jr., talks about vaccines in an interview with Tucker Carlson, and explains how the CDC is in bed with Big Pharma: [1]
 - CDC is a subsidiary of the vaccine industry. It sells \$4.1 billion worth of vaccines a year. It spends \$4.6 billion, almost half its budget, promoting vaccines. And it only spends \$20 million testing vaccines.
- On the CDC website page called CDC Contract Funding Allocations, under the title is says: [2]
 - In fiscal year (FY) 2019, OFR [Office of Financial Resources] processed 10,609 contract actions that totaled \$5.7 billion. The table below shows how CDC contracts are allocated among CDC's centers, institute, and offices (CIOs). The majority of contract spending was through the National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD), primarily for the purchase of vaccines.
- The table in the article shows that 74% of their contract allocations, of the \$5.7 billion they spend, goes to the National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases: [2]
 - NCIRD - \$4,231,948,177
- The CDC's "FY 2019 President's Budget" itemizes how they expect (presumably) to spend the money. In this budget the National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases is not mentioned but two items are for vaccines that make up almost half of the budget; children's vaccines gets more than 3 times as much money as anything else: [3]
 - Total budget for the year: \$11,095,621,000.
 - Immunization and Respiratory Diseases: \$700,828,000
 - Vaccines for Children: \$4,726,461,000

Vaccinated Vs. Unvaccinated: The Study The CDC Refused To Do

On November 22, 2020 James Lyons-Weiler and Paul Thomas published a study comparing vaccinated vs. unvaccinated children. Shortly after it was published Paul Thomas had his medical license suspended. (See my PDF, "Vaccines and the Vaccine Industry - Some Food for Thought" at the link at the top of this document for more about the study.)

James Lyons-Weiler and Paul Thomas are not anti-vaccine but believe in informed consent. They felt compelled to do the study because the CDC has never done a study comparing the overall health of those vaccinated vs. those unvaccinated.

Four bills introduced in Congress in the last fifteen years would have mandated the CDC to do such a study, but they all failed to pass. A public health agency that spends far more of its budgeted money on vaccines than anything else shouldn't have to be forced to do such a study.

- From the Informed Choice Washington website: [4]
 - The CDC refuses to perform this comparative study, and four bills in Congress that would have forced them to perform this study have all failed: H. R. 2832 in 2007; H.R. 1757 (113th): Vaccine Safety Study Act 2013; H.R.1636 - Vaccine Safety Study Act (2015-16); H.R.3615 - Vaccine Safety Study Act (2017-2018).
- As an indicator of a reason the bills may have failed note that the pharmaceutical industry is the largest donor to politicians (in dollar amount), one and a half times more than the second largest, the insurance industry. [5] [6]
- From Congress' website, H.R.2832 - Comprehensive Comparative Study of Vaccinated and Unvaccinated Populations Act of 2007: [7]
 - Comprehensive Comparative Study of Vaccinated and Unvaccinated Populations Act of 2007 - Requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) , to conduct a comprehensive study to: (1) compare total health outcomes, including the risk of autism, between vaccinated and unvaccinated U.S. populations; and (2) determine whether vaccines or vaccine components play a role in the development of autism spectrum or other neurological conditions.
- From Congress' website, H.R.1757 - Vaccine Safety Study Act 2013: [8]
 - To direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct or support a comprehensive study comparing total health outcomes, including risk of autism, in vaccinated populations in the United States with such outcomes in unvaccinated populations in the United States, and for other purposes.
- The Informed Consent Action Network submitted a FOIA request to the CDC on June 26, 2020 demanding: "All documents in the CDC's possession which compare the health outcomes of children that have received vaccines with children that have never received any vaccines." After a back and forth exchange of letters, the CDC finally answered conclusively: [9]
 - A search of our records failed to reveal any documents pertaining to your request. The CDC has not conducted a study of health outcomes in vaccinated vs. unvaccinated populations.

CDC Vaccination Propaganda Campaign Ahead of the Flu Season

In preparation for what they call the "2004-05 Influenza Vaccination Season" the CDC published a PDF by Glen Nowak, Ph.D., Associate Director for Communications, National Immunization Program. The PDF goes into how best to sell the idea of getting the flu vaccine. One

of the sections is called the communications recipe for success, where the author suggests ways to use fear in propaganda to increase demand for vaccines.

Keep in mind that these communication suggestions are being given well ahead of the flu season so any suggestions to characterize the flu as "severe" or "deadly" are pure propaganda; not based on anything real.

- Shown below are some of the ingredients to their "recipe". From the CDC's PDF, Planning for the 2004-05 Influenza Vaccination Season: A Communication Situation Analysis: [10]
 - 2. Dominant strain and/or initial cases of disease are: In cities and communities with significant media outlets (e.g., daily newspapers, major TV stations).
 - 3. Medical experts and public health authorities publicly (e.g., via media) state concern and alarm (and predict dire outcomes) - and urge influenza vaccination.
 - 4. The combination of '2' and '3' result in: A. Significant media interest and attention. B. Framing of the flu season in terms that motivate behavior (e.g., as "very severe," "more severe than last or past years," "deadly").
 - 5. Continued reports (e.g., from health officials and media) that influenza is causing severe illness and/or affecting lots of people - helping foster the perception that many people are susceptible to a bad case of influenza.
 - 6. Visible/tangible examples of the seriousness of the illness (e.g., pictures of children, families of those affected coming forward) and people getting vaccinated (the first to motivate, the latter to reinforce).

The CDC and the 1976 Swine Flu Pandemic Scam

In 1976 there was an "outbreak" of a swine flu. The consequences? A major vaccination program, 1/4 of all Americans vaccinated, lots of money for Big Pharma, and many people getting Guillain-Barré Syndrome from the rushed vaccine. From the flu itself: 1 dead and 13 hospitalized.

- From Wikipedia: [11]
 - In 1976, an outbreak of the swine flu caused one death, hospitalized 13, and led to a mass immunization program. After the program began, the vaccine was associated with an increase in reports of Guillain-Barré Syndrome, which can cause paralysis, respiratory arrest, and death.
 - The House Appropriations Committee reported out a special appropriations bill, including \$135 million for the swine flu immunization program, which was approved on April 5.
- The drug companies insisted on indemnity if they were to produce the vaccines: [11][12]
 - Assistant Secretary Theodore Cooper (HEW) informed the White House on June 2 that indemnity legislation would be needed to secure Merrell's [Marion Merrell Dow, a pharmaceutical company] cooperation. In June, other vaccine

manufacturers requested the same legislation. A little more than two weeks later, the Ford administration submitted a proposal to Congress that offered indemnity to vaccine manufacturers.

- In total, GBS cases occurred in 362 patients during the six weeks after influenza vaccination of 45 million persons, an 8.8-fold increase over normal rates.

- The CDC also showed its lack of integrity by lying to the public about the vaccine that they were using. From a "60 Minutes" report by Mike Wallace done in 1979 about the swine flu debacle: [13][14]

- Wallace: Now, nearly everyone was to receive a shot in a public health facility where a doctor might not be present, therefore it was up to the CDC to come up with some kind of official consent form giving the public all the information it needed about the swine flu shot. This form stated that the swine flu vaccine had been tested. What it didn't say was that after those tests were completed, the scientists developed another vaccine and that was the one given to most of the 46 million who took the shot. That vaccine was called "X-53a".

- Wallace: Was X-53a ever field tested?

- Dr. David Sencer [then head of the CDC]: I - I can't say. I would have to...

- Wallace: It wasn't.

The Tuskegee Syphilis Study

Although it happened decades ago and probably did not involve any of the same people in public health agencies now the Tuskegee Syphilis Study should give pause to anybody who blindly assumes that the CDC or any influential organization has your best interest in mind and can be trusted. For 40 years United States government health agencies used humans as guinea pigs to study the progress of untreated syphilis.

- From the article titled "Bad Blood: The Hidden Horror of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study" on the msn website: [15]

- In September of 1932, Public Health Service officials visited Tuskegee, Alabama, where they recruited 600 Black men to receive treatment for "bad blood".

- Of the study's participants, 399 of the men were suffering from the advanced stages of syphilis, which at that time was incurable, while the other 201 served as controls. Under the guise of offering medical treatment, the Public Health Service set out to study the effects of untreated syphilis in Black men. Doctors enticed the poor, mostly illiterate Macon County residents to take part.

- Deception was integral to the Tuskegee Syphilis Study. The men did not know they were actually participating in an experiment, and were kept in the dark about the true nature of their diagnosis. They were also unaware they weren't receiving

treatment at all: The drugs they were administered were either inadequate or completely ineffective.

- Though the study was originally meant to last for six months, the Public Health Service decided to continue it when the participating doctors deemed that only autopsies could determine the damage the disease caused. In other words, the doctors would keep tabs on the men until they died.

- The study that was supposed to last 6 months was not terminated until 1972. By the early 1950's penicillin was commonly being used to treat syphilis but the experiment continued, still without treating the men, and in the 1960's the CDC was overtly complicit. From an article by Alan Brandt, published in the December 1978 issue of the Hasting Center Report, a bimonthly peer-reviewed academic journal of bioethics: [16] [17]

- When penicillin became widely available by the early 1950s as the preferred treatment for syphilis, the men did not receive therapy. In fact on several occasions, the USPHS actually sought to prevent treatment. Moreover, a committee at the federally operated Center for Disease Control decided in 1969 that the study should be continued. Only in 1972, when accounts of the study first appeared in the national press, did the Department of Health, Education and Welfare halt the experiment.

- When the USPHS evaluated the status of the study in the 1960s they continued to rationalize the racial aspects of the experiment. For example, the minutes of a 1965 meeting at the Center for Disease Control recorded: "Racial issue was mentioned briefly. Will not affect the study. Any questions can be handled by saying these people were at the point that therapy would no longer help them. They are getting better medical care than they would under any other circumstances."

- A group of physicians met again at the CDC in 1969 to decide whether or not to terminate the study. Although one doctor argued that the study should be stopped and the men treated, the consensus was to continue. Dr. J. Lawton Smith remarked, "You will never have another study like this; take advantage of it." A memo prepared by Dr. James B. Lucas, Assistant Chief of the Venereal Disease Branch, stated: "Nothing learned will prevent, find, or cure a single case of infectious syphilis or bring us closer to our basic mission of controlling venereal disease in the United States." He concluded, however, that the study should be continued "along its present lines." When the first accounts of the experiment appeared in the national press in July 1972, data were still being collected and autopsies performed.

The CDC's Conflicts of Interest

This section gives a few examples of the CDC's conflicts of interest, primarily how their decisions that are ostensibly for public health are influenced by profit driven private concerns.

These are just a few of many cases but help to paint the picture of how this is not a case of a few rotten apples but endemic in the agency.

The Revolving Door

- The CDC is one of the “operating divisions” of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Although this PDF is about the CDC, I think the man who served as the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services from 2018 to 2021, Alex Azar, deserves mention. He is a classic example of Washington’s revolving door; a conflict of interest not worthy of a health department official. From Wikipedia: [18]

- Azar served as General Counsel of the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) from 2001 to 2005. On July 22, 2005, he was confirmed as the Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services; he served in that capacity until his January 2007 resignation.

- From 2012 to 2017, Azar was President of the U.S. division of Eli Lilly and Company, a major drug company, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Biotechnology Innovation Organization, a large pharmaceutical trade association.

The CDC Owns Patents

- In a nuts and bolts 5 paragraph article from the LawFirms website they state that CDC members make money from vaccine related patents and that they claim there is not conflict of interest. From the article: [19]

- When prompted with questions pertaining to their financial connections with pharmaceutical companies, most ACIP [CDC’s Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices] members claim they are able to remain unbiased despite the rewards they receive every time a new vaccination is recommended to the public. In numerous instances, vaccines released to the market are later removed after serious side effects are documented. The rotavirus vaccine was one such example; it was pulled from the market in 1999, a year after its initial approval. In 2001, the House Government Reform Committee found that four out of the eight ACIP members who voted to approve the vaccine had direct financial ties to one or more of the pharmaceutical companies who produced the vaccine for public use. Similar situations involving many other vaccinations have been independently documented over the course of nearly 20 years.

- To see a Google patent search page showing patents owned by the CDC, click the linked footnote. [20]

The CDC Foundation

- In 1992, Congress passed legislation to encourage relationships between industry and the CDC by creating the non-profit CDC Foundation, which began operations in 1995. From a British Medical Journal PDF titled, “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: protecting the private good?": [21]

- The CDC Foundation raised \$52m in fiscal year 2014, of which \$12m was from corporations. The CDC itself in fiscal year 2014 received \$16m in conditional funding from sources such as corporations, individuals, and philanthropy, including the CDC Foundation. Conditional donations are earmarked for specific projects. For example, in 2012, Genentech earmarked \$600,000 in donations to the CDC Foundation for CDC's efforts to promote expanded testing and treatment of viral hepatitis. Genentech and its parent company, Roche, manufacture test kits and treatments for hepatitis C.

- Numerous manufacturers give donations to the CDC Foundation. Janssen also contributed \$1.5m in 2012-13, and in 2011-12 contributors included Merck (\$915,149), Genzyme (\$762,000), Sanofi-Aventis (\$600,000), and Abbott Laboratories (\$550,000).

- The CDC issued guidelines in August 2012 recommending expanded (cohort) screening of everyone born from 1945 to 1965 for hepatitis C virus.

- In 2010, the CDC, in conjunction with the CDC Foundation, formed the Viral Hepatitis Action Coalition, which supports research and promotes expanded testing and treatment of hepatitis C in the United States and globally. Industry has donated over \$26m to the coalition through the CDC Foundation since 2010. Corporate members of the coalition include Abbott Laboratories, AbbVie, Gilead, Janssen, Merck, OraSure Technologies, Quest Diagnostics, and Siemens—each of which produces products to test for or treat hepatitis C infection. Conflict of interest forms filed by the 34 members of the external working group that wrote and reviewed the new CDC recommendation in 2012 show that nine had financial ties to the manufacturers.

- With so much money be spent to influence the CDC's agenda and recommendations, one should at least expect full disclosure of interests. Again according to the BMJ report, this has not been the case: [21]

- A report by the Office of the Inspector General in December 2009 found that external advisors to the CDC "play an influential role in decision making for the federal government." The inspector general evaluated conflicts of interest of advisors and concluded, "CDC has a systemic lack of oversight of the ethics program": 97% of disclosure forms filed by advisors were incomplete, and 13% of advisors participated in meetings without filing any disclosure at all.

- And straight from the horse's mouth, many of the usual suspects are found to be donors. From the 2019 "Corporations, Foundations & Organizations" page on the CDC Foundation website: [22]

- Bayer U.S. LLC
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- Bloomberg Philanthropies
- Facebook
- GAVI Alliance
- GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals S.A.

- Imperial College London
- Johns Hopkins University
- The Merck Foundation

Congressional Hearing on the CDC's Conflicts of Interest

- On June 15, 2000 there was a congressional hearing before the Committee on Government Reform, looking into both the CDC and the FDA. The record of the hearing published on govinfo.gov is titled, "FACA [Federal Advisory Committee Act]: Conflicts Of Interest And Vaccine Development - Preserving The Integrity Of The Process". In the report they use one example of a vaccine recommended by the CDC: [23]
 - It [the rotavirus vaccine] was approved for use by the FDA in August 1998. It was recommended for universal use by the CDC in March 1999. Serious problems cropped up shortly after it was introduced. Children started developing serious bowel obstructions. The vaccine was pulled from the U.S. market in October 1999.
 - So the question is, was there evidence to indicate that the vaccine was not safe, and if so, why was it licensed in the first place? How good a job did the advisory committees do?
- The chairman of the hearing, Dan Burton, reveals that the CDC and the FDA approved the drug in spite of their knowledge about the dangers: [23]
 - At the FDA's committee, there were discussions about adverse events. Even with all of these concerns, the committee voted unanimously to approve it.
 - At the CDC's committee, there was a lot of discussion about whether the benefits of the vaccine really justified the cost. Even though the cost benefit ratio was questioned, the committee voted unanimously to approve it.
 - How confident in the safety and need of specific vaccines would doctors and parents be if they learned the following:
 - One, that members, including the chair of the FDA and CDC advisory committees who make these decisions own stock in drug companies that make the vaccines.
 - Two, that individuals on both advisory committees own patents for vaccines under consideration, or affected by the decisions of the committees.
 - Three, that three out of the five of the members of the FDA's advisory committee who voted for the rotavirus vaccine had conflicts of interest that were waived.
 - Four, that 7 individuals of the 15 member FDA advisory committee were not present at the meeting. Two others were excluded from the vote, and the remaining five were joined by five temporary voting members who all voted to license the product.
 - Five, that the CDC grants conflict of interest waivers to every member of their advisory committee a year at a time, and allows full participation in the discussions leading up to a vote by every member, whether they have a financial stake in the

decision or not. So they're discussing it, influencing other members possibly, whether they have a financial stake or not.

- Sixth, that the CDC's advisory committee has no public members, no parents have a vote in whether or not a vaccine belongs on the childhood immunization schedule. The FDA's committee only has one public member.

- How confident can we be in the process when we learned that most of the work of the CDC advisory committee is done in "working groups" that meet behind closed doors, out of the public eye? Members who can't vote in the full committee because of conflicts of interest are allowed to work on the same issues in working groups, and there is no public scrutiny. I was appalled to learn that at least 6 of the 10 individuals who participated in the working group for the rotavirus vaccine had financial ties to pharmaceutical companies developing rotavirus vaccines.

- Burton goes on to name individuals and demonstrate their connections to Big Pharma. One of note is Paul Offit, who is a well known public figure who promotes vaccines: [23]

- Dr. Paul Offit disclosed that he holds a patent on a rotavirus vaccine and receives grant money from Merck to develop this vaccine. He also disclosed that he is paid by the pharmaceutical industry to travel around the country and teach doctors that vaccines are safe. Dr. Offit is a member of the CDC's advisory committee and voted on three rotavirus issues, including making the recommendation of adding the rotavirus vaccine to the Vaccines for Children program.

Final Thoughts

Any agency, especially any public agency that is tasked with looking out for the health and welfare of the populace should be absolutely transparent and completely free of conflicts of interest. Although that may be an ideal that is to some extent unrealistic, the CDC doesn't even come close. The intimacy it shares with Big Pharma should alarm anybody who is paying attention. It clearly has an agenda that dominates it and that agenda does not put the health of people first and foremost.

And it is this agency and others under the HHS umbrella that are influencing the dramatic unprecedented overhaul of our society that has been going on for almost a year now. Even if there is a semblance of concern for the wellbeing of the populous, one has to wonder what is really driving their recommendations.

Footnotes

- [1] YouTube - [Robert F. Kennedy Jr: My response to John Oliver](#)
- [2] CDC website - [CDC Contract Funding Allocations](#)
- [3] CDC PDF - [FY 2019 President's Budget](#)
- [4] Informed Choice Washington website - [It's Here! The Vaxxed vs Unvaxxed Study!](#)
- [5] Investopedia website - [Which Industry Spends the Most on Lobbying?](#)
- [6] OpenSecrets.org website - [Influence & Lobbying - Lobbying](#)
- [7] Congress' website - [H.R.2832 - Comprehensive Comparative Study of Vaccinated and Unvaccinated Populations Act of 2007](#)
- [8] Congress' website - [H.R.1757 - Vaccine Safety Study Act](#)
- [9] Informed Consent Action Network website - [CDC Concedes It Has Never Conducted Study Of Vaccinated VS. Unvaccinated Children](#)
- [10] CDC PDF - [Planning for the 2004-05 Influenza Vaccination Season: A Communication Situation Analysis](#)
- [11] Wikipedia - [1976 swine flu outbreak](#)
- [12] National Center for Biotechnology Information website - [Swine Flu Chronology January 1976 - March 1977](#)
- [13] Quasar website - ["Dangers of the Swine Flu Vaccine" CBS 60 Minutes 1979 Transcript](#)
- [14] BitChute - ["Dangers of the Swine Flu Vaccine" CBS 60 Minutes 1979](#)
- [15] msn website - [Bad Blood: The Hidden Horror of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study](#)
- [16] Allan M. Brandt article PDF - [Racism and Research: The Case of the Tuskegee Syphilis Study](#)
- [17] Wikipedia - [Hasting Center Report](#)
- [18] Wikipedia - [Alex Azar](#)
- [19] LawFirms website - [CDC Members Own More Than 50 Patents Connected to Vaccinations](#)
- [20] Google Patent Search - [Google Patents Search Showing CDC Owned Patents](#)
- [21] British Medical Journal PDF - [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: protecting the private good?](#)
- [22] The CDC Foundation website - [Corporations, Foundations & Organizations](#)
- [23] govinfo.gov website - [FACA \[Federal Advisory Committee Act\]: Conflicts Of Interest And Vaccine Development - Preserving The Integrity Of The Process](#)

Relevant Links

Articles

[Why is CDC Scaring Us To Death?](#)

[CDC and WHO Corrupt Financial Entanglements with the Vaccine Industry](#)

[Examining RFK Jr.'s claim that the CDC Owns over 20 vaccine patents](#)

Videos

['The CDC is actually a vaccine company' - Robert F. Kennedy Jr](#)

[Vaccinated Vs. Unvaccinated: The Study The CDC Refused To Do – Interview with Dr. Weiler](#)

Reports

[CDC Fails to Produce to Support its Claim that Vaccines Given During the First Six Months of Life
"Do Not Cause Autism"](#)

[The Tuskegee Timeline](#)