



Yikes: New York Times Estimates 90% of 'Positive' COVID Test Results Really Are Negative!

The *New York Times* reviewed PCR test data compiled by officials in Massachusetts, New York, and Nevada and determined that up to 90% of those testing positive carried either no virus or such a small amount as to be of no danger whatsoever. Furthermore: "Most of these people are not likely to be contagious..." Journalist Jon Rappoport says the PCR test is so sensitive it picks up inconsequential tiny amounts of virus that couldn't harm a flea—and calls this a "positive" test. Millions of people are labeled "positive/infected" who carry so little virus that no harm would come to them or anyone they contact. Ironically, the *New York Times*, after showing that the tests are at least a 90% failure, then recommended testing those without symptoms. [It seems that everyone is gaming the system.] -GEG

Townhall.com, August 29: "According to The New York Times, potentially 90 percent of those who have tested positive for COVID-19 have such insignificant amounts of the virus present in their bodies that such individuals do not need to isolate nor are they candidates for contact tracing. Leading public health experts are now concerned that overtesting is responsible for misdiagnosing a huge number of people with harmless amounts of the virus in their systems."

“‘Most of these people are not likely to be contagious...’ warns The Times.”

Yes, that’s what the NY Times is confessing (8/29): “Some of the nation’s leading public health experts are raising a new concern in the endless debate over coronavirus testing in the United States: The standard tests are diagnosing huge numbers of people who may be carrying relatively insignificant amounts of the virus. Most of these people are not likely to be contagious...”

“In three sets of testing data...compiled by officials in Massachusetts, New York and Nevada, up to 90 percent of people testing positive carried barely any virus, a review by The Times found.”

Let me break this down for you, because it’s a lot worse than the Times admits. The rabbit hole goes much deeper—and I’ve been reporting on the deeper facts for months.

The issue appears to be the ballooning sensitivity of the PCR test. It’s so sensitive that it picks up inconsequential tiny, tiny amounts of virus that couldn’t harm a flea—and it calls these amounts “positive.”

Therefore, millions of people are labeled “positive/infected” who carry so little virus that no harm would come to them or anyone they come in contact with.

That would be bad enough. But the truth is, the PCR test is not able to produce ANY reliable number that reflects how much virus a person is carrying. A lot, a little, it doesn’t matter.

The test has never been validated, in a large-scale study, for the ability to quantify the amount of virus a person is carrying. I’ve proposed how that study should be done IN THE REAL WORLD, NOT IN THE LAB.

You take 1000 people and remove tissue samples from them. A lab puts these samples through its PCR and announces which virus it found in each case and how much virus it found in each case.

It says: "All right, in patients 23, 46, 76, 89, 265 we found a high amount of virus."

That should mean these particular patients are visibly sick. They will have obvious clinical symptoms. Why? Because actual illness requires millions of millions of a virus replicating in the body.

So now we unblind these particular patients with high amounts of virus, according to the PCR. Are they, in fact, sick? Or are they running marathons and swimming five miles a day? Let's see. For real.

THIS VALIDATION OF THE PCR HAS NEVER BEEN DONE.

Therefore, the claim that the PCR can determine how much virus is in a human is completely and utterly unproven. Period.

Therefore, ALL the PCR tests being done on people all over the world reflect NOTHING about illness, infection, contagion, or transmission.

The scam is wall to wall.

But there's more.

The PCR isn't even testing for a particular virus in the first place. It's using a piece of RNA assumed to be part of a virus. The assumption is unproven.

And finally, as I've been writing and demonstrating for months, there is no evidence that researchers used proper procedure to discover "a new coronavirus that is causing a pandemic."

Therefore, the PCR test, as worthless as it already is, aims to show the presence of a germ that has never been shown to exist.

But let's lock down the planet, destroy economies and untold numbers of lives in the process.

Read full article here...

Additional source:

[nytimes.com/2020/08/29/health/coronavirus-testing.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/29/health/coronavirus-testing.html)