

CDC Twisted the Definition of Vaccine - A Lie to Make Billions of Dollars for Drug Companies

By [Joel S. Hirschhorn](#)

Global Research, November 17, 2021

[Mark Taliano](#) 16 November 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@crg_globalresearch](#).

CDC once was a federal agency that nearly everyone respected. That no longer is the case. Now there are many reasons why CDC should be widely disrespected. Its latest debacle is how it changed the definition of vaccine.

Just imagine this: The entire push for COVID “vaccines” was based on a lie – they did not meet the official CDC definition of a vaccine. By doing this the government could coerce the entire population to get the shot. Calling them “vaccines” was the biggest lie from Fauci and the key to drug companies making many billions of dollars.

Why would the government’s key public health agency change the definition of what a vaccine is in the midst of a pandemic? After millions of Americans have taken the shot? And millions more are being beaten into taking it for the first time and others to get booster shots.

Words matter

Here is the key point. It became widely recognized by medical experts and informed citizens that COVID vaccines clearly did not fit the official CDC vaccine definition. CDC thought the answer was not to fix what was deficient with the COVID vaccines or stop their use by most people as so many medical experts advised. Their response was to change the vaccine definition to fit the so-called vaccines.

This was done so that vaccine mandates could keep getting pushed by the government. Of course, the COVID “vaccines” should be referred to as gene therapy products, even better than calling them experimental vaccines.

To see how corrupt this action by CDC was, it is necessary to examine the details of the vaccine definition debacle.

Prior to September 1, 2021 here is how CDC defined vaccine:

A product that stimulates a person's immune system to produce immunity to a specific disease, protecting the person from that disease. Vaccines are usually administered through needle injections, but can also be administered by mouth or sprayed into the nose.

This definition had been used for years and it makes sense. No expert or sensible citizen would find fault with it. But did it honestly apply to the COVID vaccines?

Then this is what CDC concocted:

A preparation that is used to stimulate the body's immune response against diseases. Vaccines are usually administered through needle injections, but some can be administered by mouth or sprayed into the nose.

Here is what CDC also said:

Immunity: Protection from an infectious disease. If you are immune to a disease, you can be exposed to it without becoming infected.

Think about that last sentence: You can be exposed to COVID without being infected; but we know that is not true for fully vaccinated people who still get infected.

This is the key language in the original definition:

"stimulates a person's immune system to produce immunity to a specific disease, protecting the person from that disease."

How rational to invoke the purpose of a vaccine to stimulate an immune system to produce immunity to a specific disease that protects the recipient from that disease. Exactly what everyone for years thought was the correct way to think about a vaccine. People want permanent protection from the COVID infection disease.

But now CDC has taken out the language referring to getting immunity for a specific disease and getting protection from that disease.

Now, COVID vaccines do not have to directly produce immunity. No, now they only have to stimulate the body's immune system.

You don't get immunity because COVID vaccines do not directly produce immunity. They do not directly kill the COVID virus. Vaccinated people can still have high viral loads and also transmit the virus to others. While some individuals may get some health benefits from COVID shots, they do not necessarily protect the entire population. This is why mandates to get everyone the shots really do not make sense from a public health perspective, that Alexander has well substantiated.

Apparently, the only logical way to understand what CDC has done is to accept the truth belatedly seen by CDC that COVID vaccines do not, in fact, produce effective immunity for COVID infection and do not provide effective protection, once vaccinated, from that infection.

Much of the public surely does not yet know what CDC has acknowledged for the COVID

vaccines. Odds are that everyone who depends on mainstream media for good information about the pandemic has not been informed about what CDC has done and its implications.

The new vaccine definition, if publicly known, would reduce public confidence in current COVID vaccines. You don't have to be a medical expert to see how the new definition has been created to accommodate COVID shots.

In fact, these definition changes reflect what is now known about the limitations of the COVID vaccines.

Fully vaccinated people can still get COVID disease, referred to as breakthrough infections that, contrary to what the government says, can be very serious, often requiring hospitalization and sometimes causing death, as was the case for Colin Powell.

Such serious effects have been well discussed by Kampf. Other times, breakthrough infections greatly disrupt lives, as recently described by Madrigal, a strong proponent of COVID shots.

Moreover, the COVID vaccines are now widely known from considerable clinical evidence to lose their effectiveness typically in about six months. And even worse, they do not provide hardly any protection against variants like the delta variant. Same disease but from a different virus in terms of its complex genetic makeup. So, befitting the new CDC definition the COVID shots really do not have long lasting effective immunity to the specific COVID infection caused by all variants.

Elsewhere on the CDC website is a glossary of many terms; here is what is especially relevant to the debate about COVID vaccines:

Attenuated vaccine: A vaccine in which a live microbe is weakened (attenuated) through chemical or physical processes in order to produce an immune response without causing the severe effects of the disease. Attenuated vaccines currently licensed in the United States include measles, mumps, rubella, varicella, rotavirus, yellow fever, smallpox, and some formulations of influenza, and typhoid vaccines.

Most people would read this and find that it fits with what they think of as vaccines that have been routinely taken by most people, especially children. Clearly, COVID vaccines do not fit this definition. But seeing this established view of vaccines helps explain why so many people resist and reject the COVID shots. They are so fundamentally different than long accepted and used vaccines.

Natural immunity

One of the biggest pandemic scandals is that the government refuses to give full credit to natural immunity that people get from once being infected by the COVID virus. It should be officially recognized as equivalent to "vaccine" immunity.

The following CDC glossary definition is especially relevant:

Active immunity: The production of antibodies against a specific disease by the immune system. Active immunity can be acquired in two ways, either by contracting the disease or through vaccination. Active immunity is usually permanent, meaning an individual is protected from the disease for the duration of their lives.

This CDC definition of active immunity recognizes that you can get it by contracting the disease versus through vaccination. In other words, it recognizes what today is commonly called natural immunity achieved by once being infected by the COVID virus. And that such immunity is likely permanent and better than vaccine immunity, as recent clinical studies substantiate. But it also infers that active immunity obtained through vaccination is also permanent, which clearly is not the case for COVID shots, as evidenced by breakthrough infections.

Also note that it has recently been revealed that CDC has not been able to provide any proof of at least one instance of an unvaccinated, naturally immune individual transmitting the COVID-19 virus to another individual.

And a new study found that almost 60 percent of the people with antibodies had no idea they had even had COVID at all. But they would have natural immunity. Quite consistent with the reality that most people suffer no significant health impacts from being infected with the COVID virus, regardless of all the fear mongering by Fauci and others.

Conclusions

To sum up, a close look at what CDC has done lately reinforces the thinking of millions of people who have reservations and concerns about getting COVID genetic therapy shots that pose myriad adverse impacts and sometimes death.

There is a rational, science basis for thinking that the limited benefits of those shots do not adequately offset their risks. This is true for the vast majority of healthy people, especially children, who have extremely low risk from COVID infection for serious illness, hospitalization or death.

Mandates that do not recognize natural immunity are merely a sham tactic to make money for drug companies.

How interesting it would be, in the context of informed consent, if people were shown the original and new CDC vaccine definitions as a means to stimulate productive discussion with medical providers of COVID shots.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Dr. Joel S. Hirschhorn, author of Pandemic Blunder and many articles, podcasts and radio shows on the pandemic, worked on health issues for decades. As a full professor at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, he directed a medical research program between the colleges of engineering and medicine. As a senior official at the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment and the National Governors Association, he directed major studies on health-related subjects; he testified at over 50 US Senate and House hearings and authored hundreds of articles and op-ed articles in major newspapers. He has served as an executive volunteer at a major hospital for more than 10 years. He is a member of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, and America's Frontline Doctors.

He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

The original source of this article is [Mark Taliano](#)
Copyright © [Joel S. Hirschhorn](#), [Mark Taliano](#), 2021

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Joel S. Hirschhorn](#)

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