Blaze Media / Op-ed

Horowitz: NYT catches CDC in gravely consequential lie about outdoor transmission

DANIEL HOROWITZ | May 11, 2021

f in 🗖

sshepard/Getty Images

Like Blaze News? Get the news that matters most delivered directly to your inbox.

Your email

From day one of this pandemic, it was abundantly clear that outdoor transmission — aside from perhaps an infected individual screaming in someone's face — is essentially zero. Had the CDC properly conveyed this fact to the public, it could have preserved an amazing quality of life for so many people that would have included continuation of children's play and sports, seniors enjoying more friendship, fresh air, and vitamin D, and a happier, less depressed society. Yet, to this day, they are continuing to children to wear masks even outdoors in the summer heat.

Special: POLL: What scares you the most?

In what Rush Limbaugh used to call "a random act of journalism," New York Times reporter David Leonhardt published a very thorough takedown of the CDC's outdoor masking guidance. The takedown brings into question how we can trust anything else they tell us when they seem hell-bent on playing up the danger of the virus at all costs and in all situations, overstating the efficacy of non-pharmaceutical intervention, and underplaying the concerns about side effects from mask-wearing and the vaccines.

Several weeks ago, CDC Director Rochelle Walensky stated at a White House press conference that there's "increasing data that suggests that most of transmission is happening indoors rather than outdoors." She gave a number of "less than 10 percent of documented transmission" occurring outdoors.

The problem with this statement is that the number is really much closer to zero, and this fact was known over a year ago. As Leonhardt points out, some enidemiologists he enoke to helieve it may be helow 0.1 nercent and

"almost all" transmission "seems to have involved crowded places or close conversation."

"Saying that less than 10 percent of Covid transmission occurs outdoors is akin to saying that sharks attack fewer than 20,000 swimmers a year," writes Leonhardt. "(The actual worldwide number is around 150.) It's both true and deceiving."

This is not just a matter of semantics. As the article observes, based o notion that there is still some very measurable transmission outdoors CDC is still recommending all unvaccinated people wear masks outdoors, including children in summer camp. They also continue to give people the impression that one can catch the virus naturally outdoors just casually passing someone, which is continuing to discourage those who are really fearful of the virus from even living normal lives outdoors.

Indeed, not a single known case of casual outdoor transmission has been documented in the entire world. A study of 7,324 cases in Wuhan found just one outdoor transmission in a case where someone had a sustained conversation with an individual who already had symptoms. A study in Ireland found the ratio to be 1 in 1,000.

Now extrapolate the statistical anomaly of outdoor transmission to children who are not exhibiting symptoms for a virus that doesn't even meaningfully affect them, and we are still making them wear masks in the summer heat without any evidence that masks work even indoors.



According to the New York Times, much of the reputed outdoor transmission in the academic research the CDC relied upon occurred at construction sites in Singapore that were likely indoors. And of course, nobody ever bothered to research whether those individuals were indeed wearing masks, as seems to be the case in most Asian countries, which would disprove the efficacy of masks anyway.

Rather than question the CDC's illogical premise on mask-wearing altogether, Leonhardt continues to assume masks work indoors as a law of gravity and suggests that the CDC should issue the following message: "Masks make a huge difference indoors and rarely matter outdoors."

The obvious question anyone should be asking is that if the CDC is exaggerating the *need* to wear masks *outdoors*, why are we to trust them about the efficacy of wearing them indoors? Both the CDC and the WHO have recently admitted that the six-foot rule is a complete hoax and that it's primarily aerosols, remaining suspended in the air indoors and traveling farther than six feet, that are transmitting the virus.

First, this is a further indictment of their unwillingness to categorically bless normal living outdoors, given how easy it is to transmit indoors. But more broadly, as I've explained in great detail, the aerosols that are small enough to suspend in air and travel great distances are, by definition, small enough

to get through the gaps and pores of a face mask, especially ones that are not rated as high as N-95s and above. But we are somehow to believe the fake advertising of the CDC on masking as if it were brought down by Moses on the tablets.

Notice a pattern here? The misinformation always flows in the direction of creating more panic, fear, and social control, while also boosting Big Pharma, though not enough to interfere with the control, because if vaccines were that awesome, all masking should be over with. Even 1 months after amassing incontrovertible scientific data proving childron and not at risk and outdoor transmission is statistically insignificant, they are still willing to advocate life-and-death policies that contradict this science. This is what we call political science, not life science.

Most recent

Two NYC mayoral candidates go viral after displaying profound ignorance of housing values; one is a former Obama admin member

4h