

# Johns Hopkins Study Explodes COVID Death Hoax; It's Re-Labeling on a Grand Scale

## [Johns Hopkins Study Explodes COVID Death Hoax; It's Re-Labeling on a Grand Scale](#)

*"This patient who died had an ordinary heart attack."*

*"Not anymore. We're repackaging it as COVID."*

by [Jon Rappoport](#), [No More Fake News](#)

November 30, 2020

Don't blink. Johns Hopkins may delete or retract their analysis at any moment. Their author's study is devastating. Too hot to handle.

UPDATE: Yes, I wrote that opener a few hours before Johns Hopkins stepped in and DID retract the article. Boom. [1] [2] [3] [4]

Hopkins claims the article has been used to spread misinformation about the pandemic, and contains factual errors. CDC is cited as one correct source of facts. Hmm.

Regardless, here is my article, finished before the Johns Hopkins retraction. Since then, I've only polished it a bit in several places, for clarity:

Months ago, I told you this, in a number of articles: The overwhelming percentage of people who are "dying from the virus" are actually dying from traditional diseases.

These people have been relabeled and repackaged as “COVID-19.”

It has nothing to do with “the virus.”

A new analysis from Johns Hopkins confirms this in spades.

The Johns Hopkins News-Letter article, in a student publication, is headlined, “*A closer look at US deaths due to COVID-19.*” It lays out the case made by “Genevieve Briand, assistant program director of the Applied Economics master’s degree program at Hopkins.”

As you keep reading, keep this in mind: If the so-called increase in mortality from COVID is offset, almost exactly, by a decrease in deaths from all other major diseases...

Indicating that the so-called COVID deaths are nothing more than an exercise in re-labeling, then...

You can say there is a new coronavirus, but it’s even less harmful than flu, because virtually everybody recovers...

Or you can say the whole story of a new coronavirus is a fake narrative. There is no new virus.

My readers know I’ve been offering much evidence for the latter conclusion.

Here are key quotes from the Johns Hopkins News-Letter article:

“These data analyses suggest that in contrast to most people’s assumptions, the number of deaths by COVID-19 is not alarming. In fact, it has relatively no effect on deaths in the United States.”

“This comes as a shock to many people. How is it that the data lie so far from our perception?”

“When Briand looked at the 2020 data during that seasonal period, COVID-19-related deaths exceeded deaths from heart

diseases. This was highly unusual since heart disease has always prevailed as the leading cause of deaths. However, when taking a closer look at the death numbers, she noted something strange. As Briand compared the number of deaths per cause during that period in 2020 to [deaths per cause in] 2018, she noticed that instead of the expected drastic increase across all causes, there was a significant decrease in deaths due to heart disease. Even more surprising, as seen in the graph below, this sudden decline in deaths is observed for all other causes.”

“This trend is completely contrary to the pattern observed in all previous years. Interestingly, as depicted in the table below, the total decrease in deaths by other causes almost exactly equals the increase in deaths by COVID-19. This suggests, according to Briand, that the COVID-19 death toll is misleading. Briand believes that deaths due to heart diseases, respiratory diseases, influenza and pneumonia may instead be [may have been] recategorized as being due to COVID-19.”

“The CDC classified all deaths that are related to COVID-19 simply as COVID-19 deaths. Even patients dying from other underlying diseases but are infected with COVID-19 count as COVID-19 deaths. This is likely the main explanation as to why COVID-19 deaths drastically increased while deaths by all other diseases experienced a significant decrease.”

“‘All of this points to no evidence that COVID-19 created any excess deaths. Total death numbers are not above normal death numbers. We found no evidence to the contrary,’ Briand concluded.”

“‘If [the COVID-19 death toll] was not misleading at all, what we should have observed is an increased number of heart attacks and increased COVID-19 numbers. But a decreased number of heart attacks and all the other death causes doesn’t give us a choice but to point to some misclassification [re-labeling],’ Briand replied.”

“In other words, the effect of COVID-19 on deaths in the U.S. is considered problematic only when it increases the total number of deaths or the true death burden by a significant amount in addition to the expected deaths by other causes. Since the crude number of total deaths by all causes before and after COVID-19 [was first announced] has stayed the same, one can hardly say, in Briand’s view, that COVID-19 deaths are concerning.”

Of course, there is some mealy-mouthed backtracking in the article. The virus is deadly and the pandemic is real, etc. But the data are the data.

The whole COVID operation is a hoax.

If I thought other honest researchers would investigate and re-calculate the Hopkins analysis, I would say, let’s see what they come up with. But based on my experience, there will be, at best, a brief flurry of articles in the press about this extraordinary finding, and then the scientific and press denizens will move on, as if nothing happened. That is their way. They briefly expose a scandal and then they slither off to cover up the scandal.

The other possibility is: Hopkins will retract the analysis, claiming it was flawed. That is the other strategy the low-crawling creatures sometimes deploy.

So there you have it.

Hoax. Con. Fake.

As I keep reporting, the virus (never proven to exist) is the cover story for the true phase-one goal: destruction of the economy.

If the virus were real, if it were attacking people left and right, the all-cause mortality numbers would be through the roof.

But they aren't.

"I have a great idea, Bill. Let's declare a fake pandemic. We'll report all sorts of high death numbers. But really, we'll just be subtracting numbers from other traditional diseases that cause deaths, and we'll add those numbers to our fake pandemic."

"Sounds great, Tony. Can you pull it off? I mean, it's pretty obvious."

"Sure, we can pull it off. And if some journalist with a mainstream reputation or an institution suddenly develops a brief infection of ETHICS, we'll call their work a mistake or a lapse in judgment."

"You mean an institution like the World Health Organization or Johns Hopkins?"

"Right. We'll say the institution didn't issue the study, it was just one of their people, a lone researcher. And if necessary, the institution, under pressure, will back off. But that's assuming anyone noticed the study in the first place. Normally, these 'revelations' surface for a moment and then sink like a stone. No one cares. A pandemic is a money waterfall. The beneficiaries won't sacrifice their bottom lines, or their reputations..."

Of course, people can rise up and raise holy hell.

---

#### SOURCES:

[ 1 ]

<https://www.jhunewsletter.com/article/2020/11/a-closer-look-at-u-s-deaths-due-to-covid-19>

[ 2 ]

<https://web.archive.org/web/20201126163323/https://www.jhunews>

letter.com/article/2020/11/a-closer-look-at-u-s-deaths-due-to-covid-19

[3]

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1i00K75EZAF8dkNDkDmM3L4zNNY0X-Xw5/view>

[4] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3TKJN61af1I>