

Vaccinated People Who Then Test Positive for COVID; the Wave Is Building

[Vaccinated People Who Then Test Positive for COVID; the Wave Is Building](#)

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

January 11, 2022

An alert reader pointed me to a key statement in a document published by OraSure Technologies, a manufacturer of a rapid COVID test. The document [is posted on an FDA web page](#).

It is titled, *“IntelliSwab COVID-19 Rapid Test–Healthcare Provider Instructions for Use.”*

The key quote occurs in a section headlined, Limitations of the Test:

“Potential cross reactivity of the IntelliSwab™ COVID-19 Rapid Test with COVID-19 vaccines or therapeutics has not been evaluated.”

In the medical community, the term “cross reactivity” is universally understood. It means: a test designed to detect whether X is present in a person’s body is, in fact, detecting Y, an entirely irrelevant item, BUT is mistakenly calling it X.

For example, a person had three drinks the night before his test, and the test then came up positive for the presence of a germ, when actually the test was reacting to the alcohol in the drinks.

And in this document I just quoted, the manufacturer readily admits it hasn't looked into the possibility that the COVID test is reacting to the COVID VACCINE and then mistakenly stating the vaccinated person has THE VIRUS in his body.

So the question is: why hasn't the manufacturer looked into this cross reactivity issue? The document shows tests for all sorts of other possible cross reactivity.

And the next question is: how can the FDA grant emergency use authorization for this rapid test, when cross reactivity with the vaccine hasn't been explored?

The manufacturer clearly understands that cross reactivity with the vaccine is a possibility; otherwise they wouldn't have mentioned it.

Consider this scenario: a person takes the COVID vaccine. He can now go back to work at his office. But his boss wants all employees to keep getting tested. Three weeks later, the vaccinated person takes the test—and because the test DOES cross react with the vaccine, he's told he's positive. He has to go home. If he has a cough or a sniffle, he might end up at the doctor, who might direct him to the hospital. At that point, all bets are off. Who knows what highly dangerous and life-threatening treatments (e.g., a breathing ventilator) the hospital might impose—especially since the hospital is receiving federal money for both the diagnosis and treatment of every COVID patient.

In this article, I'm not trying to explain why the test could cross react with the vaccine. All sorts of educated speculations are possible. I'm simply pointing out the existence of rapid COVID tests that have never been examined, thoroughly, for cross-reactivity with the vaccine.

And this is an entirely separate issue from the huge number of deaths and severe injuries directly caused by the vaccine.

Except...it isn't a separate issue, because, if very large numbers of vaccinated people are then testing positive for COVID, and the positive tests are occurring because of cross-reactivity, this is contributing to the lunatic medical assertion that people must take TOXIC boosters, to ward off the possibility of "catching COVID" after just one or two vaccine injections.

Bottom line: It's inexcusable and criminal for a public health agency to approve a test that hasn't been vetted for cross reactivity with a vaccine, when the vaccine has been taken by millions of people.

I'll give you one educated speculation about cross reactivity. The COVID test is looking for a piece of RNA ASSUMED to be part of "the virus." The vaccine contains some part of that RNA-piece. Therefore, when the test is run—depending on the sensitivity of the test—many previously vaccinated people are going to be "positive" for "the virus."

It's all fun and games—if you consider destruction of lives fun and games.

People who have taken the vaccine, and then are told to get tested, could say, "I want you to guarantee that the test has been thoroughly vetted for cross reactivity with the vaccine. Prove it."

I'm not saying this argument would fly, legally speaking, because appearing in courts before judges is a roll of the dice; but the employer who ordered the test might back off.

This, however, is definitely NOT a recommendation that anyone should take the vaccine in the first place.

[Connect with Jon Rappoport](#)

cover image credit: [chenspec](#) / pixabay