

Coronavirus Lockdown and What You Are Not Being Told. Understanding Mainstream Media Disinformation

Part I

By [Iain Davis](#)

Global Research, April 22, 2020

[OffGuardian](#) 17 April 2020

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

We have been given a very clear narrative about the declared coronavirus pandemic. The UK State has passed legislation, in the form of the Coronavirus Act, to compel people to self isolate and practice social distancing in order to delay the spread of SARS-CoV-2 (SC2). We are told this “lockdown”, a common prison term, is essential. We are also told that SC2 has been clearly identified to be the virus which causes the COVID 19 syndrome.

At [the time of writing](#) SC2 is said to have infected 60,733 people with 7,097 people supposedly dying of COVID 19 in the UK. This case fatality ration (CFR) of 11.7% is seemingly [one of the worst](#) in the world. Furthermore, with just 135 people recovered, the recovery rate in the UK is inexplicably low.

Some reading this may balk at use of words like “seemingly” and “alleged” in reference to these statistics. The mainstream media (MSM) have been leading the charge to cast anyone who questions the State’s coronavirus narrative as *putting lives at risk*. The claim being that questioning what we are told by the State, its officials and the MSM undermines the lockdown. The lockdown is, we are told, essential to save lives.

It is possible both to support the precautionary principle and question the lockdown. Questioning the scientific and statistical evidence base, supposedly justifying the complete removal of our civil liberties, does not mean those doing so care nothing for their fellow citizens. On the contrary, many of us are extremely concerned about the impact of the lockdown on everyone. It is desperately sad to see people blindly support their own house arrest while attacking anyone who questions the necessity for it.

The knee jerk reaction, assuming any questioning of the lockdown demonstrates a cavalier, uncaring disregard is puerile. Grown adults shouldn’t simply believe everything they are told like mindless idiots. Critical thinking and asking questions is never “bad” under any circumstances whatsoever.

Only the State, with the unwavering support of its MSM propaganda operation, enforces unanimity of thought. If a system cannot withstand questioning it suggests it is built upon shaky foundations and probably not worth maintaining. Yet perhaps it is what we are not told that is more telling.

Among the many things we are not told is how many lives the lockdown will ruin and end

prematurely. Are these lives irrelevant?

We are not told the evidence for the existence of a virus called SARS-CoV-2 is highly questionable and the tests for it unreliable; we are not told that the numbers of deaths reportedly caused by COVID 19 is statistically vague, seemingly deliberately so; we are not told that these deaths are well within the normal range of excess winter mortality and we are not told that in previous years excess winter deaths have been higher than they are now.

We didn't need to destroy the economy in response to those, far worse, periods of loss so why do we need to do so for this?

We will look at this in more detail in Part 2.

Understanding mainstream media disinformation

✖ Before we address what we are not being told it's worth looking at how the MSM is spreading disinformation. On February 22nd one rag printed a story which absurdly alleged, without a shred of evidence, that Russia was somehow [deliberately spreading disinformation](#) about coronavirus. It reported this uncritically, questioning nothing. Their opening paragraph read:

Thousands of Russian-linked social media accounts have launched a coordinated effort to spread misinformation and alarm about coronavirus, disrupting global efforts to fight the epidemic, US officials have said."

On March 10th the same rag reported [another story](#) about disinformation in which it was noted:

Disinformation experts say, there remains little evidence of concerted efforts to spread falsehoods about the virus, suggesting that the misleading information in circulation is spread primarily through grassroots chatter."

The irony shouldn't be overlooked. Directly contradicting their own previous disinformation, this MSM pulp assumes we are all so stupid we won't notice their perpetual spin and evidence-free claims. The UK's national broadcaster the BBC is perhaps the worst of all the disinformation propagandists. The sheer volume of disinformation they are pumping out is quite breathtaking.

The United Nations [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#) spells out what freedom of expression means. All human beings are born free with equal dignity and rights. All are afforded these rights without any distinction at all. Article 19 states:

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."

✖ The BBC, who obviously couldn't care less about human rights, gleefully supported the

ensorship of so called [conspiracy theorist David Icke](#). They did so by spreading disinformation. Icke raised concerns about the possible link between 5G and the spread of coronavirus. He did not incite violence, as suggested in the BBC's disinformation. The BBC misled the public utterly when they stated:

"Conspiracy theories linking 5G signals to the coronavirus pandemic continue to spread despite there being no evidence the mobile phone signals pose a health risk."

While I agree with the BBC that there is no evidence of a link between 5G and the apparent coronavirus, we certainly can't rule it out. Because the second half of their statement, that there is *no evidence* that mobile signals *pose a health risk*, was a mendacious deceit.

There *is* a [wealth of evidence](#) of that risk.

The leading medical journal *The Lancet* [noted these risks](#) in 2018:

...mounting scientific evidence suggests that prolonged exposure to radiofrequency electromagnetic radiation has serious biological and health effects."

Why are the BBC so willing to mislead the public and expose them to unnecessary health harms? Is it deliberate or are they just shoddy journalists?

Either way, quite clearly they are habitual [pedlars of disinformation](#). They appear to no better than the worst clickbait sites that have proliferated over recent years.

The MSM is responsible for the majority of misinformation and disinformation circulating at the moment. We must diligently verify every claim they make and check the evidence ourselves. They are not to be trusted. As the BBC quite rightly points out:

STOP BEFORE YOU SHARE
CHECK YOUR SOURCES

(If it's the MSM check to see if they offer any evidence at all or if it's just their opinion. If it's their opinion ignore it. It's almost certainly unfounded)

PAUSE IF YOU FEEL EMOTIONAL

(If you do feel emotional you have probably just been manipulated by the MSM)

"Science led" means cherry picking science

The UK State has been keen to insist that we all believe their lockdown response is [led by the science](#). However they have cherry picked the science to roll out the lockdown and ignored the considerable scientific evidence which contradicts it. Both the UK and U.S. governments used [the computer models](#) of Imperial College London (ICL), predicting millions of deaths, to justify the removal of our civil liberties.

Almost as soon as the lockdown was in place the scientists, having launched their [vaccine](#)

[research fund raiser](#), downgraded their projections from an estimated 550,000 deaths in the UK to 20,000 or even lower. Neil Furguson, the lead scientist responsible for the [initial ICL report](#) stated that they had revised the figures because of the effectiveness of the lockdown safety measures.



Claiming the lockdown would need to last for at least 18 months until a vaccine is found. ICL are grant recipients of the [Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation](#). They have shown no interests at all in researching possible preventative treatments, reducing the need for a vaccine, such as [hydroxychloroquine](#).

The initial ICL computer models were based upon unproven assumptions. They assumed that SC2 would spread like influenza. This was contrary to the findings of the [World Health Organisation](#) who stated both that SC2 did not appear to spread as quickly as influenza and was less virulent.

The WHO found up to a 20% infection rate, where people were exposed to SC2 in crowded settings for prolonged periods, and a 1-5% infection rate in the community. This was nothing like the spread of the 1918 H1N1 influenza pandemic.

However, publishing their paper on March 16th, the ICL completely ignored the WHO research which was [published a month earlier](#) and stated, without any justification whatsoever:

COVID-19, a virus with comparable lethality to H1N1 influenza in 1918"

Public Health England (PHE) disagreed with ICL's evidence free assumptions and [downgraded COVID 19](#) from a High Consequence Infectious Disease (HCID), due to relatively low mortality rates.

However, ignoring both the WHO and PHE, the UK and US decided only the ICL knew what they were talking about. Cherry-picking their highly dubious research, they insisted the lockdown was necessary to "*flatten the curve*" and, in the UK, protect the NHS.

The science the State has chosen to believe is the minority view it seems. Epidemiologists, epidemiological statisticians, microbiologists, mathematicians and many other scientists and academics the world over have repeatedly warned that the lockdown is precisely [the wrong thing to do](#).

COVID 19, the disease supposedly caused by SC2, is experienced as little more than a bad cough or cold by the vast majority of relatively healthy people. Dr Knut M. Wittkowski (Ph.D) is among the [growing number](#) of globally renowned scientists [who question](#) what we are told by the State and its MSM. In regard to both SC2 and COVID 19.

Dr Wittkowski stated:

"With all respiratory diseases, the only thing that stops the disease is herd immunity. About 80% of the people need to have had contact with the virus. it's very important to keep the schools open and kids mingling to spread the virus to get herd immunity as fast as possible, and then the elderly people,

who should be separated, and the nursing homes should be closed during that time, can come back and meet their children and grandchildren after about 4 weeks when the virus has been exterminated....If we had herd immunity now, there couldn't be a second wave in autumn."

Such scientists and academics are all completely ignored by the State. Yet they believe others, such as Professor Neil Ferguson and [Professor Karine Lacombe](#) without hesitation. Perhaps it is just a coincidence that the scientists the State chooses to believe overwhelmingly appear to have close links to the globalist foundations and pharmaceutical corporations developing the vaunted coronavirus vaccine.

Are you sure about the coronavirus lockdown?

Those who reject all criticism of the lockdown, and simply accept whatever the State tells them, presumably believe the State only has our best interests at heart and would never do anything to harm us. Perhaps they believe that to question the claims of the State can only ever be *conspiracy theory*.

Certainly that's the message [constantly reinforced](#) by the MSM.

However, there is also plenty of evidence that the State frequently deceives the public. We only need look to the WMD lies told to start an illegal Iraq war in 2003 to understand that the State is willing to [further the interests](#) of the powerful and cares little about lives lost in the effort.



Therefore, in the UK, it is worth recapping what it is we are consenting to with the Coronavirus Act:

We consent to increased State surveillance of ourselves and our family.

We are happy that we could be detained, without charge, because some state official suspects, or claims they suspect, we may be infected.

It is fine with us that we or our loved ones can be sectioned under the Mental Health Act on the recommendation of a single doctor and neither we nor they need to have the protection of a second opinion before we are locked up.

We accept that the state can retain our biometric data and fingerprints for an extended period.

We consent that jury trials are a bit of an anachronism and Judges can hear more evidence by video or even audio link.

We think it's fine that the evidence required, and processes undertaken, to determine and record our or our loved one's deaths can be eroded to the point where they can be registered by people with no medical or legal expertise at all.

We don't think the NHS needs to adhere to practice standards or bother with assessing the needs of some patients, especially older people.

We are also fine with the complete suspension of democracy in Britain.

We accept all of this based upon a unique subset of scientific opinion which, contrary to every known scientific principle, can never be questioned.

We agree with the MSM that people who question any aspect of the stories they tell us are dangerous because these people just don't care if their own loved ones die. Only true believers care about their families.

We also accept the need for the State to invest considerable resources creating [counter disinformation units](#) whose purpose is to [censor anything and everything](#) which questions our firmly held beliefs. The beliefs informed by the many of the same people doing the censoring.



Dr. Sucharit Bhakdi -world leading microbiologist

I don't know about you, but I remain unconvinced by the evidence I've seen so far. I have no doubt that there is a health crisis and excess seasonal deaths, but I have seen no evidence at all that the numbers are unprecedented or unusual in any way. Evidence we will explore in greater detail in Part 2.

I accept that we should exercise the precautionary principle and take steps to limit the risks to the most vulnerable but I do not accept that the lockdown is the best way to go about it. Nor do I see any necessity at all for all the other dictatorial clauses in the Coronavirus Act. I do not consent.

If you think this will all be over soon and won't get worse I'm afraid you may be disappointing. The UK state have based this lockdown on the scientific rubbish spewed out by ICL. Here's another one of the ICL's recommendations:

The major challenge of suppression is that this type of intensive intervention package – or something equivalently effective at reducing transmission – will need to be maintained until a vaccine becomes available (potentially 18 months or more)."

There is nothing to suggest this isn't the intention of the State. Certainly voices in the U.S. [are already indicating](#) their desire for an 18 month lockdown. Apparently taking their cue directly from the discredited ICL report and steadfastly ignoring everything else. Nor should we assume the draconian powers seized by the state won't get worse.

Most of this response is being driven by globalist policy emanating, on this occasion, from the World Health Organisation. Speaking at the [daily WHO press briefing](#) on the March 30th Dr. Michael Ryan, Executive Director of the WHO Health Emergencies Programme, said:

Lockdowns and shutdowns really should just be part of an overall comprehensive strategy.....Most of the transmission that's actually happening in many countries now is happening in the household at family level....Now we need to go and look in families to find those people who may be sick and remove them and isolate them in a safe and dignified manner."

Given that we now live in a *de facto* dictatorship there's no reason to believe that states across the globe won't use this as justification to start removing people from their homes.

My hope is that sense will prevail and, as it becomes clear the pandemic is waning, public pressure will mount to repeal this dictatorial legislation.

However, given some of the comments I have seen on social media over the last two weeks, the panic buying and attacks upon anyone questioning the State's narrative, it seems many people are so frightened they desperately need to believe the State is trying to save them.

This fear is based upon apparent ignorance of the economic severity of the lockdown and the monumental health risk it poses. People don't seem to want to know there is considerable doubt the Coronavirus Act is even legal in international law. There is also doubt that SARS-CoV-2 is an identifiable virus and the statistics we are given may well be based upon tests that can't identify it anyway. There is evidence that the statistics we have been given have been deliberately manipulated to exaggerate the health risk and there is no evidence these excess deaths are "*unprecedented*."

If you are among the few willing to look at this evidence I hope you will read part 2 of this article series. [Click here](#).

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

All images in this article are from OffGuardian unless otherwise stated

The original source of this article is [OffGuardian](#)
Copyright © [Iain Davis](#), [OffGuardian](#), 2020

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Iain Davis](#)

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