

# The UK Government's Official Data Shows They Are Killing Our Children

They should EITHER admit their data is garbage or that the vaccines should be IMMEDIATELY halted for ages 10 to 14. Ideally, they admit BOTH. Practically speaking, they will do NEITHER.

By [Steve Kirsch](#)

Global Research, July 19, 2022

[Steve Kirsch's Newsletter](#) 15 July 2022

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [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](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

\*\*\*

## Introduction

*I was inspired by [this article in the Expose](#) to take a look at the latest UK numbers.*

*The numbers can be found by downloading the [latest dataset \(the May 2022 numbers\) found on the official UK ONS site](#).*

*When I did that, two things jumped out at me:*

- 1. The "UK numbers are garbage" is confirmed once again by this dataset.*
- 2. If you believe the UK numbers are right, then you should be jumping up and down and IMMEDIATELY BE DEMANDING a halt to the vaccines for ages 10 to 14.*

*Details of both claims are explained below.*

*But here's the punchline: there is simply no way out of this for the UK government. They must pick either 1 or 2. They must either confirm their numbers are garbage or they must call an immediate halt to the vaccines for 10 to 14.*

*The UK press should force them to choose which way they want to have their credibility decimated.*

*My suggestion: They should come clean and admit to both.*

*Here are the details for each of my assertions.*

## The UK numbers are garbage

1	<b>Whole period counts of all cause deaths, deaths involving COVID-19 and deaths not involving COVID-19, and</b>						
2	This worksheet contains 1 table.						
3	Source: Source: Office for National Statistics, National Immunisation Management Service.						
4	<b>Age group</b>	<b>Vaccination status</b>	<b>Person-years</b>	<b>Count of deaths involving COVID-19</b>	<b>Count of deaths non-COVID-19 deaths</b>	<b>Count of all cause deaths</b>	<b>Column1</b>
5	10-14	Unvaccinated	2881265	9	175	184	6.38608389
6	10-14	First dose, less than 21 days ago	61754	2	2	4	6.47731321
7	10-14	First dose, at least 21 days ago	280645	0	14	14	4.98850861
8	10-14	Second dose, less than 21 days ago	36646	0	0	0	0
9	10-14	Second dose, between 21 days and 6 months ago	135989	0	13	13	9.55959673
10	10-14	Second dose, at least 6 months ago	1028	0	1	1	97.2762646
11	10-14	Third dose or booster, less than 21 days ago	723	0	1	1	138.312586
12	10-14	Third dose or booster, at least 21 days ago	2422	1	6	7	289.017341

UH OH!!! The UK government now has a huge problem. A triply vaxxed child is 45 times more likely to die than an unvaccinated child. That makes the vaccine the biggest child killer ever deployed by any government and makes COVID deaths look like rounding error (45X vs. 0.05X).

First of all, compliments are due to the UK government for exposing the data. The US government doesn't expose any data nearly this detailed so it's impossible to do the proper analyses on the US data because there is no data to use.

The UK government seems to be not including the most interesting metrics to assess safety and efficacy. The Expose points this out; it seems when the numbers work against them, they either stop reporting the data entirely, stop breaking it out, or in this case, not doing the calculation of the deaths per 100K person years so that only more motivated people will take the time and see that there is a huge problem.

For your convenience, you can [download my annotated version here](#). Go to Table 6. My annotations are in Column G. The important numbers that we'll use below are in red.

We see that the all-cause mortality (ACM) rate for ages 20-24 is reduced by a factor of 2 (compare G21 vs. G28).

That's impossible! The vaccine isn't a fountain of youth. It is only claimed to reduce death from COVID, not eliminate deaths from all known diseases.

According to the unvaccinated Row 21, only  $(43/378) = 8.3\%$  of the deaths are from COVID. So if you have a PERFECT vaccine, ACM can only go down by 8.3%. It cannot go down by 50%.

This is similar to [what Professor Norman Fenton has pointed out in his July 13, 2022 article](#): the COVID vaccines aren't a fountain of youth but that's exactly what his analysis found as well.

This is no surprise and isn't new. I [noted this in my May 5, 2022 article when I tried to use the UK data in calculations](#) I found most of the UK ONS data was unusable because it simply

made no sense. This is why I chose the row that I did in that particular analysis.

Producing garbage data and then using that garbage data as a basis for public policy is a huge embarrassment for the UK government.

So therefore, their official response will be to label me and Professor Fenton as misinformation spreaders and ignore us. Problem solved!

Well, not so fast.

Because if the UK data is accurate then...

**Kids aged 10 to 14 are dying at a rate 45 times higher than normal**

If the UK numbers are accurate, they need to halt the vaccines for ages 10 to 14 immediately because it is raising ACM for kids by a factor of 45 (G12/G5).

In other words, the vaccines are the most dangerous intervention in human history for this age group. It makes COVID look like rounding error:

- COVID: 5% ACM increase
- COVID vaccine: 4400% ACM increase

Some “experts” could “explain” this by claiming that only the kids who were most at risk opted for the third shot and that explains the higher ACM. Only those with an AVERAGE of a 45X higher rate of death opted for the third shot? Show me the evidence please!

And while you’re at it, show me the evidence that ONLY kids with a 15X higher rate of death decided to stick with just 2 doses.

Some people could say “oh the numbers are small for dose 3.” Fine, even if we combine all the numbers for Dose 2 and Dose 3, the ACM death rate doubles for the vaccinated kids. It is supposed to slightly decrease (and for 20-24 year olds it was cut in half as we noted above). Instead it doubled.

Then the excuse will be that the Dose 3 data “skewed” the result... you should only look at the Dose 2 data.

But that doesn’t work either. Kids who just took Dose 2 are also much more likely to die than kids in the unvaccinated group.

There is only one conclusion you can draw from this:

**Someone made a huge mistake in approving these vaccines for kids**

They had insufficient data to approve these vaccines in the first place since there were no child deaths FROM COVID, there cannot ever be a positive risk benefit.

But now they HAVE data from the real world and it is clearly negative. So what do they do? They ignore it because it makes them look bad.

There is no way you can spin this data as supportive of the vaccine.

The UK government and all governments throughout the world will ignore this because it is inconvenient to talk about it.

Similarly, nobody in the mainstream media will write about it. I'd be willing to bet big money on it (and I'd be thrilled if I lost the bet). Any takers?

If you thought that was bad, it gets even worse

Read [this article showing they found the same issues in Israel with excess deaths for young kids who took the vaccine](#). The Israeli government buried the data, the scientists who did the work though that was unethical to not inform the public, so it was leaked by whistleblowers.

Or [watch this video talking about bulk ordering of caskets for babies](#) in the UK.

Also, [Fenton just updated his article](#) which now shows the ACM numbers from 2011 to 2019. The ACM numbers for 2020 were 1043 (which seems reasonable due to the increased death from COVID). So how is it possible that the unvaccinated are now dying at a rate of 1474 (40% higher than in 2020) while the vaccinated are dying at a rate of 892.9 (which is 5% less than any normal year)? Both numbers are highly improbable: the 1474 is too high and the 892 is too low.

And I think the true numbers would show the vaccinated are dying at a higher rate than the unvaccinated; it's pretty unlikely you're better off if you're vaccinated.

Why am I pointing this out to you instead of the UK government?

They didn't. So I did.

## Summary

The UK government can't have their cake and eat it too.

They have to make a decision. They must decide whether their numbers are garbage or whether to stop the vaccine for ages 10 to 14. Either way they decide, it's a huge embarrassment for the UK government.

The right decision is to admit the truth that both are true: their numbers are fraudulent and they shouldn't be vaccinating kids without data showing a clear benefit and their data shows the opposite.. That's what I would do if I were in charge.

What will they do? I know exactly what they will do. They will ignore my analysis and hope that nobody finds out about it. For sure, the mainstream media will never ask them about this data.

That is why it's important for you to share this article everywhere on all your social media platforms. I adjusted the headline to reduce the risk of censorship.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

*Featured image is from NaturalNews.com*

The original source of this article is [Steve Kirsch's Newsletter](#)

Copyright © [Steve Kirsch](#), [Steve Kirsch's Newsletter](#), 2022

---

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

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Steve Kirsch](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)