

Who controls the British Government response to Covid-19?

by Vanessa Beeley

"The welfare of humanity is always the alibi of tyrants" — [Albert Camus](#)

As Britain hurtles headlong towards neo-feudalist governance with heightened surveillance, micro-management of society and an uptick in fascistic policing of the draconian measures imposed to combat the "threat" of Covid-19, it is perhaps time to analyse the real forces behind this "new normal".

There is now serious doubt over the correlation between lockdown and saving lives. Reality is creeping into the Covid-19 dialogue. It is becoming apparent that people are getting sick because they are being isolated and effectively living under house arrest, condemned as "murderers" if they so much as think about breaking curfew, being snatched on by neighbours for "gathering" more than two people together in their back gardens.

The following graph was produced by UK Column and demonstrates the lack of correlation between lockdown and "saving lives":



Updated 21/4/20

The numbers game is acting in many instances as a smokescreen. It is impossible to rely upon "official" statistics, that vary wildly from one website to another: statistics that rely upon unreliable and sporadic testing procedures, and based upon death certificates that misrepresent the actual cause of death as Covid-19, regardless of pre-existing medical conditions. Statistics, too, that were set in stone very early on in the development stages, when the perspective was limited and compressed, before a true picture could be seen. The [newly emerging statistics](#) are now increasingly undermining initial conclusions and pointing to the futility and negative consequences of lockdown.



Afshin Rattansi
@afshinrattansi

NEW: Barclay Brothers Telegraph claiming an estimated 7,500 killed by coronavirus in UK care homes.

Boris Johnson government has not been revealing numbers to the media, claiming they couldn't calculate them.

10:39 PM · Apr 17, 2020 from [Lambeth, London](#) · [Twitter for Android](#)

263 Retweets **292 Likes**

It is now accepted that there is a high mortality rate among the elderly in [care homes](#) in the UK and [globally](#) — among the same elderly civilians who are being "asked" to sign

Who controls the British Government response to Covid-19?

DNRs (Do Not Resuscitate) forms. This amounts to signing their own death warrant, should they present any of the Covid-19 symptoms. They will be neglected, isolated from their families when at their most vulnerable and left alone to die, even though it is possible that they have not contracted the virus.



John Pilger ✓
@johnpilger



Isolation is a proven silent killer. The UK govt is silent about the 'expert' estimate of 150,000 deaths as a result of the lockdown, not the virus. This figure may prove as unreliable as the estimates 'modelled' by Imperial College. But isn't it time to break the silence?

9:27 AM · Apr 16, 2020 · [Twitter Web App](#)

1.8K Retweets **3.2K** Likes

Instead of offering proactive and positive suggestions that will enable our immune systems to combat the disease, the British Government is ensuring conditions that will suppress immune systems to dangerous levels and create the perfect environment for Covid-19 to flourish.

Britain has now received an estimated [1.4 million new benefit claims](#) for welfare payments, "about seven times the normal level". The government has pledged to bail out "80% of pay of workers who are temporarily laid off" but I have personally spoken to self-employed individuals who find themselves falling between the cracks that qualify them for financial support and now face an indefinite period of time without income.

These measures are being imposed in a country that, since 2012, has seen an exponential growth in child poverty to potentially sub-Victorian levels. In [March 2019](#), the number of children living in "absolute poverty" grew by a staggering 200,000 in a twelve-month period, to a total of 3.7 million. How will this number be further impacted by lockdown?

How did we arrive at this point? Who steered the UK Government towards this questionable and alarmist lockdown policy? The unexamined assumption is that conclusions were formed on the basis of sound epidemiological analysis and research by doctors and scientists who care about our welfare.

The reality is what we will examine in this article. Neil Ferguson, a professor at Imperial College, was responsible for the modelling of a response to Covid-19. His virtual model was recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and it passed through into policy with virtually no scrutiny. Ferguson's dramatic prediction of 500,000 deaths in the UK became the foundation of Boris Johnson's [U-turn](#) from herd immunity to collective quarantine.

While some understood that Ferguson later reduced his mortality calculations, he actually doubled down on his projections [on Twitter](#), insisting that without drastic lockdown measures being taken, the numbers would be even higher.

Who is Neil Ferguson?



Neil Ferguson

Acting Consortium
Director

Ferguson is acting director of the [Vaccine Impact Modelling Consortium](#) (VIMC), which is based at Imperial College in London. According to Ferguson's biography on the website, "much of [his] work is applied, informing disease control policy-making by public and global health institutions."

The professor who derailed Johnson's semblance of "herd immunity" strategy is no stranger to controversy and is described as having a ["patchy" record of modelling pandemics](#) by

Who controls the British Government response to Covid-19?

one of his academic peers, Professor Michael Thrusfield of Edinburgh University, an expert in animal diseases.

Ferguson was instrumental in the modelling of the British Government's response to Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) in 2001, which Thrusfield describes as "not fit for purpose" (2006) and "seriously flawed" (2012). Thrusfield has highlighted the limitations of Ferguson's mathematical modelling methods, and applied the doubts he expressed over FMD to the current Covid-19 "crisis" response.

An estimated twelve million animals were slaughtered as a result of Ferguson's 2001 initiative. The farming community was devastated by suicides and bankruptcies that irretrievably altered the landscape of British agriculture — forcing healthy smallholdings into agri-corporate mergers and empowering the EU central governance in the agricultural sector.



Image copyright: Nick Green

Insight: Slaughtered on Suspicion, a [documentary made by UK Column](#) in 2015, provides a shocking insight into the suffering precipitated by Ferguson's model and the "new normal" imposed upon Britain's farming community. The following is a statement made by one of the contributors to the programme:

12,000,000 animals [*Meat & Livestock Commission statistic*] were slaughtered but that did not include lambs at foot, aborted lambs, calves or piglets. Further, tens of thousands of chickens were slaughtered in the early months — on welfare grounds, apparently. 88% of all animals slaughtered had not contracted FMD [*source: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs*].

Great Orton airfield was used to slaughter sheep under the "voluntary" cull: that was anything but voluntary, and farmers not participating were ruthlessly threatened. There was only one mild case of FMD recorded from the thousands of blood tests done at Great Orton [*source: DEFRA*].

There was a travelator that ran from the slaughter tent at Great Orton to the graves. This ran 16 hours a day, transporting "dead" young lambs. Slaughtermen working there told me that many of the lambs were buried alive.

The man that advised Blair during this fiasco was, as many will know, Prof. Ferguson of Imperial College. He was [*reportedly*] sacked by DEFRA late on during the epidemic, but the damage had been done! Prof Ferguson **was awarded an OBE** in 2002 for his work during FMD 2001." [*Emphasis added*]

In 2002, Ferguson [predicted](#) that up to 50,000 people would die from variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, better known as "mad cow disease", increasing to 150,000 if the epidemic expanded to include sheep. The reality is: "Since 1990, 178 people in the United Kingdom have died from vCJD, according to the [National CJD Research & Surveillance Unit](#) at the University of Edinburgh." (2017)

In 2005, Ferguson claimed that up to 200 million people [would be killed by bird-flu](#) or H5N1. By early 2006, the WHO had only linked [78 deaths to the virus, out of 147 reported cases](#).

In 2009, Ferguson and his team at Imperial College [advised the government](#) that swine flu or H1N1 would probably kill 65,000 people in the UK. In the end, swine flu claimed the lives of 457 people in the UK.


Now, in 2020, Ferguson and Imperial College have released a [report](#) which claims that half a million Britons and 2.2 million Americans may be killed by Covid-19. The report has still not been peer-reviewed; despite this and Ferguson's glaring record of mathematical sensationalism, the British Government has adopted the devastating socio-economic lockdown that Ferguson has proposed.

Why is the British Government so quick to follow Ferguson's plan?

1. GAVI and Imperial College

The VIMC is hosted by the Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology at Imperial College. VIMC is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and by "GAVI, the vaccine alliance" (GAVI's own title for itself). Bill and Melinda Gates began funding Imperial College in 2006, four years before the Gates Foundation launched the [Global Health Leaders Launch Decade of Vaccines Collaboration](#) (GHLLDVC) and one year after Ferguson had demonstrated his penchant for overblown projections on mortality numbers from H5N1.

Up to the end of 2018, the Gates Foundation has [sponsored](#) Imperial College with a whopping \$185 million. That makes Gates the second largest sponsor, beaten to the top spot on the podium by the Wellcome Trust, a British research charity which began [funding](#) Imperial College prior to Ferguson's FMD débâcle and which, by the end of 2018, had already provided Imperial with over \$400 million in funding. I will examine the Wellcome Trust's connections in part two of this series.



Wellcome trust also has a focus on global immunization programmes.

The Gates Foundation established the [GHLLDVC](#) in collaboration with the WHO, UNICEF and the US National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). The following is taken from the Gates Foundation [website](#):

The Global Vaccine Action Plan will enable greater coordination across all stakeholder groups - national governments, multilateral organizations, civil society, the private sector and philanthropic organizations -- and will identify critical policy, resource, and other gaps that must be addressed to realize the life-saving potential of vaccines.


The Collaboration's [leadership council](#) at the time included the Director-General of the WHO, the Director of NIAID, the Director of UNICEF, the President of Gates Foundation Global Health, and the Chair of the African Malaria Alliance. The steering committee included the Director of Immunisation, the UK Department of Health, and many other representatives from the WHO, UNICEF and associated organisations. It is a cluster of immunisation-focused individuals controlling the policy of world health governing bodies, who claim to be neutral.

The WHO was nominated as the "directing and coordinating authority on international health within the United Nations system" and was set up to be responsible for "shaping the health research agenda", among other tasks linked to the policy of global immunisation.

UNICEF, the "world's largest provider of vaccines for developing countries" has on-the-ground access to children in over 150 territories and countries (2010).

We are already seeing the potential for some serious conflict of interest behind the Ferguson model on Covid-19, and this will become even more apparent as the connections are now made to an entire pharmaceutical complex potentially protecting its own interests over any genuine concerns for the health and welfare of global populations.

Gavi, the vaccine alliance




brings together public and private sectors with the shared goal of creating equal access to vaccines for children, wherever they live."

"Gavi is the Vaccine Alliance, which

GAVI is funded and partnered by the same network that forms the GHLLDVC, with some noticeable additions: the World Bank and donor/implementing country governments. The Gates Foundation is a primary sponsor, but is topped by the British Government, which was instrumental in creating GAVI and is its largest donor.



GAVI DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE PERIOD 2000-2020



While many sectors of British society have seen their living standards plummet, with the elderly severely neglected, a National Health Service in decline and homelessness on the increase, the British Government, via UKAID, has pledged £1.44 billion to GAVI for 2016-2020 and will be [hosting the 2020 GAVI](#) pledging conference, which is due to take place in June 2020 to "mobilise at least [US\\$ 7.4 billion](#) in additional resources to protect the next generation with vaccines, reduce disease inequality and create a healthier, safer and more prosperous world." (Emphasis added)

The conference promises to bring together political leaders, civil society, public and private donors, vaccine manufacturers and governments to support GAVI, the vaccine alliance — which boasts that it has "helped vaccinate almost half the world's children against deadly and debilitating infectious diseases". This claim will be met with praise from the pro-vaccine lobby but [concerns over the efficacy and safety](#) of these mass vaccination programmes must be taken into account, particularly when being tested in poorer, developing countries.



[Global vaccination market revenue worldwide](#) is projected to reach \$59.2 billion by 2020; this number may well increase with the arrival of Covid-19. The British Government's investment in GAVI alongside vaccine promoter Bill Gates must, again, raise the issue of conflicts of interest. To what extent is the British Government protecting its own assets in forcing the lockdown upon its population? Vaccines are set to be a major source of income for the world's largest pharmaceutical corporations, and the British Government is invested in that lucrative future.



When Melinda and I started this work more than a decade ago, we were inspired by the conviction that "all lives have equal value." So one of the first things we invested in was vaccines, which protect all children who receive them, no matter how rich or poor they may be. In short, vaccines work.

Bill Gates
Co-Chair, The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation

The GAVI replenishment conference is to be hosted by a British Government whose lockdown policy is effectively shattering the domestic economy and is collectively punishing the most vulnerable in British society.

When Bill Gates partnered with GAVI twenty years ago, he had been considering where next to focus his philanthropy and was "increasingly focusing on the power and potential of vaccines". It was Gates' substantial sponsorship that launched GAVI, and ten years later Gates launched his own "vaccine decade" plan for the 2010s.

The Global Vaccine Action Plan (GVAP) 2012–2020, endorsed by the 194 member states participating in the World Health Assembly (2012), is led by the same members of the Gates "vaccine decade" consortium, promoted by the WHO, and brings together governments, elected officials, health professionals, academia, manufacturers, global agencies, research and development, civil society, media and the private sector — to promote global immunisation. This is a profit-driven corporate complex harnessing the "humanitarian" sector to lend credence to the claims of philanthropy, or more realistically, philanthrocapitalism.

2. GAVI and ID2020



A global management consulting and professional services firm, Accenture joined as a founding partner in June 2017. Accenture representatives participate in ID2020's Executive Board and Technical Advisory Committee.

Why the Alliance
Partners
Governance



The American multinational technology company joined ID2020 in January 2018 as a founding partner. Members of the Microsoft team sit on ID2020's Technical and Program Delivery Advisory Committees.



Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance brings together public and private sectors with the shared goal of creating equal access to new and underused vaccines for children living in the world's poorest countries. Dr. Seth Berkley, CEO of Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, sits on our Executive Board.



Created by IDEO, the international design and consulting firm, to design products, services, and experiences to improve the lives of people in poor and vulnerable communities, IDEO.org joined ID2020 in 2018. IDEO.org is represented on our Program Delivery and Ecosystem & Advocacy Advisory Committees.



Since 1913, the Rockefeller Foundation has sought to improve the well-being of humanity around the world. The Rockefeller Foundation provided ID2020 with seed funding in 2017 and has been an ongoing supporter of ID2020's work.

A glance at the partner page of the GAVI website reveals that not only is GAVI heavily invested in immunisation campaigns, it is also closely connected to the Gates, Microsoft and Rockefeller Foundation seed-funded ID2020 project (Digital Identity Alliance), which incorporates Accenture, Microsoft (Gates), Ideo-Org and Rockefeller Foundation into the GAVI alliance, all with ties to the ID2020 initiative.

ID2020 is promoting the concept that there is a need for universal biometric verification, because "to prove who you are is a fundamental and universal human right," as asserted on the ID2020 website. An article by journalist [Kurt Nimmo](#) for Global Research dismantles the "humanitarian" alibi for tyranny.

[OffGrid Healthcare](#) explains:

What they really want is a fully standardized data collection and retrieval format, and cross-border sharing of identities of the entire population of the planet, in order for the stand-alone AI-powered command center to work without a hitch, and for purposes of calculating everyone's potential contribution, and threat to the system.

Nimmo describes the potential for Covid-19 to be used as cover for mandatory biometric ID. An April [article](#) carried by Reuters confirms the suspicion that biometric ID might soon be introduced, ostensibly to "help verify those who already had the infection and ensure the vulnerable get the vaccine when it is launched". This may sound perfectly sensible to those who are buying the government strap-lines on Covid-19 but — as Nimmo warns us — "COVID-19 is the perfect Trojan horse for a control freak state itching to not only micromanage the lives of ordinary citizens but also ferret out critics and potential adversaries and punish them as enemies of the state."


[Prashant Yadav](#), senior fellow at the US-based Center for Global Development, has said:

Biometric IDs can be a **gamechanger**. They can help governments **target population segments** e.g healthcare professionals or the elderly population, verify people who have received vaccination, and **have a clear record**. *[Emphasis added]*

Who controls the British Government response to Covid-19?

Such statements can easily be interpreted as the harbingers of mandatory vaccination and the inclusion of biometric ID in the "humanitarian" package.

Martin Armstrong of [Armstrong Technologies](#) introduces an even more sinister projection into the mix. Armstrong talks about a digital certificate that verifies you have been vaccinated, developed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and Microsoft, which will merge with ID2020. Covid-19 will be exploited to encourage us to accept digital implants and tracking devices that will enable authorities to keep an eye on us. Armstrong argues that just as 9/11 conditioned us to accept X-ray booths at airports, now we will be chipped alongside our dogs and cats.



The road to 2020 - the future for digital identity in the UK. (Title of Innovate Identity article June 2019)

At this point, it is worth remembering that UKAID is heavily involved in GAVI, and one presumes they are on board with the digital ID2020 project. [Rob Laurence](#), director at UK-based Innovate Identity, presented proposals for the future of digital identity back in [June 2019](#). The UK Government [Verify scheme](#) was identified as a fledgling version of the future of digital ID.

Laurence describes the digital ID "ecosystem" that is emerging: Oliver Dowden, Minister for Implementation at the Cabinet Office (the British Government's co-ordinating department), will form a new Digital ID Unit to "pave the way for the government to consume digital identities from the private sector". Laurence describes 2020 as the "now-or-never year for government and industry to collaborate" in the creation of an "interoperable digital identity market".

Covid19 provides the opportunity that might just fulfil these predictions.

It is no coincidence that a British start-up — Microsoft-funded [Onfido](#) — has recently raised \$100 million to "boost its ID technology" to enable the creation of "immunity passports" for governments "battling coronavirus".

In December 2019, researchers at MIT created a ["microneedle platform"](#) using fluorescent microparticles called quantum dots (QD) which can deliver vaccines and at the same time, invisibly encode vaccination history in the skin": the QDs can be detected by specially adapted smartphones. The "new normal" will mean we are tracked and monitored by our own communication systems to an even greater and more intrusive extent.

The future is being modelled — but not for our benefit


Who controls the British Government response to Covid-19?

In part one of this two-part series, my intention has been to raise questions over who is driving the British Government response to Covid-19. Those who have influenced the lockdown policy have very clear conflict of interest question marks over their agenda.

The [scientific clique](#) influencing government decisions is one that is incorporated into a for-profit Big Pharma industrial network which will, undeniably, benefit from the measures being taken by the British Government — a government that is financially embedded in the same complex.

Why are the views of epidemiologists, doctors, scientists, analysts and health advisors who challenge the lockdown being ignored or censored by the media and by government? Why is the government not widening the circle of advisors to take into account these opposing perspectives that might bring an end to the misery that is a consequence of enforced quarantine? *Off-Guardian* has recorded these views [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#). It is also worth following [Swiss Propaganda Research](#) for regular updates on emerging analysis and statistics that you will not always find in the mainstream media.

Lockdown is the world's biggest psychological experiment - and we will pay the price



[World Economic Forum report on the psychological experiment that is the Covid19 lockdown.](#)

Instead, the British Government is effectively endorsing the breeding of distrust in society, the erosion of public assembly, the isolation and state-sanctioned euthanasia of the elderly, the emerging police state, snitch lines, loss of dignity and livelihoods, greater dependency upon the state for survival, depression, suicide and voluntary incarceration.

31 Deaths: Toll at Quebec Nursing Home in Pandemic Reflects Global Phenomenon

Investigators are examining accusations of gross negligence after dozens of deaths at a residence where health care staff fled amid a coronavirus outbreak.



[An article in New York Times reports on the death toll in care homes which "reflect a global phenomenon" in a world under lockdown.](#)

The UN has [issued a warning](#) that the economic downturn could "kill hundreds of thousands of children in 2020". Gates, the WHO, the British Government and UNICEF are focused on global immunisation for a "pandemic" that is not living up to the alarmist virtual projections sponsored by Gates and the Big Pharma complex, while children really will start to die from malnutrition, neglect and a myriad of consequence of extreme poverty generated by the "steepest downturn since the Great Depression of the 1930s" (IMF).



vanessa beeley @VanessaBeeley · Apr 18

1.Let me be really clear. I defend my right to decide my future without interference or diktats fm a government that has no interest in the wellbeing of the planet, let alone little OLD me. To that end, I will resist anything being made mandatory that has potential to damage...

22

161

431



vanessa beeley @VanessaBeeley · Apr 18

2.. my health or my privacy, freedom, my work or my dissidence & ability to move freely long term. These governments hve effectively conducted global genocide against "brown people", what makes you think they care about their own "little people"?

7

66

219



In part two, I will delve deeper into the interlocking interests of state and private corporate sectors that should not be interfering in policies which affect the welfare of British citizens. I will reveal how the same players are influencing the media response and ensuring that their interests are given the most powerful platforms to promote their agenda.

The questions must be asked: Who is really in charge of the Covid-19 response? Who benefits most? Who will suffer most from the long term consequences? And who will provide respite from those consequences when the "pandemic" has disappeared from view?