



Covid Lies: Masks and Lockdowns

Description

“There is no medical or public health emergency. We can and should take back our freedoms with immediate effect. Testing healthy people stops. If you’re sick, please stay home. Masks belong in the trash.” – Dr. Mike Yeadon

By [Dr. Mike Yeadon](#), 10 April 2022

THE NARRATIVE POINT 6

Masks are effective in **preventing the spread of this virus.**

IMPORTANCE

This is mostly used to maintain the illusion of danger. You see others’ masks and feel afraid. Complying is also a measure of whether you do what you’re told, even if the measure is useless.

THE REALITY

We have known for decades that surgical masks worn in medical theatres do not stop respiratory virus transmission. Masks were tested across a series of operations by doctors at the Royal College of Surgeons (UK). No difference in post-operative infection rate was seen by mask use.

Cloth masks definitely don’t stop respiratory virus transmission as shown by several large, randomised trials. If anything, they increase the risk of lung infections. The authorities have mostly conceded on cloth masks.

Some people speak of “source control,” catching droplets. Problem is, there is no evidence that transmission takes place via droplets. Equally, there is no evidence it occurs via fine aerosols. No one finds it on masks, or on air filters in hospital wards of Covid patients, either. Where is the virus?

CONCLUSION AND VERDICT FALSE

FALSE

- It's not necessary to use up time on this topic. It was known long before Covid-19 that face masks don't do anything.
- Many don't know that blue medical masks aren't filters. Your inspired and expired air moves in and out between the mask and your face. They are splashguards, that's all.
- This is a good [review](#) of the findings with masks in respiratory viruses by a recognised expert in the field. No effect.¹¹
- Neither masks nor lockdowns prevented the spread of the virus. This review summarizes [400 papers](#).¹²

THE NARRATIVE POINT 7

Lockdowns **slow down the spread** and reduce the number of cases and deaths.

IMPORTANCE

The most impactful yet wasteful intervention, accomplishing nothing useful.

Useful to the perpetrators, however, wishing to damage the economy and reduce interpersonal contacts. This measure was surprisingly tolerated in many wealthy countries, because "furlough" schemes were put in place, compensating many people for not working, or requiring them to work from home.

THE REALITY

The measure, though among the most repressive acts ever imposed on citizens in a democracy, was intuitively reasonable to many. This is an example of how far off-course uninformed intuition can be.

The core idea was simple. Respiratory viruses are transmitted from person to person. Reducing the average number of contacts surely reduces transmission? Actually, it doesn't, because **the transmission concept is wrong**. Transmission is from a SYMPTOMATIC person to a susceptible person. Those with symptoms are UNWELL. They remain at home in most cases with no action from the government. Transmission occurred mostly in institutions where sick people and susceptible people were forced into contact: hospitals, care homes, and domestic settings.

CONCLUSION AND VERDICT FALSE

FALSE

- A general lockdown had no detectable impact on epidemic spreading, cases, hospitalisations, or deaths.
- This is now widely accepted, after a [meta-analysis](#) by Johns Hopkins University (interestingly, as

the JHU repeatedly features as an actor in a documentary about pandemic-related fraud by German journalist Paul Schreyer).¹³

- This is because those involved in the vast bulk of human-to-human contacts are fit and well and such contacts didn't result in transmission. Essentially, if you're fooled by the "asymptomatic transmission" lie, then lockdown might make sense. However, since it is epidemiologically irrelevant, lockdowns can never work, and of course, all the voluminous literature confirms this.
- This concept is unequivocally known to multiple public health scientists and doctors. This is why "lockdown" had never been tried before.
- Importantly, WHO scientists drafted a [detailed review](#) of all the non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) in 2019 and distributed copies of the report to all member states.¹⁴
- This means that ALL member states already knew, late in 2019, that masks, lockdowns, border restrictions, and business or school closures were futile. Only "stay home if you're sick" works at all, and people don't need to be told this, for they are too unwell to go out.

References

- ¹⁴ World Health Organization. Non-pharmaceutical public health measures for mitigating the risk and impact of epidemic and pandemic influenza: annex: report of systematic literature reviews. World Health Organization, 2019. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/329439> License: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO

Source

Dr. Mike Yeadon wrote a paper titled '[The Covid Lies](#)' which was published on the [Doctors for Covid Ethics](#) website. This paper is a working draft dated 10 April 2022.

At 31 pages long the paper is longer than most would read in one sitting. As it details vital information for all of us, we are republishing his paper in more easily digestible portions in a series of articles, one each day over the next week or so. This is the third in our series, 'Covid Lies', and covers lies 6-7 as listed in Dr. Yeadon's paper.

By Rhoda Wilson

Category

1. Crime-Justice-Terrorism-Corruption
2. Disasters-Crisis-Depopulation-Genocide
3. Health-Wellness-Healing-Nutrition & Fitness
4. Main
5. NWO-Deep State-Dictatorship-Tyranny

Date Created

05/23/2022