

DESMOND SWAYNE

N-04

by Anon

For the author's bio, please go to the last page

24 Dec 20

References: [LINK 1](#) [LINK 2](#)

AN ACCOUNT OF THE MP'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE COVID-19 TOPIC

There are 650 elected MPs in the UK parliament - and despite the difficulties surrounding the reality of lockdowns in 2020 - each has a responsibility to represent the People of their constituency. That responsibility is further extended to the wider UK community - being all the citizens of this country of ours - and in doing so, to hold the sitting government to account on all matters.

Introduction

Desmond Swayne has been the most vocal MP - by passionately speaking out - questioning the government on its strategy, criticising its disproportionate response to the virus - a virus being no24 on the UK's list for causes of death. The MP has voted against the government in the last two divisions concerning Health Protection Regulations 2020.

Whether the Tory party will gain anything of a half positive reputation once the dust has settled on this topic - whenever that happens - remains to be seen. The indications at the close of 2020 do appear extremely unlikely, meaning that more likely, their individual reputations will be in tatters. What is also likely is that the Opposition parties are going to be painted with the same brush - they have proved to be equally culpable, by their silence, their acquiescence and their lack of rigor.

What many have observed though is a single reed standing straight for good - a single reed in the wind - standing up for sensibility amid the silence from all quarters of parliament. Desmond Swayne [DS] - perhaps inspired by his own constituents and the representations shared with him or - inspired by his own research, sense of intuition and subconscious awareness, has had the strength and conviction to speak out where others - and just about all others in that place - have either remained silent or have toed the line.

Below are restated some extracts from Hansard detailing the MP's speeches on the topic over the past months. What the MP has said at different times resonates with so many people looking in from outside. What is clear however, is that that same resonance is not evidenced by what other MPs have said or in what they have not said.

09mar20 DS – a question to Matt Hancock - "Can we have net figures that take account of recoveries? It is very alarming simply to be given cumulative deaths and cumulative cases."

Here DS seeks to find answers from the government on real numbers. Since March, there has been heavy criticism of the recorded statistics based on comment and evidence that the statistics rolled out by Matt Hancock and his advisors are simply wrong. The numbers are strongly believed to be false and are intended to mislead the People – in fact causing them to panic – with the ultimate intention of gaining their submission to accept the one and only solution to stem the spread of a virus. A virus which is seen by others to be no deadlier than common flu BUT, requiring a vaccine to ensure - what Hancock says – is safety for all.

11Mar20 DS – a question to Matt Hancock – "I have received a large number of representations to pass on to the Secretary of State, but am I right in thinking that the one thing he is not short of at the moment is advice?"

*Response MH – **"This is supposed to be an easy question, but actually my right hon. Friend is completely wrong. I would rather have the advice. I would rather go through 100 ideas, 99 of which we have already looked into, to find the one that we had not thought of than not be bombarded, so I ask him to send them on."***

This response by MH is extremely interesting and poignant. It suggests his radar is attuned to all avenues of relief BUT later in the year he proves he is NOT receptive to such avenues. That is, avenues in the form of available treatment proved to be effective in treating symptoms of the virus – and proved to actually save lives.

DS also makes a most interesting point. He says he has received a large number of representations – presumably from his constituents and others also. It is also presumed that DS will not be alone. Representations must have been received by all the other 649 MPs, but we have heard little about them from those MPs. WHY?

28sep20 DS – "Less than a year ago, I celebrated what I thought was the election of a sceptical and liberal Conservative Administration. Now, I am left wondering if the Prime Minister has not been abducted by Dr Strangelove and reprogrammed by the SAGE over to the dark side."

The purpose of politicians is to impose a sense of proportion on science and not to be in thrall to it. I will make myself very unpopular, but I believe that the appearance of the chiefs last week should have been a sacking offence. When they presented that graph, it was with the caveat that it was not a prediction, but nevertheless it was clear that they presented it as a plausible scenario, with its 50,000 cases per day by mid-October based on the doubling of infections by the week. Not on one day since March have there been infections on a day that were double that of the same day of the week preceding—not once. Where did this doubling come from? What was their purpose in presenting such a graph? It was the purpose of the fat boy in "The Pickwick Papers":

"I wants to make your flesh creep."

It was "project fear". It was an attempt to terrify the British people, as if they had not been terrified enough.

I have been banging on about this since March, and with every criticism I have made, I have been told that the Government were relying on the best possible science. So I was delighted by the letter one week ago today with the nuanced criticism of Professors Heneghan, Gupta and Sikora. I believe that the Government now have to answer that criticism. I am glad that the consensus in the scientific community is broken and the critics are speaking out. I am glad that the consensus in the scientific community is broken and the critics are speaking out.

I do not underestimate for one moment the horrible nature of this disease and its post-viral syndrome, but in terms of the United Kingdom's killers, it is 24th in the league, accounting for only 1.4% of deaths. As a consequence, I believe the Government's policy has been disproportionate. By decree, they have interfered in our private and family lives, telling us whom we may meet, when we may meet them and what we must wear when we meet them. We have the cruelty of elderly people in care homes being disoriented, unable to see Toggle showing location of Column 41 the faces of their loved ones or to receive a hug. We have the tsunami of deaths that we may experience shortly as a consequence of undiagnosed cancers and heart disease, and the discontinuation of clinical trials.

Intervention by John Redwood

asking a question about the Swedish model

I deduce that it was much more proportionate. All sorts of criticisms are levelled against the Swedish Government that, on examination of the data and comparing like for like, are without foundation. I certainly hold up the Swedish model as an alternative.

We have seen the eye-watering costs that we must now all face for a generation, having closed down our economy for all those months as a consequence of the Government's policy. We face the crushing of enterprises, the destruction of livelihoods, and unemployment among

young people, all as a consequence of an overreaction. I understand that there is now some question as to whether students will be allowed to return from university at Christmas. I say most gently to the Minister that the last Administration that sought to restrain celebrations at Christmas was during the Commonwealth, when the Lord Protector was left musing in public whether, if he were to arm one in 10, that would be enough. How many marshals will be required?

I conclude by saying that the policy of the Government has been disproportionate in response to this threat. There may be a virus one day that threatens our very way of life, but this is not it, even if we are behaving as if it were."

22oct20 DS – "If we were to ask a scientist, "How do you stop a virus that spreads through human contact?", we should not be surprised if he answers by telling us that we must stop human contact as far as is possible. It falls to us, however, to decide whether the price is worth paying in terms of the misery and unemployment it generates. We are talking about a generation marred in their life chances; and mindboggling borrowing that we will have to pay off over years, which will diminish proper investment in public services and industry. All that, and for what? The Secretary of State has told us this week that the average number of deaths is consistent with the long-term average for this time of year. Some 1,600 people die every day, but covid is by no means chief among their killers. It is no good to say, "Well, every other jurisdiction in the world is following basically the same policy". That would strike me as herd stupidity.

Speaking of herds, I understand that a number of Ministers have questioned the existence of herd immunity, which is odd, given that a successful vaccine programme [Toggle showing location of Column 1315] relies on herd immunity and that is the basket into which the Government have placed all their eggs. We can throw into this mix: the fact that we appear determined to claim every possible death as a covid death, as though we were in some sort of international league and competition; the failure to be absolutely up front on the limitations of the PCR—polymerase chain reaction—test as a means of tracking the disease; and the way we use large numbers to terrify people. We have been told that intensive care units are at 80% of their capacity, but of course at this time of year that is exactly what we would expect them to be. No wonder our constituents are writing to us with ever greater conspiracy theories—it is because our actions defy rational explanation.

Hallelujah—the consensus has been broken; the Prime Minister has finally resisted the advice he has been given by the scientists, just at a time when the Opposition have embraced it with enthusiasm. Now at least an argument can be had, and proper scrutiny and freedom from groupthink

will arise. The danger is that if we do not change the way in which we respond to this disease, in years to come historians will pick over how a prosperous society entered into such a devastating act of self-harm.

But since then – since 22oct20 – little has changed. The government has recently released the clamp on Christmas only to be followed that decision a few days later – and after MPs have been sent home for the recess – with a reversal in policy cancelling Christmas for the whole population – by limiting it to one day of freedom but with restrictions. Additionally, and at the same time, a new Tier 4 regime was introduced in the south east having a major impact on life – on business – on trade with our fellow partners across the channel. Brexit related one may ask? Convenient timing might be the answer.

But *WHY*, is the bigger question. The basis for it is said to be a new strain of the virus running riot in that area of the country. The government has yet to show the evidence for this and no MPs are around to quiz government on the subject. New strains of the virus are to be expected since viruses mutate. When they mutate, they tend to reduce in severity as their effect peters out – partly due to natural herd immunity thanks to the human body's own natural defences. The strain was apparently first observed 3mths ago and determined by the government's advisors as not being serious. What then has changed since - apart from upping the testing for viruses of any kind – deadly or not?

What is clear to the writer is this.

However long this topic runs for, a line has most definitely been crossed. The stakes could not be any higher than they are now, and no back peddling will save the reputations of the Tory party or the swathes of individuals within it – except maybe one, a lone reed in the wind - DS.

The future for those found guilty of all kinds of crimes, still to be fully listed along with their perpetrators, will not be pleasant. And so it should not be, given the immeasurable damage inflicted on life – to livelihoods – to people's mental and psychological states. We can expect to see a specially convened Peoples' Court for the purpose of hearing the pleas of the guilty and the evidence now gradually amassing against them.

It will be a trial similar in nature and extent to the Nuremberg Trials – in the late 1940s - convened for the single purpose of dealing with WWII war crimes. Crimes of incredible magnitude have been committed during this last 12months here in the UK, being crimes similar in nature and scale to the crimes of WWII. All the guilty parties will one day, one day in the near future, receive their judgement.

Biography
Anon