

# Dr. Vernon Coleman: Your Government Wants You Dead

## [Your Government Wants You Dead](#)

by [Vernon Coleman MB ChB DSc FRSA](#)

June 26, 2020

[The original video was banned from YouTube. Below you'll find a mirrored copy at [Truth Comes to Light Bitchute channel.](#)]

## [Transcript – found a Vernon Coleman website](#)

I first wrote about the coronavirus crime back in February, and on the 28th February I suggested that there were hidden reasons for the way the coronavirus was being exaggerated.

I suggested that the scare might have been orchestrated to persuade us to travel less and use up less of the world's disappearing oil supplies. I also suggested that the plan might have been to prepare us for a compulsory inoculation programme.

'There will doubtless be stuff in a syringe available within a few months,' I wrote, 'and if the scare is big enough the authorities will be able to introduce laws forcing us all to be inoculated. And once one type of inoculation becomes compulsory then the same will happen with other stuff from syringes.'

That was back in February of 2020.

'Am I being paranoid?' I asked myself. 'No,' I replied. 'I don't think so.'

And then in my first video for YouTube, which was published on 18th March and entitled 'Coronavirus scare: The hoax of the century', I predicted that the hoax had been designed primarily to do two things: to prepare us for a mandatory jabbing programme and also to demonise and marginalise the elderly population.

As the outrageous piece of criminal enterprise known as the coronavirus hoax got going in earnest, governments everywhere pretended that the lockdowns and social distancing they were introducing were designed to protect the elderly – and health services which would soon be overwhelmed.

It was one of the biggest lies in history.

There was never any need to protect hospitals because there was never going to be a tsunami of patients needing treatment. Right at the start it was clear that the coronavirus that was the centre of attention was not going to be any more of a threat than a fairly bog standard flu bug. Anyone with more than two brain cells to rub together could see that.

For the record, it is worth remembering that the ordinary flu can, in a single flu season, kill 650,000 people globally. Keep that number in mind when politicians and scientists and the mass media keep reminding us of the total number of global deaths from the coronavirus. The coronavirus has killed nowhere near that many – even though many doctors now agree with me that the coronavirus death total has been wildly exaggerated.

Right at the start one of the mathematical modellers responsible for this mess remarked, rather sniffily, that the coronavirus is nothing like the flu.

Well, he was absolutely right.

The evidence shows quite clearly that it isn't as deadly and if YouTube takes down this video because I have said the

unsayable it won't change the truth. You can't banish the truth just by hiding it. Incidentally, if you haven't already watched it you might be amused by my video entitled 'Everything you are allowed to know but I can't tell you what about'.

What I didn't expect was that governments and health officials around the world would use the coronavirus to trigger a mass extermination programme.

Today, I don't think anyone not working for a government or the main stream media can doubt that the elderly have been marginalised, targeted and eliminated.

It is now clear that the aim all along was not to protect the elderly but to get rid of them.

Horrifying as it sounds, I firmly believe that an essential part of the coronavirus crime was to murder as many old people as possible.

The same thing happened all around the world.

Hospital administrators sent elderly patients who had the coronavirus into care homes where they knew there were lots of frail, elderly patients.

So either the world is stuffed to overflowing with utterly brain dead administrators who know absolutely nothing about how bugs are transmitted and who threw patients out of hospital and into care homes through plain callous stupidity, or else it was done according to some devious master plan.

To begin with I wasn't sure which it was.

But it is the fact that it was global that gives it all away.

I can believe that there might be a bunch of administrators in one country who are so stupid that they have difficulty telling the time and need help to put their clothes on in the

morning – but all over the world?

It isn't possible, is it?

I find it impossible to believe that administrators around the world all made the same terrible mistake in sending hospital patients into care homes.

No, there has been a coordinated, massive extermination programme.

The only logical conclusion is that thousands of old people around the world have been murdered. As a result, governments around the world have saved themselves billions in long-term health costs. And those same governments will also save themselves billions of pounds a year because of the pensions they won't have to pay.

By sending elderly people with the coronavirus into care homes, the health care officials were sending them in as Trojan Horse killers.

And it has been a holocaust.

Incidentally, the dictionary defines a holocaust as slaughter on a mass scale.

And I cannot think of a more appropriate word because that is what this has been.

We have to remember the obvious: that the residents in care homes are there because they are ill and need care. Most have several serious disorders. They may have heart problems, respiratory problems, neurological problems, cancer or any number of other serious health disorders. And because they probably don't eat well, and don't take any exercise, their immune systems are pretty well shot.

It is inconceivable that health care administrators didn't know that.

And yet they sent untested hospital patients who were thought to have the coronavirus, and some of whom might have had it, into those care homes where the vulnerable patients caught the infection and died.

The result would have been the same if the patients being sent from hospital had the flu.

You wouldn't put a patient with the flu into a care home, would you?

It would be criminal.

But they did that with suspected coronavirus patients.

And things were made worse because the staff in the care homes had no idea about barrier nursing and they had no equipment.

And, worst of all, they were terrified that the coronavirus was going to kill everyone who caught it because evil governments and evil journalists had spread lie after lie after lie about the disease. Care home staff were told to keep out relatives and friends – for absolutely no sane reason – and some care home staff simply ran away, with about 40% of staff simply disappearing in France for example.

In the North East of England half of care homes had a coronavirus outbreak. In Scotland nearly half of all coronavirus deaths occurred in care homes. Nearly half of all coronavirus deaths in Sweden occurred in care homes. In Spain, two thirds of the coronavirus deaths occurred in care homes. In Italy, no one seems to have any idea how many old people died in care homes – alone, without staff or family. Many of the elderly didn't actually die of the coronavirus – though that was put on the death certificates – they died of thirst.

In England and Wales in the 11 weeks until 22nd May, there were 50,000 care home deaths. That's double the expected number.

Is anyone going to try to convince us this was all an unfortunate accident?

How many were killed by this wicked plan?

I have no idea. And nor does anyone else. But the exaggerated figure for the total number of coronavirus deaths includes a very high percentage of elderly patients who need not have died.

If I had to make an educated estimate I would suggest that the number of elderly patients murdered globally between the beginning of March and the end of May 2020 was somewhere between 100,000 and 150,000. That's a fairly conservative estimate.

If any other group of people had been slaughtered so deliberately and so ruthlessly there would be unbelievable outpourings of anger visible on our streets.

Imagine if 100,000 teenagers had been deliberately murdered in three months – because they were teenagers.

Imagine if 100,000 women had been deliberately murdered in three months – because they were women.

Imagine if 100,000 black people had been deliberately murdered in three months – because they were black.

Why have there been no demonstrations about the old people who were killed?

How many celebrities have you seen or heard shouting out about the murder of old people?

No, nor me.

The real tragedy here is that although this is the worst mass slaughter of the elderly in modern history, it isn't actually anything new.

Old people have been murdered for years without anyone taking any notice.

Euthanasia (sometimes admitted and sometimes not) is now commonly practised in so-called civilised societies around the world, and the elderly are invariably the victims.

For many years in the UK, doctors and nurses were encouraged to follow something called the Liverpool Care Pathway.

This was a murderers' charter, which allowed doctors and nurses to withhold food, water and essential treatment from patients who were over 65 and who were, therefore, regarded as an expensive and entirely disposable nuisance.

Then the Liverpool Care Pathway was replaced by something called Sustainable Development Goals (which originated with the United Nations and which is, therefore, global).

Sustainable Development Goals allows the doctors and hospitals to discriminate against anyone over the age of 70 on the grounds that people who die when they are over 70 cannot be said to have died 'prematurely' and so will not count when the nation's healthcare is being assessed.

Governments everywhere love this new rule because it gives the State permission to get rid of citizens who are of pensionable age and, therefore, regarded by society's accountants as a 'burden'.

In Holland, one eminent doctor has claimed that the elderly are not admitted to hospitals – and certainly not to intensive care units. 'The Netherlands does not hospitalise the weak and the elderly in order to make room for young people.'

Don't believe me? A survey of 6,600 patients in the Netherlands found that treatment – including drugs, food and water, were most likely to be withheld from the over 65s. And in 56% of cases, doctors didn't bother to discuss their

failure to treat with their patients or patients relatives.

I have also seen claims that the elderly are routinely killed in Germany, France, Italy and Spain. Age has become a criterion for triage. Genocide is coming to a town near you – if it isn't already there.

Back in 2015, when doctors in America were reported to be withholding treatment from elderly patients, doctors said it wasn't ageism. They didn't say what it was though. It certainly wasn't stamp collecting. And it wasn't kindness or proper, decent medical practice.

Michael Bloomberg, the billionaire who nearly became the Democrat Presidential candidate in 2020, said America should deny healthcare to the elderly. There was no suggestion that the morality of it be discussed.

In Canada, patients have been buried without post-mortems and, as elsewhere, they were said to have died of the coronavirus if they were thought to have the bug. If a patient with a knife sticking out of their chest had sneezed within 14 days of their death then they died of coronavirus.

This isn't entirely new, of course.

In the UK, it was way back in February 2005 that it was revealed that the British Government had advised that hospital patients with little hope of recovery should be allowed to die because of the cost of keeping them alive.

The key words were 'little hope of recovery'.

Those words that don't mean anything.

Any doctor worthy of the name will tell you that they've seen patients get better despite there having been 'little hope of recovery'.

But Tony Blair's Labour Government suggested that 'old people'



be denied the right to food and water if they fell into a coma or couldn't speak for themselves. We shouldn't be surprised I suppose. The utterly loathsome Blair is, after all, now one of the world's richest war criminals. I don't believe in capital punishment but we should bring back the death penalty just for him.

So, patients should be killed if they couldn't speak for themselves.

So much for any hope for stroke victims.

Blair's Government suggested that the need to cut costs came before the need to preserve the lives of patients and decided it had the right to overturn a right-to-life ruling which had been made when a judge ordered that artificial nutrition and hydration should not be withdrawn unless the life of a patient could be described as 'intolerable'. The judge had added that when there was any doubt, preservation of life should take precedence.

Depriving the elderly of food and water is done all the time. Drinks or food are put on a tray and, if the patient is too ill or weak to reach them then they are taken away untouched. In most hospitals no one bothers to feed patients who cannot feed themselves.

Meanwhile, the Government pours money into vanity projects and wastes money on foreign aid programmes which result in crooked politicians putting billions into Swiss bank accounts.

But the elderly, however, are classified as the 'Unwanted Generation'.

Anyone of pensionable age is a political embarrassment and to be ignored or dumped or killed.

Elderly individuals facing blindness from age-related macular disease are denied drugs that might have prevented their

blindness because they are considered expensive, useless and expendable. The theory is that they don't contribute and rarely vote and can, therefore, be disregarded.

How have we managed to forget that in the 1930s the Nazis deliberately starved and dehydrated elderly and vulnerable patients because they were regarded as a useless burden on society?

That is exactly what we are doing today.

We're killing people off if they are old and can't complete an Iron Man Triathlon.

The Government has already given doctors the legal right to kill old people (by starving them to death, or depriving them of fluids) if they are filling a hospital bed that the administrators want to use for a patient requiring cosmetic surgery or infertility treatment.

So, what's the next step?

Well, the next obvious step is to kill off all sorts of patients with chronic or potentially expensive illnesses such as cancer and heart disease.

How on earth could you do that?

How could the politicians possibly get the voters to put up with that?

Well, you could shut down the hospitals – on the excuse that they are needed for the eight million patients expected to fall ill with the coronavirus. It would be like introducing the death penalty by the back door but we won't be killing the possibly guilty; we will be killing the definitely innocent.

You couldn't do that though, could you?

Of course you could.

And they have.

In the UK there will soon be 10 million people awaiting hospital appointments and treatment. Nearly two and a half million are currently waiting for treatment for cancer.

Hospital departments are still shut because of social distancing though there is absolutely no reason at all for it. We don't shut hospitals when there is a flu epidemic. And let me remind you – this is not as bad as a flu epidemic.

What if it was all part of a plan to get rid of people who need treatment?

What would you call it when a government decides to kill millions of patients who might need care and cost money?

Genocide, perhaps?

Is it part of the complete reset of our world – as talked about and enthused over by Prince Charles and company at the World Economic Forum?

Why have things changed so much?

It's partly money.

And it's partly eugenics – Bill Gates's pet project.

It's all part of a wider plan which I will deal with in future videos.

Of course, getting rid of the elderly will remove a big part of the drug company's profits. The elderly take a lot of drugs.

But the new leaders of our new world have solved that – they are making mass vaccination a must for billions.

And, unbelievable as it may sound, things seem destined to get even worse.

Governments around the world are deciding that because of the difficulty involved in dealing with what is now proven to be nothing more than a mild case of the flu, they can no longer treat the elderly at all.

Many of the young may shrug at this with indifference but they should remember two things.

First, they may one day be old themselves.

And second, the age regarded as 'old' is likely to be subjected to the standard creep phenomenon.

Those who don't much care about the elderly being killed will themselves be old sooner than they think. After all young people, if they are lucky, eventually become old people.

And they should remember that the definition of 'old' is getting younger by the year.

Governments have decided that the over 70s cannot be treated. But in some countries the cut off age is 65. And in five years they may reduce the cut off age to 60. And by the end of the decade, the 55-year-olds will be lucky to receive a bottle of aspirin tablets if they have a heart attack or break a leg.

This is a form of euthanasia. Or maybe eugenics would be a better word. Or population control.

It was something the Nazis thought they were good at.

But they were mere amateurs.

You think I'm exaggerating?

The BBC's junior fact checkers will doubtless say I am.

Perhaps I should remind you that, since February, I have been absolutely accurate with all my predictions for the coronavirus.

Check my track record for the last half a century – it's on my website.

Remember too that the BBC receives huge amounts of money from Bill Gates and his pals. And much of the rest of the mainstream media has also been bought.

And then decide if you think I am exaggerating.

Oh and one more thing.

As far as I know I am in pretty decent health. I am not suicidal. And I'm careful to avoid accidents...

If anything curious happens and I suddenly disappear please ask questions.

*Copyright Vernon Coleman June 26th 2020*