

ONS Covers Up Excess Deaths | FudgeGate

What we if skewered it like this...



THE UNDERDOG

FEB 22, 2024



14



1



5

Share



The Office for National Fudge Statistics of *'people die from symptoms'* infamy has once again engaged in even more fudge, this time trying to hide excess deaths by arbitrarily changing how they calculate death statistics.

What's their magic tricks this time?

Outright Fraud

Conjuring Up 54 Thousand Elderly People Out Of Thin Air (For One Year)




Dr Clare Craig ✓
@ClareCraigPath

...

Here's what ONS says happened to our population between 2021 and 2022.

They're claiming 10% more 75-79 year olds in England in a year in England.

54,375 to be precise.



8:23 AM · Feb 21, 2024 · **41.8K** Views

54k? **That's basically the same number estimated to have died in 2023**, how conveniently and perfectly shaped.

 <https://news.sky.com/video/50-000-excess-deaths-is-clearly-concerning-says-health-secretar...>

50,000 excess deaths 'clearly concerning,' says health secretary - Sk...

11 Jan 2023 · 50,000 excess deaths 'clearly concerning,' says health secretary The NHS is under tremendous pressure, according to the health secretary, but he also adds that other countries are facing similar issues. Wednesday 11 January 2023 09:57, UK NHS 0:48 Stephen Barclay says the...


Magic how precisely such a narrow age group could suddenly conveniently shift an age bracket in such a large percentage in **one single year** only (apparently they don't get older in any of the other age brackets or other years?).

Moving The Goalposts To 2020 (And Ignoring Everything Before It)

They also used another fudge method; **moving the goalposts to 2020** and ignoring everything pre-2020 (whilst talking arse about '5 year averages'... from a less than 4 year coverage). Stuart McDonald, **who brags they were involved in ONS' fudge...**



...Admits this is done by **adjusting the comparison point to the pandemic year by now ignoring pre-pandemic deaths** (2020 gives them an artificially high death count to work from, making the excess deaths seem 'less')...



Scouring Every Possible Model To Bring You The Worst One


To give you an idea of how desperate ONS have become, **they scraped the barrel for 11 different models** to find one that gives them the lowest number of excess deaths. This even included blackbox ‘neural network’ models infamous for their lack of transparency:

We explored several different methodologies for estimating excess deaths, including ¹[five-year averages](#), ²[relative age-standardised mortality rates](#), ³[segmented regression analysis](#), ⁴time series models, ⁵neural networks, the approaches used in the ⁶[CMI mortality projections](#) and ⁷[CMI pandemic monitor](#), ⁸[EuroMOMO](#), the ⁹[World Health Organization’s method for estimating excess mortality during the pandemic](#), the ¹⁰[UK Health Security Agency’s daily mortality method](#) and ¹¹[OHID’s excess death model](#). [A review of the strengths and limitations of these approaches](#) was discussed by the [UK Statistics Authority’s Methodological Assurance Review Panel \(MARP\) last year](#).

ONS also admitted their new fudged statistics on mortality are **worthless for measuring mortality of the 2020 pandemic** (because they use the 2020 as the rigged baseline — and you can’t compare rigged baselines to themselves). Read: because they deleted pre-2022, they can’t show 2020 had high mortality.

This approach provides a method for routine monitoring of excess deaths on an ongoing basis. **It was not designed specifically for measuring the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mortality** – though it can be used to shed light on this.

ONS even admit they **don’t use death counts to estimate mortality** (*death*), just some age-averaged number. ONS are ignoring death counts in order to report on death counts.



The methodology is so great that... **ONS won't be revising historic deaths data trends** (re-normalising the data would reveal the excess deaths again, and you can't retroactively compare their 2020 fudge point historically to earlier years):



Getting Their Usual Corrupt Buddies To Help Out

The usual suspects were involved, including ONS' *'can't give a straight answer to a question'* Sarah Caul, who appears to be also operating under another account (odd that, are private Twitter accounts subject to FOI?).



Vahé Nafilyan
@Vnafilyan

...

Great to see our new method for estimating excess deaths in the UK published today, which will be implemented by @ONS, @NISRA and @NatRecordsScot. Led by @DanAyoubkhani, in collaboration with @OHID @NISRA @NatRecordsScot @juliemramsay @ActuaryByDay and started by @Sarah_Caul

 **Office for National Statistics (ONS)**  @ONS · Feb 20

Replying to @ONS

In 2023, the new method estimates 10,994 excess deaths in the UK, which is 20,448 fewer than the current method.

10:22 AM · Feb 20, 2024 · 3,909 Views

This is likely why the whitewash so-called COVID-19 “inquiry” **wanted to stall investigations into the vaccines and excess deaths until after the election** — so they have time to fudge the datasets and downplay the severe harms the shots have caused.

BBC

 Sign in

 LIVE



Home

 News

 Sport

 Weather

NEWS

Home | Israel-Gaza war | Cost of Living | War in Ukraine | Climate | UK | World | Business | Politics

Health

Covid inquiry postpones vaccine investigation

🕒 10 January



Coronavirus public inquiry

Twitter did their best to desperately hide and suppress the dissent to ONS’ blatant fudge from large numbers of people **by artificially fixing the count of quotes** (we even got to see the quote number revert before our very own eyes).



I quite like the fact that despite quoting this post twice at 10 requotes, Twitter kept the number artificially down to 10. Despite the fact the ONS Tweet has 13K views.

They don't want you to know there's big dissent on this.



10:56 PM · Feb 20, 2024 · 192 Views

One merely need only peer at **the replies in the ONS' announcement** to see the historic levels of outrage at their blatantly obvious fudge.

Is it surprising the Office of National Fudge has fudged statistics once again?

Related Articles To Read

- **FudgeGate: ONS Makes Person-Years Go Up As Deaths Mysteriously Disappear**
- **ONS Declares People Die From Symptoms | FudgeGate**
- **FudgeGate: ONS Caught Fudging Mortality Data**
- **ONS Won't Explain Why They Changed Definitions | FudgeGate**
- **BMJ Accuses FDA, CDC Of Secret VAERS Database**

- [CDC Denies Deaths Datasets | FudgeGate](#)
- [FudgeGate: CDC Caught Fudging Vaccine Mortality Data](#)
- [FudgeGate: Return Of The Fudge](#)

Found this informative?

Help inform?

Thoughts, dear reader?



14 Likes · 5 Restacks

1 Comment



Write a comment...



Stephen Feldman · Stephen's Substack · 3 hrs ago

There's also about 4,500 deaths over a year after the fatality waiting just to be registered due to coroner investigations. These have doubled in the past few years. That's not the only way deaths can fail to be registered so I wonder if ONS even presents the real number of deaths??

♡ LIKE (2) 💬 REPLY ↗ SHARE

...
