

The Anniversary of the Great Barrington Declaration and the Covidians

A declaration that was hated, suppressed and misrepresented by the media hivemind and the tech giants.



The scientists who drafted the Great Barrington Declaration, in Oct. 2020. From left, Dr. Martin Kulldorff, a professor of medicine at Harvard University; Dr. Sunetra Gupta, a professor at Oxford University; and Dr. Jay Bhattacharya, a Stanford University professor.

by Armando Simón

The **Great Barrington Declaration** was created on October 4, 2020 by Drs. Martin Kulldorff, Sunetra Gupta and Jay Bhattacharya, and initially signed by dozens of scientists, at a time when the media and the leftist politicians were constantly assuring us that if we did not all obey them,

conform, submit to them, and believe them regarding covid and treatment against it, we would all die. The doctors were hosted by the American Institute for Economic Research, a libertarian think tank. The declaration was benign and relatively innocuous.

Yet, the declaration was [suppressed](#) and misrepresented by the [media](#) hivemind [and](#) the [tech giants](#) (“Conservatives Pull Google Into Their [Plan](#) to Let People Die”). By that time, a [totalitarian](#) mentality had set in—solidified in fact—prevalent primarily in persons who were politically left of center, which mindset explains the [censorship](#) and the hysterical attacks against both the creators of the Great Barrington Declaration and the arguments therein. [Many doctors](#), unfortunately, have been infected with this totalitarian virus for which there is no cure in sight.

The originators of GBD were immediately attacked for their heresy, said attacks resorting primarily to ad hominem, such as their being [arrogant](#) for giving a medical opinion since they were doctors, and equating them with climate deniers, [flat earthers](#), [Q-Anon](#) and [Creationists](#). Others implied that the signatories wanted people to die, while some parroted the mandatory “racism” mantra (“Perhaps the declaration’s most important omission is its failure to meaningfully acknowledge the disproportionate burden of this disease on persons of color” “These scientists want more young, [healthy](#) people infected by the coronavirus”). The [Great](#) and Powerful [Fauci](#) also condemned the [GBD](#) as disinformation supposedly based from an anti-science [bias](#) in the country (one that liberals claim to be immune to), as evident by people refusing to believe his everchanging pronouncements. [Others](#) have likewise echoed the science denial charge. And, of course, there were the attacks directly from journalists pretending that they [know](#) medicine but who would really have trouble differentiating a spleen from an epiglottis. *Nevertheless, hundreds of thousands of scientists*

signed, endorsing the GBD. Some journalists, in order to discredit the declaration, signed false [names](#) to it. I strongly urge the reader to read the entry for the GBD in [Wikipedia](#) since Wikipedia is considered to be a source of reliable information by [many](#).

Precisely because, [even](#) now, these [charlatans](#) insist on continuing [their](#) dictates to the [public](#) on lockdowns, [masks](#), vaccines, jabs and [what](#) not, and also because the media hivemind suppressed the declaration, here is the GBD in toto:

As infectious disease epidemiologists and public health scientists we have grave concerns about the damaging physical and mental health impacts of the prevailing COVID-19 policies, and recommend an approach we call Focused Protection.

Coming from both the left and right, and around the world, we have devoted our careers to protecting people. Current lockdown policies are producing devastating effects on short and long-term public health. The results (to name a few) include lower childhood vaccination rates, worsening cardiovascular disease outcomes, fewer cancer screenings and deteriorating mental health – leading to greater excess mortality in years to come, with the working class and younger members of society carrying the heaviest burden. Keeping students out of school is a grave injustice.

Keeping these measures in place until a vaccine is available will cause irreparable damage, with the underprivileged disproportionately harmed.

Fortunately, our understanding of the virus is growing. We know that vulnerability to death from COVID-19 is more than a thousand-fold higher in the old and infirm than the young. Indeed, for children, COVID-19 is less dangerous than many other harms, including influenza.

As immunity builds in the population, the risk of infection to all – including the vulnerable – falls. We know that all populations will eventually reach herd immunity – i.e. the point at which the rate of new infections is stable – and that this can be assisted by (but is not dependent upon) a vaccine. Our goal should therefore be to minimize mortality and social harm until we reach herd immunity.

The most compassionate approach that balances the risks and benefits of reaching herd immunity, is to allow those who are at minimal risk of death to live their lives normally to build up immunity to the virus through natural infection, while better protecting those who are at highest risk. We call this Focused Protection.

Adopting measures to protect the vulnerable should be the central aim of public health responses to COVID-19. By way of example, nursing homes should use staff with acquired immunity and perform frequent testing of other staff and all visitors. Staff rotation should be minimized. Retired people living at home should have groceries and other essentials delivered to their home. When possible, they should meet family members outside rather than inside. A comprehensive and detailed list of measures, including approaches to multi-generational households, can be implemented, and is well within the scope and capability of public health professionals.

Those who are not vulnerable should immediately be allowed to resume life as normal. Simple hygiene measures, such as hand washing and staying home when sick should be practiced by everyone to reduce the herd immunity threshold. Schools and universities should be open for in-person teaching. Extracurricular activities, such as sports, should be resumed. Young low-risk adults should work normally, rather than from home. Restaurants and other businesses should open. Arts, music, sport and other cultural activities should resume. People who are more at risk may participate if they

wish, while society as a whole enjoys the protection conferred upon the vulnerable by those who have built up herd immunity.

It is hard to believe that anyone would find objection to such common sense, but it was [censored](#) by the media, which once again underlines the fact that the [media](#) is truly the enemy of the people. The mediocrities in [California](#), New York and [Canada](#) still [follow](#) the discredited policies and [still](#) insist in the public submitting, conforming and obeying them without question. Backing [them](#) is the [media](#) hivemind labeling medicine and science that contradicts the Covidian dogma as “[disinformation](#)” and “[misinformation](#)” while at the same time nagging the rest of us to “Trust the science!” In fact, California passed a law prohibiting [doctors](#) from dispensing [treatment](#) and medical advice that contradicts the Covidian dogma.

Nor was it just the ones in authority. The [true believers](#) of the [Covidian](#) ideology [harassed those](#) who [refused](#) to [conform](#).

Aside from the signatories, [other doctors](#) and [nurses](#) have bravely objected to not only to the wrong treatment to covid and to the lockdowns but also to the poisonous “vaccines” that, although they [did](#) not [prevent](#) a person [from](#) contracting [covid](#), the [vaccines](#) ironically [facilitated infection](#) and even [caused illnesses](#) and [deaths](#), all of [which](#) have been substantiated by an [increasing number](#) of scientific [studies](#)—which are presently being [ignored](#) by the political spectrum that likes to posture as being pro-science.

By now, regardless of political affiliation most everyone would agree that the episode with covid was a fiasco. The fiasco was on data collection, diagnosis, treatment, lockdowns, censorship, and tallying the infections and fatalities, The fiasco was exacerbated by covid having been

politicized, and it had no business being politicized. Unfortunately, the politicization of innocuous topics, words, events or objects has become commonplace in today's toxic atmosphere. And here, the onus falls squarely on the political left, aka, liberal, activist, etc. and not the libertarian or conservative end of the spectrum. Conservatives and libertarians were more open minded about all aspects of covid, insistence on freedom of choice and overall freedom, and voiced skepticism on elements of the fiasco. On the other hand, liberals (activists, etc.) spread fear and insisted on the control of people, demanded submission and unquestioned obedience from the public, and also indulged in censorship, persecution of dissenters and demonizing doctors, [politicians](#) and private individuals. This dichotomy is borne out by polls conducted by [Gallup](#) and [Pew](#) research, it has been [evident](#) for some time, and even [some](#) liberals [have](#) pointed out the dichotomy.

What is bothersome to many libertarians and conservatives is the liberal propensity to be in a seemingly perpetual state of hysterics: climate change, covid, genetically modified foods, racism obsession, plastics in the ocean, gays, #MeToo, PETA, abortion, Trump, overpopulation, transgenders, eating crickets; they appear to accept and embrace ever-changing crusades and doomsday scenarios with an evangelical fervor to which EVERYONE must adhere to and no one may question, and anyone who does question, who does not conform, who thinks for himself, is a racist, a fascist, a Nazi, a homophobe, an Islamophobe, a misogynist, a flat earther, a creationist, a science denier.

First published in [FrontPage magazine](#).