

Don't Let Them Rewrite History: Ventilators Killed People... and It Was No Accident

New studies claim many "Covid patients" were killed by invasive mechanical ventilation, but we knew this at the time and now people are re-writing history.

By [Kit Knightly](#)

Global Research, May 23, 2023

[OffGuardian](#) 20 May 2023

Theme: [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

A new study from Northwestern University has concluded that the majority of "Covid19" patients put on ventilators were actually killed by bacterial pneumonia, not the alleged virus.

You can read that paper [here](#).

This should not come as a shock to any regular OffG reader – or indeed anyone who tried to keep themselves informed during the "pandemic". Mechanical ventilation is not a treatment for respiratory infection, and quite often makes the situation worse.

Deliberate, institutional misuse of mechanical ventilation probably killed huge numbers of patients during the so-called "first wave". We cover this in great detail in our ["40 Facts" covid cribsheet](#).

Predictably enough, though, mainstream talking heads are not ready to admit this, and the Northwestern paper has produced a wave of somewhat fevered revisionism among the dwindling covidiot class.

See, for example, this tweet from "Dr Craig Spencer":

You know why we intubated people for Covid in March 2020?

Because otherwise they were going to die. Full. Stop.

I remember a patient rolling in with an oxygen saturation of 42%, breathing twice as fast as normal, struggling on a face mask with oxygen all the way up.

What to do?

— Craig Spencer MD MPH (@Craig_A_Spencer) [May 19, 2023](#)

Ironically, while he is accusing others of revisionism, he is the one rewriting history. Ventilators were never recommended for treating Covid, but rather for preventing transmission.

The [WHO](#), [CDC](#), [NHS](#) and [ECDC](#) all published guidelines instructing healthcare workers to put “Covid patients” on respirators as early as possible, and in every case it was classed as an “infection control measure”.

This is not new information, it was all [known at the time](#).

Further, it was known, that this policy was potentially doing harm, having been reported in mainstream articles (such as [this one from Time](#) or this one [from The Spectator](#)) as early as April 2020.

But it’s not just the “ventilators saved lives” crowd who are rewriting history, even this new discussion recognizing the role ventilators played in Covid stops several steps short of the truth, characterizing it as a mistake or a panic reaction.

It was neither. It was deliberate policy.

This was [recorded by whistle-blowers](#) and becomes glaringly obvious when you consider that, in the US, the CARES Act [paid out bonus money to hospitals](#) for ventilating “covid patients”.

So no, it is **not** revisionism to blame ventilators for many of the deaths usually attributed to “Covid”, that was obviously true, and widely known, at the time.

Real revisionism is pretending there was no way anyone could have known the harm that was being done, or to close your eyes to the fact it was all done on purpose.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Featured image is from AdobeStock

The original source of this article is [OffGuardian](#)

Copyright © [Kit Knightly](#), [OffGuardian](#), 2023

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

Become a Member of Global Research

Articles by: **Kit Knightly**

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca