

Lestrade Investigates: Case #3: Nonsense about Novichok

I saw this and laughed.

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2019/feb/15/novichok-victim-dawn-sturgess-parents-tell-of-their-anger-and-hurt>

Whereas in America – a land of giant sized hamburgers, Stetson hats and skyscrapers – the corrupt inbred elite use complex psychological operations and billion-dollar media industries to fool the population (who somehow remain increasingly savvy to the reality of constant mental conditioning), in the UK the average person is routinely tricked by the BBC and *The Guardian*, which scare them with googly-eyed sockpuppet Russian spies and stories about innocent Brits being murdered by superlethal nerve agents that are hidden in perfume bottles. No, really.

It's quite embarrassing. Can we not figure this stuff out a bit faster than our transatlantic cousins?

I won't go into the whole Novichok story because it's so completely ridiculous and self-defeating it doesn't require actual analysis to any great extent. However, this particular article was a gem and I wanted to share it.

It's getting near the anniversary of the Skripal poisoning so *The Guardian* is running a little propagandist piece to remind us of the great terror that is Vlad Putin. The first twist comes in paragraph three where they tell us that Dawn Sturgess, the unfortunate woman who was gifted the bin-perfume and was generally represented as a homeless alcoholic/junkie is actually from a very respectable middle-class family. When they say she is from a 'very respectable family' this is to be taken as she is from money. A respectable family in the UK is not merely a local councillor or something like that. It infers some sort of link to aristocracy or great wealth. At least that's normally how it's used.

Here's the next twist: her father is then referred to as a retired bricklayer. So number one – no disrespect to bricklayers here – she's *not* from a very respectable family according to English class standards; and number two, the old guy in the photo does *not* look like a retired bricklayer. The arms and shoulders give it away. Bricklayers are generally quite built. They have upper body strength. On retired ones you can still see it clearly – a sort of hunch boxiness to the frame. This man looks like he works in an office or suchlike, not coming from a career of working with his hands.

The father then says he doesn't care if the assassins of his daughter are arrested or not. What? Seems unlikely he wouldn't want them to face justice, right? He then blames the government simply for housing the Skripal's in Salisbury in the first place.

'I want justice from our own government. What are they hiding? I don't think they have given us all the facts. If anyone, I blame the government for putting Skripal in Salisbury.'

Dawn supposedly died of the Novichok poisoning. Tricky stuff this Russian poison – the Skripals ended up alright after a spell in hospital. Same for the policeman who got affected by them (allegedly) and also had a brief stint with doctors. Dawn's boyfriend Charlie Rowley got Novichok spilled over his hands but it was alright because (you can't make this up) he **washed his hands with**

soap and water so that stopped him dying. Of the military nerve agent. He did foam at the mouth, apparently, but otherwise he's tip-top.

Dawn though, who applied the found-in-a-bin perfume with a few spritzes, died about a week later as a result. Poor luck there. I can only imagine the conversation if I tried to present my wife with perfume that I had found lying around in the street.

I like where it says 'They trust Rowley's memory of the perfume bottle being in a sealed box, even though this undermines the idea that the novichok Dawn came into contact with was the same as was used in the attack on Skripal more than three months before.' They know the story doesn't work but they decide to try to put it by you anyway. Because you're a Brit and don't expect the news to make sense.

'I think Charlie would remember that. I do believe it was sealed,' said Caroline. Asked how they believed Rowley came by the novichok, Caroline said: 'I think he stumbled on it. I believe he had only just found it. If Charlie had found it in a bin in March he would have given it to Dawn straight away.'

So the Mum remembers the perfume being found in a bin, but if you follow the links on the article to Charlie talking about the incident he's now saying he 'can't remember' where he found the perfume. Rewrites and lack of cohesion to the narrative, as usual. Lazy scriptwriters.

So then the article goes back to the Sturgess family being 'stalwarts' of the village of Durrington, so again the language use there indicates they have a long family history in the village. They describe their daughter as an intelligent, upbeat hippy-type who visited Stonehenge and picked flowers in Cornwall. Sure. This is night-and-day to how she was described repeatedly the entire last year of press coverage of the incident, in which she was a junkie. They are blatantly trying to rewrite history here, maybe to blackwash hippies?

There's a nice anecdote where Mum was allowed to be in the hospital room with the not-quite-dead-yet Dawn, but was safe because Mum was wearing rubber gloves. Everyone else involved in the investigation was stumbling around in full NBC biohazard gear – like in E.T when they come to grab the alien – but it's all good to have the Mum touching her as long as she's got some Playtex living gloves on. Presumably they had her wash her hands afterwards as that's the ultimate cure for Soviet poison gel.



We then have a nice photo of Young Dawn standing in a field. What's that supposed to prove: that our crisis actress has a photo of herself young? That really sells it for me! They tell us the family

had to flee their home as the media (rabid pack of wolves that they are) were going to hound them remorselessly. Because there are no privacy laws or legal defences people can use to not be harassed by the media, you know. They 'gathered in a car park' and then drove 40 miles away, which if you use Google map for Durrington will show you is quite far given how close they were to Salisbury. If you drive 40 miles you end up in Southampton or Basingstoke. Was it really necessary to relocate there?

We then learn they were informed by doctors on a later visit to the hospital that when Dawn first collapsed from the poison she was oxygen starved for 25 minutes. I'm not House MD but I know that longer than six minutes without oxygen means you're either a vegetable or dead. Most likely dead. So this is obvious bollocks.

Of course Dawn was cremated like everyone else involved in spook psychological operations. I am just surprised the entire countryside isn't charcoal by now.

The family didn't really mourn – presumably because they're not a real family.



We then get a photoshopped picture of her family at Christmas 2011, all sprawled across a sofa. I'll point out the three female heads betwixt the fat guy in the chequered shirt and the little girl are out of proportion and weirdly positioned. They look shopped in. Especially the woman in the red party hat who has two diagonal lines across her jaw. I'm sure Sherlock will spot more things.

[Sherlock: I think the middle one is supposed to be Dawn, and indeed her head is too small compared to the other two women. So Lestrade was right there. But the bigger problem is the fact there is no room for her body in there. How do we fit her in between the two other ladies? Is she supposed to be only an inch wide? Or is she just a disembodied head?]

The family were of course 'relieved' that it wasn't drugs that killed their daughter, which seems to contradict their initial position that she should never have been portrayed as a junkie in the first place. At least she 'took the bullet' for others. Again, weird thing to say about your dead daughter.

She went out 'in a blaze of glory'. Oh, absolutely, that makes it alright.

If you want more fun, try looking up the father, Mr. Stan Sturgess, on Facebook. You will find there is a Stan Sturgess of Durrington – [facebook.com/stan.sturgess](https://www.facebook.com/stan.sturgess) – which has only three photos on it, two of a completely different person to the Stan Sturgess shown in *The Guardian* article and the previously shown Christmas Sofa Photo (hence me knowing this is the guy in question and not some random Stan). The sofa photo was uploaded on August 29, 2014, which is an odd time to post a Christmas photo from three years prior. There's little to no other information about them and it

looks like a fake planted account to act as paper-thin background if anyone tried to actually be a journalist in this country and look into things.

Finally I note that all the photos in this article are tagged to authorship of Adrian Sherratt, a professional photographer who usually takes commissions for magazines, PR companies and the *Sunday Times*. Quick question: how can he own the Young Dawn in a Field and Sofa Christmas photos? They would be photos belonging to the family so it should read 'photographs courtesy of the Sturgess family' or similar. Instead they are owned by a private photographer who makes images on demand. Interesting.

No comments are allowed on this article – like practically all the articles in major newspapers in the UK nowadays – which was originally implemented because people were being 'mean trolls' to journalists and 'bullying' them with their facts and unpopular opinions.

Anyway, just some observations I thought people would enjoy.

