

SUBMISSION

COVID-19 Response Inquiry

Background

I am a [REDACTED] male resident of Victoria. In the six-and-a-half years prior to the vaccine mandates, I worked as a [REDACTED] teacher in specialised subjects and was well regarded in this role by students, colleagues, and management. It was a job that I really enjoyed doing and had no plans of leaving. I did all I could to maintain a working relationship with my employer. I stated up front to my employer that I could not take the vaccines for religious reasons, and they never considered this in any process. Even after demonstrating (to my managers approval) that I could continue to do my job just as effectively, if not more so, whilst complying with the requirements to work from home if not vaccinated. Despite this they were determined see that nobody who was un-vaccinated could continue to work for the organisation. Since then, I have had a lengthy period of unemployment (due to mandates being in effect) and have only been able to work in jobs outside my professional qualification - [REDACTED] roles - which has nearly halved my income. I had to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and move in with relatives to keep going. At present, I still cannot foresee going back to work as a [REDACTED] teacher or manager, as these roles would undoubtedly require me to act against my conscience and religious convictions with no support from government to ensure my rights to such work as I am qualified and capable to do.

Summary

The Australian Government's response to Covid-19 was a failure. It was disproportionate to the actual threat of the disease and did far more harm than good. It utilised tactics of fear and propaganda previously reserved to communist and totalitarian governments and has eroded freedoms and trust in government. The government should have followed its pre covid pandemic plans and worked to accurately inform, educate, and recommend (not force) measures for staying healthy.

Government Narratives

There were many catchy slogans being tossed around as if there was logic, ethics, and science to back them – while in fact real logic, ethics and science stood in stark contrast. For example, “safe and effective”. How could a completely experimental therapy with no long-term safety data, known side-effects, and confirmed deaths be called safe? How could a therapy that does not stop you from catching the illness, keep you from spreading it any more effectively than simple preventative measures, nor keep people from dying with the illness, be called effective. How could a government that clearly did not know or understand what was in these therapies refuse to consider their risks.

Any expert that attempted to share these concerns was quickly silenced, even if the issues they raised were adopted to the narrative a few weeks later. Pseudo-science was enthroned and pushed by Chief Health Officers, fact checkers who could not admit what was published by vaccine manufacturers on their websites, and statisticians that were happy to manipulate data. It should be thoroughly investigated what links Big Pharma Industry, the Vaccine Manufacturers, foreign governments and their officials, International Organisations such as the World Economic Forum, and Influencers such as [REDACTED] had in shaping these narratives and the approach to pushing them to strict compliance.

Fear

The authorities were singularly focused on preventing the number of “cases” of the virus through lock-down and isolation; no matter whether these “case” numbers would ever actually translate into anything more than mild cold symptoms. There was no attention paid to the simple prevention of severe illness through common sense remedies of good diet and vitamin intake, sunlight exposure, fresh air, and good mental and spiritual health. Instead, citizens were locked in their homes, denied the ability to worship God, denied the ability to run their businesses, or work their jobs or go to school, see the great outdoors recreationally, separated from their loved ones (including those who were dying, whom they would never see again), and suffered to a constant barrage of fear-driven messages 24/7 with red-faced politicians telling off their constituencies for not getting on board with the messaging.

Recommendation

The Government should have followed Australia’s planned pandemic response (shaped pre-covid). It was known early in the pandemic that the elderly, obese, diabetic, etc were at greater risk of severe illness from Covid-19 infection. Those in these categories could have had home isolation, travel caution etc. recommended to them, and been given genuine healthcare support if they were infected. Everyone else, especially the young and healthy, should have been advised to practise good hygiene (such as washing hands and staying home when sick) and, otherwise, should have been unaffected and uninhibited by this outbreak. Masks could have been recommended to those who were sick, when they needed to be out in public, but should never have been recommended (and never ever mandated) to those who were not sick. Masks restrict oxygen intake, encourage the build-up of bacteria and lead to the inhalation of microparticles. The government, as in past times, should have recommended against healthy people wearing masks during the pandemic.