

# Submission to COVID-19 Response Inquiry

## by D. Miller-Stinchcombe

### Summary Points

**1 – The ethics of the pandemic handling.** From the beginning to the end, the whole pandemic handling has suffered from the fallacy of one sided assessment. From the limited information in the public domain, vulnerability to measures imposed (such as mandates, isolation, unemployment) were never considered.

**2 – Selective advisers, and selective data.** From early on in the pandemic it was possible to find eminent academics, scientists, medics, and epidemiologists who disagreed with the dominant narrative, citing data (or a lack of it): for example Prof. ██████████ at the British Medical Journal, writing about vaccine trial data, and ██████████ Special Envoy on Covid-19 to the World Health Organisation, rejecting lockdowns. These voices could not be discerned in any of the decision making made at any level of government in Australia, and the reasons for rejecting such eminent views were never given.

**3 – The Covid handling caused a loss of faith in government.** The issues raised in points 1 and 2 caused a loss of trust in Federal and State government. An overtly democratic process should be in place for any future pandemic handling, such as already existed in the Victorian State pandemic policy, prior to 2020 .

**4 – Potted personal experience.** From March 2020 until July 2022 I was only able to earn money for five months, and received Covid payments for four months. My ██████████ started school in 2020, then ██████████ He stopped trying to attend early in 2021. He was denied space for play and socialising during a key phase of his childhood. Further, our living situation for the long lockdown of 2020 was enormously affected by permitted building works taking place directly below us. Being denied conventionally understood human rights had a real impact on our lives.

“Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive ... those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end for they do so with the approval of their own conscience. They may be more likely to go to Heaven yet at the same time likelier to make a Hell of earth. This very kindness stings with intolerable insult. To be "cured" against one's will and cured of states which we may not regard as disease is to be put on a level of those who have not yet reached the age of reason or those who never will; to be classed with infants, imbeciles, and domestic animals.”

— C.S. Lewis, God in the Dock

### Point 1 - The ethics of the pandemic handling.

A characteristic of the pandemic handling was that of ‘One Sided Assessment’. That is to say only covid-19 was treated as a risk to our health and well being. The impact of government action on other risk factors was not considered. The most obvious example of this was revealed at the curfew trial by the Deputy CHO, ██████████ When asked about the effect of curfews on heart disease, cancer, domestic violence, and mental health, she replied “I did not specifically obtain data on that.” In other words she had no idea of the health impacts, in the round, of the curfew.

In 2021, ██████████, state Shadow Mental Health Minister, through FOI. showed that the Victorian Executive knew that lockdowns in 2020 were linked to a rise in suicides. Despite this knowledge, further lockdowns occurred, signed off by the office of the Chief Health Officer. The Chief Health Officer and his deputies, were prepared to put some people at risk, who had vulnerabilities to the imposed measures, for the sake of other people. This flies in the face of the historic medical ethic of “first do no harm”.

Despite the fact that we had now entered a real life version of the infamous ‘Trolley Dilemma’, there was no attempt to model the harm caused by the pandemic measures.

I would like to frame the issue of mandates with these comments from the Federal Health Minister [REDACTED] from the 21st February 2021, in an interview with the ABC :

“The world is engaged in the largest clinical trial, the largest global vaccination trial ever, and we will have enormous amounts of data.

But what’s the message for the public? It’s safe, it’s effective, it will help protect you, but it will also help protect your mum and dad, your grandparents, your nonna, all of Australia.”

These two paragraphs show an appalling level of mendacity for a minister in a democratic country. Minister [REDACTED] at best, was promoting a ‘noble lie’.

In November 2020 [REDACTED], CEO of [REDACTED] stated that “If the question is whether we can stop the pandemic with this vaccine, then my answer is ‘yes’”. However in December 2021 he said “even the triple jabbed can transmit the disease”. Vaccine mandates were in place for most of the public until mid 2022, long after the admission by vaccine manufacturers that the vaccines failed to prevent transmission. Vaccine mandates are still in place for a number of professions.

Discussions about the meaning of informed consent were well rehearsed at the time of the mandates. The official line coming from all levels of government was that the vaccines were safe and effective, and had been extensively trialled. However the publicly available data, for example as discussed by Professor [REDACTED] at the British Medical Journal, meant that the assertions of ‘safe and effective’ were unfounded. The debate about informed consent at the time was grounded in a false hood. This issue has still not been resolved.

An insidious, anti-democratic, effect of the mandates was to insulate those in the public sphere from alternative viewpoints. That is to say you could only be a teacher, a doctor, a nurse, a police officer, or even attend state parliament if you were vaccinated and issued with proof of vaccination. This meant that many in public life were not exposed to important information that ran counter to the official narratives. The issue was illustrated by the testimony of Dr [REDACTED] to the Parliamentary Long Covid Inquiry, who found that many in the medical profession did not even want to discuss her injuries caused by vaccination.

## **2 – Selective advisers, and selective data.**

It is often the case that in any area of inquiry, including scientific inquiry, that there are expert voices who disagree with each other. However such dialogue could not be discerned in the words or policies of those who handled the pandemic in Australia.

Towards the start of the pandemic Prof. [REDACTED] AO PSM was working with the National Cabinet as a Covid-19 Commissioner. She had a glaring conflict of interests as, while she was a Covid-19 Commissioner, she was the chair of CEPI, an organisation with financial interests in pandemic vaccines. In May 2020, months before any vaccine had been created, she stated to the Canberra Press Club “It’s no jab no play for adults”. This became Prime Minister Scott Morrison’s position. In August 2020, Morrison said that the vaccination will be as ‘mandatory as possible’. The policy of mandates, appears to have been instigated by Prof [REDACTED], a person who was financially conflicted in this area.

Lockdowns were a key tool during the pandemic. However On 8th October 2020 [REDACTED], Special Envoy on Covid-19 to the World Health Organisation stated:

We in the World Health Organisation do not advocate lockdown as a primary means of controlling this virus ... STOP using lockdowns as your primary control method ... lockdowns just have one consequence that you must never belittle – and that is making poor people an awful lot poorer.

Regarding the vaccines, in January 2022, while vaccine mandates were in place, [REDACTED], a deputy editor at the British Medical Journal, wrote



Repeating the words of the WHO special envoy or an editor of the BMJ can still result in the accusation of pushing misinformation. It is hard to know how one should respond to such accusations.

██████████ was a speaker at Event 201, late in 2019. The information available online from that event suggests that the narratives and policies that were subsequently adopted by governments, including in Australia, were decided at Event 201, outside of national democratic processes. During Covid, alternative voices were denied publicity, an approach that ██████████ herself had foreshadowed in her speech at Event 201.

### **3 – The Covid handling caused a loss of faith in government.**

The way the pandemic was handled should not be used for any future event. It helped foster a mistrust of government in many Australians. In order to ensure the public have faith in the actions of government, a genuinely open and democratic process, in keeping with the stated values of Australia, needs to be created for future events.

### **4 – Potted personal experience.**

At the start of 2020 I had just started a new job. However it was a bad fit, so I left and started some casual work. When the first lockdown happened I did not qualify for any Covid payments. After the first lockdown I was offered an ongoing position. The second lockdown came into effect before my start, and so I had no pay, and no Covid payments. I started work in February 2021. When the long lockdown of 2021 came into place I did qualify for some payments. However the payments ended with the vaccine mandates.

At this time I won a grant to create a pavement art project, in the City of ██████████. After the lockdowns, but during the mandates, there was no impediment to me busking, which had the same health risks as my project. However if I wished to draw down on the project's funds, I was required to have a vaccine certificate. According to the measures in place, uniquely among diseases, for covid-19 the risks depended upon whether or not I was earning money for an activity.

My ██████████ started school in 2020. Due to disruptions, he was unable to form relationships, and after about a year and a half it was decided that it was best for him if we schooled him at home. The measures in place prevented him from going to playgrounds, making the street the only available playground. The risks of playing in the street for a healthy child were enormously higher than those posed by Covid-19.

We live in a two bedroom flat, above a shop. At the start of the long lockdown of 2020 the shop below began a refit. We were locked into our flat, while extensive works took place below us. At times we were subjected to noise levels of 80+dB. Our water and electricity were disrupted, as was access to our property. We could not use the enforced free time to enjoy peace and quiet. This was not a fit environment for a child.

We were socially isolated, banned from working, prevented from receiving payments, and subject to enormous disruption within our own property, without the freedom to change matters, all as a direct consequences of government actions.

Thank you for any consideration you are able to give my personal submission to this inquiry.  
Yours sincerely

Mr. D. Miller-Stinchcombe