

Submission to the Covid-19 Response Inquiry - December 2023

(Note: this is the final version of earlier submissions sent on 15/12 & 16/12)

As a private citizen of Australia, it is my strongly held belief that the population was harmed *primarily* by both the Commonwealth and State governments' cooperative pandemic *response* rather than the pandemic itself, being a historic public health disaster. This response consisted of gross government overreach and malfeasance and was an unlawful attack on humanity itself - on the values of human dignity and freedom, which are fundamental to our so-called democratic society. Whilst able to be the biggest protector of human rights through legislation, it was governments' Covid-19 responses that perfectly illustrated the fact that government is also the institution with the greatest potential to threaten human rights. A full and independent Royal Commission that looks at *all* government pandemic responses would be more appropriate. I request that any Covid-19 inquiry is an honest, unbiased, and thorough investigation into *all* aspects of the pandemic.¹

This submission is a *personal* account of the government actions that had a significant impact on myself. Its focus will fall under two of the Covid-19 Response Inquiry's terms of reference - *Governance*, and *Key health response measures*.

I was harmed by the *mandatory vaccination policy* and its *associated propaganda campaign* directed at the public, which tore our society apart, and has had an ongoing psychological impact on myself. This detrimental effect on social cohesion is yet to be addressed or remedied.

Although the Commonwealth Government denied that vaccination was mandatory, then Prime Minister Morrison stating that "people make their own decisions about their own health and about their own bodies. That's why we don't have mandatory vaccination in relation to the general population", it effectively outsourced it to the states. The Commonwealth Government's involvement in a misleading and coercive vaccination campaign demonstrated its silent approval of the mandates. It also did not introduce any anti-discrimination legislation to counter the actions of the states regarding mandates, including action by our own Australian Human Rights Commission. Essentially, the Commonwealth and State governments worked collaboratively, with the National Cabinet composed of executive branches of both Commonwealth and State governments.

Disinformation and censorship by the Commonwealth Government

Our Commonwealth Government, and its associated bodies, was *captured* by corporate and political interests, instead of caring for the public's health. To achieve its seeming aim of mass vaccination it conducted dishonest media campaigns, as well as targeted censorship:

The public was not informed of the age-stratified relative risk of Covid-19

Firstly, the Government chose to execute a massive fear campaign by public officials. The public succumbed to this fear as they were not provided with information to be able to realistically assess their individual risk for serious disease or death – it was known *early* that those at greatest risk were the elderly and people with co-morbidities.

False claims about the safety and efficacy of the vaccine

The population was deceived regarding purported benefits of the Covid-19 vaccines - the vaccine *did not prevent infection nor transmission*. The vaccine trials themselves showed an *absolute* risk reduction of only 0.85% (rather than the promoted 95% *relative* risk reduction), and they did not test for transmission. The vaccinated and unvaccinated *equally* could transmit the virus if infected. Additionally, there was a lack of proper safety testing by the TGA, known potential safety risks were downplayed or dismissed, and the dogmatic claim of safety was simply not justified due to the lack of *long-term* safety data. This misleading public messaging by the Government violated valid *informed* consent, as the public was not provided with *full* information about the vaccines.

Withholding information and supply of cheap and effective alternative treatments

Nor was the public informed about well-known cheap, safe, and effective early treatment options that could have reduced fear levels, let alone many hospitalisations and deaths if doctors had been able to prescribe them. These drugs were, in fact, maligned, dismissed and banned, due to the prerequisite for the provisional

approval of the novel Covid-19 vaccines being that there must be '*no adequate approved and available alternative to the product*'. Advice to the public about ensuring adequate levels of Vitamin D and other nutraceuticals was also not offered.

Commonwealth Government censorship activities

Everything was done to protect the 'safe and effective' illusion. In addition to controlling the narrative on mainstream media, [Freedom of Information documents](#) revealed that the Commonwealth Government [colluded with big tech platforms to censor public discussion](#) regarding the vaccines if it went against this narrative, particularly regarding adverse effects of the vaccines. This censorship of even *true* information was once more a violation of valid *informed* consent and, ultimately, harmed the public.

Furthermore, Commonwealth Government/AHPRA directives to the medical profession to encourage vaccination meant that many doctors who had concerns that didn't align with the Government narrative were silenced out of fear of losing their licence to practice. Many viewpoints by qualified professionals were therefore never aired in an open public forum, thus creating a *manufactured* consensus. This lack of debate and discussion hindered the provision of the best health information and opportunity for the public to make *informed* individual health decisions, as well as rendering doctors unable to use their qualified medical judgement to advise and treat their patients. Those long-standing doctors who did question the so-called consensus were deliberately discredited in the media in order to reinforce the Government narrative.

Government manipulation and coercion

The Government media campaigns stating that vaccination was a tool to stop transmission and that, therefore, people must be vaccinated to protect others, was based on a lie.

The public succumbed to social pressure, wanting to be seen as 'doing the right thing' and fearing social ostracisation. In Victoria, the lengthy period of social lockdown was also a driver in the public getting vaccinated so that they could get out earlier, based on the underlying belief that they wouldn't transmit the virus if vaccinated.

The deception that the vaccines reduced transmission also *underpinned the reason for the mandates*. Many submitted due to these mandates so that they could participate in society and maintain their employment.

This manipulation and coercion violated voluntary (free) informed consent and was therefore a breach in medical ethics. Any discrimination against the unvaccinated is economic or social opportunity coercion, precluding the possibility of *valid* medical consent.

The absence of valid voluntary consent was a violation of many human rights laws by our governments, including the Nuremburg Code, in which both informed and freely given consent is central. The Code was established in response to [REDACTED], which therefore renders mandatory vaccination with the *experimental* Covid-19 vaccines even more egregious.¹

My workplace experiences

Employed as a qualified librarian, it was natural for me to want to inform myself about the new gene-based Covid-19 vaccines. As Australia began its vaccine rollout much later than other countries, I was able to observe the effect of vaccination on their populations. The evidence that the vaccines did not stop infection nor transmission was confirmed, in addition to worrying safety signals that normally would have advised our authorities to pause vaccination and investigate. As even more time elapsed, these safety concerns became justified. I, therefore, took a cautious position and elected not to receive a Covid-19 vaccination. Given the vaccines were still in an experimental phase and long-term effects could not be known, I believed this was the most logical and sensible decision to make.

Suddenly becoming marginalised in society and prohibited from my workplace of more than [REDACTED] years in [REDACTED] 2021, due to not taking a novel and experimental treatment that would *not* prevent infection *nor* transmission, and possibly result in short or long-term adverse health effects, turned my life on its head. It has been one of the most traumatic and inexplicable experiences of my life.²

All of my workplace experiences and their impact are echoed in a [study](#) of Covid-19 vaccine non-compliant Queensland health workers.

Psychological trauma

Government disinformation and manipulation of the public towards vaccination, in conjunction with the stigmatisation of the unvaccinated by politicians in the media, who characterised them as harmful and morally corrupt, fuelled societal division and consequential psychological harm. Broken and strained relationships, in families, friendships, workplaces, medical settings, and elsewhere, were suffered by enormous numbers of people, including myself. The resulting lack of understanding that exists about the choice of many people to decline the Covid-19 vaccine is testament to the powerful and effective nature of the propaganda that came from the Commonwealth and State governments. This social fracturing is yet to be healed, due to the absence of 'truth-telling' by governments.

Solutions

Truth-telling by political leaders

Psychologist, [Mattias Desmet](#), writes about the current perversion of political discourse, stating that, for Aristotle, the core of political virtue was the courage to speak the truth, or, in Greek, *Parrhesia*, which means bold speech. This is speech for which one may have to sacrifice their public reputation, but which is necessary for a healthy society. Words can be used in a manipulative way or as propaganda to convince others of something one doesn't believe in himself/herself. Desmet urges that we must switch to a political culture that is oriented towards truth rather than propaganda.³⁴

I must remain hopeful that some of our politicians will indeed show courage and speak truthfully and apologetically to the citizens they represent, in full awareness that only this will bring reconciliation between people, a healing to our country, and go some way towards regaining the public's trust in government and public institutions. This includes action towards rightful punishment to ensure such malfeasance is never repeated. However, I am no longer as naïve as I once was, and I do fear that truths regarding the pandemic may never be publicly declared due to the nature of the powers involved and the consequences faced by whistleblowers and truth-tellers.

Footnotes

¹ This should include, amongst other things:

- The origins of the Covid-19 virus and its links to gain of function research, including involvement of Australia.
- The nature of the Covid-19 vaccine procurement and the Government contracts with pharmaceutical companies, including high financial cost of the vaccines.
- Government provision of insulation from legal liability for these pharmaceutical companies.
- The fraudulent and secretive nature of some of the vaccine trials.
- The lack of due diligence in safety testing of the vaccines by the Therapeutic Goods Association (TGA), and its hiding of reported deaths.
- The impact of the TGA's strong ties to the pharmaceutical industry.
- Poor treatment of the vaccine injured and lack of honest and unbiased investigation into claimed safety of the Covid-19 vaccines.
- Whether in fact the Covid-19 mRNA vaccines were *not* subjected to the usual requirements for regulatory oversight *if* they were acquired and authorised through [mechanisms in the United States designed to rush medical countermeasures to the military during emergencies](#). This raises more questions that must be answered if this was the case.
- An examination of the post-pandemic ongoing excess death rate from non-Covid-19 related illnesses.

- The role of the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) in the silencing and persecution of qualified doctors.
- Government collusion with big tech companies to censor public discussion.
- Mandated masking and vaccination.
- The misrepresentation and banning of proven early treatment options.
- The validity and use of the Covid-19 PCR test.
- The use of lockdowns, when prior evidence showed they do little to stop transmission of a respiratory virus, and that they cause immense psychological and economic harm to society.
- The vast amount of government spending to counter lockdowns, that have now contributed greatly to inflation and the cost of living.

² Irrespective of whether the Covid-19 vaccine is as safe and effective as claimed, mandatory vaccination is a violation of basic human rights, based on every individual's fundamental right to bodily integrity, and has no place in a free and democratic society. Every individual has the right to assess their own health needs, weighing up whether vaccination represents a greater benefit than risk for the individual. It is unethical for a person to incur any vaccine risk or lose personal freedoms for the sake of somebody else.

³ The actions of my employer not only seemed unreasonable, but felt extremely hurtful and callous, as I was deemed a 'non-compliant' employee, having been a diligent and reliable employee, and respected among my colleagues.

I felt coerced by my employer to be vaccinated to avoid termination, and thus remain financially secure. I experienced an enormous level of stress in assessing my financial options and weighing up my decision.

I felt that I was not treated with dignity as an individual human being - no consideration was given to my individual health risk profile, nor respect for my individual decision about my own body. I felt powerless and in shock that my self-determination was suddenly taken away from me, and that this right was now being transferred to my employer and the State.

My senior manager did not offer any genuine compassion or understanding at the beginning of this process, nor contact me later to see how I was faring.

I decided to apply to use my annual and long service leave. However, this process was made as difficult as possible by my employer and approval was not guaranteed.

My employer continued with the mandate even though the State government revoked this for my area of work and other public venues in [REDACTED] 2022, so I was permitted to visit my workplace as a member of the public but not to work there. This felt highly discriminatory, illogical, and little to do with health.

My psychological stress endured for as long as the mandate continued, due to my future remaining uncertain. This situation also created immense distress for my family. Without their support, I would not have endured the experience, and the outcome may have even been fatal, as it was for some.

The fact that I had contracted Covid-19 (early in my period of leave) and, therefore, had durable reduction in severe disease from natural infection, was never taken into consideration. Only the vaccine was viewed as being protective.

I exhausted all of my annual leave and long service leave, and was only able to return to work in [REDACTED] on the basis of obtaining a vaccine exemption after a desperate plea to my GP. This was not previously offered by my GP. This exemption, granted by Commonwealth health authorities, was only temporary (6 months).

Despite the vaccine and boosters not preventing infection nor transmission amongst my colleagues, the vaccination mandate persists to this day (December 2023) at my workplace. I have, therefore, had to renew my original exemption twice (every 6 months), due to requests by my managers to ensure that my 'status' complied with my employer's requirements.

These conversations have caused me distress, and I have felt that there was very little understanding by my managers of their impact, nor of my experience of being prohibited from coming to work in 2021-2022. There has neither been any advocacy on my behalf from my managers with respect to my employer's unjustified policies, or any satisfactory responses to my concerns addressed to the staff responsible for my employer's Covid-19 policy.

⁴ However, even though during the Covid-19 pandemic, the government was the biggest source of disinformation, there are signs that the government is not interested in changing this but, rather, in continuing to silence truth and different viewpoints, as can be witnessed with its intent to bring in the *Communications Legislation Amendment (Combatting Misinformation and Disinformation) Bill 2023*. Therefore, this does not bode well for a transparent and truthful Covid-19 Response Inquiry, which may become yet another propaganda exercise.

⁵ Further, as there is no indication that the Commonwealth Government intends to oppose the World Health Organisation's (WHO) International Health Regulations (IHR) amendments, this questions the current Inquiry's legitimacy in relation to having any authority over Australia's health policy. These IHR amendments would significantly expand the WHO's power to declare and manage public health emergencies on a global scale, thus having serious ramifications for our national sovereignty and citizens' rights.